CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Suggestibility is a stable trait of personality and suggestion plays an important role in healing many psychological and psychiatric disorders. Brown (1927) said that "in hysteria, suggestion treatment, with or without hypnosis, may be a quick and satisfactory method of improving the patient's mental condition, and of enabling him to achieve greater power of mental synthesis for himself". Bibring (1954) and Weider (1967) pointed out that "behaviour therapy, psychoanalysis and group therapy - nude or otherwise - abound with elements of suggestion". In spite of the importance of the psychological process of suggestion and suggestibility, not much systematic work has been done in this area.

Earlier efforts to relate suggestibility to personality variables have not given consistent results. Charcot (1888-1894), Janet (1907) and Babinski (1918) found a close association between suggestibility and hysterical personality. Janet went to the extent of proposing suggestibility as the "most fundamental stigmata of the hysterical state". Pridaux (1919) found a relation between extraversion and suggestibility. These investigators made no effort to test their hypotheses experimentally and left many things unexplained.

Nancy School found no relationship between suggestibility and neuroticism. This was supported by Bartlett (1936) who
used body sway test and concluded that "psychoneurotic subjects are no more suggestible than are normal individuals". However, the size of her sample was very small (neurotics = 21; normals = 16) and results could not be taken as conclusive. Messer, Hinckley and Moiser (1938) studied a larger sample of 129 students and pointed out that "not only is suggestibility not correlated with total score on the neurotic inventory type of test, but that it exhibits no correlation with any of the several traits."

However, Weyer (1941) found a relationship between suggestibility and neuroticism and said that those who "possess a temperament or a completion which makes them easily obey a persuasion succumb most frequently to the prevailing mental diseases." This was supported by Eysenck (1944).

Experimental findings in the area of suggestion and suggestibility up to 1948 were evaluated by Kretch and Crutchfield (1948). They concluded, "Extensive experimental work has failed to supply unambiguous data to support the assumption that suggestibility is a personality trait and individuals can be differentiated with respect to that trait independently of the situation in which it is presumed to appear. Almost all the data available can be much more readily interpreted to mean that whether or not an individual accepts a suggestion is a function of the total psychological situation."
Our present knowledge of the relationship between suggestibility and personality is limited as very little work has been done on this subject in the recent past. Most of the investigators in our time have been concerned with hypnosis (William, 1967; Barber, Spence and Chaves, 1974; Hilgard, 1975) and not with suggestibility though they are related phenomena. As a result of this, the concept of suggestibility remains vague and ill-defined. At times, primary suggestibility has been mentioned in connection with hypnotic susceptibility since hypnosis is said to be related to primary suggestibility. But such studies are very few in number. Further, primary suggestibility covers just one aspect of suggestibility and on the basis of the results of this aspect, we cannot say anything about suggestibility in general.

**Nature of study:**

In the present investigation, attempt has been made to study primary and secondary suggestibility in neurotics and normals taking into consideration Eysenck's theory of personality.

According to Eysenck (1947) personality involves 4 levels of behaviour organization. At the lowest level there are specific responses such as responses to experimental test or to experiences in everyday life which are observed once and may not be characteristic of the individual. At the second level there are habitual responses. These are specific responses which can
occur again under similar circumstances. At the third level there are organizations of habitual acts into traits like accuracy, irritability, persistence and rigidity. At the fourth level there is organization of traits into a general type such as the introvert. The three dimensions of personality proposed by Eysenck are -

1) Neuroticism, 2) introversion - extraversion and 3) psychotendism. Out of these three, the first two have been taken into consideration because Eysenck (1953) has found that psychiatric syndromes in the area of neurosis are produced by these two dimensions of personality. Guilford (1935), Vernon (1952) and Cattell (1961) have supported the existence of these two dimensions of personality.

Position of various clinically diagnosed neurotic groups on two continua as represented by Eysenck (1957).
In the diagram presented above, we find that the three dysthymic groups (anxiety states, reactive depressives and obsessionals) have high scores on introversion and neuroticism. The hysterics and psychopaths have high scores on extraversion and neuroticism. The extraverted normal group is found in the extraverted normal quadrant and the introverted normal group is found in the introverted normal quadrant. Since these groups lie in different quadrants of the dimensional space, it is theoretically expected that they will respond differently as far as suggestibility is concerned. But the experimental findings of Eysenck (1953) indicate that this is not so. Suggestibility is related to neuroticism and not to introversion - extraversion differences.

In the present investigation, an attempt is made to verify a certain hypothesis within the framework provided by Eysenck.

Scope of the study:

Suggestion is a psychological mechanism and plays an important role in our daily lives. It is a process of influencing a person to accept an idea uncritically. Hence it is found in all situations in which one person attempts to influence the other. It plays a major role in hypnosis and is said to be responsible for producing disorders like hysterical conversion reaction.
Suggestibility needs to be studied in a scientific manner because of its immense value in the field of prevention and therapeutic treatment in Psychology and psychiatry.

Importance of the study:

The concept of suggestion was not clear in the beginning. It was first studied in relation to animal magnetism and then in relation to hypnosis. More emphasis was laid on clinical observation rather than on experimentation.

Systematic investigation in the area of suggestion started with Binet (1900). Hull (1929) also felt the need for more objective knowledge on suggestibility and said that "upto the present time the experimental work on suggestion has been relatively coarse and for the most part, rather superficial in nature. He studied suggestion and hypnosis in an experimental manner.

Following the work of Binet and Hull a number of investigators have worked in this area. Suggestibility has been studied in various ways like asking the subjects to detect an odour when no such odour exists, making the subject look for a change in brightness when no change occurs and directly suggesting the subjects to fall forward and then measuring the extent of body sway. Efforts have also been made to relate suggestibility to different variables like age, sex, intelligence and personality. Inspite of this, we are not in a position to say as to what makes a person suggestible and what role personality plays
because results in most of the areas have been inconclusive. There are many reasons for this. It has been found that some of the instruments which were used to study suggestibility were very crude, and it was difficult to measure and control variables which were related to suggestion. Barber (1965) analyzed different aspects of hypnosis and suggestion and concluded that many independent and dependent variables may or may not influence hypnotic research. Apart from this, there was no general agreement regarding the crucial variables which were related to suggestibility.

Considering other areas in Psychology, very little work has been done on suggestion and suggestibility in India. A few available studies are concerned with prestige suggestibility alone, the status of which is not very well established. Further, prestige suggestibility is not independent of primary and secondary suggestibility, therefore high scores on prestige suggestibility cannot be attributed to 'prestige factor' only.

In Indian context, Das has covered various aspects of primary suggestibility like body sway and prestige factor of the experimenter (1960), body sway and mental deficiency (1961) and body sway and semantic satiation (1968). He has included psychiatric patients also by studying suggestibility in paranoid and nonparanoid schizophrenics (1959), but this piece of work has been done in Maudsley Hospital, London and the patient
population consists of only psychotics while neurotic group of
subjects have been ignored.

Ojha and Jha (1969) have studied suggestibility in neuro-
tic subjects, but the type of suggestibility is of prestige
type.

Sinha and Dhowan (1971) and Sah (1973) have taken
into consideration secondary suggestibility. In their studies,
only normal subjects have been covered and findings on normals
have little utility for mental patients.

As far as the investigator's knowledge goes, primary sug-
gestibility has been studied extensively but there have been few
efforts to relate secondary suggestibility to personality.

Eysenck has studied primary and secondary suggestibility
of dysthymics and hysterics in Maudsley Hospital, London, but
there has been no effort on his part to study them in a corres-
ponding group of normals. The present study is an attempt in
this direction.

The concept of suggestion:

Suggestion is a complex process and it is difficult to
define suggestibility. Freud (1921) stated that "there has been
no explanation of the nature of suggestion" and that the term
was "acquiring a looser and looser meaning." Similarly, Jones
(1923) wrote - "To be able to attribute a given occurrence to
'suggestion' is with many a complete solution of the problem,
and they do not find it necessary to pursue the matter further, or even to acquire any clear idea of what they actually mean by suggestion."

Efforts to define suggestibility have taken into consideration 'suggestion' although 'suggestion' and 'suggestibility' are two distinct concepts. Suggestion is either a method or a content whereas suggestibility is a trait of personality. Further, in discussing suggestion, mention has also been made of hypnosis.

*Suggestion explained in terms of animal magnetism:*

Nasmer (1779) explained suggestion in terms of 'animal magnetism'. Animal magnetism was a kind of gas or fluid which could be transmitted from one person to another and it had healing powers. Suggestion was thought to be activated by this vital fluid. There was nothing to prove the existence of animal magnetism and therefore this explanation of suggestion could not be accepted.

*Suggestion explained in terms of idea-motor action and conditioned response:*

Braid (1843) explained suggestion in terms of ideo-motor action (i.e., an idea leads to a motor action) and replaced animal magnetism by a more appropriate word 'hypnosis'. He felt that the disappearance of hysterical symptoms was not due to animal magnetism but as a result of the suggestive effect of ideas given
to the patient by the doctor. These effects of suggestion he called 'hypnotism' and believed that hypnotism started with a limited field of consciousness. Sensory fixation led to a restriction of ideas which he called 'monoidism'. Once the idea was firmly established in the mind, it led to motor behaviour.

Liebeault (1866) who worked in Nancy School, also explained suggestion in terms of idea-motor action and regarded suggestion as the acting out of an idea planted with rapport in a field of limited attention. He found that suggestion was the same as hypnotism and it was possible to hypnotize anyone under favourable conditions.

Bormhein (1884) found suggestion a normal idea-motor process and defined it as "the process by which an idea is awakened in the mind of the subject and accepted." He expanded the scope of idea-motor action by suggesting that ideas not only created movements but also other mental functions like sensations, emotions and organic responses. He saw hypnosis as a form of behaviour continuous with normal waking behaviour. He also equated suggestion with association and said that "every impression, every mental picture, every association is suggestion."

The idea-motor action concept was criticized by Thorndike (1919) who said that ideas did not evoke acts by themselves but only via habits and instincts. A few behaviourists of Watson school criticized concepts like 'imagination', 'ideas' and 'consciousness'.
Emile Coue (1974), the founder of New Nancy School and Brooks (1974) took up the ideas of Nancy school and explained suggestion in terms of idio-motor action. They laid more emphasis on autosuggestion than on suggestion. Suggestion was defined as the act of imposing an idea on the brain of another. Auto-suggestion was 'the implanting of an idea in oneself by oneself' and involved two processes:

1) an idea was accepted and
2) it was transformed into reality.

Three features of New Nancy School were:

1) Auto-suggestion was more important than heterosuggestion as far as hypnotic phenomena were concerned.

2) The idea of 'the law of reversed effect' is, when an idea imposed itself on the mind to such an extent as to give rise to suggestion, all the conscious effort which the subject made in order to counteract this suggestion, were not without the desired effect, but they actually ran counter to the subject's conscious wishes and intensified the suggestion.

3) The most important phenomena of auto-suggestion occurred in the sub-conscious (unconscious).

Kanting (1907) found the term 'auto-suggestion' misleading and wrote that "the idea is really suggested from without and appears to be 'self-suggested' only to the person in whose mind it has been latent."
Baudin (late 19th century) followed Emile Coue and defined suggestion as the subconscious realization of an idea which involved 2 processes:

1) An idea proposed or imposed by the operator, was accepted by the mind of the subject and

2) this idea was transformed into an action so that the object of an idea was realized.

The idea was realized through a process of subconscious activity. That is why the subject was aware of performing the action, but was not aware of the true motive for it. This unawareness on the part of the subject distinguished the phenomenon of auto-suggestion from acts of volition, where the realization of an idea was through conscious effort.

Allers and Schominsky (1927), Freeman (1931) and Jacobson (1938) proved the reality of idea-motor action by means of action currents measurements. It was shown that if the thought of a movement was not followed by a movement which we could observe; then it was followed by activity in the muscle groups which were involved in the imagined movement.

The concept of idea-motor action which was earlier used as an explanatory concept, has been interpreted in terms of conditioned response.

Pavlov (1927) explained suggestion in terms of conditioning principles and regarded suggestibility as the most simple form of a typical conditioned reflex in man. He explained
suggestion in terms of his theory of brain function and said that
suggestion led to a concentration of excitation in part of the
cortex while other areas were inhibited by negative induction.
This diminished the effect of influences, which would, otherwise
tend to counteract suggestion.

Hull (1933) objected to the assumption that an idea was
a non-physical entity and believed that an idea was a pure sti-
mulus act. Ido-motor action could be explained in terms of
conditioned response. Symbolic stimuli specially words could
acquire the power to evoke corresponding reactions by the condi-
tioning process. He regarded hypnosis and suggestion as habit
phenomena and said that the effect of suggestibility was to keep
the 'symbolic processes' of the subject in a state of passivity
and to allow the 'symbolic stimulation' conveyed to him by the
experimenter to lead to an action. This was quite close to what
Bernheim called 'the law of ido-dynamism', according to which,
in certain conditions, the idea could be directly transformed
into movement.

Hull identified types of suggestibility in terms of homo-
action and heteroaction. He defined homoeaction or homeactive
hypersuggestibility as a result of the response to one suggestion
upon the response to a second suggestion calling for the same
act - i.e. a response carried out facilitated a repetition of the
same behaviour. Hetero suggestion or heteroactive hypersugges-
tibility was defined as heightened suggestibility to a second but
different suggestion i.e. the repetition of one act also facilitat
the occurrence of different acts of behaviour.

He found that actions performed under the influence of suggestion were experienced as qualitatively different from ordinary acts. Ordinary acts were usually felt as willed suggestion actions as not willed.

Hull and Bornheim's views were quite similar. Bornheim explained hypnosis in terms of suggestion defined mentalistically as the association of ideas. Hull also explained hypnosis in terms of suggestion, but defined it in more behaviouristic terms as the association between stimulus and response.

Welch and his collaborators (1947) found that early phases of hypnosis and waking suggestibility could be explained with the help of simple conditioning, but a complicated type of conditioning was involved in producing phenomena like amnesia and hallucinations. This was known as 'abstract conditioning'.

Although Hull and Welch failed to indicate as to what relative weight they gave to past conditioning and to conditioning that was taking place in the suggestion situation, ideo-motor and conditioned response theories explained features of primary suggestibility quite well. These theories were economical in nature since all phenomena were explained by one mechanism - i.e. conditioned response.
Suggestion explained in terms of association of ideas and reintegration:

Thomas Brown (1820) explained suggestion in terms of association where a particular stimulus led to a particular response.

Holding a different form of associationistic view, Hamilton (1859) made suggestion a matter of reintegration. He believed that a previously formed disposition of a highly complex order could be reawakened as a whole by an associated cue and paid attention to the "part arousing the whole" relationship.

Wundt (1892) also analyzed suggestion in terms of principles of association and found that "suggestion is association with simultaneous restriction of consciousness on the ideas aroused by the association." It was the restriction of consciousness which distinguished suggestion from ordinary perceptions.

Wundt was not able to explain as to what produced the restriction or the focusing of attention upon a single set of ideas and hardly distinguished between autosuggestion and suggestion coming from another person (hetero suggestion).

Although association theories explained primary suggestibility well, they failed to differentiate suggestion from any other process of association of ideas.
Suggestion explained in terms of dissociation of consciousness:

Dissociation theories considered suggestibility as a result of the activity of a secondary subconscious self, dis-aggregated from the normal waking consciousness.

Charcot (1868-1894) felt that only hysterical personalities could be hypnotized and that normal suggestion and hypnosis were not the same.

Sidis (1898) and Janet (1907) modified Charcot's position.

Sidis (1898) regarded hypnotism as 'abnormal suggestibility' marked by deep dissociation and disaggregation of consciousness. Normal suggestibility was not true hypnotism although it was also a matter of splitting off the waking, guiding, controlling, guardian consciousness from the automatic reflex subconscious self. He summed up his views under three laws:

1. Suggestibility varies directly with dissociation of consciousness and inversely with unification of consciousness.
2. Normal suggestibility varies directly with indirectness of suggestion and inversely with directness of suggestion.
3. Abnormal suggestibility, that is, hypnotizability, varies directly with directness of suggestion and inversely with indirectness of suggestion.

Janet (1907) viewed suggestibility as an abnormal phenomenon. According to him, suggestion and suggestibility depended upon a narrowing of mental activity combined with a certain
strengthening of automatism. He defined suggestion as a special reaction to certain perceptions and distinguished between the ordinary response and the response of a suggestible person. He found that in an ordinary individual an idea developed into action only with the co-operation of the will. Personality backed the idea and the result was accompanied by a conscious effort. In the suggestible person a clear-cut idea was transformed and became at once another psychological phenomenon, an act or perception. This complete development of all the elements contained in an idea was an essential characteristic of suggestion. According to Janet suggestibility was an immediate and complete response to an idea.

Dissociation theories explained some of the observed features of primary suggestibility well since the behaviour of the subject in primary suggestibility experiments appeared to be automatic and disintegrated in contrast to the normal conscious behaviour. However, dissociation theories were descriptive in nature. Janet made an effort to go beyond the descriptive level by relating dissociation to the hierarchy of the individual's tendencies and certain psychopathological states like hysteria, but this needed experimental support.

Suggestion explained in terms of 'need for conformity', 'expectative factors' and subconscious phenomena:

Sinat (1900) found that suggestion included the following phenomena:
1) obedience to mental influence from another person

2) a tendency to imitate

3) influence of a preconceived idea that paralysed the individual's critical sense.

4) expectative attention

5) subconscious phenomena produced during a state of distraction.

Although the first four phenomena explained the mechanisms involved in secondary suggestibility and fifth (5) phenomenon explained primary suggestibility. Binet made no attempt to analyze those phenomena in detail.

**Suggestion explained on the basis of permanent characteristics of the suggestee:**

McDougall (1908) said that the dynamics of suggestion were found in man's instinct of submission and defined suggestion as "process of communication resulting in the acceptance with conviction of the communicated proposition in the absence of logically adequate grounds for its acceptance." More emphasis was given to a restriction in the determinants of behaviour - where the individual did not make use of all relevant ideas nor was he making a full use of his intelligence. His behaviour was due to a selected field of determinants.

McDougall explained features of secondary suggestibility well. His emphasis on motivational and cognitive factors as determiners of suggestibility was of great importance.
However, his definition was incomplete because we do not know whether it included both hetero-suggestion and auto-suggestion or referred to hetero-suggestion only. Further, he attributed suggestion "to the conative energy of the submissive instinct." His theory not only failed to differentiate between suggestion on the one hand and obedience and compliance on the other but also failed to explain the fact that many dominant individuals in the very act of controlling a situation were often the victim of suggestion.

_Suggestion explained in terms of transference:_

The transference between examiner and subject played an important role in enhancing primary suggestibility.

_Freud (1924) defined suggestion as "influence on a person through and by means of transference manifestations of which he is capable." According to him suggestibility was an inclination to transference. For Freud the relationship between the subject and examiner was of erotic nature whereas for Forenczi (1909) the relationship involved was one of parent child._

_Transference theories simply expressed a common observation that in hypnosis an emotional relation developed between the subject and hypnotist. These theories appeared inadequate as there was not much experimental support for them._
Suggestion explained in terms of frame of reference:

Sherif (1936) regarded suggestions as frames of reference. The term 'frame of reference' was used to denote factors which affected perceptions and judgments. He found that a stimulus was always experienced, perceived, judged and reacted to in relation to other present or past stimuli, to which it was related. If the external stimulus situation was well structured, the frame of reference was made up of the properties of the objective stimulus field. If the external stimulus field was unstructured, organization still took place. But in this situation, internal factors like attitude, set and emotional state played an important role in organization.

Coffin (1941) also found suggestion as a framework response, determined by internal or attitude factors and the external features of the stimulus situation. He wrote "When the situation is well-structured', in terms of either attitudinal or situational factors, those suggestions which accord with the existing structuration will tend to be accepted, those which conflict will tend to be rejected. When, for the individual, no clear structuration is perceived, either in terms of existing attitudes or by way of unambiguous stimulus characteristics, and some form of response is required of the subject, he will tend to be suggestible to the 'propositions' presented by the experimenter. The experimenter, by his suggestions, thus provides for the subject the needed structuration." In terms of Coffin's
model, secondary suggestibility tests had a preparatory period during which a set or 'Einstellung' was established. This set was the experimentally produced attitude. After this, the subject was given ambiguous stimulus material and the suggestion effect was made up of the extent to which the subject's responses were determined by the frame of reference produced during the preparatory period.

Sherif and Coffin explained secondary suggestibility phenomena in a simple manner, but they laid more emphasis on the cognitive aspect of internal factors and overlooked the emotion's element which was involved in the acceptance or rejection of suggestions.

**Suggestion explained in terms of cognitive restructuring:**

The term 'cognitive restructuring' was used to remind us of the fact that much of the behaviour which appeared suggestible and irrational to others was not so from the subject's point of view. He did what he could in the given circumstances. For example Asch (1952) found that in prestige suggestibility experiments, the subject acted sensibly and was not just passive.

Asch and his associates emphasized cognitive factors in suggestion, but overlooked motivational factors.
Suggestion explained in terms of physiological basis:

Different physiological theories were put forward to explain causes for primary suggestibility like inhibition of the ganglion cells of the brain (Hindemith, 1906), a shift of nervous energies from the central nervous system to the vaso-motor system (McDougall, 1926) and a functional dissociation between nerve cells (Sidis, 1927).

Eysenck (1943) found a connection between ideo-motor action and primary suggestibility. He believed that primary suggestibility was related to neuroticism (emotionality). Since visceral brain was responsible for individual differences in emotionality - stability, suggestibility was related to the activity of visceral brain. Eysenck’s theory was sound since there was experimental support for it. The support for the existence of such a phenomenon came from the work of Eysenck and Broadhurst (1964) on emotionality in rats and its inheritance.

Similarly physiological theories were also put forward for secondary suggestibility Klein and Schlosinger (1950) found that suppressor areas in the cortex may control sensory phenomena. Murphy and Hochberg (1951) found that the activity in perception depended upon afferent impulses from proprioceptors or interoceptors.
Choice of the measures:

Out of the three types of suggestibilities described by Eysenck and Furneaux (1945) and Eysenck (1947) viz. primary, secondary and prestige suggestibility, only the first two have been taken into consideration in the present study.

Primary suggestibility is revealed by idio-motor type of tests in which the subject executes a motor movement when he is given verbal suggestion by the experimenter that such a movement will take place, although he is not consciously participating in such a movement. Body sway test has been chosen to study primary suggestibility because it correlates highly with it \( r = .92 \). Apart from this, the test - retest reliability of the test has been found to be high \( + .91 \) (Eysenck, 1947).

In secondary suggestibility, the subject experiences sensation or perception when he is given direct or implied suggestion by the experimenter that such an experience will take place although there is no objective basis for the sensation or perception. Three tests are used to measure secondary suggestibility. They are:

Research on absolute sensory thresholds in human beings has shown that if the presentation of a stimulus is expected by the subject and no stimulation is given, a hallucinatory
perception of stimulation occurs. The three tests mentioned above establish a strong expectation of stimulation by verbal means and produce simple sensory hallucinations.

Operational definition of suggestibility:

Eysenck (1947) has used suggestibility score as an index of suggestibility. In this study, suggestibility, is operationally defined in the same manner. Inability of the subject to resist suggestion to sway forward constitutes a criterion of body sway suggestibility. Perception of change in the stimulus situation by the subject even when no such change is introduced makes the subject suggestible in case of brightness perception, size perception and motion perception.

Introversion - extraversion:

As far as the dimension of introversion - extraversion is concerned, Eysenck (1957) has followed Pavlov who interpreted cortical events in terms of the concepts of excitation and inhibition. Eysenck said that "introverted people are characterized by strong excitatory and weak inhibitory potentials, whereas extraverted people are characterized by weak excitatory and strong inhibitory potentials." A weak interpretation of 'excitation' and 'inhibition' would show that 'excitation' refers to the facilitation of cortical events underlying perceptual, learning and motor movement phenomena whereas 'inhibition' refers to the depression of these phenomena.
In its strong form the law of excitation/inhibition is related to the notion of the ascending reticular formation. The locus of the facilitatory and inhibitory cortical tendencies may be found in the activating and synchronizing parts of the reticular formation respectively. Eysenck (1965) states the law in the following manner - "Introverts are characterized by a reticular formation the activating part of which has a relatively low threshold of arousal, while the recruiting part of it has a relatively high threshold of arousal, conversely, extraverts are characterized by their possession of a reticular formation whose activating part has a high threshold of arousal and whose recruiting (synchronizing) part has a low threshold of arousal. Under identical conditions, therefore, cortical arousal will be more marked in introverts, cortical inhibition in extraverts." Evidence for the existence of such phenomena comes from E.E.G., the study of evoked potentials, critical flicker fusion thresholds, expectancy wave and drugs.

Neuroticism:

Neuroticism refers to emotional - overresponsiveness. Eysenck (1960) has equated this dimension with emotionality - instability. It is not the strength of the sympathetic reaction to new and disturbing stimuli which characterizes the emotionally labile person, but the persistence of such an arousal.
Dysthymics:

Jung linked his concepts of extraversion - introversion with two of the main group of neurotic disorders given by Janet (1894, 1903) and believed that an extravert develops 'hystoria' in cases of neurotic breakdown, the introvert 'psychasthenia'. The word 'psychasthenia' is now replaced by the word 'dysthymia' which denotes 'the neurotic syndrome characterized by anxiety, reactive depression and/or obsession - compulsion features'.

The term 'dysthymic' has been suggested by Eysenck (1947). Dysthymics are introverted neurotics.

In this study, subjects belonging to all three categories of dysthymia namely anxiety, reactive depression and obsession - compulsion are taken into consideration.

Anxiety reaction:

In anxiety reaction, the anxiety is diffuse and is not restricted to definite situations or objects as in the case of phobic reaction. This reaction involves anxious expectation and somatic symptoms are common.

Neurotic depressive reaction:

A neurotic depressive reaction is a mood disorder which is marked by lowered spirits, reduced self-esteem and self-depreciation. Sleep and appetite disturbances are common. The patient feels guilty, inadequate, tired, his interests are
restricted and there is difficulty in concentration. Somatic symptoms are present.

This reaction is differentiated from a psychotic depressive reaction by the absence of certain endogenous characteristics and by a lesser degree of regression. In neurotic depression reality testing and interpersonal functioning are not impaired to a marked degree.

**Obsessive-compulsive reaction:**

The word 'obsessive' or 'obsession' refers to an idea or thought. The word 'compulsive' or 'compulsion' refers to an urge or impulse to action.

Obsession and compulsions have certain features:

1) An idea or an impulse obtrudes itself insistently, persistently, and impellingly into the individual's conscious awareness.

2) A feeling of anxious dread accompanies the control manifestation and frequently leads the individual to take counter-measures against the initial idea or impulse.

3) The obsession or compulsion is ego-alien i.e. it is experienced as being foreign to and not a usual part of one's experience of oneself as a psychological being, it is undesired, unacceptable and uncontrollable.

4) No matter how vivid and compelling the obsession or compulsion, the individual recognizes it as absurd and irrational - he retains his insight.
5) Finally the person suffering from these manifestations feels a strong need to resist them. (Nomiah, 1971).

**Hysterics:**

Hysterics are extraverted neurotics. In this study, cases of both conversion and dissociation reaction are taken into consideration as far as hysteria is concerned.

**Conversion reaction:**

In conversion reaction the impulse which leads to anxiety is not experienced consciously but is converted into functional symptoms in organs or parts of the body, usually those that are under voluntary control. The symptoms reduce conscious (felt) anxiety and are symbolic of the underlying mental conflict.

**Dissociative reaction:**

Four episodes of unusual behaviour which are beyond conscious control, the dissociated experience of feelings without appropriate external or internal stimuli and the dissociation from awareness of sensations are classified as dissociated phenomena.

The four dissociative reactions are - fugue, amnesia, somnambulism and multiple personality.
Suggestion and hypnosis:

In the past suggestion was associated with hypnosis and therefore it was widely believed to be similar to hypnosis. Liabeuf (1856) and Bornheim (1884) considered suggestion and hypnosis as identical and Bornheim even proposed that "there is no such thing as hypnotism, there is only suggestibility". Wells (1931) distinguished between suggestion and hypnosis on the ground that in suggestion experiment, the purpose or motive of the experimenter was not explained. If this was done, results would not occur. But the reverse was true in hypnosis. Subjects knew the purpose and frankness and truthfulness enhanced hypnosis. Hull (1933) found suggestion and hypnosis more or less similar and regarded hypnosis as 'heightened suggestibility'.

Iisagor (1949) distinguished between suggestion and hypnosis and found that suggestion led to action not through persuasion, but by presenting an idea or hint indirectly. Hypnotism was a higher mental process of accepted suggestion, resulting in trance or sleep.

Weitzenhoffer (1953) and Barber (1962) found suggestion and hypnosis as identical. Barber said that physiological changes under hypnosis could be produced by suggestion in predisposed subjects. Kroger (1963) said that suggestion could not be equated with hypnosis unless it was accompanied by diversion or 'misdirection of attention.'
Hilgard (1973) found suggestion and hypnosis as different phenomena since suggestion included responses which did not belong to hypnosis and hypnosis involved more than specific responses to suggestion. In favour of his argument he said that secondary suggestibility was not related to hypnosis and types of social suggestibility like conformity, gullibility were not connected with hypnotic like behaviour (Moore, 1964 and Burns and Hammer, 1970). Further, response to placebo was also different from hypnotic like responsiveness (McGlashan, Evans and Orne, 1969). The only type of suggestibility which was related to hypnosis was primary suggestibility.

**Suggestion and imitation:**

Some of the early sociologists like Tarde (1903) found it very difficult to distinguish between suggestion and imitation and regarded them as synonymous. Similarly Ross (1908) found suggestion and imitation as two aspects of the same thing in which suggestion functioned as cause and imitation as effect. Research has shown that suggestion and imitation are two different phenomena. Suggestion is a higher and more complicated stage of behaviour which requires some degree of interpretation whereas in imitation interpretation is not required and the observed behaviour is just repeated.