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This research addressed the problem of whether a relationship exists between a particular level of ego development and guilt engendered by a rigid conscience based upon orthodox Christian beliefs. It was anticipated that forty-five graduate students at a conservative midwestern seminary who experienced higher levels of guilt and demonstrated a more rigid conscience/superego would score at the Conscientious stage of ego development measured by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test. Guilt and rigidity of conscience were measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

Object relations theories of the origins of guilt were examined along with the relationship between object relations development processes and ego development processes. It was suggested that early object relations problems are recapitulated at later ego development stages. In particular, it was expected that the Conscientious stage of ego development would recapitulate early object relations difficulties in ways that lead to increased vulnerability to excessive guilt. It was also suggested that certain characteristics of orthodox Christian faith contribute to heightened vulnerability at that stage. Developmentally oriented treatment implications based upon object relations theories were described.
No significant differences in the experience of guilt measured by 16PF Factor O were found between ego development levels measured by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test. Mean scores of seminary students on 16PF Factors G (moral standards), O (guilt), Q3 (compulsivity), and Qv (strictness of conscience) did not differ meaningfully from general population norms. However, significantly elevated levels of compulsivity measured by 16PF Factor Q3 and of strictness of conscience measured by 16PF Factor Qv were found at the Conscientious level of ego development. It was suggested that compulsivity serves as a defense against the experience of guilt and that Christian moral standards contribute to that compulsivity.

Ego development scores for the sample population were limited to a range of three levels. It was suggested that further studies using a wider range of scores from a more demographically diverse population are needed to unambiguously clarify differences or similarities in the experience of guilt across levels of ego development.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From the time of Freud's *Totem and Taboo* (1913/1950) religion has been associated with the development of a rigid conscience and related problems of guilt. Although orthodox Christianity has been regularly criticized for its role in the creation of guilt, remarkably little has been written from that perspective. Narramore (1984) found that his *No Condemnation* and Tournier's (1962) *Guilt and Grace*, both largely theoretical and anecdotal works, were the only substantive treatments of guilt from a Christian psychological viewpoint. Yet, Meehl (1958) wrote, "he who does not come to terms with such theoretical problems as determinism, guilt, original sin, materialist monism, conscience, and conversion cannot even begin to work out a cognitive rapprochement between Christian theology and the secular sciences of behavior" (p. 5). There appears to be a distinct need for empirical study of the relationship between conscience, guilt, and conservative Christian faith. The ego development literature provides a promising framework for investigating that relationship.

Traditionally, guilt has been viewed as a manifestation of an unconscious conflict between natural drives or impulses and an overly strict superego (DeWald, 1971, pp. 22-33). Treatment of those disturbed by guilt is directed at exposing the conflict and modifying the defense mechanisms which maintain it. It is anticipated that psychopathogenic patterns of historical experience (e.g., parenting...
patterns, peer relationships, religious training) which have contributed to the development of superego rigidity will be revealed in the process of psychotherapy. Such insight into the unrealistic and maladaptive nature of superego demands, together with the maturing of the adaptive ego functions, tempers the experience of guilt. Thus, the conflict between impulse and control, along with defense mechanisms which disguise and maintain it, is diminished. As a consequence, manifest guilt should also diminish.

An ego development perspective, in contrast to classical psychoanalytic theory, presents an alternate view of the origins and treatment of guilt. From this perspective guilt may be considered a natural result of the human development process. That process moves through a sequence of patterns and stages in which tensions between self and other and between intrapsychic drives, impulses, wishes, or desires and a developing superego are experienced in different ways at different times. All of that is part of the process of developing a sense of self and self-other behavior patterns which are appropriate for living. Guilt may be understood developmentally as a product of gradually learning how to relate to self and others and of failing to do so appropriately and suffering the consequences. Such tensions between self and other are often naturally resolved as developmental processes carry a person to new levels of ego integration (Loevinger, 1976a, p. 410). At times, however, the developmental process may be slowed or arrested at some stage. Consequently, the tensions of that level may be manifested in characteristic symptoms peculiar to the self and self-other issues of that stage for an extended time.
If it can be shown, as ego development theory suggests, that a rigid conscience accompanied by guilt is especially associated with a particular developmental stage, then psychological treatment would involve understanding the issues of that stage and assisting clients along the developmental path to higher levels of ego integration. A developmental approach stands in contrast to the theory and practice of the traditional approach of understanding and tempering pathological defense mechanisms. The focus of a developmentally oriented psychotherapy would be more upon fostering ego development and less upon exposing and modifying pathological ego defenses (Ivey, 1986; Kegan, 1982; Loevinger, 1976a). Gross (1981) summarized the developmental perspective:

Developmental therapists are particularly aware of the psychological aspects of development (cognitive and affective), but they are aware that these aspects depend upon and are influenced by 1) organic growth and maturation, 2) exercise of one's physiological and psychological systems and the experience acquired thereby, 3) social transmission and the interactions and the press of life tasks which this includes, and 4) the process of equilibrium or self-regulation in response to external disturbances. Thus, developmental therapists see their clients as persons who, against the background of biological growth, life-task pressure, social interactions, and past and present experiences seek to bring harmony to their lives by the development of adequate cognitive, affective, and behavioral schemes. They understand that it is in the recognition of the characteristics of these schemes or patterns of thought, affectivity, and behavior that one may assess aspects of growth. For an accurate analysis of their clients' cognitive, affective, and behavioral schemes, developmental therapists look to the explication of the stages of development presented by [various] theorists. (p. 58)
Problem

The problem which this research addressed was that of determining if a relationship exists between a particular level of ego development and guilt engendered by a rigid conscience based upon orthodox Christian beliefs.

Loewinger's Theory of Ego Development

Loewinger (1976a, 1976b; Loewinger & Wessler, 1970) provided a theoretical overview of the ego development and conscience development literature which described the interaction of ego and conscience development in the production of guilt. In Ego Development (1976a) Loewinger undertook a comprehensive review of the work of developmental theorists which she integrated into a ten stage/level pattern of ego development. She viewed these stages as sequential but without clear age parameters:

The question most often asked—What age does each stage correspond to?—I shall not answer. For one thing, there are two different answers, since the average stage for a given age is not the same as the average age for a given stage. More importantly, to describe the progress of average children would be to slip back into a classical child psychology study of socialization. That would defeat the purpose of this book. In principle, I seek to describe every stage in a way that applies to a wide range of ages (granted, of course, that the earliest stages are rare after childhood and that the highest stages are impossible in childhood and rare even in adolescence). What I seek to describe is what persons of each stage have in common, whatever their age. This attempt requires excluding age-specific contingencies (such as, "This behavior pattern indicates Stage X if the subject is a small child, but not if he is over fifteen"). (pp. 13,14)
The first stage, which Loevinger called the Presocial, corresponds to earliest infancy. At that point, she said, the infant "cannot be said to have an ego" (1976a, p. 15). The child experiences an undifferentiated awareness of self and surroundings; he or she simply exists. If the infant were to remain at this level indefinitely, he or she would be autistic.

Normal infants rather quickly move to a Symbiotic stage characterized by the elementary experience of self-other differentiation. This differentiation occurs, however, in a context of nearly complete dependence upon caretakers. Mother and infant are separating, but the child's existence is intricately intertwined with that of the mother.

From there children move to an Impulsive stage in which they are not only aware of a self-other distinction but also begin to actively assert their independence. They are primarily concerned with themselves and impulse gratification and tend to communicate with the "emphatic 'No!' and the later 'Do it by self'" (Loevinger, 1976a, p. 16). Prototypical self-other differentiation has now normally occurred.

As children begin to assert their sense of self/autonomy in a move toward independence, they also become aware of their vulnerability to the adverse reactions of others (e.g., punishment or rejection). In normal development, they will move to guard against that vulnerability—thus the Self-Protective (originally Opportunistic) label of the next stage. Here children are concerned with structuring the environment in ways that are non-threatening and
yield maximum gratification. The emphasis is on rules and controls that limit threat and protect self. Said Loevinger (1976a, p. 17), "An older child or adult who remains here may become opportunistic, deceptive, and preoccupied with control and advantage in his relations with other people. For such a person, life is a zero-sum game; what one person gains, someone else has to lose."

In her description of the next stage, the Conformist, Loevinger (1976a) wrote, "A momentous step is taken when the child starts to identify his own welfare with that of the group, usually his family for the small child and the peer group for an older child" (p. 17). At this level children are primarily concerned with acceptance, affirmation, and approval by the group. Norms, values, and rules are adopted and valued because they are those of the group. Issues of autonomy are secondary to group life and membership. Loevinger (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) held that the Conformist stage is the highest reached by a large minority of people.

For those who advance, the next step is the Self-Aware level which "is probably the modal level for adults in our society" (Loevinger, 1976a, p. 19). This is viewed as a transitional level between the Conformist stage and the Conscientious stage. Loevinger (1976a) wrote that "Two salient differences from the Conformist Stage are an increase in self-awareness and the appreciation of multiple possibilities in situations" (p. 19). There is, then, both an increasing focus on inner life and a growing awareness of the complexity of life and morality.
As persons move into the Conscientious stage this awareness grows into a more intense experience of the ambivalence of the self-other conflict. There are vestiges of the need to respond to others from the Conformist stage, but there is also the need to allow the self to develop fully. There is "mutuality in interpersonal relations...characteristic conceptual complexity...a rich and differentiated inner life [with] a variety of cognitively shaded emotions" (Loevinger, 1976a, pp. 20-23). Persons at the Conscientious stage are beginning to consider the probabilities and possibilities of life. They continue to struggle to embrace both internal (subjective) and external (objective) reality, but in new terms. They struggle with the tension between self and other, impulse and restraint, autonomy and dependence.

Conscientious stage conflicts begin to find resolution in the next transitional level, the Individualistic. Here, people are experiencing a "heightened sense of individuality and a concern for emotional dependence" (Loevinger, 1976a, p. 22). People at this level become more clearly aware of the need for integration of autonomy and dependency needs. They are moving toward a position in which they can live and care for themselves while maintaining a healthy dependence upon others; that is, one characterized by love, appreciation, or respect, not by exaggerated neediness. The self-other balance, however, is tipped toward the self.

In the Autonomous stage people develop "the capacity to acknowledge and to cope with inner conflict...the person recognizes other people's need for autonomy...there is some freeing of the person from
oppressive demands of conscience in the preceding [Conscientious] stage" (Loevinger, 1976a, p. 23). There is, then, an appreciation of the autonomy of both self and other integrated into a sense of interdependence. Loevinger believed that only a small minority of the population reaches this stage.

Loevinger's last level, which she believed fewer than one percent of the population reaches (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), is the Integrated stage. She likened those at this level to Maslow's Self-Actualizing Person who has resolved some of the remaining problems implicit in the interdependent tension of the Autonomous stage into a well-integrated sense of self which can engage fully and meaningfully in the process of living.

**Superego Development**

Loevinger's (1976b) review and integration of the superego development literature, "Origins of Conscience," illustrated the relationship between the stages of conscience development and ego development. From the interaction of those two threads of development come indications that guilt may be an anticipated characteristic of those at the Conscientious stage of ego development.

Loevinger conceptualized five stages of superego development: (1) Narcissism, (2) Aggression, (3) Mastery, (4) Parental Standards, and (5) Mutual Love. Her formulation suggested that conscience originates in the Narcissism of the Presocial stage. She held with classical psychodynamic theorists that the narcissistic sense of self which develops at this earliest stage of separation/individuation
includes the ego-ideal or idealized image of the self which will form the prototypical standards to which the ego must later conform. This is the first superego "content."

The second stage of superego development is Aggression. It develops in the context of the Impulsive level of ego development. Here, children begin to impulsively assert themselves and their desire to have their wishes and needs fulfilled. Caretakers are not, however, likely to respond to every wish. They are, in fact, natural sources of refusals and frustration. Children are seen as responding in anger toward parents but as experiencing conflict because they remain dependent upon the parents. They may feel that they cannot be angry at those upon whom they are still dependent and, consequently, turn their aggressive feelings toward themselves. Therein lies the potential for development of a pathologically compliant false self. "I hate you for not giving me what my impulses desire" is translated into "I am bad for wanting that and deserve to be punished." It is in fact this very transformation that eventually ends the impulsive behavior and brings about transition to the Self-protective stage of ego development. By the end of the Impulsive stage, then, children have in place both a sense of an ideal self and an anxious, self-critical "aggression turned inward" sense of "badness" when some impulses are acted upon.

A need for control over one's environment is characteristic of the Self-protective stage of ego development and the associated stage of superego development, labeled Mastery by Loevinger. If one is to master the impulses that gave rise to parental refusal in the
Impulsive stage, one must develop self-control in the service of meeting parental expectations. Thus develops that aspect of conscience which exercises mastery over impulse so as to avoid anticipated parental refusal, rejection, or punishment. Mastery, then, operates not from a moral sense of right and wrong but from the anxious sense of threat which arises when one does not exercise the superficial conformity and self-control necessary to satisfy perceived parental demands and expectations.

The adoption or introjection of Parental Standards (and the standards of other significant groups, especially peers) constitutes the fourth stage of superego development. The work of this stage occurs during the Conformist stage of ego development. It is here that one's conscious awareness is most preoccupied with the standards of others. It is also at this stage that those standards are internalized as a part of unconscious dynamic patterns. Shame or guilt may result when such external standards are violated.

The fifth stage of superego development is associated with the Conscientious stage of ego development and is characterized by the incorporation of Mutual Love and respect into the conscience. There develops a "toleration of individual differences and devotion to disinterested justice that mark the highest estate of conscience" (Loewinger, 1976a, p. 409). No longer is the concern "what have I done to violate someone else's standards or my own ego ideal?" Rather, there is a move away from such a black and white perspective to a search for justice in an ambiguous world. The pursuit of this understanding coupled with a growing ability to live with unresolved
ambiguity are important hallmarks of the transition into the Autonomous and Integrated stages of development.

Considering the interaction of ego development and superego development, Loevinger (1976a, p. 23) suggested that it is in the Conscientious stage of ego development with its "excessive moralism and responsibility for self and others" that people are consciously aware of the most "oppressive demands of conscience." Vestiges of unresolved issues from each stage of conscience development may contribute to those demands. Rules are internalized but "exceptions and contingencies are recognized" (1976a, p. 23). There is a sense of ambiguity about right and wrong coupled with a yearning for the clear-cut answers of earlier stages. There is the ambivalent conflict between dependency needs (obligation to others) and autonomy needs (obligation to self). And there is an inner awareness and a self-reflective capacity which cause people to more intensely experience the anxiety created by the subtle interplay of these various factors.

The emerging ambiguity, inner conflict, and anxiety implied by such growing awareness is not yet recognized as normal or understandable and may be experienced as guilt. Attempts to reduce anxiety and guilt through a rather compulsive imposition of the structure of earlier stages of ego and superego development are doomed to failure, serving only to intensify the anxiety and guilt. Said Loevinger (1966):

Morality has been internalized. Inner moral imperatives take precedence over group-sanctioned rules. The sanction for transgression is guilt. Interpersonal relations are seen in terms of feelings and traits rather than actions; they become more vivid, intensive, and meaningful than in
earlier periods. Conscious preoccupation is with obligations, ideals, traits, and achievement as measured by inner standards rather than by recognition alone.... Capacity for self-criticism characterizes this stage, its absence the conformist stage.... Conformists as a group tend to see themselves in socially acceptable terms, though they may also report accurately specific symptoms; conscientious persons, or at least some of them, tend to view themselves hypercritically. (p. 199)

Christian Faith and Conscience

The common association of excessive guilt with Christian faith suggests that Christian belief systems may contribute unique elements to underlying processes of ego and superego development. Faber addressed this issue (1972/1975) by suggesting that the "faith religions" (in which he included Islam, Judaism, and Christianity) introduce conflicts associated with issues of interdependent relationships, ethical living, and ambiguity in life which may be troublesome at certain points in the developmental process. With respect to Loevinger's formulation of ego development, those issues would be expected to become most prominent during the Conscientious stage.

Specifically, within Christianity, there is an emphasis on mutuality in relationships (with both God and fellow humans) which calls forth and perhaps intensifies the self-other conflicts of the Conscientious/Mutual Love stages of ego/superego development defined by Loevinger. There is an emphasis on ethical living guided by seemingly "black and white" rules of morality which may not correspond with the "grayness" of life. This conflict is the same as that faced by the Conscientious person seeking to maintain rules in the
face of an emerging awareness of the complexity of life. Further, there appears to be a certain amount of ambiguity and paradox in Christian scripture and theology; many unresolved issues and questions exist. Such ambiguity elicits in the Conscientious stage person the tension between the need for order implied in earlier developmental stages and the later stage need to embrace life and its uncertainties. Those issues presented by a Christian belief system, then, would be expected to interact with ego and superego development in ways that may be significantly troubling for conscience as it exists in the Conscientious stage of ego development.

In summary, it appears that ego development, conscience development, and traditional Christian faith may interact to produce distressing guilt for persons at the Conscientious stage of ego development. That guilt can be viewed as an expected consequence of the human development process. Consequently, psychotherapeutic techniques which serve to further the developmental process may be more appropriate than those traditional techniques which seek to dismantle or modify defense mechanisms. It should be noted that Hauser (1976), in a critical review of Loevinger's model of ego development, called for empirical investigation of such predicted affective components of the various stages of ego development.

Research Hypothesis

For a group of subjects who hold orthodox Christian beliefs, those who experience higher levels of guilt (measured by Factor 0 on the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire) and demonstrate a
stricter, more rigid conscience (measured by Factor Qv on the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire) will score at the Conscientious stage of ego development (measured by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test).

Definitions

Orthodox Christian Beliefs: Used synonymously with "conservative" and "evangelical" Christian beliefs to denote specific theological propositions including (a) divine inspiration and authority of the original Biblical documents, (b) the dual humanity and divinity of Jesus Christ, (c) a triune Godhead, (d) original sin through the Fall of Humanity, and (e) redemption from original and actual sin through Jesus Christ's atonement.

Guilt: An emotional experience of self-punishment and condemnation characterized by anger at the self in reaction to fear of anticipated punishment or rejection by significant others or their internalized representations.

Conscience: An internal set of standards designed to guide behavior so as to avoid actual or potential punishment or rejection by significant others or their internalized representations.

Ego Development: A sequential process of cognitive and emotional growth and change by which a sense of the self (including characteristic cognitive, affective, and behavioral patterns), perception of others, and ways of interacting with the environment is acquired.
On March 6, 1691, at Whitehall before the Queen, Bishop John Moore of Norwich preached a sermon on "religious melancholy" in which he made reference to persons plagued by guilt feelings or "dread of those punishments which he hath threatened to inflict on unrelenting sinners" despite "their...sincere love of God"; these same people experience a "flatness in their minds...which makes them fear, that what they do, is so defective and unfit to be presented unto God, that he will not accept it"; they are overwhelmed by "naughty, and sometimes Blasphemous Thoughts" which "start in their Minds, while they are exercised in the Worship of God" despite "all their endeavours to stifle and suppress them." Unfortunately, these thoughts are anything but easy to overcome, as "the more they struggle with them, the more they encrease"; furthermore, "they are mostly good People...for bad men...rarely know any thing of these kind of Thoughts." For the treatment of such a condition he suggested "gentle Application of such comfortable things as restore the strength, and recruit the languishing Spirits that must quash and disperse these disorderly tumults," and finally he advised "not to quit your Imployment...For no business at all is as bad as too much; and there is always more Melancholy to be found in Cloyster, than in the Market-place." (Mora, 1969, p. 163)

Little systematic progress was made in the understanding and treatment of excessive guilt until Freud (1923/1962) proposed the conflict theory of neurosis. He traced the development of guilt to the Oedipal origins of the superego which occurred between the ages of four and six. It was his belief (cited in Greenberg and Mitchell, 1983) that incestuous wishes toward the mother cause boys to deny those wishes and identify with the father in order to avoid competition with and severe punishment by the father. Girls develop incestuous wishes toward the father because of "penis envy" and later
must repress those wishes out of fear of losing the mother's love, actual frustration of desires by the father, or fear of injury should the wishes be fulfilled. In either case, introjection of same sex parental standards serves to lessen the fear of punishment by that parent for the Oedipal desires.

Those introjected standards comprise a two part superego. The first part, the Ego Ideal, is a positive emulation of parental standards. The second part, never formally named by Freud (Narramore, 1984) but often inaccurately identified by others as "the superego," consists of a fearful, compliant acquiescence to parental expectations motivated by the wish to avoid punishment. In Freud's usage, the superego was never entirely negative nor distinguished from a positive Ego Ideal. Rather, the Ego Ideal and the unnamed negative component were each viewed as elements of the superego. It is, however, the later negative component which arouses anxiety in the form of guilt whenever the ego entertains impulses or wishes that are in conflict with introjected superego standards.

Object Relations Theories

Klein (1932/1975) proposed a much earlier (age four to six months) origin of guilt. She believed that frustration aroused by the naturally unsatisfying infant feeding process provokes an angry response in the infant. Anxiety over the anger and its potential for driving away the needed object (mother) causes an object-splitting process to take place which allows the infant to maintain the image of the mother as a "good" and non-threatening object. The mother (or
her breast in Klein's terminology) is split into good and bad "part-
objects." Infants crave the good part-object and fear the bad.
Through a process of introjection the part-objects become internalized mental representations. Infants may identify with a part-object (that is, define the self in terms of the object) or project it onto external objects (persons). When the identification is with the bad part-object and the good part-object is projected onto others, a guilty sadistic ego results. The guilt might be captured by a statement that "you are all good and provide me with that which I need; therefore, I must be good in order to avoid the loss of what you can offer me. I must be angry at and correct the badness in me which may drive you away."

In contrast, when the good part-object is introjected and the bad object is projected onto the environment, self is viewed as omnipotent and invulnerable. Guilt serves to reinforce the invulnerability in the face of surrounding bad objects. It operates as a signal that "badness" may exist in the self. Such imperfection would render one vulnerable to internalized bad-objects, but guilt serves as a stimulus to correct the perceived imperfection of the self in order that the illusion of goodness and invulnerability of the self may be maintained.

In Klein's view, then, guilt is a way of making oneself conform to introjected part-object standards in order to avoid loss of needed or wished-for relationships or to maintain a positive self representation. The process is not necessarily carried on with any basis in external reality but on the level of the relationships which are
imagined to exist between the **internal** representations of external objects. Those representations become the filters through which the external world is perceived and imagined to be.

Two theoretical strands are apparent in Klein's views. The first is that of the infant as helpless and living in fear of losing the love and care of the needed and desired-for good maternal object. The second is that of the infant as omnipotent center-of-the-universe whose needs and wishes become demands which must be met and who fears the behavior of the bad maternal object. Fairbairn (1952) and Guntrip (1957, 1961, 1969, 1973) have expanded the first theme into a theory of the relationship of guilt to dependency.

**Guilt Rooted in Dependency**

Fairbairn and Guntrip suggested that children develop a conscious sense of self, labeled the Central Ego (see Figure 1), through an obedient relationship with parental caretakers who are viewed as Ideal Objects. The Ideal Objects are essentially conscious idealizations of the real parents. On an unconscious level, however, children internalize parental representations. The "pristine," whole ego with which children are born becomes divided into separate components. It is suggested that parents, in particular the mother, present to infants and young children opportunities for gratification of physical and emotional needs. Those tantalizing possibilities cause children to internalize a representation of the mother as an Exciting Object. The desires that children experience for attachment to the mother as giver of love and care coalesce into a sense of self
labeled the Libidinal (or needing) Ego. This represents the "needy child craving love" (Guntrip, 1957, p. 81).

Parents, however, are not uniform providers of love and care; they refuse and frustrate libidinal (i.e., needy, object-seeking) desires. They also come to be internally represented as Rejecting Objects, in Fairbairn's terms. That causes a corresponding internal self-representation in children of an Anti-libidinal ego or Internal Saboteur, a part of the self which "has turned against his own needs out of fear of parental disapproval, and sabotages all his active, spontaneous, creative self-expression" (Guntrip, 1957, p. 81). In order to elicit and maintain parental love and care, then, children sabotage (through the Anti-libidinal Ego) the spontaneous wishes, needs, and expression of the Libidinal Ego. It is an attempt to assuage the perceived anger of the Rejecting Object over such desires in order to turn it into an Exciting (need-meeting) Object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscious</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ideal Object</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ego</td>
<td>(i.e. conscious idealization of real parents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unconscious Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libidinal Ego needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-libidinal Ego (Internal Saboteur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fears</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Object Representations.
Fairbairn and Guntrip referred to this as an "object cleansing" process.

The identification of the child with the Rejecting Object constitutes the first experience of guilt. It is a "pre-moral" (Fairbairn, 1952; Guntrip, 1961) rejection of the self. To this is later added (in the course of child rearing) an educative and disciplinarian ("moral") aspect for which acceptance is contingent upon good behavior. Fairbairn and Guntrip suggested that it is the early Rejecting Object together with the additional, later moral parent object which is internalized as the superego or conscience. It is important to note that they viewed the "pre-moral" object relationships as the basic source of anxiety and guilt. The later "moral" aspects of the conscience present conflicts—cast in terms of values—which produce guilt because of the underlying, unconscious (pre-moral) object relations conflicts they arouse.

On an unconscious level, then, children go through a process of object splitting and consequent ego splitting which leaves them vulnerable to a good deal of internal conflict. The Libidinal Ego desires the Exciting Object but is frustrated by the Anti-libidinal Ego in its attempts to please the Rejecting Object (and the later moral parent) in order to maintain parental care and love. Guilt is the experience of the anger of the internalized Anti-libidinal Ego at the Libidinal Ego over the fear of driving away the needed providers of love and care (the Exciting Objects) or eliciting the punishment of the Rejecting Object. As Guntrip (1957, p. 62) wrote, "guilty feelings are all reactions to...frustrated love needs."
Like Klein, Fairbairn and Guntrip emphasized that these conflicts are not conscious or realistic but spring from internal, unconscious dynamics. Guntrip (1957, p. 83) wrote, "our major problems are caused by our unshakable primary emotional loyalties. Deep down we never desert entirely those who gave us birth and brought us up."

In contrast to Freud, Fairbairn and Guntrip viewed guilt as arising not from ego in conflict with superego but from the split parts of the ego in conflict with each other (Libidinal versus Anti-libidinal Ego). Ausubel (1952) also suggested that conscience is an ego function which makes the concept of superego irrelevant.

Taken together, these authors implied that conscience is comprised of an Ego Ideal which contains standards which the Anti-libidinal Ego deems necessary to avoid parental rejection or punishment. It is not parental standards, per se, that are internalized but any behavior which the Anti-libidinal Ego learns can prevent Exciting Objects from becoming Rejecting objects. Presumably, such behavior would include internalized parental standards. The insidious nature of guilt, however, derives not from strict allegiance to realistic standards but from the propensity of the unconscious objects to create elaborate systems of standards which may have no basis in reality. Consequently, parents who present ambiguous standards may actually produce more guilt than those with clearly defined standards. The issue is not the presence of standards (except to the extent that they result in failure, rejection, or
punishment) but the inevitable inconsistency of love in an imperfect world.

Guilt is experienced, then, at the conscious level (by the Central Ego) as violation of an obedient relationship with parental caretakers. The more basic conflict, however, is between unconscious desires of the Libidinal Ego and the self-punitive demands of the Anti-libidinal Object. Those standards are projected upon the environment and take on the appearance of reality.

Winnicott (1975; cited in Davis & Wallbridge, 1981) also viewed guilt as developing from the "capacity for concern" over the loss of love. As such, he emphasized its healthy socializing influence in motivating attempts to repair real or fantasied relationship (mothering) problems. The healthy reparative process leads to responsible behavior. In contrast, parenting which fails to promote the capacity for concern may lead either to a defensive anti-social response or to the development of a compliant, False Self. In the latter case, parents who fail to provide a secure "holding environment" in which children experience the "capacity to be alone" in an "unintegrated" state of experiencing self and environment may cause children to retreat into a False Self as a defense against a conflict between True Self impulses and parental impingement upon those impulses. In the face of intrusive or otherwise not-good-enough parenting, they learn to comply. That is, because of parental impingement, there is no development of a capacity to live with unintegrated ambiguity; rather there is compulsive conformity to standards which Winnicott labels "false morality." True morality, in contrast, is defined as
the integrity of the True Self; one lives according to genuine inner experience and in genuine reciprocal relationships with others.

Guilt Rooted in Narcissism

Kohut (1978) and Kernberg (1975) echoed Klein's formulations of the narcissistic origins of guilt. Kohut proposed that children develop healthy self-esteem through a parental "mirroring" process which involves the display of attention, appreciation, and affection. This recalls Winnicott's (1971) notion that good-enough-mothers mirror the whole child, thereby minimizing the need for object splitting defenses. When that process goes well, children experience a "transmuting internalization" of idealized parental objects which forms the core of a healthy ego.

However, when the mirroring involves psychological overholding, there is an internalization of "idealized selfobjects" which forms a narcissistic, grandiose sense of self in a move toward invulnerability in the face of environmental threat. That is, the selfobjects are not integrated into a healthy ego but serve as grandiose substitutes for the true self which are cast in the image of idealized parents (superego). There is no true development of an adequate and independent sense of self.

Masochistic guilt arises when the narcissistic invulnerability of the selfobject (i.e., the internalized representation of idealized parents as self) is threatened. The failing self-representation is buttressed by a guilty statement that "I am a very good person; the evidence that I am so good is that I punish myself for failure."
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Kohut's Guilty Man is threatened by anxiety over loss of self-esteem and reacts by a masochistic attack on the self which paradoxically serves as a demonstration of the goodness of the self and a repudiation of the needed objects.

Kernberg (1975) integrated the narcissism and dependency themes into a view of narcissism as "splendid isolation" in defense against intense dependency needs which, it is feared, can never be met. The narcissistic self-representation serves as a denial of neediness and a repudiation of object relatedness. Guilt is equated with anxiety over the potential failure of the narcissistic defense which would expose the underlying dependency. To be "good" is to be grandiose and invulnerable; to be "bad" is to experience the conflict of needing those who punish because of the "badness." Kernberg (1975, p. 215) wrote, "in severe cases internal fantasies determined by superego pressures are that because of their badness they have destroyed their inner objects and are therefore left alone in a world now devoid of love."

Narramore (1984) attempted to integrate the dependency and narcissism themes of guilt dynamics within the context of Christian theology. He believed that the Fall of Humanity created a potential for distorted God, self, and other object representations through the acquisition of the "knowledge of good and evil." He quoted theologian Bonhoeffer:

Conscience is concerned not with man's relations to God and to other men but with man's relation to himself. [Conscience] derives the relation to God and to men from the relation of man to himself. Conscience pretends to be the voice of God and the standard for the relation to other
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men.... Bearing within himself the knowledge of good and evil, man has become judge over God and men, just as he is judge over himself (1965, pp. 24-25).... Before the fall there was no conscience. Man has only been divided in himself since his division from the Creator. And indeed it is the function of the conscience to put man to flight from God.... Conscience drives man from God into a secure hiding place. Here, distant from god, man plays the judge himself and just by this means he escapes God's judgment.... Conscience is not the voice of God to sinful man; it is man's defense against it (1959, p. 81).

According to Narramore, awareness of the introduction of evil into the environment created the potential for basic anxiety over unmet wishes and for the associated splitting and narcissistic defense processes. There is concomitant guilt over anger at not having wishes fulfilled by needed objects. That guilt evolves into a conscience designed to forestall rejection and assure wish fulfillment. Parental and religious values expand the conscience which may become a repository for distorted standards because of idealization and projection. Perceived failure to meet the distorted standards leads to self-punitive guilt in an attempt to atone for failure and maintain good object relationships.

Amato (1982), Belgrum (1985), Kaufman (1985), and Piers and Singer (1971) emphasized the punitive aspect of guilt. They suggested that guilt differs from other reactions to fear about potential loss of love (such as shame) in its emphasis on punishment. They note that guilt usually carries with it a sense of violation of moral standards (whether internalized parental standards or projections of the Anti-libidinal Ego) which requires punishment. The punitive response may take one of two forms: (1) it may be a self-condemning fear of active parent-object punishment or passive denial of care and
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love (dependency theme) or (2) it may be a demonstration of the goodness of the self through masochistic responses (narcissism theme).

The notion of the punitive aspect of guilt is useful in understanding the relationship of guilt to depression. Depression according to Arieti and Bemporad (1978) and Masterson (1976) arises from fears of abandonment, of being left alone without the love and care of the needed object. Depression implies a helplessness (Seligman, 1979) in the face of this actual or feared loss. Guilt may be seen as an attempt to repair and restore the relationship through self-punishment. In that sense, the guilty person may actually demonstrate a more developed sense of self than the severely depressed person. The guilty person at least retains some hope for repair of the relationship through the absolution of self-punitive guilt or the motivation to good behavior it provides; the depressed person helplessly suffers the absence of relationship. In Guntripian terms, depression would represent a defense against the fear of losing the "Exciting Object" while guilt would represent a defense against the fear of arousing the "Rejecting Object."

A study by Dauber (1981) supported the notion that guilt is an intermediate position between dependency-based depression and healthy autonomy. He found that guilt contributed to depression by "precluding the attainment of autonomy." Guilt is an attempt to repair needed object relationships, but it is an inappropriate attempt. When its dynamics fail to bring resolution in those relationships for an extended period, helpless depression may result.
Guilt as Developmental Arrest Versus Intrapsychic Conflict


Slipp (1984), and Stolorow and Lachmann (1980) attempted to reconcile these positions. They suggested that earlier problems with developmental arrest (characterological problems) are not actually a different class of problems from later intrapsychic conflict (neurotic) problems. Rather, they proposed, early developmental problems become "pre-stages" for later problems of intrapsychic conflict. That is, early child-rearing patterns and separation-individuation problems determine the nature and pattern of later neurotic conflicts. Kegan (1982) described this as a subject-object (self-other) balancing process in which later tensions and balances recapitulate unresolved issues from earlier attempts at balance.

This notion corresponds to Winnicott's (1975) and Horney's (1939) view that developmental problems give rise to a False Self (Winnicott) or Idealized Image of the self (Horney). Later (neurotic) problems can be viewed as conflicts between the False Self and the Real Self or the False Self and realistic demands and pressures.
from the environment. Neurotic conflicts are not a different class of conflicts from characterological problems, then, but represent the reawakening of earlier, unresolved developmental issues which become cast as conflict/defense problems as the False Self tries to deny or impose defensive solutions upon problems. Appropriate object relating patterns are not within the repertoire of the individual, so defensive patterns are the only way to deal with the intrapsychic conflicts which actually have their origin in unfinished developmental tasks.

Problems do not exist, then, in different "classes" (characterological or neurotic) but along a continuum from characterological to neurotic. The earlier and more severe the developmental problems, the more the symptoms will appear characterological. The later and less severe the developmental problems, the more the symptoms will appear neurotic. The symptoms in either case result from earlier unresolved separation-individuation problems, but the nature and severity of the symptoms depends upon the severity and chronology of the underlying developmental problems. In the words of Horner (1984, pp. 168-169), "Later stages of hierarchical development are...assimilated into and transformed by earlier ones."

This would suggest that the symptoms which ego development authors such as Loevinger (1976a) and Kegan (1982) described as characteristic of various stages of development may be considered to be intrapsychic conflicts aroused by a normal developmental process which awakens earlier unresolved primary object representation problems. Ego development processes proceed rather smoothly from one
stage or era to the next when there are minimal early object relations problems and early conflicts were relatively well resolved. When later developmental problems occur, there is a recapitulation of earlier, unresolved object relations problems which gives indications of what those problems may have been.

Loevinger's formulation of conscience development as an aspect of ego development entailed the same notions. Her stages of conscience development did not actually refer to the creation of the conscience but rather to the various characteristics that the conscience acquires as early developmental patterns are recapitulated in the later ego development processes. The guilt which is aroused at Loevinger's Conscientious stage of ego development, then, can be seen as an intrapsychic problem in the sense of Freud or Kohut from which one may infer earlier object relations problems in the sense of Fairbairn and Guntrip.

In summary, symptoms can be viewed in this way: early developmental patterns create a Central Ego or conscious sense of self characterized by unconscious object representation and relations patterns such as object and ego splitting. The part-object representations implied by ego splitting create the potential for conflict between themselves. Those conflicts may be avoided for a time by the operation of the defensive False Self or by an absence of environmental triggers. When later ego development problems occur, they are likely to arise at stages which awaken and recapitulate the earlier unresolved object relations patterns which gave rise to the introjected split ego and object representations. Both developmental arrest
and intrapsychic conflict and defense patterns which arise from those arrests can be inferred from the stage appropriate ego development conflicts. That is, the stage at which conflicts or arrest in ego development occurs and the severity of the conflicts or the length of the ego development arrest indicates the chronology and severity of the early object relations development problems. To the extent that those at Loevinger's Conscientious stage of ego development experience excessive guilt, then, it may be because the conflicts of that stage recapitulate the unresolved object relations patterns discussed above.

Comparison of Loevinger With Selected Other Developmental Theorists

Loevinger's formulation (see Table 1) paralleled the ego development helix of Kegan (1982) in which persons progress through a series of self-other "balances" favoring either psychologies of inclusion or psychologies of autonomy at various stages. Kegan (p. 86) suggested that his Incorporative stage, in which "self and other are one," was comparable to Loevinger's Presocial stage. Her Symbiotic stage should also be included here. Both Kegan and Loevinger labeled the next stage as Impulsive. From there, Kegan viewed children as moving into an Imperial stage which was perhaps more accurately labeled Self-Protective in Loevinger's model. Kegan's next stage, the Interpersonal, and Loevinger's next, the Conformist, both emphasized the importance of inclusion by peers. Loevinger proposed a Self-aware level as a transition into her
Table 1
Comparison of Selected Developmental Theorists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loevinger's Ego Stages</th>
<th>Loevinger's Conscience Stages</th>
<th>Kegan's Ego Stages</th>
<th>Kohlberg's Moral Stages</th>
<th>Fowler's Stages of Faith</th>
<th>Meissner's Religious Modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presocial Narcissism</td>
<td>Incorporative Primal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive Aggression</td>
<td>Impulsive Punishment</td>
<td>Intuitive-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Protective Mastery</td>
<td>Imperial Hedonism</td>
<td>Mythic-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist Parental Standards</td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationship Synthetico-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Aware Conscientious</td>
<td>Mutual Love</td>
<td>Social Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Interindividual Universal</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Ethical Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Ethical Awareness</td>
<td>Univer-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conscientious stage. Kegan identified the Conscientious level with his Institutional stage. However, Loevinger's Conscientious stage was characterized by self-other tension, whereas Kegan's Institutional stage was clearly on the side of the helix favoring self and autonomy. Loevinger's Self-Aware and Conscientious stages are
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probably better considered positions of self-other tension "on the way" to the independent focus of Kegan's Institutional Stage. Loevinger's Individualistic level more accurately corresponded to that stage. Finally, her Autonomous stage is best considered an earlier level of Kegan's Interindividual stage while her Integrated stage would be a later level.

In summary, Loevinger's formulation was somewhat more detailed than Kegan's but suffered from some consequent obscurity which Kegan's simpler and more gracefully stated model avoided. Nonetheless, the ego development test which she developed yields information of value to Kegan's model because of the close similarity in conceptualization of ego development.

Kohlberg's (1981-1984) stages of moral development also paralleled Loevinger's model. Kohlberg's first stage, Punishment and Obedience, corresponded to Loevinger's Impulsive stage. There is no intrinsic morality at this point, only a concern to "not break rules" and avoid punishment. External punishment is the restraint upon impulse. Kohlberg's next stage, Instrumental Hedonism, corresponded to Loevinger's Self-protective stage. Both emphasized doing what one does (or what is right) in order to serve one's own interests. Next, there was a shift to an "other" orientation in Kohlberg's stage of Interpersonal Relationship Orientation and Loevinger's Conformist stage. In each case the focus was on doing that which will maintain cordial relationships with others.

At the next stage of moral development, the Social System and Conscience Orientation, there was a focus on law and order and doing
that which maintains the social institutions of which one is a part. The internalized standards are those of the institutions. Loevinger's Conscientious stage entailed similar conflicts of internalization of standards and conflict between needs of self, others, and larger institutions and laws. Kohlberg's fifth stage, that of Prior Rights and Social Contract, implied a sense of respect for others as individuals and for their rights, values, and opinions. This corresponded to Loevinger's Individualistic stage. Finally, at the sixth level of moral development, Kohlberg described a sense of Universal Ethical Principles which corresponded to the move toward the principled outlook of Loevinger's Autonomous stage. Kohlberg (1981-1984) has recently postulated a seventh stage of Ethical Awareness which goes beyond acknowledgement of principles toward a more sophisticated "wondering" about the nature of such principles and morality. This stage has overtones of Loevinger's Integrated stage and also of the teachings of major religious systems.

It must be emphasized, however, that Kohlberg confined himself to moral reasoning processes. His was essentially a cognitive theory of morality which did not address the issue of guilt in the terms of emotional experience which are implied in Loevinger's broader integration of cognitive and emotional development into a theory of ego development. This explains, in part, why various studies have found the relationship of moral to ego development to be that of similar but not identical constructs. Hauser (1976); Liberman, Gaa, and Frankiewicz (1983); and Lutwak (1984) found correlations between ego and moral development ranging from .46 to .66.
Loevinger, Kegan, and Kohlberg all had roots in Piaget's theories. Their systems clearly reflected the Piagetian (1932) notion of progress from preoperational to concrete to formal operational thinking with its corresponding progress in moral development from heteronomy to cooperation and equalitarianism to equity and principle.

Erikson's (1950) stages of epigenesis are more difficult to reconcile with Loevinger's theory. Loevinger (1966, 1976) attributed this to the intrinsic difference between a hierarchical theory rooted in ego psychology and Erikson's biologically based theory. She believed that there is a linear progression through each stage of development and that being at a higher stage necessarily implies the leaving behind of earlier ones. There is an overall resolution into a new set of representations and perceptions; some unresolved issues may remain but are experienced in the new context of the later stage. There are no "age appropriate" stages; rather, persons move through the stages at their own pace.

In contrast, Erikson's theory implied an "age push" to development. One moves to the next stage when the biology of development demands, whether or not there are unresolved issues at earlier stages. Thus, persons dealing with later stage issues may continue major struggles with unresolved conflicts of earlier stages. It is theoretically possible, then, to be dealing with the issues of several stages at one time. The difficulty in reconciling the developmental approaches of Erikson and Loevinger essentially distills into the decades old problem of reconciling drive/instinct
models of development with object relations and ego psychology models (Greenberg and Mitchell, 1983).

Religious Development

Fowler (1981, 1983, 1984) provided a bridge from ego and moral development to religious development. His seven stage model described an early Primal Faith which may be seen to correspond with Loevinger's Presocial and Symbiotic stages. The emphasis is on basic trust in parents and others to offset separation anxiety. Next was a stage of Intuitive-Projective Faith characterized by imagination, stories, and symbols, not logic. This seems to have the carefree flavor of Loevinger's Impulsive stage and of Winnicott's Transitional Stage. Fowler's Mythic-Literal stage of faith development, the first concrete operational stage, probably corresponds to a late Self-protective or early Conformist level in Loevinger's formulation. Synthetic-Conventional faith serves as a "largely unreflective synthesis of beliefs and values [which] evolves to support identity and to unite one in emotional solidarity with others" (1983, p. 58). This would correspond to Loevinger's Conformist stage. Individual-Reflective Faith involves critical reflection, a sense of responsibility, and tension between individual and social concerns characteristic of Loevinger's Conscientious and Individualistic stages. Fowler's stage of Conjunctive Faith implies an acceptance of paradox, polarities, and "multiple interpretations of reality" (1983, p. 58) reminiscent of Loevinger's Autonomous stage. Finally, the stage of Universalizing Faith involves a "passionate yet detached
spending of the self in love, devoted to overcoming division, oppression, and brutality" (1983, p. 58). The same are characteristic of Loewinger's Integrated stage of ego development.

Broun (1985) found a significant correlation between Fowler's stages of faith and Loewinger's stages of ego development. This supports the notion that issues of religious belief interact with issues of ego development. Broun was not, however, able to demonstrate a one to one relationship between Loewinger's and Fowler's stages. Rather, she found that "high ego level scorers tend to have higher faith development scores whereas low ego scorers tend to have lower faith development scores." This probably indicates, again, that ego and faith development are related but not redundant constructs. Ford-Grabowsky (1986) and Ratcliff (1985) have questioned Fowler's exceedingly broad use of the term "faith." They found it difficult, for example, to use the same term to describe both "faith" in one's corporate employer and deep religious faith.

Meissner (1984) proposed five "modes" of religious development derived from object relations theory. He described a first mode which develops during the period of primary infantile narcissism. This mode, similar to Loewinger's Presocial and Symbiotic stages, is one of "unconditional omnipotence and absolute dependence." It has to do with issues of basic trust. "The religious experience at this level would presumably involve merging the boundaries between self-representation and God-representation" (p. 150). This is thus a mode characterized by mysticism, "diffusion of the sense of self, and absorption into the divine."
Meissner's second mode of religious experience was characterized by self-other differentiation which resolves into an introjected grandiose sense of self similar to Loevinger's Impulsive and Self-protective stages. This is a projection of idealized parental objects upon whom one is dependent but separate. Said Meissner, "At this stage idealization of and dependence on the parental imago are essential for sustaining and maintaining the inner cohesion of the self" (p. 153). The representation of God at this stage parallels the idealization of parents: he is seen as omnipotent and the "faith experience is riddled with a sense of utter dependence, a terror of the omnipotence of the godhead, and a superstitious and magical need to placate by ritual and ceremonial" (p. 153).

As the ego develops more secure boundaries there is reduced need for retreat to narcissistic defensive patterns of projection and introjection. This leads to the third mode of religious development, that of a cohesive self in relationship with significant others. The themes are similar to those of Loevinger's Conformist stage. "Matters of belief or valuative judgment are determined primarily by an appeal to trusted authority, although...the capacity for using...thought processes increases" (p. 154).

The fourth mode of religious development corresponded to Loevinger's Conscientious stage and "is articulated around the formation and consolidation of the superego" (p. 155). Moral anxiety is prominent, reality is seen as more complex, and "there is increasing awareness of the multiple dimensions of authority figures and their functions" (p. 156).
Meissner's fifth mode of religious development involved a healthy integration of internal object representations into realistic perceptions of self, others, and the environment. Similar to Loevinger's Autonomous and Integrated stages, persons are "capable of profoundly meaningful object relations that are characterized by selfless love and acceptance of others" (p. 157). The experience of God is "unselfconscious...and capable of integration into a life of activity, responsibility, and generative fulfillment" (p. 157).

Other authors (Elkind, 1970; Gleason, 1975; Godin, 1985) proposed schemes of religious development similar to that of Meissner with its progression from object embeddedness to autonomy to interdependence. Rizzuto (1979) and Pruyser (1968, 1985), however, have a different focus, that of religious development which occurs during Winnicott's Transitional period of ego development. Roughly similar to Meissner's second mode of development, this is the period in which children make the crucial transition from an omnipotent self-centered experience of reality (in which they are in fact totally dependent upon parents) to a more realistic self-other differentiation.

Winnicott described "playing" behavior as the single most important aspect of the Transitional period. It is through play and the accompanying fantasy that children begin to reconstruct the world in their own illusionistic terms. As they do so, however, they begin to experience a sense of acting upon the world rather than being acted upon by caretakers. They experience a corresponding differentiation between themselves and those upon whom they were utterly dependent before. The magical, illusionistic playing of the
Transitional period allows the separation-individuation process to move from a position of embedded dependence to realistic differentiation and mastery of the environment.

Rizzuto (1979) and Pruyser (1968, 1985) suggested that it is during this period that children construct their representations of God as part of their fantasies of movement toward self-management of the environment. The God-representation is essentially parental and allows the children to "play" with their position vis-a-vis parents in a symbolic fashion. They can experiment with a God upon whom they are utterly dependent or whom they can cause to perform magical and omnipotent acts. The illusionistic nature of the representation of God at this point allows children to use him to structure the environment and the parent-object representations in ways that make the separation-individuation transition manageable.

Spilka, Addison, and Rosensohn (1975) noted that formulations like those of Pruyser and Rizzuto have led some to conclude that the idea of God is no more than a creation of projected intrapsychic dynamics. However, they found in an empirical study of God representations that projection itself accounted for only a part of the divine image. The study supported the expected conclusion that social and cultural factors also significantly affected the idea of God. Vergote and Tamayo (1981) in a large multi-cultural study had similar results. They concluded that parental images were an important part of the representation of God, but that it is not entirely the invention of a projective process. The concept of God, they found, is also significantly determined by the theology of the
belief system. Knight (1969) raised the alternative formulation that parental images are carriers of a projection of God derived from theology.

Faber (1972/1975) and Lovinger (1984) implied that such findings can be explained by differences in the kinds of religion to which various theorists referred. In general, discussions such as those of Rizzuto and Pruyser focused on what Faber and Lovinger labeled "natural religion." Natural religion, in Faber's view, arises from Winnicottian transitional issues involving the maintenance of basic trust in primary caretakers as one begins to interact with an uncertain and threatening environment. Those issues find partial solution in the creation of a God who is all-inclusive, loving, and omnipotent and is consequently ever-present and able to assist in managing the transition. Eastern religions with their panentheistic (all are in God) philosophies and emphasis on the goodness of human beings would support such longings for basic trust from which one can interact with others and the environment. Universalist and liberal theologies which emphasize belief in and acceptance by God with little emphasis on exclusion on the basis of belief or behavior would also fall into the natural religion category.

In contrast, Faber suggested that the "faith religions," in which he included Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, interact with higher levels of ego development. The experience of reality implied by those religions is "fundamentally...different from the experience of reality found in transitional objects" (Faber, 1972/1975, p. 165). Such religions present issues of interpersonal relating, ethical...
living, and ambiguity in Scripture, theology, and life which address stages of development later than the relatively early transitional stage. Consequently, they require adherents to embrace a representation of God (essentially derived from theology and not projection) which is more complex than that of the transitional projection of God as object. That can create both possibilities and problems. On one hand such faith can stimulate one through the process of ego development to the Individualistic, Autonomous, and Integrated stages which can accommodate the vicissitudes of mutuality in interpersonal relating, the vagaries of application of ethical standards, and acceptance of paradox and ambiguity in teachings, theology, and life which the faith embraces. On the other hand it may create difficulties for those who are unable to integrate such principles into their perception and projection of reality.

For those who are at Loevinger's Conformist stage and below, it may be possible to ignore such difficulties through denial or reliance upon significant others and trusted authority. At the Self-aware and Conscientious levels (Meissner's fourth mode of religious development), however, such conflicts become more difficult to deny. One is forced to struggle with issues of interpersonal mutuality, ethical living, and ambiguity in religious teaching, theology, and life. Those are the issues that must be resolved at the Conscientious stage of ego development. The confluence of ego and religious development intensifies the conflicts.
Summary

As the processes of ego development and subsidiary religious development progress, they enable infants to move from positions of embeddedness in self and primary caretakers to an expanded perception of reality. For those whose early development of object relations went well, the conflicts implied in such a progression are eventually resolved. The characteristic guilt of the Conscientious level would not be excessive. When early problems in the development of object relations occur, conflicts may arise at later stages of ego development. Those conflicts will be triggered by self-other relations stressors which reflect the unresolved earlier object relations problems. That is, early object representation problems leave one vulnerable to later conflicts which present persons with similar self-other dynamics. Problems of guilt may indicate Conscientious stage conflicts which recall early problems of either a narcissistic or dependent nature. Those conflicts are aroused because of the self-other ambivalence and the awareness of ambiguity awakened at this stage.

Religious training may intensify the conflicts. Attempts to assuage guilt through compulsive compliance to Christian teaching are doomed to failure. No amount of compliance can forestall the unconsciously feared rejection or punishment by primary objects masquerading as God. The Ego Ideal, it will be recalled, creates whatever standards it believes are necessary to avoid such rejection or punishment. However, for those with exaggerated bad-object
representations, the self is always in danger of rejection, regardless of the degree of compliance to lofty standards. Consequently, there is an interminable projection of anticipated rejection onto God with an exquisite sensitivity to or a creating of "reasons" for punishment. Thus, one must punish oneself with guilt, and the Ego Ideal must find new standards of conscience to assure acceptance. The cycle goes on and on, adding layer after layer of standards which only serve as further reason to fear rejection or punishment.

Because this process is cast "in the name of God," one cannot easily reject the Other (God) in anger. Were the Other a mere human, the anger beneath the guilt might lead to such a resolution. When the Other is, because of projection and theology, the primary and eternal caretaker, one dare not express the anger at the object. One must direct it at self. Consequently, one becomes even more worthy of rejection and the guilt cycle deepens. Seemingly, there can be no resolution because the projected standards of God cannot be wrong; yet, because the standards are so utterly unrealistic, the self feels increasingly helpless to comply. At that point, guilt may turn to depression, despair, and finally hopelessness (Aardema, 1984).

When such internal conflicts can be avoided by False Self defenses such as denial or conformity they are less troublesome. Those at the Conformist stage of ego development and below may be able to limit their perception and projection to a manageable level. Conversely, for those at the Individualistic stage and above, the issues may be finding resolution.
However, for those who are at the Conscientious stage of ego
development or Meissner's fourth mode of religious development, ego
development processes and a growing understanding of genuine Chris­tian faith can create real conflicts with enormous potential for
guilt, given a susceptibility rooted in certain unconscious dynamics
created by earlier arrests in object relations development. The
struggle then becomes one of separating a projection of God which is
essentially a distortion from that which is accurately carried in
theology and Scripture. The accurate presentation invites growth
toward the meaningful engagement in life and relationships character­
istic of higher stages of ego development. The distorted presenta­
tion ensnares one in a deepening cycle of guilt reinforced by twisted
theology and God-representations.

Related Studies

Several studies related to ego development, object relations,
religious belief, and guilt are presented in this section. Albert
(1984) attempted to measure guilt as an "indicator of level of object
relations" (p. 6) defined as object "differentiation, articulation,
and integration" (p. 6). However, the author stated that his was not
a developmental hypothesis in the sense of ego development. No
relationship was found between guilt and level of object relations, a
result that Albert attributed to lack of correlation between measures
of guilt. That would be expected because of varying definitions of
guilt implied in the instruments and the limited scope of those
definitions—for example, guilt as moral failure.
Browning (1983) measured the relationship of ego development to authoritarian attitudes. She found Conformist and Self-protective level subjects to be most authoritarian (but about different issues) and Conscientious level subjects to be less authoritarian than either. That would imply that Conscientious stage persons experienced less rote conformity than Conformists and suggested a greater potential for entertaining ambiguity and its related conflicts.

Clouse (1985) contrasted college students who were conservative Christians with those who were not on a measure of moral development. She found that Christian students tended to cluster at conventional levels of moral development, while other subjects tended to be lower or higher.

Geurkink (1981) tested several hypotheses presumed to describe the affective characteristics of each of Loevinger's stages. With respect to guilt, her experimental hypothesis was that guilt would be higher for those at the Self-Aware level and above than for those below that level. Results were non-significant.

Mandel (1977) found a three stage progression in conceptualization of guilt experience. In her study, pre-adolescents tended to view guilt as "deviation of standards of 'proper conduct' that are defined by agents external to the self" (p. 91). Adolescents experienced guilt as "deviation from personally held standards and values" (p. 102). Adults experienced guilt "solely in connection with interpersonal interactions...[or] standards that relate specifically to the treatment of others" (p. 112).
McAdams, Booth, and Selvik (1981) compared ego and religious development in college students. They found that students at Loevinger's Self-aware stage and below reported a failure to question or doubt their religious beliefs. Those at the Conscientious stage and above reported that they have or are going through a fundamental re-evaluation of religious life and ideology. This supported a notion of interaction of ego and religious development which is characterized by more internal conflict at the Conscientious stage.

L. R. Vincent and K. R. Vincent (1979) and K. R. Vincent and Castillo (1984) studied the relationship of ego development stage to MMPI profile patterns and DSM III personality disorder classifications for an inpatient population. They found those at lower levels of ego development to have more "characterological" MMPI profiles. They also found that those with personality disorder diagnoses fell at lower levels of ego development. This suggested that severe problems in early object relations development may prevent one from reaching higher levels of ego development.

Several authors have written about the so-called moral therapies. Adams (1970), Menninger (1973), Mowrer (1961), and Pattison (1969) all argued that psychology and psychiatry have tended to move society away from a sensitivity to morality and constructive guilt. Certainly, where too little restraint of conscience exists, social welfare calls for a buttressing of morality. This study, however, had to do with excessive, not constructive, levels of guilt.
Implications for Treatment

Inasmuch as problems of guilt are viewed by some object relations theorists as object relating problems rooted in ego and object splitting, the goal of therapy may often become that of assisting clients to view themselves and others as realistic persons with both good and bad elements. The good is to be recognized and appreciated; the bad is not to be feared as unsurvivable. The treatment is generally considered to be facilitated by interpretation and relationship. Interpretation enables conscious understanding of formerly unconscious dynamics to be used in the service of the ego. It is generally acknowledged that the relationship between client and therapist is the critical therapeutic factor (Blanck & Blanck, 1974, 1979; Blocher, 1966; Gross, 1981; Guntrip, 1957; Kell & Burow, 1970; Kernberg, 1975; Kohut, 1977; Masterson, 1981; Silverman & Weinberger, 1985; Stolorow & Lachmann, 1980).

In Winnicottian terms, it is in the therapy relationship that clients experience the adequate "holding environment" of the "good enough other" which allows them "potential space" to experiment and experience self and other in a realistic manner. This facilitates the development of realistic object introjection and projection with consequent appropriate perception of and interaction with the other based on secure ego boundaries. There is, in other words, opportunity to fuse part objects into realistic, whole objects which endure.

Client projective processes and therapists' physical presence in time of distress may make therapists psychologically more significant.
than clients' God-representations. As such, careful therapists may eventually come to have the therapeutic power to contradict the distorted God-and-theology representations. It is at that point that they may begin to assist clients to slowly and carefully rework their old systems into a new set of understandings, meanings, and realistic interpersonal experiences. Therapists provide a consistent and accepting relationship experience and cognitive understanding of dynamics which allow old part-objects to become fused into new whole objects. Therapists create an experience of relating and reality which contradicts the internal object relations patterns (with all of the concomitant anger, fear, and anxiety) and provides the experience of alternate patterns. At first, this happens vis-a-vis the person of the therapist, but in time that experience and understanding may transfer (be projected into) to the God-representation. Gradually, if therapists stay in place during the new integration (Kegan, 1982), clients may begin to forsake the old primary emotional loyalties with the associated distortions of reality, replacing them with a new perceptual openness and authentic engagement in life and relationships.

There is within Christian theology a place for "constructive sorrow" (Narramore, 1984) over failure, but there is no basis for the Christian's perceived rejection by God. That is a denial of the essence of Christianity; namely, that Christ's atonement yields unconditional forgiveness and acceptance. There can be no punishment or rejection, especially over minute and ambiguous details. It may become clear to clients that excessive guilt feelings cannot be
messages from God; they must be projections of internalized dynamics. The words of theologian Bonhoeffer (1959, p. 81) are recalled: "Conscience is not the voice of God to sinful man; it is man's defense against it."

Loevinger (1976a) discussed the role of developmental pacers in the therapeutic process. Citing empirical studies by Dember, she suggested that presentation of stimuli slightly more complex than that to which persons are accustomed fosters growth in complexity and ego development. Suggesting that equilibration at a given level of ego development is a matter in part of selective perception, Loevinger indicated that an environment which disconfirms expectations (introduces disequilibration) is necessary for growth.

With specific reference to the context of therapy, Aardema (1984) wrote:

The therapist's position as a significant other in the client's life enables the therapist to influence client change through the gradual introduction of contrasts to the client's views and experience. In the offering of contrasts, the client is offered both a new possibility and a challenge to the old possibility (p. 246). . . . Clients move from the old psychological status and meanings which brought them into therapy, toward discovering new ways of meaning construction and new meanings, and finally toward the discovery of reintegration of the old and new meanings. The therapeutic holding environment, which is to say the therapeutic provisions, performs the . . . functions of holding on (confirming), letting go (contrasting), and staying in place (constancy). (p. 252)

The implication is that therapists become new "object presenters" in the Winnicottian sense. That is, they present carefully modulated and graduated novel stimuli and create therapeutic provisions designed to disconfirm client expectations and old, pathological
meaning constructions. In a similar vein, Kegan (1982) suggested that therapists are thrust into a position of sharing in clients' developmental processes as presenters of contrasts and contradictions which create the tensions that find integration at higher stages of ego development. Piaget's (1932) concepts of assimilation and accommodation are recalled here. In this way therapists become new, replacement objects for the original objects. Their presentation of themselves, insight, and new ways of viewing and interpreting experience can lead to internalization of new whole objects, assist in the repair of old split objects, and lead to better integrated self-representations. Within the context of a secure "holding environment," therapists contradict the old internalized object relations patterns that underlie the conflicts of earlier ego stages and present new patterns that invite clients to higher stages.

Loevinger (1976a) suggested that conscience is an important developmental pacer. Drawing from the work of Dember, Baldwin, and Loewald, she suggested that the ideals presented by conscience include a set of aspirations and injunctions which represent the internalization of formerly external pacers. Loevinger, of course, was describing a healthy conscience here. The overly rigid conscience serves not as a pacer but as an obstacle to growth. To the extent that therapists can enable clients to internalize new object representations which assist in freeing the conscience to perform its appropriate functions, they create an ever-present pacer in clients which can be taken beyond the therapeutic setting. It is a circular process. Therapists present new objects which help to redefine and
free the conscience. The conscience then becomes an internal pacer which may serve to stimulate new growth in ego development. The new growth assists the development of an even more mature conscience.

Tournier (1962) echoed that theme when he suggested that a troubled conscience can lead one to search for a deeper understanding and relationship with God. Vitz (1984) argued that such an understanding of God, characterized by love and forgiveness, allows him to be internalized as a whole object which "transforms the superego" by replacing the Rejecting Object with an unconditionally accepting one. Thomas (1984) suggested that a therapeutic experience of "taking" from the therapist without obligation helps to integrate a wholistic representation of God.

Both Kegan and Loevinger argued for social and cultural intervention as a means to facilitate appropriate ego development. In that vein, Guntrip (1969) argued that much pathology is rooted in a "schizoid" scientific view of life rooted in a sterile, positivistic empiricism. He suggested that genuine religion is the necessary cultural counterpart to science. It is through religion that we maintain an emphasis on human object relatedness.

To the extent that the church can capture a genuine faith it has enormous potential to foster healthy ego development. The so-called trend toward a "post-Christian era" may well be an emergence from a Conformist perspective on life to one which is better able to embrace the realistic ambiguities and vicissitudes of living. A church which suggests that its theology embraces and encourages this journey (cf. Calvin, 1536-1559/1960) is likely to provide a holding.
environment of unconditional acceptance coupled with appropriate
contrasts and contradictions which fosters personal and religious
development. The emphasis will be a shift away from laws, regula-
tions, and ceremony toward grace and its implied acceptance of that
which is fully human (Macaulay & Barrs, 1978). The impact of such an
environment on personal integration and social welfare could be
significant. The church would become a partner in the search for
meaning, integration, healthy relationships, and positive social
contributions.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Subjects and Procedure

The critical characteristic for the subjects of this study was homogeneity with respect to orthodox Christian beliefs. For that reason subjects were drawn from the student body of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (TEDS) in Deerfield, Illinois. Students generally choose to attend Trinity because of its conservative theological stance and are required to sign a statement of faith indicating subscription to orthodox Christian theology (see Appendix A). For purposes of this study it was assumed that subjects from this population met the criterion of homogeneity on that characteristic.

Loevinger (1966, p. 197) has noted in reference to Piaget's work that sample homogeneity across levels of ego development is the major concern for developmental studies:

Careful reading will reveal what American readers, with their normative bias, often miss, that Piaget is not setting norms for different ages but rather using average age differences as a device for tracing developmental sequence. The representativeness of his samples is not a major concern; he need only have comparable samples at different ages.

The homogeneity of the TEDS sample with respect to orthodox Christian faith, then, suggests that it is an appropriate sample for a study of ego development of conservative Christians.
The student body at TEDS is reasonably heterogeneous with respect to several other characteristics. Relatively large for a seminary, Trinity enrolled approximately 1300 students for Fall quarter, 1986. It is an interdenominational institution in which students come from a wide variety of denominational backgrounds. Less than half of the students are enrolled in professional divinity programs with the rest enrolled in courses of study such as counseling psychology, religious education, theology, philosophy of religion, or missions. Age range of students is from approximately 20 to 50 years. The sample age range for this study was 22 to 48 years. The TEDS population, then, may be considered to be reasonably reflective of other orthodox Christian populations.

Forty-five students (17 females and 28 males) from counseling psychology and pastoral counseling classes (which are required of all students) volunteered to participate in the study during the fall quarter of 1986. All subjects completed the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) for ego development and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) on a "take home" basis.

Protocols for the 16PF were scored by the publisher's (Institute for Personality Assessment) automated scoring service. WUSCT protocols were independently rated by the investigator and a graduate student in psychology who was trained according to the programmed training manual for raters (see Instrumentation, below). This fulfilled the test manual requirement for two raters per item with each rater having completed at least one year of graduate training in psychology (to assure the minimal psychological sophistication...
necessary to understand the theory of ego development which underlies the test).

The WUSCT yielded a rating of ego development stage which corresponds to Loewinger's (1976a) model. The 16PF was used to determine scores on four factors. 16PF factor G is a measure of moral standards; factor Q3 measures compulsivity. Together, G and Q3 yield a second order factor, Qv, which indicates strictness of conscience. Factor O on the 16PF is a measure of guilt. Detailed discussion of the definition of these concepts as measured by the 16PF appears in the Instrumentation section, below.

Instrumentation

Washington University Sentence Completion Test

The Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) was used to measure stage of ego development. Developed by Loewinger and Wessler (1970) and most recently revised in 1985 (Loewinger, 1985), the WUSCT was intended as a rating instrument for ego development which corresponded to Loewinger's ten stage model. The test consists of thirty-six stems compiled into Male and Female forms (see Appendix B) which are independently scored by two raters according to a precise set of criteria contained in the test manual.

The WUSCT was constructed using a sample of 972 subjects ranging in age from 12 to 66 and verified on a sample of 793 subjects, ages 9 to 70. Median interrater reliability correlation was .76 for items and .86 for total protocol ratings (TPRs). Odd/even
intercorrelations between raters ranged from .78 to .95 (.88 to .95 corrected for length). Alpha coefficients of internal consistency ranged from .88 to .92.

Loevinger and Wessler (1970, pp. 48-53) reported several studies in support of the construct validity of the WUSCT. In a factor analysis of responses of subjects in the verification sample, first factor eigenvalues ranged from 8.8 to 9.8 for different raters, while eigenvalues for second and third factors dropped to a range of 1.2 to 2.0. They concluded, "the first factor is essentially identical with the sum of item ratings \( r = .999 \)...the items taken together measure a unitary dimension" (p. 48). A study of the relationship between interview ratings of ego development and WUSCT ratings yielded correlations from .58 to .61. Loevinger & Wessler wrote (1970, p. 49):

> Considering the restricted range of ego level ratings (both TPRs and interview ratings spread over only five of the ten possible points on the scale), these correlations are quite respectable.... As is often the case, I-level based on interview, is in some ways more dubious than the test being validated.

Correlations between TPRs and the expected chronological sequence of ego development for a sample of 201 Toronto schoolchildren were .74 for boys and .69 for girls. Verbal fluency (measured by item word count) correlated .44 with items and .58 with TPRs. WUSCT score correlations with Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence scores were .45 for boys and .47 for girls. These mid-range correlations (and the internal consistency) supported the construct validity of the WUSCT as "related to other measures but distinct from [them]" (Yates, 1982,
This is supplemented by Loevinger and Wessler's logical development of test items and scoring criteria from the underlying theory of ego development. The close reasoning of this process argues for the content validity of the WUSCT. Loevinger (1979) provided a critical review of the WUSCT literature, concluding that the test "has adequate validity for research purposes" (p. 281).

Rafferty's (1972, p. 1729) review of the WUSCT in Buros Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook included the following assessment:

The self-training exercises appear to be excellent. They provide practice first in rating 20 responses for each item and then a series of 20 complete protocols for additional practice. For each exercise ratings and explanations of them are given which should prove particularly helpful for difficult or borderline kinds of responses. That this method is a successful training device is provided by the reliability data which demonstrate that self-trained raters were able to achieve the same level of reliability as those raters who were involved in the Manual construction. However it should be noted that the item reliabilities are somewhat lower than is desirable (mid-.70's), although TPR reliabilities are more respectable (mid- to upper-.80's). ... It would appear that a good case could be made for construct validity in view of the factor analysis, the internal consistency, and a study which demonstrated the expected growth curve in ego development in four age groups of boys and girls.... In summary, the authors have provided research workers in personality as well as clinicians, a rather simple, but basically sound means for assessing ego development.

Hauser (1976, p. 951), in his critical review of the WUSCT literature, concluded:

The major emphasis of this paper has been on empirical aspects of Loevinger's model and measure of ego development. With regard to the measure of ego development, two related points were stressed within the review: (a) The sentence completion test specifically designed for assessing ego development stages has been carefully constructed and standardized in terms of its form, administration, and scoring procedures and (b) The fact that the scoring procedures are so clearly described and prepared for the
"self-teaching" of scorers (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970; Loevinger et al., 1970) has enabled empirical research using this instrument to proceed unambiguously in terms of how any given study arrived at its ego development results. Not surprisingly, studies of the scoring procedure consistently report high reliability values by several different analyses.

Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)

Guilt and strictness of conscience were measured by a combination of four factors from the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Form A). Two of the factors (G and Q3) taken together yielded a measure of strictness of conscience (Qv). The degree of guilt a subject may experience in relation to that strictness was measured by factor O. These factors may be considered together as a measure of the degree of a troubled conscience and relative to each other for a better understanding of the nature of the troubled conscience. Conceptual definitions of factors are discussed below.


Whatever coheres in the psychoanalytic concept of superego strength seems to be embodied in this demonstrated source trait. Certainly, it best depicts the deeply rooted concern for moral standards, for persistence of effort, and, in general, that tendency to drive the ego and to restrain the id, which clinical theory has regarded as marks of the superego.... Subjectively, i.e., in items checked, the G+ person views himself as correct in, and a guardian of, manners and morals, persevering, planful, able to concentrate, interested in analyzing people, cautious in statements, and preferring efficient people to other
Table 2
Factor G
[From Handbook for the 16PF]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW SUPEREGO STRENGTH or LACK OF ACCEPTANCE OF GROUP MORAL STANDARDS, G- (Disregards Rules, Expedient)</td>
<td>versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting, Fickle</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frivolous</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-indulgent</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slack, Indolent</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undependable</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregards Obligations to People</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


companions.... In accordance with the classical clinical picture of the superego, we are almost certainly dealing here with attitudes implanted early by strong fear and affection, which are partly unconscious and no longer subject to rational manipulation, and which have some... "rigid" and forceful qualities.1

Karson and O'Dell (1976, p. 49) indicated "that someone high on G may make a show of the external trappings of conventionality and morality without necessarily having achieved introjection of parental and societal standards, as in the case of sociopaths." This factor, then, measures the "content" of the superego—the awareness of
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Table 3
Factor G
[From Administrator's Manual for the 16PF]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPEDIENT, Disregards Rules</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>CONSCIENTIOUS, Conforming, Self-indulgent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moralistic, Staid, Rule-bound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People who score low on Factor G tend to be unsteady in purpose. They are often casual and lacking in effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. Their freedom from group influence may lead to antisocial acts, but at times makes them more effective, while their refusal to be bound by rules causes them to have less somatic upset from stress.

People who score high on Factor G tend to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible, planful, "fill the unforgiving minute." They are usually conscientious and moralistic, and they prefer hard-working people to witty companions. The inner "categorical imperative" of this essential superego (in the psychoanalytic sense) should be distinguished from the superficially similar "social ideal self" of Q3+.


morality—but does not in itself indicate any psychological distress which may result from that content. Such an interpretation requires the contribution of other factors.

Factor Q3 is often statistically associated with high G scores and was described in the Handbook for the 16PF (Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka, 1970, p. 106) and the Administrator's Manual for the 16PF (1986, p. 31) as shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka (1970, p. 106) added, "According to loaded items, the Q3+ person shows socially approved character
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Table 4
Factor Q3  
[From Handbooks for the 16PF]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW SELF-SENTIMENT vs. HIGH STRENGTH OF SELF-SENTIMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION, Q3-</td>
<td>SELF-SENTIMENT, Q3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uncontrolled, Lax,</td>
<td>(Controlled, Exacting Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Own Urges, Careless</td>
<td>Power, Socially Precise, Com-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Social Rules)</td>
<td>pulsive, Following Self-image)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5
Factor Q3  
[From Administrator's Manual for the 16PF]

| UNDISCIPLINED SELF-CONFLICT, vs. FOLLOWING SELF-IMAGE |
| Lax, Careless of Social Rules | Socially Precise, Compulsive |

People who score low on Factor Q3 will not be bothered with will control and have little regard for social demands. They are impetuous and not overly considerate, careful, or painstaking. They may feel maladjusted, and many maladjustments (especially the affective, but not the paranoid) show Q3-.

People who score high on Factor Q3 tend to have strong control of their emotions and general behavior, are inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidence what is commonly termed "self-respect" and high regard for social reputation. They sometimes tend, however, to be perfectionistic and obstinate. Effective leaders, and some paranoids, are high on Q3.

responses, self-control, persistence, foresight, considerateness of others, conscientiousness, and regard for etiquette and social reputation." Karson and O'Dell (1976, pp. 71-72) stated:

The items on this scale appear to measure something closely akin to self-control or a careful, calculated approach to life. A person who is Q3+ is programmed to think before he acts and to keep things in order. He does not let his emotions run away with him.... He is typically a well-controlled, even compulsive person.... Q3 is usually an excellent indicator of how successfully a person is able to bind his anxiety...too high a score on Q3, coupled with... G+, can be indicative of undue obsessiveness and rigidity. ... Certainly the Q3+ person is not going to be tolerant of much ambiguity or disorder in his life.... Generally, the clinician will find that Q3 is most useful as an indicator of ability to control emotions, particularly anger and anxiety."2

Meyer (1983, p. 45) added:

Scale Q3 is denoted as low self-concept integration (the low end of the scale) versus a controlled approach to life, with an emphasis on a strong will. In clinical terms, high scores on Q3 can reflect a high need to control conflict and anxiety that threaten to break through brittle modes of coping, or, as Karson and O'Dell (1976) so aptly state, there is a high need to bind anxiety into symptomatology or avoidance patterns.... People high on scale Q3 persist on tasks and keep to their commitments, yet are also inclined toward suppression of anger and to obsessive and compulsive concerns.

Taken together, then high G and Q3 scores indicate both the content of the superego and the degree of internalization of that content. As such those who are high on both factors should have more potential for experiencing a troubled conscience than someone high only on G. Both factors (and no others), in fact, load significantly on a second order factor, Qv, High Superego Strength. The Administrator's Manual for the 16PF (1986, p. 37) description of this factor is presented in Table 6.
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Table 6
Factor Qv (Superego/Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Control</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>High Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
People who score low on this factor typically do not act according to others' values or out of a sense of duty. They tend to be nonconformists who do not hesitate to bend rules, or who develop their own set of rules whenever it is expedient to do so. These are flexible people, yet because they tend to follow their own impulses, they may not be as self-disciplined as some situations may require. Further, they may be perceived as unreliable at times, because the rules by which they operate may not be clear to others.

People who score high on this factor typically have strong superego controls; that is, they have internalized the rules of the milieu in which they function. Hence, they tend to conform to expectations that others have of them or to expectations that they have of themselves. They are quite reliable because they do not "bend the rules"; however, they may be so perceived by others as rigid or moralistic.


According to Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka (1970, p. 17), Qv is "probably best regarded as the real superego factor, of which G is a special expression." Karson and O'Dell (1976, p. 94), who labelled this factor "compulsivity-vs.-sociopathy," referred to "conformity, rigidity, and lack of spontaneity at one pole of the factor, as well as the freedom and lack of restraint at the other pole." Factor G loadings on Qv were .78 for males and .86 for females. Factor Q3 loadings were .61 for males and .57 for females (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970).
Still, $Q_v$, $(G + Q_3)$ indicates only the potential for a troubled conscience based upon rigid superego development. Factor 0 must be included to indicate the actual presence and degree of guilt. Tables 7 and 8 present descriptions of Factor 0 taken from the Handbook for the 16PF (Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka, 1970, p. 101) and the Administrator's Manual for the 16PF (1986, p. 29).

Table 7

Factor 0
[From Handbook for the 16PF]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNTROUBLED ADEQUACY, 0-</td>
<td>GUILT PRONENESS, 0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Self-assured, Placid, Secure, Complacent)</td>
<td>(Apprehensive, Self-reproaching Insecure, Worrying, Troubled)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Self-confident               | Worrying, Anxious                              |
| Cheerful, Resilient          | Depressed, Cries Easily                        |
| Impenitent, Placid           | Easily Touched, Overcome by Moods              |
| Expedient, Insensitive to    | Strong Sense of Obligation, Sensitive to People's Approval and Disapproval |
| People's Approval or         |                                               |
| Disapproval                  |                                               |
| Does Not Care                | Scrupulous, Fussy                              |
| Rudely Vigorous              | Hypochondriacal and Inadequate                 |
| No Fears                     | Phobic Symptoms                                |
| Given to Simple Action       | Lonely, Brooding                               |

Table 8
Factor 0
[From Administrator's Manual for the 16PF]

| SELF-ASSURED, Secure, Feels Free of Guilt, Untroubled, Self-satisfied | vs. APPREHENSIVE, Self-blaming, Guilt-prone, Insecure, Worrying |

Persons with low scores on Factor 0 tend to be unruffled and to have unshakable nerve. They have a mature, unanxious confidence in themselves and their capacity to deal with things. They can, however, be secure to the point of being insensitive to the feedback of others.

Persons with high scores on Factor 0 have a strong sense of obligation and high expectations of themselves. They tend to worry and feel anxious and guilt-stricken over difficulties. Often they do not feel accepted in groups or free to participate. High Factor 0 score is very common in clinical groups of all types.


Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka (1970, pp. 101-103) further described Factor 0:

Earlier adjustment questionnaires have used such items as "depressive tendency," "moodiness," "emotional sensitivity," "self-deprecation," and even "neuroticism" for this factor.... As questionnaire items show, the O+ person feels that he is unstable, reports overfatigue from exciting situations, is unable to sleep through worrying, feels inadequate to meet the rough daily demands of life, is easily downhearted and remorseful, feels that people are not as moral as they should be, is inclined to piety, prefers books and quiet interests to people and noise, and shows a mixture of hypochondriacal and neurasthenic symptoms, but with phobias and anxieties most prominent. It is thus broader than guilt in its most specific sense, though guilt proneness and piety are central in the general "oceanic emotionality".... Clinically, 0 is very important, first as one of the largest factors in anxiety, and,
secondly, as tending to be generally high in neurotics.... For those accustomed to purely clinically derived, psychoanalytic ideas, the factor analytic discovery of apparently two distinct factors, namely G and 0-, or even three if we consider the self-sentiment, Q3, in what is commonly considered the superego region, may require some thought. The G factor undoubtedly best represents the concept presented in the classical superego factor pattern. By contrast, 0 is a "guilt proneness," "poorness of spirit," or piety which may be considered an emotionally deeper sense of general unworthiness, occasioning a more sensitive reaction to superego infringements (and perhaps other types of personal inadequacy and conflict, too), though not a greater development and strength of the superego itself — which is a matter of G.3

Meyers (1983, p. 44) added:

Scale 0 is generally labeled as a placid confidence (the low end of the scale) versus an insecure proneness to guilt. Persons high on this scale are avoidant of stimulation, oversensitive, show a strong sense of morality and duty, and are prone to anxiety-based disorders.... Along with scale G, 0 taps what Freudians have referred to as superego.

Karson and O'Dell (1976, p. 64) wrote:

...our experience has shown this to be one of the two most important scales on the 16PF from a clinical standpoint. A glance at the items shows again and again the worrisome anxiousness and guilt that is associated with many clinical syndromes, especially obsessional worrying. Feelings of vague dread, guilt for no reason at all, extreme reaction to criticism, fear of criticism and punishment, and poor self-esteem, are the bread and butter of many therapists. ... Clinical experience with this scale has shown that scores other than the average signal disturbance all too frequently. That is, either 0- or 0+ scores bear investigation. If one is too untroubled, the question is immediately raised as to the adequacy of superego controls. On the other hand, if the person admits to excessive worries, then the problem of overwhelming guilt is raised.... It should be apparent to anyone familiar with Freudian theory that both of these concepts refer in some way to the superego, and in our experience the relationship goes this way: Someone high on G may safely be assumed to be aware of the standards of society, but the question of how well the superego standards have been introjected can be answered only by the elevation of scale 0.4
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Taken together, then, scales G, Q₃, and 0 give an indication of the content of the superego (i.e., the awareness of standards), the extent of its introjection into the personality, and the degree of guilt felt as a result of the introjected standards. G and Q₃ are probably best combined into the second order factor, Qᵥ, since that weights (loads) G and Q₃ for the statistical effect that each has upon superego, measured as Qᵥ. Qᵥ, then, represents rigidity of superego or conscience and 0 represents the guilt experienced in association with that rigidity.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The terminology used in the data analysis and discussion of results (per Loevinger and Wessler, 1970) is displayed in Table 9:

Table 9
Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol for Ego Development Level (I-level)</th>
<th>Level of Ego Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>Impulsive Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Self-Protective Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>Conformist Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3/4</td>
<td>Self-Aware Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Conscientious Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4/5</td>
<td>Individualistic Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Autonomous Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Integrated Stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary statistics for sample subjects for 16PF factors G (moral standards), O (guilt), Q3 (compulsivity), Qv (rigidity of conscience), and age are presented in Table 10. 16PF scores are reported as Sten (Standard Ten) scores, consistent with Institute for Personality and Ability Testing usage. The general population mean for the Sten scoring system is set at 5.5 with a standard deviation.
of 2.0. Sten scores, which are adjusted for age and sex, are derived through comparison of raw scores with general population norms. Thus, they allow direct comparison and interpretation across age and sex both within the sample population and between the sample and general populations.

Table 10
Summary Statistics for Sample Subjects for 16PF Factors and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Qv</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quartile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper quartile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile range</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized kurtosis</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11 presents frequency tabulations for subjects at each stage of ego development.

Table 11
Frequency Tabulation for I-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cum. Rel. Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3/4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4/5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrater Reliability Coefficient = .91

Figure 2 displays the I-level distribution in the form of a frequency histogram. Given the small number of subjects at I-3 (n=1) and I-5 (n=2), those subjects were included in the I-3/4 and I-4/5 categories, respectively, for the analyses of sample mean differences. In effect, the I-3/4 category then represents all subjects below the Conscientious (I-4) stage of ego development, while the I-4/5 category represents all subjects above that stage. This usage is consistent with the experimental hypothesis which states that I-4 subjects will differ from those above and below that level. It also has the benefit of slightly increasing the power of the analyses. Standardized kurtosis coefficient for this distribution was -1.22.
Figures 3-6 display frequency polygons for each of the 16PF factors.

Figure 2. Frequency Histogram for I-level.

Figure 3. Frequency Polygon for Factor G (Moral Standards).
Figure 4. Frequency Polygon for Factor 0 (Guilt).

Figure 5. Frequency Polygon for Factor Q3 (Compulsivity).
Tables 12-15 present means and distribution characteristics for the various 16PF factors at each I-level.

Table 12
Factor O by I-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standardized kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13
Factor G by I-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standardized kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14
Factor Q₃ by I-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standardized kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15
Factor Qᵥ by I-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standardized kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 16 presents means and distribution characteristics for age at each I-level.

Table 16
Age by I-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standardized kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to test the main hypothesis of interaction between level of ego development and strictness of conscience in the production of guilt. I-level and Qv were the classification factors and O was the dependent variable. Levels of Qv were set at natural breaks in the data to correspond to Low (<4), Medium (4 - 6.8), and High (>6.8) scores on O. Results are displayed in Table 17.

Table 17
Two Factor ANOVA for 16PF Factor O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-level</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qv</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 17—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-FACTOR INTERACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-level Qv</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>164.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 lists the Factor 0 means for each level of Qv, I-level, and the Qv by I-level interaction.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Means for Factor 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95 Percent Confidence for mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95 Percent Confidence for mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qv x I-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 3/4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 4/5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3/4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4/5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3/4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 4/5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate ANOVAs were performed to test for differences between I-level means for each 16PF factor as well as age and sex. Where overall significance levels were p < .05, multiple comparisons were performed and simultaneous confidence intervals constructed using Tukey’s HSD (Honest Significant Difference) procedure. This procedure is recommended by Huitema (1980, p. 86) when all pairwise comparisons are of interest.

Tables 19–21 present the results of one factor ANOVAs for O, G, and Q3. Significance levels of p < .05 were considered significant.
### Table 19
One-Way ANOVA for Factor O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests for Homogeneity of Variances:

- Cochran's C test: 0.488266  P = 0.212503
- Bartlett's test: 1.05101  P = 0.365573

### Table 20
One-Way ANOVA for Factor G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests for Homogeneity of Variances:

- Cochran's C test: 0.344825  P = 1
- Bartlett's test: 1.00043  P = 0.991332
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Table 21

One-Way ANOVA for Factor Q3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests for Homogeneity of Variances:

Cochran's C test: $0.382789 \quad P = 0.908265$

Bartlett's test: $1.00393 \quad P = 0.92365$

Table 22 displays means and simultaneous confidence intervals for Q3 at each I-level.

Table 22

Means and 95% Confidence Intervals for Q3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95 Percent Tukey HSD intervals for mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 displays 95 percent confidence intervals for Q3 at each I-level.
Table 23 presents the results of multiple comparisons among $Q_3$ means.

Table 23

Multiple Comparisons for $Q_3$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method: 95 Percent Tukey HSD Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. 95 Percent Tukey HSD Intervals for $Q_3$. 
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Table 24 lists the results of the univariate ANOVA for $Q_v$.

Table 24
One-Way ANOVA for Factor $Q_v$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>140.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests for Homogeneity of Variances:
Cochran's C test: 0.356643 P = 1
Bartlett's test: 1.0013 P = 0.974009

Table 25 displays means and simultaneous confidence intervals for $Q_v$ at each I-level.

Table 25
Means and 95% Confidence Intervals for $Q_v$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95 Percent Tukey HSD intervals for mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.0 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.4 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0 5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8 displays 95 percent confidence intervals for $Q_v$ at each I-level.

![Figure 8. 95 Percent Tukey HSD Intervals for $Q_v$.](image)

Table 26 presents the results of multiple comparisons among $Q_v$ means.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method: 95 Percent Tukey HSD Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 lists the results of the univariate ANOVA of mean age differences across I-levels.

Table 27
One-Way ANOVA for Age across I-levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1482.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1531.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 28-31 describe the results of univariate ANOVAs performed to test for differences in 16PF factor scores attributable to sex.

Table 28
One-Way ANOVA for Sex—Factor 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>155.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29
One-Way ANOVA for Sex—Factor G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>172.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30
One-Way ANOVA for Sex—Factor Q3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31
One-Way ANOVA for Sex—Factor Qv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The modal I-level (ego development level) score for this sample was I-4 (Conscientious stage) compared with a general population mode of I-3/4 (Self-Aware) reported by Holt (1980). The sample ranged from I-3 (Conformist) to I-5 (Autonomous); however, the small n at I-3 (n=1) and I-5 (n=2) yielded little meaningful information about those two levels. The sample was essentially confined to the rather narrow range of levels from I-3/4 (Self-Aware) to I-4/5 (Individualistic). Given that Loevinger considered these to be transitional levels between more clearly distinguishable stages at I-3 and I-5, one would anticipate relatively small distinctions between the 3/4, 4, and 4/5 levels. If there are, in fact, differences, they would be expected to be more pronounced between stages 3, 4, and 5 but somewhat subtler and more difficult to detect in the limited I-3/4 to I-4 to I-4/5 range. Nevertheless, the standardized kurtosis coefficient of -1.2 indicated that the I-level scores did not depart significantly from normal distribution (within this limited range) and could be appropriately analyzed for mean differences with the parametric procedures described in Chapter IV.

16PF factors O (guilt), G (moral standards), and Qv (rigidity of conscience) displayed means of 5.4, while the factor Q3
(compulsivity) mean was 5.5. Standard deviations were 1.9 for factors $O$, $Q_3$, and $Q_v$ and 2.0 for $G$. These were almost identical to the general population means and standard deviations which were set at 5.5 and 2 in the Sten scoring system of the 16PF. The sample did not differ meaningfully from the general population in its overall scores on these factors. The sample appeared, then, to score at a slightly higher level of ego development than the general population but to display the same 16PF factor scores as the general population. The interpretation of this relationship is discussed later.

**Discussion of Sample Mean Differences**

In the following discussion of analyses, it should be noted that standardized kurtosis coefficients indicated that no group distribution departed significantly from normal. In addition, variance checks indicated no significant departures from between cell homogeneity of variance. Consequently, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures employed were appropriate.

A two factor analysis of variance was performed as a test of the experimental hypothesis. That research hypothesis stated that for subjects who hold orthodox Christian beliefs, those who experience higher levels of guilt (measured by factor $O$ on the 16PF) and demonstrate a stricter, more rigid conscience (measured by factor $Q_v$ on the 16PF) will score at the Conscientious stage of ego development (measured by the WUSCT). This means that it was expected that subjects at the Conscientious stage who had the most rigid consciences (high $Q_v$ scores) would have had the highest guilt (factor $O$)
scores. No significant main effects or interaction effects were found. The I-level by Qv interaction (that is, level of ego development by rigidity of conscience interaction in predicting high guilt scores) approached significance (p=.096) but was not believed to warrant further analysis given the levels of error already implied in the use of a second order factor such as Qv. While rejection of the null hypothesis would yield an unacceptably high risk of Type 1 error, the .096 level of significance for interaction effects suggests that there is also risk of committing a Type 2 error if the experimental hypothesis is rejected on the basis of these findings alone. Although the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, the derived p-level suggests that further study is in order to clearly establish or reject the experimental hypothesis.

Univariate analyses of variance were performed to test for differences between levels of ego development on each of the 16PF factors, as well as age and sex. Significant differences (p=.041 and p=.002, respectively) between mean scores across I-level were found for factors Qv (rigidity of conscience) and Q3 (compulsivity). Qv means were 6.1 at I-4, 4.9 at I-3/4, and 4.4 at I-4/5. The I-3/4 and I-4/5 means may be considered statistically equivalent, while the I-4 mean differed from both. It may be inferred, then, that I-4 subjects had slightly stricter consciences than those at levels I-3/4 or I-4/5.

As noted, differences between I-levels were significant for factor Q3 (p=.002). In this case each I-level mean was significantly different from the other two means. Means were 6.3 at I-4, 5.1 at
I-3/4, and 3.8 at I-4/5. The definition of 16PF factor Q3 implies that I-4 subjects were somewhat more compulsive than those at either I-3/4 or I-4/5. In turn, I-4/5 subjects were less compulsive than either those at I-3/4 or I-4.

**Interpretation**

**Compulsivity as a Defense**

Based on these data, the only clear distinctions that can be drawn between ego development levels are those of differences in Q3 and Qv scores. A review of the Q3 description in Chapter III indicates that Q3 may well be labeled "compulsivity." As such, its elevation at the Conscientious stage of ego development is consistent with Loevinger's characterization of that stage. It will be recalled that the Conscientious stage is one of self-other tension. There is movement away from the focus on the other of the Conformist stage toward respect for self at the Individualistic stage. At the Conscientious stage, however, one experiences the greatest tension of the self-other conflict.

That a degree of compulsivity would be expected at this stage is consistent with the definition of compulsivity proposed by Millon (1969, 1981) in his general theory of psychopathology. He defined compulsivity as a symptom of conflict rooted in ambivalence between dependency and autonomy:

Ambivalence connotes conflict, an opposition between contrary tendencies...[to] assert himself, to take the initiative and act autonomously...[or] to submit to others and submerge his individuality. To secure the support and
comforts which others provide, he rigidly controls his impulses toward independence, and overcomplies to the standards and expectations they set down.... To assure that his aggressive impulses do not break through [he] becomes overconforming and over-regulates his life in an effort to bind his unconscious, rebellious and oppositional urges. Moreover, he not only accepts societal rules and customs but vigorously espouses and defends them; he becomes moralistic, legalistic, and righteous. (1969, pp. 277-278)

This description of the compulsive defense pattern not only captures the self-other conflict implied at Loevinger's Conscientious stage but also suggests an explanation for the absence of expected levels of guilt at that stage. It may be that the dynamics of guilt are indeed at work at an unconscious level but that the anxiety which would otherwise be experienced as guilt is avoided or bound by a relatively compulsive style of compliance to standards. Compulsivity may mask the presence of guilt dynamics at an unconscious level. The expected underlying dynamic patterns of guilt may indeed exist, unexpectedly evidenced by high Q3 (compulsivity) scores rather than elevated 0 (guilt) scores. Meyer's (1983, p. 45) description of Q3 supports this notion: "In clinical terms, high scores on Q3 can reflect a high need to control conflict and anxiety that threaten to break through brittle modes of coping, or, as Karson and O'Dell (1976) so aptly state, there is a high need to bind anxiety into symptomatology or avoidance patterns."

As suggested in Chapter II, Christian faith may supply both the ambiguity to motivate heightened anxiety at this level of ego development and a perceived set of standards which provides content for a compulsivity defense against the unconscious conflicts of that stage. Such a notion of a coupling of moral standards with
compulsive defenses is supported by the significant differences in Q_v across I-levels. Q_v, it will be recalled, coalesces a weighted combination of Q_3 (compulsivity) and G (moral standards) into a second order factor which closely describes strictness of conscience. Although G alone displayed no significant differences across I-levels, it appears that it did have an effect when combined in the appropriate linear equation with Q_3. That is, higher levels of Q_3 (compulsivity) and G (moral standards) together were more likely to be found at the Conscientious stage of ego development.

One explanation may be that people are able to forestall the feared rejection by introjected bad objects (which would otherwise be experienced as guilt) through a relatively compulsive compliance with Christian moral standards. That is, if one is able to comply with those standards, one can maintain a sense of self as "good." That serves as a defense against the internalized fear of rejection or punishment which constitutes the dynamic basis for guilt. Guilt may then be experienced in pathological intensity by a relative minority of subjects—those for whom a combination of early object relating patterns, current stressors, and failing compulsive defenses allowed excessive guilt to break through. This suggests that guilt and compulsivity may be seen as alternative symptoms springing from similar unconscious dynamic patterns elicited at the Conscientious stage of ego development. Under a defense of anxious compulsivity may lie the specter of an attack upon the self in the form of pathological guilt. Certainly, the approach toward significance of the guilt by conscience interaction invites further investigation of
that hypothesis. Perhaps the best way to test this theory would be through a study based on a sample of subjects selected on the basis of excessive levels of guilt.

It must also be noted that elevations in $Q_3$ and $Q_v$ at I-4 are only slightly higher than that of the general population. Such mild elevations may well be explained by the generally accepted relationship between intelligence, education, and compulsivity as well as by Christian faith. If these explanations apply, it is not as clear that Christian standards contribute to compulsivity. Rather, it may be that they represent a convenient subset of the generic standards to which all compulsive personalities appeal. A study which measures contrasts between a Christian and general population would be necessary to answer that question.

In general, these findings support Loevinger's notion of the I-4 stage as one characterized by Conscientiousness. The tensions of this stage may recapitulate early object relating patterns which would arouse excessive guilt in a minority of the population and a tendency toward compulsive defense or coping mechanisms in a larger segment of the population. That there exists, in contrast, at the Autonomous stage some "freeing of the person from oppressive demands of conscience in the preceding [Conscientious] stage" (Loevinger, 1976a, p. 22), is suggested by the rather markedly lower scores on $Q_3$ and $Q_v$ (3.9 and 4.4, respectively) of subjects at the I-4/5 level. Although not yet at the Autonomous stage, these Individualistic level scores support the notion that the demands of conscience lessen as
one moves past the Conscientious stage. Such findings certainly lend support to Loevinger's formulation of ego development stages.

**Limited Range of I-level as Explanation of Results**

The narrow range of I-level scores, essentially from I-3/4 to I-4/5, implies the necessity of exceedingly fine discriminations between dependent variable scores across levels. Were the sample distributed over a wider range, say with substantial representation at least from I-3 (Conformist) to I-5 (Autonomous), contrasts between levels may have been more evident. This consideration is particularly noteworthy given the approach to significance of the ego development level by conscience by guilt (I-level x Qv measured on 0) interaction across this limited range of I-levels. Loevinger, as noted above, considered the I-3/4 and I-4/5 levels as transitions between the major stages at I-3, I-4, and I-5. Thus, the emerging presence of differences in the variables of interest at these transitional levels may be more unambiguous when compared across a wider range of distinct stages. This significant consideration implies that a study based upon larger sample sizes and drawn from a more generic population of Christians, for example, from a number of churches with considerable demographic diversity, would be in order.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

In summary, the major unanswered questions are (1) would a clear guilt by conscience by ego development level interaction be found in a population characterized by more excessive guilt than the present
sample, (2) can it be demonstrated that a Christian population differs from a general population in the frequency and nature of excessive guilt reactions or the use of compulsivity as a defense against guilt, and (3) would a wider range of ego development levels detect a significant guilt by I-level interaction? This suggests a study or series of studies with the following characteristics: (1) use of a sample selected on the basis of high guilt experience, perhaps a clinical sample rather than the normal sample of this study, (2) use of contrasting Christian and general populations to clarify the unique contribution, if any, of Christian faith to the issues of interest, (3) use of a larger sample drawn from a demographically diverse population which would be likely to span a wider range of ego development stages. Such a diverse sample would also eliminate the confounding of intelligence and education with Christian faith in the development of compulsivity.

Conclusion

While the experimental hypothesis regarding the interaction of excessive guilt, ego development, and Christian faith was not supported by this study, meaningful conclusions may be drawn from the data. It may be inferred that the underlying dynamics of guilt interact with ego development and perhaps with Christian faith to produce a relatively compulsive style at the Conscientious stage of ego development. That style may serve as a means of coping with or defending against the potential experience of painful levels of guilt. No evidence emerged to clearly contradict the main hypothesis.
regarding the actual experience of excessive guilt. Further study, as suggested, is necessary to unambiguously confirm or deny that hypothesis. At the least, however, the findings supported Loevinger's description of some of the differences between the Self-Aware, Conscientious, and Individualistic stages of ego development.

It should be noted that this study focused upon characteristics of a group which professes a conservative Christian faith. Results should not be taken to apply to other groups of Christians or to the contrast between a Christian and a general population. Further study, as suggested, is necessary in order to comment meaningfully about those populations and issues.
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Appendix A

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Statement of Faith
TRINITY EVANGELICAL DIVINITY SCHOOL
STATEMENT OF FAITH

1. We believe the Scriptures, both Old and New Testaments, to be the inspired Word of God, without error in the original writings, the complete revelation of His will for the salvation of men, and the Divine and final authority for all Christian faith and life.

2. We believe in one God, Creator of all things, infinitely perfect and eternally existing in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

3. We believe that Jesus Christ is true God and true man, having been conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. He died on the cross a sacrifice for our sins according to the Scriptures. Further, He arose bodily from the dead, ascended into heaven, where, at the right hand of the Majesty on High, He now is our High Priest and Advocate.

4. We believe that the ministry of the Holy Spirit is to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ, and during this age to convict men, regenerate the believing sinner, and indwell, guide, instruct, and empower the believer for godly living and service.

5. We believe that man was created in the image of God but fell into sin and is therefore lost and only through regeneration by the Holy Spirit can salvation and spiritual life be obtained.

6. We believe that the shed blood of Jesus Christ and His resurrection provide the only ground for justification and salvation for all who believe, and only such as receive Jesus Christ are born of the Holy Spirit, and thus become children of God.

7. We believe that water baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances to be observed by the church during the present age. They are, however, not to be regarded as means of salvation.

8. We believe that the true Church is composed of all such persons who through saving faith in Jesus Christ have been regenerated by the Holy Spirit and are united together in the body of Christ of which He is the Head.

9. We believe that only those who are thus members of the true Church shall be eligible for membership in the local church.

10. We believe that Jesus Christ is the Lord and Head of the Church, and that every local church has the right under Christ to decide and govern its own affairs.

11. We believe in the personal and premillennial and imminent coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and that this "Blessed Hope" has a vital bearing on the personal life and service of the believer.

12. We believe in the bodily resurrection of the dead; of the believer to everlasting blessedness and joy with the Lord, of the unbeliever to judgment and everlasting conscious punishment.
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Appendix C

Raw Scores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject #</th>
<th>Sex (f=1)</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Qv</th>
<th>I-level</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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