Chapter II

THEORIES AND CONCEPT OF PERSONALITY

Development of the Concept of Personality

Personality, according to the popular view is a cluster of traits which are socially pleasing and effective. We often hear people say 'he has a great deal of personality' or 'he does not have any personality'. But for a psychologist, it is not a fact that one person has more personality than the other. It is simply that one's personality is different from that of the other.

Concept of personality has undergone a considerable change through the ages. The word personality is etymologically derived from the Latin persona, 'mask', a term akin to the verb personare, 'to speak through', which refers to speaking through the mask as an actor on the stage. Both the Greek and Roman employed masks while acting on the stage for dramas. Here not the actual person, but the person with the mask was what the spectators actually visualized. Personality too, according to this concept precisely means what the mask of the actor implied, a cover for the real person behind it.

The mask concept may be traced back to Plato's time as one of the strongest influences in the preservation of this concept was the Philosophy of Plato. "Plato's views represent the clearest expression of idealistic philosophy, a philosophy
which still is very much in evidence and should not be underestimated in considering the problem of personality. Some scholars still believe that personality is a mere facade for some 'substance' presumably underlying it" (Thorpe and Schmuller 1965: 5).

But within classical time itself, not long after the word first appeared, it went under a series of extensions and transformations and in Cicero’s writings we find at least four distinct meanings of persona.

(a) as one appears to others;

(b) the part someone plays in life;

(c) an assemblage of personal qualities that fits man for his work;

(d) distinction and dignity. (Allport 1949: 26)

By the third century A.D. certain church Fathers used the term personae to designate the members of the Trinity. This gave way to an equivalence between persona and the inner (true) self and from the assumed manner it came to mean just the inner nature. By associating personality with inner nature, the theologians helped the philosophers of the sixth century to prepare many important definitions of the term. Boethius adds the attribute of rationality to the substantial nature of the person and defines it as "Persona est substantia individua rationalis nature" (Allport 1949: 30).
Many philosophers, later, maintained self-consciousness, memory, intellect etc., to be the criteria of a person and his personality. Stressing on Self-consciousness Locke says that "a person is a thinking, intelligent being, that has reason and reflection and can consider self as self" (From an Essay concerning Human understanding, Book II, chapter xxvii, Sec. 9).

There are many other philosophical definitions of personality which consider personality as an ethical rather than a metaphysical conception. Kant was the one who maintained a sedate expression of the ethics of personal integrity. "Everything in creation, except one thing, is subject to the power of man, and can be used by man as a means to an end, but man himself, man the rational creature, is an end in himself. He is the subject of moral law and is sacred by virtue of the autonomy of his individual freedom" (Allport 1949 : 32).

Kantian ethics is the starting point for the personalistic doctrines. Personalistic philosopher B.P. Browne maintains that "The essential meaning of personality is selfhood, self-consciousness, self-control and the power to know. These elements have no corporeal significance" (Browne, Personalism 1908 : 264).

So far as the personalistic philosophy focuses attention upon the organization of the individual mental life but
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with its super-individual realism, it becomes metapsychological in nature.

Justinians of the olden time maintained that only the free born men had the dignity of persons; and that the slaves were not persons. An individual can have the right to be a person only if he enjoys legal status. A human being who is deprived of being called a person cannot certainly possess any personality according to them. Christian moralists strongly objected to this social discrimination and urged that each man should be called a person. In modern times, all civilized countries protect their people by law and thus all human beings are called persons. Gradually law came to embrace not only the rights and duties of individual human beings but of whole group of people, thus, the conception that a person might be a group, came up. Later a nation also came to be called a moral person which however is far beyond the dealings of the psychologists.

A concept similar to this was held by the sociologists of the early time. For them personality meant a human unit or a group of individuals. At certain times the emphasis was placed upon the portion of the individual when it was said that of injuring the person, expose one's person etc. Again it was sometimes used to mean the physical presence when it is said that such and such person will appear in person.

At one stage of the development of the concept of personality, it was used interchangeably with character. However,
whenever one speaks of character one is likely to imply a moral standard to it. But the term personality needs to be away from the judgement of moral acceptability.

Some like to use the term temperament as equivalent to personality. Temperament, however, constitute only one part of personality. Like intelligence and physique, it may be said to be the raw material from which personality is fashioned.

Many approaches have been made in the past to understand personality. First was according to temperament. Four temperament - sanguine, melancholic, choleric and phlegmatic corresponding to irascible, hopeful, sad and apathetic personality.

Physiognomy also went deep to discover the characteristics of personality. It tried to do this from temperament/ from outward appearance, but especially from the configuration, cast or expression of the face.

Literary characterology too tried to depict personality. It gave certain characteristics suitable for a kind of personality. One person was put under a typical class if he fits into the standards set for the class of people.

Then there was phrenology, which made an attempt to discover the radical unity composing human personality. Franz Joseph Gall (1758-1828) did important work in searching the primitive units of personality. He was against the faculty theory, the theory which held that for each behaviour there are
different faculties. He gave a list which included qualities such as self-esteem, good-nature, firmness, mechanical aptitude, wit etc. But though he did not use the universal faculties in his list, his list of characterological variables is not totally unlike the traditional list of universal faculties.

Only in the late nineteenth century the experimentation and quasi-experimentation came about in the study of personality. Though many developments took place in the field of personality before this, they were mere assumptions which could not be put to any experimentation. Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911) who established the first psychological laboratory at Leipzig in 1879, though was interested in the individual differences initially, pointed out that personality can also be put to experimentation. Since then there came about a new discipline called the science of personality.

Present day views regarding the concept of personality maintain personality to be the end product of individual's effort to meet the demands of daily living. If the individual is unable to adapt to the requirements of the cultural group to which he belongs, he is considered to be mal-adjusted. Psychologists, who are in favour of the adjustment theory consider any data of personality to be valid, only as long as it emerges from behaviour itself. Behaviouristic school who attribute and interpret everything with behaviour, strongly favours this adjustment concept. For them personality is nothing but behaviour. A reputed behaviourist Prof. C.L. Hull in his writing makes no
distinction between a theory of behaviour and a theory of personality.

G.W. Allport who has dealt with the concept of personality widely has defined personality as the "dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment" (1949 : 48). Later he modifies the last part of his definition and writes - "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought" (1961 : 28).

By 'dynamic organization' he means the total integration of personality i.e. the forming of patterns, of hierarchies of ideas and habits. 'Psychophysical' means, those which are not exclusively mental or exclusively physical or neural. Personality organization includes, functioning of both mind and body. 'Systems' mean, the complex elements which generate activity like habits, sentiments, traits etc. The term 'determine' implies that personality has determining tendencies. They exert direct influence upon all the inner and expressive acts by which personality to be known. 'Characteristic' means, characteristic to an individual, as all behaviour and thought are characteristic of the person. An individual according to Allport acts to adjust to his environment. We however cannot agree with him at this point as one does not only adjust to one's environment but also reflects on it. Behaviour and thought are elicited in the process of adjustment. So, making a bit of modification he in his later
definition makes it adjustment to his the 'behaviour and thought' instead of adjustment to his environment.

Two terms - type and trait are often evoked in the description of personality. There are many authors who consider that a 'trait' theory must be opposed to a 'type' theory under any circumstance. The theory of trait presupposes a normal distribution of the characteristics measured, the type theory on the other hand presupposes a bidominal distribution. In the words of Stagner - "Type theory tends to classify people into sharply divided groups, while trait theory assumes a continuous gradation with most people near the average." An example can be given to show the distinction between the type and the trait theory. For the personality variable of introversion and extroversion, type theory would call all people either introvert or extrovert, whereas the trait theory would find most people to be ambivert. In reality also we find that most of the personality variables are normally distributed. In a population very few people are extremely aggressive or extremely submissive, most people fall in between. Eysenck on the other hand speaks of type as observed constellation or syndroms of traits, and of traits as observed constellation of individual action tendencies. Thus, he makes a distinction between types and traits not in terms of their distribution, but in terms of their relative inclusiveness as determined experimentally (1955 : 28).
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Haward Brand cites three alternative concepts of personality - (1) individual-behaviour, (2) general-behaviour and (3) functional, and considers three varieties of definitions corresponding to them. "The individual-behaviour definition imply the study of individual difference, the tendency and the patterning of individual behaviour. The general-behaviour definitions imply a study of the commonalities in behaviour and the minimizing of individual differences. The functional definition is an attempt to synthesize the individual-behaviour and the general-behaviour definitions. The functional definitions attempt to define a distinct area of behaviour apart from behaviour-in-general, and proposes to restrict the observations of behaviour to given individuals (1954 : 3, 13-14).

Major View Points on the Concept and Definition of Personality

There are two major concepts regarding personality - one laying emphasis on the internal aspects of personality and the other on the external aspects. Those who give emphasis on the internal aspects opine that there is nothing but the total internal structure of man which refers to the psychological and biological characteristics that he possesses and all the reactions that he makes on the basis of these characteristics. Morton Prince put forward a definition with the similar view. He maintains that, "Personality is the sum-total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites and instincts of
the individual and the acquired disposition and tendencies - acquired by experience" (1924: 532). On the other hand according to those who lay emphasis on the external aspects, maintain that a man's personality is largely determined by his membership character. The structure of the social group in which the individual holds his membership, determines the pattern of the traits of his personality. The pattern of his personality, traits, his beliefs, attitudes, modes of thinking and behaving differ with the structure of the social group. So much emphasis is laid on culture patterning the personality that Kluckhohn and Murray (1948) said "Personality is the subjective side of culture, and in a sense every culture has its own characteristic personality, though of course, it is personality, that changes with time." 

Gardner Murphy goes even further to tell us that personality is nothing but the reflection of certain cultural requirements at a given time. "Individual-environment relation involves larger fields, the organism being an aspect of such a field. Each individual is a member of a community and is guided, inhibited, moulded and structured by the life of the community; each personality is a reflection of a developmental history in a specific cultural whole" (1947: 20-21).
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We may agree with Murphy in that personality is not just a biological entity but also a social one. To prove this point he says -

"Man is a creature that responds to other men in as full a sense as he responds to oxygen or gravity; he is as fully anthropotropio as geotropic. Man as man is in some degree social; the inner-outer structure which is the product of a particular organism - culture interaction, gives at the same time the first law of cultural reaction, the key to the cultural nexus itself. If all the men and all of the culture, its geographic, economic, institutional patterns are held in view at once, personality study becomes bio-social, not only a biological investigation" (Murphy, 1947 : 6).

Personality thus is the inter-relation of the internal and external fields of the individual. Internal field is the biological process including physiological, mental and psycho-sexual functions, temperament, nervous system, endocrine functions and body chemistry and other related inner functions. External field includes the social, cultural, geographical other such forces. According to some sociologists, anthropologists and social psychologists, the social and cultural forces are more important than the heredity and biological forces in the process of development of personality pattern. Many of the biological urges such as sex, hunger etc. are found to be subordinated to social and cultural forces. An individual's motivation and action pattern are most often influenced by the
cultural pattern of the society to which he belongs. His ideas, mode of thinking; emotions and many other internal structure, are much influenced by the cultural norms and values of his own group. The difference of personalities of men and women, of young and old are mostly due to the experience of playing various roles in conformity with cultural standards. Although, the operation of biological factors such as age, cannot be overlooked here as the activity declines with age and it manifests in one's personality. Again women are different from men also due to their biological difference.

A definition put forward by Warren includes both views and comes quite near to a general consensus of psychological thought at the present time. According to him "personality is the integrated organization of all the cognitive, affective, conative and physical characteristics of an individual as it manifests itself in focal distinctness to others." For Eysenck, "Personality is the sum-total of the actual or potential behaviour patterns of the organism, as determined by heredity and environment, it originates and develops through the functional interaction of the four main sectors into which these behaviour patterns are organized: the cognitive sector (intelligence), the conative sector (character), the affective sector (temperament) and the somative sector (constitution) (1955 : 25).
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Some field theorists such as K. Lewin and others, maintain that the individual may experience certain psychological frustrations or blockages due to the pressure put on him by the field structure of the social group to which he belongs. The Neo-Freudians like K. Horney, O. Fenichel and some other depth-psychologists are also of the view that man's psychological blockages are primarily determined by certain socio-psychological forces. Certain ambitions and activities of an individual are directed towards a particular goal, but due to some pressure from the society, he may not reach the goal and cannot fulfill the ambitions. This raises frustration in his mind which in turn decides his personality pattern.

As regards heredity and environment also, there is a great deal of controversy as to which plays more influence on personality. It is however agreed that both play very important role on one's personality. Wiggan, being in favour of heredity, says - "Heredity, and not environment is the chief maker of man. The difference is in the germ cells with which they are born" (1923: 42). Behaviourists on the other hand strongly advocate the superiority of environment to heredity. Watson therefore says, "Give me a dozen healthy infants, well formed, and my own specified world to bring them up and I will guarantee to take any one of them at random and train them to become any type of specialist I might select - doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief and yes, even beggar - man and thief, regardless of his talents peculiarities, tendencies, abilities, vocations and race of his ancestors" (1925: 82). But even such an extreme environmentalist
like Watson cannot deny the inheritance of physical structure. They however talk of only structure as inherited, i.e., the structure determined by the germ cells and the others like habits, handwriting, emotional outburst are the results of training.

Though not only extremist like Watson but most psychologists tend to stress the operation of environmental forces on personality. They ascribe almost all personal characteristics to conditioning, imitation, trauma or some other form of learning. But nobody can deny the influence of genes on one's action patterns. When genes do not allow, no amount of training can enable him to achieve. Practice is possible but it has its demarcating line. The doctrine of genetic determination, however, does not imply that personality is inherited but, it only implies that no feature of personality is devoid of hereditary influences. Allport puts forward an equation which reads as -

"Personality = f (Heredity) x (environment). The two causal factors are not added together but are interrelated as multiplier and multiplicated. If either were zero there could be no personality" (1949 : 106).

Development of Personality

Personality does not begin at birth. Human infant is fully a creature of heredity; unable to encounter the world - the environment in which he is to pass his life. Although, hereditary
endowments are latent at birth, at the time of development of personality they emerge into visible qualities. Heredity and environment gives personality a matured form. Motivation is what directs the individual's activities in a goal oriented direction, thereby influencing personality. Learning determines personality and other than the few instinctive behaviour all other behaviour is learnt. Motivation and learning are two factors closely related in giving the ultimate pattern to personality. Behind all learning there lies some motive. In other words all learnings are motivation oriented.

Allport lays tremendous stress on the phenomenon of integration to the growth of personality. It is often considered to be the supreme principle of the growth of personality. He distinguishes a hierarchy of levels produced by integration in ascending order. He thus writes -

"Firstly, there are the (1) Conditioned reflexes, the simplest learned forms of adaptive behaviour involving substitution of associated stimuli for congenitally effective stimuli, with the result the individual performs innate acts to altered stimuli situations. (2) Habits are integrated systems of conditioned responses, involving altered responses as well as an extended range of effective conditioning leading to fairly stereotyped forms of responses in the face of recurrent situations of a similar type. (3) Traits are, more dynamic and flexible dispositions, resulting at least in part, from the integration of specific habits, expressing characteristic modes of adaptation"
to one's surroundings. Belonging to this level are the dispositions variously called sentiments, attitudes, values, complexes, and interests. (4) Selves are systems of traits that are coherent among themselves, but are likely to vary in different situations" (1951 : 139-140).

Last of all, there is the (5) personality, the progressive final integration of all the systems of responses that determine his action and influences his thought pattern.

For Sigmund Freud (1949) the 'libido' is the central force behind the entire structure of personality. By the term libido, he meant the force by which the sexual instinct is represented in the mind. Like many other psychologists he too maintained that personality is the accumulated experiences since one's birth and childhood till whatever age he is at. Experiences during childhood is no doubt very important for the mental growth of the individual. But Freud was the first to explain the role of childhood sex experiences on the pattern of one's personality. His psychoanalytic theory of behaviour refers particularly to the psycho-sexual or libidinal development that is attached to the oral, anal and oedipal phases of child's life. The most important sources of infantile sex urge are the oral, anal and genital area of the child out of which, only one becomes predominants at a particular phase of the child's development. According to the nature of the childhood sexual experience and how he gratifies them at different stages, he may, in later life develop an oral, anal or oedipal personality. Many character and personality
traits of normal individuals are derivations and continuation of infantile sexuality. Early oral eroticism, for example, is represented in later life by kissing, smoking etc. Hoarding, excessive cleanliness, obstinacy etc. are derivatives of anal stage. Individuals who opt for professions that put them in the limelight demonstrate residual narcistic tendencies. The glimpse of oedipus complex is seen in the tendency for boys to marry girls who resemble their mother and for girls to prefer men who have some similarity with their father.

At birth and during the oral stage i.e. the first year of life the child is not able to distinguish between self and non-self. He knows only his own self and not conscious of others around him i.e. 'Id' is predominant at this stage. At the age of two the child develops the idea of self and non-self and with this he develops the ego. This stage is named by Freud as 'anal'. 'Ego' is the consciousness of one's own self. During the first year he had no knowledge of the environment and limitations set by the environment in fulfilling his demands. The moment he felt an urge he wanted it to be gratified. For example, when he felt hungry he wanted to be fed immediately. But in the second year he is able to explore the environment a bit with his newly gained locomotion. In the third year he develops the super-ego with his acceptance of the values and standards of the society. Super-ego always exercises its censorship on animal tendencies of the individual. It commands him to behave in socially approved ways.
The third year of the child's life is the most important of all the years as proper organization of the psychosexual forces in the third year helps the child to meet the emotional problems attached to the Oedipus Complex in male-child and Electra-Complex in female-child. Oedipus Complex is anti-father attitude and jealousy for one's father and Electra-complex is the anti-mother attitude and jealousy for one's mother. However, at this stage the child gradually begins to develop some control over his emotions. The ego checks the child's antisocial desires and tendencies. Thus social anxiety develops in the mind of the child at this stage. Many abnormalities of adulthood are traced back to this period as most of the repressed desires which find their outcome through other channels originate at this period. At the end of the sixth year the individual's super-ego is more synthesized and one is able to handle situations carefully enough.

Freud was the first to formulate the psychology of unconscious. But years before, Aristotle formulated the psychology of conscious mental life. According to Freud the unconscious, preconscious and conscious - these are the three stages of the mind. Unconscious has to serve two main purposes. On one hand, it stores up forgotten or repressed memories. On the other hand, it contains the basic energies, instinctual drives, mainly sex and aggression. Dynamic 'id' is unconscious and is the original system of personality, out of which other systems differentiate.
As mentioned above the 'id' has no power with which he can recognize outer reality. It operates only for the gratification of the instincts, on the pleasure-principle, avoids pain and obtains pleasure. It contains the reflex action and the primary forces. Reflex actions are such as sucking, sneezing, blinking etc. and primary process refers to the wish-fulfilling tendencies which are noted in fantasies and dreams. It wants its desires to be gratified directly and immediately. But it can do nothing to bring about such gratification; it is beyond its reflex action.

Ego comes about at an early age of one's life for the purpose of serving the id. With the aid of secondary process it operates itself by the 'reality principle'. The ego solves various problems, it has the power to think and protect itself and the id. It keeps a balance between the instincts and the outer world. It has to carry on such varied tasks, that often it cannot make the difficult adjustments required and consequently frustration and conflict occurs and it breaks down into anxiety. Anxiety, originating in such cases, if prolonged and unresolved, results in some form of neurotic behaviour.

Ego has another task which is to bring about a balance between the outer reality and the super-ego. Super-ego is one's conscience. It is a set of habits learned from parents and from society that requires the individual to carry out his task according to prescribed rules.
'Id' wants its way out. It refuses to be socialized or civilized - but society demands behaviour which are carried out according to its norms. With the help of the secondary process the ego has to satisfy both the id and the super-ego. Most of the time the intelligent problem solving helps, but, with a strong id and a strong super-ego, ego can do nothing but use the power of repression. Repression sends the unfulfilled desires and memory of them out of consciousness and prevents them from returning. If ever they return to the consciousness they do so in a censored form. As socialization continues, the super-ego sees to it that more and more repressions occur to the desires which are regarded as taboo in the society. They, however, come out in dreams, fantasies and in the symptoms of mental abnormalities.

There are many other thinkers who put forward their views regarding the concept of personality, often giving their own definitions to suit their point of view. Adler and Jung who were in collaboration with Freud disagreed with many of his views and deviated from him to establish their own theories. Adler's theory is known as Individualistic theory and Jung's the Depth psychology. Perhaps the Neo-Freudians - Moreno, Erikson, Sullivan, Horney and Fromm's contributions were made due to Freud's labo­rious treatment however strongly they may refute him of his theory and his very basic principles. Freud's concept of infantile sexuality is strongly criticized. But all agree on the point that the modes through which an individual meets his frustrations determine his personality make up (see Freedman, Kaplan and Kaplan 1967 : 270-300).
Jung (1953) deviated vigorously from Freud as he found that although the root of ill-health lies in the unconscious - it is not necessary that this deeper region of human nature contains only what is evil, dirty and dangerous. Jung's unconsciousness contains more than aggressive and sexual impulses embedded in the taboos and rejected memories. It also contains "racial memories" (archetypes) which are thought-forms basic to human existence. Therefore, the concepts like orderly nature, immortality are categories of a universal human order and seem to lie in a latent form in the unconscious. Likewise, there are creative urges and energies available in the unconscious. Furthermore, the unconscious contains the complement of our everyday personalities for qualities that reside there are the reciprocal of our real nature.

Adler (1911) on the other hand turned to the sociological determinants of behaviour. He developed his own theory of personality in which he redefined the unconscious and challenged the validity of Freud's concepts of basic drives and the phenomenon of repression as an essential prerequisite for the development of neurotic symptoms. Adler's theory has been criticized for over-simplification on the grounds that he reduces all sources of motivation to "feelings of inferiority" and the "striving for superiority". But Adler claimed that he used these terms in a very broad sense.

Lastly, a group of psychologists offered a purely physiological basis of personality. It is, of course, apparent
from the everyday observation that physical condition of the body is an important factor in shaping and moulding personality. Holding such views, some have gone so far as to call personality the product of the workings of the endocrine glands. But, though personality to a large extent is dependent on the glands, it is not merely the glands that personality depends on. Malfunctioning of the glands may however change the personality pattern and lead to maladjusted personalities.

Other than Adler and Jung, there are many others who deviate from Freud in their view. Among them the name of Karen Horney, H.S. Sullivan, E. Fromm, Otto Rank are worth mentioning.

Karen Horney's theory is mainly the formulation of the concepts during the last fifteen years of her life. She differs from the classical (Freudian) theory in several respects. She did not accept the libido theory and the postulates derived there from while recognizing the importance of sexual drives, she did not think them to be universally uniform neither did she consider them to be the cause of neurosis. On the contrary, cultural factors and the disturbances in interpersonal and intrapsychic development were considered to be the cause of disturbances in sexual functioning and of neurosis in general. She rejected the concept of id, ego, superego and in its place postulated a more holistic and dynamic concept of the self. An emphasis was placed on the significance of childhood events which, however, was not direct or relatable cause of adult neurotic symptoms. Infantile attitudes were seen by her as
initiating neurotic development, which then becomes self-perpetuated. As Horney was an experimental clinician, her main concern was therapy and her theory is clinically oriented (see Feedman, Kaplan and Kaplan, 1967: 327-328).

H.S. Sullivan was another prominent figure who made basic and significant contributions to the psychodynamic theory and to the theory of mental disorders, which emphasized the cultural matrix of personality development. He was particularly dissatisfied with those psychoanalytic concepts which could not be validated because they were based on experiences which were beyond recall or because they required prior acceptance of certain variables, such as the aggressive or death instinct, as universal human attributes. He, therefore, insisted on formulating his concepts entirely from observable data. He limited his concepts to formulations which were capable of being tested and either validated or disproven.

Sullivan formulated four basic postulates as the foundation of all his theories. Firstly, there was the 'biological postulate'. This stated that man, as an animal, differs from all other animals in his cultural interdependence. His functioning within his cultural matrix differs from the instinctually derived herd behaviour which is characteristic of most animals. Instead, man's cultural development is a function of his psychological, as well as his physiological dependence. It stems from his growing capacity for tenderness, from his ability to develop interest in another human being which is equal to his interest in himself.
His second postulate is that "man is more simply human than otherwise." This postulate implies that man, in the performance of his most diverse activities, is still closer to the human mode of functioning than to that of animals. It thereby tends to encourage more simple explanations for complicated distortions of behaviour, without evoking unnecessary or unsupported hypothesis derived from myth or instinctual explanations.

His third postulate is the 'significance of anxiety'. This refers to the central role of anxiety in human development. It emphasizes the presence of anxiety, to varying degrees, in all human functioning, but postulates the impossibility of absolute states of anxiety, and also of absolute states of euphoria.

The fourth is the tenderness postulate. It is an attempt to conceive of tenderness, in all its various manifestations, as an interpersonal development rather than an innate feeling present in the form of an instinct or a God-given virtue.

With the help of above postulates he tries to explain all human behaviour - normal and abnormal. His stages of personality development can also be well conceived by any one. They are - infancy, childhood, Juvenileera, preadolescence, adolescence and adulthood. One's personality is his experiences and fulfilment of the biological and cultural necessities during these stages (see Freedman, Kaplan and Kaplan, 1967 : 338-351).
R. Fromm is another Neo-Freudian who has contributed important insights into individual psycho-dynamics and their relationship to historical and socio-economic concepts, which have exerted a significant influence on the layman, as well as, on psycho-analysts, psychologists, sociologists, and philosophers. Fromm has been critical of many of Freud's formulations mainly of his source and nature of psychic energy, i.e., his libido theory. As opposed to the view of classical psycho-analysis, Fromm believes that the fundamental basis of character is not seen in various types of libido organization but in specific kinds of a person's relatedness to the world, in the action of acquiring things and relating to people.

Fromm recognises that man's behaviour is motivated by his biological requirements. However, he contends that human motivation are culturally determined and society generates new needs and problems which are superimposed upon man's instinctual needs and are as imperative as the instinctual demands of hunger, thirst and sexuality. He believes that society has a creative as well as a suppressing function; that man's passions and anxieties are, for the most part, products of his culture.

His theory of personality development is in harmony with his hypothesis that man relates to his world, either through acquiring and assimilating things ("assimilation") or by relating to people and to himself ("socialisation"). He can take things or produce them himself, to satisfy his needs. But he must also associate with others in work, play and sexual activities.
Complete isolation is incompatible with sanity. The specific way in which the individual relates, that is, whether with love or hate, competition or co-operation, freedom or oppression, is an expression of his personality or character.

Socialization may take one of five forms or orientations - masochism, sodism, destructiveness, automation, conformity, and love which correspond to five types of assimilation emerging as receptive, exploitative, hoarding, marketing and productive character (See Freedman, Kaplan and Kaplan, 1967 : 351-354).

**Abnormal Personalities**

People who cannot adjust to their environment in the proper fashion are said to be having abnormal personality. Abnormality, however, is a relative term and there is no hard and fast dividing line between normality and abnormality of personalities. There are some people in the society who are considered to be accepted members and others to be deviators. People differ from one another in personality traits. But, they need not have to be exceptionally excitable, seclusive, depressed, suspicious, or otherwise very outstanding. Although they have frustrations, conflicts and hardships, their lives are not greatly disrupted by their misfortunes. These common men and women, who exhibit competence in self-management and get along reasonably well with themselves and their associates, constitute the normal or average group.
There are some who deviate from the normal, in a favourable or healthy direction and are called superiors as they have superior intelligence, better social adjustment and high emotional stability. But there are also some who deviate from normal in a pathological direction and are emotionally unstable. They have disorganised personality and character defects. There are abnormal deviates who constitute about ten per cent of the general population and falls in the categories of psychosomatic, psychotic, mentally defective and antisocial.

According to the statistical criterion, abnormality and superiority merely represent quantitative deviation from normal or average. As Page maintains - "most individuals, on the basis of statistical criterion, are normal. They are located at the centre of the bell-shaped curve. As we proceed away from the centre in either direction, greater and greater deviations from the normal are encountered, and the most extreme deviants are arbitrarily called "abnormal" and 'superior', depending upon the social evaluation or the desirability of the considered trait." (1947 : 14). He explains it with the help of a curve which is given below:
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In the above curve the largest number of individuals are concentrated in the central or normal area, and the number gradually decreases as the extremes of abnormality and superiority are approached.

Of the abnormal group, people suffer from two types of psychological illness - Neurosis and psychosis. In the neurotic type, personality remains intact. But in the psychotic form of disorder, personality integration is shattered and individual's social relationship is disrupted. In mental deficiency, personality suffers for the fact that mentally deficient have subnormal intelligence or retarded mental development. Antisocial personalities are those who show signs of antisocial behaviour. They may be either law violators or psychopathic personalities. Various treatments, however, are available which improve or cure abnormality in personality.

Personality - Viewed from Indian Systems of Thought

Personality, as a distinctive subject of study, that engages attention of the modern psychologists was not a topic of formal discussion in any system of Indian Philosophy. Separateness or uniqueness in character of individuals or rather psychological individuality of a human being did attract their casual attention but it can hardly be called a systematized study. The Indian Philosophy, after all, is a study of man in its spiritual aspect and it is quite natural that philosophers of the different
systems touch upon the varying character of human nature as found in different individuals. The scriptures like the smritiś, epics and puranas also deal with this topic in different context. So, it is not altogether impossible to form an idea of the theories regarding the nature, cause and ways of development of personality as propounded by the ancient seers of India.

Almost all the systems of Indian Philosophy except that of charavāka and Nādha agree in holding that the outward expressions of the human personality does not reflect the true nature of the soul. The soul is pure and untouched by the activities of the body and the mind. The body, mind and intellect are the products of Prakriti or Karmic matter as put by the Jainas. The soul identifies wrongly with it and this wrong identification results in such knowledge as "I am a Brahmin", "I am wise", "I am stout", etc. The individual soul falls a victim of former vasanas (the impressions of the past life) and therefore of Karma and rebirth. Thus the individual's concern should be to rise above the personality consciousness. Different sadhanas are meant to lead the individual to that stage of spiritual progress. It, therefore, appears that personality according to Indian systems of thought is largely determined by the results of one's previous Karmas and the soul in its true nature remains pure and aloof, save and except that it lends its illuminating consciousness. The individuals' endeavour is to realize the true nature.

Personality including physical traits, is the result of the evolution of prakriti at the urge of former vasanas of the
individual soul. The soul entrapped in it retains the original illuminating consciousness but, as a result of super-imposition of the body, senses and mind gives it an individual character. The conscious principle (ātman) is only the illuminating factor without which the body, mind and intellect are not capable of functioning. But 'ātman' cannot be held responsible for the peculiar traits of the individual. These peculiar traits which form the character and individualness of the human personality are the products not of the soul, but of the creative matter and accumulating influence of the past actions of previous births. Thus reincarnation (punarjanma) and the revolution of the three gunas of prakriti are responsible for peculiar way of functioning of the body, senses, mind and intellect of an individual which contributes towards the growth of the personality in human being. This is, by and large the view of the Indian systems of Philosophy regarding the growth and development of personality.

So, according to Indian view of life a person has little hand in shaping his personality in the present birth. Personality acquires its individuality through automatic action of the propensities (Vāsanā) which he accumulates and carries with it through the cycle of death and existence. The Hindu scriptures classify men into three categories in accordance with the preponderance of one of three gunas with which he is born. The Gita in the 16th chapter while enumerating the godly (daivī) and āsurīś (demonic) manifestations, roughly corresponding to the three gunas Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, uses the word abhijāta in
respect of the person possessing them. The word abhijàta is explained by commentators as one who is born towards the fulfilment of certain vices and virtues. This means a man is born inclined naturally towards certain behaviour pattern of life. The Gita again in a previous chapter (14th) classifies human traits of character in three broad categories. We give here the translation of the relevant slukas.

"The Nature-born qualities of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas firmly tie the imperishable soul to the body, O Valiant Arjuna.

"Of these Sattva, being immaculate, is illuminating and flawless; it binds through self-identification with happiness and wisdom, O sinless Arjuna.

"Again, know Rajas, which is of the nature of passion, as born of cupidity and attachment. It binds the soul through attachment to actions and their traits, O son of Kunti.

"And know Tamas, the deluder of all embodied beings, as born of ignorance, it binds the soul through error, sloth and sleep, Arjuna.

"Arjuna, Sattva urges one to happiness, and Rajas to action; while Tamas, clouding wisdom, urges one to error.

"Sattva prevails suppressing Rajas and Tamas; Rajas prevails suppressing Sattva and Tamas; and Tamas prevails suppressing Sattva and Rajas, O descendant of Bharata.
When in this body, as well as in the mind and senses, perspicuity and discernment make their appearance, then Sattva should be regarded as predominant.

With the preponderance of Rajas, O chief of Bharatas, greed, activity, under taking of actions with a selfish motive, restlessness and a thirst for enjoyment make their appearance.

With the growth of Tamas, Arjuna, obtuseness, inactivity, carelessness and stupor — all these appear in the mind and senses” (chapter 14: 5-13).

In the 16th chapter these three classes, having preponderance of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas are compressed into two only — divine and demonic characteristics of human personality (Daivi and Āsuri Sampat). The Gita uses the word Sampat in a significant way which can be translated as special characteristics of a person. In fact, the word can be used for personality. The 16th chapter enumerates these Sampats as follows :

“Fealessness, absolute purity of heart, constant absorption of mind in meditation for Self - Realization and the Sattvic form of charity, control of the senses, worship (of God as well as celestial beings and superiors) and the performance of Agnihotra (pouring oblations into the sacred fire) and other auspicious acts, study of the Vedas and other sacred texts, chanting of Divine Names and glories, bearing of hardships for the sake of one’s own Dharma and Straightness of mind, including straightness of the body and senses.
Non-violence in thought, word and deed, truthfulness and geniality of speech, absence of anger even on provocation, renunciation of the idea of doership in action, tranquility of mind, refraining from malicious gossip, kindness to all creatures, absence of attachment to the objects of senses even during their contact with the senses, mindfulness, sense and shame in doing things not sanctioned by the scriptures or usage, abstaining from idle pursuits, —

Sublimity, forgiveness, fortitude, external purity, absence of malice, absence of the feeling of self-importance: these are the marks of one who is naturally endowed with divine virtues, 0 descendant of Bharata.

Hypocrisy, arrogance, pride, anger, harshness and ignorance; these, Arjuna, are the marks of one who is born with demonical properties.

Divine virtues are regarded as conducive to liberation and demonical properties as conducive to bondage. Grieve not, Arjuna, for you are born with divine virtues (16 : 1-5).

This is only a broad statement, it delves only at the root cause of diversity of individual characteristics. It has not ruled out the possibility of innumerable combinations and varieties leading to myriad of personality.

Now, does it mean that the personality in man is pre-determined and the individual concerned has no hand in reshaping
or reforming it? Does it mean that the heredity and environment play no part in the growth of personality? Indian thinkers did not treat these factors as special topics of discussion. But, they have not failed by implication at any rate to take all these influences into account and have not overlooked their importance in the scheme of individual and social life. As to the first that is individual’s hand in shaping personality is discussed in various context in the Gita, the Patanjala Yoga Sutra and the other Smritis. Swami Vivekananda in his Jnanayoga while commenting on the Yogasutra 1:12 variably determines the place of individual’s effort to fight against the accumulated vasanas or Karmāśaya (according to Yogadarshana). The translation of the relevant portion is quoted below.

"The mind to have non-attachment, must be clear, good and rational. Why should we practice? Because each action is like the pulsations quivering over the surface of the lake. The vibrations dies out, and what is left? The samskaras, the impressions. When a large number of these impressions is left on the mind, they coalesce and become a habit. It is said, 'Habit is second nature', it is first nature also, and the whole nature of man, everything that we are is the result of habit. That gives us causation, because, if it, only habits, we can make and unmake it at any time. The samskaras are left by these vibrations passing out of our mind, each one of them having its result. Our character is the sum total of these marks, and accordingly as some particular wave prevails one takes that tone. If good prevails one becomes good; if wickedness, one becomes wicked; if
joyousness, one becomes happy. The only remedy for bad habits is counter-habits; all the bad habits that have left their impressions are to be controlled by good habits. Go on doing good, thinking holy thought continuously; that is the only way to suppress base impressions. Never say any man is hopeless, because he only represents a character, a bundle of habits, which can be checked by new and better ones. Character is repeated habits, and repeated habits alone can reform character (Rajayoga : 126-27).

The determining factors of development of personality such as heredity, environment, social setup, racial memories etc. are not discussed as such. But from a study of the Hindu code of life as represented in the Dharma sastras we learn, that these factors are not totally ignored. These codes were framed with an eye to promote healthy growth of physical, mental and spiritual faculties of a person. And these faculties largely contribute towards the formation of personality. Let us examine a few of these rules and try to find out their underlying purpose in so far as they contribute towards the growth of personality.

**Heredity**

That Hereditary transmission of physical features, mental qualities and intellectual abilities is a factor in formation of personality which is not a subject of serious controversy. The ancient law givers of India took this as granted in formulating rules of marriage and in setting out its restrictions
and limitations. For instance when Manu says -

"Sons born of the four forms of marriage, consecutively counted from the Brahma form, become possessed of the energy of Brahma and are recognized (as well-born) by honest men.

"Handsome looking, wealthy, renowned, possessed of fortitude and good qualities, virtuous and amply provided with all the objects of enjoyment, these sons live for a hundred years.

"Sons of the remaining (four) law (forms of marriage) are born cruel, untruthful, and hostile to the religion of Brahma (i.e., to the Vedas).

"Sons begotten on commendable wives are born with commendable traits (in their character); sons, the offsprings of unions with commendable wives, are born with commendable traits in their character. Hence, let a man avoid a vile form of matrimony (Manu Samhita 3:39-42).

This clearly indicates that when Manu prescribed these rules and praised the first four types of marriage he had in his mind the conviction that heredity plays an important part in forming traits of human character, although the subject-matter of heredity is not discussed as such. Further, Manu lays special stress on marrying a girl from good families, the members of which possess high qualities of head and heart. He enumerates the causes that lead to a fall of families of high esteem (Manu Samhita 3:55-65). Manu, of course, lays special emphasis on Vedic learning and performance of Vedic rituals for these were
considered as the sure criteria of an exulted and cultured family. One may argue that the special stress of good families for the purpose of marriage run counter to the theory of Karma. This is not so. The Gita states clearly that a person with good achievement to his credit in this birth will be reborn in a pure and prosperous family (Gita 6:41). So, birth in a good family is the result of good actions.

Environment

Almost all the authors of the Smriti Sastra were sufficiently conscious of the inevitable part played by environment on the life and character of an individual. There are definite recommendation as to the proper place and surroundings where a householder should settle and as to improper places where he should not settle. For instance one should not settle in a village surrounded by people devoid of virtue nor should one settle in a village where most people suffer from diseases or mostly inhabited by mlecchas or infested by people who are outside the Vedic society (Manu 4:60-61).

Other unorthodox system of philosophy such as Buddha and Jaina accept Karma theory, nevertheless, these systems attach great importance to the organizational scheme (Sangha). This presupposes strong belief in the influence of environment on the growth of a desired personality in a Vonk. Jainism is based on the theory that the soul gathers karmik matters (Kārmaka-śarīra) around it. These karmik matters determine the mental and
physical nature of a person, so much so, that according to the Jaina Sādhanta the conditioning of the physical body and of the circumstances depending on that body such as decent, family-status, wealth, duration of life etc. are the results of the mechanical operation of the force of Karma stored up in the kārmāṇaśārīra. Inspite of these the Jaina rules of aestheticism demand that a house holder who desired to be ordained a saint (Sādhu) should have been born in an ārya country. This is because a proper environment is necessary to the success of a Sadhu life which may be adversely affected by unsuitable surroundings.

In spite of all what we have said in the previous paragraphs the difficulty of scientific presentation of the formation and growth of personality on the background of Indian philosophy and religion remains. This difficulty arises out of the mystic character of the theory of Karma which precludes scientific investigation.

Notwithstanding, we may examine the theory so far as it admits scientific pursuit. The theory that every action has its reaction has nothing to oppose. We see and feel that our thoughts, feelings and works leave an impression on our mind. The impressions in turn produce stimuli for further similar actions, sometimes favourably and sometimes adversely. In this way the process continues. Our present actions determine the nature of future actions to a great extent and thus the process goes on building up the character of the individual. It has
been established by experimental psychology today that some events of childhood leave an indelible mark in mind which is responsible for particular development in the character of the individual. If things are viewed from this angle, the varma-theory may help us in pursuing the cause of growth of individual-ness, distinct personalities. This perhaps has not been done fully so far.

In the above discussion we have dealt with various views that have been put forward regarding the concept of personality - from mask concept to the extreme behaviouristic concept. While appreciating the different points of view we hold that personality is not a finished product, but is a dynamic aspect of an individual which varies from person to person according to varying cultural and environmental conditions and mental make-up.

In the present thesis we intend to find out the effect of culture in moulding one's personality with reference to two tribes, i.e., Khasi and Naga. Although it may be true that culture is not solely responsible for the growth and pattern of personality, it is undoubtedly an important factor. In this thesis we will make an endeavour to find out how far the culture of these two different tribes is effective in bringing about similarity and dissimilarity in the personality of the individuals of the Khasi and the Naga tribes.