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CHAPTER VI.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF CONCEPT OF PERSONALITY IN WESTERN PSYCHOLOGY:
ITS INTEGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT.

Psychology was particularly considered in the West as the Science of Mind or the Soul for centuries past. Along with the varying interest of the Psychologists at different times, and in consideration of the changing needs of society, the definitions, meanings, methods of study and the scope of psychology underwent great change. And with the approach of the twentieth century, when the physical sciences were advancing by leaps and bounds, psychology also tried in various ways to follow suit, and to join the race. As a Science of the "Breath of life", or "Science of the Soul" with the contesting spirit of becoming a pure Science at the current century, its methods became more analytical and experimental, so that it may be regarded and defined at present as "What Psychologists are interested in." (1). Although different psychologists used different terms in those definition of the subject like 'Soul', 'self', 'individual' etc., these words practically meant only the mind. The craze for making psychology an exact science, and the ambition to extend its scope to the study of creatures other than man, minimised the depth and richness of the human individual with a view to meet the demands of the scientific methods of observation and experiments. So, man as individual with all his richness and depth of his being has to be done away with making its shadowy "generalised human mind", as Professor

(1) Psychology - Woodworth & Marquis, page 1.
Allport has observed, the subject matter of psychological research. Such an approach to psychology failed to satisfy all the psychologist alike, for this will leave out of account some of the essentials of true human individual, and will deal with the abstract and manifest at the cost of the real and the concrete.

In order to make good the imperfect picture of the human individual and to give a fuller account of the human mind, a new movement took place a decade or two back, which came to be known as the Psychology of Personality. In attempting to know specially the structure and composition of personality, very extensive literatures on the subject have within this short period accumulated. Methods adopted for various researches on the subject become purely Scientific. Methodologies used in Psychology of personality were again prevailed upon by the Sciences. The urge to reduce the study of personality to a Science of personality based upon the laws of uniformity of events and cause and effect compelled Psychologists to "ignore "Richness and dignity of human personality", together with the fact of its being a "relatively enduring and unique organization" (1). Professor G.W.Allport has the credit of making systematic and exhaustive review of the current literatures on the subject and also making a critical estimate. It will be worthwhile to make a brief review of the opinions of the leading writers on the subject selecting our subject-matter from some competent sources. In so doing, we shall limit our discussion only to the definitions, integration and development of personality alone. How far is it possible to make the psychology of personality Scientific? Mathematics is a Science, because it can observe,

(1) Personality, a Psychological Interpretation—Professor G.W.Allport.
verify and formulate laws, which hold good in the sphere of that Science. Similarly, Physics, Botany, Geology etc. study the facts of nature belonging to their respective spheres, analyse, compare, classify and observe and experiment upon their behaviour and establish laws that hold good in regard to those facts. Other biological Sciences also may be Scientific both in their methods without doing much injustice to the phenomena under investigation. But human individuality and the core of personality accompanying it differ from the rest on account of its varied structure, richness and depth of its make-up. Due to this fact, the more we make Scientific approach to the study of personality, the further does it recede from our grasp like the distant horizon. "To abstract generalized human mind from population of active, prepossessing, well-born persons is a feat of questionable value. The generalized human mind is an entity really mythical; it lacks the most essential characteristics of mind-locus, organic quality, reciprocal action of parts and self-consciousness."

Science is commonly considered to give men control over nature, but in the psychological field there is no "generalized mind" to be controlled. There are only single, concrete minds, each one of which presents problems peculiar to itself. We are, therefore, constrained to note that Science of Psychology either as an individual psychology or as psychology of a "generalised mind", can hardly claim to be purely Scientific.

Next let us consider what the psychology of personality or Science of personality undertake to deal with? What is the exact concept of personality that psychology of personality

(1) Personality - Professor G.W. Allport, page 5.
proposes to discuss? What exactly do they mean by the term 'Personality'? What is the exact definition of the term 'Personality'? Personality is distinct and different from individuality of man. Individuality of every man consists in being peculiarly distinct, separate and unique from others. Individuality of a man consists in being "an amazingly complex organization, comprising of distinctive habits of thought and expression, his attitudes, traits and interests, and his own peculiar philosophy of life."(1). Individuality thus comprises of manifold psycho-physical distinctness and separations. Thus we can go on distinguishing personality from individuality, character, self, etc. and show what it is not. But to give an exact definition of personality and to say what it really is, is too difficult a job for the psychologists. For, as Professor Allport has observed, "Personality is one of the most abstract words in our language, and like any abstract word suffering from excessive use, its connotative significance is very broad, its denotative significance negligible."(2).

The term personality was etymologically derived from the word "Persona", which means mask put on by an actor in a dramatic performance to play his role. Beginning with such an etymological interpretation, Professor Allport made very exhaustive and critical estimate of as many as fifty definitions of the term 'personality', and finally gave his own working definition of the term. In so doing he grouped the definitions under the categories - Physical, theological, philosophical, juristic, sociological, biosocial, psychological etc. Allport also distinguished Personality from Character, temperament,

(1) Personality - Professor G.W.Allport, p.24.
(2) Loc.cit.,p.25.
attitude, disposition etc. In his opinion, Character belongs to, either as evaluation or moral estimate of the individual and as such, psychology has nothing to do with it. To him "Character is personality evaluated, and personality is character devaluated."(1). Similarly, temperament is an element in personality, a raw material for personality. He, therefore, defines temperament in the following way."Temperament refers to the characteristic phenomena of an individual's emotional nature, and includes his susceptibility to emotional stimulation, his customary strength and speed of response, the quality of his prevailing mood, and all peculiarities of fluctuation and intensity in mood; these phenomena being regarded as dependent upon constitutional make-up and, therefore, largely hereditary in origin."(2). Allport makes rather a very comprehensive review and critically examined some of the representative definitions of personality, before formulating his own definition of the term. These definitions, therefore, for the sake of brevity do not properly deserve repetition. After critical observations, Allport has framed his own working definition of personality attempting to make it synthetic and free from their flaws, making good their omissions and inadequacies. He also analysed the essentials of his definition of personality with a view to bringing out its propriety and comprehensiveness. He defined personality as "Dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment."(3). On analysis of this definition, it is clear that the writer emphasized 'dynamic organization' 

(1) Personality - Professor O.W. Allport, p. 52.
(2) Loc. cit - p. 54.
(3) Loc. cit - p. 48.
in order to include mental organization, which changes in
the process of evolving, being also motivational and self-
regulating. The dynamism also indicates both the normal
and abnormal. The definitions also unites the Psychoso-
omatic activities in the uniqueness of personality.
Professor Allport has succeeded in giving rather a comprehen-
sive and synthetic definition of personality satisfactorily
representing the concept as understood by the modern western
Psychology.

If we approach the above definition given by one
competent authority on the subject, despite the manifold
merits of the definition, we are constrained to observe that
it lacks some of the essential elements without which human
personality falls short of its richness and proper connotation.
Professor Allport himself admits clearly that "Personality is
something and does something" and that "It is what lies behind
specific act and within the individual." He also admits that
in behaviour and reaction to environment, human personality
unlike the plants and animals is 'unique' and involves 'mastery'
over the environmental situations. How can there be a dynamic
organization within the individual, if there is nothing
superior and beyond individuality to organize and systematise
the behavioural patterns in view of the supra-sensuous values
and standards or ideals of our being? How can behaviours to
environmental situations be understood, when we leave out of
account the character of the agent? What is it that supplies
the driving force to the will to act or behave, or the desire
to choose a particular line of action at the exclusion of
other conflicting motives of the moment? Is it the 'dynamic
organization', which is an abstract something, that supplies
the moving and the regulative force? Therefore, we cannot leave out of account Character of the individual, which forms an essential element in the structure of personality, nor can we ignore the permanent underlying spiritual subject, which is within, behind and beyond the individual to systematize and organize the behaviour patterns in a unique way and evaluate them and string them together in its own history.(1). This perennial substance, call it philosophical or metaphysical, lies beneath and beyond individuality. 'I' and 'me' of psychology cannot be ignored without distorting the concept of personality. Personality is, therefore, the mark of individuality of this spiritual ego lying beyond and behind individuality.(2). Professor Allport possibly ignored this aspect of personality in order that his definition might be free from philosophical bias and fit for use in psychology as an empirical science. But for the sake of truth, we must not hesitate to call a spade a spade, and Sacrifice the essence of human personality by a process of abstraction. Personality is of course a dynamic organization and there is teleology in the behaviour patterns, as Professor Allport has truly stated, but he did not specifically indicated regarding the organizing principle and the nature of teleology. Hence his definitions is also open to objection.

Another modern Psychologist of repute defines Psychology as "the Science of the activities of the individual", while using the terms activity in broad sense to include both mental and bodily activities.(3). These psychologists also regarded psychology as a Science and used Scientific methods of

(1) Personality -Dr.S.R.Jajwai-p.9.
(2) An Idealist view of life-Dr.Radakrishnan.
(3) Psychology- Woodworth & Marquis-p.3.
observation and experiment to find answers to theoretical and practical questions. In keeping with the Scientific methods and spirit of the subject, these writers believed that personality is not substantive but adverbial giving us not what personality is, but how it acts or behaves. Personality is, therefore, defined as "the total quality of an individual behaviour, as it is revealed in his habits of thought and expressions, his attitudes and interests, his manner of acting, and his personal philosophy of life."(1). The definition clearly aimed at judging personality and suggesting means to develop and improve it. The aim is a biosocial study of personality and as such, the aim is to study social behaviour of the individual rather than to know what personality really is. It appears that these writers equate personality with individuality in action, and believe that every act of the individual bears the stamp of personality. Behaviours and patterns of reaction, however, can give us only the individuality as it appears to others, but not what it really is. Personality is not the sum-total of behaviours and activities of the individual. They may at best give us the empirical aspect of personality and is an imperfect picture of the empirical "me". Personality as a unique whole is greater than its parts giving meaning to the fragmentary and disorganized activities and behaviours by evaluating and systematizing them into its own being. There is urge to unify separateness into a systematic whole. Behaviour of personality cannot be devaluated. "For, "it is most important to distinguish value-experience from empirical-experience. The distinction which emphasise the essential importance of value over against chance-experiences.

(1) Psychology- Woodworth & Marquis - p.87-88.
that occur to us from moment to moment, and from day to day, is extremely important for our theory of personality, because it places the centre of gravity of the personality in the right place."(1). Structural psychologists also lay great emphasis on the separate structures of personality, and busy themselves about finding suitable methods of measurement of dimensions of personality.(2). In almost similar manner, some psychologists define personality as "The pattern of individual life. If we know some one's personality, we can predict how he will behave in a great variety of circumstances." "Personality is not a separable part of an individual, like arm or liver. It is rather a way of regarding everything that he does. It includes his abilities, his disposition, his temperament and his character."(3). Activities and behaviours certainly display individuals abilities, disposition, temperament and character, but they are important aspects of personality, and their sum is not equal to personality. An organic unity, a dynamic system cannot be the sum of its component parts alone, but requires central organizing force by and for which the system goes on working. They are but means to an end.

Different writers describe and define personality in keeping with their viewpoints and thus stress the particular aspect suited to their points of view. Psychologists, who favour biosocial view of personality, emphasise influence of the Individual upon other members of the Society. The biophysical view stresses what the individual is, whereas the biosocial view emphasises the individuals' influences on other people and thus his reputation in Society. In keeping

(2) The Structure of Human Personality - F.J.Eysenck-Mathuen &Co.  
with such a view, some define personality as "the sumtotal of the effects made by an individual upon society." (1). Another writer defines personality as a man's "Social-Stimulus Value". (2). Or in other words, "It is the responses made by others to the individual as a stimulus that define personality". (3). As Professor Allport has pointed out that the biosocial definitions seem to deny personality to men aloof from society like a solitary hermit or a Robinson Crusoe, and that personality of a man becomes a Social gift. Moreover, the exponents of biosocial view err in introducing degrees of personality. Personality cannot be a thing reliant on, other peoples' judgment. "Personality is just as objective a fact as any other event in Nature; there are no special grounds to single it out for biosocial definition." (4).

The behaviourists like Watson in consonance with their behaviouristic creed give rather a physiological meaning to personality. But the blind physiological and material behaviour pattern can by no means be a complex and dynamic system like human personality. Inadequacies and absurdities of the behaviourist's explanation of personality have been pointed out by several writers, and it is needless to repeat them again here.

A recent group of psychologists again attempted to offer a purely physiological basis of personality. Physiological bearings of course play significant role in personal activities and behaviours. "It is apparent from everyday observation that the physical condition of the body is an important factor in personality." "The influence of physiological factors can be

(3) The Foundations of Personality-M.A.May-Chapter-IV.
(4) Personality-Prof.G.W.Allport-p.40ff.
most clearly studied by observing the personality before and after an experimentally produced change in the body condition" (1).
The endocrine glands also affect the body condition by their secretions. This fact has been much exaggerated by some writers. L. Berman, for instance, reduced the human personality to the extent of a product of the workings of the endocrine glands. (2). But such observations are not conceded to by many authorities on the subject. "In more recent years, it has been found that other glands of internal secretion also play a great role in preserving the normal aspects of personality - the parathyroids, the adrenals, the pituitary, and the sex-glands. All these seem to produce internal secretions, which then pass into the blood stream or the lymph-stream and are carried by it to different parts of the nervous system, and these through the nervous system influence conscious life." "Berman and others are ready to believe that many of the idiosyncracies of personality can be explained in this way." "In other words, though we may concede that many of the pathological alterations and changes of personality can be partially explained in terms of disturbed activity of the endocrine glands, this is quite a different thing from claiming that normal personality is to be explained in a materialistic way by normal activity of these glands. The endocrine glands are no more essential to a normal personality than the brain itself or any other parts of the body. One cannot argue from a fact of the pathological order to an explanation of the normal mind." (3). Thus it is far from truth to say that personality is a working of the physiological states and processes, although disorder and pathological conditions of personality may be caused by

irregularities of endocrine glands or any other vital parts of our body. It is not, therefore, logically sound to argue from the facts true to the abnormal minds to those pertaining to normal human mind or personality. Granular disorders may have much to do with emotional tensions, change in temperament and dispositions, but the way these are finally handled is a matter determined by the characteristic of personality and the philosophy of life of the individual. It appears that the endocrinologists made a confusion between personality proper with temperament of the Individual.\(^{(1)}\).

It is now worthwhile to make a brief review of the interpretations of the psycho-analytic school regarding personality. The discussion will be purposely cut short for two-fold reasons. We have already stated in some details the position of Psycho-analysis incorporating the views of Freud as well as his followers both orthodox and dissident. Secondly, psychoanalytic literature has already gained much vogue and familiarity. Freud introduced into psychology a new type of dynamism and gave a new meaning to and picture of human personality. It is necessary, therefore, to discuss the analytic approach of Freudian School in brief regarding the Psychology of personality.

The dynamic theory of psychoanalysis came as a challenge to the prevailing intellectualism in Psychology. From the study of the neurotic and pathological cases, Freud was firmly convinced that the impulsive and emotional factors lying in the unconscious play the most important role in the entire personality. Like the Faculty psychologists of old, Freud

\(^{(1)}\) Allport- page 120.
considered human personality to be composed of three parts -
the Id or impulsive-emotive aspect, Ego or self-conscious
cognitive side of the self and the super-ego or socio-ethical
self as conscience being predominantly cognitive in character.
The Id, as the blind emotional aspect of personality, is the
most powerful factor, whereas the ego as the conscious cognitive
aspect is a passive and much weaker factor. As such, the Ego
is tossed and subject to the tyranny of the reality-principle
of the objective world, the instinctive impulses within the
Id and the constant pricks of conscience or the Super-Ego.
Thus the self-conscious Ego is constantly at war with the three
tyrants leading to manifold inner conflicts and disorders. The
degree of this state of inner conflicts varies in intensity
from the normal to the abnormal or neurotics. The greater the
conflict, the greater is the disintegration and disorder in
personality. Integration and development of personality,
according to Psychoanalysis, consists in effecting a compromise
between the warring aspects of personality by enlarging the
domain of the conscious ego and narrowing down the sphere of
the unconscious Id by a process of release of emotional
tensions and reclaiming the repressed wishes. Freud's theory
of personality is apparently a drama in which Id, Ego and
Super-Ego play their role. Though his dynamic psychology
received great appreciation, much of the psychoanalytic
doctrines do not square well in the study of normal minds,
because these were mostly deduced inductively from the study
of the abnormal and pathological cases. There are, however,
certain mechanisms and concepts derived from psycho-analysis,
which are of much value even in the study of normal personalities.
Still Psychoanalysis has been accused of over-emphasis and exaggeration of some of its basic mechanisms and principles. Freud, of course, deserves the credit for introducing the concept of dynamic organization in personality and the great role of the unconscious.

According to Freud, personality in the process of maturation and development is under the pressures of pleasure-principle of Id and to reality-principle of the Ego. In childhood, the pleasure-principle of the Id urges the individual to seek immediate gratification of impulses, regardless of remote consequences of moral and social values. The reality-principle, on the other hand, is the principle of the ego, which requires personality to sublimate its selfish impulses and instincts with due social, moral and religious considerations.

The unconscious is the power-house releasing motive forces, which play immense role in moulding and fashioning personality without the direct knowledge of the individual. According to the Freudian School, the unconscious is the above of all repressed wishes and tendencies rejected by the Super-Ego on account of their not being conducive to social, moral and human values. Psycho-analysis considers the human mind as a battle-ground in which the conflicting forces of the Id and Ego are continually at war, and that integration of personality means bringing about a compromise between the hostile groups. The primary instincts of man are brought under control, according to it, by either of the three processes — (1) defence reaction, (2) substitution, and (3) sublimation. (1) "The Ego represents what we call reason and

(1) An Idealist view of Life.—Radhakrishnan—Cf. p. 198ff.
sanity, in contrast to the Id, which contains the passions." (1). The conscious perceptions cover the field of the Ego, and the instincts as the forces behind consciousness belong to the reign of the Id. The Super-Ego or the Ego-ideal is the representative of the inner world of man, whereas Ego is the representative of the real world outside. Thus the power-house of the personality lies in the unconscious libido, the region of the unconscious, and development and integration of personality is the product of the unconscious in its flow between the two banks— the real and the ideal, the conscious reality-principle and the ego-ideal of the Super-ego, the stern realities of the external world and the ideal world of values—moral, social and religious.

Psycho-analysts of the Freudian School also made much of the Sex-instinct, and they attempted to explain all disorders in personality by a process of causal determinism, in which some form of sexual urge is at the root. This is largely true in the development of personality of the child. Such pan-sexualism or psycho-sexuality is regarded particularly by the Freudian group to be the ruling factor in the personality of children. Although Freud used the word "Sex" in a much broader sense to include all forms of love, yet in theory and practice the term was applied in narrower and specific sense. Without adding further details of the principles and mechanism of the psycho-analysis, it is necessary now to make certain observations by way of criticism of the theories propounded by the School regarding study of personality.

None can deny that conflicts are important facts in the process of growth and development of even normal persons. But

(1) The Ego and the Id.— S. Freud, p. 29-30.
the fact has been stressed too far by the School, and these
are not always unconscious. In voluntary actions, there is
often conflict of motives, which resolves only when the final
choice is made.

Then again psycho-analysts consider the Individual and
personality as a mechanical and stereotyped sum-total of
three distinct parts rarely in unity but mostly at war. This
appears to be a most artificial and mechanistic conception
of human individual. But human personality exhibits the
singular instance of functional autonomy as well. In the
midst of diversity of cognitive and conative experiences,
the unity and singleness of personality is maintained by a
process of transformation and unification of manifold
experiences of the growing individual. This fact was badly
ignored by the psycho-analytic school. Personality grows by
a process of synthesis of the antitheses in course of
development. Professor Allport considers such autonomy of
human personality as "Functional autonomy of Motives."(1).

For the act of integration and maturation of personality,
Freudians have made much of the so-called process of sublima-
tion. The concept of sublimation is very much vague and
exaggerated. Anti-social, immoral or amoral impulses do not
always admit of sublimation, and tensions are often set at
rest by processes other than redirecting the libido to end
socially or morally wholesome.

The process of identification which plays great role
in psycho-analysis of children, should have been regarded
also as a potent factor in the adult and grown-up personalities.

(1) The Ego and the Id—S. Freud, page 291.
The Freudian school also over-emphasised the role of sexuality in motives and interests of the human individual. Sex-instinct never remains pure and simple in human personality, but if it works at all, it becomes diffused and mixed up with heterogenous elements of the personality as a whole. But the Freudians wrongly made fetish of the sex-instinct and arrived at many unwarranted inductive generalisations. "The Psychopathology of Everyday Life" attempted illogically to offer almost the universal explanation of homo-sexuality as the root of all troubles and disorders. This conception is far from truth. Freud also seems to overlook the essential human goodness, while maintaining his theory of pan-sexualism. The libido is not only sexual impulsive force remaining the same all throughout life, but it must admit of sublimation and refinement. C.E.M. Joad rightly points out also that Freud often writes as if all the contents of the consciousness at a given time were composed of more or less sublimated forms of the unconscious desires. "This applies not only to the emotional and passional elements of our nature, our desires, wishes, aversions and hopes, but also to our beliefs and thoughts. A man's tastes in arts or beliefs about religions are on this view just as much determined by the trends of his unconscious Self as his taste in female beauty or his beliefs about his own character."(1). Moreover, Freudian concepts are personified, and the Psycho-analysts rendered the 'unconscious' the foundation stone on which the mighty super-structure of psycho-analysis was raised.

Among the later Freudians, Jung introduced collective or racial unconscious as racial mneme, Adler instinct of self-assertion, Karen Horney cultural factors, and Sullivan emphasized interpersonal relations. In explaining the origin of conflicts, Karen Horney, for instance, emphasized the importance of human relationship. Neuroses are generated by disturbances in human relationship. "Compulsive drives are neurotic cravings for affection and for power." (1). "The theory of neurosis", she says, "whose dynamic centre is a basic conflict between the attitudes of 'moving toward', 'moving against' and 'moving away from' people." "... Conflicts can be resolved by changing the conditions within the personality that brought them into being." (2). Conflicts, according to her, emanate from incompatible attitudes and disturbances in human relationship. Criticising Freud, she further observes, "Freud's pessimism as regards neuroses and their treatment arose from his disbelief in human goodness and human growth... My own belief is that man has the capacity as well as the claim to develop his potentialities and become a decent human being, and that these deteriorate if his relationship to others and hence to himself is and continues to be disturbed. I believe that man can change and can go on changing as long as he lives. And this belief has grown with deeper understanding" (3). Thus Horney lays greater stress on interpersonal relationship and social factor for the integration and development of personality.

A few more pertinent remarks may be made against Psycho-analysis in general. Psycho-analysis keeps itself aloof from

(2) -do-, p. 18-19.
(3) -do-, p. 19.
other branches of psychology inasmuch as in its craze for the study of the unconscious as the cause of neurosis and abnormality, it has neglected the normal states and processes of the mind. It has succeeded in expounding doctrines and creeds pertaining to the neurotics and the abnormal, and with its craze for psychological science, it has brought the normal under the laws of the abnormal. "The view that normality may be studied through the lens of abnormality is remarkably common, but it is nonetheless debatable. Even if it be sound, the equation should be reversible, and the study of normality should illuminate the field of abnormality. But this possibility is persistently overlooked." Moreover, "conscious motives and manifest behaviours are of as great importance as are repressed motives and latent dispositions."(1). The unconscious, as the repository of the past and the archaic, of course, reflects on and influences the conscious present, but nevertheless, motives and traits are more prospective than retrospective in the process of development of personality. The attitude of Psycho-analysis to dive deeper into the unconscious in search of the hidden motives and traits is not always warranted by facts true to the life of the normal people.

The differential Psychology headed by Francis Galton, on the other hand, makes a different approach to the psychology of personality. It studies an aspect or quality of the individual and stresses on the degree and nature of individual differences and variations. It overlooks the uniqueness and totality as well as the inner unity of Individuals, in spite of manifest individual differences and variations. It ignores

the core of personality maintaining functional unity and organization in the midst of seeming differences. The differences and variations in intelligence, aptitude, skill, ability etc. can lend us only the picture of the individual, but the individual is much more than the sum-total of his differences, for, he is above all a person manifesting differences in the process of maintaining unity and integrating them into the life of the whole. The living portrait of human personality can never be depicted in its richness simply by enumeration and measurement of differences of the individual attributes and traits. Hence, in spite of its usefulness as a study of the individual, differential psychology can never lend proper guidance to a rational interpretation of human personality. Another School that has come into prominence about a couple of decades back makes a radical departure from traditional approach to the study of the individual, i.e. the Gestalt psychology. It has vehemently opposed the traditional psychological procedure of studying the elements of mind abstracted from the back-ground of individual experience. It advocates the study of the individual as he is and of the mental life in its totality and natural setting. According to it, individuality can be studied only as an organizational pattern knowing the functions of an organism only in its relationship with other organs belonging to the same system. It is no way rational to attempt to know about the tree on the analysis of the branches and leaves lopped off from the tree as a living whole. The apparent similarity of individual behaviours does not warrant inductive generalization, for the fact that same cause under varying conditions may produce
different effects, and also some effect may be produced by
different causes under different context of the individual
life, and, as such, law of uniformity will hardly hold good.
Individual behaviour is both prospective pointing to an ideal
as well as retrospective as being influenced by the deed habits
of the past. Further, according to the Gestalt School, the
method of logical inference used in knowing other minds and
individuals is hazardous and fallacious, because individual
experiences and overt behaviours are patterns of Gestalt's
rooted deeper in the entire personality, which can be known
and clearly understood only by empathy or intuition, in which
the knower and the known must be one for the time being through
feeling. Such act of intuition is used in appreciation of an
art like music, a piece of literature etc. The Gestalt is
a distinct departure from the traditional outlook in
Psychology and is a challenge to the elementarism and
associationistic atomism in psychology. Yet their contributions
to the study of personality and psychology in general have not
yet been fully conceded to. K. Kaffka, a pioneer of the Gestalt
School, for instance, vehemently criticized the over-simplified
behaviourist theory of personality. The behaviourists ignored
the depth and richness of human personality, which was reduced
to a sum of elementary reflexes. Personality cannot be
reduced to an automaton of sensory-motor reflexes, but it
must be unique 'whole' or 'Configuration'. Personality is
meaningless without consciousness and mind. As an environmen-
talist, Watson reduced human personality to a stream of
reflexes subject to conditioning, but he left out of account
the dynamic organisation of the unique whole. To Kaffka, the
Ego is directly known and it develops under proper social structure and context. The boundary of the Ego expands and contracts, according to the nature of the environment and situations. The Ego develops in the context of the field. This field is psycho-physical, and the Ego goes on growing and developing by maintaining its configuration. (1).

It may be pointed out that Kaffka is right in considering personality as a whole or dynamic organization. He was also right in asserting consciousness and psychical aspects as important factors of personality. But Kaffka did not clearly state what personality is and the nature of the organization. His conception of Ego is also too wide and ambiguous. Uniqueness and identity of personality are not variable, despite the changes in the environment or social structure. So Kaffka's theory of personality is not wholly free from confusion and ambiguity arising out of his vagueness of the concept of the Ego.

Let us then take up the conceptions of development and integration of personality. What is meant by development of personality? What are the factors of development? What is the process of development? How is personality integrated or disintegrated? What are the causes of disintegration of personality? These are some of the questions that we shall try to find answers to from the different Western Schools of Psychology.

In the foregoing chapter, we discussed about the influences of heredity and environment on the growth and development of personality. There is divergence of views among

psychologists regarding the importance of these two primary factors for development of personality. As we have already seen, some favour heredity, others environment and still others both. In order to avoid repetition, we shall confine our discussions to the nature and process of growth and development of personality throughout its life avoiding details of the disputed points in the matter.

A man is never born as fully developed social and moral being. The nature and process of growth of the individual to a fully developed personality from birth to death is the most critical and difficult problem in psychology. Every individual is at birth but a rudimentary psychophysical organism, which is in need of developing to its highest stature, so as to lead its life in a manner befitting its own being. In the process of development, personality persists in the midst of changes. In the process of growth and maturation, functional changes and complexities also bring about complexities in the structures both mental and physical.

Psychologists maintain opposing views regarding factors of development of personality. Behaviourists like Watson maintain that environment and training are solely responsible for the type of personality. Normal and healthy individual can be fashioned in any way with proper training under specified environments. The extreme environmentalists forget the fact that they already assume specific physical structures inherited at birth. The extreme advocates of heredity, on the other hand, attempt to explain difference in personality by hereditary differences. To them heredity determines what an
individual will be like, and nothing can be credited to the environmental factors. Difference in man's personality is due to the germ-cell of the bodily organism inherited. The geneticists, on the other hand, are inclined towards heredity propounded by the theory of genes and tried to establish by experimental investigations as to how far and in what way genes as the basis of the physical structure determine personality. Jennings, for instance, maintain that fundamental characteristics of a person depend upon genes. He, however, did not assert that the total personality together with its functional aspect is purely determined by the inherited genes. What his doctrine of genes affirms is that "no feature of personality is devoid of hereditary influences." (1). So, as Professor Allport has stated, personality is never the product of a single factor like heredity or environment, it is rather in mathematical language a function of both heredity and environment. (2). Absence of any of these factors will be tantamount to total denial of personality. It may be also said that in different persons the contributions of the two factors will be different. Traits and attitudes of personality are dependent upon the physical structures, intelligence and temperament which in their turn wait upon inherited genetic structures. In course of development, the inherited physical structures are in favour of the environmental influences in case of some persons, while in others they put set-back on the environmental factors. The process of growth and development of personality is never the same either in different individuals or in the same individual at different stages of life.

(1) Personality - Allport., page 105.
(2) -do-, page 106.
In early childhood, the process of growth is more in conformity with biological laws. During the post-natal period, the child's life is urged to activities of biological order by the congenital drive or motive force, variously called by different writers as Horme (Munn), will, Elan vital (Bergson) etc. by means of hereditary equipments. The satisfaction of the simple biological needs, the random activities, the simple reflexes etc. all display this vital urge with the help of the hereditary apparatus. Such random and reflex activities at the beginning of life are only materials of personality and at this stage the individual is devoid of mature personality. By degrees, these random and reflex activities begin to grow complex and adaptive by process of conditioning and adaptive mechanisms are at work at the demands of the environment. Gradually a sort of motivation takes place. How to account for such purposive behaviour in the life of infants and little children? The advocates of the hormic theory with their instinct-doctrine attempt to explain purposive activities and motivation by means of instincts as psycho-physical hereditary patterns or mechanisms of behaviour. To them an instinct "determines its possessor to perceive (to pay attention to) any given object of a certain class and to experience in its presence a certain emotional excitement and an impulse to action, which finds expression in a specific mode of behaviour in relation to that object."(1). But the instinct-doctrine fails to account for the behaviour of infants with their dependence on the process of maturation. Moreover, activities of human beings can hardly be explained adequately in terms of animal behaviour. By unnecessarily multiplying the list of instincts

(1) Outlines of Psychology - W. McDougall - p. 110 ff.
the advocates of the theory are guilty of violating the
Scientific law of parsimony, while failing still to account
for the more complex and higher activities of human beings.
Many modern psychologists, therefore, rule out the play of
instincts, and hold that so-called instincts are but
interests and sentiments acquired in the process of
maturation and learning.

The biological psychologists with a mechanistic
conception of life attempted to explain motivation in
development of personality by means of their theory of drive.
A drive is considered to be an organic or innate tension,
which prompts the organism to act in such a way as to release
or minimise that tension. One of the leading exponents of
the biological theory of drive is E.J.Kemf, who formulated
the theory in details in his article "The Autonomic Functions
and the Personality", a brief but concise exposition of which
has been given by Allport.(1). According to the theory of
drive, the automatic and the central nervous system react
and interact at the influence of the drive in responding to
the environment. The theory of drive is very much similar
to other forms of voluntarism and hormic theories advocated
by A. Schopenhauer, C.Darwin, W.McDougall and S.Freud. These
theories give priority to will at the expense of intellect,
and are thus antirational and anti-intellectual. Of the
biological drives, according to Kempf, sexual and nutritional
drives are the basic and most powerful. These drives work
two ways, i.e. either to possess something or to avoid
something detrimental to survival or security and thus drives
are acquisitive or avertive. Conflicts and disorders in

(1) Personality - Allport, p.114 f.
personality are the results of conflicts of drives. Thus according to the biological theory of drive, "personality represents the mode of survival that the individual has consciously worked out for himself. It is a resultant in a parallelogram of forces." (1).

It may be pointed out against this theory that complex human personality can hardly be explained by such simple mechanical and biological theory of drive. Motives are the results of rational nature of man, and the theory is not justified in compartmentalizing the function of the autonomic and cerebral system. Drives and conditioning can explain activities and behaviours of lower creatures and to some extent of infants only, but they can never adequately account for the complex role of personality in the context of the manifold complexities in the life of the adults and the grown-ups. Personality shows signs of greater self-consistency as it grows and develops by a process of maturation and learning.

Many writers arbitrarily point out varying number of stages in the continuous process of development of personality from birth to death. They, accordingly, speak of different principles of growth at different stages. But such arbitrary division of stages of development, principles and mechanisms of growth are never justified nor true to facts. Personality grows and develops by a dialectical process, by the basic principles of differentiation and integration, dissociation and association, while increasing complexities in dual psychosomatic aspects, retaining, nevertheless, the unity of personal life. In the process of integration, personality also develops

(1) Personality - Allport, p.119.
and maintains functional autonomy. Maturation plays an important part in the growth and development of personality. Behavioural tendencies ripen without experience and training through the processes of differentiation or integration or both. Thus all hereditary endowments, physical as well as intellectual, are ripened parallely by the process of maturation. The process of maturation thus brings into play the hereditary mental and physical endowments to their highest capacity in the course of development.

Learning is another important factor, which contributes to the development of personality. Learning mainly takes place in three different ways - Conditioning, efferent modification and imitation. Conditioning is largely related to the theory of drive, and is at best a process of "efferent learning". Efferent modification is a process of learning based upon the two well-known laws of learning formulated by E.L. Thorndike, e.g. Frequency and recency. Many things are also learnt by a process of imitation, which reigns supreme particularly in the early part of our life. Imitation is of two types, spontaneous and deliberate. In early part of life, the child imitates many things spontaneously, and gradually things are imitated deliberately and purposively. Imitation thus plays a great part in the life of the child and also in a lesser degree in the life of the grown-ups.

Apart from the process of learning and maturation, self-consciousness and personal identity are the basis of integration and development of personality. All forms of our knowledge and experiences have inevitable reference to the consciousness of the self. All our experiences belong to the
self and are owned by it. This knower must have the consciousness of being identical, unifying and integrating the manifold and changing experiences of life. Some psychologists are inclined to reject immediate experience in introspection and self-consciousness. Behaviourists, Psychoanalysts and Logical Positivists join hands in discrediting introspection and self-consciousness. In their opinion, the unconscious or the Psycho-chemical bodily constitution is the true matrix of personality. But in advocating such a view, these psychologists forget that they tacitly assume the "Subjective core of personality, viz. his self-consciousness." (1). Personal existence and personal identity in form of self-consciousness, therefore, must needs be posited as the basic fact in the growth and integration of personality.

Along with consciousness of self, every individual shows a prominent characteristic of regarding and asserting his own self in the process of growth. The natural attitude of every person is to assert and receive appreciation of others. Such a natural characteristic of the individual has been differently described by different psychologists. The advocates of instinct psychology, like W. MacDougall, called it 'Will-to-power' and so on. Thus self-esteem in form of egoism runs parallelly with the consciousness of self in course of development, and in forward movement of the primoradial drive or "elan vital", this principle colours all our experiences, traits and attitudes. The process of compensation, defence mechanism, rationalization, projection etc. are the round-about ways of satisfaction of this

(1) Personality - Allport, p.159.
fundamental nature of individuality e.g. self-esteem or self-assertion. Another factor that is considered important by psychologists for integration and unification of personality is the basic philosophy of life. Every individual in the process of growth aims at a particular goal. This indicates that a human individual, in his onward march, tries to live in a world of values. His ideal may be hedonistic, altruistic, religious, moral, social etc. and in the light of his cherished goal, he learns gradually to evaluate his experiences and activities. The individual, while maintaining a distinct philosophy of life, learns to evaluate his doings and experiences, and thus learns to step into a world of values. This philosophy of life always incites him to coordinate his experiences, to unify his attitudes and to integrate his personality under the banner of his basic philosophy of life. Thus growth and development of personality is in a way two dimensional. Personality normally becomes unified and integrated in course of its vertical growth, while it grows up horizontally by a process of extensity and variety of experiences through maturation.

Another point deserves mention in this connection. The course of development of personality is neither smooth and gradual, nor same for all individuals. Accidents, catastrophies and hurdles are there in course of development of the individual. That is why course of development of personality cannot be gradual and uniform throughout. Uncommon changes and novel experiences are brought upon the individual as a result of what are called traumatic changes. Life's hurdles and traumas may totally change the course of development and bring about sudden reorientation by alteration.
of even the basic philosophy of life. Such traumatic changes affect personality by changing emotional attitude, traits and general outlook on life. Traumatic changes are generally more frequent in adolescence and earlier stage than in the advanced stage in life. Thus personality is altered and reoriented with the change of habits, attitudes and philosophy on the stress of sudden trauma, and new functional autonomy is set up in a new direction. Hence unless under morbid condition, personality maintains the functional autonomy in spite of its sudden stages of transformations and reorientations.

Personality is never a finished product, set and plastered in fixed character and trait. It varies in richness from individual to individual, according to varying environmental conditions and mental make-up. A simple life in an easy-go-lucky surrounding may show signs of integration, but personality may be awfully lacking in richness and depth. Nevertheless one's mental endowments or environmental complexities may sufficiently enrich personality, in spite of lack of due functional autonomy and integration. Some writers, therefore, aptly denominate personality as hierarchical organisation. (1) "Integration means that from disparate units of behaviour larger and more inclusive integers are formed. The actual functional scope of these new integers may be narrow or broad." There are levels of integration from infancy onwards, which are distinguished as habits, traits, selves and personality. It may be noted, however, that such stereotyped stages pure and simple are

---

(1) Personality - Allport, p.142.
hardly in consonance with the real stages of growth of the individual. These are often intermixed and interwoven in the progressive growth of personality as a whole.