

SCHIZOPHRENIA AND THE FAMILY:  
AN APPLICATION OF LAING'S THEORY TO  
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF FOUR COLOURED  
SCHIZOPHRENIC MALES, USING KELLY'S  
REPERTORY GRID

by

Sarah Schrire, B.A. (Hons.)

Thesis prepared in fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree  
of Master of Arts in Sociology

Department of Sociology  
University of Cape Town  
1975

The copyright of this thesis is held by the  
University of Cape Town.  
Reproduction of the whole or any part  
may be made for study purposes only, and  
not for publication.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. G. Wiendieck, my supervisor, showed great understanding of the problems encountered in my research. His critical outlook helped me in clarifying my ideas at a time when they were most vague. I am grateful for the stimulation provided by my discussions with him and for the patience he displayed throughout.

I am indebted to Professor P. Hare for enabling me to pursue my work in his department.

Dr. F. Pascoe made available his resources and I would like to thank him and the staff of Valkenberg Hospital for the assistance given me.

My thanks go to various members of the Department of Psychology, where the earlier part of my work was conducted: to Dr. A. Abramowitz, who supervised and encouraged me in the early stages, to Nigel Mackay for his critical evaluation of sections of my work, to Lester Gilbert for assistance with some of the statistical aspects of this study. I am also indebted to Dr. H. Cooper for his helpful comments on parts of my work.

I am grateful to Professor H.W. van der Merwe and his assistants in the Department of Intergroup Studies for providing me with parts of their work and for their suggestions.

My research assistants, Sammy Schrire, Yunoos Ebrahim, Sally Winter and Nina Gersholowitz, rendered me invaluable help, both by their discussions with me and by their practical participation.

My typist, Jo Tunbridge, did more than was asked of her. I am particularly grateful for the enthusiasm she showed, which served as an example to me during the last few weeks and prevented my own task from becoming too burdensome.

The financial assistance of the Human Sciences Research Council towards the costs of this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed or conclusions reached are those of the author and are not to be regarded as a reflection of the opinions and conclusions of the Human Sciences Research Council.

Throughout the time spent on this thesis, I was helped in a personal way by people close to me. I refer here to Sally Winter, Yunoos Ebrahim and Nigel Mackay, and to my parents, all of whom gave me encouragement, support and friendship, to my ten-month old son, Dani, for cheering me up on dismal days, and to Sammy, my husband, for everything he has done and put up with, but particularly for always being there.

Finally, I would like to thank my families for all that they have taught me.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	(i)
CONTENTS .....	(iii)
ABSTRACT .....	(iv)
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. Schizophrenia and the family .....	1
2. The socio-political position of the South African Coloureds .....	19
3. The psychology of personal constructs .....	28
METHOD .....	50
1. Subjects .....	50
2. Apparatus .....	50
3. Procedure .....	53
RESULTS .....	54
1. Alan S .....	56
2. Murphy P .....	102
3. Phillip V .....	144
4. Stephen F .....	177
DISCUSSION .....	200
1. Implications of present study for social-familial research into schizophrenia .....	200
2. Questions of method .....	207
3. The role of sociological factors in schizophrenia .....	217
CONCLUSIONS .....	220
REFERENCES .....	222
APPENDIX A .....	229
APPENDIX B .....	231
APPENDIX C .....	234
APPENDIX D .....	238
APPENDIX E .....	257
APPENDIX F .....	276
APPENDIX G .....	295

ABSTRACT

In this descriptive study, an attempt was made to make intelligible the schizophrenia of four Coloured male schizophrenics by analysing their social-familial background in terms of Laing's concepts of invalidation and mystification. Data was obtained from structured and unstructured interviews with father, mother and son in each family. Kelly's repertory grid was the main structured technique used. Invalidation and mystification were found to occur in three of the four families. Their specific manifestations and the possible reasons for their occurrence are analysed in the three cases. The inconclusive results in the case of the fourth family are discussed. Implications of these findings for Laing's theory of schizophrenia and for the role of sociological factors in schizophrenia are discussed. Methodological problems encountered are pointed out. Suggestions for future research in the area are made.

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. Schizophrenia and the family

Research into schizophrenia and the family has, over the past twenty-five years, progressed alongside research based on genetic and biochemical theories of aetiology. None of the approaches has gained significant ascendancy over the others. The present thesis is based on one of the social-familial theories of schizophrenia, that of Laing and his colleagues, and passes no judgment on the validity or invalidity of research based on different approaches.

An overview of social-familial research into schizophrenia reveals the existence of both causal and descriptive studies in the field. The work of Laing and his colleagues is of a descriptive rather than a causal nature. As a result, the stress in this chapter will be placed on this. However, since the causal studies comprise the larger part of the work in the area, and since many of Laing's ideas cannot be treated in isolation from these, a brief summary of some of the causal approaches will be presented in the following section. Since the chief purpose of this will be to demonstrate the major trends in the area in an attempt to place Laing's work in an historical context, the actual findings of the various studies will not necessarily be reported.

#### 1.1. Causal approaches

One of the earliest concepts in the field, and which figures, to a greater or lesser extent, in the later work as well, is that of the schizophrenogenic mother. A schizophrenogenic mother, as a result of certain personality characteristics or attitudes repeatedly manifested in her interaction with a pre-schizophrenic child, produces schizophrenia in this child. The general picture is of a mother who regards the pre-schizophrenic child as an extension of herself, and who denies this child the role of an independent agent with needs and views which are separate from and often opposed to hers.

Whenever the child manifests independence of this nature, this is invalidated by the mother. Invalidation is a process whereby the reality of the expressed needs of someone, in this case, those of the pre-schizophrenic child, is denied and substituted by the reality of the other person's needs, in this case, those of the mother. The world of the pre-schizophrenic child is disintegrated so that the mother can maintain the integrity of her world. Furthermore, the mother is conscious, neither of doing this, nor of the threat that her child's possible independence holds for her.

The main problem encountered by researchers working with this concept was to operationally define "schizophrenogenesis". There were many noteworthy attempts in this direction. Bateson et al (1956) considered schizophrenogenesis to be manifested in the double-bind situation, where the mother's meta-communication was at variance with her communication, thus serving to confuse the child. Meyer and Karon (1967), Mitchell (1968) and Werner et al (1970) operationally defined schizophrenogenesis as constituting certain indices on the Thematic Apperception Test. From the various studies, the schizophrenogenic mother emerges as either overprotective, or rejecting, or dominant.

As work with the schizophrenogenic mother concept became more refined, there was a growing awareness among some researchers that it was too simplistic to view the mother in isolation from the other family members. Firstly, if only maternal variables comprised the causal factor, then why were the schizophrenic's siblings usually not schizophrenic? It became evident that the schizophrenogenic mother was not "overprotective" or "rejecting" as such, but usually only so with relation to the pre-schizophrenic child. Secondly, it was no longer considered justifiable to talk of a "dominant" mother in isolation from her husband's personality or from her relationship with him.

As a result, the focus shifted towards the mother-pre-schizophrenic child sub-system, the mother-father sub-system, the father-pre-schizophrenic child sub-system, and the father-mother-pre-schizophrenic child sub-system. Fisher et al (1959) compared families of schizophrenics, neurotics and normals on their respective ability to work jointly on Rorschach and other tasks. Farina and his colleagues (1960, 1963, 1967, 1968) attempted to assess patterns of dominance and conflict in families of schizophrenics by observing their communications in structured situations. Mishler and Waxler (1968) investigated, inter alia, the responsiveness of family members to one another's communications. Haley (1968) compared families of schizophrenics with families of normals on clarity of communication by presenting them with structured tasks.

The development in the field is clearly reflected in the work of Lidz and his colleagues (1965). They started by comparing mothers of schizophrenics with control mothers, then later turned to investigating the various sub-systems within these families. Amongst their more important findings are:

- (a) that families of male schizophrenics are considerably different from families of female schizophrenics - fathers tend to be dominant, disparaging towards their wives and overprotective to their daughters in families of female schizophrenics (such families are characterized by marital schism); in families of male schizophrenics either the reverse pattern prevails, and the father is usually a passive individual who does nothing to counteract his wife's pathogenic influence (such families are characterized by marital skew, with a reversal of the instrumental and expressive roles), or the father competes with his son for his wife's affection, and is disparaging towards the son while trying to raise his own stature in the family - and

(b) that in families of schizophrenics where the siblings were well-integrated, the pre-schizophrenic child had been brought up under different conditions from his siblings - this led to the concept of the pre-schizophrenic child being the victim, either because of something in his psychological make-up leading to his being a more conducive target than his siblings, or because of external circumstances which had altered the family situation over time.

Lidz's work is particularly important to an understanding of Laing's ideas. From it emerges the concept of a dynamic family situation, as well as the idea that the pathogenic actions and attitudes towards the pre-schizophrenic child may appear to come from one parent, but are in fact a function of the relationship between both parents, of the pre-schizophrenic's own personality, and of circumstances external to but acting on the family situation. In addition, Lidz's isolation of three possible general patterns suggests the possibility of other patterns existing and of variations within each of these patterns, thus pointing to the merit of investigating the particularities of individual families. This therefore paved the way for the descriptive studies undertaken by Laing and his colleagues.

#### 1.2. Descriptive approaches

The metatheoretical basis underlying descriptive approaches to social-familial research into schizophrenia is best illustrated by the following citation:

"...the events involving the sick individual with his family occur within a total system of interdependent subsystems, any one of which - for example, the individual, the family, the community, the value system - may become, temporarily a focus of observation... Within the field encompassing the interconnected subsystems, a component system, such as the individual, can be isolated and studied as an entity, but this is a heuristic device which

always involves some distortion and sacrifice of precision or predictive ability... this point of view alters the concept of causality. Viewing one entity or process as causing another, or as dependent on another is possible only if their interrelations can be isolated from total contexts. Putting variables within a total context shifts the question from 'What in the family "causes" pathology in the individual?' to 'What processes occurring between the individual and the family are associated with the behaviours which are called "pathology"?' (Spiegel and Bell, in Arieti, 1959).

Essentially the same idea is put forward by Laing (1971 b):

"...much or even all, of the apparent irrationality of the individual finds its rationality in its original family context. The family as a whole now appears irrational. Does the irrationality of the family will find its rationality when placed in its context? And so on... presumably through meta-meta-meta-...contexts...".

Such an approach involves contextual or structural studies. These are in contrast with the single-factor studies described earlier.

Empirical applications of this are found in Laing and Esterson's (1970) attempts at making intelligible the apparently unintelligible "schizophrenic" behaviour of eleven females by viewing each case in the context of its nuclear family. The fact that to stop at the nuclear family is merely a heuristic device, but that one can continue investigating various "meta-contexts" is illustrated by Esterson's (1972) attempt at making the unintelligible behaviour of one of the nuclear families (in terms of which one of the above-mentioned eleven females had been viewed) intelligible by viewing the family as a whole in the context of the families of origin of the parents and in the context of its reigning value system. Another example of investigations of

"meta-contexts" is Speck and Attneave's (1973) network intervention, which involves group therapy with various related families and friends in order to treat one disturbed individual.

The reason why the act of putting variables in a total context alters the concept of causality is illustrated by the following simple example:

"Consider... two mothers who are found to be similarly disturbed when evaluated as individuals apart from their families. The psychological impact of these similar mothers in different family constellations might vary considerably - depending on differences in their 'fit' with the rest of the family social system. In some families a father may augment, or at least not counteract substantially, the disturbing impact of the mother... In other families the father may not share or collusively support the wife's disturbed functioning. If his stylistic differences from his wife do not lead to utterly chaotic family disorganization, and if he can have a steady, differentiated, recognizable role in the family, he may become an alternative, effective model for identification". (Singer and Wynne, 1965).

Two principal related points have been made thus far and these are essential to an understanding of the meta-theory underlying Laing's studies on schizophrenia and descriptive studies of schizophrenia in general:

- (a) The value of viewing the schizophrenic's behaviour in one or more total contexts, and the manner in which the concept of causality is thereby altered have been pointed out. Research with this basis does not attempt to answer the question as to the origins of schizophrenia, but attempts to describe the situations surrounding the behaviour of individual cases.
- (b) Theoretically, the number of contexts to be described is infinite. For practical reasons, this cannot be done, so that the individual researcher sets limits on the number of contexts

to be considered. Laing and Cooper (1964) and Esterson (1972) elaborate on this point by referring to some of Sartre's later ideas. One can account for one social phenomenon by viewing it as a sub-system of a more encompassing system, thus creating a "totalization" of the situation. This same phenomenon can then be viewed in such a way that the system is itself considered as a sub-system of an even more encompassing system, thus "retotalizing" the situation. No "totalization" is ever complete, but is merely treated as such out of practical considerations.

The four family analyses in the author's own study are thus incomplete in the above-mentioned sense, since the individual schizophrenic son is treated as a sub-system of, ultimately, the father-mother-son system. Even though reference is made, in these analyses, to sociological factors applicable to the individual families, this is done only in order to better clarify the family interactions - no attempt is made to treat the family itself as a sub-system of the community, or of its socio-economic class position in any systematic way.

It should be pointed out, before we move away from this metatheoretical discussion, that one need not necessarily see a radical split between causal and descriptive approaches. It could be argued that, since it is up to the individual researcher to set his own limits on the number of sub-systems or systems to be considered, causal studies are merely setting narrower limits, and are consequently better able to control extraneous variables and to make statements of the kind that one variable causes another. It could also be argued that these descriptive studies are paving the way for future, more complex, multi-factorial causal studies. Laing and his colleagues, however, do not consider the existence of such a continuity, and oppose their phenomenological approach to positivistic approaches, and their dialectical reasoning to analytic reasoning. They also

imply that their dialectic approach represents a radical revision of social science. Although this whole issue has scope for much discussion, it is not relevant to the purposes of this thesis, so will have to remain unresolved.

The method employed by Laing and Esterson (1970) in their family analyses (what they call the "dialectic" method) follows from their philosophical position. In each case, they start off with the problem posed by the specific psychiatric signs and symptoms attributed to the particular schizophrenic individual. The family members are then interviewed in various possible combinations, i.e. patient alone, mother alone, father alone, patient and mother, patient and father, mother and father, patient, mother and father, etc. Issues that could be relevant to an elucidation of the problem are discussed during these interviews. This usually leads to information about the interactions within the specific family, and makes possible direct observation of these interactions in vivo. The interviewer is then able to view the original problem from various vantage points. The different view-points are usually conflicting and give rise to contradictions. An attempt is then made to present the most plausible account of the original problem. This "most plausible account" is the one which succeeds in resolving, synthesizing or "totalizing" the contradictions. If it achieves this aim, it will have attained a "degree of probability", as Esterson (1972) puts it. In line with what has been said before, this account of the problem is valid only for the data considered. If more data are taken into consideration, a new synthesis will have to be created.

This same method is attempted by the author in this thesis. It should be evident that any good descriptive study of social situations tends to implicitly follow the method just described, but without necessarily attaching the same verbal labels to the method and without incorporating it systematically into a metatheoretical position.

The rest of this chapter will now be devoted to a presentation of Laing's theory of schizophrenia.

An examination of the eleven case studies presented by Laing and Esterson (1970) reveals a point that has already been made in this chapter, viz. that no two families are alike. However, when one reads them against the background of Laing's (1965, 1967, 1971 a, 1971 b) theoretical framework, it becomes possible to abstract certain general patterns running through all these families.\*

Laing sees the family as a social institution which, to a greater degree than any other, is, under optimal conditions, responsible for giving the child his identity, for enabling him to establish a "real self-system". Laing's conception of the "real self-system" is very similar to Erikson's conception of identity as developing out of and eventually (usually during the period of adolescence) transcending the various roles or identifications which the individual has acquired, both within and outside the family, until then. For this relatively stable identity to develop, the family must function in such a way as to provide a testing platform for the various roles and identifications of

\*Laing's work stresses the point about differences between families, something which is, anyway, self-evident. Yet similarities become obvious to the reader despite these being under-emphasized and even sometimes denied by Laing. This contradiction between what is explicitly stated and what is implicit should be borne in mind.

the child, without attempting to invalidate or mystify (confuse)\* his constructions of the world. When the family environment has been such as to, by and large, validate the child's constructions of the world, and when it has provided the child with relatively little mystification, the child is able to acquire an internally consistent system of constructions of the world, and to interact appropriately with his environment once he moves outside his family of origin. When the family environment has been such that the child is repeatedly subjected to invalidation of his experience, this results in the development of a "false self-system".

It appears from an examination of the eleven case studies that the schizophrenic individual experiences the following two situations:

- (a) Invalidation of his constructions of reality by one or both parents during the course of his development.

\*It should be pointed out that it is senseless to talk of the family without reference to the social context of which it is a part. It must be remembered that the child, even from an early age, moves both inside and outside his family. His family environment may be, from one point of view, entirely free of confusion, but this may well have been attained by its cutting itself off from outside contact. The discrepancy between the family's way of life and the way of life of others outside the family may in itself mystify the child. The child should not experience too much discontinuity between his experiences within the family and his experiences outside it - the former should equip him to cope with the latter.

- (b) Mystification of his constructions of reality during the course of his development, either by one or both parents, or as a result of the parents' constructions of reality being in conflict, or as a result of a discontinuity between the constructions of reality upheld by the parents or the family as a whole, and those upheld by the rest of the community with which the child increasingly interacts as he grows older.

Generally, if one of these situations is present, the other is too.

Each of these situations will now be described in detail.

The definition of invalidation has already been given in a previous section where the concept of the schizophrenogenic mother was discussed. However, it should be pointed out that, within the family, it need not necessarily be the mother, or the mother alone, who is the invalidator. Quite often, both parents are directly responsible for invalidating the child, and sometimes, even the siblings are in collusion with the parents. In other cases, the mother alone or the father alone may be chiefly responsible, and sometimes only one parent is directly responsible while the other parent does nothing to counteract this.

It should be evident from the definition that invalidation does not only imply disagreement of opinions or outlooks between the invalidator and the invalidated person. Disagreement is sometimes operative in invalidation, but when invalidation takes this form, it is usually not as total an annihilation of the invalidated person as other forms of invalidation where the existence of this person's different opinion is itself invalidated.

Examples of invalidation abound in the eleven case studies. If we take the Church family as an example, Laing and Esterson say about Mrs Church that she "...attributed to her daughter memories, experiences, and actions that were disjunctive with Claire's self-attributions,

while being impervious both to Claire's own feelings and actions and to her attributions about her self..." Mrs Church's attributions were the result of defence mechanisms like projective identification, denial, minimization and imperviousness. Only when projective identification is operative does disagreement comprise the invalidation. When the invalidator uses defence mechanisms like denial, minimization and imperviousness, the invalidated person is not left with the impression that his opinion or outlook are wrong, but that he had no opinion or outlook in the first place.

The result of repeated invalidation on the invalidated person is that he is no longer able to distinguish between what is real and what is unreal. Laing and Esterson (1970) say about Lucie Blair, "Her inability to find significant others with authority to confirm or validate her point of view left her...mistrusting the fabric of her experience." She herself says at one stage, "I can't trust what I see. It doesn't get backed up. It doesn't get confirmed in any way..." The hallucinations and delusions of a schizophrenic can be interpreted, in the light of this, as the invalidated person's eventual inability to distinguish between real and imaginary perceptions, and between thoughts that have a basis in reality and thoughts that do not. The social and emotional withdrawal that are so often symptomatic of schizophrenia, and which, in more extreme cases, result in the psychomotor rigidity of catatonia, can then be regarded as an attempt, on the part of the invalidated person, to shut out any more invalidation.

The concept of invalidation seems to effectively account for many of the principal symptoms of schizophrenia. One other important symptom of schizophrenia, thought-disorder, which is characterized by loose, tangential associations in the person's speech, inconsistencies in what the person says, and thought-blocking, is only partially explained by the concept of invalidation. The concept of mystification can better account for this symptom.

Mystification involves acting in such a way as to confuse the "victim", or pre-schizophrenic, in this case. Laing (in Boszormenyi-Nagy and Framo, 1965) makes the point that the concept of mystification was originally used by Marx "to mean a plausible misrepresentation of what is going on (process) or what is being done (praxis) in the service of the interests of one socioeconomic class (the exploiters) over or against another class (the exploited)." He goes on to say that this concept can successfully account, not only for the relations between classes of society, but for interpersonal relations.

An important characteristic of mystification is that the person is confused without, at the time, feeling confused. It is when some factor brings to his awareness a feeling of confusion that he will break down. Within the family, mystification may be due to either the contradictory attributions imposed on the pre-schizophrenic by a significant other, usually the father alone or mother alone, or by the fact that the attributions imposed on the pre-schizophrenic by two or more significant others, usually the father and mother and sometimes one or more siblings, are conflicting. The double-bind situation referred to earlier is necessarily mystifying. Mystification is also characteristic of the six techniques, described by Searles (1959), that a person may use to undermine another's confidence in his construction of reality. Mystification may also arise out of the existence of a conflict between the outlook of the family of origin of the pre-schizophrenic (this outlook usually being governed by that of one or both parents) and that of persons in authority outside the family.

An example of a single individual in the family being the agent of mystification is found in the following statement by Mrs Church:

"We've just let the children carry on their own sweet way, whatever way they wanted to go, provided it was the right one." (Laing and Esterson, 1970).

It is evident from a reading of this family analysis that the mother was the principal party responsible, but that the father had too much of a passive role in the family to counteract his wife's pathogenic influence. Quite often, various family members are involved but share the same confused and confusing constructs so that the effect produced is still of the mystification emanating from a single entity.

An example where mystification is the result of the constructs of different family members being in conflict is illustrated by the following description of a schizophrenic girl's delusion of being a tennis-ball:

"(Jane) was absorbed in a reverie of a perpetual game of tennis. Mixed doubles. Centre Court. Wimbledon. The crowd, the net, the players, and the ball, back and forth, back and forth. She was all these elements, especially the ball... The family set-up, under the one roof, consisted of father and mother, mother's father and father's mother, ranged against each other, father and his mother against mother and her father: mixed doubles. She was the ball in their game... the two sides would break off direct communication with each other, for weeks at a time, while communication was maintained through Jane..." (Laing, 1971 b).

Mystification and invalidation are related in a number of ways. Firstly, most individuals experience confusion at various points in their life. However, they are usually able to cope with it. What distinguishes this type of confusion from that experienced by the pre-schizophrenic is that the pre-schizophrenic's constructs have not been validated during the course of his development. As a result, he has no stable vantage-point from which to assess the confusing experiences that he encounters. Mystification within the family environment thus aggravates the situation caused by the invalidation. Secondly, in certain cases, the pre-schizophrenic may have been subjected to repeated invalidation within the family environment, but the constructs imposed on him may well

be, in themselves, consistent. His family environment will thus be invalidating but not mystifying. Such an individual, were he to be only minimally involved with influences outside the family for the rest of his life, would probably never experience a schizophrenic "breakdown." Usually, however, he does interact with outside influences. He will then, either be unable to cope with this since he has never been given the opportunity to formulate his own opinions, and consequently break down under the stress, or encounter large discrepancies between his family's opinions and values and those of others outside, and be mystified by this. This latter experience refers to the third type of mystifying situation mentioned earlier.

From what has been said, it can be seen that the process of mystification can account for the thought-disorder found in schizophrenia. The individual repeatedly subjected to contradictory constructs of the world becomes unable to unite these into a logical whole. As a result, he is forced to loosen the links between the constructs so that he has a separate, unrelated construct for almost every event. More will be said about this in the chapter on Personal Construct Theory.

The question now arises as to why certain people invalidate and mystify the experience of others. Laing (1971 b) offers the following suggestion:

"Persons do manifestly try to act on the 'inner' worlds of others to preserve their own inner worlds... There is no systematic psychoanalytic theory of the nature of transpersonal defences, whereby self attempts to regulate the inner life of the other in order to preserve his own, nor of techniques of coping with such persecution by others."

The implication of this is that, if in a schizophrenic's family, the mother is seen to be the prime agent of invalidation or mystification, her actions can be understood if viewed in terms of, inter alia, her relationship with husband, other children, her own parents, the community...

This point has been emphasized throughout this chapter.

One final point which merits attention here is related to the distinction usually made in psychiatry between reactive and process schizophrenia. Reactive schizophrenia refers to a schizophrenia where the onset is acute and where one or more precipitating factors can be isolated and regarded as related to the schizophrenia. It is in this case that the term "schizophrenic breakdown" becomes applicable. Usually, the symptoms disappear after conventional drug and shock treatment, and the patient is able to function "normally" for a variable period of time. More often than not, the patient tends to break down one or more times during the course of his life, the symptoms being precipitated by stressful situations of some kind. The present thesis is concerned with this type of schizophrenia. Process schizophrenia, by contrast, is of insidious onset. No clear-cut precipitating factors can be related to the condition. Persons in close contact with the patient usually report a deterioration in the patient's behaviour over months or years. Such patients are usually maintained on drug treatment indefinitely, and this tends to halt any further deterioration. However, the patient is not able to function "normally".

Laing and Esterson's (1970) case studies are concerned with both types of schizophrenia. The concepts of invalidation and mystification thus account for both. In terms of Laing's theory, the actual "breakdown" that occurs in reactive schizophrenia, i.e. the period when the person is actively manifesting the schizophrenic symptoms, represents, at one and the same time, both a sign that the person is no longer able to cope, and an awareness of his pathogenic social (more specifically, familial) environment. Laing and his colleagues aim, in their therapy, to make use of this awareness as a means of treating the patient. They generally adopt a psychoanalytic model in their therapy with both reactive and process schizophrenics, allow the patient to regress as far back and for as long as he likes, and then attempt

to rear the patient again in a validating environment. The therapy of Mary Barnes (Barnes and Berke, 1974) is an example of this. Such psychotherapy can take years, but the argument in its favour is that it takes years to drive someone mad, so that years are needed to make the same person sane. Furthermore, the alternative treatment (drugs and Electro-Convulsive Therapy) seems to be effective only in treating the symptoms, whilst leaving everything else in the patient's social situation unchanged. As a result, the reactive schizophrenic, on returning to the same situation, will tend to relapse after a period of time, and the process schizophrenic remains in the same state as he was before treatment.

Foudraine (1974) makes the following remarks in this connection:

"Laing describes the psychotic mode of being as a process of regression. He calls it 'metanoia', a journey inward and then a return (neogenesis) with an enriched and deepened mode of being oneself. A process of death and rebirth with reintegration on a higher level as a result. The point is that one is not able to make this journey (the 'metanoia sequence') within the original family, nor in a psychiatric institution. Laing's thesis is that one is not able to make the journey, one stops halfway, because the culture of the institution prevents it."

Cooper's (1967) conceptualization of "madness", "normality" and "sanity" is related to the above idea. More will be said about this at a later stage.

It should be mentioned that the arguments in favour of and against the alternative types of therapy with schizophrenics cannot be resolved at this stage since too many extraneous variables are operative if one is to compare different therapies. The issue does not concern us directly, but was only mentioned in order to present a more complete picture of Laing's theory.

### 1.3. Implications of Laing's theory of schizophrenia for research

Research into schizophrenia based on Laing's theory will need to aim at the following:

- (a) A descriptive analysis of the interactions within the sub-systems relevant to an understanding of the particular person's schizophrenia, as well as an analysis of the relationship between the various sub-systems. Since not all sub-systems can be taken into account, those that are must be clearly specified.
- (b) An attempt, within the descriptive analysis, to reconcile the various view-points of the persons and combinations of persons included in the study, so that the analysis becomes the most plausible and internally consistent account of the situation possible.
- (c) A clear presentation, within the analysis, of experiences, on the part of the schizophrenic, that can be described as invalidating or mystifying.
- (d) Where invalidation occurs, it must be specified
  - (i) who the invalidator is,
  - (ii) what type of invalidation is operative,
  - (iii) for what reason(s), on the basis of the data known, the invalidation occurred.
- (e) Where mystification occurs, it must be specified
  - (i) who the agent of mystification is,
  - (ii) what type of mystification is operative,
  - (iii) for what reason(s), on the basis of the data known, the mystification occurred.
- (f) The manner in which the schizophrenic symptoms become intelligible when viewed in the light of the invalidation and mystification to which the schizophrenic has been subjected should be pointed out in the analysis.

It should be evident that it is in order to arrive at the possible reason(s) behind the invalidation and mystification that an analysis of the interactions between the various people included in the study needs to be carried out. The manner in which the researcher can obtain knowledge about these interactions will vary according to the time and resources available to the researcher. The best possible method would be for the researcher to live with the family, and even, if possible, with other persons intimately involved with the family, for a period of time. However, this would be feasible only under very special circumstances. Usually researchers in this area have to be satisfied with a few interviews with a few of the family members. As a result, the interviews have to be geared towards obtaining the maximum amount of relevant information possible within a restricted period of time. The artificiality of this needs to be taken into account when conclusions are drawn. More will be said about suitable methods for gathering information in a later chapter.

## 2. The socio-political position of the South African Coloureds

### 2.1. General

It was mentioned in the previous chapter that the individuals in the family as well as the family as a whole are inextricably linked with the community of which they are a part. The value-systems of the individuals within a family, the family structure, as well as the interactions between the family members are partly understood if one takes cognisance of "psychological" factors. However, reference also needs to be made to the "sociological" factors which play a role. Since the present thesis is concerned with middle- and working-class urban Christian Coloured families from the Western Province of the Cape, this chapter will attempt to present certain general points about this group.

Since we are concerned here with middle- and working-class Coloureds, something will have to be said about socio-economic class in general.

A definition of socio-economic class is necessary as a starting-point. Centers (1961) distinguishes between objective and subjective definitions of class. In the objective sense, class "... is the aggregate of persons playing the same part in, and standing in the same relation towards other persons in that system of production and exchange of goods and services extant in a given society." In the subjective sense, class involves class consciousness, "... not only consciousness of kind, or consciousness of membership in and feeling of solidarity with a group called a class, but the possession of common interests and a common political and economic orientation..."

An inspection of the above definitions suggests that the two are closely interdependent: one's production relations influence one's class consciousness and vice versa.

Two points made in Centers' paper deserve attention. The one is that Centers divides society into two main

classes: the middle-class and the working-class. Although many sociologists use a tripartite division of society into upper-, middle-, and lower-class, or, in the manner of Hollingshead and his colleagues, a division of society into five classes, Centers' simpler division seems to have gained extensive application. One possible reason accounts for this. The upper and lower extremities of the socio-economic status scale (called upper-class and lower-class by most sociologists using finer divisions) consist of a relative minority of persons, so that the two-fold division retains its validity provided that one bears them in mind when making generalizations. Since the present thesis is concerned with families as such and not so much with their being a member of a socio-economic class, the two-fold division is the one adopted as the more detailed one is not necessary. However, reference will be made to the more detailed sub-divisions.

The second relates to the indices most commonly used by the general American public for the assignation of others to a particular class. The most common one was occupation, followed by the way the person "believes and feels about certain things". These two indices were closely related, and it is interesting that they correspond closely to the aspects stressed by the objective and subjective definitions respectively. This suggests that occupation is an accurate enough index of socio-economic status.

The manner in which socio-economic class affects the general values of individuals is discussed by various researchers in this field. Centers (1961) and McKinley (1964) consider the middle-class to be geared towards attaining self-direction in life, and particularly in a career, and the working-class\* to be geared towards attaining respectability and economic security. The

\*We are talking here of a stable working-class, not of one engaged in changing the political status quo.

middle-class has the respectability and security that the working-class yearns for, so that its energies can be directed at the satisfaction of "inner" needs. The working-class must achieve respectability and economic security first. This requires the abandonment, on the part of the working-class individual, of "traditionally" working-class coping mechanisms, such as the immediate fulfilment of needs for the sake of more long-term goals. The "traditionally" working-class coping mechanisms become adopted by individuals at the lower extremity of the socio-economic status scale, since they feel no hope at all of being recognized by society.

McKinley points out that the mediating factor between socio-economic status and family policy is the father's work situation and climate. It is not difficult to see how the individual involved in work requiring initiative and responsibility will bring home a different set of values from the individual working on an assembly-line and receiving orders from his superiors.

Kohn (in Anderson, 1971) refers to Duvall's pioneering study, carried out in 1946 as follows:

"Duvall characterized working-class (and lower-middle-class) parental values as 'traditional' - they want their children to be neat and clean, to obey and respect adults, to please adults... middle-class parental values are more 'developmental' - they want their children to be eager to learn, to love and confide in their parents, to be happy, to share and cooperate, to be healthy and well."

Kohn and Farmer (1970) extended Duvall's findings. They found that working-class parents are far more inclined than middle-class parents to use physical punishment on their children, whereas middle-class parents tend to use methods requiring verbal discipline, threats of withdrawal of love, emotional blackmail and other guilt-producing mechanisms. It was also found that working-class parents generally expect a greater amount of apparent obedience to their demands by their children than do middle-class

parents. Kohn points out that "...working-class parents want their children to conform to external authority because the parents themselves are willing to accord respect to authority in return for security and respectability. Their conservatism in child-rearing is part of a more general conservatism and traditionalism." In addition, Kohn points out that the working-class parent, usually himself on the receiving end of an authoritarian structure at work, will use the same structure as a model for patterning his family relationships. The converse pattern, with middle-class family relationships being more egalitarian, has been described by Farmer.

Similar ideas are put forward in Bernstein's (1971) theory on the role of language as mediating between culture and the individual. He sees the nature of the speech code of a particular individual as depending on, and maintaining, the prevailing system of social relations. Middle-class individuals make use of an elaborated speech code which arises out of, and maintains, the middle-class stress on individual initiative, and decision-making at work and at home which provides the basis for a more person-centered attitude to social relationships. Working-class individuals, by contrast, make use of a restricted speech code. This speech code arises out of, and maintains, work relations with little variety and decision-making, work tasks that require physical manipulation and control rather than symbolic organization and control, and a home environment with little intellectual stimuli (Bernstein, 1970).

These general trends running through normal families of the two socio-economic classes must be borne in mind in any study of disturbed families, so that any deviations from the norm can become apparent.

It is now necessary to see whether the same general patterns are applicable to Coloured family life. Before this can be discussed, we need to arrive at a certain understanding of the South African political policy of apartheid.

As Schlemmer (in Randall, 1970) points out, apartheid is the total system of "... material, social and political privilege enjoyed by Whites. Apartheid...(includes) not only the policies of the present government, but the system of inequality maintained by previous governments as well, which the present government has simply made more rigid and pervasive." Schlemmer adds that the original problem in South Africa was one of class, not race. The racial factors, the cultural and ethnic pluralism of the country, are used as a rationalization for the maintenance of the system of inequality. South African history reveals that material wealth in the first few decades of the industrial era was enjoyed by a certain class who had all the advantages that a middle-class has over a working-class. This privileged class was composed primarily of Whites. As education became more widespread and reached various sectors of the working-class, the middle-class was threatened with the loss of much of its economic power. So that the middle-class could continue enjoying its material privileges, legislation was put forward where the political and social powers of the majority of the members (those who were not White) of the working-class was curtailed. Such legislation capitalized on the inter-racial friction already present. In more recent years, the justification for continuing such legislation (which has become more rigid under the Nationalist government) has been the cultural differences existing between the various population groups. So well has the idea of separate development for different cultures become entrenched, that the source of the discriminatory legislation, the class conflict existing at the time of Union, has become forgotten by the (White) electorate.

As far as the present purposes of this chapter are concerned, there is one main implication of apartheid. The rationalization regarding cultural differences creates a problem when applied to the Coloureds. The Coloureds do not possess a culture that is exclusively their own. The result is a group of people who share the same culture as the Whites, but who are discriminated against politically,

socially, and, hence, materially. The marginality of this situation is manifested particularly in the case of the middle- and upper-middle-class members of this group.

The concept of marginality, as applied to a sample of Durban Coloureds, was investigated by Dickie-Clarke (1966) and Mann (1957). Referring to this group, Dickie-Clarke says, "... the inconsistency is between (their) complete cultural similarity (to the Whites) and their partial acceptance on the social dimension..." However, Mann makes it clear that being in a marginal situation does not lead to psychological marginality per se, i.e. it is one's attitude to the fact of being in an inconsistent and ambiguous situation that ultimately determines whether any pathogenic effects will be generated by the situation. Dickie-Clarke distinguishes three main reactions to the situation:

- (a) the Coloureds can strive for equality with the Whites,
- (b) they can accept the intermediate status accorded to them, and
- (c) they can link with the other oppressed groups in the country in concerted Black action.

All three of the above attitudes prevail. However, it is only logical that the attitude of trying to gain equality with the Whites will predominate more in the Coloured middle- and upper-middle-classes than in the Coloured working- and lower-classes, since the members of the former stand far more chance of being accepted into the White group.

The second attitude, that of accepting the intermediate status, is, conversely, more likely to predominate among members of the working-class.

The distribution of these attitudes among the upper and lower sectors of the Coloured group respectively is confirmed by Whisson (in Randall, 1971 a). Whisson also points out that the third attitude, that of Black militancy, has been confined to a relative minority of the Coloured

population, ostensibly, certain professionals residing largely in the urban areas of the Western Cape.

As far as the middle- and upper-middle-class Coloureds are concerned, therefore, two main attitudes to their socio-political situation can be expected: a reactionary one and a militant one. Both, however, necessitate the same achievement-orientated values that characterize a normal middle-class. For the reactionary elements who are trying to prove their equality to the Whites, great odds have to be surmounted. For the militant elements, the pressure of a political mission colours all their activities.

The Coloured working- and lower-classes, by contrast, neither try to be accepted by the Whites nor resort to militancy. They accept their intermediate status in a rather fatalistic manner. "Ultimately the belief that one is truly an inferior type of person enables one to accept the status quo." (Whisson, in Randall, 1971 a). Whisson isolates two main mechanisms whereby the individual can cope with the situation. The one is a retreat into religion, and the other is the formation of a sub-culture, characterized by a life of crime, drink, dagga smoking and violence. Both are escape mechanisms. Since the former is a more socially acceptable means of coping than the latter, it is the preferred mechanism of the working-class rather than of the lower-class.

These general attitudes on the part of the Coloureds to the socio-political situation should be borne in mind when assessing family structure among them. The studies on family structure among Coloureds are in essential agreement. Cilliers (1963) found that families among the upper sectors of the Coloured population are egalitarian or father-dominated. Patterson (1953) obtained similar findings, but says in addition that the egalitarian pattern prevails among the younger members of the professional group.

It would appear from this that the egalitarian pattern, which is less authoritarian in nature, prevails among the more militant elements of the Coloured middle- and upper-

middle-classes, and the father-dominated pattern among the more reactionary elements. Steyn's (1961) findings are also in agreement with those of Cilliers and Patterson. It is interesting that the father-dominated pattern characterizes a normal working-class. It is logical enough that this pattern should occur among the reactionary Coloured middle- and upper-middle-classes, since it is this group that is striving for acceptance by the Whites. This attitude is comparable to that of a normal working-class trying to attain respectability and economic security in order to be accepted by a middle-class. The Coloured middle-class, therefore, is composed of those who share the same family structure as that of a conventional middle-class, and of those who share the same family structure as that of a conventional working-class.

Family structure among the Coloured working-class is similarly not straightforward. Although many of the families in this group are father-dominated (thus comparable to a normal working-class in this respect) (Cilliers, 1963), a fair proportion of the families are "unstable" since both parents are usually out at work (Patterson, 1953). The Coloured lower-class families tend to be mother-dominated (Patterson, 1953), chiefly as a result of the high rate of illegitimacy in this group and consequent absence of the father in these families. It should be pointed out, however, that since the dividing line between working-class and lower-class among the Coloureds is not clear-cut, many lower-class patterns will be found among the working-class and vice versa.

## 2.2. Implications for family investigations of schizophrenia among Coloureds

This chapter has been concerned with:

- (a) a brief presentation of the general socio-political position of Coloureds from different socio-economic classes, and
- (b) a brief presentation of general family structure among Coloureds from different socio-economic classes, and the manner in which this is related

to the general values and political attitudes of the Coloureds from the different classes.

Generally, families are not shut out from society, but this is particularly pronounced in the case of Coloured families since they are such a distinctive socio-political situation. It was felt, therefore, that many of the values and interactions existing in families of Coloured schizophrenics, would not be adequately understood unless general sociological trends were taken into account.

Descriptive studies into schizophrenia among Coloureds should aim, not only at what was put forward at the end of the previous chapter, but additionally at a specification of the particular family's socio-economic class position, and, within the family analysis, a comparison of its family structure, and general values and political attitudes with those of its specific class. This should be done in order to specify clearly to what extent these interact with the more specifically "psychological" factors.

This aim will not always be treated as separate from those put forward at the end of the previous chapter, but will more usually be considered in conjunction with them.

### 3. The psychology of personal constructs

The aim in this chapter is to provide a description of a psychometric technique appropriate to the type of investigation carried out in this thesis. The technique to be discussed, repertory grid technique, is based on Kelly's Personal Construct Theory.

The fact that the view of man to which Kelly subscribes is totally compatible with that of Laing as well as the fact that the repertory grid devised by Kelly (1955) lends itself to idiographic studies make this repertory grid a suitable means of obtaining information about the individual family members.

These points will be discussed more fully during the course of this chapter. We first need to turn to a general overview of Personal Construct Theory.

#### 3.1. Basic theory

Kelly's (1955) theory of personality takes the position of viewing man, all men, as the scientist who is continually experimenting in order to arrive at an understanding of the world. Man has the creative capacity of representing the environment, not merely of responding to it in a passive fashion. By saying this, Kelly avoids falling into the trap of acknowledging the existence of two kinds of men: those who formulate theories about men; and those who are being written about in the theories. According to Kelly, all men are scientists and all formulate theories. Understanding the world (and the meaning of this should not be restricted to a purely intellectual understanding) is thus the basic driving force.

The representation of the universe is what Kelly calls the construing of events.

"Man looks at his world through transparent patterns or templets which he creates and then attempts to fit over the realities of which the world is composed. The fit is not always very good. Yet

without such patterns the world appears to be such an undifferentiated homogeneity that man is unable to make any sense out of it. Even a poor fit is more helpful to him than nothing at all."

(Kelly, 1955)

These patterns are constructs.

Constructs which subsume events or elements are organized hierarchically so that they vary in terms of superordinacy-subordinacy. Superordinate constructs subsume subordinate constructs. Constructs have a predictive function in that they are formed out of the individual's perception of uniformities and differences between events and hence enable him to make predictions about subsequent events. This can be compared to the scientific endeavour of formulating a hypothesis. These predictions are thus open to validation or invalidation by the turn that the events take. Constructs are thus not immobile fixtures, but are continually being modified by the outcome of the events predicted. Subordinate constructs are likely to change more frequently than are superordinate constructs. This results from the constructs constituting systems and sub-systems. If a single event had the power of altering a complete system every time, there would be no stability in individual functioning. Less encompassing constructs thus tend to be more susceptible to change and such change is felt by the individual to be less threatening than a more pervasive change in the system, which would involve superordinate constructs. Of course, that is not to say that superordinate constructs never change, but they do so in the light of events which have more impact on the individual.

The events themselves do not impose constructs on the individual. Rather, the individual forms constructs so that the events can be represented. This is similar to saying that events do not determine what the individual construes. Determinism operates only in so far as superordinate constructs have control over and determine subordinate ones. Following from what has been said

about change, it should be evident that there are always some alternative constructions available to choose among in dealing with the world. This constitutes the basis of both Kelly's philosophical position of constructive alternativism, where he states that his theory is only one of many possible ways of looking at man, and his view that men, because they are all scientists, can construe events in different ways at different times.

Kelly (1955) has put forward his theory in the form of a fundamental postulate and various corollaries following from, or extending and elaborating, the fundamental postulate. The fundamental postulate, "A person's processes are psychologically channelised by the ways in which he anticipates events" and the construction corollary, "A person anticipates events by construing their replications", constitute a reiteration of what has just been said. The dichotomy corollary makes it clear that constructs are bipolar.

"In construing, the person notes features in a series of elements which characterize some of the elements and are particularly uncharacteristic of others. Thus he erects constructs of similarity and contrast. Both the similarity and the contrast are inherent in the same construct. A construct which implied similarity without contrast would represent just as much of a chaotic undifferentiated homogeneity as a construct which implied contrast without similarity would represent a chaotic particularized heterogeneity." (Kelly, 1955)

The bipolarity of constructs is very important if one is to understand the working of the repertory grid. It should also be pointed out that constructs may be expressed verbally, but that they are by no means always verbal formulations. This will be elaborated on later.

The individuality corollary follows automatically from the philosophical standpoint of constructive alternativism and states that different individuals may construe events in different ways. The converse of this is the commonality corollary which states that persons

who construe events in similar ways have similar psychological processes. This is also implicit in the fundamental postulate.

The main points implied by the organization corollary have been dealt with in the discussion of the organization of constructs into systems and sub-systems of superordinate and subordinate constructs, where the latter are subsumed and determined by the former. The fragmentation corollary represents the other side of the same coin and states that "(a) person may successively employ a variety of construction subsystems which are inferentially incompatible with each other." This suggests that, although there is an organization of constructs, sub-systems may function independently of one another. It also has implications for the question of predicting man's future behaviour on the basis of his past behaviour, and suggests that direct inference from past to future is invalid.

The experience corollary reiterates what has been said with regard to constructs being open to change. However, according to the modulation corollary, the amount that a construct system can change is limited by the permeability of the constructs within whose range of convenience the variants lie. Since permeability implies the capacity of a construct to admit new elements to its range, it should be evident that this capacity is limited. Constructs vary in their permeability, superordinate constructs having a greater capacity to admit new elements to their range than subordinate constructs. It follows from this that the extent to which a system can change will thus be limited.

The choice corollary states: "(a) person chooses for himself that alternative in a dichotomized construct through which he anticipates the greater possibility for extension and definition of his system." This implies that the person can constrict his field of vision so as to define more clearly existing constructs in his system. Alternatively, he may broaden the scope of his vision so

as to extend the predictive range of his system. Either decision is essentially elaborative in that he is seeking to improve his construct system.

Having thus far discussed the basic tenets of Personal Construct Theory, it now becomes possible to explain the functioning of the various kinds of repertory grids.

### 3.2. Technique

That a construct system can be viewed cybernetically in such a way that an individual's psychological space can be mapped constitutes the basis for the Role Construct Repertory Test, the precursor of the repertory grid, and of the subsequent different forms of repertory grids.

The Role Construct Repertory Test involves presenting the testee with a list of role titles. These titles comprise types of persons, e.g. Mother, Father, Liked Teacher, Disliked Teacher, Employer, etc. The various titles represent the elements which are to be subsumed by constructs. These elements are organized into various sorts or combinations of three. For example, Mother, Father, Employer may comprise the first sort; Mother, Liked Teacher, Disliked Teacher may comprise the second sort, etc. In order to facilitate matters, the testee is required to identify a particular role title by assigning to it the name of a person whom he knows and who fits the role. The role titles are thereafter referred to by name. From the various sorts, constructs are elicited from the testee. This is done by asking the testee to group any two of the three persons in the particular sort on the basis of some similarity which is at the same time the contrasting feature from the third. For example, when presented with the sort Father, Mother, Mr Smith (Employer), the testee may group Father and Mr Smith together by saying that they are both authoritarian, and are to be distinguished from Mother, who is permissive. This procedure is repeated for each sort. Although there is a large number of possible sorts, Kelly (1955) makes the point that, by the time a testee

has given forty constructs in a repertory test with twenty elements, he will have then expressed nearly all the constructs that he would have expressed by the eightieth or hundredth sort. Conversely, when the number of sorts is held constant, twenty elements will produce as many constructs as thirty elements. It is up to the tester to draw a happy medium between eliciting as many constructs as possible and cutting down on the number of sorts for the sake of convenience.

It should be noted that sorts are composed of three elements since this is the minimum number of elements required for the eliciting of a construct. Kelly (1955) lists a number of assumptions underlying the repertory test. These are as follows:

- (a) the permeability of the constructs elicited is assumed. It is assumed that the constructs elicited, each from three elements originally, can admit new elements to their range,
- (b) a certain degree of permanence of the constructs is assumed,
- (c) the representativeness of the elements is assumed,
- (d) it is assumed that a fair number of the elicited constructs represent the testee's understanding of the construct systems of the element figures,
- (e) the communicability of the constructs elicited is assumed. This means that the verbal labels must correspond to the constructs themselves.

Kelly (1955) also puts forward certain guidelines for the analysis of a repertory test protocol. A summary of this follows:

- (a) Number of constructs elicited:

If a large number of constructs is elicited, the suggestion may be that the testee is prone to intellectualization or compulsivity. A small number of constructs may suggest a lack of discrimination of persons, or difficulties at a preverbal level in the verbalization of constructs. The latter may occur in testees

of low intellectual or educational level or in testees who, in psychoanalytic terms, are not allowing to awareness their constructs of persons.

(b) Correlation between constructs:

A complete similarity between two constructs, for example, may suggest, either that the testee is employing different verbal labels for what is essentially the same construct, or that one construct necessarily implies the other.

(c) Permeability of the various constructs:

This can be determined by noting whether, once the testee has expressed one construct with relation to certain elements, he has gone on to express the same construct when presented with different elements. However, in a repertory test, it is difficult to establish whether constructs are impermeable unless the testee is asked whether he knows anybody else that that construct can apply to. Permeability can thus indicate whether the testee has the ability to apply his existing constructs to new situations. Impermeability suggests that the testee needs new constructs with every new situation. This could result in a lack of an organized construct system or, if the testee is not prepared to tolerate disorganisation, a reluctance on his part to meet new situations.

(d) Unique figures:

These are figures which, in the context of the test, are always represented at the implicit pole of the construct and are never like any other figure. The uniqueness of any one figure can be checked by presenting it to the testee in conjunction with two other figures from another sort, one of whom was represented at the same contrasting pole of the same construct and one of whom was represented at the other contrasting pole of the same construct. If the testee persists in not linking the figure in question

with one of the two new ones, its uniqueness has been established. The implication, according to Kelly, is that the testee's adjustment to such a figure "... is likely to be fixed and immobile, though not necessarily unpleasant. His role in relation to the person is likely to be highly stereotyped...it is the figure, and not the construct, that is impervious in this instance."

(e) Situational constructs:

An example of a situational construct would be "both at school-one works in an office". This may suggest that the testee is unable to deal meaningfully with the figures involved. This can be confirmed by asking the testee in what way school-going people differ from people working in an office and thus determining whether he is in fact unable to proceed from his original construct to a more superordinate one.

(f) Pre-emptive constructs:

Such a construct pre-empts its elements for membership in its own realm exclusively. An example of this would be when the testee persists in assigning the same construct to the same element even when the latter is presented in different sorts. This would suggest a unidimensional way of construing that particular element.

(g) Dependency constructs:

An example of this would be, "Both nice to me-Unpleasant to me". This would suggest the testee's dependence on people and may imply a primitive use of persons as symbols of constructs.

(h) Conventionalized constructs:

An examination of the types of figures associated with "good" constructs and of those associated with "bad" constructs can give some indication of the testee's value orientations.

(i) Ambiguous figures:

Confusion may be suggested by the occurrence of figures which appear on opposite sides of similar constructs in different sorts.

(j) Power constructs or figures:

The proportion of such constructs or figures can be assessed and may yield some information regarding the testee's inclinations in that direction.

(k) A similar objective could be achieved by grouping the various constructs in culture categories of success, education, occupation, etc.

The repertory test just discussed became popularized in the subsequent forms of repertory grids. It is important in that it illustrates rather effectively the relationship between the theory and the technique and, of all the methods that have been based on the theory, is perhaps the closest to the theory.

At present, various kinds of repertory grids exist. The first to be discussed is the repertory grid devised by Kelly himself and, of all the kinds of repertory grids, bears the closest similarity to the repertory test.

In this grid, constructs are elicited in exactly the same way as in the case of the repertory test. Everything that has been said about the sorts, elements and bipolarity of the constructs of the repertory test applies to this repertory grid as well. However, the grid goes one step further. After the constructs have been elicited, the testee is asked to consider each construct in turn in relation to each of the other elements. Thus, once the testee has expressed one construct on the basis of one sort of three elements, he assigns each of the remaining elements to one or other pole of the elicited construct, depending on which pole is the most applicable. Kelly talks here of incidents and voids. An incident is expressed by a check mark at the intersect of the particular element and construct and implies that the emergent or construct pole (pole of similarity) of the particular

construct applies to the particular element. A void is expressed by a blank at the intersect of the particular element and construct and implies that the implicit pole (pole of contrast) applies to the particular element. As Kelly (1955) expresses it, "... the construct, while selected for its applicability to a prescribed trio of figures, is subsequently considered in relationship to all the remaining figures...".

The repertory grid rests on the same assumptions as the repertory test. This has already been discussed. However, there are a few additional assumptions specific to the grid form of the test only. These are:

- (a) the representativeness of the sorts,
- (b) the stability of the concept (it is assumed that the testee implies the same thing when he is applying a particular construct to the new elements as he did when the construct was initially elicited at an earlier stage of the procedure), and
- (c) the range of convenience, or permeability, of all the constructs. This is particularly important since each construct is made to apply to each element.

Kelly's (1955) repertory grid consists of nineteen representative elements and a number of sorts aimed at presenting the testee with a wide variety of situations.

The nineteen elements and the particular groups they fall into are listed below:

- (a) Self
- (b) Family: Mother, Father, Brother, Sister
- (c) Intimates: Spouse, Ex-flame, Pal, Ex-pal
- (d) Valencies: Rejecting Person, Pitied Person, Threatening Person, Attractive Person
- (e) Authorities: Accepted Teacher, Rejected Teacher, Boss
- (f) Values: Successful Person, Happy Person, Ethical Person.

Once a repertory grid protocol has been obtained, it is ready for analysis. The guidelines which Kelly put forward for the analysis of a repertory test protocol can be applied to the analysis of this type of repertory grid as well. There are however, additional pieces of information which can be obtained from this type of repertory grid. This is discussed below.

Where the content of the grid is concerned, a wealth of important information can be obtained by a componential analysis (a specific type of factor analysis) of the constructs and the elements (Slater, 1972).

Such a componential analysis determines the relationship between every construct and every other (inter-construct correlations), between every element and every other (inter-element correlations), between every construct and every element (construct-element correlations), and also groups constructs and elements into components. The grouping of constructs and elements into components, although summarizing the other information provided by the componential analysis, often presents an inaccurate picture of the relations between constructs, between elements, and between constructs and elements, this being caused by the neglect of specificities for the sake of generalities. As a result, it has to be checked against the other information. Even though it is possible to determine the components by inspection of the other data and, hence, to avoid the inaccuracy of the component grouping, the process of inspection can often lead to one's neglecting certain components. As a result, this, in turn, has to be checked against the component grouping. A full componential analysis of a grid should, therefore, focus on all the data and check each piece of information against the other.

Where the structure of the construct system is concerned, one feature to look for after a componential analysis has been completed is what Adams-Webber (in Bannister, 1970) has described as unidimensionality of a construct system. The emergence of only one or two

main components would suggest this. A constricted view of the world is implied by this prevalence of constellatory constructs i.e. constructs which are similar to one another and where each implies the other(s).

Another structural feature which does not apply to the repertory test relates to the looseness-tightness continuum in terms of which a construct system may be analysed. The statistical interpretation of this continuum involves the degree of correlation (positive or negative) between any two constructs. Bannister and his colleagues have devoted much attention to the looseness characteristic in the thinking of thought-disordered schizophrenics. This will be discussed in a following section.

Although, as should be evident from what has been said, much information can be obtained about an individual testee, much is left out. One of the biggest criticisms that can be levelled at repertory grid technique in general is that it is dependent on verbalization and, hence, on material which is readily accessible to the testee's awareness. That whole area which psychoanalysts label the "unconscious" is ignored. It is ignored from the technique rather than from the theory since, in the latter, Kelly devotes a considerable amount of attention to explaining the unconscious in terms of the theory.

To complete this discussion of repertory grid techniques, it is necessary to describe briefly other types of repertory grids which have developed subsequently to the publication of Kelly's work.

According to Bannister and Mair (1968), subsequent repertory grids have modified three aspects of Kelly's original grid. The one aspect is that of elicited constructs. Various researchers have abandoned the initial step in the procedure by supplying constructs to the testee, and then asking the testee to apply each of these supplied or assigned constructs to each element. The second aspect that has been modified involves the

replacement of Kelly's (1955) "all-or-none grid", the grid where elements are assigned to either the emergent or the implicit pole of a construct, by grids employing scaled scores and by grids where elements are ranked. Thirdly, the nature of the elements has been modified in different ways by different researchers, to meet the requirements of their particular studies. Many researchers have used grids which have deviated from the original in terms of all three of these aspects. The use of a rank-order grid where constructs are supplied and where the elements are photographs of unknown people (Bannister and Fransella, 1966) is such an example.

Grids with supplied constructs hold one advantage over grids where constructs are elicited, viz. that they can be used in research where the aim is to compare groups of individuals. Mair (1967a) points out one problem with such grids, viz. that of the testee imposing his personal interpretation on the constructs supplied. As a result, what one testee understands by a construct may be entirely different to what another understands. Apparent equivalence may thus not be equivalence at all. However, this same problem is encountered in conventional questionnaire-type psychometric tests, and does not really have a solution. Where the aim is an understanding of the individual testee, and not of comparing individuals, a grid where constructs are elicited would appear to be more appropriate.

The use of grids with scaled or rank-order scores originated out of a dissatisfaction with the restrictions imposed by the "all-or-none grid". Many people find difficulty in fitting elements in categories on an all-or-none basis. This criticism of the "all-or-none" grid has a certain amount of validity. However, some of the solutions are equally, if not more, open to question. The assigning of a score of 6 on a scale that has a range of 10 to an element so that its position on the continuum of the "kind-unkind" construct can be assessed may have more mathematical sophistication than labelling the particular element either kind or unkind. However, whether this has psychological validity is questionable.

The same type of objection applies to rank-order grids. However it should be pointed out that, particularly in the case of an intelligent testee, the option of an emergent or implicit pole may provide him with difficulties where certain constructs are concerned. However, whether more than three options (emergent pole, implicit pole, in between) are necessary, and whether, in reality an individual works with more than three options, is dubious. The possibility of working with three options has been discussed by Kelly and he states that a componential analysis of such a grid, although more complicated under these circumstances, can be done. Grids with several options do, however, have their place in certain types of research. Grids with only two options are also suitable in certain cases, provided that one bears in mind the problem that certain testees may find with dichotomous constructs.

In conclusion, therefore, it can be said that if the aim of the research is an understanding of the functioning of the individual, Kelly's theory provides an adequate framework. Furthermore, the original, "all-or-none grid" where constructs are elicited from the testee is, in the author's opinion, suited to this aim.

### 3.3. Laing's concept of invalidation in the light of Personal Construct Theory

In this section, Laing's concept of invalidation, discussed at length in the first chapter of the introduction, will be analysed in terms of certain ideas encompassed by Personal Construct Theory. In the first chapter, mention was made of Laing's "real self-" and "false self-systems". However, these are not precise enough terms within which the process of invalidation occurring in families can be viewed. Laing's ideas on invalidation can gain much precision if seen in the light of Personal Construct Theory. This is thus the aim of this section.

"Prejudiced", etc. were supplied to the S. The same constructs were used in the two grids. In each grid, the same procedure was carried out. The S had to rank-order the various elements on each supplied construct. From the repertory grids of each S, various scores were computed, the two most important ones being an Intensity score and a Consistency score. The Intensity score reflects the average relationship between the constructs, and is thus the measure par excellence of tightness or looseness of construing. The Consistency score reflects the stability of the individual's conceptual system in the light of different situations. The various groups were compared with one another on these scores. Results indicated that thought-disordered schizophrenics could be differentiated from each of the other groups on the basis of the Intensity and Consistency scores obtained. However, there were no significant differences between any of the other groups. In addition, the various measures did not relate significantly with psychiatric sub-classifications of schizophrenia, such as the paranoid-catatonic-hebephrenic-simple dimension. As has been mentioned, only when the sub-classification involved the presence or absence of thought-disorder was there any difference.

Bannister (1962) replicated the above-mentioned study, slightly modifying the constructs supplied although retaining a similar essence, and replacing the use of known people as elements with photographs of unknown people. Different sets of photographs were used in the two grids. The previous findings were replicated. However, Bannister found the use of photographs of unknown persons to be preferable to the use of known people since he contends that people, particularly thought-disordered schizophrenics, give remembered judgments of people, made before the onset of their condition, and thus achieve spuriously high Intensity scores. This point will be elaborated on shortly.

Bannister's conclusions from this study are particularly relevant to our purposes. He maintains that, since constructs are essentially predictions about future events, they may be validated or invalidated, depending on the outcome. If, for example, an individual construes another as "loving", only to find that his subsequent behaviour suggests something different, the initial reaction may be to then construe him as "hating". However, he may then exhibit behaviour which does not confirm that either. This contradictory behaviour may create in the individual the reaction of shuffling and reshuffling the construed person from one pole to the other of the same construct. If, however, this contradictory behaviour persists sufficiently, the individual may be unable to tolerate the anxiety engendered by such inconsistency and may modify the construct itself. This could imply loosening the relationship between that construct and others which have, up to then, been related to it. For example, most individuals construe loving people as also helpful, kind, sincere, etc. If the person exhibits unhelpful behaviour, he will no longer be construed as loving. Such constellations of constructs thus play an important role in the processes of validation or invalidation. If, however, the relationship between constructs is loosened, such constellations will cease to exist. The opportunity to validate or invalidate a particular construct will thus be minimized, and predictions about events will no longer be unvarying. As a result, "... schizophrenic thought-disorder is experienced subjectively as living in a fluid, unfocussed and undifferentiated world in which anxiety is not felt to any marked degree since only the vaguest and least destructible anticipations arise in the mind of the subject." (Bannister, 1962). From what has just been said, Bannister's (1962) operational definition of schizophrenic thought-disorder can be understood. It is "... a condition in which subjects on any sorting task produce weak sorting relationships. These sorting relationships (matching scores) show little stability

when the subject moves from one group of elements (stimuli) to another and the pattern of sorting relationships is private and idiosyncratic, with the subject manifesting little conscious awareness of the nature of such patterning as does remain."

The notion that thought-disordered schizophrenia consists in a loosening of constructs gave rise to the serial invalidation hypothesis (Bannister, 1963). This hypothesis reiterates what has been said above. Of interest is the compatibility of this hypothesis with the concepts of invalidation and mystification put forward by Laing and his colleagues with regard to families of schizophrenics.

Bannister (1963) attempted to experimentally produce the condition of a weak conceptual structure in normal Ss, by subjecting them to serial invalidation. In this study, each S had to rank-order ten photographs of unknown people on each of ten supplied constructs. The procedure was carried out over ten successive days. The Ss were given the impression that there was a specific correct order in the ranking. Each S was validated in his ranking of the elements on five of the constructs, and invalidated in his ranking of the elements on the remaining constructs. However, the aim of the experiment was not achieved. The failure to produce the desired effects was attributed to two factors:

- (a) to the fact that one is working with individuals with already formed construct systems, and
- (b) to the fact that, since sub-systems of constructs are related, it is not logical to treat the validated group and the invalidated group of constructs as distinct.

The experiment was thus replicated, but with the constructs of half the Ss being validated and with those of the other half being invalidated. When this was done, a significant difference between the two groups was found in the extent to which a loosening of structure had occurred. However, the expected total loss of structure in the invalidated group had not occurred.

The procedure of the above experiment was subsequently refined (Bannister, 1965) in the following way. Each S was supplied with constructs which fall into two distinct categories: a constellation of moral constructs, and a constellation of intellectual constructs. Half of the Ss were validated on the one set of constructs and invalidated on the other, and the remainder of the Ss were validated and invalidated on the opposite sets of constructs. The scores for each S were grouped into three blocks:

- (a) a validated block, which consisted in assessing the internal correlations between the four constructs on which he was told that he was doing well,
- (b) an invalidated block, which consisted in assessing the internal correlations between the four constructs on which he was told that he was doing badly, and
- (c) a mixed block, which consisted in assessing the correlations between the moral and the intellectual constructs.

Results indicated an increase in correlational strength in the validated block, a significant decrease in the invalidated block, and no change in the mixed block. However, the extent to which constructs had loosened in the invalidated block was not to the same extent as that found in thought-disordered schizophrenics. The fact that this procedure was carried out within the context of an experimental situation could account for this.

The work done on the loosening of conceptual structure has given rise to the Grid Test of Schizophrenic Thought-Disorder (Bannister and Fransella, 1966, 1971).

Of importance to what is being said is Bieri's work (referred to by Adams-Webber, in Bannister, 1970) on cognitive complexity. It appears that cognitively complex individuals, because they perceive others in a multidimensional way, may, in sorting tasks such as those used by Bannister, give the impression of having a loose conceptual structure. In fact, this is merely

a manifestation of the relationship between the various constructs not being so clear-cut. Such cognitively complex individuals can be differentiated from thought-disordered schizophrenics on the basis of their consistency of construing. According to Adams-Webber, the two cases of loosened conceptual structure are not equivalent. He substantiates this by saying that thought-disorder may, in certain cases, be the result of the loosening of a once tight construct system governed by impermeable superordinate constructs. The impermeability of superordinate constructs precludes the development of new construct sub-systems and creates a unidimensional construct system. As a result, the various constructs will be highly related to one another, and the predictive failure of one construct will have a greater impact on such an individual than on an individual with a less unidimensional system.

"... the more closely related all an individual's constructs, the greater will be the impact throughout the system of a single invalidational experience."  
(Adams-Webber, in Bannister, 1970).

Adams-Webber goes on to say that Bannister's concept of serial invalidation, although supplying an answer to the question of the origin of schizophrenic thought-disorder, does not answer why certain individuals, and not others, are subject to such invalidatory experiences. He puts forward the theory that it is the impermeability of the superordinate constructs in an individual's system that causes the invalidatory experiences to have such a devastating effect. This view should be borne in mind, as should the alternative view that certain individuals tend to be subjected to serial invalidation to a greater extent than others. The possibility that both factors play a role should also not be overlooked.

Adams-Webber's theory about a thought-disordered schizophrenic's having a tight, one-dimensional construct system prior to the onset of his schizophrenia, and Bannister's finding that schizophrenics achieve spuriously high Intensity scores on grids where the elements are

persons known to them (as a result of giving remembered judgments of these people) should be considered in conjunction with Cooper's (1967) idea that acute schizophrenics function "normally" until their breakdown and return to this "normal" state after drug and shock therapy. The picture that emerges in the case of the acute schizophrenic is that the pre-schizophrenic has an abnormally tight construct system (possibly modelled on that of one or both parents) to start with, that invalidatory and mystifying experiences thus have a strong impact and result in the chaotic looseness of the construct system, and that conventional treatment, if not accompanied by a change in the patient's environment or by therapy geared to making the patient aware of his situation, will make the patient return to his original mode of construing events. Patients for whom the breakdown has been a learning experience will not return to this original way of construing events, but will attempt to elaborate their originally tight construct systems.

All this should be borne in mind in research where repertory grids employing elements known to the person are carried out with thought-disordered schizophrenics. Any interpretation regarding the schizophrenic's construction of events should

- (a) specify whether the repertory grid was done when he was actively manifesting schizophrenic symptoms or after a period of treatment, and
- (b) attempt to assess whether his "breakdown" had been accompanied by a change of his situation or perception of it, or whether, after treatment, he had reverted to virtually the same "normal" state as prior to the "breakdown".

In conclusion of this section, it can be said that Personal Construct Theory provides an appropriate framework within which to interpret both the thought-disorder characterizing schizophrenics and the processes of invalidation and mystification occurring in certain

families. The concept of serial invalidation put forward by Bannister is totally compatible with Laing's ideas and explains some of these in more precise terms.

## METHOD

### 1. Subjects

Subjects (Ss) were composed of 4 young males, psychiatrically diagnosed as thought-disordered schizophrenics, and their biological parents. The schizophrenics were all acute cases, and the time of the investigation coincided with their first admission to a mental hospital.

It was required that, in each family, the son included in the study should have lived with his parents at least until leaving school, in order to ensure that he had had sufficient contact with his family. It was also required that the son included in the study should be between 16 years and 28 years of age. The upper limit was set in order to ensure that both parents would be of a testable age, and the lower limit was set so that, as far as the sons were concerned, one would be dealing with people with an already relatively developed personality.

Ss were English- or Afrikaans-speaking Coloureds. Only persons of Christian origin were selected so as to cut down on the number of sociological variables to be accounted for. The inclusion of Moslems or Hindus, for example, would have necessitated taking cognisance of cultures other than Western European. Since urban-rural factors were also considered relevant variables to be accounted for, the study was restricted to urban families residing in the Cape Town area.

### 2. Apparatus

#### 2.1. Biographical Information Questionnaire

This questionnaire (see Appendix A) was devised by the author with two aims in mind:

- (a) to elicit a certain amount of general information from each S regarding personal particulars, and

(b) to serve as the basis for an interview where the S would be encouraged to talk about his family and psychiatric history (where relevant). This enabled a comparison of information obtained by this means with that from other sources.

## 2.2. Repertory grid devised by Kelly

Kelly's (1955) "all-or-none" grid where constructs are elicited from the S (described at length in the introduction) was the one used.

The exact form constructed by Kelly was used.\* In addition, three constructs, which the author felt would provide additional, possibly relevant information, were supplied. A blank grid, with these three supplied constructs added at the end, is shown in Appendix B.

## 2.3. Ingrid 72

Slater's (1972) computer-programme for the analysis of repertory grids (described in the introduction) was used to analyse the raw grid data for each subject. The information obtained from each grid is shown in Appendices D, E, F and G.

It should be noted that the three supplied constructs in each case were not included in the computer analysis since they were separate from the main grid. These constructs were interpreted by inspection.

## 2.4. Occupational Status Scale

This scale, aimed at measuring occupational status among Coloureds, was devised by Van der Merwe (1975). It was constructed according to the North and Hatt method which involves asking a representative sample to rate a given list of occupations as "excellent", "good", "above

\*In his original grid, Kelly used 22 sorts. One of these was omitted in error by the author at the outset of the study, so that only 21 sorts were used.

average", "below average" and "poor". A percentage score, ranging from 100 for "excellent" to 20 for "poor" is given to each occupation as ranked by each respondent. The average percentage score is then calculated for each occupation.

In the case of the present scale, a pilot-study was initially conducted, where a representative sample of 15 people was asked to rank a given list of 23 occupations according to the North and Hatt method. This preliminary stage was considered successful, so that the following stage involved presenting another representative sample of 15 people with a list of about 100 occupations. This list was compiled from the types of occupations occupied by the respondents in the first sample and from the occupations of their fathers (or mothers or guardians in the absence of fathers). Percentage scores for the occupations were then calculated. The final list of the 98 occupations with their respective percentage scores is shown in Appendix C.

According to Van der Merwe, it is permissible for a researcher to establish cut-off points separating the socio-economic classes required by the particular study. Since this is not a socio-economic status scale, such cut-off points will necessarily be arbitrary. This is open to criticism, but in the absence of an existing socio-economic status scale for Coloureds, it is the most viable alternative. Furthermore, in view of the fact that occupation is the most accurate single index of socio-economic status, the cut-off points will, by and large, be accurate.

The author established the cut-off point separating the working-class and the middle-class at the percentage of 60. All occupations with an average percentage rating of 60 and above were seen as reflecting middle-class status.\* Those below 60 were seen as reflecting working-class status.\*

\*Middle-class status includes what is termed "middle-class", "upper-middle-class" and "upper-class" in scales using finer divisions. Working-class status includes what is termed "working-class", "lower-middle-class" and "lower-class" in scales using finer divisions.

### 3. Procedure

Each family was classified as either middle-class or working-class, depending on the rating of the father's occupation on Van der Merwe's (1975) scale.

The research procedure was carried out in the form of interviews with the three members of each family. The interviews were carried out in the language preferred by the particular S.\*

The author was assisted by two interviewers. In the text, Interviewer 1 refers to the author herself, Interviewer 2 to a medical practitioner, and Interviewer 3 to an undergraduate psychology student. Interviewer 1 was involved with all four families, Interviewer 2 assisted the first interviewer with three families, and Interviewer 3 assisted the first interviewer with another family.

All the interviews, except for some of those with the schizophrenic sons, and except for one interview with one of the fathers, were conducted in the homes of the Ss. The interviews with the sons were carried out in the mental hospital if they had not yet been discharged, and, where applicable, in their homes after discharge. One of the fathers was interviewed on one occasion at his place of employ. The reason for this will be mentioned when the relevant family is discussed.

Interviews were both structured and unstructured. The former involved grid administration and interviews based on the Biographical Information Questionnaire; the latter were informal sessions with one or more family members. During the structured sessions, each S was interviewed alone. The unstructured sessions usually occurred where more than one family member was present, although these also sometimes took place with only one S. Information obtained in this unstructured way was used in conjunction with information from the structured interviews.

\*Interview results from interviews conducted in Afrikaans were translated into English and are presented in English. When this occurred, mention is made of it. Where no reference is made to the language in which a particular interview was conducted, the implication is that it was carried out in English.

\*\*Interviewer 1 designed the study and directed research.

The Biographical Information Questionnaire was done either during the first or during the second session with each S. Since it was partly used as a basis for a general discussion with the S, although the general format was adhered to and the relevant information filled in by the interviewer in the appropriate area on the sheet, much deviation was permitted.

The complete repertory grid was done with each S in one session where possible. The schizophrenics who were still in hospital at the time of the investigation were usually not able to complete the whole grid in one session since they became tired within a relatively short space of time. The grid administration was then done over the course of two or more sessions, but it was seen to that the time gap between these sessions was no more than three or four days.

Each grid was processed by Slater's Ingrid 72 computer programme on a Univac computer. From this, the statistical relationships between the constructs, between the elements, between the constructs and the elements, as well as the component groupings were obtained for each grid. In addition, the various features that can be determined by inspection (outlined in the introduction) were noted for each grid.

On the basis of the computer analysis of each grid, various inferences were made about each individual's potential ways of interacting with his environment. At the same time, since grids were obtained from three family members in each case, it was possible to make inferences regarding the possible patterns of interaction among the three family members. This, however, was done in conjunction with the information obtained from the other sources. An attempt was made, in the case of each family, to reconcile the contradictory view-points, both of each individual family member, and of the three family members, into a plausible interpretation of the situation that had existed prior to the son's "breakdown". These interpretations are shown in the following section.

## RESULTS

The results presented in this section take the form of descriptive accounts of each of the four families in an attempt to make intelligible the schizophrenic symptoms in each case.

Each family analysis is based on information from the following sources:

- (a) Reports from professional helpers involved with the schizophrenic Ss, or with the whole family, e.g. psychiatric reports, social workers' reports, etc.
- (b) Each S's verbal report.
- (c) The Biographical Information Questionnaire of each S.
- (d) The computer analysis of the grid data of each S.
- (e) General features of the grid data of each S not determined by the computer analysis.

Within each family analysis, the following general format is adopted:

- (a) A description of the interviews.
- (b) General information about the family.
- (c) The son's verbal report: this includes the data from the Biographical Information Questionnaire.
- (d) Interpretations of the son's grid data.
- (e) The father's verbal report: once again, the data from the Biographical Information Questionnaire is included.
- (f) Interpretations of the father's grid data.
- (g) The mother's verbal report, including the data from the Biographical Information Questionnaire.
- (h) Interpretations of the mother's grid data.
- (i) Concluding comments.

The repertory grids of the family members, as well as the relevant data from the computer print-out is given in Appendix D for the S family, in Appendix E for the P family, in Appendix F for the V family, and in Appendix G for the F family. Various points relevant to the interpretation of this data are made in the first family analysis, that of the S family, and are not repeated subsequently.

Interpretations of the situation surrounding the son's schizophrenia make reference to Laing's theory, to Personal Construct Theory and, where applicable, to some broader sociological factors. In line with Laing's method of reconciling contradictions, interpretations are put forward at various stages in the analysis, and reviewed in the light of new information. The final interpretation occurs at the end of each analysis, but does not preclude the existence of alternative interpretations based on different theoretical frameworks, or of alternative interpretations based on additional data.

1. ALAN S

1.1. Interviews: Number and form

Alan's name was obtained from mental hospital files. The interviewers'\* initial session was with his mother, an extremely talkative woman who was very keen to participate in the research. This session took the form of a two hour long unstructured interview. Alan's father, Mr S, was approached on the interviewers' second visit to the S's home. He was in his bedroom and refused to come to the sitting room to see the interviewers, so that one of the interviewers went to him in an attempt to persuade him to co-operate. After an informal chat of about two hours, he said that he would participate at a later stage, when the pressures of work had eased. During this time, the other interviewer conducted the structured interview with Mrs S. Alan was in hospital at the time. The family was left for about one month so as to give Mr S a chance to attend to his work. During this period, a very brief meeting was held with Alan where he was informed about the research and his co-operation secured.

After a month, the interviewers visited the S family again. Alan had been discharged from hospital by then, but was not home that evening. Mrs S was once again keen to chat, but she reported that her husband refused to come out of his room. After an informal chat with Mrs S, the interviewers left, and decided, for reasons to be explained later, that Mr S might agree to co-operate if interviewed at work. One of the interviewers then went to his place of employ and conducted the structured interview with him there. The interviewers visited the home of the S family for the last time shortly after that, and spent several hours there on that occasion. During this time, one of the interviewers conducted the structured interview with Alan, while the other chatted informally

\*Interviewers 1 and 2.

with Mr and Mrs S. A certain amount of time was spent with the two interviewers chatting informally with all three members at the same time.

The other members of the household remained in other parts of the house when the interviewers were there.

Eight weeks separated the initial and final sessions with this family.

The table below summarizes what has just been said:-

Session No.	Inter-viewer(s)	Family Member(s)	Struc-tured/Unstruc-tured	Length of time (hrs)	Place of interview
1	1,2	Mother	U	2	Home
2	1	Father	U	2	Home
	2	Mother	S	2	
3	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
4	1,2	Mother	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Home
5	2	Father	S	2	Work
6	1	Son	S	2	Home
	2	Father, Mother	U	2	
	1,2	Father, Mother, Son	U	1	

### 1.2 Initial information regarding Alan

Alan is an eighteen year old middle-class Coloured male. He went as far as Standard Six at school, then, at the age of sixteen, obtained employment as a pantryman on a ship. He was away at sea for one year and, on his return, obtained employment as a clerk at the factory where his father has a senior position. While Alan was still in that employ, several incidents, to be described below, led to his being admitted to a mental hospital where he was diagnosed paranoid schizophrenic.

The psychiatric diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia was made on the basis of his exhibiting thought-disorder, social and emotional withdrawal, and delusions of grandeur with religious content. The onset of his schizophrenia was sudden and, since there had been no process of deterioration over time, his "breakdown" was considered acute.

In hospital, he responded to drug treatment and Electro-Convulsive therapy and attended occupational therapy classes for most of his eight weeks there. On discharge from hospital, his condition was described as improved.

Alan was first seen by the author two weeks after he had been admitted to hospital. By then, his condition had improved considerably. During this initial meeting, he was co-operative, but slightly withdrawn. He answered coherently when spoken to, but did not volunteer anything spontaneously.

The second meeting with Alan took place when he was back at home. He was once again co-operative, but, in addition, spontaneous. He exhibited none of the symptoms characteristic of schizophrenia. He spoke freely about his "breakdown" as well as about circumstances at home, and displayed a tremendous amount of insight into his situation.

Most of the details surrounding Alan's "breakdown" came from Mrs S. She reported that one evening, he emerged from his room with a haversack. He appeared quiet and purposeful and announced to his parents that he had something to tell them. He had been thinking about God and had come to the realization that material values were unimportant. He felt a mission to bring this to the knowledge of others and to liberate his people (the Blacks) from White oppression. He had decided to go to the mountain to meditate about how his mission was to be actualised.

He left the house after this, and was away for three days. During this time, his parents started worrying

about him and organized a search party to look for him on the mountain. The search party did not find him, but he returned on the fourth day, dressed only in a blanket (not his own) and carrying a staff. Mrs S commented that he looked exactly like Moses.

They questioned him about what he had done for three days and about the loss of his haversack. He said that he had wandered around the mountain and survived by eating grass. After having "gained insight", he had walked into town and told people to repent and had then returned home. He could remember, neither where he had obtained the blanket, nor what had happened to his own possessions.

Mrs S decided that his behaviour warranted psychiatric treatment, and he was taken to a mental hospital.

### 1.3. General information regarding the S family

Alan is the second youngest in a family of nine siblings (six brothers and three sisters). His father holds an administrative post in a transport company while his mother, an ex-teacher, is a housewife. Mr S has a Standard Eight education and his wife holds a post-matriculation primary teaching diploma. Mrs S regarded her husband with contempt for having attained a lower educational level than her. As will be seen later, whether someone was educated or not played an important role in her construal of events. Mr S, by contrast, did not consider a high degree of education nearly as important as working hard at whatever one did, and excelling at the task. Alan himself had only reached Standard Six. This is rather incongruous with his parents' higher educational achievements, but he had done well at school and only left because his friends were leaving and going out to earn a living. Although surprising where Mrs S was concerned, neither of his parents seemed to mind about his not having carried on.

None of the older siblings was still at school and those who did not have families of their own and were

still living with their parents helped to support the family. The eldest of Alan's three sisters had an illegitimate child, so did not work, but looked after her child and helped her mother with household duties. Mrs S had an accepting attitude to her daughter's having had an illegitimate child. She said that, although she would have preferred this not to have happened, one had to be practical about it. She could not leave her own daughter in the street and this had been the time when her daughter had needed her most. This formed part of a general attitude of accepting most of the things that her children did. Her allowing Alan to leave school can be seen in this light.

Mr S, by contrast with his wife, was much less permissive with regard to his children's upbringing. According to Alan, he was reasonable, but tended to be restrictive with his daughters. Mrs S, however, painted a picture of a firm disciplinarian, intent only on working hard and on his children's doing the same, and totally intolerant of their missing a day's work or having friends come round. She felt that this was driving her children to the streets to seek their fun. She gave numerous examples of occasions where her husband had offended guests and embarrassed her and the children by telling them to keep quiet or by switching off the gramophone. On one occasion, he had stopped a party by switching off the electric mains. Mrs S felt that her husband had completely alienated himself from her and his children, and she was proud that she had all the children on her side. She made a point of constantly reminding her husband of this. She also felt that her husband had driven Alan mad. Alan, according to her, was more quiet and less assertive than his siblings. Whereas they expressed their anger towards their father quite freely by telling him not to interfere, Alan tended to "bottle things up". She felt that Alan's madness was caused by the unexpressed aggression that he felt towards his father. She recounted an incident that had occurred while Alan was in hospital. She and her husband went

to visit him on a certain occasion and Alan suddenly turned on his father and said, "I may be mad, but you are bad." She added that this was the first time that Alan had ever spoken to his father like that, and it was then that she knew that he was on the way to recovery.

The discipline of the children was a source of tremendous marital discord in the S family.

The general atmosphere in the house corroborates Mrs S's comment that she had the children on her side. Mr S was never in the living room, never participated in the family's activities. Mrs S was always at the centre of all the activity. In fact, Mr S's absence from the living room, the centre of the family's activities, was a symbol of his defeat. One could speculate as to how much was cause and how much effect. Was his banishment to one room of the house self-imposed or imposed by others? If the former, then Mrs S's report of the situation was accurate and one could view his attitude as a cause of the disharmony in the family. If the latter, then one could view it as a sign of his wife's victory over him in a battle for supremacy in the family. The answer to this question is crucial to an understanding of the dynamics of the interaction in this family and will be dealt with after more information has been sifted.

Mr S's absorption in his work should be viewed in the same light as his retreat to his room. The same can be said for his week-end drinking bouts. This was the other major issue over which he and his wife had numerous arguments, and something which Mrs S repeatedly used as a weapon when she blamed him for being a worthless husband and father. He had withdrawn from his family:

- (a) to his room,
- (b) in his work,
- (c) in his solitary drinking.

It should be pointed out that his drinking occurred only on week-ends and did not affect his work at all. As a result, these two seemingly contradictory mechanisms of withdrawal were perfectly compatible. It was the

fact that his drinking did not affect his work and hence, his ability to support a family, that prevented Mrs S from using his drinking as grounds for divorce. She had apparently attempted to obtain a divorce on those grounds and had failed.

These three forms of withdrawal were precisely the issues over which Mr and Mrs S had constant arguments. She saw his withdrawal as the cause of the disharmony in the family; he saw it as being the result of her having fought for supremacy in the family, having won and nagging him for having lost; all the siblings (except for Alan) were on Mrs S's side; Alan was confused - he was the only one who had never spoken up against his father until the one visit to the hospital. Mrs S saw his confusion as being bad: the other children had avoided being mad by fighting their father; Alan had not fought him, and had gone crazy. Mrs S was certain that Alan felt the same about his father as did the rest of the family, but that he was unable to express his anger. This interpretation of the situation is a corollary to her view of her husband's being the cause of the disharmony. However, one must question whether Alan's madness was not related to his being confused about which side was right rather than to his knowing which side was right without being able to take a stand. The answer to this should become apparent once the question of the circumstances surrounding Mr S's withdrawal has been answered.

In the pages which follow, an attempt is made to understand Alan's behaviour in the light of what was going on in his family.

#### 1.4. Alan's verbal report

In reply to certain set questions (see Appendix A) asked of Alan, the following points were made.

Alan said that he had been to one school throughout his life, and was part of a social clique formed there. He had done well at school, but left after completing Standard Six since all his friends were leaving. He went out to work.

At the time that the study was conducted, he was working as a clerk in the firm where his father held an administrative position. He was generally satisfied with his work, but for two factors. The one was that he resented his father bragging about his achievements at work. He felt that this was all his father spoke about at home anyway, and he (Alan) was subjected to it to a greater extent than the rest of the family by virtue of working with his father. The second factor involved the salaries of the African workers in the firm. Alan felt that they were underpaid, and this bothered him. He said that this was one of the factors that had led him to believe that he had a mission to save the Blacks from White exploitation. Although he realized that this belief was a symptom of his illness, he nevertheless felt that there was a considerable amount of validity to the thoughts that had characterized his illness.

He described himself as outgoing. He did not like to be on his own. His social life consisted of going out with his friends, going to parties, playing soccer and swimming. He added that his mother was also active socially. She was involved with church-work and also spent a considerable amount of time talking with him and his friends when they came to the house. She generally fitted in very well with and enjoyed the company of younger people. His father, by contrast, was "not like a father". He was much too involved with his work and with people outside his family. Alan mentioned that Mr S knew how to please and get on well with others, but not with his wife and children. He added that the other children did not get on well with their father, and that he was often unreasonable. Alan gave as an example the fact that Mr S still attempted to rule the life of his twenty-seven year old daughter.

The above seems to suggest that what Mrs S had said about the children being on her side has validity. Alan's report tends to corroborate his mother's. However, certain additional factors need to be taken into account.

Firstly, when Alan was asked about the patterns of dominance in the family, he said that his mother made the decisions where general, financial and household matters were concerned. Discipline, he said, had been in the hands of his older brothers when he was small. When he was older, there had been a relaxation of discipline. This pattern had characterized the upbringing of the boys in the family. Since the girls were all much older than he was, he was uncertain about who had been responsible for their discipline. He just knew that his father had tried to restrict the movements of his twenty-seven year old daughter - whether this had always been the case or whether his father was only now attempting to impose certain restrictions on his daughter, Alan could not say. The possible significance of this will be discussed shortly. Also of importance was Alan's comment that he had spent more time with his father than with his mother until he had reached twelve years of age. After that, he had drifted away from his father and started spending more time with his mother.

The second point that suggests that the issue is not clear-cut relates to an incident that occurred during session 6. Interviewer 1 was conducting a structured session with Alan in the kitchen while Interviewer 2 was having an informal chat with Mr and Mrs S in the sitting room. It should be pointed out that Mrs S had been ready to give her perception of the situation right at the outset, and considered the interviewers to be on her side. However, Interviewer 2 had built up an extremely good rapport with Mr S during a previous session. Mr S thus felt that he had an ally against his wife. Both thus felt that Interviewer 2 was on their side. A hectic argument started where Mrs S turned to Interviewer 2 and told him, "You tell him, Doctor, you tell him that he is the cause of it all, and that he must stop his drinking and spend some time with his family.... He is the cause of Alan's going mad...." Snatches of this argument reached the kitchen. Alan turned to Interviewer 1 and

put his hands to his ears as if to shut out the argument. He said, "I wish they would stop. They go on like this all the time. She nags him and nags him and he talks back at her...."

With regard to the first point made, pertaining to the pattern of dominance in the family, it appears that, at the time of the investigation, Mrs S was running the family. However, the fact that Alan remembers having been closer to his father than to his mother until the age of twelve suggests that Mr S had not always been uninterested in his family as his wife would have had the interviewers believe. This lends support to the view that Mr S's banishment from the family activities was not self-imposed, and a result rather than a cause of familial disharmony and a struggle for power between him and his wife. His attempt to discipline his twenty-seven year old daughter, if viewed in this light, appears as a final desperate effort to retain some authority in the home.

The second point, regarding Alan's reaction to the argument between his parents, suggests that he was not unequivocal in taking his mother's side by any means. He seemed to be upset that they could not get on with each other. He also seemed to be saying that his mother's nagging was a cause of his father's attitude.

It should be remembered, therefore, that although Alan, in direct answers to questions, sided with his mother and corroborated her view of the situation, at a less conscious level, he seemed ambivalent in his perception of the situation.

The question can now be viewed by considering his repertory grid.

#### 1.5. Alan's grid

##### 1.5.1. General

Alan's grid consists of eighteen elements and eighteen constructs. He left out element 12 since he was unable to think of anyone who was threatening to him. As a

result, constructs pertaining to sorts 12, 13 and 19 could not be elicited.

He is unmarried, therefore element 6 was modified in his case to represent the girl-friend that he had at the time that the research was conducted.

#### 1.5.2. Inter-construct relations

Four clusters\* emerge from the grid.

Cluster A involves the following constructs\*\*:

\*Constructs are clustered when they correlate significantly with one another. The level of significance is determined by interpreting any given correlation in a Pearson r table. Degrees of freedom (df) is equal to the number of components emerging from the grid. It should be noted that, since  $df = \text{number of components}$  in a given grid, it is the same for the inter-construct correlations, the inter-element correlations, and the construct-element correlations.

Whether a correlation between constructs is positive or negative determines whether the emergent pole (pole of similarity) of a particular construct relates to, respectively, the emergent pole or to the implicit pole (pole of contrast) of another construct. In the following presentation, the construct pole of any one construct relates positively with the construct poles (of other constructs) on the same side, and negatively with those on the opposite side. This system is followed throughout the thesis when construct clusters are presented.

\*\*The number of the sort is given in parenthesis. In addition, an attempt is made to present the constructs within each cluster in such a way that those constructs presented first are superordinate to those below. When constructs appear to be equivalent as far as superordinacy-subordinacy is concerned, or when superordinacy and subordinacy is not apparent, the numerical order of the sorts is applied. This system is followed throughout the thesis.

- People who are nice to Self - People who are nasty to Self (3)
- People with whom Self can communicate well - People with whom he cannot (5)
- People who try to help Self - People who do not go out of their way to please Self (8)
- People who are close to Self - People who are not so close to Self (9)
- People with whom Self can lead a peaceful existence and who are generally peace-loving - People with whom Self argues (14, 15, 21)
- Very soft-hearted people - People who are not as soft-hearted (11)
- People who are prepared to do what Self wants - People who do not fall in as easily with Self's plans (16)
- People who lead an active social life and like to go out - People who are more quiet and at home (1).

Cluster B involves the following constructs:

- Strict people - Lenient people (2)
- People who do not give in so easily to others - People who give in more easily to others (17)
- More serious people - More happy-go-lucky people (18).

Cluster C involves some of the constructs found in Cluster A and some found in Cluster B. As such it mediates between the two. The following are the constructs involved:

- People with whom Self can communicate well - People with whom he cannot (5)
- People who try to help Self - People who do not go out of their way to please Self (8)

People who are close to Self - People who are not so close to Self (9)

People with whom Self can lead a peaceful existence and who are generally peace-loving - People with whom Self argues (14, 15, 21)

People who give in more easily to others - People who do not give in so easily to others (17)

People who have a relationship of equality with Self - People who have an uneven relationship with Self (20)

People who are straightforward with Self - People who are not (4) .

It should be noted that construct 20 is unrelated to either of the two preceding clusters.

Cluster D involves two constructs, one of which occurs also in Cluster B. As a result, Clusters B and D are linked. The two constructs involved are:

People whose social life is linked with family - People whose social life is linked with friends (7)

More serious people - More happy-go-lucky people (18).

It should be noted that, since the above clusters involve all but one of the constructs (construct 6) and since they are linked to one another through one or more constructs in each case, one can conclude that Alan has a tight, rather than a loose construct system. His constructs are also constellatory to a large extent. Both these factors arise out of his elements fitting into a "good" or "bad" stereotype, depending on how they react to Alan and what they do.

However, the componential analysis, to be dealt with more fully later, indicates that many of the elements do not fit into the above stereotype and that there are various

minor components (minor in that they account for a relatively small amount of the total variation of the grid) which arise out of the "exceptions", out of the elements which do not fit the stereotype. Alan's construct system, therefore, although tight rather than loose, is by no means pathologically tight. However, he is very far from the chaotic looseness which is supposed to characterize the construct systems of thought-disordered schizophrenics. The only explanation that can be ventured for this is the fact that this grid was done after Alan had been discharged from hospital, and is compatible with the author's view of him as being well in touch with reality and as possessing insight into his situation at this time.\*

\*This raises the point, implicit in Kelly's view of a construct system being dynamic, that a very different grid would have been obtained when Alan was actively schizophrenic. If we accept Bannister and Fransella's (1970) view of thought-disordered schizophrenia being characterized by a loosening of the relationship between constructs, one could assume that a grid obtained from Alan when he was actively schizophrenic, would have manifested such characteristics. However, what sort of grid would have been obtained in Alan's pre-schizophrenic state, although an extremely important question for an understanding of the thought processes of a schizophrenic, remains a matter for speculation. Furthermore, it can only be answered by long-term research where a large sample of normal subjects are followed through until they become schizophrenic. The lack of knowledge on this issue hampers an understanding of Alan's situation in the following way: we have the construct system of someone who was schizophrenic and is now recovered, and this tells us something of the way in which he perceives events at this moment. It is, however, important to know how he perceived events before he "broke down" as well as during his "breakdown",

A content analysis of the constructs reveals one important feature of the way in which Alan looks at the world. Constructs 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 20, i.e. ten of the eighteen constructs elicited, refer to the manner in which the persons in Alan's world react to Alan.

This predominance of dependency constructs, although primitive, is, in the author's opinion, progressive in Alan's case. To view events from one's own point of view is a safe way of coping with the world when other points of view have proved contradictory in the past. Alan appears to have rejected totally the imposition of others' construal of events onto his. Although his construal of the world at this stage was rather restricted as a result, it was at least internally consistent and free of confusion, and with the potential for elaboration in the future. Grids obtained from Alan in his pre-schizophrenic state would have proved extremely enlightening on this issue, but one can venture to say that, if one accepts that the loosening of the relationships between constructs is related to serial invalidation, then in his pre-schizophrenic state, his construal of the world must have been imposed almost totally from outside, i.e. invalidated, and must have been confused, i.e. mystified.

\*(continued)

if we wish to fully understand what was going on in his world throughout. Is his present construal of events the same as it was before or during the "breakdown"? This is the same as asking whether the schizophrenic experience has been a learning experience for him. All these questions have to remain unanswered. One can merely venture to say that certain of the characteristics of Alan's grid would have occurred in grids done in his schizophrenic and pre-schizophrenic states, but that, since in his particular case, he appeared so well, other features must have changed. This confuses any interpretations made, so that these should be treated with caution.

His "breakdown" and subsequent resorting to "egocentric" thinking are progressive when viewed in the light of this.

The above interpretation is, at this stage in our analysis of the S family, tentative, but it will be reconsidered at various stages in our analysis.

### 1.5.3. Inter-element relations

There are two main clusters here which are relevant to the purposes of this analysis.

Cluster A involves the following elements\*:

Self (1), Pal (8), Sister (5)  
 Ex-pal (9) - Boss (16), Spouse (6)  
 Rejecting Person (10).

Various important points should be noted. Self is not construed with relation to either of the parental figures. There is a complete identification of Self with Pal. Spouse is construed in a negative manner and as being opposite to Self, together with Rejecting Person and Boss.

Cluster B involves the following elements:

Mother (2), Happy Person (18),  
 Successful Person (17),  
 Pitied Person (11) - Father (3), Spouse (6),  
 Rejecting Person (10).

Here it should be noted that Mother and Father are construed as opposites, the former being positively construed and the latter negatively.

\*The number of the element is given in parenthesis. This is done throughout this thesis when the element clusters are presented. The basis for the similarity or contrast between elements is determined by the correlation between any given element being positive or negative.

Elements 6 and 10 occurred in Cluster A, and thus link Clusters A and B. From this, one can say that, although neither of the parental figures forms a model for Alan, his mother, rather than his father, forms a point of reference.

The above two clusters include the figures about which Alan has strong negative or strong positive feelings. The fact that elements 3, 6 and 10 are negatively perceived is confirmed by an examination of the assigned constructs. He would like to be like all the elements except for these, and he attributes authoritarianism only to these.

As far as the three key people in Alan's life, viz. Alan himself, his mother and his father, are concerned, the following becomes apparent.

Alan construes himself as being most like Pal, which suggests that this is the figure with whom he identifies. The fact that he does not see himself as being directly like either of his parents suggests that neither of them is an adequate enough model for him. He seems to have thus turned to a peer to find the qualities absent in his parents. However, it should be remembered that one cannot say that Alan had had this attitude prior to his "breakdown", although it is quite possible that his "breakdown" was associated with a disillusionment with either one of or both his parents as models and that his identification with other figures (Pal, Sister, Ex-pal) at the time of the investigation was an attempt to find more satisfactory models.

If we now turn to Alan's construal of his mother, various paradoxical points become apparent. On the whole, he has a positive attitude towards her and she is contrasted with figures that he dislikes (Father, Spouse, Rejecting Person). However, his identification with her is indirect - through the fact that both he and her are contrasted with Spouse and Rejecting Person. Despite his aligning her with Happy Person and Successful Person and thus seeing her as possessing the characteristics embodied by these two figures, he also aligns her with Pitied Person.

There is thus a certain degree of ambivalence in his attitude to his mother. Something seems to be preventing an unequivocal positive regard for her. Once again, one wonders whether this ambivalence had always been present or whether he started being cautious with regard to his mother only after his "breakdown".

Alan's contrasting his mother with his father suggests that he is acutely aware of the contrasting personalities of the two. This is totally compatible with what both Mr and Mrs S said about their own relationship, with Alan's verbal report, as well as with the interviewers' conception of the situation. It confirms that the S household was characterized by open conflict between the parents.

A consideration of Alan's construal of his father merely confirms what has just been said, since his father can be seen as the anti-element of his mother. His father is seen as lacking the characteristics embodied by Happy Person, Successful Person and Ethical Person. By aligning his father with Rejecting Person, Alan seems to be implying that he feels rebuffed by his father. This raises the question of whether he has a desire to be accepted by his father. Although Alan's perception of his father is a very largely negative one, he does not identify with the anti-element (a hypothetical figure in this case) of his father. The negative identification is indirect - through Spouse and Rejecting Person. There is thus also ambivalence in his attitude to his father. A desire to be accepted by his father, accompanied by rejection rather than the desired acceptance, would be compatible with this ambivalence.

#### 1.5.4. Construct-element relations

The analysis here will be restricted to the characteristics attributed to three of the elements: himself, his mother and his father.

Alan considers himself\* someone who: is a person with whom others can communicate well (5), is a person whom others can get close to (9), is prepared to do what others want (16), is more happy-go-lucky (18), leads an active social life and likes to go out (1), is more lenient (2), is straightforward with others (4), has a social life linked with friends (7), will go out of his way to please others (8), is very soft-hearted (11), and gives in more easily to others (17).\*\*

He construes his mother as someone who: is nice to him (3), likes to help him (10), leads a peaceful existence with him and is generally peace-loving (14, 15, 21), is someone with whom he can communicate well (5), is close to him (9), is not interested in relatives (i.e. extended family) (6), is very soft-hearted (11) and is prepared to do what he (Alan) wants (16). However, these characteristics, although positive, do not apply to her very strongly.

\*The dependency constructs are not really appropriate in the given form since they refer to the relationship between the elements and Alan. They were, however, modified in such a way that they could be applied to him. This procedure is followed throughout the thesis when dependency constructs are applied to Self.

\*\*Only the applicable pole is given, this being determined by whether the correlation is positive or negative. This is done throughout the thesis when construct-element relations are under consideration. In addition, the characteristics that are presented first are correlated with the particular element at a higher level of significance than those occurring later. When the same level of significance is operative, the characteristics are presented in the numerical order of the sort (given in parenthesis). This system is followed throughout the thesis.

Alan construes his father as someone who: is nasty to him (3), does not like to help him (10), argues with him and likes to start fights (14, 15, 21), is someone with whom he cannot communicate well (5), is not so close to him (9), will not go out of his way to please him (8), is not so soft-hearted (11) and does not fall in so easily with his (Alan's) plans (16).

An examination of the above confirms once again that Alan considers his mother and father as opposites since they are represented by the opposite poles of constructs 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16 and 21. Although Alan appears to construe himself as like his mother and different from his father, as was mentioned, the positive characteristics attributed to his mother do not apply very strongly. The fact that he is not unequivocal in his positive regard for her substantiates the point made about the ambivalence with which he views her. This point will be taken up again in the next section. The ambivalence with which he views his father is not really evident in this section, but will also be discussed in the next section.

#### 1.5.5. Component grouping

The following points should be remembered with regard to interpreting component groupings throughout the thesis.

The total number of components in a given grid make up 100% of the total grid variation. Usually, there are so many components that, for practical reasons, it is not feasible to discuss all. The discussion is thus limited to the first few components. An attempt is made to discuss a sufficient number of components so that approximately 90% of the grid variation is accounted for. As a result, the detailed composition of only these components is presented in the Appendix. Furthermore, when one of these components provides information that has already been determined by inspection of the inter-construct correlations, inter-element correlations and construct-element correlations, this is not repeated here, even

though the composition of that component is given in the Appendix. The same applies to components given in the Appendix, but which provide information that is either inaccurate (see third chapter of introduction) or irrelevant to the purposes of the analysis.

In the case of each grid, in the presentation of the first few components in the Appendix, information is provided regarding the percentage contributed by each element and each construct to the variation of the component. There is no statistical method of determining the significance of these percentages (or "loadings"). The procedure followed by the author is to consider those elements and constructs with the highest percentages as loading "significantly" on a particular component. It should be noted that the percentages preceded by a positive (absent) sign refer to constructs and elements falling under one component pole. Those preceded by a negative sign refer to the contrasting pole.

If we now turn to Alan's grid, component 1 accounts for almost 50% of the total variation of Alan's grid. It is very general and approximately 78% of it is represented by the constructs which refer to being nice versus not nice to Alan. Nine of the elements contribute to a large amount of this component.

Pal, Mother, Successful Person and Happy Person contribute to the one pole of the component and are seen as communicating well with Self, close to Self, trying to help Self, being prepared to do what Self wants, soft-hearted, nice to Self and peace-loving. Spouse, Rejecting Person, Father and Boss contribute to the opposite poles of the component and are seen as not communicating well with Self, not close to Self, not going out of their way to please Self, not falling in so easily with Self's plans, not so soft-hearted, nasty to Self and argumentative. This component refers to the same constructs grouped into Construct Cluster A (see inter-construct relations). This component thus relates to the elements which fit Alan's stereotype of "good" versus "bad".

Component 2 accounts for approximately 15% of the total variation of the grid. It is represented to a large extent by three of the constructs (they account for approximately 83% of this component) and nine of the elements. The position of Father is relevant to our purposes. He is seen as happy-go-lucky, lenient, and as having a social life linked with friends rather than with family. This component is interesting in that one sees a breakdown of the stereotype found in component 1. The poles referring to being happy-go-lucky, lenient and having a social life with friends are positive in Alan's construct system. It is thus not surprising to find Self, Pal and Sister represented by those poles. However, it is surprising to find Father represented by those poles. The position of Father in this component is particularly interesting since it confirms the point made earlier about Alan's equivocal construal of his father. It should be remembered that the three constructs which represent this component are three of the constructs found to be inapplicable to Father (discussed in the section on construct-element relations). This implies that these constructs are not the most important characterizing Alan's perception of his father. However, they are present and it is in the area represented by these constructs that Alan's positive view of his father lies.

Components 3, 4, 5 and 6 account for approximately 11%, 8%, 5%, and 4% of the grid respectively. We will not proceed beyond the first six components in this analysis since they account for over 90% of the total variation of the grid.

The above four components are alike in that they include the various constructs in such a way that they (the constructs) do not fall into the type of cluster found in the first two components. In the case of these four components, the positively connotative poles of the constructs do not all fall under the same pole of the component. For example, in the constructs "Nice to Self-Nasty to Self", and "Straightforward with Self-Not straightforward with Self", "nice" and "straightforward" have positive

connotations. Whereas "nice" and "straightforward" would fall under the same pole in the case of the first two components, they would fall under the opposite component pole in the case of the four components in question. These four components thus indicate instances where Alan's stereotyped view of events breaks down. In other words, they cover instances where the constructs are not constellatory, and thus represent the exceptions to the rule.

Only one of these four components will be discussed - component 6, which reveals information about Alan's construal of his father.

Four constructs represent approximately 75% of component 6. Father falls under the pole of the component represented by the following construct poles: having an uneven relationship with Self, being more quiet and at home, giving in more easily to others, being more happy-go-lucky. Spouse falls under the pole of the component represented by the following construct poles: having a relationship of equality with Self, leading an active social life, not giving in easily to others, being more serious.

The ambivalence in Alan's perception of his father arises out of the fact that the first two construct poles (having an uneven relationship with Alan and being more quiet and at home) have a negative connotation, whereas the other two construct poles (giving in more easily to others and being more happy-go-lucky) have a positive connotation.

We can now reconsider the very crucial issue, raised earlier, about Alan's egocentrism arising out of an attempt to ward off the confusion that results from serial invalidation. There is already a fair amount of evidence pointing both to circumstances conducive to the development of such confusion and to the existence of confusion even in Alan's post-schizophrenic state.

Circumstances conducive to the development of confusion involve: Alan's construal of his father and mother as opposites, and his ambivalent attitude (emphasized through=

out the analysis) towards them. It is interesting that, in the grid analysis, the ambivalence towards both figures is revealed only on inspection of minor clusters of constructs and elements and/or of minor components. This implies that it is found at a less conscious level of functioning. On a more conscious level, Alan's attitudes are clear-cut, and he seems to have skirted the problem of being confused by his parents by withstanding the imposition of their perceptions onto his, relying on his own and identifying only indirectly with them.

The above interpretation has a fair degree of probability (in Esterson's sense of the term) in the light of the analysis which precedes it. It will, however, be reviewed in the light of further evidence.

#### 1.6. Mr S's verbal report

The first interview with Mr S was unstructured. He refused to come out of his room to meet the interviewers and had transmitted the message through his wife that he did not wish to participate in the research. She had delivered this message rather triumphantly, saying that it proved her point about his being unsociable and unhelpful, and that he probably did not wish to participate because he felt guilty about his son's madness. One of the interviewers then went to his room to try to persuade him to participate in the study by explaining its nature more fully. Mrs S's description of her husband had engendered in the interviewer the expectation of meeting with an aggressive rebuff from an extremely hostile man. This was by no means the case. He greeted the interviewer in a friendly manner, asked her to sit down, and apologised for not wishing to participate. He said that his sole reason for refusing to do so was that he worked very hard during the day and liked to spend the evenings relaxing so that he could be fresh for work the following day. He continued talking for approximately two hours in a dull monotone. The conversation was, in fact, practically a monologue, with the interviewer interjecting now and then.

What he said covered two main topics: his work - its nature, how important it was to him, how nobody at home understood the importance of hard work; and his experiences during the Second World War.

A casual listener would have considered the content of his words to be merely the tangential associations of a tired man. However, there was a definite theme which connected these: that of a man who had done what he thought was right throughout his life and who now had to face the fact that nobody who mattered to him could see the point of what he had achieved.

He spoke for a considerable length of time on the virtue of working hard, of punctuality, of never missing a day's work. At first, it appeared to be a theoretical lecture. However, the personal significance of this soon became apparent. He said that his children were very unlike him and tried to get out of doing any work at the slightest opportunity. They were out till all hours of night and, as a result, felt too tired to get up in the morning, and made various excuses for missing work. This, he said, was one of the reasons why he could not tolerate the continual parties held at his home. The other reason was that he himself was tired after a hard day's work and could not bear the noise that went on. He added that his reproaching his children for having too much fun and doing too little work was one of the main reasons for the rift that had developed between him and them. In addition, his wife enjoyed chatting to their children's friends until late at night and this encouraged them to disobey him and to quote their mother in justification for their actions. He said that this caused arguments between him and his wife. He seemed very sad about his wife's failure to understand his point of view. However, he appeared to love his wife very much and did not talk against her as she had done about him. He simply expressed the wish that things could be otherwise.

Two significant points emerged from his discussion of his war experiences. One was that his family was totally uninterested about what he had been through during those years and they laughed at him whenever he started speaking about it. The other was that he had been engaged to a girl before going off to war. He had remained completely faithful to her while he was away, and had returned to find that she had married another man. He had never quite recovered from this.

The following important points become clear from the above. As emerged from the one assigned construct in Alan's grid, and as his wife had said, Mr S was definitely authoritarian. He was obsessive about his work and everything related to it, and very concerned that his children should be the same. His intolerance of their parties arose from this. However, the value of what he stood for went unrecognised by his family so that, initially, they had argued with him. Once they all united to stand against him, they no longer bothered to even verbally contradict him. They simply did what they pleased. He was thus negated as a person. He withdrew and ceased to concern himself with family matters. His absence from the living room and his retiring to his room straight after supper every night were thus symbolic of his emotional withdrawal. (Furthermore, he was blamed for showing lack of interest in his family, and his absence from family matters was often thrown at him whenever he did try to make himself heard). Ousted from the family, he immersed himself even further in his work and became even more obsessive about it. This, too, was used by his family as proof of his lack of interest in them. The incident about his previous girl-friend having jilted him is significant in that it represents an earlier case of having been negated. His family's lack of interest in his war experiences is a further example of this type of negation.

Of tremendous importance is also what Mr S did not say. He knew that the study concerned his son. Yet not one word was uttered about this. He was so immersed in

himself and his own problems that he mentioned nothing that had direct bearing on his son's "breakdown". It is interesting that this sort of behaviour would be cited by his family as an example of his lack of interest in them. The interviewer, however, gained the impression that, although a lack of interest in his family existed, it was the result of preoccupation with himself, which was, in turn, the result of his having repeatedly met with a lack of interest in him. The interpretation of Mr S's withdrawal being largely a result, and only minimally a cause, of the familial discord backs up Alan's point about remembering his father to be involved with the family in earlier days. However, it should be taken into account that, even if his withdrawal was a result, it was also a secondary cause in that it reinforced the already present discord.

The interview ended with Mr S promising to participate the following time. However, when the interviewers returned, he once again refused to come out of his room, and his wife transmitted his message that he was very busy at work. The interviewers then abandoned the S family for a period of time and, in the interim, decided that, since Mr S seemed to be himself in his work situation to a greater extent than at home, he should be interviewed at work. The second interview with him was then carried out at his place of work. It should be pointed out that Mr S had, in the past, been repeatedly subjected to interviews by social workers sent by his wife for his "drinking problem". The interviewers suspected that part of his reluctance to co-operate with them stemmed from his linking them with the social workers who had seen him on previous occasions. The fact that his wife appeared to be on very good terms with the interviewers (she made a point of telling him this) could also have strengthened his suspicions. Whether this is what Mr S believed or not was not ascertained. However, the interviewers' decision to see him at work rather than at home was prompted by their view that he would be less inclined to link them with his wife and with social workers sent by her if

approached in a place where he felt that he was master. In fact, he was more at ease at work, and co-operated readily. The second interview then took place.

There was very little time for an informal chat on this occasion since the interview was structured. However, one of the constructs elicited during the repertory grid administration prompted Mr S to speak about his drinking, something that he had not mentioned in the previous interview. Of importance here is the fact that he did not view his drinking as a problem in the same way as his wife did. She saw it as one of the major causes of the rift between them and as a manifestation of his lack of interest in the family since he drank alone in his room instead of participating in the social life of the family. He spoke about his drinking quite casually, saying that he drank only on week-ends so that it would not affect his work, could abstain if he wanted to, but drank because there was nothing better to do on week-ends and because he wanted to escape his wife's nagging.

His drinking could also be seen as a manifestation of the type of withdrawal discussed above, as arising out of the same factors and as functioning as a secondary cause of familial disharmony. He also mentioned that his parents never used to argue and were very much in love with each other. When his mother had died, his father had had an acute stress reaction and denied that she was dead. He had moved in with his son and daughter-in-law. However, he drank rather heavily and Mrs S threw him out of the house as a result. This upset him (Mr S) a great deal since he had got on very well with his parents. When his mother was alive, he used to visit her regularly and often stay for supper, something which made Mrs S extremely annoyed.

This leaves much room for speculating as to exactly what was going on. Was Mr S's good relationship with his parents an important source of Mrs S's resentment of him or was it another haven to which he could withdraw from his already unsatisfactory relationship with his wife?

It is interesting to note that Mr S's parents got on well despite the father's drinking heavily. Perhaps Mr S expected the same acceptance of his own drinking from his wife. Also of interest is the fact that Mrs S succeeded in throwing her father-in-law out of the house, an indication of who was boss at home.

The third occasion on which Mr S was seen by the interviewers was extremely interesting. The interviewers had gone to his home, primarily with the purpose of interviewing Alan. They were chatting informally to Alan and Mrs S when Mr S came home from work. He had, by this stage in the investigation, become at ease with the interviewers and felt that they understood him. He seemed genuinely pleased to see them, greeted them warmly, and sat down in the living room to participate in the conversation. His wife, unaware that the interviewers sympathized with him as well as with her, immediately started an argument with him about his drinking, his lack of interest in his family, his role in his son's "breakdown", etc. The argument became rather heated and Mrs S would repeatedly turn to the one interviewer (the other interviewer had gone to interview Alan in the kitchen during the argument) for confirmation (which she did not get) of what she was saying. She often negated her husband's presence by turning to the interviewer and making comments like, "You see, this is exactly what I was telling you the other day.... he never listens to my point of view...". Eventually, Mr S left the house, saying to the interviewer, "Please excuse me... Now you see why I drink..."

It is evident that Mr S had done something that he had not done for a long time by sitting in the living room and participating in the conversation. He had even neglected having his supper in order to do so. His action seems to have been prompted by his feeling that, for once, other people understood him. However, his effort went unrecognised by his wife, he was attacked on various issues at a time where it was uncalled for - and he withdrew, not by retreating to his room this time, but by

leaving the house. The inferences made on the basis of his verbal reports in the first two interviews with him are corroborated by what took place on this occasion.

We can now turn to a fuller analysis of Mr S's personality on the basis of his repertory grid.

## 1.7. Mr S's grid

### 1.7.1. General

Mr S's grid consists of nineteen elements and fourteen constructs. Although all twenty-one constructs were elicited, eight were impermeable and had to be discarded prior to the computer analysis.

It should be noted that element 7 represents the girl-friend who had jilted him (mentioned earlier), element 11, representing Pitied Person, is one of his sons, element 12, representing Threatening Person, is someone at work who wants his (Mr S's) job, element 17, representing Successful Person, is a Coloured person who holds a job normally reserved for Whites, and element 18, representing Happy Person, is Mr S's brother.

### 1.7.2. Inter-construct relations

An examination of the correlations between the constructs reveals that, with the exception of construct 15 (No protest against Self drinking - Do not want Self to drink), every construct correlates with every other at least at the ,05 level of significance. Most of the correlations reach the ,001 level. Structurally, this implies an extremely tight construct system where events are construed largely in terms of one dimension.\* The constructs are thus constellatory in nature and, apart from construct 15, only one constellation is revealed.

\*The one dimension would be a superordinate construct.

An additional point with bearing on the structure of the construct system relates to the constructs omitted from the computer analysis on the grounds of their being impermeable. Although most individuals will tend to have a few impermeable constructs, eight impermeable constructs out of a total of twenty-one is excessive. Such a characteristic suggests that, once the main dimensions (in Mr S's case, one dimension) along which events are construed cannot be used in the case of certain events, the individual is incapable of forming new dimensions which relate to the rest of the construct system. The constructs then formed have applicability only to the particular events in question and are useless in helping the individual construe subsequent events. Impermeable constructs are thus pigeonholes for a very limited number of events. According to Kelly and Bannister and Fransella, obsessive-compulsive neurotics have impermeable constructs (except where the events relate to their particular ritual). This is compatible with the view which sees obsessive-compulsive neurosis as an attempt to fight a pending schizophrenia: the obsessive-compulsive neurotic has a chaotic, disintegrated view of the world, but his ritual safeguards him from complete disintegration.

In the light of the above, Mr S's grid shows a similarity to the characteristics found in obsessive-compulsive neurosis: his construal of the world is chaotic (manifested in the eight impermeable constructs) as long as he does not stick to the safety of his one dimension (which incorporates twelve of the other constructs).

A content analysis of Mr S's grid shows that the twelve constructs which are highly related with one another are all of the nature, "Good to Self-Not good to Self". The same type of dependency constructs found in Alan's grid is thus also present in Mr S's grid. However, it is far more pronounced in Mr S's case in that people are construed solely in terms of whether

they are good or bad to him. It seems, therefore, that this is the only manner whereby he can evaluate events safely. It suggests a desperate fight against complete disintegration.

Construct 15, which is unrelated to the rest, is of considerable interest and will be discussed in subsequent sections.

An example of the constructs omitted from the computer analysis is construct 4 (elicited from elements 6, 7 and 8). Spouse (6) and Pal (8) are seen as "very nice to Self" and Ex-flame (7) is seen as "also a good girl, but should have waited for Self".

### 1.7.3. Inter-element relations

Since Mr S's constructs revolve around people who are good or not good to him, we can limit the discussion here to positively perceived versus negatively perceived characters without detracting from any complexity that might be inherent in the grid.

One cannot really talk here of the emergence of separate clusters of elements. As can be expected from what was said in the previous section about the structural aspects of this construct system, most of the elements relate to one another.\* It is, however, possible to analyse these relations in terms of their degree of correlation rather than on an all-or-none basis.

Mr S's most positively perceived (i.e. "ideal") characters are Self, Mother, Father, Sister, Ex-flame, Pal, Accepted Teacher and Pitied Person. It is of interest to note here the presence of Ex-flame and absence of Spouse. Also of interest in the light of the rift between Mr S and his children, is the presence of Pitied Person, one of his sons. This contradicts Mrs S's view of him as uninterested in his children.

\*Only two did not: Brother and Ethical Person.

These ideal characters are contrasted with the three most negatively perceived elements in the grid: Threatening Person, Rejected Teacher and Happy Person (one of his brothers). Other negatively perceived (although not as strongly) characters are Rejecting Person and Ex-pal.

Spouse and Successful Person are positively perceived, but not strongly. It is of interest that there is a complete identification of Spouse with Successful Person. Successful Person (the Coloured man who holds a job normally reserved for Whites) embodies, to Mr S, a high degree of achievement, and must be regarded by Mr S with a certain amount of awe and envy. This casts his relationship with his wife in an interesting light, and may explain his tendency to withdraw in the face of confrontation with her. It may also explain why he let his wife throw his father (whom he seems to have loved very much) out of the house. It should also be noted that Spouse and Successful Person are the only two elements in the grid that are correlated significantly with Boss. Two points merit attention here. One is that the relationship of employer-employee is generally based on the latter's subservience to the former. This corroborates the interpretation made above about Mr S's relationship with his wife. The second point is that Boss is perceived rather ambivalently. This would suggest ambivalence in Mr S's perception of his wife, which is manifested at a less conscious level. This last point will be taken up again. It is of considerable importance, since the generally positive construal of his wife manifested in the grid is not compatible with the sort of relationship that they both described, with the information from Alan's grid, or with the interviewers' observations of them in action.

An analysis of the three assigned constructs reveals that Mr S would like to be like all the positively and ambivalently perceived elements. Alan is seen to be like all these elements. Once again, this is interesting in the light of the rift between Mr S and his children. Finally, authoritarianism is attributed to all the elements except for three of the negatively perceived elements:

Ex-pal, Threatening Person and Happy Person. The fact that authoritarianism is not considered a negative characteristic is compatible with the interviewers' interpretation of Mr S himself being extremely authoritarian and with his own praising of a value system which encompasses such characteristics as obsessive punctuality, meticulousness and an intolerance of "fun and games". It is also compatible with the structural rigidity of his construct system, discussed earlier.

#### 1.7.4. Construct-element relations

As can be expected from a grid where most of the constructs (with the one exception) correlate highly with one another and where most of the elements fall into a single all-or-none category, all the constructs are applicable to all the elements, with a few exceptions.

Generally, the positive characteristics, manifested in the emergent pole of each construct, are attributed to the positively perceived elements, and the negative characteristics, manifested in the implicit pole of each construct, are attributed to the negatively perceived elements. The degree to which the elements are positively or negatively perceived is reflected in the level of significance at which the constructs correlate with the elements and in the number of correlations applicable to the elements. For example, construct 12 (Not backstabbers-Two-faced) correlates at the ,001 level of significance with the extremely perceived elements and at the ,01 or ,05 level with the elements that are not so extremely perceived. In the case of Boss, Ethical Person and Brother, the ambivalently perceived elements, none of the constructs correlates significantly with them.\*

\*There is one exception: Construct 15 (No protest against Self drinking-Do not want Self to drink) applies to Boss.

Construct 15 (No protest against Self drinking-Do not want Self to drink) applies to only three elements - Spouse, Boss and Successful Person - all of whom raised objections to Mr S's drinking. The fact that this construct does not fit into the rest of the construct system suggests that Mr S is unable to integrate it into his general behaviour pattern, and that it is a source of conflict with him. His denial to the one interviewer of his drinking as a problem is compatible with this interpretation. It is interesting that the three elements to whom this construct applies are the three people to whom he is in a position of subservience. It is evident that, since he is unable to reconcile himself with his drinking, these three elements have a powerful tool to use against him in a confrontation. They merely need to remind him of it and he will be reminded that there is a hole in the otherwise watertight compartment which he has constructed against the threat of chaos. His wife uses this weapon regularly, thus sealing the position of power that she has over him.

#### 1.7.5. Component grouping

The component grouping generally confirms what has been said in the previous sections, so that the information will not be repeated. However, one additional piece of information deserves mention.

Component 4, although accounting for under 4% of the total variation of the grid, is interesting because it reflects one aspect of Mr S's construal of events that has not been mentioned, and which is in apparent contradiction with the view presented thus far of his tendency to see the world largely in terms of a single all-or-none category. Approximately 80% of the variation of this component is represented by constructs 20, 9 and 10. These are, respectively: Always helped Self-Blamed Self for everything, Go to Self for advice-Blame Self, and Good people-Self does not like them. Four elements contribute to approximately 92% of the variation of this

component: Rejecting Person, Threatening Person, Rejected Teacher and Happy Person. These are four of the five negatively perceived characters. Rejecting Person (which contributes to almost 71% of the variation of this component) refers to its emergent pole, whereas the other three elements (each contributing to approximately 7% of the variation of this component) refer to its implicit pole. The implication is that Rejecting Person, although negatively perceived, is not as negatively perceived as the other three characters, thus confirming what was said in this connection in the section on inter-element relations. This suggests that Mr S is able to go beyond an all-or-none view of the world and, with the aid of certain of constructs, for example, the three representing this component, is capable of discriminating more finely between rather similar events. His ability to depart from this all-or-none type of construing implies that his customary failure to do so is not due to any cognitive impairment. This supports the point that has been made repeatedly, that Mr S's largely one-dimensional view of events is a defence against threatening disintegration in the face of psychological problems. This problem, we have said, is closely linked with his marital relationship. This can be reviewed in the light of the subsequent analysis.

#### 1.8. Mrs S's verbal report

It was mentioned near the beginning of this family analysis that the bulk of the information about Alan's "breakdown" was obtained from Mrs S. The content of what she said in this connection, as well as her description of her husband, of her relationship with him and of his relationship with the rest of the family, have, of necessity, been presented in earlier sections and will thus not be repeated here. However, the tone of the interviews with her needs to be discussed.

By contrast with her husband, Mrs S was extremely lively and very keen to participate in the research. Once she started talking, it was difficult to stop her,

so that the unstructured interviews, as in the case of her husband, consisted largely of monologues. However, whereas Mr S spoke in a rambling monotone, her accounts bore vivid descriptions given in a loud tone of voice and accompanied by a large number of physical gestures. She seemed to know a fair amount of psychological jargon, as well as psychological views of mental illness and she resorted to these in her analysis of Alan's "breakdown", her husband's drinking, and the dynamics of their family interaction. Whereas the focus of Mr S's account had been himself, Mrs S said nothing of herself per se, but only of herself in relation to others. Her descriptions of Alan's "breakdown" and of the family interaction patterns were geared to getting the interviewers on her side rather than on her husband's. One gained the impression that her main reason for her keenness to participate in the study was in order to obtain the approval of the interviewers and thus score another personal victory over her husband. This was borne out by her attitude to the one interviewer in the last interview when she had an argument with her husband. This was discussed in the section on Mr S's verbal report. She put forward her own point of view so convincingly that it was easy to see how she had the backing of all her children against her husband. Whenever the interviewers arrived, she would be sitting in the living room, always surrounded by one or two of her children and their friends. Just as Mr S's absence from the living room appeared symbolic of his alienation from the centre of the family's activities, her presence there symbolised her dominant role there.

## 1.9. Mrs S's grid

### 1.9.1. General

Mrs S's grid consists of nineteen elements and twenty-one constructs.

### 1.9.2. Inter-construct relations

An examination of the inter-construct correlations indicates that there is little point in grouping the constructs into clusters since, although there are not always direct significant correlations between constructs, all the constructs are, at least indirectly, linked to one another. Structurally, therefore, Mrs S has a tight construct system and her constructs tend to be constellatory.

Like her husband, her view of people is stereotyped, but she has a great deal of variety within the stereotypes. People who are intellectual are assertive, educated, fair in judgment of others, mix well socially, get on with the rest of the family, are not heavy drinkers, are compassionate, charitable, attractive, religious, happy, and not snobbish. The more superordinate constructs among these are those referring to sociability (3, 4, 14 and 16) and to intellectuality (5, 15 and 19).

It should be noted that, since not all the above characteristics are directly linked to one another, her perception of events need not necessarily be stereotyped. However, since the links do exist, there is potential for her to view events in a stereotyped way. In the light of the content of some of her constructs, such a course of action could be dangerous. This will be discussed in the following section.

### 1.9.3. Inter-element relations

An examination of the correlations between elements reveals that three main clusters can be elicited.

Cluster A involves the following elements:

Self (1), Attractive Person (13),	
Accepted Teacher (14), Boss (15),	
Ethical Person (19), Sister (5),	
and Father (3)	- Rejecting Person (10),
	Spouse (6), Brother (4)
	and Successful Person (17).

Attractive Person, Accepted Teacher, Boss and Ethical Person are identified totally with one another and are the most positively perceived elements in the grid. They represent Mrs S's "ideal cluster". Mrs S's strongly negative perception of her husband is to be expected from what was said in earlier sections about their relationship. It is interesting that she links him with a character like Rejecting Person. This could suggest that one of the sources of her negative feelings towards her husband is related to feeling rejected by him.

Cluster B involves the following elements:

Mother (2) - Threatening Person (12)  
and Rejected Teacher (15).

Mother is generally positively perceived, but not strongly so. Threatening Person and Rejected Teacher are negatively perceived, but also not strongly.

It should be noted that another element, Pal (8), is indirectly linked to both of these clusters.

Mrs S's perceptions of her mother and her friend suggest that she gets on (got on, in the case of her mother, who is dead) with them. However, they are not figures that she idealizes, since they form a separate group from her "ideal cluster". They appear to be rather innocuous characters in that Mother is contrasted most sharply with Threatening Person, and Pal with Rejected Teacher. This seems to imply that, in a friendship relationship, for example, Mrs S needs to feel master of the situation. She seems to have got on with her mother for the same reason. This supports the point, made throughout this analysis, that Mrs S's poor relationship with her husband is related to her feeling the need to score personal victories against him in a battle for supremacy in the household.

Cluster C involves the following elements:

Father (3), and Pitied  
Person (11) - Rejecting Person (10) and  
Spouse (6).

Father is positively perceived and is linked with Pitied Person, thus suggesting that Mrs S got on with her father because, although she looked up to him (evident from his being indirectly linked with the "ideal cluster" through the indirect links between Cluster A and Cluster C), he was in a position of subordination to her (through his link with Pitied Person). In addition, his being contrasted with the strongly negatively perceived elements, Rejecting Person and Spouse, suggests that he must have strongly accepted her, thus setting the basis for the strong resentment towards her husband for not doing the same, and for her consequent attempts to reduce him in everyone's eyes.

#### 1.9.4. Construct-element relations

An examination of the construct-element relations reveals that the following are the characteristics that Mrs S most admires: being compassionate (6, 10), having understanding ways (11), being attractive (20), fair in judgment of others (21), very religious (1), charitable (7), getting on well with everybody (16), being very happy (2), sociable (3, 4), intellectual (5, 15, 19), well-educated (8, 18), and getting on well with the rest of one's family (17).

The elements constituting the "ideal cluster" possess all of the above attributes. Mrs S sees herself as possessing all those characteristics except for one - being attractive (20). In addition, she sees herself as assertive (9), a characteristic inapplicable to the elements in her "ideal cluster".

The characteristics which Mrs S most despises are: possessiveness (3, 9), not being an easy mixer (4), being unsociable (14), being snobbish (16), not being intellectual (5, 15, 19), always scolding (2), being a heavy drinker (12, 13), not getting on well with the rest of one's family (17), being unfair in the judgment of others (21), not being religious (1), being selfish (6, 7), not being well-educated (8, 18), wanting one's own way (10), and thinking of oneself a lot (11).

The two most negatively perceived elements in the grid, Spouse and Rejecting Person, embody most of the above characteristics. The exceptions are constructs 7 and 11, which are inapplicable to Spouse, and constructs 12 and 13, which are inapplicable to Rejecting Person.

Mrs S's view of her husband as not intellectual and not well-educated fits in with the fact that she had a higher degree of education than he. She often used this in arguments against him, scorning him for not knowing what he was talking about. Her view of him as unsociable and not an easy mixer confirms what has been said about Mr S in this connection. Most of Mrs S's constructs represent precisely those areas over which she had countless arguments with her husband: she reproached him for being unsociable, uninterested in his family, being a heavy drinker, being unfair in his judgment of his children, always wanting his own way, and being poorly educated and unintellectual.

The relations between the constructs and three of the remaining elements (Father, Mother and Pal) will be analysed in order to clarify certain points raised in the preceding section.

Mrs S considers her father intellectual (5, 15, 19), compassionate (6, 10), well-educated (8, 18), assertive (9), as getting on well with everybody (16), and as fair in judgment of others (21). The other constructs are inapplicable to him. This means that, although he does not embody all the positive characteristics, he is seen only in positive terms. The fact that he possesses such qualities as assertiveness, intellect and a high degree of education seems to contradict what was said earlier about Mrs S getting on with him because she is able to feel in a superior position with regard to him. Nevertheless, this is hinted at by his link with Pitied Person. However, the grounds on which her feeling of superiority over her father are based have to remain a matter for speculation.

She considers her friend to be very religious (1), compassionate (6, 10), charitable (7), and attractive (20). This backs up what was said in the previous section about Mrs S choosing a friend who is non-threatening. Also non-threatening is her mother, whom she sees as not intellectual (5, 15, 19) and not well-educated (8, 18).

#### 1.9.5. Component grouping

The discussion will be limited to an analysis of the second component since the information emerging from the other components is either repetitive, or irrelevant, or imprecise.

Component 2 accounts for almost 18% of the total variation of the grid. It is fairly general, but is represented to a large extent by constructs relating to intellect, degree of education, assertiveness, charity and understanding (5, 15, 19, 8, 18, 9, 7, 11), these together contributing to approximately 70% of the variation of this component. The elements contributing the most are Mother, Pal, Threatening Person and Rejected Teacher (together contributing to approximately 67% of the variation of this component). The first two elements are seen as not intellectual, not well-educated, possessive, charitable and understanding. The other two elements are seen as intellectual, well-educated, assertive and selfish. This reveals that a high degree of intellect and education, charity and a tendency to think a lot of oneself are characteristics that Mrs S considers threatening to herself. It confirms what was said earlier about her getting on with her mother and her friend because they are not threatening to her, and supports the interpretation about her need to feel superior in relationships with others. The implication of this for the dynamics underlying her relationship to her husband (which has already been discussed at length) should be borne in mind.

#### 1.10. Concluding comments

The following summarizes the main factors in the S family situation in terms of which Alan's schizophrenia can be viewed.

Mr and Mrs S were found to be individuals whose respective constructions of events were diametrically opposed. It was established that Mrs S had a strong need to be in a position of superiority in interpersonal relationships. In order to preserve her own construct system and to assert her leadership in the family, she had initiated a fight for supremacy against her husband. The transpersonal defences of denying and minimizing her husband's worth as a person, as well as her imperviousness to his needs, were manifested throughout the investigation. By the time that the investigation was undertaken, Mrs S was in complete control of the family and had ousted her husband from the family almost completely. Her outgoingness and love of "fun", which contrasted sharply with her husband's introversion, endeared her to her children, and made her perception of the family situation and of events in general very convincing, so that she obtained the support of the whole family (except for Alan, who remained relatively neutral) against Mr S.

Mr S's typical response in the light of such negation was to withdraw. He withdrew by immersing himself in his work, in solitary drinking, and in himself. The withdrawal was reflected in the rigid structure of certain parts of his construct system. This rigidity was, in turn, manifested in his authoritarian attitude to his work and to his family. The rigidity of his construct system was interpreted as reflecting an attempt to ward off its potential disintegration. Mrs S used the various manifestations of his withdrawal as examples (which she continually cited to him, to the children and to the interviewers) of his lack of interest in the family. This reinforced further withdrawal and gained her further victories.

The following can be said about Alan's position in this situation.

In the same way as Mrs S was impervious to her husband's needs, she was impervious to Alan's, although to a lesser extent. She could not accept that Alan could possibly view his father favourably on any level or that he could attribute any part of the blame for the marital discord to her. She interpreted Alan's not speaking up against his father as a "bottling up" of his "true" feelings. Alan, however, was not totally negative in his evaluation of his father, nor totally positive in his evaluation of his mother. To the interviewers, Alan's reactions appeared as attempts to arrive at his own conclusions about his parents and about the world in general. However, he obtained no validation for this from either parent. Mrs S directly invalidated his experiences by being impervious to them in order to preserve the integrity of her own construct system. She was thus the principal agent of invalidation. Mr S, although not directly an invalidator, contributed to the pathogenic process by not directly validating Alan's attempts either, largely as a result of his being too preoccupied with coping with the invalidation of his own constructs by his wife.

In addition to the invalidation in terms of which Alan's schizophrenia must be viewed, the mystifying experiences must also be considered.

Whereas Alan's siblings had avoided confusion by siding with their mother in the marital arguments and by adopting her perception of events, Alan had, by his own attempts at impartiality, been drawn into a confusing battle. The mystification of his constructions was thus linked to his inability to reconcile the two diametrically opposed view-points. The mystification thus seems to have been caused, not by any one individual, but by the confusion created by the parents' interrelationship.

Alan's symptoms become intelligible in the light of the above. The thought-disorder that he manifested in

his schizophrenic state appears to be related to the mystification to which he had been subjected. His social and emotional withdrawal at the time of the "breakdown" can be explained as attempts to ward off further invalidation and further mystification. In interpreting the religious aspects of Alan's delusion, we must remember that Alan was the odd one out in the family in that he was the only "impartial observer". To proceed from a feeling that he was the only one who could sort out his family to a feeling that he was the chosen one to save "his people", does not represent such an incomprehensible step. The political content of his delusion is to be expected from his sociological position as a middle-class Coloured in South Africa. His having been overwhelmed by a sense of the injustice of the political system appears as the factor which precipitated the breakdown of an already confused system of construing the world.

Alan's "breakdown" appears to have had a beneficial effect on him in that, subsequent to it, he was relying on his own construal of events, rejecting either of his parents as models for identification, and relying on someone outside the family, a friend, for validation. His construct system subsequent to his "breakdown" was thus coherent and relatively free of confusion. It was restricted, but this was due to his attempt to start afresh. There appeared to be potential for elaboration in the future.

The attempt to sort out precisely what was going on in this family was made difficult by the fact that the investigation was carried out at a time when the pathological interaction patterns were firmly entrenched. The question of what was cause and what was effect had been clouded by time and by the differing interpretations of the family situation by the different family members. This is a problem in any investigation of this nature. Although the interpretation put forward by the writer has focussed on Mrs S's need for supremacy in the family as a cause, this is by no means the primary cause. For

example, it was established that Mrs S did genuinely feel rejected by her husband and that this posed a threat to her. At the time of the investigation, there seemed to be no grounds for this. However, such grounds must have existed in the past. There is the suggestion that Mr S was not always the intimidated man struggling against pending disintegration. The grounds for Mrs S's feelings of rejection remain a matter for speculation: they may have arisen from her resenting his close relationship with his parents, or from his already present (although not strong) tendencies towards drink and hard work. Enough was ascertained for the purposes of an analysis of Alan's schizophrenia, of an analysis with a fair "degree of probability". That does not mean, however, that the establishing of further information would not shed a different light on the interpretations put forward. An analysis such as the one presented is never complete.

## 2. MURPHY P

### 2.1. Interviews: Number and form

Murphy was a new admission to a mental hospital when the interviewers\* went to his home to secure his parents' co-operation in the study. Mrs P was the first family member approached. An unstructured session with her was held, during which the circumstances surrounding Murphy's "breakdown" were discussed. She assured the interviewers that both she and her husband would participate in the study, but that this should be confirmed after she and her husband had discussed the matter.

Interviewer 1 spoke to Mr P by telephone very shortly after that, and an appointment was made to see him and his wife. The only condition imposed by Mr P was that Murphy should not be included in the study until he was slightly better.

The second session took place at the home of the P family within a few days of the telephonic communication. This was a long session, during which Interviewers 1 and 3 conducted the structured interviews with Murphy's mother and father respectively, and where an informal conversation among the four took place.

After Murphy had been in the mental hospital for one month, he was showing signs of improvement. Interviewer 1 approached him at this stage and had an informal chat with him. Once he heard that the interviewer had spoken to his parents, he was very keen to talk about his family, friends and school. Murphy was scheduled to be discharged from hospital within two weeks of this, and the interviewer intended to conduct the structured session with him before this. However, an incident, which will be discussed later, led to a relapse of his condition and to his being detained in hospital for a further four months. The interviewer thus left Murphy for two months since neither his parents, nor the psychiatrist under whose treatment he was, wanted

\*Interviewers 1 and 3.

any interference before then. When Murphy's condition had improved once again, the interviewer saw him five times over a period of one month. Structured and unstructured sessions took place during this time.

The table below summarizes what has just been said:

Session No.	Inter-viewer(s)	Family Member(s)	Struc-tured/Unstruc-tured	Length of time (hrs)	Place of interview
1	1,3	Mother	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Home
2	1	Mother	S	$1\frac{1}{2}$	Home
	3	Father	S	$1\frac{1}{2}$	
	1,3	Mother Father	U	$1\frac{1}{2}$	
3	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
4	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
5	1	Son	S	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
6	1	Son	S	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
7	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital

## 2.2. Initial information regarding Murphy

Murphy is a sixteen year old middle-class Coloured male. His "breakdown" occurred in the middle of the third quarter of his Standard Eight year at school.

In the mental hospital, Murphy was psychiatrically diagnosed paranoid schizophrenic. On admission he exhibited thought-disorder and social withdrawal. He appeared out of touch with reality and was disorientated for time and place. He had delusions of persecution with political content.

Murphy responded to drug treatment and Electro-Convulsive Therapy and was about to be discharged after he had been in hospital for one month. Just at that time, however, psychiatric staff found him talking to the Black

African patients on the ward and telling them to join the revolution against the White government. This was followed by a recurrence of his symptoms, and he was detained in hospital for a further four months. Drug treatment was continued during this period, and, when he was finally discharged, his condition was described as improved.

Murphy was first seen by the author when he had been in hospital for almost one month, just prior to his relapse. He was initially shy, but keen to chat once rapport had been established. At this stage, he exhibited none of the schizophrenic symptoms described above. He seemed to have established contact with some of the younger patients on the ward.

On the various occasions that the author saw Murphy during the last month of his stay in hospital, he appeared fully in touch with reality. Despite his shyness, he was co-operative and spoke freely about himself, his home, his school life and his political views. He had some misgivings about the interviewer's being White, but he expressed these openly and reasonably. During the last interview, he asked her to remain in contact with him once he was back at home.

### 2.3. General information regarding the P family

Murphy is the eighth child in a family of twelve boys and three girls. At the time that the study was conducted, he was a schoolboy and both his parents were schoolteachers. His mother had a primary teaching diploma and his father a secondary teaching diploma. The latter was attending night classes twice a week in certain B.A. courses.

Mr P had been married previously, but his first wife had died. The three children from this marriage had been brought up with those from the second. The eldest of these, Dominic, had initially been antagonistic to his stepmother and had, until he married and left home, maintained a certain aloofness from her and from his step-brothers and -sisters.

Since both parents were away at work for the greater part of the day, the children were left to their own devices. This was aggravated by the fact that Mr P was inclined to abuse drink, so that Mrs P accompanied him whenever he went out in order to see that he did not lose control of himself. A nun who had known the family for years told the social worker who was handling Murphy's case that Mr P was an inadequate personality who resorted to drink to solve his problems. This drinking greatly upset the whole family and resulted in Mrs P's neglecting the children so that she could look after her husband. Each of the children had his share of household tasks. Murphy complained that he was unable to do his schoolwork properly since his afternoons were spent helping with the housework. This, he said, had been a source of much of the anxiety preceding his "breakdown".

Various other factors seem to have been related to the "breakdown". During the winter holidays, Murphy had gone with his class on an organized tour of the country. While in the Transkei, he had been greatly upset by the poverty there, as well as by the excessive drinking that accompanies certain Xhosa rituals. The latter had aroused feelings of guilt in him since it had reminded him of his father's abuse of drink as well as of his own secret drinking with a friend. This was aggravated by the fact that most of his class-mates on the tour were drinking without the teacher's knowledge. He became withdrawn while on the tour and spent the nights lying awake thinking about the political situation in the country.

Murphy returned from the tour to find that his whole family had become involved with a student protest at the Coloured university where his father and one of his older brothers was studying. It should be pointed out here that Coloured teachers have, during the past twenty years, been fairly active politically. The student protest in question gained the support of a large part of the Coloured community and Coloured teachers played important roles in the action groups formed. This, in conjunction with the

fact that Mrs P was the daughter of a mixed marriage, which had led to her being rejected by her parents and being sent away to a convent, resulted in the P family's personal involvement with the protest. Murphy, too, became involved. The protest failed and Murphy became even more disillusioned with the political situation than he had been in the Transkei. He broke down immediately after that.

At this stage in our analysis, it seems that all the factors just mentioned must have played a role in Murphy's "breakdown". However, the picture that emerges thus far is rather confused and we need to see to what extent the various factors were involved and how they interacted. This will be done by looking more closely at each of the three family members in turn.

#### 2.4. Murphy's verbal report

The topics discussed in the sessions with Murphy involved his views of himself, his family, his schoolwork and the political situation. His shyness prevented him from volunteering information spontaneously during the initial interviews, but he replied to questions asked of him. Once the interviewer had gained his confidence, however, the discussions became less formal.

He described himself as a solitary character. He had no bad friends and got on with the people he knew. However, he did not go out much with them. At school, during intervals, he played cards with friends on the field, but when school was over, he spent most of his time at home, reading books or sitting around the fire in winter. There was one friend with whom he had indulged in secret drinking a short while before his "breakdown". The fact that he had kept this away from his parents had worried him a great deal. He had eventually told them about it. When asked how his parents had reacted, he replied that they had neither shouted at him nor given him a hiding, but had prevented him from going out for a period of time.

He mentioned that he loved his parents, but was not close to either of them since he was not with them much. When he had problems, he confided in no-one, but tried to work through them on his own. He felt particularly warm towards his mother, but had not had the opportunity to get really close to her, something which he regretted greatly. He added that, even on week-ends, the parents used to spend their time with each other rather than with the family as a whole. He cited as an example the fact that they went to a drive-in cinema on Saturday evenings, but always on their own and not with the children. They were dedicated to teaching, and, during the week, they were both away at work.

An important feature of Murphy's feelings towards his parents is illustrated by what he said in connection with his stepbrother, Dominic. He mentioned that Dominic had disliked his parents, but had liked him (Murphy). Murphy had found this situation rather threatening, because it prevented him from having unequivocal feelings to the parties concerned. He had never really resolved this, but the problem had ceased to be a problem when Dominic had left home to get married.

When asked about the structure of authority in the family, Murphy reported that there was no real pattern of dominance. Both parents were involved in the discipline of the children in that, if they did something wrong, the mother would talk to them and, if necessary, the father would give them a hiding. However, he did not see them as being overly strict. He was allowed to go out where he wanted provided that he told them when he was going out.

As far as his schoolwork was concerned, Murphy said that he was doing well at school and only experienced some difficulty with subjects requiring figure-work. However, he was taking Standard Eight more seriously than he had taken the previous classes and he was worried that he would be unable to cope with both his homework and the household tasks that he had to fulfill in the afternoons. He felt that, since he could not work in the evenings as

a result of his having to share a room with two of his younger brothers, who went to bed early, the day was too short for him to get everything done.

It should be pointed out in this connection that Murphy had, indeed, been taking his schoolwork very seriously that year. One of the main worries that he expressed during his stay in hospital was that he was missing out on important lessons. The psychiatrist under whose care he was had apparently told him that he should not carry on with school after being discharged. This had upset him tremendously and, whenever he saw the interviewer, he asked her to intervene on his behalf and to tell the psychiatrist that he had to finish Standard Eight at least.

The circumstances immediately preceding Murphy's "breakdown" have been described in a previous section. It should be noted that a large part of these were of a political nature. He took the political situation very seriously and felt that he could not sit back and do nothing. The failure of the student protest in which his family had been involved had upset him precisely because it had made him feel powerless in the face of opposing forces. During the interviews, this powerlessness became manifested, and he keenly questioned the interviewer on her political views and on her opinions regarding possible solutions.

Various points emerge from the above description of the discussions between the interviewer and Murphy. It appears that the trip to the Transkei and the student protest brought Murphy face to face with the political situation in the country. It upset him and he was confused as to what to do about it. The failure of the student protest left him with a feeling of powerlessness. This, however, seems to have been a factor which precipitated, rather than which was an underlying cause of, his schizophrenia. Murphy seems to have had a fear of powerlessness. This is reflected, not only in his reaction to the political situation, but also in his

worrying about how to pass Standard Eight while at the same time coping with the household tasks. His feeling, while in hospital, that he had to complete Standard Eight, and the fact that he was not achieving this, further illustrates this. His attributing elements of threat to the situation of being liked by Dominic, who disliked the parents that he (Murphy) loved, similarly reflects a sense of powerlessness to do anything to solve the problem. This feeling of powerlessness seems to have been accompanied by a feeling of mystification or confusion: Murphy was confused about there being so much poverty in a prosperous country, about the existence of so much drinking (an attribute which he considered "bad", after having been party to its effects at home) among his people (whom he liked to think of as "good") about how to cope with homework and housework at the same time, and about how to react to Dominic and his parents when there was conflict between them. Another situation which seems to have aroused in him a sense of confusion was his secret drinking: he thought that drinking was bad, yet he was indulging in it himself. Furthermore, he was keeping this a secret from his parents. It is significant in this connection that, when he eventually told them about it, they did not shout at him or give him a hiding. Such forms of punishment would have left him feeling that he had paid for having been naughty and would have removed from him his guilt and confusion. Instead, they prevented him from going out. This typically middle-class punishment was thus of long duration, with the result that he was left with both his guilt and his confusion. However, this point will be elaborated on in the concluding section of this analysis.

Perhaps one of the most important sources of Murphy's mystification is to be found in his attributing to his parents feelings of love for him (since he loved them), while at the same time feeling rejected by them since they had so little time to spend with him. Although this can be no more than speculation at this stage in the analysis, it would appear that it is this situation

which played the most important role in leaving Murphy with a sense of powerlessness at his inability to overcome confusion. This, in conjunction with the fact that Murphy did not really have peers as a point of reference, must have been a key factor leading to serial invalidation of Murphy's constructs about the world.

The other problem situations in Murphy's life, which have already been described, became problems precisely because Murphy did not have a solid enough basis from which to tackle them.

Various occurrences during the actual interview situations lend support to these interpretations. It was pointed out earlier that Murphy became keen to confide in the interviewer the moment that he heard that she had been to his home and had spoken to his parents. This suggests that his parents did indeed mean very much to him. In addition, he was confused by the fact that he liked the interviewer, who was White. The fact that she had been accepted by his parents added to this confusion. He was unable to resolve this completely. The fact that he was unable to perceive his parents in anything but positive terms is also manifested in his description of their discipline as being fair. The disadvantages of the disciplinary action which they took against his drinking exploits have already been pointed out. However, there is an alternative interpretation to this, which will be taken up in the concluding section. All this supports the author's view of the confusion engendered by the political situation being a precipitating factor in Murphy's "breakdown" and of that created by his relationship with his parents being a more deep-rooted source of invalidation and mystification.

All these interpretations, however, need to be examined again after Murphy's grid has been discussed.

## 2.5. Murphy's grid

### 2.5.1. General information

Murphy's grid was one with sixteen elements and thirteen constructs. The elements omitted were Ex-flame, since he had no past girl-friend, Rejecting Person, since he could not think of anyone who had rejected him during his life, and Pitied Person, since there was no-one whom he was aware of pitying. The sorts pertaining to these three elements were thus omitted, thus reducing the number of constructs elicited.

With regard to the elements included, it should be noted that Spouse was represented by the girl-friend who Murphy had at the time. He had known her for a very short period, and she was his first girl-friend. It should also be noted that the people representing Threatening Person, Successful Person and Ethical Person were all older brothers, whereas Brother was represented by a younger brother. Threatening Person was represented by Dominic, to whom reference has been made in previous sections. Finally, since Murphy had not worked at any stage in his life, Boss was represented by the principal of his school.

The grid was done over two sessions, sessions 5 and 6. He took a considerable amount of time in naming the appropriate elements, but the constructs were produced without much hesitation. He was at ease with the interviewer during these sessions and seemed to enjoy doing the grid once he had understood what was required of him.

### 2.5.2. Inter-construct relations

The following clusters emerge from an analysis of the relations between the constructs.

Cluster A involves the following constructs:

Self has a close relationship  
with them

- Self has a more casual  
relationship with them (16)

- More loving to Self - Less loving to Self (1)
- Talk to Self lovingly - Talk to Self as friends (8)
- Self can talk to them in a close, brotherly way - Self cannot (12, 13).

Cluster B involves the following constructs:

- Self has a close relationship with them - Self has a more casual relationship with them (16)
- Self talks to them more often and more freely - Self does not confide in them to a great extent (6)
- Self likes them - Self dislikes them (2)
- Self knows them well - Self knows them more superficially (7).

Constructs 6, 2 and 7 are not directly related to one another, but only indirectly, through construct 16. This part of the construct system is thus not as tight as that covered by Cluster A.

It should be pointed out that construct 16 is superordinate to the other constructs in both clusters. In addition, the subordinate constructs in one cluster are indirectly linked to those in the other through construct 16, which is common to both.

Two constructs are involved in Cluster C:

- Look after Self - Do not (5)
- Can give Self more attention - More distant, brotherly relationship (19).

The three remaining constructs are isolated in that they have no significant relationship either to one another or to any of the clusters mentioned. These are:

- Older than Self, can teach Self new things - Cannot teach Self new things-same age-group (18)

Similar activities to Self - Different activities to  
Self (21)

More outgoing - More quiet (17).

The following structural aspects of Murphy's grid should be noted. One cannot really talk of his construct system as being either tight or loose. Looseness is present to the extent that three of the constructs are unrelated to the rest of the grid, and to the extent that three separate clusters are manifested. However, tightness is reflected in the relationships between the constructs within each of the three clusters - in fact, constructs 1, 8, 12 and 13 are identical, as are constructs 5 and 19. Tightness is also reflected in the link between the first two clusters.

A content analysis of the constructs reveals that, with the exception of construct 17 (referring to outgoingness-quietness), all the constructs strongly emphasize the relationships between Self and the other elements. Murphy's constructs are thus dependency constructs. This is compatible with what was said previously about Murphy being a quiet, solitary person, left very much to himself by his parents.

The structural and content analysis of Murphy's grid should be viewed in the light of the author's opinion that he had only temporarily recovered from his schizophrenic "breakdown", without the underlying problems having been solved. Since he seemed to have simply returned to the point where he had been prior to the "breakdown", i.e. from madness to normality, as Cooper (1967) would characterize it, it could be postulated that the grid obtained from him prior to his "breakdown" would have been essentially the same as the one in question now. If one accepts this in conjunction with the notion implicit in Personal Construct Theory that, if the constructs in a tight construct system are serially invalidated, disintegration of the type found in schizophrenia results, it follows that the constructs occurring

in Clusters A and B were susceptible to this (both before and after his "breakdown"). If one adds to this the facts that these constructs accounted for the greater part of Murphy's construct system and that, from what Murphy said in the unstructured sessions, they were those with a large amount of psychological importance, it becomes apparent that Murphy's whole personality was in potential danger, both before and after his "breakdown".

### 2.5.3. Inter-element relations

An examination of the inter-element correlations reveals that, with the exceptions of Mother and Father, who are completely identified with each other, and Murphy's three older brothers (Threatening Person, Successful Person and Ethical Person), who are completely identified with one another, no clear-cut clusters emerge. However, most of the other elements are related to one another, at least indirectly.

These indirect links mediate among the various elements in such a way that the elements can be grouped as follows if one is prepared to sacrifice a certain degree of accuracy:

Self (1), Mother (2), Father (3),  
 Brother (4), Sister (5), Threatening Person (12), Successful Person (17), and Ethical Person (19)

- Spouse (6), Pal (8), Ex-pal (9),  
 Attractive Person (13),  
 Accepted Teacher (14), Rejected Teacher (15), Boss (16),  
 and Happy Person (18).

It is significant that all the elements occurring with Self are members of his family and that those contrasted with him are "outsiders". This becomes even more significant if one considers the role titles which tend to have either a clear-cut positive or negative connotation. "Threatening Person" has a negative connotation to most

individuals, yet this element is indirectly linked to Self. Pal, Attractive Person and Accepted Teacher usually have positive connotations to most individuals, yet these are contrasted with Self. Murphy's perception of these elements is thus exceptional. Whether a person is or is not a member of his family seems to oust other considerations that one generally uses as a basis for judging people. This is substantiated by an examination of the assigned construct, "Like I would like to be-Not like I would like to be" since five of the six ideal elements are family members. This substantiates the emphasis placed in an earlier section on the family situation having played the prime role in Murphy's schizophrenia. The discussion that follows in the next section should clarify this issue.

#### 2.5.4. Construct-element relations

In this section, we will examine the basis for the above grouping.

The following characteristics apply to Self: being the sort of person who looks after others (5), who can give others attention (19), who is loving to others (1), whom others can get to know well (8), to whom others can talk in a close, brotherly way (12, 13), and with whom others can have a close relationship (16).

Murphy construes his mother and father as people who look after him and give him more attention (5, 19), are loving to him and talk lovingly to him (1, 8), and are people with whom he can talk in a close, brotherly way (12, 13) and with whom he has a close relationship (16). Threatening Person, Successful Person and Ethical Person are construed in the same way as Mother and Father except that constructs 5 and 19 are inapplicable. This is to be expected from the fact that these tend to be more strictly "parental" characteristics. Sister is also construed in the same terms, although less strongly so. In addition, the characteristic of being a person to whom Self can talk more often and more freely (6) is applicable

to her. Brother is construed in the same general terms that apply to the other three brothers, but with the additional attribute of quietness (17), a characteristic which applies particularly strongly to him.

This, then, appears to be the basis on which Murphy's positive construal of the family members is founded. It is interesting to note that the characteristics which he attributes to his parents are at odds with what was reported by Murphy himself about his parents' lack of concern for him as well as with the nun's account of the situation. This suggests that Murphy is presenting an idealized conception of his parents in this grid. He is giving a picture of what he would like them to be, rather than of what they are. Since the bulk of the information obtained from other sources centred around Murphy's relationship with his parents, we cannot say with the same degree of certainty that the same is true for his perception of the other family members. However, it is evident that the family means a lot to Murphy and that close relationships between himself and them, and among themselves, are extremely important. The fact that he aligns Threatening Person (i.e. Dominic) with his parents tends to point to his idealization of, not only his parents, but the family as a whole. His finding the rift between his parents and Dominic threatening can be explained by its being a situation which invalidated this idealized view and thus confused him.

What seems to emerge from all this is that Murphy's system of constructs is held together by the belief in his family being close and loving to him and to one another, and that this belief was slowly and repeatedly shattered over the years. This was, in fact, the serial invalidation to which Murphy was subjected. Since most of the constructs that apply to the family members are those comprising the major part of his construct system, the part characterized by tightness, it becomes evident that the invalidation of any one of these constructs would have had ramifications throughout that part of the construct system, threatening

it with ddsintegration. It is thus evident that the integrity of his construct system depended on his idealized view of his family being validated.

The following section will amplify this theme.

#### 2.5.5. Component grouping

The first five components together account for over 93% of Murphy's grid. Our discussion will be restricted to two of these, since the first component provides information already discussed in the previous section, and since the third and fourth components do not provide information relevant to the main argument.

Approximately 89% of the variation of component 2 is accounted for by three constructs, and 70% by six elements. Ex-pal, Happy Person and Pal indulge in similar activities to Self, are people to whom Self talks more often and more freely, but cannot teach Self new things. Accepted Teacher, Rejected Teacher and Boss contribute to the opposite component pole.

Component 2 is important since it sheds some light on the basis for Murphy's friendship relationships as well as his relationships with authority figures. Two of the three factors related to the basis for these relationships (accounted for by constructs 18 and 21) are unrelated to the main construct clusters in the grid. This implies that any invalidation of these constructs cannot really be responsible for a total collapse of the construct system. This is therefore further confirmation of the point that has been made repeatedly throughout the analysis about one having to look for the underlying basis of Murphy's schizophrenia within the family rather than outside it.

Although component 5 accounts for only a relatively small percentage of the total variation of Murphy's grid, it is important in that it sheds further light on Murphy's relationships with certain of the elements comprising the non-family group. Four of the elements seem to be the

most involved here, and they together account for approximately 75% of the variation of this component. Rejected Teacher and Happy Person are contrasted with Attractive Person and Accepted Teacher on the basis of Murphy's knowing the former two well while disliking them at the same time, and his knowing the latter two superficially but liking them. The two constructs involved here contribute to approximately 89% of the component.

What emerges from this is that Murphy's stereotype of liking people whom he knows well and disliking those whom he knows superficially\* has broken down in this case. This suggests that Murphy's construal of non-family members was not characterized by the same rigidity with which he construed the members of his family. This reinforces the point made with regard to component 2 that Murphy was able to tolerate ambiguity where "outsiders" were concerned, and substantiates the interpretation that the source of his schizophrenia lay in the discrepancy between his idealized, one-sided view of his family and the reality of the situation. This provided the platform for invalidation and mystification. However, his relationships with "outsiders" did not, since his view of them, as outlined in the discussion of components 2 and 5, was relatively realistic.

#### 2.6. Mr P's verbal report

When Mr P was interviewed, he had just returned home from one of his evening lectures. As a result of the student protests, the university was to be temporarily

\*Constructs 2 and 7 were found to be generally linked to each other in this manner, and both were found to be subordinate to construct 16. As was outlined in the section on inter-construct relations, constructs 2 and 7 were two of the constructs comprising Cluster B, and, as such, involved with the part of Murphy's construct system that was characterized by tightness.

closed as from the following day. He felt bitter towards the university authorities and this issue seemed to preoccupy him then. The bulk of the informal chat thus centred around the protest and more general political issues. Murphy was discussed only in so far as his "breakdown" was seen as arising out of disappointment at the political situation.

Mr P impressed the interviewers as a quiet, introverted man. He was concerned about Murphy's condition. However, he saw the "breakdown" as related solely to Murphy's disillusionment with the political situation, and considered the school tour and the student protest as the only relevant factors. As a result, he did not discuss any of the more personal, familial problems like Murphy's loneliness, guilt about his secret drinking and punishment for it, or his own drinking and how this affected the relationship between him and his wife and between them and the children. The conversation thus took the form of a political discussion.

Mr P's reluctance to focus on more personal issues could have been due to one or more of three factors. Firstly, he was genuinely concerned with the political situation and, since the interviewers were students and sympathetic to his standpoint, it afforded a good opportunity for him to air his views. Secondly, it would have been an admission of guilt to have discussed familial issues, and blaming his son's "breakdown" on the more remote, political situation was the logical way in which to salve his own conscience. Thirdly, his wife also participated in this conversation. She seemed equally reluctant to face her role in Murphy's "breakdown" and therefore welcomed the political turn that the conversation took, thus reinforcing this topic of discussion.

It became evident from the conversation that Mr P, although very much involved with politics, drifted with the tide rather than initiated any course of action. He had been involved with various political organizations

since his youth. However, his views were far from elaborated, and he had joined in the activities of any movement that was promising change, without too much questioning. This attitude appeared to the interviewers as a manifestation of a more general passivity. The nun's description of him as an inadequate person who resorted to drink in order to solve his problems seemed particularly accurate. We will need to review this after examining his grid.

## 2.7. Mr P's grid

### 2.7.1. General

Mr P's grid consists of nineteen elements and twenty-one constructs. It should be noted that element 5, representing Sister, was a cousin of his, that element 7, representing Ex-flame, was his ex-wife (who had died), and that element 11, representing Pitied Person, was his eldest son, Dominic.

### 2.7.2. Inter-construct relations

A large proportion of the constructs in Mr P's grid is covered by Cluster A as follows:

People who are just, kind and considerate	-	People who are not (2)
People who are friendly and not aggressive	-	People who are unfriendly and aggressive (3, 9, 10)
People with whom Self gets on	-	People with whom he does not (4, 12, 13)
People who are understanding and sympathetic	-	People who are not (14, 15)
People who do not have a superior attitude	-	People who do (19)
People who are not concerned with material things	-	People who are (8)

- People who agree with Self  
on all issues - People who disagree with  
him on certain issues (16)
- Understanding people - People who lack under=  
standing (20).

In addition, construct 17 (People with the same moral values as Self-People with different moral values) is indirectly linked to this cluster through construct 2, construct 18 (People who have a similar taste to Self: fond of music, high ideals-People with a different taste) is indirectly linked through construct 10, and construct 21 (People who are practical and logical in reasoning and argument-People who are not) is indirectly linked through constructs 2 and 10. Construct 7 (People who praised Self and recognised his ability-People who did not) is indirectly linked through construct 20. Construct 11 (Realistic people-People who are unrealistic and live in a world of fantasy) is very indirectly linked through construct 21.

Cluster B involves two closely related constructs:

- Children - Adults (1)
- Cheerful people - People who are not  
cheerful (6).

Construct 5 (Coloureds-Indians) is the only construct that is unrelated to any other and that does not form part of a cluster.

Various points need to be taken into account when one considers Cluster A. Constructs 3, 4, 9, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are completely related to one another, so that being friendly and not aggressive necessarily implies being understanding and sympathetic and being the sort of person with whom Self gets on. Constructs 2 and 10 are very closely related to these seven constructs, and these nine constructs are the more superordinate ones in that cluster. Constructs 19, 8, 16 and 20 are the more subordinate ones. Structurally, the relationship between these thirteen constructs is tight. The same

amount of tightness does not apply to the five constructs that are indirectly linked to Cluster A. In addition, the same thirteen constructs are strongly constellatory whereas the other five are not.

The content of the constructs in Cluster A also reveals certain interesting points. Mr P seems to classify people on the basis of their being loving and non-threatening versus hostile and threatening, and he seems to get on only with the former. This reveals an inability on his part to adapt to less accepting people, and reinforces the view of him as an inadequate person.

Nothing much can be said about Cluster B and construct 5 other than that the dimensions Children-Adult and Coloured-Indian do not relate to the rest of his construct system.

What is of interest, however, is the discrepancy between the focus of his conversation and the focus of his constructs. The former was political and the latter personal. This tends to back up the interpretation made earlier that Mr P was steering the discussion towards politics in order to avoid facing up to more personal problems. It is evident from the grid that he functions on a personal rather than on a political level, and that the most important problems in his life arise out of his personal relationships and not out of the political situation. Preoccupation with the political situation can thus be seen as a means of escape from personal problems.

### 2.7.3. Inter-element relations

As can be expected from the nature of the relationship between the constructs, certain of the elements are closely linked to one another, others are only weakly linked to one another and indirectly linked to the emerging clusters, and two are unique figures.

Cluster A involves certain of the elements as follows:

Self (1), Brother (4), Accepted Teacher (14) and Boss (16) - Rejecting Person (10), Threatening Person (12), Rejected Teacher (15) and Ex-flame (7).

Brother, Accepted Teacher and Boss are completely identified with one another and form an "ideal cluster". The four contrasting elements are the most negatively perceived in the grid.

Cluster B involves Attractive Person (13), Happy Person (18) and Ethical Person (19). These elements are completely identified with one another. They are positively perceived (although not as strongly as are Self and the "ideal cluster") in so far as they are weakly linked to the "ideal cluster" and weakly contrasted with the four most negatively perceived elements.

The remaining elements are not strongly perceived. Mother (2) is weakly linked to Cluster A and is construed in a positive way. Spouse (6) is even less strongly perceived, but also positively in that she is weakly linked to Mother. Pal (8) is positively related to Spouse and Ex-pal (9), so that Pal and Ex-pal are also weakly positively construed elements. The same is true for Pitied Person (11), who is weakly linked to Mother. Sister (5) is perceived negatively, but rather weakly.

Father (3) and Successful Person (17) are unique figures since they are unrelated to each other or to any of the other elements in the grid.

An examination of the assigned constructs reveals that Mr P would like to be like all the positively perceived elements except for Pitied Person, and like Father. He sees Murphy as being like Self and Mother. Authoritarianism is attributed to the five negatively perceived elements, to the two ambivalently perceived elements and to three of the positively perceived elements: Spouse, Pitied Person and Boss.

The above has interesting implications for an assessment of Mr P's construal of his wife. Although she is construed positively, she does not represent an ideal to him. Through her being linked with Pal and, indirectly, with Ex-pal, there is the suggestion that one of the components of the relationship between him and his wife is friendship. Since she is contrasted with one element, Rejected Teacher, it appears that she is someone whose values he accepts and looks up to. In addition, she is linked with Mother, which suggests that she is maternal and supportive to him. These last two points are compatible with what has already been said about Mrs P accompanying her husband everywhere in order to keep an eye on his drinking. It is also compatible with the view of Mr P as an inadequate person, since such people usually rely on others to solve their problems. His perception of his wife as authoritarian is in keeping with the suggestion that he was submissive to her.

Mr P's construal of Murphy as being like him and his (Mr P's) mother suggests that he regards him positively, but little more can be ascertained with regard to this.

#### 2.7.4. Construct-element relations

In this section, the characteristics attributed to Self, Father, Spouse, the "ideal Cluster" and the four most negatively perceived elements, will be discussed.

Mr P sees himself as just, kind and considerate (2), friendly and not aggressive (3, 9, 10), as someone with whom others can get on (4, 12, 13), as understanding and sympathetic (14, 15), not concerned with material things (8), and understanding (20).

Only one characteristic is applicable to Father: that of being an Indian and having foreign traditions (5). This is the only case in which this characteristic applies. Furthermore, it relates particularly strongly to this element. This is interesting for a number of reasons.

Mr P construes his father pre-emptively, which implies that he was incapable of knowing his father in terms other than this one. Since the fact that his father was Indian and a foreigner precluded him from identifying with him, the source of Mr P's inadequacy may rest on this "absence" of a male model. What is also particularly interesting in the light of Mr P's professed political liberalism is the fact that his father was Indian prevented him from seeing him in others terms - an attitude which is the essence of racialism. This corroborates the interpretation made previously about Mr P merely drifting with the tide of political events and using politics as a scapegoat for and an escape from personal problems.

Mr P construes his wife as friendly and not aggressive (10), and as someone who agrees with him on all issues (16) and who does not have a superior attitude (19). These are all positive attributes, but only one refers to a superordinate construct. This is compatible with what was said in the previous section about Mr P perceiving his wife in positive terms, but not as positively as the elements comprising the "ideal cluster". In addition, the characteristics applicable to her are those that one would expect in a friendship relationship. However, there is at the same time a marked absence of many of the more important characteristics that will be seen to apply to the "ideal cluster". This is possibly due to Mr P's resenting his wife's vigilance over him.

The elements comprising the "ideal cluster" are seen as just, kind and considerate (2), friendly and not aggressive (3, 9, 10), people with whom he gets on (4, 12, 13), not concerned with material things (8), understanding and sympathetic (14, 15), agreeing with Self on all issues (16), not having a superior attitude (19), understanding (20), and practical and logical in reasoning and argument (21). Many of these characteristics refer to superordinate constructs (which is not the case with those applicable to Spouse) and most of them relate very strongly (which is not the case with the characteristics applicable to his mother).

Generally, the contrasting characteristics apply to the four most negatively perceived elements in the grid.

It is evident, therefore, that Mr P's evaluation of "good" versus "bad" people is based on whether they are loving and supportive to others or antagonistic. This confirms what has been said about his needing others to guide him.

#### 2.7.5. Component grouping

The first six components together account for over 93% of the total variation of Mr P's grid. The discussion here will be limited to an analysis of component 3, since the information from the other components is either repetitive of what has been discussed in previous sections, or inaccurate, or irrelevant to the main argument.

Component 3 is important in that it sheds light on the basis for the grouping of the elements in Cluster B (see section of inter-element relations) and on the basis for Mr P's ambivalent construal of his father.

Five constructs together contribute to over 75% of the variation of this component. The one component pole is represented by the following characteristics: cheerfulness, being children, agreeing with Self on all issues, but being impractical. Attractive Person, Happy Person and Ethical Person possess the above characteristics whereas Ex-pal, Father and Pal possess the contrasting characteristics. These six elements together contribute to almost 84% of the variation of this component. This is interesting since it illustrates that the three elements comprising Cluster B are liked by Mr P because of a childish naivety. A lack of practicality and logic is disliked by Mr P, yet he tolerates this where children are concerned. His father, by contrast, appears here as a serious, logical man, who did not always agree with Mr P. One could

imagine that Mr P felt him to be his superior. The ambivalence could have arisen out of a mixture of fear and admiration for his father. Ex-pal is seen as similar to Father on the basis of the constructs contributing significantly to this component, a factor which could account for the existence as well as subsequent termination of this friendship. This interpretation is not negated by the fact that Pal also falls under this component pole since he falls under the contrasting poles of constructs 16 and 21.\* He thus emerges as a less fearsome character than the other two.

#### 2.8. Mrs P's verbal report

The unstructured session with Mrs P was the interviewers' first contact with the P family. It should be pointed out that, for a reason which will become apparent soon, Mrs P would not have been as keen as she was to participate in the study had she known from the start that Interviewer 1 was White. Since Interviewer 3 was Coloured, she assumed that Interviewer 1 was also. It was only during the second session that she became aware of the truth and, by then, since she had got to like Interviewer 1, this made no difference. As a result of her mistake, she was extremely friendly and co-operative right at the outset.

The discussion revolved around her own personal history, the family as a whole, and the circumstances which she saw as related to Murphy's "breakdown". She was 46 years old and her husband eight years older than she. She was born in the Transkei, one of ten children of a mixed marriage. Apparently eight of her siblings had "White features". She and one of her brothers were more dark-skinned. Her mother, who was Coloured,

\*This component is therefore also inaccurate, but was discussed because important information is provided.

had wanted to live as a White and so had sent her and her brother away from home at an early age. She had been brought up in a convent. She mentioned that she and her brother used to occasionally visit their parents. However, she felt that, although her father had done his best to make them feel wanted, her mother had been overtly rejecting towards her and her brother. As a result, she resented her mother greatly. In addition, the whole situation had made her acutely aware of the injustice of the political status quo. She resented Whites generally and was particularly opposed to the White government. This, in conjunction with the fact that she was a primary school teacher, led to her interest in politics and to her participation in protest movements. At the time of the investigation, she was preoccupied, as was the rest of the family, with the student protest already mentioned. However, the interviewers gained the impression that she was far more personally involved with politics than was her husband.

She had apparently met her husband very shortly after leaving the convent, and they had married soon after. She reported that she was very happy with him. The only problems that had arisen out of his having been previously married were those centering around Dominic's resenting both her and his father. It should be pointed out that, like her husband, she avoided mentioning his drinking problem. She said that both she and her husband were very happy with teaching, but that she was put out by the handicaps under which Coloured teachers had to work, viz. poor salaries in comparison with their White counterparts, overcrowded classes, and generally inferior living conditions, which made it difficult for schoolchildren to attend to their work properly.

She and her husband did everything together. Their social life consisted of going to films and organized dances. The children had a separate social life. Murphy played football and was a member of a social clique of boys whose activities involved leadership

courses, mountain-climbing week-ends occasionally and various other social programmes. She felt that he should leave school after completing Standard Eight and do a trade. She had mentioned this to him, and he had apparently been "quite pleased". Mrs P said that Murphy did not spend so much time with his parents, but that both she and her husband were involved in the discipline of the children. However, she saw herself as the dominant partner in the marriage, and she was in charge of managing the family's financial matters. She was herself too busy to run the household on her own, so that each child was in charge of a particular area.

When asked about Murphy's "breakdown", she said that it must have been the result of the political disappointment caused by his school's touring the Transkei and by the failure of the student protest. She did not see other factors as being involved.

One can see from this that, like her husband, Mrs P blamed Murphy's "breakdown" on the political situation. Her avoiding the subject of her husband's drinking and Murphy's consequent loneliness shows that she was equally reluctant to face up to her possible role in his "breakdown". This same attitude is also manifested in her "solution" to his inability to cope with schoolwork, viz. that Murphy should leave school and enter a trade. This implies that she saw it as related to an intrinsic lack of ability at school subjects on his part, rather than the result of the conditions under which he had to work at home and of his personal problems.

It should be noted that everything that Mrs P did say is confirmed by information from other sources. However, a lot of significant material was omitted. The nun's report to the social worker as well as Murphy's own report provided additional details which suggest that Mrs P's view of Murphy's "breakdown", just like her husband's, left out the parents' responsibility in it.

Mrs P's description of Murphy's social life seemed to imply that he was not lonely. This was an obvious rationalization for the fact that she and her husband had a separate social life from their children. Similarly, her leaving out Murphy's secret drinking exploits from her account seemed to be an attempt at evasion. To face up to its importance would have meant facing up to her and her husband's inadequacy as parents as well as to its relation to her husband's drinking problem. In addition, she discussed the Transkei tour purely in terms of Murphy's disappointment at the living conditions there, whereas Murphy had talked about it in terms of the poor living conditions as well as in terms of the guilt that he had felt by witnessing the drinking during Xhosa rituals. Once again, if Mrs P had faced up to the importance of that last factor, she would have been forced to acknowledge its relationship to Murphy's drinking and to her husband's.

Like her husband, therefore, Mrs P refused to see her role in Murphy's "breakdown" and blamed it on the political situation. This is particularly understandable in her case since she had herself experienced in a very personal way the effects of the political system.

The general impression gained of Mrs P was of a quiet woman who had genuinely tried her best. Although she was obviously the dominant partner, she did not exercise her dominance in an aggressive way. During the second session, for example, she let her husband do most of the talking and her participation in the political discussion that occurred then (see section on Mr P's verbal report) was restricted to agreeing with him. She obviously had built up a good relationship with him, and her involvement with his faults was directed towards helping him in a quiet way rather than blaming him. It was unfortunate that this had been achieved at the expense of the children.

## 2.9. Mrs P's grid

### 2.9.1. General

This grid consists of seventeen elements and fourteen constructs. Ex-flame was omitted since Mrs P had not had a previous boy-friend and had met and married Mr P shortly after leaving the convent. Threatening Person was the other element omitted since Mrs P could not think of such a person. The sorts where these two elements were involved were thus left out so that the relevant constructs could not be elicited.

It should be noted that element 5, representing Sister, was a good childhood friend (she did not really know her sisters since she had lived away from home) and that element 10, representing Rejecting Person, was Dominic.

Mrs P was at ease during the structured session and had no trouble in providing the elements that filled the role titles or the relevant constructs.

### 2.9.2. Inter-construct relations

The following clusters emerge from the inter-construct correlations:

#### Cluster A:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| People who are kind and sweet<br>to Self         | - People who are not (8)                       |
| People who are more friendly<br>to Self          | - People who are less friendly<br>to Self (18) |
| People who are more friendly<br>and warm to Self | - People who are more aloof (16)               |
| People who are not rejecting<br>towards Self     | - People who are rejecting<br>(9, 10)          |
| People on whom Self can<br>depend                | - People who are not depend-<br>able (11)      |

People who always are very fair to Self - People whom Self resents: Self wants justice from them but does not see it (2)

People who are protective to Self - People who have a friendship relationship with Self (7).

It should also be noted that constructs 8, 18, 16, 9 and 10 are more superordinate. Constructs 2 and 7 are linked to this cluster only through construct 8, and construct 11 through constructs 18, 16, 9 and 10.

Cluster B involves two constructs which are totally identified with each other:

People who are involved in religion - Lay people (1)

People whose plane of life is prayer - Lay people with whom worldly problems can be discussed (6).

Cluster C involves two constructs which are totally identified with each other:

Assertive people - Reserved people (3)

More assertive people - More reserved people (5).

In addition, there are two constructs which are unrelated to each other or to any other construct in the grid:

High degree of education - Not as educated (17)

People with female interests - People with male interests (21).

It is evident from the above that Mrs P has the ability to move from tightness to looseness as the occasion warrants. Although Cluster A includes a large number of the constructs in the grid, the relationships between the constructs within the cluster are not particularly tight in every case. The constructs are nevertheless integrated. Integration is also revealed in the absence of impermeable or pre-emptive constructs. The existence of various

clusters and unrelated constructs shows that Mrs P can construe events in a flexible way. She is thus not susceptible to a stereotyped view of the world, but at the same time, her view is not chaotic.

An examination of the content of her constructs reveals that all those constructs in Cluster A are dependency constructs. The others are more "objective". This implies that, although she has the tendency to evaluate people in terms of how they relate to her, she is equally capable of judgment on the basis of less subjective features.

From the points of view of both structure and content, therefore, her constructs are adequately balanced.

What is also interesting is the absence of a single construct with political connotations. Just as in the case of her husband, therefore, her involvement in politics is not revealed in the grid. It should be conceded that, in her case, although she attributed Murphy's "breakdown" to the political situation, the focus of the first unstructured session with her was her personal life. Unlike her husband, she did not use politics as an attempt to evade her personal problems, but like her husband, this evasion was present where Murphy was concerned.

### 2.9.3. Inter-element relations

As can be expected from the absence of stereotypy referred to in the previous section, the inter-element correlations reveal a large number of clusters. At the same time, almost every element is related to at least one other. This follows from the fact that Mrs P's grid showed integration. There are only three exceptions: Mother, Attractive Person and Boss are unique figures.

Cluster A involves the following elements:

Rejected Teacher (15), Reject=  
ing Person (10), Pitied  
Person (11)

- Pal (8).

It should be noted here that Pitied Person is not contrasted with Pal directly but only through the links with the other two elements in the cluster.

Cluster B involves the following elements:

Self (1), Sister (5) and Ex-pal (7).

Self and Sister are totally identified with each other, but Ex-pal is weakly, although significantly related.

Cluster C involves two elements:

Father (3) and Spouse (6).

The relationship between these is very strong.

Cluster D involves the following elements:

Accepted Teacher (14), Happy Person (18)  
and Ethical Person (19).

Cluster E involves two elements in a weak although significant relationship:

Brother (4) and Successful Person (17).

Two interesting points emerge from the above.

It is to be expected from the singular circumstances under which Mrs P was brought up that she does not identify with either of her parents, but with the childhood friend in the convent. Her lack of contact with her parents is perhaps the factor responsible for her choice of being with her husband at the expense of her children. She may have felt that, if she had managed to cope without her parents and had managed to find alternative figures for identification, her children should be able to do the same. Mrs P was, in fact, doing the same as her own parents had done, but for different reasons.

The link between Father and Spouse suggests that her husband is construed in similar terms as her father. Mrs P had suggested during the unstructured session, that her father had been overruled by her mother in the decision to send her and her one brother away from home. This

suggests that, in certain respects, her mother had been the dominant partner and her father submissive in those respects. This is corroborated by an examination of the assigned construct, "Authoritarian-Not authoritarian". Mother is seen as authoritarian whereas Father is not. This could imply that the basis for the similarity between Father and Spouse is their submissiveness.

We will have to reassess this point as well as determine the basis for the grouping of the other elements in the above clusters in the next section.

#### 2.9.4. Construct-element relations

With one exception, the four elements in Cluster A are construed in terms of the constructs in Cluster A. Rejecting Person and Rejected Teacher are seen as not kind and sweet to Self (8), rejecting to Self (9, 10), more aloof (16), less friendly to Self (18), and not dependable (11). These characteristics, especially the first four, apply particularly strongly. Except for the characteristic referring to construct 8, the same ones apply to Pitied Person. However, only the characteristic referring to rejection is particularly strong. Pal, who was contrasted with the above three elements, is seen as kind and sweet to Self (8), more friendly to Self (18), and as a person with female interests (21). This last characteristic is the only one not encompassed by construct Cluster A.

Self and Sister are construed in terms of only one characteristic, viz. that of having female interests (21). The relationship, although significant, is rather weak. Ex-pal is seen as having a friendship relationship with Self (7).

As far as the elements comprising Cluster C are concerned, Father is seen as reserved (3, 5) and not highly educated (17). Spouse is seen as reserved (3, 5). The similarity between the two is thus on the basis of their both being reserved rather than assertive. This confirms what was said in the previous section about both

these people being rather weak characters, and confirms the general view of Mr P as an inadequate person.

All three elements comprising Cluster D are construed in terms of being involved in religion (1) and a life of prayer (6). This is to be expected from the fact that Accepted Teacher and Happy Person are both nuns and Ethical Person a priest.

As for the two elements comprising Cluster E, Brother is seen solely in terms of not being highly educated (17), and no characteristic is significantly applicable to Successful Person.

Finally, Mother is seen solely as not highly educated (17), Attractive Person as reserved (3, 5), and Boss as not kind and sweet to Self (8), as someone whom Self resents (2), who is aloof (16), and less friendly to Self (18). The characteristics applicable to Boss are those found in construct Cluster A. Boss is thus the fourth disliked element, along with Rejecting Person, Pitied Person and Rejected Teacher.

Various points emerge from the above.

It is evident that Mrs P's dislike of people is based largely on their negative feelings and actions towards her. Her present friendship relationship, manifested in her perception of Pal, is based on the friend's displaying positive feelings and actions towards her, as well as on a similarity of interests. It is rather strange that the only significant factor in common between her and her childhood friend, however, should be a similarity of interests. On the other hand, this could perhaps be explained by the fact that such a characteristic is very important in relationships between children.

The basis for the similarity between Mrs P's father and husband has already been discussed.

Mrs P's construal of her mother purely in terms of her not possessing a high degree of education is rather strange in the light of what she said about her. One

would have expected her to have seen her mother in terms of the negative characteristics embodied by the constructs in Cluster A. Even in the case of the assigned construct "Like I would like to be-Not like I would like to be" Mrs P said that she wanted to be like her mother. The only people that she did not want to be like were the four disliked elements and Attractive Person. The fact that she does not see her mother more negatively cannot be explained on the basis of what we know.

We can now determine some of the factors involved in Mrs P's construal of Murphy. In so far as he is seen to be like her father and her husband, Murphy is seen as being reserved rather than assertive. This is in keeping with Murphy's own description of himself as well as with the interviewer's impression of him. He is also seen to be like the three religious characters. Once again, this is in keeping with his introversion and very serious outlook on life. The basis for his similarity to Successful Person cannot be assessed now since nothing is known about the latter other than his rather weak link with Brother. It is interesting that Murphy is not seen as being like the negatively perceived elements. This would suggest that Mrs P's neglect of him was not due to anything intrinsically "negative" about his personality.

All these points will have to be re-examined.

#### 2.9.5. Component grouping

The first six components together account for almost 94% of the total variation of Mrs P's grid. Only those components which provide additional, relevant information will be discussed.

The information from component 1 corroborates what was said about the four negatively perceived elements in the previous section.

Component 2 accounts for almost 17% of the variation of this grid. Constructs 3 and 5 (Assertive-Reserved), 1 and 6 (Involved in religion and prayer-Lay people with whom worldly problems can be discussed), and 21 (Female

interests-Male interests) contribute to over 90% of the variation of this component. Four elements seem to be the most relevant here and contribute to over 74% of the variation of this component. Accepted Teacher and Happy Person are considered assertive, involved in religion and prayer and as having female interests. Father and Spouse are seen as possessing the opposite characteristics.

In the previous section, it was established that one of the factors responsible for Mrs P's view of her husband and father as similar was their lack of assertion. Here we see that, in addition, he represents someone with whom she can discuss "worldly problems". It should be remembered that Mrs P, as a young girl reared in a convent, could not discuss many matters with the nuns. She used to go home to her parents occasionally and the information from this component suggests that her father was the person with whom she used to discuss these problems. Once she left the convent, she must have felt it important to find someone who could fulfill this role - hence her early marriage to Mr P. This is important if one wishes to understand the various factors involved in their marital relationship. Although, as has been mentioned, Mrs P was the dominant partner in so far as she supported her husband when he was unable to solve his problems, it is evident from this that she needed from him the sort of support that she had obtained from her father.

Component 4 accounts for almost 11% of the total variation of this grid. The constructs involved account for almost 74% of the variation of this component and the elements for almost 70%. Boss and Mother are seen as dependable, not rejecting to Self, assertive and as people whom Self resents, from whom Self wants justice, which is not forthcoming. Pitied Person and Attractive Person are seen in terms of the contrasting characteristics.

This component is important in so far as it yields information on Mrs P's view of her mother. The implications of her being assertive have already been discussed in the previous section. The question was raised in the

previous section as to why Mrs P did not construe her mother in terms of more negative characteristics. Here it becomes evident that Mrs P construes her mother ambivalently: she is seen as dependable and not rejecting, but at the same time as someone whom Mrs P resents. Although this does not totally confirm what Mrs P actually said about her mother during the unstructured session, it is not incompatible with it. The fact that her mother is seen in some positive terms should also be viewed in the light of Mrs P's own actions towards her own children. To condemn her mother for rejecting her would imply also condemning herself for doing the same to her own children.

We will not go into a detailed analysis of component 5, but merely consider it in terms of its shedding more light on Mrs P's construal of her mother. Here her mother is seen as protective, as a lay person with whom worldly problems can be discussed, as having female interests and as not highly educated. The characteristics referring to constructs 17 and 21 are relatively neutral. The others have positive connotations (even though their "opposites" do not have negative connotations). This again reinforces the point made about Mrs P's ambivalent construal of her mother.

Component 6 is represented largely by two constructs and two elements. Mother is seen as someone whom Self resents and as having female interests. These characteristics have already been found to apply to her and their implications have already been discussed. What is of interest here is Mrs P's view of Successful Person as someone who was always very fair towards Self and who has male interests. This is important because it is our main source of information about this element.

It was mentioned in the previous section that Murphy was seen to be like Successful Person, but nothing could be said about this at that stage. Now that we have some information about Successful Person, and that it becomes evident that the characteristics applicable to him are not negative, we can say with an even greater amount of

certainty than we did at the beginning of this section that Mrs P's neglect of Murphy was not due to any negative sentiments towards him. Rather, it should be seen as due to her involvement with her husband and her feeling that, if she had managed to cope without her parents, Murphy and the other children should be able to do the same.

#### 2.10. Concluding comments

It was postulated in this family analysis that Murphy's construct system, as manifested in his repertory grid, which was administered when his schizophrenic symptoms had disappeared, was essentially the same as would have occurred during his pre-schizophrenic state.

Murphy thus emerges as a person with a particularly positive construal of his family. The stability of the greater part of his construct system hinged on this positive construal being validated. His efforts to preserve this view of "The Perfect Family" are evidenced in the extreme uneasiness which he experienced at the conflict between Dominic and his parents, and in his inability to feel any resentment towards his parents for the manner in which they disciplined him for his secret drinking. His involvement with his family was related to a corresponding lack of involvement with peers and "outsiders" - those "outsiders" with whom he was involved, he viewed, either negatively, or at least not nearly as positively or unrealistically as he viewed his family.

Evidence from various sources (from Murphy's verbal report, from his parents' description of their relationship to each other, and from the nun's report) suggested that Murphy's view of his family was an idealized one, and that his parents, far from validating it, were in fact too involved with each other to show any active concern for him. Since, in Murphy's construct system, the relationships between the constructs subsuming the events in that area were particularly tight, it is easy

to see how the invalidation of any one of these constructs by what was actually occurring should have had an impact on the others.

It would appear that, most of the time, the particular type of invalidation that was occurring was not due to the direct actions of either parent. Neither parent construed Murphy negatively. Neither was actively using him for his own devices, as is usually the case when invalidation is manifested. However, Mr P was too preoccupied with his own inadequacy and Mrs P too preoccupied with helping her husband, for either of them to be aware of what Murphy's needs actually were. The invalidation was the result of their imperviousness to his needs, which was, in turn, caused by their preoccupation with Mr P's needs. The fact that both parents were involved with their work and the fact that there were so many children to attend to made a concern for Murphy even more difficult for them.

Murphy's experience was mystified in a number of ways. Firstly, there was the general confusion that must have been caused by his idealized perception of his parents as caring for him and the invalidation of this by the lack of concern they manifested (if they felt concern, they were too preoccupied with other matters to show it). Secondly, there were various specific incidents which reinforced the general mystification. Murphy had to reconcile his idealized perception of his family with the strife that existed between Dominic and his parents, as well as with his father's drinking. These two "bad" points were difficult to reconcile with his view of the family as "good".

Murphy's own secret drinking and the manner in which he accepted his punishment suggests two interesting possible interpretations. It is clear that he did not view his own actions lightly. Perhaps this was because his drinking reminded him, symbolically, of his father's and, hence, of his parents' concern with this rather than with him. If this was so, then the drawn-out punishment

meted out to him, rather than enabling him to forget about his parents' involvement with his father's drinking problem, merely reminded him of it and reinforced his confusion. Alternatively, there is the possibility that Murphy accepted his punishment without protest because it made him feel that he was atoning, not only for his own drinking, but also for his father's. This would have had the effect of making him feel that, having obtained forgiveness for his father's sinfulness, his father was once again "good". The confusion would then no longer be present. The first interpretation suggests that his secret drinking and his subsequent punishment added to his mystification; the second that they represented attempts to deal with it. The problem with the first interpretation is that it does not explain why Murphy indulged in the drinking in the first place, particularly if it added to his confusion. The second interpretation, however, would explain this in terms of Murphy's anticipation of punishment. However, what is important is that both interpretations suggest that there was mystification to start with.

The Xhosa drinking rituals and the drinking of Murphy's school-mates on the school tour also seem to have been a source of mystification in that they also seem to have been reminders of Murphy's family situation. Furthermore, Murphy now became confused by the discrepancy between his idealized view of "his people", the Blacks, as "good", and their drinking, which implied "badness".

The Xhosa drinking rituals, the drinking of his school-mates, as well as his being faced with the injustices of the political system, which were manifested in the poverty of the Transkei, and the hopelessness of the political situation which came home to him with the failure of the student protest - all seemed to have precipitated the "breakdown" of an already confused construct system that was ill-equipped to cope with further confusion. Murphy's typically middle-class need for achievement, manifested in his concern with schoolwork,

and inability to actualise it, also seems to have been a precipitating factor.

The above analysis views the socio-political factors as peripheral to the intra-familial factors. This is substantiated by the fact that all three family members involved in the study were, although middle-class Coloureds involved with politics, more concerned with interpersonal and intrapsychic problems. This was discussed during the course of this family analysis.

In conclusion, it can be said that the thought-disorder characterizing Murphy's schizophrenia becomes intelligible when viewed in the light of the mystification experienced by him. His social and emotional withdrawal appear as a logical way of avoiding further invalidation and mystification. Finally, the delusional material related to politics makes sense when viewed in terms of the political involvement of his family and the "political" events immediately preceding his "breakdown".

### 3. PHILLIP V

#### 3.1. Interviews: Number and form

Initial contact with the V family was made when Interviewer 1 held an unstructured session with Phillip in hospital. On this occasion, the aims of the research were clearly outlined to him. He agreed to co-operate, but seemed worried that the information gathered from him would be shown to the psychiatrist in charge of his case. The interviewer did her best to reassure him on this point, but he became perfectly at ease only after the two subsequent sessions. As a result, the repertory grid was only done in the fourth and fifth sessions with him. The first three sessions with Phillip were unstructured and involved discussions about his "breakdown", and about topics which he himself broached. The latter consisted of discussions about religion, and Zen Buddhism in particular, about art and poetry, with Phillip showing the interviewer his own poetry, about the aims of psychiatry, and about the generation gap. These issues were all very important to Phillip, and it will be shown later how they were all related to one another and how they are relevant to an understanding of Phillip's situation.

After the initial session with Phillip, Interviewers 1 and 2 visited the home of his parents. They lived in a respectable working-class area of Athlone, Cape Town, and were busy tidying up the house and making supper when the interviewers arrived. Despite this, and although no appointment had been made previously, they were quite willing to receive the interviewers. They agreed to participate in the study once they had been informed of its aims. An appointment was made for the following week and, after a short conversation, the interviewers left. Mr and Mrs V were interviewed by Interviewers 2 and 1 respectively on the next occasion. This session was both structured and unstructured and lasted about three hours.

Although only two sessions were conducted with the parents, contact was maintained with the V family through Phillip for a period of eight weeks. When Phillip was seen for the last time, he was still in hospital, but his condition was described by hospital personnel as improved and he was scheduled to be discharged.

The above is summarized in the table below:

Session No.	Inter-viewer(s)	Family Member(s)	Struc-tured/Unstruc-tured	Length of time (hrs)	Place of interview
1	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
2	1,2	Father, Mother	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Home
3	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
4	1	Mother	S,U	2	Home
	2	Father	S,U	2	
	1,2	Father Mother	U	1	
5	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
6	1	Son	S	1	Hospital
7	1	Son	S	1	Hospital

### 3.2. Initial information regarding Phillip

Phillip is a twenty-one year old working-class Coloured male. After having gone as far as Standard Seven at school, he was forced, for financial reasons, to go out and work. He obtained employment as a messenger in an office. He continued in that line of work until the time of his "breakdown", but was continually moving from one firm to another, and had worked in six or seven different places by the time he was admitted to hospital.

Phillip was diagnosed paranoid schizophrenic by psychiatric staff in the mental hospital to which he was admitted. He was described as being thought-disordered

on the basis of his disconnected speech and vague, loose associations. While in hospital, he manifested a strong preoccupation with religious matters, art and poetry. He was particularly interested in the symbolic language of these.

The author's initial contact with Phillip occurred approximately a week after his "breakdown". He was friendly, but, as has been mentioned, suspicious about the motives behind the interview. He was in an elated mood, and spoke at an extremely rapid rate, constantly switching from one subject to another. In this session, the author found it difficult to detect any thread which linked Phillip's thoughts in a logical manner. When addressing the author, he spoke loudly, but, every now and then, would turn to an imaginary person and mutter in an undertone for a few seconds, to ask, "What does she really want out of me?", or, "Should I answer this question?"

The subsequent sessions showed a progressive decrease in Phillip's suspicion towards the author, accompanied by a diminished tendency to speak to his imaginary companion. His elated mood persisted throughout all the interviews but one. The exception seemed to be the result of Phillip's having been subjected to Electro-Convulsive Therapy a few hours previously. He was very tired on that occasion, and dozed off for a few seconds every now and then.

It seemed obvious that Phillip was preoccupied with religion, art, poetry and symbolism, but the author was reluctant to label this as delusional without knowing more about Phillip's situation. The author's contention that Phillip's symptoms could be explained by an examination of his situation will be taken up at various points in subsequent sections.

### 3.3. General information regarding the V family

Phillip is the eldest of four siblings. The two younger siblings, a girl and a boy, were still at school

at the time of the investigation. The other sister was already working. Phillip's brother had experienced two acute schizophrenic "breakdowns", and was being maintained on drug treatment at the time of the study. All the siblings, except for Phillip, were living with their parents.

Phillip's parents were both forty-six years old. Mr V was born in a small town in the Western Province and moved to Athlone when he went out to work. He went as far as Standard Four at school, and had held two employments throughout his life. At the time of the investigation, he was a semi-skilled worker employed as body-builder by a local bus company. He had held that job for thirteen years. Mrs V was born in Wynberg, Cape Town, and moved house three times before settling down in Athlone when she got married. She had a Standard Six education and, after leaving school, worked in a factory for some time. She then left to become a cleaner in a school, and was still employed as such at the time of the investigation.

The general impression gained by the interviewers was that a great deal of conflict existed between husband and wife. Mr V was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church whereas Mrs V was a Seventh Day Adventist. Both were committed to their religion and seemed to argue about it, rather than keep their views to themselves. On the first visit to the V's home, the interviewers were immediately questioned by Mr V on their religious beliefs. Without waiting for an answer, he embarked on a long dissertation about the evils of atheism and the necessity of believing in God. He tended towards extremely literal, dogmatic interpretations of the Bible and was intolerant of any deviations from what he believed was correct. His wife seemed embarrassed by his outburst and remained quiet throughout, and seemed relieved when the subject was changed to Phillip. It is important to bear in mind the religious conflict between the parents as well as Mr V's intolerance of other people's beliefs if we are to under=

stand Phillip's schizophrenia. It has been mentioned that one of his "symptoms" was described as relating to an excessive preoccupation with religious matters. In fact, Phillip was preoccupied a great deal with religion. During one of the unstructured sessions with the interviewer, he himself volunteered an explanation for this. He told the interviewer about his parents' differing beliefs, and summed up his own resulting conflict symbolically as follows: "My father celebrated the Sunday, my mother the Saturday...so I decided to celebrate the Friday and become a Moslem." This had occurred about two years before his "breakdown" and, as a result, his father had ordered him to leave home. He had lived in various boarding houses during this time. He then turned to Zen Buddhism, because he felt that it was more compatible with his personality.

Another source of conflict in the V household was Mr V's drinking. His wife mentioned that she could not put up with it and that, on one occasion, she had seriously considered leaving home as a result. She felt that her husband's drinking must have upset Phillip, and she attributed his schizophrenia partially to that.

It should be noted that the conflicts over religion and Mr V's drinking seem to be related in more than one way. Firstly, Mr V's drinking was unacceptable to his wife, not only because it was unpleasant, but also because her religion strongly opposed it. Secondly, it must have been a source of much mystification of Phillip's experience to, on the one hand, listen to his father holding forth on the evils of atheism, and, on the other, to witness his father behaving very much unlike the religious person he professed to be. In the light of this, it is no wonder that he rejected both his parents' religious beliefs in order to attempt to establish his own.

It was difficult to ascertain who was the dominant partner in the household. Phillip considered his father the dominant one, and although he felt that both his parents had played a role in his leaving home, his anger

was directed towards his father. However, both Mr and Mrs V, when questioned separately on this issue, replied that Mrs V played the leading role in that she was in charge of financial and other household matters as well as being the one chiefly responsible for the children's upbringing. Phillip agreed with this last point and remembered having spent most of his childhood at home with his mother. However, all three family members interviewed said that Mr V had been the disciplinarian and had punished the children when he had considered it necessary.

The interviewers felt that Mr V played the dominant role in a rather covert way. Although his wife was in charge of daily household matters and even of the family income, she appeared to be frightened of him. At no stage during the interviewers' sessions with them did she openly confront him. However, she did voice her disapproval of her husband the moment he left the room. She did this in rather strong language and in the presence of Phillip's brother. Another incident which lends support to the view of Mr V as the dominant partner relates to the fact that neither of the parents visited Phillip in hospital during the eight weeks that the author remained in touch with him: Mrs V said that she wanted to see him and wanted him back home, whereas Mr V did not. If this was so, then it seems that Mr V had forbidden his wife to carry out her wishes.

Generally, Mrs V appeared well-disposed towards Phillip. She was concerned about his welfare and had formulated her own ideas about his schizophrenia. She mentioned that he had been working as a messenger and had felt frustrated in his ambitions to become a writer and do something creative. She considered this to be one of the reasons behind his "breakdown", a view which coincided with Phillip's. Mr V, by contrast, did not seem concerned about Phillip and, when questioned about the "breakdown", tried to evade the issue, attributing it all to "getting mixed up with bad company". It was

clear that he was not claiming any responsibility for his son's schizophrenia.

All that has been said so far suggests that one should consider Phillip's symptoms in the light of the conflict and the balance of power between the parents, and the manner in which Phillip was affected by it all. Certain points have been raised in this section, some only tentatively, and they will be reviewed at various stages in the following pages.

#### 3.4. Phillip's verbal report

The manner in which the sessions with Phillip were conducted as well as the features of his speech were discussed at the outset. His preoccupation with religion and the possible reasons behind this have also been discussed in previous sections, so none of this will be repeated here, but should be borne in mind.

It has been mentioned that he was also preoccupied with art, poetry and the generation gap. This needs further elaboration. Phillip told the interviewer that his work as a messenger held no scope for creativity or self-expression. He felt that he had an artistic bent and he was trying to find an outlet for this through writing and drawing. The interviewer was impressed by his intelligence and sensitivity and felt that, had Phillip had the opportunity to study further, he could well have developed his artistic talents. It was not difficult to understand that he felt frustrated in his work. If Phillip's ambitions were to be labelled "delusions of grandeur", then these had a definite basis in reality, and, as such, were not delusions. One wonders whether, had he come from a middle-class home, his aspirations would have been dismissed in quite the same way.

Phillip's discussions with the interviewer about the generation gap arose from what he said about his parents and the people with whom he was in contact at work. He felt that his father was far too dogmatic to

listen to anyone, let alone to him, and that his mother, although an easier person to get on with, did not really understand his ideas. He considered her superstitious and could not communicate with her in any depth. The people with whom he worked were all older than he was and did not take his ideas seriously, so that he obtained no validation for his opinions about himself and others from that source either.

When asked about his social life, Phillip mentioned that he lived largely in seclusion and that, although he knew quite a few people of his own age, he really had only one good friend with whom he could communicate.

In discussing his "breakdown", Phillip said that what he considered the most important factor related to it was his failure to meet his "psycho-opposite", i.e. someone who was able to reflect and complement his own personality. He felt that he would now be able to come to terms with this, but that, just before his "breakdown", he had been overwhelmed by it all. He mentioned that, when he had lived at home, his parents' constant arguments had been disturbing, but he did not think that his schizophrenia was related to this.

It appears from all this that Phillip's schizophrenia is related to his inability to find validation for himself as the person that he was trying to become. It is obvious that he was not satisfied with being what his parents wanted him to be. Either because he felt that their ideas were too narrow to explain what he was trying to understand, or because he had become progressively disillusioned with them as a result of their inability to live with each other, or both, since the two are related, he rejected their way of seeing life and living it. This rejection is symbolized by his rejection of both their religions, and his consequently being forced to leave home represents his father's intolerance of his search for a new meaning in his life and his mother's inability to counteract his father's attitude on this point. His childhood upbringing did not equip him for his new way

of life and he was unable to cope with the task that he had set for himself. When he failed to find confirmation outside the family (i.e. failed to meet his "psyco-opposite"), he broke down, no longer being able to distinguish between reality and unreality.

Once again, we will have to reconsider this interpretation in the following section.

### 3.5. Phillip's grid

#### 3.5.1. General

Phillip's grid consists of eighteen elements and eighteen constructs. He left out element 12 since he could not think of anyone who was threatening to him. As a result, the three sorts which involved this element could not be included. Construct 14 (Give Self mother-love - Deep emotional involvement with Self) was excluded from the computer analysis since it was impermeable as far as most of the elements were concerned. As a result, the computer analysis was done on the basis of eighteen elements and seventeen constructs.

It should be noted that element 6, representing Spouse, referred to the girl-friend that Phillip had at the time, since he was unmarried.

The grid was administered when Phillip had recovered from his symptoms. The amount of insight that he showed into his situation in both his schizophrenic and post-schizophrenic states suggests that, in Cooper's (1967) sense, he was on the way to bridging the gap between madness and sanity. However, his "breakdown" seems to have occurred at a time when he had already seen through the shortcomings of his parents' way of life, at a time when he had already gone beyond normality. As a result, a grid obtained from Phillip just prior to his "breakdown" would not have been very different from the one in question since his learning experience had begun when he had left home, not with the onset of his schizophrenia. However, a grid obtained two years prior to his "breakdown", when

he was still living at home, would have probably been very different.

### 3.5.2. Inter-construct relations

Two clusters as well as a few isolated constructs emerge from the computer analysis.

Cluster A includes the following constructs:

- More way-out, non-conformist - Extreme conformist (4, 17)
- Egalitarian relationship with  
Self, friendship relationship - Unequal relationship,  
teacher-pupil type relationship (7, 8)
- Let Self do his thing,  
brotherly relationship with  
Self - Like to teach Self to conform  
back to rules, preach to  
Self (6, 16)
- Teenagers: young ways - Adults: set in their ways  
(11, 18)
- Light-hearted - Serious involvement in  
conversation (20)
- Not disciplinarians - Disciplinarians (15)
- Light-hearted like children - Can be more heavy (21).

It should be noted that constructs 4, 17, 6, 16, 11 and 18 are more superordinate with regard to the rest. The subordinate constructs, constructs 15 and 21, are not directly linked to all the constructs in this cluster.

Cluster B involves only the following two constructs:

- Motherly, warm, affectionate - More hard-core, rule with  
an iron hand (5)
- Involved personally with  
Self - Taught Self school subjects  
(10)

The following constructs are unrelated to any other constructs:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Down to earth, in contact with reality | - Ecstatic (1)   |
| Act like devils                        | - Do not (2)   |
| Perfectionistic, ambitious             | - Not perfectionists: too timid to go higher, leave things uncompleted (3) |
| Easier to communicate with             | - More difficult to communicate with (9).                                  |

Three points are of interest here.

One relates to the nature of the constructs in Cluster A. He differentiates between people who let him do what he wants and people who impose their view of events onto him. The former are the non-conformists, the people of his own age-group; the latter those who are bound by rules, the older generation. This is the type of construct system that can be expected from what Phillip said about himself, his parents and his work situation. It lends support to the interpretation that Phillip's attempts to assert himself as an individual with his own way of viewing life were invalidated by those with relation to whom he was in a subordinate position, most notably his parents.

The second interesting point relates to the fact that construct 9 is not linked to any other construct. It is evident from what has been said about the constructs in Cluster A that Phillip feels more understood by his contemporaries than by the older generation. However, he does not find it significantly easier to communicate with the former than with the latter. This fits in with Phillip's account of his "breakdown" having been precipitated by his failure to find his "psycho-opposite".

The third point relates to construct 3. This construct manifests a need for achievement and is compatible both with what has been said about Phillip's being dissatisfied

with the "working-class ideas" that he came into contact with at home and at work, and with his "middle-class" aspirations towards a creative job and a generally creative life.

The above three points taken in conjunction substantiate and elaborate on our earlier interpretation.

### 3.5.3. Inter-element relations

An examination of the inter-element correlations reveals the existence of two main element clusters and one isolated element.

The majority of the elements are accounted for by Cluster A in the following way:

Self (1), Successful Person (17),  
 Pal (8), Ex-pal (9), Pitied  
 Person (11), Happy Person (18) - Father (3), Rejecting  
 Person (10), Rejected  
 Teacher (15), Boss (16),  
 Accepted Teacher (14),  
 Ethical Person (19),  
 Sister (5), Attractive  
 Person (13), Mother (2).

It should be noted here that Mother is not linked to all the constructs in the cluster, but only by being contrasted with Pitied Person. Attractive Person and Sister are similarly not linked to every construct in the cluster: they are construed as alike and as different from Pal, Ex-pal and Pitied Person.

Of interest is the fact that, with the exception of Sister and Attractive Person, the basis for differentiating one lot of elements from the other is the age factor. This is relevant to what was said in the previous section.

If one looks at the assigned construct, "Like I would like to be", it appears that Phillip's ideal elements are Self, Pal, Ex-pal, Pitied Person and Happy Person. With the exception of Successful Person, these comprise all the elements occurring on the one side of Cluster A.

Cluster B involves two elements which are construed as alike:

Brother (4) and Ex-flame (7).

The only unique figure is Spouse (6).

#### 3.5.4. Construct-element relations

In this section, the discussion will be limited to the constructs applicable to the following elements: Self, Mother, Father, Brother, Spouse, Pal and Boss.

Phillip construes himself as way-out and non-conformist (4, 17), as letting others do their thing (6, 16), as having egalitarian relationships with others (7, 8), as having the young ways of a teenager (11, 18), as not disciplinarian (15), and as light-hearted (20).

His mother is construed as liking to teach him to conform back to rules and preaching to him (6, 16), as having the set ways of an adult (11, 18), and as becoming seriously involved in conversation (20).

His father is seen as liking to teach him to conform back to rules and preaching to him (6, 16), as having an unequal, teacher-pupil type of relationship with him (7, 8), as being more difficult to communicate with (9), as having the set ways of an adult (11, 18), as an extreme conformist (4, 17), as a hard-core person who rules with an iron hand (5), as a disciplinarian (15), and as becoming seriously involved in conversation (20).

Phillip construes his brother rather pre-emptively - he sees him as a person who is too timid to go on with a task, as the opposite of a perfectionist (3).

No constructs were significantly related to Spouse.

Pal is seen as having an egalitarian relationship with Phillip (7, 8), as being way-out and a non-conformist (4, 17), as letting Phillip do his thing (6, 16), as light-hearted (20), not a disciplinarian (15), always ecstatic (1), and as having the young ways of a teenager (11, 18).

Boss is construed as someone who likes to teach Phillip to conform back to rules and to preach to him (6, 16), as having the set ways of an adult (11, 18), as having an unequal, teacher-pupil type of relationship with Phillip (7, 8), as being an extreme conformist (4, 17), disciplinarian (15), and as becoming seriously involved in conversation (20).

It is evident from the above that Self and Pal are favourably construed whereas Mother, Father and Boss are unfavourably construed, although Mother is far less unfavourably construed than Father or Boss. This is in keeping with what was said in the previous section regarding the elements in Cluster A as well as with what Phillip himself said about his family situation, his work situation and his relationship to his one friend. In addition, Phillip had mentioned that, although his relationship with this friend was better than his relationships with others in his life, it was not totally adequate and he could not obtain complete validation from that source. It is noteworthy in this respect that construct 9 (referring to ease versus difficulty of communication) is not significantly related to the element, Pal, even though the positive correlation with Pal is greater than with any other element in the grid.

The fact that no constructs are significantly related to Spouse suggests that this is a weak element in the grid. Phillip does not construe his girl-friend either particularly favourably or particularly negatively. She appears as a relatively innocuous person who neither validated nor invalidated him as the person he was trying to become. Quite clearly, she represented his "psycho-opposite" to an even lesser degree than did his friend.

The choice of Phillip's brother as an area for discussion was made because it was felt that, since he had himself been diagnosed schizophrenic, Phillip might have considered him someone who could understand his (Phillip's) problems and aspirations. However, this was not so. There is the suggestion that Phillip views his brother

as someone who was in the same position as him, but who did not have the courage or ability to pursue the same course as him (Phillip). One could apply the Laingian conception of schizophrenia as a learning experience here in that Phillip saw through the sham of his family's way of life, rejected it, tried to find an alternative but broke down with the effort, but was determined to carry on, whereas his brother, despite the same awareness, was not prepared to act on it and, after his "breakdown", returned to the point where he had been before. This interpretation, although plausible and substantiated by the fact that Phillip's brother had had two "breakdowns" within a short space of time, should be treated with caution since little is known about Phillip's brother's schizophrenia.

In general, what emerges from the analysis of the construct-element relations with regard to the elements selected for discussion substantiates and elaborates on the interpretations made thus far.

#### 3.5.5. Component grouping

The first six components together account for over 90% of the total grid variation. However, no discussion is warranted here since the first component repeats information already discussed and since the fit is not always good for some of the major constructs and elements involved in the other components.

#### 3.6. Mr V's verbal report

The important points that emerged from the two sessions with Mr V have been discussed in earlier sections. These will be repeated very briefly.

When he was seen with his wife, he completely dominated the conversation. He was polite to the interviewers, but seemed interested only in expressing his own views about events. The main topic of conversation was religion, and he appeared to be a person who interpreted the Bible

completely literally and who was intolerant of any view other than his own. He liked to think of himself as a righteous man, yet we know from what his wife said that he had a tendency to drink rather heavily. There was thus a contradiction between his words and his deeds, and he expected others to judge him on the basis of the former and to do what he said should be done even though he sometimes did the opposite.

He was extremely evasive on the subject of Phillip and seemed to want nothing to do with him, having written off the "breakdown" as being due to Phillip's deviation from Christianity and involvement with a "bad crowd". He did not want Phillip back at home and he made no effort to visit Phillip in hospital. It was conjectured that he had also forbidden his wife to do so.

His leisure time was filled by participating in the activities of his church. Otherwise, he stayed at home. According to both Phillip and Mrs V, much of his time at home was spent in quarrelling with his wife and the children. He, however, did not mention the marital conflict at all, and only hinted at not seeing eye to eye with Phillip by mentioning that he had told Phillip to leave home when he (Phillip) decided to become a Moslem. He said that, in the home, his wife was dominant and that she controlled all aspects of the household budget and child-rearing. However, for reasons that have already been mentioned, it appears that, on a less concrete level, he was actually in control of his family.

When we examine Mr V's grid, we must thus bear in mind

- (a) his dogmatism and rigidity,
- (b) the contradiction between his words and deeds,
- (c) the manner in which he dominated the family, and
- (d) his conflicts with his wife and children with particular reference to Phillip.

The main aim of the discussion of his grid will be to see to what extent the above points are corroborated.

### 3.7. Mr V's grid

#### 3.7.1. General

Mr V's grid consists of eighteen elements and seventeen constructs. He did not remember his father, so this element was omitted. As a result, the four sorts where this element is involved had to be left out. Construct 17 (Closer to each other-Not from the same parents: stepbrother) was impermeable, so was omitted from the computer analysis. The grid that was presented for analysis thus consisted of eighteen elements and sixteen constructs.

#### 3.7.2. Inter-construct relations

A detailed construct per construct analysis will not be done in this case, since, with the exception of construct 14, every construct is related to every other, at least indirectly. Many of the constructs are repetitive, but two related areas are covered. Mr V differentiates between

- (a) helpful people who give advice and encourage one, and unhelpful people who have no time for one or who are unable to give advice, and
- (b) open people that one can accept and get close to versus people who are not so open and whom one cannot get through to.

The construct which is unrelated to any of the others is construct 14 (Helpful people who are like a mother to others-People who are more distant towards others). With this construct, Mr V was applying an unusually stringent criterion for inclusion in the emergent pole.

Structurally, Mr V has a tight construct system. This suggests that he construes events from a limited vantage point, thus confirming the previous points made about his rigidity. It is clear that Mr V would find it threatening to extend his construct system when confronted with alternative views of the same events. Given Phillip's creativity, his rejection of his father's

way of life becomes understandable, and Mr V's reactions to Phillip's alternatives can now be seen in terms of the element of threat that this represented to Mr V's construct system. His avoiding the subject of Phillip during the sessions with the interviewers, and his refusal to either visit Phillip in hospital or to have him back at home should all be seen in terms of this. It is also quite possible that Mr V found his wife's view of events threatening where these did not coincide with his. However, this last point is made very tentatively at this stage, and will be taken up again.

### 3.7.3. Inter-element relations

An examination of the inter-element correlations reveals the emergence of two main clusters and one unique figure.

Cluster A covers fourteen of the eighteen elements in the grid. These elements are grouped in the following way:

Self (1), Brother (4), Sister (5),	
Ex-flame (7), Accepted Teacher (14)	
Boss (16), Successful Person (17),	
Ethical Person (19), Mother (2),	
Spouse (6)	- Pal (8), Rejecting Person (10),
	Threatening Person (12),
	Rejected Teacher (15).

It should be noted that, of the ten elements in the former group, the first eight are completely identified with one another, and that, of the four elements in the contrasting group, the last three are completely identified with one another. This is to be expected from the tightness of his construct system. Mother and Spouse, although positively perceived, are not as positively perceived as the other eight elements in the group. It is interesting that Mother and Spouse are completely related to each other, since this could suggest that his wife represents a maternal figure to him. This contradicts a previous interpretation of Mr V as the dominant figure in the family. This inter-

pretation will have to be reviewed in the light of further evidence. The fact that Mr V construes his wife in positive terms and does not group her with elements like Threatening Person and Rejecting Person is also at variance with what was said in the previous section regarding her possibly representing a threat to his construct system. This will also be reconsidered later.

Three elements are covered by Cluster B: Happy Person (18), Pitied Person (11) and Attractive Person (13). They are seen as alike, but the relationship among them is rather weak.

The unique figure is Ex-pal (9).

#### 3.7.4. Construct-element relations

Self, Brother, Sister, Ex-flame, Accepted Teacher, Boss, Successful Person and Ethical Person are considered people who can give advice (1), who are helpful and encouraging and whom one can talk to (2, 6, 7, 11, 18, 20, 21), who are on the same level as Self and not arrogant (3), who are open people that one can accept (4), whom one can get close to and get along with (9, 10, 16), and whom one can feel drawn to (12, 13). With the exception of construct 14, all the constructs in the grid are significantly related to these elements.

Generally, the opposite characteristics apply to Rejecting Person, Threatening Person, Rejected Teacher and Pal.

Mother and Spouse are seen as people who can give advice (1), who are helpful and encouraging and whom one can talk to (6, 7, 11, 18, 20, 21), and who are like a mother to others (14). These two elements are thus positively construed, but not as positively as the other eight elements with whom they are related, since fewer of the constructs apply and since those that do, are less strongly linked. It should be noted that these are the only two elements that are significantly related to construct 14.

It is difficult to determine the basis for the grouping of the three elements, Happy Person, Attractive Person and Pitied Person (see previous section) since no constructs are significantly related to the former two elements, and only the emergent poles of constructs 1 and 2 apply to Pitied Person. These elements thus appear rather neutral and are not construed strongly either way.

It is equally difficult to determine in what way Ex-pal is construed since no constructs relate significantly to this element.

If we examine the assigned construct, "Like I would like to be-Not like I would like to be", Mr V's ideal elements are: Mother, Brother, Sister, Spouse, Ex-flame, Pitied Person, Attractive Person, Accepted Teacher, Boss, Successful Person, Happy Person and Ethical Person. All the positively construed elements, with the exception of Self, are represented here. In addition, the three "neutral" elements are also represented, thus suggesting that positive, rather than negative, characteristics are attributed to element Cluster B.

The assigned construct, "Like my son, Phillip-Not like him", is extremely interesting since Phillip is considered to be like Self, Mother, Spouse, Attractive Person, Accepted Teacher, Boss, Successful Person, Happy Person and Ethical Person. Phillip is considered to be like seven of the ten positively construed elements and two of the three "neutral" elements. This is at variance with our previous interpretation of Mr V's relationship with Phillip.

Mr V's response to the third assigned construct shows that he attributes authoritarianism to the four negatively construed elements only.

At this stage in the analysis, three principal contradictions exist:

- (a) the manner in which he construes Phillip in the grid is at variance with the general attitude

- that he manifested to Phillip, and with Phillip's and Mrs V's reports on his attitude to Phillip,
- (b) the manner in which he construes his wife in the grid is at variance with what Mrs V said about their marital conflict and their marital relationship generally, and
  - (c) the fact that he does not see himself as being authoritarian is at variance with the rigid structure of his construct system as displayed in the grid, with Phillip's and Mrs V's accounts of his personality, and with the interviewers' own impressions of him.

All three of these points are crucial to an analysis of the V family, and will be re-examined in the light of further information.

### 3.7.5. Component grouping

The first three components together account for over 93% of the total grid variation. However, the information from these does not require discussion, since it is either repetitive or irrelevant.

### 3.8. Mrs V's verbal report

It has already been mentioned that Mrs V considered Phillip's "breakdown" to be related to

- (a) his father's drinking,
- (b) the arguments between her and her husband, and
- (c) his creativity being stifled by his work.

It was also mentioned that Mrs V seemed favourably disposed towards Phillip and was not averse to either visit him in hospital or to have him back at home. This, in addition with the fact that she seemed to have thought about the situation, pointed to a genuine concern for her son. However, Mrs V was not unequivocal in her sentiments towards Phillip. In describing him, she said: "His sense of humour only developed recently... He used to be very quiet, very stingy, very fond of money, and very sour...."

Mrs V's ambivalence towards Phillip is important if we are to understand the situation. Although Phillip had been ordered out of the house by his father and although it seemed that it was his father who did not wish to visit him in hospital or to have him back, it did not seem that Mrs V had taken, or was taking, any trouble to oppose her husband. It has been suggested that one reason for this was linked to Mr V's position of authority over his wife. However, it should be remembered that she had dared to confront him on issues that affected her, such as his drinking and their religious differences. It seems, therefore, that another possible reason for her acquiescence where Phillip was concerned lay in her own misgivings about Phillip. This point will be re-examined during the analysis of her grid.

The interviewers' general impression of Mrs V was that she was a quiet, polite woman, but that much lay beneath the surface of friendliness. Her antagonism towards her husband was manifested usually only when he was absent from the room, and the switch from the quiet, understanding wife to the spiteful woman intent on doing down her husband was so rapid that the effect was rather confusing. It seems that, like her husband, what she did and said in one situation often contradicted what she did and said in another. We will return to this later.

### 3.9. Mrs V's grid

#### 3.9.1. General

Mrs V's grid consists of eighteen elements and eighteen constructs. She was unable to think of a person who was threatening to her, so that this element was left out, as were the three related sorts.

As far as the elements, Mother, Father, Brother and Sister are concerned, it should be noted that Mrs V had been adopted by a family, and that these are her adopted relatives.

### 3.9.2. Inter-construct relations

An examination of the inter-construct correlations reveals the existence of four clusters and one isolated construct.

Cluster A incorporates the following constructs:

Stern	- Lenient (7)
Strict	- Sweet-natured (2)
Stern people	- People with a loving heart (5)
Keep things to themselves	- Speak out (17)
Do not come out with things	- Outspoken (14)
Sour, serious	- Humorous (15)
Good-hearted	- Never give (3).

It should be noted that construct 3 is not related to all the constructs in the cluster, but only to constructs 2 and 5.

The following constructs comprise Cluster B:

Worldly	- Serious (10)
Young: like worldly pleasures	- Old: religious (11)
More outgoing	- Religious (16)
Not as religious	- Very religious (18)
Less religious	- More religious (1)
Drink	- Do not drink (6, 9).

It should be noted with regard to the above that constructs 10, 11 and 16 are completely related to one another. Despite the different verbal labels, they represent a single construct. Constructs 6 and 9 are not related to all the constructs in the cluster, but only to constructs 10, 11 and 16.

Cluster C involves the following constructs:

Do not drink	- Drink (6, 9)
Understood Self	- Did not (4)

Good-hearted	- Never give (3)
Serious	- Worldly (10)
Old: religious	- Young: like worldly pleasures (11)
Religious	- More outgoing (16).

It should be evident that certain of the constructs in Cluster C also form part of either Cluster A or Cluster B. Cluster C is thus linked to both of the other clusters, and these two are indirectly linked to each other through the mediation of Cluster C.

Cluster D involves two constructs only:

People that one can get to know well	- People that one cannot get to know well (8)
Not educated	- Educated (20).

The constructs in this cluster are unrelated to any other clusters.

Construct 21 is the isolated construct in the grid (Make friends easily-Cannot make friends easily).

Two significant points emerge from the above.

The one relates to the content of the constructs in Cluster B. Five of the six constructs involved have direct bearing on religion. The fact that Mrs V uses this as a basis for construing people is in keeping with what was said earlier about her serious adherence to her religion. In addition, the fact that constructs 6 and 9 (referring to drinking) are linked in the way that they are to constructs 10, 11 and 16 suggests that she regards abstention from drink as being consistent with a religious attitude to life. It becomes clear that her husband's drinking was, in her view, inconsistent with both his professed adherence to religion and the meaning attributed by her to religion.

The second point relates to the structural aspects of Mrs V's construct system. She manages to maintain

a good balance between tightness and looseness. The existence of a few separate clusters points to her ability to depart from a rigid view of events, and, at the same time, the links among three of the clusters suggest an orderliness in her thought.

### 3.9.3. Inter-element relations

An inspection of the inter-element correlations suggests that many of the elements are not construed solely favourably or solely unfavourably. As a result, it is difficult to group all the elements into separate, relatively mutually exclusive clusters. This can be expected from the structural nature of this construct system.

Only one relatively clear-cut element cluster does emerge. The following elements are involved:

Self (1), Father (3), Ethical  
 Person (19), Attractive  
 Person (13), Happy Person (18) - Brother (4), Rejecting  
 Person (10), Boss (16).

It should be noted here that Father and Ethical Person are completely identified with each other. In addition, Happy Person is indirectly linked to Self and Boss through the other elements in the cluster, and Boss is indirectly linked through being contrasted with Father and Ethical Person.

With the exception of Successful Person (17), which is a unique figure, each of the remaining elements stands in some relation to one or more others. Spouse (6) is contrasted with Ex-flame (7) and Accepted Teacher (16) and likened to Mother (2), thus suggesting that Spouse and Mother are, in general, construed unfavourably. This is supported by the fact that Mother is also construed similarly to Rejected Teacher (15), a usually negatively connotative element. Sister (5) seems to be one of the least clear-cut elements in the grid in that, by being contrasted with Mother, she appears to be a favourably

perceived element, and by being likened to Brother and Rejecting Person, she appears to be negatively perceived. The strongest likeness is with Pitied Person (11). Pal (8) seems to be favourably construed, and Ex-pal (9) unfavourably.

We need to establish the basis for Mrs V's construal of most of the elements through an examination of the construct-element relations, since what emerges from this section is not very helpful.

#### 3.9.4. Construct-element relations

Mrs V sees herself as a person who has a sweet nature (1), understands others (4), does not drink (6, 9), is lenient (7), serious (10), religious (11, 16, 18), outspoken (14, 17), and who cannot make friends easily (21).

Although she attributes these characteristics to herself, they are not related very strongly to her.

Mrs V's response to the assigned construct, "Like I would like to be-Not like I would like to be", shows that her ideal elements are Father, Ethical Person and Attractive Person (three of the elements in the cluster presented in the previous section).

She considers Father and Ethical Person as people who understand her (4), are outspoken (14, 17), have a sweet nature (2), do not drink (6, 9), are lenient (7), serious (10), religious (11, 16, 18), and humorous (15). With the exceptions of constructs 15 and 17, the same characteristics apply to Attractive Person. It should be noted, however, that whereas the most important characteristics in terms of which she construes Father and Ethical Person are their understanding and outspokenness, the most important ones relating to Attractive Person involve her serious and religious attitude to life. Another important point is that seriousness is not incompatible with a sense of humour since both of these characteristics are attributed to Father and Ethical Person.

A crucial issue emerging from a comparison of the characteristics attributed to the three ideal elements with those attributed to Self, is that Mrs V construes herself in very much the same terms (with one or two exceptions) as the ideal elements. However, she refrained from aligning herself with the ideal elements when faced with having to reply to the more direct form of questioning involved in the presentation of the assigned construct.

The two elements that are contrasted most sharply with Self and the three ideal elements are Brother and Rejecting Person. Since these two are considered very similar to each other, we will focus only on the characteristics attributed to one of them. Rejecting Person is construed as being a person who is strict (2), never gives (3), drinks (6, 9), does not understand Self (4), is stern (5, 7), worldly (10, 11), does not come out with things and keeps things to herself (14, 17), is more outgoing (16), not very religious (18), and whom one cannot get to know well (8).

It becomes clear from the above that Mrs V prizes such characteristics as understanding, outspokenness, abstention from drink, leniency and a serious, religious attitude to life, and despises the opposite.

Spouse is construed as being someone who never gives (3), is strict (2), stern (5, 7), does not understand Self (4), drinks (6, 9), does not come out with things but keeps things to himself (14, 17), and is sour (15).

It appears that Mrs V construes her husband in an unfavourable light. It is interesting that the constructs referring to religion are not significantly related to Spouse. It follows from this that she does not see her husband as the religious man that he professes to be. However, the existence of low (but not significant) correlations between this element and constructs 1, 16 and 18 suggests that she is inclined to view him as religious rather than worldly.

It should be noted that certain of the elements that Mrs V seems to like, such as Ex-flame, Pal and Pitied

Person, are all considered worldly rather than religious. This seems to be the basis for her pitying Pitied Person. However, their redeeming features are such characteristics as outgoingness, outspokenness and/or sense of humour. This suggests that, although a religious attitude to life is a factor which influences Mrs V's liking of others, she is nevertheless inclined to forgive a lack of religion in the face of other favourable characteristics. This is important for an understanding of her relationship with her husband: she still would have been able to get on with him, despite his (in her view) not taking religion seriously, if she could construe him favourably in other respects. It seems, therefore, that the conflict between them was linked, not only with their religious differences or with her view of him as not being serious about his own religion, but with other factors as well. It is quite probable that, when Mrs V initiated an argument with her husband, she used their religious conflict as a vehicle for criticizing other aspects of her husband's personality or actions. We will review this interpretation in the next section.

Inspection of the assigned construct, "Like my son, Phillip-Not like him", reveals that Mrs V sees only her husband as being like Phillip. This is crucial since it confirms the point made previously about her not liking Phillip. How then are we to interpret

- (a) her apparent concern for him, which was markedly in contrast with her husband's lack of it, and
- (b) Phillip's opinion of his mother, which was that, even if he had never been really close to her, she was at least innocuous and far preferable to his father?

A plausible solution to both these problems is to view Mrs V in terms of the classic double-bind situation. In certain situations, she said and did one thing, and in other situations, she said and did the opposite. From observing how she had reacted to her husband in his presence, and her different reactions in his absence,

one can infer that she was quite capable of disguising her dislike of Phillip during certain of her interactions with him.

The possible effects of Mrs V's confusing attitude on Phillip, Mr V and on the family situation as a whole will be discussed in the conclusion.

### 3.7.5. Component grouping

The first six components together account for over 90% of the total grid variation. Components 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 will be omitted from the following discussion, since their information is either repetitive or irrelevant.

Component 2 accounts for over 27% of the total grid variation. The constructs involved contribute to over 75% of its variation, and the elements involved to over 83%. Rejected Teacher, Spouse and Mother are construed as being sour, keeping things to themselves and not coming out with them, being stern, religious and strict. The opposite characteristics apply to Ex-flame and Pitied Person.

This component is important since it shows that Mrs V is not necessarily bound by the general, more rigid view of events manifested in the first component. She is capable of construing elements like Ex-flame and Pitied Person favourably despite their not being religious, and of construing other elements unfavourably despite their religious attitude. This confirms what was said at the end of the previous section.

The fact that Spouse falls with the elements that are construed unfavourably despite their religious attitude demands that we modify the interpretation made about the role of their religious conflict in the previous section. Bearing in mind what was said previously about the constructs pertaining to religion being positively but not significantly related to this element, it appears from the information provided by component 2 that Mrs V is inclined to view her husband as religious rather than not. She construes him unfavourably, not because of a lack of

religious attitude, but despite his religious attitude, however weak or superficial this attitude might be in her opinion. The basis for her negative perception of her husband lies rather in, inter alia, his sourness, sternness and tendency to keep things to himself. In the light of this, the religious conflict appears far less relevant to an understanding of their marital relationship than was supposed at the outset, and, as was mentioned in the previous section, was probably a convenient starting point for Mrs V to hit at her husband.

### 3.10. Concluding comments

From the above analysis, Phillip emerges as an intelligent young man with creative potential and ambition, striving to become something different from what was prescribed by his social-familial environment. However, he set himself goals that this environment had not equipped him to handle and "broke down" under the stress.

The present interpretation views what happened to Phillip during the time that he was living away from his family as having precipitated his "breakdown". However, the reasons for his failure to actualise his goals are seen as related to his family situation.

Mr V emerges as a person with a generally dogmatic view of life and a rigid construct system, as a person intolerant of views different from his. This was manifested in his intolerance of Phillip's differing religious views, which led to his ordering Phillip to leave home, in his intolerance of his wife's differing views, which was partly a cause of their marital conflicts, and, within the interview situation, in his proselytizing to the interviewers. At the same time, Mr V did not adhere strictly to his beliefs and the same man who preached against "vice" and "sin" indulged in heavy drinking.

Mr V's efforts to preserve the integrity of his construct system led to his invalidating the constructs of others when these contradicted his. It is in this light that we can interpret the apparent contradictions between the manner in which he reacted to Phillip's "deviation" from his (Mr V's) way of life and his positive construal of Phillip in the grid, and between the conflict between him and his wife and the positive manner in which his wife was construed in the grid. In order to preserve the integrity of his construct system, he had to see both Phillip and his wife as he wanted to see them. He thus denied any actions of theirs which contradicted his view of them. In this manner, by denying what Phillip was striving to be, he invalidated Phillip's own constructions of himself. It is not unreasonable to assume that the relationship between him and Phillip had been characterized by this type of invalidation for a substantial period of time.

Furthermore, Mr V's tendency to say one thing and do another can be seen as having had the effect of mystifying Phillip's experience.

Mr V, however, was not the sole party responsible for invalidating and mystifying Phillip's constructs. Mrs V, although not impervious to Phillip's needs, and although appearing to understand Phillip to a considerable extent, did not like her son. This was manifested in her construing Phillip as similar to her husband, in her generally describing Phillip in the same terms as she used to describe her husband and in her lack of initiative in doing anything to oppose her husband's decision not to visit Phillip in hospital. As a result, although not being directly responsible for invalidating Phillip's constructs, by not supporting Phillip against her husband, she contributed to her husband's invalidatory actions towards Phillip in a passive manner.

However, although not being directly an invalidator, one can attribute Phillip's mystification to her to an even greater degree than one can attribute it to Mr V.

From the data known, Mr V appears to have been a confusing person only in so far as his own actions and beliefs were contradictory. Although this is pathogenic, it is not pathogenic to the same extent as Mrs V's confusing behaviour since she was confusing in her actions and reactions towards others. This was manifested in her attitude towards both her husband and Phillip. She even succeeded in confusing the interviewers. It was mentioned in the analysis that her confusing behaviour represented the behaviour described in the classic double-bind situation.

Phillip's constructs of events were thus invalidated by his father and, indirectly, by his mother, and mystified by his mother and, to a lesser extent, by his father.

Further mystification within the family environment was produced by the parents' differing constructions of events.

In the light of such invalidation and mystification by his parents, it is no wonder that Phillip attempted to find validation elsewhere, among members of his own age-group. However, although Phillip found more validation from that source than from his family (hence the preference for the younger generation manifested in his grid), he was unable to find complete confirmation, so that his "breakdown" was precipitated.

Phillip's schizophrenic symptoms gain intelligibility when viewed against this background. The thought-disorder that he manifested during his schizophrenic state can be explained if one takes into account the confusion that he was subjected to, both at home and outside home. His preoccupation with art, poetry and religion appear, not so much as delusional material, but as the genuine interests of someone who has rejected the conventional religions of his social-familial background in favour of alternative, more esoteric ones, in the hope that this will provide the answer that he is seeking. One should also bear in mind that his working-class background did not adequately equip him to understand such matters as

poetic symbolism or Zen Buddhism, and that his attempt to assimilate this material foreign to his social class background must have been accompanied by, and contributed to confusion. Furthermore, one wonders whether his preoccupation with these matters would have been so readily labelled delusional had he come from an upper-middle-class background.

In conclusion, it appears that what was ascertained about Phillip's social-familial environment explains his schizophrenic behaviour to a considerable extent. Some of the factors underlying the dynamics of the interpersonal relationships within Phillip's family were determined. However, what the data gathered fail to explain is the reasons behind Mrs V's attitudes and actions. That she acted in a mystifying way was ascertained, but there was nothing in her grid, nor anything in what she said, that could suggest why she acted in such a confusing way. All that can be concluded about her is that she disliked both Phillip and her husband because they were sour and stingy and lacked a sense of humour. However, this does not appear to be a satisfactory explanation and, although enough was ascertained to show her role in Phillip's schizophrenia, she herself remains an enigmatic character. A fuller picture of the V family would thus warrant further investigation.

#### 4. STEPHEN F

##### 4.1. Interviews: number and form

The interviewers'\* initial contact with the F family was with Mr and Mrs F. Stephen had, at this stage, been in the mental hospital for one week. During this initial session with Mr and Mrs F, the aims of the study were explained to them, and their co-operation was secured. An appointment was made to see them the following week. When the interviewers arrived on this second occasion, Mrs F was waiting for them and apologetically said that her husband had gone for a drive with some of the children but had not yet returned. He had not forgotten about the appointment and had mentioned to her that he would be back on time. The interviewers wanted to interview Mrs F while waiting for Mr F, but she shyly told them that she was rather frightened at the prospect and preferred to be interviewed after her husband. The interviewers then waited for a while and, when Mr F had not returned after an hour, left, and postponed the interview to the following week.

During this week, Interviewer 1 held an unstructured session with Stephen in hospital. The structured interviews with Mr and Mrs F were carried out by Interviewer 1 at the end of that week, and, on this occasion, Mr F apologized for not having kept his appointment on the previous occasion, and explained that his car had broken down while on their drive.

After four weeks in hospital, Stephen's condition had improved and he was discharged. Interviewer 1 had made an appointment to hold the structured interview with him at home. However, when she went to see him, Mrs F informed her that Stephen had relapsed after having been home for a few days, and was back in hospital. The interviewer conducted the structured session with him in hospital three weeks later. Contact was thus maintained with the F family for a period of two months.

\*Interviewers 1 and 2

It should be noted that all the interviews were conducted in Afrikaans.

A summary of what has been said is presented in the following table:

Session No.	Inter= viewer(s)	Family Member(s)	Struc= tured/ Unstruc= tured	Length of time (hrs)	Place of interview
1	1,2	Father, Mother	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Home
2	1,2	Mother	U	1	Home
3	1	Son	U	$\frac{1}{2}$	Hospital
4	1	Father	S	$1\frac{1}{2}$	Home
	1	Mother	S	$1\frac{1}{2}$	
5	1	Son	S	1	Hospital

#### 4.2. Initial information regarding Stephen

Stephen is a seventeen year old working-class Coloured male. He completed Standard Two at school before going out to work at the age of twelve years. He held an unskilled job at a bakery in the vicinity of his home for five years, then, a month prior to his "breakdown", began work for the Cape Town City Council as a gardener in a municipal park. He had sought this employ because it was better paid than the previous one.

For reasons to be discussed shortly, he was admitted to a mental hospital and diagnosed catatonic schizophrenic. He alternated between phases of catatonic excitement, during which he manifested violent behaviour and thought-disorder, and catatonic stupor, during which he was socially withdrawn and emotionally blunted. In hospital, he told the psychiatrist in charge of his case that he had been smoking dagga and that, just prior to his "breakdown", a friend had given him a pill which he had taken. He did not know what it was. He was discharged after

four weeks in hospital, but re-admitted after a few days, in a catatonic stupor. His schizophrenic symptoms persisted for some time before he began to respond to drug treatment and started showing signs of improvement. Since his schizophrenic symptoms had persisted for some time, psychiatric staff did not diagnose his illness as a drug psychosis. They took the view that the drugs had precipitated the schizophrenia and that, even had he not taken drugs, a schizophrenia would have been precipitated by some or other stress factor at a later stage in his life.

On both occasions that the interviewer saw Stephen, the severity of his symptoms was diminishing, since, on the first occasion, he was scheduled for discharge, and on the second occasion, he had already been in hospital for some weeks since his relapse. Despite this, however, although not in a stuporous state, he was socially withdrawn and emotionally blunted to a substantial degree. He was not at all spontaneous and replied to questions with difficulty and cryptically.

The bulk of the information on the circumstances surrounding Stephen's "breakdown" was obtained from his mother. Stephen had apparently been restless for three days prior to his "breakdown". He had left home on the second day and stayed away for thirty-six hours. On returning home, he appeared confused and restless, and remained so the whole afternoon and evening. On the following day, Mr and Mrs F went off to work early in the morning. Neighbours then saw Stephen walking naked in the vicinity. He then returned home, and, in a violent outburst, broke some of the windows and attempted to throttle one of his younger brothers. The brothers then called the police, who had him taken to the mental hospital.

#### 4.3. General information regarding the F family

Stephen is the eldest of six brothers and one sister. Mr F is a forty year old man, who was born in a rural district of the Cape and who moved to Cape Town as a young man. He was a semi-skilled worker, who had been employed

by the Cape Town City Council for twenty-three years. He had completed Standard Three at school. Mrs F was thirty-eight years old at the time of the investigation. She was also born in a rural district of the Cape and moved to Cape Town shortly before meeting Mr F. She had completed Standard Two at school, then found employment as a char. For a few years after getting married, she was unemployed since she had to attend to the children. At the time of the investigation, she had been working again for some time and was employed as a packer in a factory.

The interviewers' general impression of the F family was that it was a relatively normal working-class family. Both parents had to work hard in order to make ends meet, but, in accordance with the pattern typical for this socio-economic class, the family appeared to be father-dominated. Both Mr and Mrs F reported being content with their work and with their general life-style. Their leisure time appeared adequately balanced; both parents spent a good deal of time at home with each other and the rest of the family; Mr and Mrs F each had a circle of friends so that each spent some time visiting friends. They seldom went out to the cinema or to parties, but were quiet people. Stephen, by contrast, had been extremely outgoing prior to his "breakdown" and had spent a lot of his leisure time going to the cinema and to parties with friends. He had also spent some time with a girl-friend. The reports given by the three family members interviewed regarding job-satisfaction, leisure activities and patterns of dominance within the family were in essential agreement, and, with one exception, each one seemed to know how the others felt about their work, what they did with their spare time, and who was responsible for which tasks within the family.

The exception relates to the question as to who had been most involved with Stephen during the course of his life. Whereas both Mr and Mrs F reported that Stephen had been closer to his father and had spent more

time with his father than with his mother and not confided in the latter, Stephen reported having spent more time with his mother and having confided in her rather than in his father. He did agree with his parents, however, on the point that his father had been most responsible for disciplining him.

It should be pointed out that Mrs F mentioned to the interviewer that, at the age of fourteen years, Stephen had, for no apparent reason, become extremely aggressive towards his mother and had thrown boiling water at her face. He had then refrained from speaking to her for two years, and had only started to speak to her again when he started to go out with his girl-friend.

In the light of this, it would appear that Mr and Mrs F's reports are more accurate than Stephen's. Quite possibly, Stephen reported being closer to his mother than to his father in order to compensate for his past actions and attitudes towards her.

Apart from that one incident relating to Stephen's aggression towards his mother and apart from the aggression that he expressed towards his younger brother at the time of his "breakdown", the F family appeared relatively free of conflict. The parents themselves appeared to be quiet, pleasant people who seemed to have a good marital relationship. Mr F was protective towards his wife and she seemed to rely on him for emotional support. At the same time, both parents expressed concern for Stephen and were anxious to know from the interviewers how soon he would recover and exactly what his illness meant.

From this description of the F family situation, little emerges as possibly having a relation to Stephen's schizophrenia. However, we will attempt to review the situation in the light of further information.

#### 4.4. Stephen's verbal report

The various points that the interviewer observed concerning Stephen's psychological state during the interviews have, of necessity, been presented in a previous section.

Little information was obtained from him. In reply to the interviewer's question about the circumstances which he saw as possibly related to his "breakdown", he said that he did not know. He remembered nothing about what had happened other than having been confused. He did not mention to the interviewer anything about his drug-taking, even though he had mentioned this to the psychiatrist in charge of him, who had then informed his parents.

He said nothing about the rift between him and his mother than had existed for two years: this information was obtained from Mrs F.

His view of the patterns of dominance within the family was at odds with the reports of his parents and, although he saw his father as being generally dominant and being responsible for the discipline of him and his siblings (thus concurring with his parents' reports on these issues), he saw his mother as being in charge of the family's financial matters and of running the household. He also described himself as having been closer to and having spent more time with his mother than with his father. It would appear from his attributing to his mother roles that neither she nor her husband attributed to her that he was not completely in touch with what was going on in his family. The possible reason for his reporting that he had been closer to his mother than to his father has already been mentioned.

However, he was not totally out of touch with what was going on in the family, since he described their social life in much the same terms as they. In addition, he seemed to know how they felt about their work, since his description of them as being satisfied with their respective employments was in agreement with their own views on the matter.

He felt that his "breakdown" could not have been related to any circumstances surrounding either his social relationships or his work situation. He said that he led an active social life and was on good terms with his

friends, and that he liked his new job and got on with his colleagues at work.

#### 4.5. Stephen's grid

##### 4.5.1. General

The grid obtained from Stephen consists of eleven elements and three constructs. The element, Spouse, was omitted, since he was unmarried and he had broken up with his girl-friend a short while before his "break-down". The element, Ex-pal, was also omitted, since he was not aware of having had any friends in the recent past with whom he was no longer in contact, and the school-friends that he had had in the more distant past, he could no longer remember. The elements, Rejecting Person, Pitied Person, Threatening Person, Rejected Teacher, Successful Person and Ethical Person were the other elements left out, since he could not think of people who were representative of these roles. Since at least one of these elements was involved in sixteen of the nineteen sorts, these sorts had to be omitted.

What little information was obtained from this grid was done with considerable difficulty. However, although Stephen was withdrawn, he was trying his best. It appeared to the interviewer that he was experiencing difficulty in both thinking and remembering, so that his inability to think of more elements can be attributed to that. This is substantiated by the fact that he was able to name those elements that are easier to think of, such as family members and friends. However, the author's experience with normal persons' performance on this same grid is that most people encounter difficulty with finding people who are representative of elements like Rejecting Person, Pitied Person and Threatening Person. This would support the interpretation that Stephen, as a result of his psychological state, was experiencing difficulty with the grid rather than being unco-operative.

It should be pointed out that the author had considered leaving Stephen for some time and doing the grid at a later stage, in the hope that he would be more responsive. However, since the aim was to obtain grids from the patients at a time when they had just recovered from the worst of their symptoms, it was considered inadvisable to test Stephen later than the other patients had been tested.

#### 4.5.2. Inter-construct relations

The three constructs obtained from Stephen, "Drinks-Does not" (5), "Works-Is still at school" (6), and "Has never been mentally ill-Has become mentally ill" (17) were unrelated to one another.

#### 4.5.3. Inter-element relations

An examination of the inter-element correlations shows that two definite clusters and two unique figures emerge.

Cluster A involves five elements which are completely identified with one another: Mother (2), Father (3), Pal (8), Attractive Person (13), and Happy Person (18).

Cluster B involves four elements which are completely identified with one another: Brother (4), Ex-flame (7), Accepted Teacher (14), and Boss (16).

The two clusters are unrelated to each other.

The two unique figures are Self (1) and Sister (5).

Since the above grouping is based on the position of the elements on only three constructs, it is not particularly meaningful to draw any conclusions about the relations between the various elements or about the structural aspects of the grid.

#### 4.5.4. Construct-element relations

The basis for the grouping of the elements in Cluster A seems to be Stephen's view of them as being people who drink (5). However, the relationship between

that construct and these elements, although significant, is rather weak.

The basis for the grouping of the elements in Cluster B is Stephen's view of them as being people who do not drink (5). Once again, the relationship is weak.

The fact that the elements in Cluster A are not significantly related to the elements in Cluster B despite the fact that construct 5 is significantly related to both (with the one pole being applicable to the one cluster and the contrasting pole to the other) is the result of the degrees of freedom being particularly small. Consequently, the correlation between an element in the one cluster and an element in the other, although high (.87), is not significant. However, these two clusters are contrasted with each other.

As far as the two unique figures are concerned, Stephen views himself as someone who has become mentally ill (17) and his sister as someone who is still at school (6).

It should be noted that each element is viewed in terms of only one construct. However, once again it would be dangerous to draw any conclusions from this. It would be absurd to say that all the elements are construed pre-emptively, since there were only three constructs in terms of which they could have been construed in the first place.

#### 4.5.5. Component grouping

Although the composition of the three components in Stephen's grid is presented in Appendix G, this will not be discussed since the fact that there were only three constructs renders the information psychologically meaningless.

#### 4.6. Mr F's verbal report

Both the content of Mr F's report and the general impression that he gave the interviewers have been discussed in previous sections, so that this will not be repeated here.

#### 4.7. Mr F's grid

##### 4.7.1. General

Mr F's grid consists of eighteen elements and eighteen constructs. Threatening Person was the element omitted, so that the three sorts pertaining to this element were excluded.

##### 4.7.2. Inter-construct relations

An examination of the inter-construct correlations reveals the existence of four clusters and two unrelated constructs.

Cluster A involves the following constructs:

- |                                 |   |   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Give to others readily          | - | Let it be known that they have given (17) |
| Speak nicely                    | - | Do not (2)                                |
| Good-hearted; help others       | - | Think only of themselves (3)              |
| Like to give to and help others | - | Never give (7)                            |
| Gentle                          | - | Coarse: swear when they speak (8).        |

It should be noted that constructs 2 and 8 are completely related to each other, so that different verbal labels are actually referring to the same construct. The same applies to constructs 3 and 7.

Cluster B involves the following constructs:

- |                              |   |   |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Give to others readily       | - | Let it be known that they have given (17) |
| Friendly: not arrogant       | - | Arrogant (6)                              |
| Can make friends with anyone | - | More shy (16)                             |
| Friendly                     | - | Arrogant (18, 20).                        |

It should be noted that constructs 6, 16, 18 and 20 are completely related to one another, so that once again, a single construct is represented by different verbal labels. It should also be noted that Cluster A is linked to Cluster B through construct 17, which is superordinate to the constructs in both clusters.

Cluster C is not really a cluster, since it involves a single construct repeated five times:

Like to go out - Stay at home (4, 9, 10, 14, 15)

Cluster D is also not really a cluster, since it involves a single construct expressed verbally in two slightly differing ways: construct 1 (Church-going people-Not church-going people) is completely related to construct 11 (Like to go to church-Do not go to church).

The two unrelated constructs are:

Social drinkers - Never drink (5)

Have male interests - Have female interests (21)

The above suggests that Mr F's construct system is rather impoverished, since his construct system as expressed in his grid in fact consists of eight constructs out of a possible total of eighteen. However, since there is no evidence to suggest that an elaboration of his construct system would have constituted a threat to it, we have to view his construct system in terms of its being a manifestation of the restricted code of his socio-economic class position, and as its being an adequate means of coping with the contingencies of his particular social environment. This would be in keeping with the interviewers' general impression of the F family as a very typically working-class family. If one accepts this, then the nature of Mr F's constructs does not appear abnormal in any way.

#### 4.7.3. Inter-element relations

Four clusters and four unique figures emerge from an examination of the inter-element correlations.

The following elements are involved in Cluster A:

Pal (8), Accepted Teacher (14),  
 Successful Person (17),  
 Ethical Person (19) - Spouse (6).

It should be noted here that the four elements comprising the one pole of this cluster are completely identified with one another, and that Spouse is weakly

although significantly contrasted with them.

Cluster B involves the following elements:

Brother (4), Attractive  
Person (13), Boss (16) - Rejected Teacher (15).

The three elements comprising the one pole of this cluster are completely identified with one another.

Cluster C involves the following elements:

Mother (2), Ex-flame (7),  
Happy Person (18) - Ex-pal (9).

Two points should be noted with regard to the elements in this cluster. Mother and Ex-flame are completely identified with each other, and Happy Person is weakly, although significantly, related to them. In addition, Mother and Happy Person are viewed as similar to Attractive Person and Boss and as different from Rejected Teacher, and Ex-pal is viewed as similar to Rejected Teacher. As a result, Cluster B is closely linked to Cluster C.

Only two elements are involved in Cluster D in a weak, although significant, positive relationship: Self (1) and Spouse. Spouse thus links Cluster D to Cluster A.

The unique figures are Father (3), Sister (5), Rejecting Person (10) and Pitied Person (11).

In the case of certain of the elements, it can be inferred which are positively and which are negatively construed. It would appear, from the objective connotations of some of the role titles that Mother, Brother, Ex-flame, Attractive Person, Boss and Happy Person are viewed favourably and that Ex-pal and Rejected Teacher are viewed unfavourably. The basis for the grouping of the elements in Clusters A and D and for the position of the unrelated elements cannot be inferred from the above.

An examination of the assigned construct, "Like I would like to be-Not like I would like to be", reveals that Mr F's ideal elements are five of the six favourably construed elements just mentioned (Mother being the exception)

as well as all the elements in Clusters A and D. This would suggest that the basis for contrasting Spouse with the other elements in Cluster A is not one of liking or disliking.

Mr F's construal of Stephen appears unclear in that he views Stephen as being like Self and Brother, two positively construed elements, and Rejecting Person, an element with an objective negative connotation. Since we know nothing about Mr F's perception of Rejecting Person by virtue of its being unrelated to any other element, this will have to be reviewed in the following section.

Mr F attributes authoritarianism to Father, Spouse, Ex-pal and Attractive Person. His attribution of this characteristic to his wife is at variance with the interviewers' view of her as a submissive woman who was totally dependent on her husband for emotional support. This will also have to be reviewed.

#### 4.7.4. Construct-element relations

In this section, we will examine the basis for Mr F's construal of some of the elements in an attempt to answer some of the questions raised thus far.

The same characteristic relates significantly to Self and Spouse: that of being the sort of person who stays at home (4, 9, 10, 14, 15).

Ex-pal and Rejected Teacher, the two negatively construed elements in the grid are viewed in the same terms. They are seen as being arrogant (6, 18, 20), shy (16), as people who do not speak to others nicely but who are coarse and swear when they speak (2, 8), as people who think only of themselves and never give (3, 7), as people who like to stay at home (4, 9, 10, 14, 15) and as people who let it be known when they have given something (17).

It is important to note that Ex-pal and Rejected Teacher are construed unfavourably despite their similarity

to Self and Spouse on the basis of liking to stay at home. This would suggest that constructs 4, 9, 10, 14 and 15 do not constitute a basis for Mr F's favourable or unfavourable perception of people.

No constructs are significantly related to the four elements comprising the one pole of Cluster A. The three elements comprising the one pole of Cluster B have only one characteristic applying significantly, that of not being church-going (1, 11). No constructs apply significantly to two of the four unique figures, Rejecting Person and Pitied Person. As far as the other two unique figures are concerned, Father is construed unfavourably, as being someone who thinks only of himself and never gives (3, 7) and who lets it be known when he has given something (17), and Sister is also construed slightly unfavourably in that she lets it be known when she has given something (17).

Some important points emerge from the above. Mr F does not appear to be aware of his feelings for people other than disliked people. Strong feelings are expressed towards the three disliked elements in the grid, Father, Ex-pal and Rejected Teacher (particularly the latter two) and, to some extent, towards Sister. However, he appears to be rather neutral towards the other elements in the grid, since either no constructs are significantly applicable to them, or, when there exist significantly related constructs, these are relatively neutral and indicate neither a liking or a disliking of the elements concerned.

This implies that he gets on with people, not because of any clearly positive construal of them, but because of the absence of a negative construal. He is aware of the basis for disliking people; the basis for liking people, however, constitutes the submerged pole of one or more constructs and thus occurs at a less verbal or conscious level of functioning.

As a result, little can be ascertained about his perception of himself and his wife other than the fact that he construes neither himself nor her in negative terms. The constructs applicable to them are of a neutral

nature. However, the fact that they both like to stay at home suggests that they are satisfied with each other and with their family life in general, since they are not attempting to escape each other or their children by being away from home.

To infer from the fact that they are construed similarly on the basis of a "superficial" characteristic, that their marital relationship lacks any psychological depth would be to deny the role of their socio-economic class position on their perception of events: firstly, what appears to be superficial to a middle-class observer is not necessarily superficial to the working-class person concerned; secondly, the fact that no positive characteristic applies significantly to him and to his wife could well be the result of its being submerged, an interpretation which is in keeping with the notion of the restricted speech-code which is attributed to working-class individuals.

If we now review Mr F's view of Stephen in the light of the above, it appears that Stephen is not construed unfavourably by his father, since he is seen as being like three neutral elements. Furthermore, in terms of what has been said about Mr F not being directly aware of the basis for his perception of elements that he does not dislike, and thus appearing neutral, it is quite likely that Stephen is construed favourably. However, since Rejecting Person does tend to have an objective negative connotation, this interpretation is put forward tentatively at this stage.

Once again, we have to conclude, at this stage in the analysis, that there is no evidence which would support an interpretation of Stephen's schizophrenia as being related to anything in his family situation. It should be pointed out that what has been said above could lead to an erroneous interpretation in the following way: it would be easy to say that, since Mr F had a construct system where the basis for his liking of people was submerged and not often verbally expressed, Stephen was subjected to a lack of validation by his father. However

this would imply that Stephen, through contact with middle-class norms, felt a lack in his working-class family environment, or more precisely, a lack in his father's working-class constructs of events. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Stephen had, in any way, been in contact with middle-class norms. He was involved in a working-class occupation, did not have a high degree of formal education, was in contact with working-class friends, and was generally very removed from middle-class outlooks on events.

#### 4.7.5. Component grouping

The first four components together contribute to over 91% of the total grid variation. Only component 2 will be discussed here, since component 1 provides information that has been discussed in previous sections and since components 3 and 4 provide information irrelevant to the main argument.

Over 84% of the variation of component 2 is accounted for by constructs 3, 7, 1, 11, 4, 9, 10, 14 and 15, and over 80% by elements 1, 3, 6, 10 and 11. Father and Rejecting Person are seen as people who think only of themselves and never give, church-going, and as liking to go out. The opposite characteristics apply to Self, Spouse and Pitied Person.\*

The information that this component provides about Mr F's construal of himself and his wife is important, since the characteristics encompassed by the applicable poles of constructs 3 and 7 are favourable. It will be remembered, however, that these did not relate at a significant level to these two elements. This therefore supports the interpretation made previously about Mr F's construing himself and his wife favourably, but at a not very conscious level.

\*It should be noted that this component does not provide totally accurate information. Pitied Person is, in fact, construed as a church-going person.

The information provided about Rejecting Person is also important, since this element has thus far been an unknown quantity. It becomes apparent from the characteristics encompassed by the applicable poles of constructs 3 and 7 that this element is construed unfavourably. However, Mr F's negative construal of this element is not strong, since these constructs are not significantly correlated with this element. Seeing that Rejecting Person was one of the three elements that Mr F saw as being like Stephen, there is the suggestion that, in certain respects, Stephen is construed slightly unfavourably by his father. However, since the other two elements likened to Stephen are perceived slightly positively, there are no grounds for inferring that Mr F manifested a particularly strong dislike of his son or that there was ambivalence to any great degree.

What has been discussed about Mr F's construct system thus still fails to explain Stephen's schizophrenia in any way.

#### 4.8. Mrs F's verbal report

This has, of necessity, been discussed in previous sections, so will not be repeated here.

#### 4.9. Mrs F's grid

##### 4.9.1. General

Mrs F's repertory grid consists of seventeen elements and fifteen constructs. She could not remember any of the teachers that she had had at school, so that elements 14 and 15, and the sorts in which these elements were involved were left out.

##### 4.9.2. Inter-construct relations

An inspection of the inter-construct correlations reveals the existence of two main construct clusters and three isolated constructs.

Cluster A involves the following constructs:

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Likes "high society"          | - Does not like "high society" (13)    |
| False: talk behind one's back | - Not false (3)                        |
| Unhelpful                     | - Always help when things go wrong (1) |
| Unhelpful                     | - Helpful (4)                          |
| Arrogant*                     | - Friendly (19)                        |
| Like to run around            | - Do not like to run around (21)       |
| Unhelpful                     | - Helpful (16).                        |

It should be noted that constructs 19 and 21 are each related only to construct 13, and that construct 16 is related only to constructs 1, 3 and 4. These links are indirect.

Cluster B involves the following constructs:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Approachable: people that one can talk to               | - People that one cannot talk to (8)                      |
| People that one can get to know                         | - People that one cannot get to know (5, 12, 14)          |
| People with whom one can have a friendship relationship | - On too high a level for a friendship relationship (18). |

Constructs 5, 12 and 14 are completely related to one another, and thus constitute a single construct repeated three times. Construct 18 is linked to the constructs in this cluster through construct 8.

The three unrelated constructs are:

\*The translation from the Afrikaans, "Kop in die lug", is not totally accurate.

- People from whom one cannot  
get advice - People from whom one can get  
advice (11)
- Like chatting, singing,  
drinking - More quiet (15)
- Responsible - Irresponsible (17).

Structurally, this construct system manifests an adequate balance between tightness and looseness. The construct system is, on the whole, organized, but not in a rigid manner.

An examination of the content of the constructs referring to arrogance-friendliness, helpfulness-unhelpfulness, and outgoingness-quietness reveals a basic similarity to some of the constructs in Mr F's grid. This similarity in construal, although not necessarily implying a good marital relationship, would tend to suggest that their marital relationship had been characterized by agreement on various points at least, thus substantiating what has been said thus far in this connection.

#### 4.9.3. Inter-element relations

Three element clusters and three unique figures are apparent from an examination of the inter-element correlations.

Cluster A involves the following elements:

- Spouse (6), Ethical Person (19)  
Self (1), Ex-pal (9) - Threatening Person (12),  
Brother (4), Rejecting Person (10).

Ex-pal is not significantly related to either Self or Rejecting Person, but indirectly, through the other elements in this cluster. Spouse and Ethical Person are completely identified with each other.

Cluster B involves the following elements:

- Pal (8), Attractive  
Person (13) - Ex-flame (7), Successful  
Person (17).

Successful Person is indirectly linked to this cluster through a highly significant relation with Ex-flame.

Cluster C involves the following elements:

Father (3), Pitied Person (11) - Happy Person (18),  
Rejecting Person (10).

Father, Pitied Person and Rejecting Person are related in the above very indirectly, through being linked with Happy Person. The relationships among the former three elements are thus indirect.

The three unique figures are Mother (2), Sister (5) and Boss (16).

What is particularly interesting about the above is the position of Self and Spouse. Mrs F sees herself and her husband as being alike, thus again suggesting the existence of a basic compatibility between them. It is evident that she views herself and her husband favourably, since they are contrasted with Threatening Person and Rejecting Person, both elements with a usually negative connotation. The fact that her husband is contrasted with these two elements suggests that she views him as accepting and non-threatening. This is in keeping with the interviewers' impression of Mr F as essentially supportive to his wife.

Mrs F's response to the assigned construct, "Like my son-Not like my son" indicates that she sees a similarity between Stephen and only one element in the grid: Spouse. Since Spouse appears to be a particularly favourably construed element, it would seem that Stephen is viewed in positive terms by his mother. This confirms what has been said previously about there being no suggestion of family conflict.

#### 4.9.4. Construct-element relations

The characteristics applicable to Self and Spouse will be discussed in this section.

Self is construed as not false (3), helpful (4, 16), approachable and somebody that one can talk to (8), someone who can give advice (11) and who does not like to run around (21).

The same characteristics apply to Spouse. In addition, he is seen as someone who always helps when things go wrong (1), and who does not like "high society" (13). The characteristic represented by the relevant pole of construct 1 is related very strongly to this element.

The information from this section confirms that Mrs F sees herself and her husband favourably and that they are seen as alike in many respects.

#### 4.9.5. Component grouping

No further relevant information emerges from an examination of the components so that no discussion is warranted here.

#### 4.10. Concluding comments

The above analysis of Stephen's family situation has not been successful in making Stephen's schizophrenia socially intelligible.

The information obtained from the three family members investigated indicates that Stephen's experience within the family was marked by an absence of invalidation and mystification. There appear to be no grounds for suggesting that either his father's or his mother's relationship with him was pathogenic in any way. Furthermore, there was no evidence to suggest the existence of any conflict between his parents. Stephen's extra-familial social relationships also appeared satisfactory.

There are three possible interpretations for these results.

The first relates to the problems involved with a psychiatric diagnosis of schizophrenia. Schizophrenia encompasses such a broad range of behaviour that it is quite possible that, when one is dealing with schizophrenia,

one is working, not with a single entity, but with two or even more. This problem is particularly applicable to Stephen's case since there was the additional factor of what the psychiatric staff termed a toxic psychosis superimposed on an underlying schizophrenia. Even though Stephen's symptoms persisted for a long time subsequent to his drug intake, with the result that an unequivocal psychiatric diagnosis of schizophrenia was made, the issue remains problematic: is a schizophrenia precipitated by drugs equivalent to one precipitated by a purely social factor? The argument that he would not have indulged in dagga smoking in the first place unless something had been wrong, cannot really be applied here, since, in the social environment in which Stephen moved, dagga smoking is not such a freak incident and is more symptomatic of social pathology rather than psychopathology.

The implication of this first interpretation is that the diagnosis of schizophrenia in Stephen's case was incorrect. This would therefore not negate any of Laing's ideas on schizophrenia, but would point to the need of research aiming at determining the relationship between schizophrenia precipitated by drugs and schizophrenia precipitated by other factors.

The second possible interpretation of the results on this family has bearing on Stephen's withdrawn state at the time of the investigation, and on Mr F's lack of introspection. Both resulted in a paucity of information. Mr F's lack of introspection was seen as related to his working-class position, or, more precisely, to the effect of this on his mode of construing. It is quite possible that Stephen's schizophrenia had caused him to repress any disturbing events, so that these were not communicated to the interviewer, either directly or through the grid. As far as Mr F was concerned, there was a strong suggestion that many of the characteristics that he attributed to some of the elements in his grid were submerged. Consequently, he was able to verbalize his construal of certain elements, but not of others. The problem here

relates to the fact that the repertory grid is a largely verbal instrument and that it was an inadequate means of tapping the construct system of someone who functions preverbally to some extent.

It should also be pointed out that the interviewers were unable to obtain much information during the less structured sessions with both Mr and Mrs F. Both Mr and Mrs F seemed to be aware of the social gap that separated them from the interviewers, so that the interaction between themselves, and between them and the interviewers was stilted.

This second interpretation thus suggests that there might have been pathogenic characteristics in the F family, but that the above-mentioned factors were responsible for these not being manifested during the interviews. The implications of this for further research in the area will be presented in the following section.

The third possibility is that this was indeed a case of schizophrenia with no invalidation and mystification. If this was so, it casts a serious doubt on the range of application of Laing's theory. However, this interpretation has to remain but a possibility since the possibility of one or both of the other two being applicable confounds the issue.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. Implications of present study for social-familial research into schizophrenia

An assessment of the results presented in the previous section indicates that, in three of the four cases investigated, the schizophrenic symptoms were made intelligible when placed in their appropriate familial-social context. The concepts of invalidation and mystification, as put forward by Laing and Esterson (1970) and Esterson (1972) were found, in these three cases, to comprise an effective theoretical framework in terms of which the experience of the schizophrenic could be viewed.

What is particularly important is that the invalidation and mystification was, in each of the three cases, manifested in different ways and the result of a combination of totally different factors.

Broadly speaking, the invalidation and mystification in Alan S's case were the result of the confusion generated by his parents' marital conflict. His mother attempted to impose her constructions of the world on to her son. His father, himself a victim of his wife's invalidation, had retreated from the family's activities, and any attempt to assert his will over his wife's was met with increasing disparagement by her and by Alan's siblings, with the result that he retreated even more and was accused of a lack of interest in them. Mr S, by attempting to preserve the integrity of his own construct system in the face of this invalidation, offered no substantial resistance to his wife's pathogenic interactions with the children. Furthermore, the rigidity caused by his fight against the pending disintegration of his construct system made him unpleasant and increasingly unpopular with his family. Alan attempted to remain objective in this situation and, as a result of his obtaining no validation from either his mother or his father, became mystified.

Murphy P's case was entirely different. Apart from the tension caused by his stepbrother's (Dominic's) attitudes

to his parents, the family situation was itself conflict-free. The situation here was more one of a series of unfortunate circumstances. Mr P, a rather inadequate person, resorted to drink to escape his problems. Consequently, Mrs P directed all her efforts towards helping her husband and seldom let him go out on his own. This, in conjunction with the fact that both parents were at work most of the day and with the fact that there were fifteen children to care for, resulted in Murphy's being neglected by his parents. Murphy, however, was not very active socially and his family was all-important to him. Whereas he was realistic in his evaluation of non-family members, he had a completely idealized view of his family as perfect. These idealized constructs of his family, and of his parents particularly, were continually invalidated by what was actually going on. The discrepancy between the ideal and the real was the principal cause of his mystification. Various other specific incidents discussed in this family analysis, some of which were of a political nature, added to the mystification and precipitated his "breakdown".

The circumstances surrounding Phillip V's invalidation and mystification were, in turn, different from those in the other two cases. Like the S family, the V family was also characterized by marital conflict. However, the religious differences between the parents constituted an added source of conflict in the family. Phillip had to contend with his father's dogmatic views of the world and his (his father's) attempt to impose these on him, a lack of support from his mother, who did nothing to counteract her husband's pathogenic interactions with him (Phillip) and who thus passively contributed to his (Phillip's) invalidation, the confusing behaviour of each of his parents since there were large discrepancies between what they did and said in different situations, and the confusion generated by their marital discord and their opposed constructions of events. Phillip, an intelligent, creative individual, was unable to tolerate either his parents' rigidity or the monotony of his work. As a result,

he broke with his family and adopted a religion different from his parents' respective religions, read widely on poetry and art and attempted to find validation elsewhere. His experiences outside his family further reinforced his view of his family as rigid, but, being ill-equipped to integrate these new experiences, he broke down. Although there are some superficial similarities between the V family situation and the S family situation, there is one fundamental difference, viz. that there was no evidence to suggest that Phillip had been a pawn in his parents' marital conflict, whereas Alan had played such a role for Mrs S in her conflict with her husband.

There are various implications of the above for subsequent research in the area of schizophrenia and the family.

If we view the monocausal studies briefly discussed in the introduction in terms of these three family analyses, their shortcomings, already recognized by researchers in the area, become even more clearly exposed. It is clear that one cannot restrict familial studies of schizophrenia to investigations of single factors. This same point is implicit in Laing and Esterson's (1970) study. Although the concepts of invalidation and mystification are broad enough to account for the pathogenic interactions of the eleven cases in Laing and Esterson's study and for those in the three cases in the present study, it is clear that the invalidation and mystification are manifested to different degrees, in a number of different ways and occur for different reasons in each case.

If we attempt to apply the strict definition of invalidation (a situation whereby the reality of the expressed needs of someone is denied and substituted by the reality of the other person's needs) and the strict definition of mystification (a plausible misrepresentation of what is going on or what is being done, in the service of one person over or against another) to the findings on three of the four families in this study, i.e. those discussed above, then the following becomes apparent:

- (a) Invalidation and mystification, as defined above, characterized the interactions between Mrs S and Alan as well as, to a lesser extent, those between Mr V and Phillip and between Mrs V and Phillip.
- (b) In the case of both Alan and Phillip, the other parent did not intervene to actively counteract the pathogenic effect of these interactions, but the reasons for this, discussed in the relevant family analyses in a previous section, were different for the two cases.
- (c) In the case of Murphy, there was no active party doing the "misrepresentation" or "denial". What happened here was that his anticipations were invalidated indirectly by his parents' actions. This was not a case of their either substituting his needs with theirs, nor of misrepresenting anything (if anyone was misrepresenting anything, it was Murphy himself), but of their being impervious to his needs because they were preoccupied with other matters. This case therefore suggests that the above definitions of invalidation and mystification should be modified to incorporate, not only interactions involving active invalidation of one person by another/others, or active mystification of one person by another/others, but also interactions where a person does not obtain active validation from another/others, or where his own misrepresentation is not corrected by another/others.
- (d) From what was said in a previous section about both Alan and Phillip, it appears that, apart from the direct acts of misrepresentation by their mother and father respectively, an added source of mystification involved, in both cases, the parents' opposed constructions of events. This had the effect, not of misrepresenting reality, but of placing them in a situation where they were faced with incompatible representations of reality.

It is therefore suggested that this aspect of mystification also be considered.

However, once the definitions of invalidation and mystification become wider, the danger exists that they will lose any real meaning, unless such definitions specify the characteristics that differentiate between pathogenic versus non-pathogenic invalidation and mystification.\*

Ultimately, researchers in the area should be conducting multi-factorial aetiological studies of schizophrenia where the various manifestations of invalidation and mystification have been specified and operationally defined in such a way that they are measurable, so that statistical comparisons between experimental and control groups can be carried out. However, before this can be done, it will be necessary to obtain more clarity, theoretical and empirical, about the processes of invalidation and mystification. On the empirical side, it will be necessary to gear research towards descriptive studies of the kind described here. Only when extensive work of this nature has been carried out, will it be possible to obtain sufficient knowledge about the invalidation and mystification occurring in families of schizophrenics for operational definitions of these processes to be precise without being simplistic. A similar plea has been made by Schuham (1967) in his evaluation of the double-bind hypothesis (the double-bind situation being one which involves invalidation and mystification).

The present study was aimed at extending existing knowledge about invalidation and mystification in families of schizophrenics, but far from being the final word on the matter, merely indicates that more work of this nature is needed.

It should be pointed out that, to view the work of Laing as a bridge between the existing causal studies which isolate one, or, at best, a few factors from the total social context, and future causal studies which will make use of the findings of descriptive studies in order to operationally define a multi-factorial situation, would

\*The work of Adams-Webber (described in the introduction) could be helpful here.

not be accepted by Laing himself. His aim in his research was not one of laying the groundwork for the more complex causal studies of the future. Rather, he was attempting to show that such studies are, in fact, ludicrous, given the complexity of each family situation and the vast differences among families. However, the author's contention is that the existing causal studies are ludicrous merely because they are attempting to answer the question of the social aetiology of schizophrenia before the groundwork has been laid. From this point of view, Laing's work should be taken, not as a sign that there is little point in doing further research, but as an indication that research of a similar nature is essential if these descriptive studies of individual cases are to amount to more than interesting reading.

Future descriptive studies in this area might also concentrate on the manifestations of invalidation and mystification in families of non-schizophrenics in an attempt to determine what aspects of these are or are not schizogenic.

It is also essential to determine whether invalidation and mystification are present in all families of schizophrenics. The results on the F family in the present study leave much room for speculation. Were these negative findings due to

- (a) a misdiagnosis of Stephen's symptoms,
- (b) to Stephen's schizophrenia being different from the other three cases,
- (c) to the paucity of information obtained, or
- (d) to the fact that this was actually a case of schizophrenia where no invalidation or mystification had occurred?

It was impossible to provide an unequivocal interpretation of the findings on the F family.

- (a) The possibility of a misdiagnosis existed since the toxic factor in his illness confused the issue - despite the clinical consensus that the persistence of schizophrenic symptoms for some weeks after

drug intake implies schizophrenia - since little is known about the relationship between toxic psychosis and schizophrenia.

- (b) The possibility that, apart from the toxic factor involved, Stephen's schizophrenia was different from those of the others can also not be eliminated. This has bearing on the question of whether schizophrenia is, in fact, a unitary condition, or a convenient label for many, and on the differences in nosology existing between different psychiatric schools. This highlights the problem as to whether research into schizophrenia as such should be undertaken (Bannister, 1968). The author was careful in selecting only first cases of an acute onset where thought-disorder was present. However, Bleuler (in Rosenthal and Kety, 1968) has, on the basis of a twenty-three year longitudinal study, isolated seven courses that schizophrenia may take. Of these seven, five begin with an acute episode. Consequently, it is quite possible, not only that Stephen's schizophrenia was different, but that the schizophrenia in each of the four cases should eventually take a course different from the others. It is thus necessary for future researchers to establish whether invalidation and mystification within the family environment is restricted to only certain of these "types" of schizophrenia, as well as to take into account the paranoid-hebephrenic-catatonic-simple dimension. This, however, can only be determined by longitudinal studies.
- (c) The third possible interpretation for the "negative" findings, viz. that involving the amount of information obtained, is a methodological problem which will be discussed shortly.
- (d) The fourth possibility, if applicable, has the most serious implications for Laing's theory. However, it is impossible to determine whether

it is applicable, since the other three possibilities cannot be excluded.

## 2. Questions of method

The present study attempted to adhere to the phenomenological approach of understanding a social situation by reconciling the view-points of the various participants in that situation (Laing and Cooper, 1964, Laing and Esterson, 1970, Esterson, 1972).

Since, in each case, three family members and two interviewers were involved, an attempt was made to produce a consistent analysis of the family situation by reconciling the view-points of the five people involved. This was, in fact, effective, and is recommended, not only for future research of this nature, but also as a viable clinical approach to understanding individual cases.

As was mentioned in the introduction, the boundaries of the social situation remain for the individual researcher to specify. In the present study, it was felt that much would have been gained had the study not been restricted to an investigation of the father-mother-patient situation.

In Alan's case, it will be remembered that he was the only child who had not taken sides in his parents' battle. A vast amount of information would have been obtained had the investigation included one or two of his siblings, those of approximately the same age-group, since this would have enabled one to observe directly in what way his sibling(s) had managed to cope, and what made Alan so different from them that he had refrained from taking sides.

In the case of Murphy, the root of the problem appeared to be the discrepancy between his idealized view of his family and the "objective" reality of the situation. If one or two of his siblings, again those of approximately the same age-group, had been included in the study, and found to have a realistic construction of the family situation, many of the ideas put forward in the analysis would have gained much in the way of substantiation.

Murphy's case strongly suggests that, unlike, or at least to a greater extent than his siblings, he had been dependent on his parents. Had his siblings avoided his predicament by detaching themselves from their family? If they had, this would be compatible with Lu's (1962) findings in a study of the double-bind situation that pre-schizophrenics are more dependent on their parents than are their siblings and that the siblings manage to avoid the pathogenic effects of the double-binds by maintaining an independence from their parents.

In the case of Phillip, it would have been particularly interesting to include his brother, who was himself on continuous treatment for schizophrenia, since this would have enabled a comparison of the two. In addition, it was mentioned during the course of the analysis of this family, that much of Mrs V's behaviour remained unexplained. An inclusion of one or two friends of hers and of a colleague at work could well have furnished more information about her.

It is therefore strongly suggested that future studies of this nature should include at least one of the patient's siblings in the field of investigation.

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming in the present study is the fact that it was conducted after the patients had become schizophrenic. Two principal problems have resulted from this.

The first is that one may be dealing, not with a family situation that existed prior to the patient's schizophrenia, but with one that resulted from it. However, since the study focussed to a large extent on the subjects' past experiences and attitudes, it can be said with a fair degree of certainty that, at least as far as the parents in each family were concerned, one was dealing with patterns that had existed in the past. The issue, however, is far more problematic as far as the patients themselves were concerned. This has bearing on the second problem. Most of the interviews with the patients were conducted at a time when they were over the worst of their symptoms

and on the way to recovery (Stephen was the only one who still manifested schizophrenic symptoms when he did the repertory grid). This raises various questions. To what extent had their schizophrenia distorted their perception of events? To what extent had their treatment altered their perception of events? Had their schizophrenic experience distorted their perception of events at all, or had it led to a heightened awareness of events? To translate these questions into practical terms, we can ask whether a similar repertory grid would have been obtained from each patient shortly before the onset of his schizophrenia and whether he would have given similar reports about himself and his family if questioned before.

The author resorted to an approach that was the most viable one given that this was an ex-post facto study, but which is nevertheless inadequate. This was to accept the Laingian conception of schizophrenia as, either a learning experience for the patient, in which case he will, as Cooper (1967) puts it, bridge the gap from madness to sanity, or as a crisis which, if only the symptoms, and not the causes, are dealt with, will lead the patient back to normality (rather than sanity), i.e. back to the point where he had been prior to his "breakdown". The former implies that the patient has proceeded, via his schizophrenia (metanoia) to a state of heightened awareness about events (neogenesis). The latter implies that he construes events in essentially the same manner as before his "breakdown". Distortion would therefore only occur when the patient is actively manifesting schizophrenic symptoms. The interviewers thus attempted to assess each patient in those terms. It was suggested that Alan and Phillip appeared to have reached a state of heightened awareness, in which case they were construing events more clearly than they would have done if interviewed prior to the onset of their schizophrenia. Murphy, by contrast, appeared to have returned to where he had been prior to his "breakdown", so that it was suggested that the grid obtained from him would have been essentially the same as one done prior to his "breakdown".

The problem with this approach is that the view of schizophrenia as, under ideal conditions, being a bridge between normality and sanity is largely theoretical and, is open to the criticism, often levelled against the "psychedelic" aspects of Laing's work, of romanticizing mental illness.

The questions posed above can only be answered by prospective longitudinal studies of the kind attempted by Mednick (1966). This sort of research would involve studying a large sample of children in their social setting from an early age, so that one would have data on those who eventually do become schizophrenic, as well on those who do not. This sort of research would enable one to say with certainty that any pathogenic factors found were the cause and not the result of the schizophrenia, and would also produce information about the extent to which, and under what circumstances, the schizophrenic's construct system alters after his schizophrenia.

The final point relating to the methodological aspects of the present study refers to the use of the interview method and of the repertory grid itself in this type of research.

Ideally, the interviewer should be able to spend a considerable amount of time with each family, so that they will eventually behave naturally in front of him, and thus enable him to observe family interactions in vivo. Practical considerations, however, make this unfeasible, so that the technique of interviewing subjects at home becomes the best possible alternative.

The interviewers felt that the home interviews were particularly important, since this permitted some degree of informality as well as observation of the subjects in their natural setting. The importance of the setting was aptly illustrated by the fact that Mr S did not, in fact, feel at ease at home and had to be interviewed at work. This suggests that, if the focus of the study is the family, subjects should be interviewed at home at least part of the time, so that they can be observed in

their home setting, and, if part of the problem is, as in the case of Mr S, alienation from the family and the home, the rest of the interviews with that subject should be conducted in a setting of his choosing. The hospital setting in which three of the four subjects had to be interviewed, was found to hamper communication between interviewer and subject, particularly during the initial interviews, since the interviewer had to attempt to build up an accepting atmosphere in a setting which is most invalidating (Goffman, 1961). Furthermore, the fact that these three patients were still hospitalized at the time of the investigation prevented the interviewers from observing them together with their parents in the home environment, thus losing the opportunity for gaining some possibly valuable information.

With the exception of the F family, the amount of information obtained from the repertory grid and from the unstructured interviews was found to be generally sufficient to permit an understanding of the patients' schizophrenia. It is suggested that these same techniques be applied in future research aiming at descriptive analyses, with the following modifications:

- (a) Each subject should be interviewed in the home as well as in any other setting of his choosing if he so wishes. In the case of patients who are still hospitalized at the time of the investigation, it is strongly advised that at least one interview should be conducted with them in their home setting.
- (b) The method employed in the present study of interviewing one family member alone as well as together with another or more family member(s) should be extended so that more interviews with combinations of family members are carried out than was done in the present study. This is compatible with Framo's (in Boszormenyi-Nagy and Framo, 1965) plea for the abandonment of individually orientated family research. He says: "A host of vitally important data about families escaped detection until the

family members were observed interacting together: e.g. the family's emotional organization, its communication patterns, its overt and covert role assignments, its forms of influence, etc."

- (c) The kind of repertory grid employed in the present study, i.e. Kelly's (1955) grid where constructs are elicited from the subject and applied to elements on an all-or-none basis was found, on the whole, to be a suitable means of obtaining information about each subject's view of events. It would appear, however, that although future researchers have no need of confining themselves to this particular repertory grid and although they could well design grids with elements that they might consider more pertinent to the requirements of their work, it is recommended that grids should be used where constructs are elicited from the subject and where elements are grouped on an all-or-none basis, or, at most, grouped on the basis of three alternatives. Grids with assigned constructs could well have a place in studies occurring after enough has been ascertained about family patterns in schizophrenia for specific hypotheses to be formulated. However, since this will only be possible in the distant future and since the author's contention is that descriptive studies will have to precede these, grids with assigned constructs would not provide information about what is important to the subject, and it is on this that descriptive studies should focus.

An extension of the repertory grid used in this study, which could well be applied to similar studies is the dyad grid described by Ryle and Lunghi (1970). In the dyad grid, once elements have been elicited from the subject, the researcher pairs the elements and devises sorts which he considers suitable. Ryle and Lunghi (1970) outline the method of administering this type of grid as follows:

"The "... pairs will normally include a number in which the subject figures (e.g. self to parents, self to husband) and will also include pairs likely to be of psychodynamic interest, e.g. mother and father... The list of selected elements is presented to the subject, and random pairs are chosen for comparison in the form 'tell me the way in which John's relationship to Jill is like or unlike your mother's relation to you'. The descriptions and comparisons which the subject provides are listed and form the constructs of the test. The complete list of elements is then rated against the list of constructs as in the usual test, and the resulting grid is analysed ... on the same programme as is used in the ordinary test..."

The one advantage of this type of grid is that it does not lead to the loss of information that occurs in the ordinary grid where constructs are applied to elements in general.

"... in rating John on the construct 'is understanding' the rater must make an overall judgement which might take no account of John's relative lack of understanding of Jill or of his exceptional understanding of Elizabeth." (Ryle and Lunghi, 1970).

The second advantage of the dyad grid is that it would prevent the problem encountered in the present study of applying a construct, "Nice to Self-Not nice to Self", to the element, Self. As was mentioned in an earlier section, the author was forced to modify such constructs when they were applied to the element, Self, into the more general form of "Nice to others-Not nice to others". However, it is recognized that the general form of such constructs is not always equivalent to the specific form, so that distortion could have occurred in certain cases. This problem could be overcome with the use of the dyad grid.

It was mentioned during the analysis of the F family that one of the possible reasons for the inconclusive results was that the family members, particularly Mr F, could have

been people who function to a great extent on a non-verbal level. Many of their constructs might therefore not have been tapped by a verbal instrument like the repertory grid employed, or by their answers to the questions asked of them. If this was, in fact, the case, then future researchers in this area should not neglect this problem. The work of Bernstein, mentioned in the introduction, shows that working-class individuals construe events in a concrete manner. The F family's relative inability to deal with material requiring abstraction could very well be the outcome of their socio-economic class position. This would indicate that they do not constitute an isolated case and that future researchers might encounter the same problem if they attempt to present their working-class subjects with verbal tasks.\*

This problem could be tackled in a number of ways. One is to present such subjects with "repertory grids" that do not require verbalization. An example of such a technique is the Personal Construct Inventory devised by Riedel (1970). Riedel mentions that this technique can find application with children and handicapped people. Consequently, problems could be encountered when subjects are working-class adults: this technique appears suitable for people with a limited repertoire of constructs, but working-class individuals do not necessarily have a limited repertoire, but rather a limited number of constructs that can be verbally expressed. If one were to extend the Personal Construct Inventory so that an adequate number of elements and constructs could be obtained, one would be imposing on the subject a task which, even though not requiring verbalization, would still necessitate a great deal of abstraction. However, work of this nature is still in its infancy, and future researchers aiming at studying working-class individuals or families should consider the possibility of devising non-verbal grids appropriate to their aims.

\*That does not mean that all working-class families would experience difficulty with verbal tasks. The V family in the present study, did not.

An alternative way of circumventing the problem of presenting "non-verbal subjects" with a verbal task is to not use a repertory grid at all. However, two points need to be taken into account. Firstly, structured interviews involving a question-answer technique (such as the interviews where the Biographical Information Questionnaire was applied) will produce a limited amount of information, for the same reasons as the repertory grid does. The answer would be to conduct unstructured, informal interviews and to observe the interactions that take place. This, however, brings us to the second point. The author's experience with the F family and, to a lesser extent with the V family, was that the family members were far more inhibited to act "normally" than the members of the middle-class families had been. This therefore creates a stumbling-block to what otherwise would be the ideal approach to research with working-class subjects.

It seems, therefore, that there is no short-cut to research with working-class subjects if one wishes to obtain meaningful information. Either one sets about devising appropriate structured techniques that require a minimum of verbalization and abstraction from the subject, or one must be prepared to spend a considerable amount of time with each individual or with each family so that, eventually, the element of threat that the interviewers represent will diminish, and subjects will start acting naturally.\*

\*It should be pointed out that interviewers are probably threatening to most people, although the author's experiences with the four families suggests that this was far less the case with the middle-class subjects, and far less the case with the V family than with the F family, the former being considerably higher on the Occupational Status Scale than the latter; since the occupation, "manual labourer" has a far lower score than the occupation "riveter" (which was considered equivalent to Mr V's occupation as a bodybuilder for a bus company).

The final methodological problem encountered in the present study has bearing on one of the three assigned constructs presented during the repertory grid administration. This was one of the two whole-figure constructs, "Like my son-Not like my son". Initially, it had been decided not to include "Son" as an element in the grid on the grounds that one might be touching on a sensitive area and that less distortion would occur if the parents' construal of their schizophrenic son was determined in a more indirect way by providing a whole-figure construct. The result of this oblique method was an equally oblique answer, which the author was not always able to interpret. The problem was pronounced when the son was seen as being only like elements that the subject construed either ambivalently or equivocally, since it was impossible to determine the basis for the son's similarity to these elements.

Mair (1967 b), in a study on the use of whole-figure constructs, says that, when elements are chosen because they are like some figure, each element may be chosen for a different reason, i.e. on a different construct dimension. Furthermore, elements may not necessarily be chosen on the basis of constructs actually used in the grid, although this latter problem applies to grids making use of assigned constructs rather than to grids using elicited constructs.

The problems involved with the use of whole-figure constructs were not really found to apply to the construct, "Like I would like to be-Not like I would like to be", in the present study, since, in the case of most of the subjects, there was a close relationship between the elements that emerged as ideal on this construct and those that emerged as constituting an "ideal cluster" on the basis of the total grid analysis. However, in the case of this whole-figure construct, there was a means of checking the information against the information from the other source and to thus determine the basis for the particular subject's construal of certain elements as ideal.

In the case of the whole-figure construct involving each parent's construal of his/her son, this sort of check was not possible. It is therefore recommended that future researchers should include "Son" as an element in the grid rather than as a whole-figure construct. Since the general impression gained by the author was that the grid does not appear to be conducive to distortion or falsification of information, the initial misgiving about including "Son" as an element does not apply.

### 3. The role of sociological factors in schizophrenia

It was mentioned in the introduction that the present study did not represent an attempt at a systematic evaluation of the role of sociological factors in schizophrenia. The author's contention was rather that the broader social context should not be overlooked when the focus of a study is interactions within families.

Consequently, an attempt was made to consider the possible role that sociological factors were playing in each of the four cases.

The three cases in which the schizophrenia was seen as related to invalidation and mystification within the family suggest that the interactions within these three families did not differ substantially from those reported by Laing and Esterson (1970) to have occurred in their eleven families. Although it would be unjustifiable to generalize from these three cases to the population of Coloured schizophrenics, it can be ventured that the differences between these three families on one hand and Laing and Esterson's families on the other were no more pronounced than the differences between each of the fourteen families. The basic invalidation and mystification in the three families in this study were related to the intrapsychic and interpersonal problems of the individuals within each family, and not to any factors which had bearing on the individuals within each family being Coloured.

Sociological factors did, however, play minor or secondary roles. Alan's and Murphy's schizophrenic "breakdowns" were both precipitated by factors of a political nature. It was mentioned in the introduction that middle- and upper-middle-class Coloureds react to their marginal situation by, either competing with the Whites and seeking acceptance from them, or by opposing them. Both Alan and Murphy seemed to have adopted the latter course of action, a course of action which was perfectly compatible with their being middle-class Coloureds, and which was particularly understandable in Murphy's case since his whole family was politically involved. In both these cases, therefore, sociological factors played a minor role, but were nevertheless essential to understanding how their political disillusionment served to add to the already present confusion.

In Phillip's case, sociological factors played a secondary role. It was suggested in the analysis of the V family that Phillip's involvement with middle-class norms and values had brought home to him the shortcomings of his working-class family environment. However, having rejected the latter, he was unable to fully make sense of the former, so that, without validation from either his working-class or from his middle-class contacts, his "breakdown" was precipitated.

Kohn's (in Rosenthal and Kety, 1968) comment on the role of socio-economic status on schizophrenia has particular applicability to Phillip's case. In talking about schizophrenia among the lower- and working-classes, he says:

"Their occupational condition and their limited education gear their thinking processes to the concrete and habitual; their inexperience with dealing with the abstract may ill-equip them to cope with ambiguity, uncertainty and unpredictability.. Or, a related hypothesis, the lower- and working-class valuation of conformity to external authority, and disvaluation of self-direction, might cripple a man faced with the necessity of suddenly having to rely

on himself in an uncertain situation where others cannot be relied on for guidance."

The importance of taking into account sociological factors when making analyses such as those presented in this study is further illustrated by a certain point made with regard to the F family. At one stage during the analysis of the F family, it was mentioned that Mr F's relative inability to verbalize his constructs could have been felt by Stephen as a lack of validation. This interpretation was rejected on the grounds that Stephen appeared to be firmly entrenched in his position as a working-class Coloured and that only a middle-class individual would have experienced a lack of validation in this situation. This is therefore an example where a failure to take cognisance of Stephen's socio-economic class position would have led to an absurd conclusion.

The present study indicates that future research into families of schizophrenics should not overlook the broader social context of which the family is a part. In the present study, the extent to which each individual conformed to his particular socio-economic class position was inferred from what the subjects said in this regard during the interviews. It is recommended that future researchers combine such inferences with information obtained by a more precise method.

## CONCLUSIONS

The invalidation and mystification described by Laing and his co-workers was found to occur in three of the four families studied. In a basic sense, these were of a similar nature to the invalidation and mystification characterizing Laing and Esterson's (1970) families. This suggests a broad applicability of these concepts. However, since there were individual variations between families, and since the question was raised as to the dividing line between pathogenic and non-pathogenic invalidation and mystification, it follows that more empirical work of this nature is needed, with both families of schizophrenics and families of non-schizophrenics, so that the theoretical framework can be elucidated.

The main suggestions that have been made are:

- (a) that monocausal studies in this area should be replaced by descriptive studies and by theoretical clarification of concepts until such time as knowledge has been systematized to such an extent that meaningful, multi-factorial causal studies can be carried out.
- (b) that, when practical considerations permit, longitudinal studies of individual cases of schizophrenia should be conducted, since this will prevent a confounding of what is cause and what effect.
- (c) that structured techniques, such as Kelly's repertory grid, are useful in this type of research, provided that statistical data from them relate meaningfully to social psychological factors rather than obscure our view of the individual or groups of individuals in a maze of figures, and provided that they are used in conjunction with data obtained by unstructured means. Problems with the use of the grid have been pointed out, as well as possible methods to overcome them.

- (d) that, when the focus of the study is a social sub-system such as the family, as many of the participants in that social sub-system as possible should be included - this will permit an observation of that sub-system from a variety of angles, an essential prerequisite to the phenomenological position that there is no ultimate Correct View.

It is clear that the knowledge we have about schizophrenia, family interactions, the relationship between broader social systems and the family sub-system, as well as adequate methods for increasing this knowledge, is extremely limited. Any research conducted under these conditions will create more new questions than it will provide answers. Furthermore, the answers provided will be of such a nature that the researcher will be left with the uneasy feeling that, not only are these answers incomplete, but that the interpretations made about the social situations observed are not the only possible ones. It is in this position that the author finds herself on completion of this study.

It is hoped, however, that the present study has been successful in showing both the merits and demerits of Laing's approach to schizophrenia, in pointing out the applicability of Kelly's repertory grid to family studies, in pointing out the theoretical and methodological problems that could be encountered in this field and in suggesting how future researchers could overcome some of these.

If we are to assess what has been said thus far, it appears that the line of enquiry pursued in the present study is a fruitful one. However, this area of research is, by virtue of its dealing with flesh and blood individuals, a messy one. The author is, however, of the opinion that one should not be deterred by this if any of the questions that abound are to be answered at all.

REFERENCES

- Adams-Webber, J.R. Actual structure and potential chaos: relational aspects of progressive variations within a personal construct system. In Bannister, D. (Ed.). Perspectives in personal construct theory. London: Academic Press, 1970.
- Bannister, D. Conceptual structure in thought-disordered schizophrenics. Journal of Mental Science, 1960, 106, 1230-1249.
- Bannister, D. The nature and measurement of schizophrenic thought-disorder. Journal of Mental Science, 1962, 108, 825-842.
- Bannister, D. The genesis of schizophrenic thought-disorder: a serial invalidation hypothesis. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1963, 109, 680-686.
- Bannister, D. The genesis of schizophrenic thought-disorder: re-test of the serial invalidation hypothesis. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1965, 111, 377-382.
- Bannister, D. The logical requirements of research into schizophrenia. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1968, 114, 181-187.
- Bannister, D.  
Fransella, F. A grid test of schizophrenic thought-disorder. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1966, 5, 95-102.
- Bannister, D.  
Fransella, F. Inquiring man: The theory of personal constructs. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Bannister, D.  
Mair, J.M.M. The evaluation of personal constructs. London: Academic Press, 1968.

- Barnes, M. Mary Barnes: Two accounts of a  
 Berke, J. journey through madness.  
 Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Bateson, G. Towards a theory of schizophrenia.  
 Jackson, D.D. Behavioural Science, 1956, 1,  
 Haley, J. 251-264.  
 Weakland, J.
- Bernstein, B. Education cannot compensate for  
society. New Society, 26th February  
 1970.
- Bernstein, B. Class codes and control, Vol. I.  
 London: Routledge and Kegan Paul,  
 1971.
- Bleuler, M. A 23 year old longitudinal study of  
 208 schizophrenics and impressions  
 in regard to the nature of schizo-  
 phrenia. In Rosenthal, D. and  
 Kety, S.S. (Ed.). The transmission  
of schizophrenia. Oxford: Pergamon  
 Press Ltd., 1968.
- Centers, R. The psychology of social classes.  
 New York, Russel and Russel, 1961.
- Cilliers, S.P. The Coloureds of South Africa.  
 Cape Town: Banier Publishers, 1963.
- Cooper, D.G. Psychiatry and anti-psychiatry.  
 London: Paladin, 1967.
- Dickie-Clark, H.F. The marginal situation. London:  
 Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Esterson, A. The leaves of spring: A study in  
the dialectics of madness.  
 Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.

- Farina, A. Patterns of role dominance and conflict in parents of schizophrenics. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 31-38.
- Farina, A. Measurement of family relationships and their effects. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1963, 9, 82-91.
- Dunham, R.N.
- Farina, A. Attitudes and behaviour of fathers and mothers of male schizophrenic patients. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 381-387.
- Holzberg, J.D.
- Farina, A. Interaction patterns of parents and hospitalised sons diagnosed as schizophrenic or non-schizophrenic. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 114-118.
- Holzberg, J.D.
- Farmer, M. The family. London: Longman Group Limited, 1970.
- Fisher, S. Parents of schizophrenics, neurotics and normals. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1959, 1, 149-165.
- Boyd, I.
- Walker, D.
- Foudraine, J. Not made of wood: A psychiatrist discovers his own profession. London: Quartet Books, 1974.
- Framo, J.L. Systematic research on family dynamics. In Boszormenyi-Nagy, I. and Framo, J.L. (Ed.). Intensive family therapy. Maryland: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Goffman, E. Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.

- Laing, R.D.  
Esterson, A.      Sanity, madness, and the family:  
Families of schizophrenics.  
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Lidz, T.  
Fleck, S.  
Cornelison, A.      Schizophrenia and the family.  
New York: International Universities  
Press, 1965.
- Lu, Y.C.      Contradictory parental expectations  
in schizophrenia. Archives of  
General Psychiatry, 1962, 6, 51-66.
- McKinley, D.G.      Social class and family life. New  
York: The Free Press of Glencoe,  
1964.
- Mair, J.M.M.      Some problems in repertory grid  
measurement, I. The use of bipolar  
constructs. British Journal of  
Psychology, 1967 a, 58, 261-270.
- Mair, J.M.M.      Some problems in repertory grid  
measurement, II. The use of whole-  
figure constructs. British Journal  
of Psychology, 1967 b, 58, 271-282.
- Mann, J.W.      The problem of the marginal personality:  
a psychological study of a Coloured  
group. University of Natal:  
unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1957.
- Mednick, S.A.      A longitudinal study of children with  
a high risk for schizophrenia.  
Mental Hygiene, 1966, 50, 522-535.
- Meyer, R.G.  
Karon, B.P.      The schizophrenogenic mother concept  
and the T.A.T. Psychiatry, 1967,  
30, 173-179.
- Mishler, E.G.  
Waxler, N.E.      Interaction in families. New York:  
Wiley, 1968.

- Mitchell, K.M. An analysis of the schizophrenogenic mother concept by means of the Thematic Apperception Test. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 571-574.
- Patterson, S. Colour and culture in South Africa. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953.
- Riedel, W.W. An investigation of personal constructs through nonverbal tasks. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 76, 173-179.
- Ryle, A.  
Lunghi, M. The dyad grid: a modification of repertory grid technique. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1970, 117, 323-327.
- Schlemmer, L. The factors underlying apartheid. In Randall, P. (Ed.). Anatomy of apartheid. Johannesburg: The Study Project on Christianity in Apartheid Society, 1970.
- Schuham, A.I. The double-bind hypothesis a decade later. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 68, 409-416.
- Searles, H.F. The effort to drive the other person crazy - an element in the etiology and psychotherapy of schizophrenia. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1959, 32, 1-18.
- Singer, M.T.  
Wynne, L.C. Thought disorder and family relations of schizophrenics, IV. Results and implications. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 12, 201-212.
- Slater, P. Notes on Ingrid 72. Institute of Psychiatry, London: Unpublished, 1972.

- Speck, R.V.  
Attneave, C.L.
- Speck, R.V. Family networks. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Attneave, C.L. Family of the psychiatric patient. In Arieti, S. (Ed.). American Handbook of Psychiatry. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Spiegel, J.P.  
Bell, N.W.
- Spiegel, J.P. Die rolle van die man en die vrou in die Kaapse Kleurlingfamiliegesin. University of Stellenbosch: unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1961.
- Steyn, A.F.
- Steyn, A.F. A study of mobility and political change among Coloureds. University of Cape Town: unpublished ongoing research, 1975.
- Van der Merwe, H.W.
- Van der Merwe, H.W. Thematic Apperception Test method for the differentiation of families of schizophrenics, delinquents, and "normals". Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 1970, 75, 139-145.
- Werner, M.  
Stabenau, J.R.  
Pollin, W.
- Werner, M. The Coloured people. In Randall, P. (Ed.). South Africa's minorities. Johannesburg: The Study Project on Christianity in Apartheid Society, 1971.
- Whisson, M.G.

APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name.....
2. Age.....
3. Place of birth.....
4. Number and sex of siblings.....
5. Occupations, past and present.....  
.....
6. Educational level.....
7. Social activities
  - (a) Self.....
  - (b) Wife<sup>\*</sup>/Husband<sup>\*\*</sup>/Father<sup>\*\*\*</sup>.....
  - (c) Son<sup>\*,\*\*</sup> / Mother<sup>\*\*\*</sup>.....
8. Relationship to work of
  - (a) Self.....
  - (b) Wife<sup>\*</sup>/Husband<sup>\*\*</sup>/Father<sup>\*\*\*</sup>.....
  - (c) Son<sup>\*,\*\*</sup> / Mother<sup>\*\*\*</sup>.....
9. Dominance
  - (a) General.....
  - (b) Financial.....
  - (c) Household.....
  - (d) Discipline of son.....
  - (e) Discipline of other children.....
10. Son: spent most of his time with.....  
is/was closest to.....
11. Factors related to the particular schizophrenia  
.....  
.....  
.....

\* Asked when questionnaire is father's  
 \*\* " " " " mother's  
 \*\*\* " " " " son's

APPENDIX B

BLANK REPERTORY GRID

ELEMENTS		ELEMENT NUMBERS		SORTS		EMERGENT POLE		IMPLICIT POLE	
1	Self	1	2	17, 18, 19					
2	Mother	3	4	14, 15, 16					
3	Father	5	6	10, 13, 11,					
4	Brother	7	8	6, 7, 8					
5	Sister	9	10	2, 3, 4					
6	Spouse	11	12	14, 18, 5					
7	Ex-flame	13	14	2, 14, 9					
8	Pal	15	16	16, 17, 3					
9	Ex-pal	17	18	4, 15, 10					
10	Rejection	19	20	5, 10, 15					
11	Rejected Person	21	22	5, 19, 11					
12	Pitied Person	23	24	4, 12, 9					
13	Threatening Person			12, 18, 6					
14	Attractive Person			6, 7, 2					
15	Accepted Teacher			6, 7, 3					
16	Rejected Teacher			8, 13, 9					
17	Boas			1, 4, 5					
18	Successful Person			16, 17, 9					
19	Happy Person			2, 3, 12					
20	Ethical Person			14, 15, 7					
21	Person			1, 8, 6					
22				Assigned					
23				constructs					
24									

C O N S T R U C T N U M B E R S

When the above grid is completed, the following notations are adopted:

A tick ( / ) implies that the characteristic represented by the emergent pole of the particular construct is applicable to the element.

A blank block implies that the characteristic represented by the implicit pole of the particular construct is applicable to the element.

A cross ( X ) implies that the characteristic represented by the emergent pole of the particular construct is applicable to the element, but that this is one of the three elements from which the construct is elicited.

A circle ( 0 ) implies that the characteristic represented by the implicit pole of the particular construct is applicable to the element, but that this is one of the three elements from which the construct is elicited.

APPENDIX C

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS SCALE

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE RANKING FROM  
VAN DER MERWE'S OCCUPATIONAL STATUS SCALE

Delivery Boy	20,0
Farm Labourer	21,3
Pensioner	22,7
Laundry Hand	28,0
Messenger	28,0
Manual Labourer	29,3
Cleaner	32,0
Domestic Worker	34,7
Warder	34,7
Chauffeur	38,7
Packer	38,7
Presser in Clothing Factory	40,0
Seaman	40,0
Barman	42,7
Handyman	42,7
Liftsman	44,0
Linker	44,0
Security Guard	44,0
Waitress	44,0
Badge Rubber	46,7
Driver	46,7
Nurse's Aid	46,7
Stevedore	46,7
Blockman	48,0
Machinist	48,0
Repairman	48,0
Bus Driver	49,3
Mineworker	49,3
Policeman	50,7
Sales/Shop Assistant	50,7
Checker/Examiner	52,0
Corker	52,0
Marker	52,0
Shoemaker	52,0
Cooper	53,3
Insurance Salesman	53,3

Knotter	53,3
Storeman	53,3
Porter	54,7
Printer's Assistant	54,7
Painter	56,0
Riveter	56,0
Counter	57,3
Furniture Polisher	57,3
Laboratory Assistant	57,3
Spray Painter	57,3
Detective	58,7
Postman	60,0
Small Farmer	60,0
Tailor	60,0
Clerk	61,3
Cutter in Clothing Factory	61,3
Accounts Clerk	62,7
Bookbinder	64,0
Engineer's Assistant	64,0
Steel Fixer	64,0
Dressmaker	65,3
Foreman	65,3
Operator (e.g. Crane)	65,3
Cafe Proprietor	66,7
Upholsterer	66,7
Boilermaker	68,0
Setter	68,0
Typist	68,0
Bookkeeper	69,3
Nurse	69,3
Telephonist	69,3
Bank Teller	70,7
Bricklayer	70,7
Cabinet Maker	70,7
Electrician	70,7
Secretary	70,7
Sister	70,7
Health Inspector	72,0
Personnel Officer	73,3

Plasterer	73,3
Post Office Inspector	73,3
Teacher	73,3
Deputy Principal	74,7
Despatch Manager	74,7
Jeweller	74,7
Watchmaker	74,7
Accountant	76,0
Boat Builder	76,0
Social Worker	76,0
Carpenter	77,3
Minister of Religion	77,3
Contractor (e.g. Cartage)	78,7
Mechanic	78,7
Plumber	78,7
Commercial Artist	80,0
Principal	80,0
Draughtsman	82,7
Garage Owner	85,3
Matron	85,3
College/University Lecturer	89,3
Medical Doctor	89,3
Owner/Director/Manager of large Firm or Factory	92,0

APPENDIX D

DATA ON THE S FAMILY

E L E M E N T S	E L E M E N T N U M B E R S																			SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19			
1	✓	✓																		17, 18, 19	Active social life, like to go out	More quiet and at home
2	✓		✓																	14, 15, 16	More strict	More lenient
3	✓	✓	✓																	10, 12, 11	Nice to Self	Nasty to Self
4	✓	✓	✓	✓																6, 7, 8	Straightforward with Self	Not straightforward with Self
5	✓	X	✓	✓																2, 3, 4	Self can communicate well with them	Self cannot communicate well with them
6	✓	✓	✓	✓																14, 18, 5	Involved with extended family	Not interested in relatives
7	X																			2, 14, 9	Social life linked with family	Social life linked with friends
8	X																			16, 17, 3	Will not go out of way to please Self	Will try to help Self
9	✓	✓	✓	✓																4, 15, 10	Close to Self	Not so close to Self
10	✓	✓	✓	✓																5, 10, 15	Likes to help Self	Does not like to help Self
11	✓	✓	✓	✓																5, 19, 11	Very soft-hearted	Not as soft-hearted
14	✓	X	✓	✓																6, 7, 2	Peaceful existence with Self	Arguments between them and Self
15	X																			6, 7, 3	Arguments with them	Peaceful existence with them
16	✓	✓	✓	✓																8, 13, 9	Prepared to do what Self wants	Does not fall in as easily with Self's plans
17	X	✓	✓	✓																1, 4, 5	Give in more easily to others	Does not give in as easily to others
18	✓	✓	✓	✓																16, 17, 9	More happy-go-lucky	More serious
20	✓	✓	✓	✓																14, 15, 7	Uneven relationship with Self	Equal relationship with Self
21	X	✓	✓	✓																1, 8, 6	Peace-loving	Like to start fights
22	✓	✓	✓	✓																(Like I would like to be assigned constructs)	(Like I would like to be assigned constructs)	Not like I would like to be
24	✓																				(Authoritarian)	Not authoritarian

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1																				
2																				
3																				
4																				
5																				
6																				
7																				
8																				
9																				
10																				
11																				
12																				
13																				
14																				
15																				
16																				
17																				
18																				
19																				
20																				
21																				

\* Significant at the .05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " " " } for 13 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " " " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM ALAN S's REPERTORY GRID

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	,20	-,37	,22	,75	-,70	,17	1,00	,74	-,67	-,17	,18	,50	-,31	-,75	,47	,20	,04
2	-,76	-,76	,02	-,01	-,58	,50	,19	-,04	-,54	,54	-,03	,24	-,12	-,34	,73	1,00	,29
3		-,76	-,15	-,21	,70	-,53	-,37	-,23	,75	-,38	,02	-,33	-,21	,29	-,63	-,76	-,51
4			,06	,06	-,22	-,43	,22	,04	-,38	,11	,35	-,14	-,04	,01	,22	,02	-,46
5			-,52		-,52	-,04	,75	,51	-,48	-,33	,42	,28	-,07	-,57	,24	-,01	-,14
6					-,70	-,35	-,70	-,55	,82	-,22	-,25	-,64	,10	,52	-,70	-,58	-,13
7							,17	,47	-,30	,53	-,49	,22	-,14	-,37	,17	,45	*,76
8								,74	-,67	-,16	,18	,50	-,31	-,75	,47	,20	,04
9									-,51	,09	-,01	,26	-,47	-,61	,22	-,04	,30
10										-,41	-,21	-,36	,14	,43	-,87	-,54	-,32
11											-,30	-,11	-,35	,04	,30	,54	,37
13												-,19	-,07	-,02	,18	-,03	-,52
14													,12	-,43	,50	,24	,09
15														,37	-,31	-,12	,15
16															-,49	-,34	-,11
17																,73	,04
18																	,29
19																	

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " " " } for 13 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " " " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FOR ALAN S'S REPERTORY GRID



COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	48,06
2	15,35
3	11,07
4	7,96
5	5,26
6	3,76
7	3,51
8	1,75
9	1,29
10	0,96
11	0,66
12	0,31
13	0,06

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION OF ALAN S'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	3,54	6,22	-0,48	-0,59	-0,97	-0,57
2	2,87	-3,98	-0,02	1,85	13,55	-1,27
3	-18,70	20,02	-1,25	3,08	0,00	11,06
4	0,53	1,29	22,95	6,21	-3,19	-4,15
5	1,85	7,82	0,07	-4,44	-0,85	-1,64
6	-24,55	-0,69	-1,64	1,49	-1,53	-28,58
7	1,27	-3,34	-11,39	0,06	-1,04	0,07
8	3,54	6,22	-0,48	-0,59	-0,97	-0,57
9	2,15	3,78	-4,27	0,25	-13,39	1,16
10	-22,34	0,08	-4,56	-2,08	16,02	-0,02
11	0,87	-7,39	-0,43	22,42	-0,97	2,54
13	0,18	6,21	18,63	0,08	1,97	-1,37
14	1,96	0,27	-1,13	-8,06	4,19	22,52
15	-0,30	-6,72	5,61	-44,09	-0,28	-1,35
16	-8,03	-13,73	17,54	0,07	-6,35	20,69
17	3,69	-0,01	0,22	1,80	9,96	0,14
18	2,87	-3,98	-0,02	1,85	13,55	-1,27
19	0,77	-8,25	-9,32	-1,00	-11,22	-1,01
CONSTRUCT No.						
1	5,16	2,89	13,06	-7,94	23,46	-7,89
2	-1,86	-10,45	0,72	-7,62	-17,80	-3,74
3	6,55	-1,61	2,98	-0,47	-2,34	2,01
4	3,65	0,28	-5,09	-22,10	13,00	-1,85
5	9,47	-0,00	0,02	-0,66	-0,02	-2,41
6	-0,69	4,94	-23,84	-28,27	-13,42	-0,47
7	-0,39	-33,21	-3,36	-0,39	14,65	1,09
8	-8,99	0,77	2,29	0,88	0,83	0,62
9	9,47	-0,00	0,02	-0,66	-0,02	-2,41
10	6,55	-1,61	2,98	-0,47	-2,34	2,01
11	8,13	-0,89	-6,34	8,92	-0,01	0,65
14	6,55	-1,61	2,98	-0,47	-2,34	2,01
15	-6,55	1,61	-2,98	0,47	2,34	-2,01
16	8,80	-0,16	-17,96	0,85	0,13	1,69
17	5,08	3,42	-9,12	3,39	1,31	7,33
18	1,52	34,85	2,59	-0,00	-0,91	5,29
20	-4,06	-0,11	0,73	-15,95	2,75	54,52
21	6,55	-1,61	2,98	-0,47	-2,34	2,01

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN ALAN S'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENTS	ELEMENT NUMBERS																								SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24			
Self	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17,18,19	Very good, very nice	Not as nice	
Mother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15,16	Very nice to Self	Huffy, strict	
Father	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10,13,11	Very nice to Self	Always picks arguments with Self	
Brother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 8	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Sister	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	Good people	Can abuse drink	
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,18, 5	Good to Self; pacifying influence	Argue with Self	
Ex-flame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2,14, 9	Maternal, supportive to Self	Not supportive	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 3	Always give advice and help Self	Blame Self	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4,15,10	Go to Self for advice	Blame Self	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5,10,15	Good people	Self does not like them	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5,19,11	Close relationship with Self	Not so close; acquaintances	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4,12,9	Not backstabbers	Two-faced	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12,18, 6	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 2	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 3	No protest against Self drinking	Do not want Self to drink	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8,13, 9	Good friends with Self	Not such good friends	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 9	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3,12	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15, 7	Always helped Self	Against Self; blamed him	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	Like I would like to be	Not like I would like to be	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Like my son constructs	Authoritarian	Not authoritarian	

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
1	1,00																			
2		1,00																		
3			1,00																	
4				1,00																
5					1,00															
6						1,00														
7							1,00													
8								1,00												
9									1,00											
10										1,00										
11											1,00									
12												1,00								
13													1,00							
14														1,00						
15															1,00					
16																1,00				
17																	1,00			
18																		1,00		
19																			1,00	
20																				1,00

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 9 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MR S'S REPERTORY GRID





COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	80,21
2	5,75
3	4,84
4	3,94
5	2,04
6	1,39
7	0,98
8	0,85
9	0,00

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A  
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION  
OF MR S's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4
1	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
2	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
3	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
4	-1,00	2,18	2,68	1,14
5	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
6	-2,45	-15,40	-2,14	-0,27
7	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
8	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
9	9,87	-5,77	56,57	2,10
10	9,70	1,05	-8,51	70,97
11	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
12	18,04	0,10	-1,50	-7,34
13	-1,17	7,82	-14,87	-0,24
14	-2,13	1,23	0,31	-0,15
15	18,04	0,10	-1,50	-7,34
16	-1,23	-40,07	-3,44	0,63
17	-2,45	-15,40	-2,14	-0,27
18	18,04	0,10	-1,50	-7,34
19	-1,00	2,18	2,68	1,14
<b>CONSTRUCT</b>				
CONSTRUCT No.				
1	-9,19	0,07	-0,36	-1,58
2	-9,19	0,07	-0,36	-1,58
3	-9,19	0,07	-0,36	-1,58
5	-8,25	-0,38	-2,77	-4,11
6	-9,19	0,07	-0,36	-1,58
7	-9,19	0,07	-0,36	-1,58
8	-8,15	16,30	0,36	-3,35
9	-6,43	0,77	-6,23	23,11
10	-6,43	0,77	-6,23	23,11
11	-8,25	-0,38	-2,77	-4,11
12	-6,40	-1,36	18,36	-0,05
15	0,46	71,37	9,65	0,03
16	-5,56	-8,02	46,10	0,02
21	-4,13	-0,31	5,71	34,22

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3 AND 4 IN MR S'S REPERTORY GRID.

C O N S T R U C T N U M B E R S	E L E M E N T S																								S O R T S	E M E R G E N T P O L E	I M P L I C I T P O L E	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24				
1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17, 18, 19	Very religious	Not very religious	
2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14, 15, 16	Very happy	Always scolding	
3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10, 13, 11	Mix well socially	Possessive	
4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 8	More sociable	Not an easy mixer	
5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	Not as intellectual	Intellectual	
6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14, 18, 5	More compassionate	More selfish	
7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 14, 9	More charitable	Selfish	
8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16, 17, 3	Educated	Not as well-educated	
9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4, 15, 10	Possessive	Assertive	
10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5, 10, 15	Always wanted own way	More compassionate	
11	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5, 19, 11	Understanding ways	Thinks of himself a lot	
12	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4, 12, 9	Heavy drinkers	Not heavy drinkers	
13	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12, 18, 6	Heavy drinkers	Drink socially	
14	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 2	More sociable	Unsociable	
15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 3	Intellectual	Not so intellectual	
16	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8, 13, 9	Get on well with others	Does not get on well with rest of family	
17	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	Get on well with rest of family	Snobbish	
18	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16, 17, 9	Very well-educated	Does not get on well with rest of family	
19	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 12	Intellectual	Limited education	
20	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14, 15, 7	Very attractive	Not as intellectual	
21	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	Fair in judgment of others	Cheeky	
22	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	(Like I would like to be)	Can be unfair in judgment of others	
23	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Like my son)	(Like my son)	Not like I would like to be	
24	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Authoritarian)	(Authoritarian)	Unlike my son	
																												Not authoritarian

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1	,34	,51	,51	-,11	,47	,57	,11	-,22	-,47	,73	-,51	-,51	,51	,08	,34	,70	,11	,34	,58	,26
2	,48	,48	,48	-,21	,54	,48	,21	-,28	-,54	,44	-,13	-,13	,48	,37	,68	,28	,21	,37	,35	,54
3		,00	,00	-,84	,46	,33	,33	-,73	-,46	,37	-,60	-,60	,00	,48	,84	,73	,33	,84	,29	,46
4				-,84	,46	,33	,33	-,73	-,46	,37	-,60	-,60	,00	,48	,84	,73	,33	,84	,29	,46
5					-,26	-,03	-,51	,62	,26	-,12	,33	,33	-,64	-,76	,48	-,37	-,51	-,76	,46	-,49
6						,72	,26	-,15	,00	,81	-,46	-,46	,46	,29	,54	,39	,26	,29	,42	-,79
7							,03	-,11	-,72	,58	-,33	-,33	,33	-,07	,48	,37	,03	,21	,46	,49
8								,62	-,26	,12	-,12	-,02	,33	,76	,21	,11	,00	,48	,22	,49
9									,15	-,03	,40	,40	-,73	-,57	-,57	-,46	-,62	-,86	-,15	-,39
10										-,81	,46	,46	-,46	-,29	-,54	-,39	-,26	-,29	-,42	-,79
11											-,37	-,37	,37	,18	,44	,51	,12	,18	,57	,60
12												,00	-,60	-,13	-,48	-,73	-,02	-,48	-,29	-,17
13													-,60	-,13	-,48	-,73	-,02	-,48	-,29	-,17
14														,48	,84	,73	,33	,84	,29	,46
15															,37	,28	,76	,88	,35	,54
16																,57	,21	,68	,35	,54
17																	,11	,57	,41	,15
18																		,48	,22	,49
19																			,35	,54
20																				,42
21																				

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " " " } for 15 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " " " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MRS S'S REPERTORY GRID

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1	,01	,53																	
2		-,30	-,12	,20	,21	-,37	,42	-,41	-,22	-,37	-,23	*,79	*,79	-,31	*,79	-,46	-,36	*,79	
3			-,39	,35	-,52	-,08	-,03	-,22	*,55	*,79	,09	,35	,35	,07	-,09	-,09	-,36	,35	
4				-,43	*,73	-,21	-,51	,11	*,66	-,20	,41	-,85	-,85	,07	-,85	-,01	-,14	-,85	
5					-,54	-,20	,20	-,31	*,57	,21	-,31	,60	,60	-,40	,60	-,54	-,11	,60	
6						-,34	-,26	-,02	*,84	-,33	,11	-,74	-,74	-,06	-,74	,04	,23	*,74	
7							-,13	,36	-,36	-,18	-,01	,20	,20	,30	,20	,15	,21	,20	
8								-,50	-,28	-,11	-,48	,53	,53	-,59	,53	-,13	-,07	,53	
9									,15	-,28	,14	-,31	-,31	*,71	-,31	,29	,06	-,31	
10										-,34	-,04	*,78	*,78	,12	*,78	,22	,25	*,78	
11											,30	,21	,21	-,03	,21	-,18	-,41	,21	
12												-,31	-,31	,35	-,31	,24	-,21	-,31	
13													*,00	-,40	*,00	*,54	-,44	*,00	
14													1,00	-,40	1,00	-,54	-,44	1,00	
15														-,40	-,40	*,55	,01	-,40	
16																-,54	-,44	1,00	
17																	,45	-,54	
18																		-,44	
19																			-,44

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " " " } for 15 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " " " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MRS S's REPERTORY GRID



COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	46,59
2	17,69
3	12,04
4	6,19
5	4,47
6	4,06
7	2,75
8	1,93
9	1,32
10	1,01
11	0,93
12	0,48
13	0,29
14	0,21
15	0,03

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A  
 PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION  
 OF MRS S'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	-4,44	0,68	-0,81	-0,15	4,81	-0,53
2	0,09	27,31	2,84	-2,37	2,77	-2,82
3	-1,70	-1,60	-1,03	-12,22	4,82	1,32
4	15,61	-0,98	-20,28	3,96	-0,36	-5,57
5	-3,05	1,15	-1,00	-0,28	12,90	-11,94
6	22,88	5,44	-3,98	0,05	-1,59	-0,10
7	-0,36	-2,93	4,77	10,52	-8,58	-5,17
8	-2,36	10,58	0,15	-0,01	-17,37	16,60
9	0,58	-8,88	6,68	17,27	10,23	0,34
10	20,96	3,58	0,02	0,76	5,23	16,95
11	-0,87	-2,04	-4,72	-19,36	2,94	2,06
12	0,81	-16,22	-4,76	-8,80	-14,35	-3,94
13	-5,95	0,28	-1,20	3,15	-0,55	0,28
14	-5,95	0,28	-1,20	3,15	-0,55	0,28
15	0,57	-13,27	5,86	0,22	4,99	3,67
16	-5,95	0,28	-1,20	3,15	-0,55	0,28
17	1,03	-2,59	16,14	-8,53	-6,08	4,89
18	0,90	2,23	22,18	-2,90	-0,78	-22,99
19	-5,95	0,28	-1,20	3,15	-0,55	0,28
<b>CONSTRUCT</b>						
No.						
1	-5,29	5,64	3,01	22,07	-0,03	-12,21
2	-3,31	0,43	-1,08	-6,89	-12,15	-12,74
3	-4,96	-0,77	4,36	-2,00	-0,05	-0,66
4	-4,96	-0,77	4,36	-2,00	-0,05	-0,66
5	4,60	8,96	-0,10	-0,10	6,70	-23,17
6	-8,18	6,31	-5,92	-2,38	5,18	2,70
7	-4,00	9,52	-0,67	-0,54	-0,22	-6,47
8	-2,85	-11,68	-8,69	5,68	6,80	-4,18
9	4,08	10,11	-1,98	0,43	-1,26	4,71
10	8,18	-6,31	5,92	2,38	-5,18	-2,70
11	-6,18	10,52	-1,92	4,34	0,03	0,03
12	2,60	-0,53	-8,16	-0,12	-9,31	-6,99
13	2,60	-0,53	-8,16	-0,12	-9,31	-6,99
14	-4,96	-0,77	4,36	-2,00	-0,05	-0,66
15	-3,15	-8,83	-2,25	0,98	-0,95	2,30
16	-5,55	-0,00	1,53	-11,03	-3,82	-1,31
17	-4,94	0,36	12,40	3,88	0,80	-0,25
18	-2,85	-11,68	-8,69	5,68	6,80	-4,18
19	-5,18	-5,28	2,35	-0,50	-1,27	0,02
20	-3,96	0,99	-0,35	22,06	-29,59	4,89
21	-7,61	-0,00	-13,73	-4,83	-0,45	2,16

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE  
OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN  
MRS S's REPERTORY GRID.

APPENDIX E

DATA ON THE P FAMILY

ELEMENTS		ELEMENT NUMBERS																		SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18				19	
CONSTRUCT NUMBERS	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17,18,19	More loving to Self	Less loving to Self	
	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15,16	Self likes them	Self dislikes them	
	5	✓	X	X	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	Look after Self	Do not	
	6	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,18, 5	Self talks to them more often and more freely	Self does not confide in them to a great extent
	7	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2,14, 9	Self knows them well	Self knows them more superficially
	8	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 3	Talk to Self lovingly	Talk to Self as friends
	12	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4,12, 9	Self can talk to them in a close, brotherly way	Self cannot
	13	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12,18, 6	Self cannot talk to them in a close, brotherly way	Self can
	16	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8,13, 9	Self has a close relationship with them	Self has a more casual relationship with them
	17	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	More outgoing	More quiet
	18	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 9	Older than Self: can teach new things	Cannot teach Self new things: same age-group
	19	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3,12	Can give Self more attention	More distant, brotherly relationship
	21	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	Similar activities to Self	Different activities to Self
22	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	(Like I would like to be authoritarian	Not like I would like to be authoritarian	
24																								

	2	5	6	7	8	12	13	16	17	18	19	21
1	,48	,48	,58	,48	*** 1,00	*** 1,00	*** -1,00	,78	-,26	,14	,48	-,26
2		,23	,46	,18	,48	,48	-,48	,62	-,12	,37	,23	,04
5			,28	,23	,48	,48	-,48	,37	,12	-,02	*** 1,00	-,04
6				,46	,58	,58	-,58	*** ,75	-,15	-,08	,28	,45
7					,48	,48	-,48	,62	-,12	,02	,23	,04
8					*** 1,00	*** -1,00	*** ,78	*** ,78	-,26	,14	,48	-,26
12						*** -1,00	*** ,78	*** ,78	-,26	,14	,48	-,26
13							-,78	-,78	,26	-,14	-,48	,26
16									-,20	,04	,37	,07
17										,38	,12	,20
18											-,02	-,31
19												-,04
21												

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 9 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MURPHY P's REPERTORY GRID

	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	,69*														
2		,37	,46	-,48	-,34	-,06	,22	-,46	-,72*	-,72*	-,72*	-,74*	,22	-,22	,22
3			,30	-,63*	-,51	-,59	,57	-,62*	-,55	-,55	-,55	-,55	,57	-,69*	,57
4				,37	-,63*	-,51	-,59	,57	-,62*	-,55	-,55	-,55	,57	-,69*	,57
5				,37	-,33	-,51	-,19	,57	-,62*	-,55	-,55	-,55	,57	-,35	,57
6					-,78*	-,09	-,24	,71*	-,33	-,69*	-,69*	-,68*	,71*	-,44	,71*
8						-,04	,20	-,69*	,41	,72*	,72*	,54	-,69*	,58	-,69*
9							,76*	-,46	,57	,17	,17	,28	-,46	,40	-,46
12								-,59	,39	,03	,03	,12	-,59	,63*	-,59
13									-,65*	-,57	-,57	-,54	1,00*	-,75*	1,00*
14										,65	,30	,41	-,65*	,48	-,65*
15										,66*	,66*	,82*	-,57	,17	-,57
16												,82*	-,57	,50	-,57
17													-,54	,27	-,54
18														-,75*	1,00*
19															-,75*

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 9 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MURPHY P'S REPERTORY GRID

	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	,64	,80	,80	,66	,73	-,71	-,62	-,59	,88	,73	-,74	-,73	-,75	,88	-,71	,88
2	,30	,43	,43	,27	,50	-,74	,07	-,08	,50	-,11	-,23	-,74	-,27	,50	-,73	,50
5	,80	,86	,88	,05	,09	-,36	-,36	-,31	,10	-,39	-,40	-,41	-,42	,10	-,35	,10
6	,57	,42	,42	,41	,68	-,76	,10	,12	,48	-,19	-,82	-,82	-,83	,48	-,16	,48
7	,37	,40	,40	,35	,45	-,68	,02	,01	,46	-,71	-,78	-,26	-,30	,46	-,15	,46
8	,64	,80	,80	,68	,73	-,71	-,62	-,59	,88	-,73	-,74	-,73	-,75	,88	-,71	,88
12	,64	,80	,80	,68	,73	-,71	-,62	-,59	,88	-,73	-,74	-,73	-,75	,88	-,71	,88
13	-,64	-,80	-,80	-,66	-,73	,71	,62	,59	,88	,73	,74	,73	,75	-,88	,71	-,88
16	,60	,62	,62	,56	,70	-,81	-,07	-,05	,71	-,64	-,81	-,81	-,76	,71	-,59	,71
17	-,08	,00	,00	-,85	-,04	,07	,27	,03	-,18	,28	,21	,24	,21	-,18	,11	-,18
18	-,37	,26	,26	-,37	,24	-,39	,11	-,54	,39	,09	,21	,11	,24	,39	-,55	,39
19	,80	,86	,88	,05	,09	-,36	-,36	-,31	,10	-,39	-,40	-,41	-,42	,10	-,35	,10
21	,30	-,31	-,31	-,26	,29	-,15	,64	,69	-,41	,47	-,24	-,25	-,25	-,41	,53	-,41

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " " " } for 9 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " " " }

CONSTRUCT-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MURPHY P's REPERTORY GRID

COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	55,89
2	14,56
3	9,73
4	8,48
5	4,57
6	3,38
7	1,39
8	1,37
9	0,62

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A  
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION  
OF MURPHY P'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5
1	-7,40	11,69	22,36	1,36	-1,36
2	-8,84	-1,70	8,39	9,75	0,67
3	-8,84	-1,70	8,39	9,75	0,67
4	-4,81	0,04	-0,00	-37,82	-4,69
5	-4,28	1,97	-9,11	0,00	-0,13
6	11,35	-2,85	14,70	-10,29	-6,28
8	1,89	8,82	-10,48	6,96	4,14
9	2,22	22,18	-0,66	-0,30	0,52
12	-4,88	-2,49	-5,89	-1,39	0,10
13	6,23	2,17	-3,34	9,97	-26,56
14	8,21	-10,76	-0,07	2,90	-16,30
15	8,25	-8,04	0,94	-0,25	26,10
16	6,16	-7,24	-0,50	1,50	5,13
17	-4,88	-2,49	-5,89	-1,39	0,10
18	6,83	13,38	3,37	-4,98	7,18
19	-4,88	-2,49	-5,89	-1,39	0,10
<b>CONSTRUCT</b>					
CONSTRUCT No.					
1	-16,86	-0,91	0,01	-1,44	-0,66
2	-3,45	0,13	-11,16	10,25	-15,03
5	-3,31	0,11	28,01	15,94	0,12
6	-5,91	18,61	-3,71	0,18	-0,37
7	-3,36	2,06	-0,76	-0,79	73,70
8	-16,86	-0,91	0,01	-1,44	-0,66
12	-16,86	-0,91	0,01	-1,44	-0,66
13	16,86	0,91	-0,01	1,44	0,66
16	-12,28	4,86	-3,72	-0,01	1,46
17	0,21	-0,01	0,00	10,98	2,52
18	-0,29	-17,92	-23,20	34,95	3,20
19	-3,31	0,11	28,01	15,94	0,12
21	0,45	52,55	-1,38	5,19	-0,83

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4 AND 5 IN MURPHY P's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENTS	ELEMENT NUMBERS																	SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17				18	19
Self	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17,18,19	Adults	People who are not
Mother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15,16	Children	People who are just, kind and considerate
Father	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10,13,11	People who are friendly and not aggressive	
Brother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 8	People with whom Self gets on	
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	Coloureds	
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,18, 5	Cheerful people	
Ex-flame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2,14, 9	People who praised Self and recognized Self's ability	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 3	People who are concerned with material things	
Ex-pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4,15,10	People who are unfriendly and aggressive	
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5,10,15	People who are unfriendly and aggressive	
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5,19,11	People who are unrealistic and live in a world of fantasy	
Ex-flame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4,12, 9	People with whom Self gets on	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12,18, 6	People with whom Self gets on	
Ex-pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 2	People who are understanding and sympathetic	
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 3	People who are understanding and sympathetic	
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8,13, 9	People who agree with Self on all issues	
Ex-flame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	People with the same moral values as Self	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 9	People who have a similar taste to Self; fond of music, high ideals	
Ex-pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3,12	People who have a superior attitude	
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15, 7	People who lack understanding	
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	People who are practical and logical in reasoning and argument	
Ex-flame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned	(Like I would like to be	
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Like my son	constructs	
Ex-pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Authoritarian	Authoritarian	
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Not like I would like to be	Unlike my son	
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Not authoritarian	Not authoritarian	

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1	,26	,22	,22	,10	,12	,19	-,41	-,22	-,26	-,22	,22	,22	,22	,22	,41	,15	,19	-,33	-,37	,33
2	,86	,86	,86	-,14	,02	,40	-,63	-,86	-,73	-,28	,86	,86	,86	,86	,63	,57	,40	-,78	-,70	,54
3	1,00	1,00	1,00	-,12	,27	,48	-,54	-,86	-,86	-,05	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
4		,86	,86	-,12	,27	,48	-,54	-,86	-,86	-,05	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
5			,86	,12	-,10	-,25	,12	,14	,14	,12	-,12	-,12	-,12	-,12	,25	-,08	-,10	-,31	,20	-,18
6				,22	,22	-,23	-,27	-,31	-,31	,05	,27	,27	,27	,27	,23	-,24	,22	-,13	-,18	,13
7						-,46	-,48	-,48	-,48	-,13	,48	,48	,48	,48	,46	-,15	-,19	-,27	-,51	-,03
8							,54	,63	,63	,03	-,54	-,54	-,54	-,54	-,58	-,36	-,46	,59	,69	-,15
9								,86	,86	,05	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	-,54	-,24	-,48	,88	,61	-,41
10										-,02	-,86	-,86	-,86	-,86	-,39	-,18	-,73	,54	,46	-,29
11											-,05	-,05	-,05	-,05	-,29	-,24	,22	,41	,08	-,88
12											1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
13												1,00	1,00	1,00	,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
14													1,00	1,00	,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
15														1,00	,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
16															,54	,24	,48	-,68	-,61	,41
17																,36	,17	-,81	-,47	,37
18																	,32	-,45	-,40	,45
19																		-,27	-,22	,27
20																			,45	-,55
21																				-,45

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " " " } for 14 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " " " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MR P'S REPERTORY GRID

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	,24	,33	,68	-,31	,15	-,66	,09	,27	-,62	,31	-,62	,33	,68	-,53	,68	,08	,33	,33
2		-,17	,50	,02	,54	-,34	,03	-,24	-,53	,61	-,53	,22	,50	-,69	,50	,02	,22	,22
3			,08	,08	-,27	-,27	,12	,24	-,24	,27	-,25	-,08	,08	-,16	,08	,09	-,08	-,08
4				-,51	,43	-,82	,39	-,00	-,79	,05	-,78	,56	1,00	-,69	1,00	,31	,56	,56
5					-,05	,18	-,09	,03	,06	,34	,20	-,20	-,51	-,04	-,51	-,35	-,20	-,20
6						-,43	,46	,10	-,39	,14	-,40	,16	,43	-,56	,43	-,07	,16	,16
7							-,48	-,10	-,82	-,08	-,77	-,68	-,82	-,88	-,82	-,38	-,68	-,68
8								,53	-,44	-,37	-,45	,12	,39	-,35	,39	,34	,12	,12
9									-,29	-,17	-,29	-,14	-,00	-,02	-,00	,04	-,14	-,14
10										-,25	-,94	-,66	-,79	-,81	-,79	-,14	-,66	-,66
11											-,26	-,10	,05	-,39	,05	-,29	-,10	-,10
12												-,65	-,78	-,78	-,78	-,15	-,65	-,65
13													,56	-,59	,56	,09	1,00	1,00
14														-,69	1,00	,31	,56	,56
15															-,69	-,28	-,59	-,59
16																,31	,56	,56
17																	,09	,09
18																		,09
19																		

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 14 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MR P'S REPERTORY GRID

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	,01	-,04	-,17	,15	-,12	-,08	-,32	-,12	-,22	-,30	-,20	-,30	,89	,15	-,25	,15	-,06	,89	,89
2	,68	,50	,27	,85	-,45	,46	-,86	,46	,23	-,85	,20	-,88	,60	,85	-,81	,85	,36	,60	,60
3	,62	,54	,30	,74	,02	,47	-,91	,49	,25	-,94	,31	-,91	,60	,74	-,93	,74	,27	,60	,60
4	,62	,54	,30	,74	,02	,47	-,91	,49	,25	-,94	,31	-,91	,60	,74	-,93	,74	,27	,60	,60
5	-,10	,17	-,92	,03	-,02	,23	,12	-,03	-,07	,07	-,14	,09	,09	,03	,04	,03	-,02	,09	,09
6	-,10	-,03	-,14	-,04	,40	-,10	-,27	-,11	-,19	-,29	-,08	-,23	,75	-,04	-,28	-,04	-,17	,75	,75
7	,27	,38	,12	,45	,04	,33	-,66	,10	-,56	-,29	,23	-,23	,39	,45	-,71	,45	,27	,39	,39
8	-,57	-,63	,22	,74	,33	-,48	,58	,13	,32	,61	-,35	,61	-,86	-,74	,63	-,74	,15	-,86	-,86
9	-,82	-,54	-,30	,74	-,02	-,47	,91	-,49	-,25	,94	-,31	,91	-,60	-,74	,93	-,74	-,27	-,60	-,60
10	-,62	-,51	-,27	,86	-,10	-,51	,77	-,39	-,23	,87	-,38	,83	-,57	-,86	,80	-,86	,21	-,57	-,57
11	-,25	,54	-,11	-,34	,61	-,04	,40	-,36	-,18	,03	,70	,04	,28	-,34	-,04	-,34	-,36	-,28	-,28
12	,62	,54	,30	,74	,02	,47	-,91	,49	,25	-,94	,31	-,91	,60	,74	-,93	,74	,27	,60	,60
13	,62	,54	,30	,74	,02	,47	-,91	,49	,25	-,94	,31	-,91	,60	,74	-,93	,74	,27	,60	,60
14	,62	,54	,30	,74	,02	,47	-,91	,49	,25	-,94	,31	-,91	,60	,74	-,93	,74	,27	,60	,60
15	,62	,54	,30	,74	,02	,47	-,91	,49	,25	-,94	,31	-,91	,60	,74	-,93	,74	,27	,60	,60
16	,10	,48	-,30	,75	-,42	,51	-,63	,46	-,22	-,57	-,25	-,57	,67	,75	-,60	,75	,41	,67	,67
17	,35	,21	,10	,48	-,75	,16	-,21	,20	,17	-,30	,00	-,56	,28	,48	-,13	,48	,18	,28	,28
18	,38	,34	,17	,40	,08	,26	-,26	,21	,31	-,68	,30	-,69	,37	,40	-,28	,40	-,53	,37	,37
19	-,50	-,41	,24	,81	,48	-,52	,74	-,55	-,23	,71	,26	,71	-,84	,81	,64	-,81	-,40	-,84	-,84
20	-,62	-,48	-,29	,73	,39	,06	,65	,15	,31	,63	-,33	,63	-,62	-,73	,63	-,73	-,33	-,62	-,62
21	,50	-,29	,32	,58	-,52	-,22	-,54	,43	,36	-,51	-,45	-,53	,52	,58	-,16	,58	,38	,52	,52

\* Significant at the ,05 level  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 14 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

CONSTRUCT-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MR P's REPERTORY GRID

COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	56,87
2	11,06
3	8,22
4	6,57
5	5,58
6	4,99
7	2,55
8	1,55
9	1,40
10	0,50
11	0,36
12	0,25
13	0,11
14	0,00

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A  
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION  
OF MR P's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	-1,73	0,01	2,23	0,34	2,00	-4,74
2	-1,80	-5,72	-2,22	16,79	1,83	1,42
3	-0,27	-1,72	14,84	-4,10	-0,38	-33,80
4	-2,88	1,43	0,18	2,93	0,46	-0,02
5	0,48	-40,35	-1,68	-16,19	-10,47	2,09
6	-1,06	-0,83	-0,01	6,54	-0,19	20,66
7	18,94	-0,75	-0,58	0,06	18,30	1,75
8	-0,84	0,50	8,13	-0,64	-3,42	14,22
9	-0,11	-0,04	23,42	-9,14	1,59	8,92
10	18,24	1,87	-1,25	3,13	-4,29	-0,86
11	-0,29	-21,32	-0,22	5,63	4,51	-9,63
12	19,36	0,38	-2,68	1,28	-15,48	-0,51
13	-3,93	2,85	-12,37	-6,50	0,08	-0,14
14	-2,88	1,43	0,18	2,93	0,46	-0,02
15	15,97	7,39	1,33	-4,63	13,01	-0,00
16	-2,88	1,43	0,18	2,93	0,46	-0,02
17	-0,48	6,29	3,93	3,24	-22,91	-0,93
18	-3,93	2,85	-12,37	-6,50	0,08	-0,14
19	-3,93	2,85	-12,37	-6,50	0,08	-0,14
<b>CONSTRUCT No.</b>						
1	-0,90	3,36	-19,60	-12,90	0,19	-0,35
2	-7,99	0,83	2,36	2,04	0,48	-0,36
3	-7,38	-1,93	0,99	-0,21	-0,92	0,03
4	-7,38	-1,93	0,99	-0,21	-0,92	0,03
5	0,01	0,22	-2,61	0,90	0,10	9,80
6	-0,70	-0,22	-24,71	-30,05	-1,46	0,03
7	-1,64	-0,36	-4,82	5,39	-21,72	-5,35
8	5,93	-0,08	16,99	-11,08	-14,02	0,34
9	7,38	1,93	-0,99	0,21	0,92	-0,03
10	6,79	5,28	-0,03	1,71	-2,19	-0,49
11	0,26	-26,50	-2,85	1,59	5,30	0,21
12	-7,38	-1,93	0,99	-0,21	-0,92	0,03
13	-7,38	-1,93	0,99	-0,21	-0,92	0,03
14	-7,38	-1,93	0,99	-0,21	-0,92	0,03
15	-7,38	-1,93	0,99	-0,21	-0,92	0,03
16	-5,75	9,60	-6,45	5,82	-2,07	14,21
17	-0,66	4,31	1,52	1,84	13,35	-0,15
18	-1,62	-2,65	0,12	-4,88	30,25	1,97
19	7,07	-9,33	-0,01	-1,60	0,01	-17,69
20	6,07	-1,11	2,74	-4,09	-1,48	44,70
21	-2,98	22,64	8,29	-14,62	0,97	-4,09

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE  
OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN  
MR P'S REPERTORY GRID.



	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	16	17	18	21
1	-,21	,21	,21	** 1,00	,39	,21	-,21	-,21	,26	,30	,21	,26	,13
2		,21	,21	-,21	-,24	-,60*	,19	,19	-,11	-,38	-,19	-,47	-,18
3			** 1,00	,21	-,07	-,21	,21	,21	,11	-,30	,19	-,26	,18
5				,21	-,07	-,21	,21	,21	,11	-,30	,19	-,26	,18
6					,39	,21	-,21	-,21	,26	,30	,21	,26	,13
7						,55*	-,24	-,24	,38	,51	-,39	,38	-,07
8							-,60*	-,60*	,47	,72	-,21	,84	,49
9								** 1,00	,84	,72	,21	,84	-,18
10									-,84	-,72	,21	-,84	-,18
11										,56	-,26	,67	,03
16											-,30	,86	,17
17												,26	,18
18													,31
21													

\*Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 11 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MRS P's REPERTORY GRID



	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	-,17	-,12	-,19	-,12	-,17	-,14	,02	-,23	-,29	-,19	-,25	*,92	-,30	-,27	-,03	*,92	*,88
2	-,24	,48	-,18	-,11	-,24	-,30	-,36	-,09	,21	,01	-,24	-,32	*,59	*,73	-,29	-,32	-,28
3	,19	,13	*,79	,00	,19	*,86	,19	,26	,20	,23	*,75	,24	,22	,25	,07	,24	,16
5	,19	,13	*,79	,00	,19	*,86	,19	,26	,20	,23	*,75	,24	,22	,25	,07	,24	,16
6	-,17	-,12	-,19	-,12	-,17	-,14	,02	-,23	-,29	-,19	-,25	*,92	-,30	-,27	-,03	*,92	*,88
7	-,47	,35	,41	,53	-,47	,35	,45	-,56	-,52	-,02	-,35	,48	-,51	-,54	,51	,48	,53
8	,33	,30	,32	,33	,33	,32	*,69	,06	*,82	-,24	,21	,48	*,89	*,84	,35	,48	,26
9	-,43	-,34	-,36	-,35	-,43	-,37	-,49	-,14	*,89	*,86	-,12	-,39	*,84	,23	-,41	-,39	-,34
10	-,43	-,34	-,36	-,35	-,43	-,37	-,49	-,14	*,89	*,86	-,12	-,39	*,84	,23	-,41	-,39	-,34
11	,31	,38	,24	,48	,31	,22	,51	,12	*,78	-,74	-,38	,41	*,73	-,10	,54	,41	,44
16	,29	,34	,45	,45	,29	,45	,55	-,39	*,81	-,64	,21	,47	*,80	-,66	,48	,47	,43
17	,23	-,71	-,67	*,81	,23	-,15	,01	,30	,29	,23	,12	,17	,21	,16	-,10	,17	,09
18	,45	,32	,40	,41	,45	,39	*,59	,06	*,89	-,69	,22	,47	*,91	-,67	,43	,47	,37
21	,61	,29	-,38	-,38	,61	-,38	*,59	,48	-,37	,17	,29	,42	-,37	-,42	-,41	,42	-,22

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 11 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	40,24
2	16,96
3	12,74
4	10,82
5	8,08
6	4,85
7	2,68
8	2,07
9	0,72
10	0,55
11	0,29

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION OF MRS P's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	0,51	0,47	-12,97	2,65	-0,34	2,34
2	1,66	-0,05	0,09	12,43	24,63	-26,68
3	3,42	-27,03	4,67	-0,93	0,37	-1,06
4	1,90	-2,20	7,12	4,07	7,72	5,83
5	0,51	0,47	-12,97	2,65	-0,34	2,34
6	2,46	-17,52	1,35	-4,07	-3,84	0,83
8	2,09	0,74	-1,72	0,19	4,45	2,68
9	-0,10	1,04	-13,55	3,56	-0,38	3,63
10	-24,88	0,00	0,88	-3,20	-0,59	5,66
11	-9,50	2,45	-0,23	-18,85	28,12	0,58
13	0,14	-10,85	-21,34	-12,32	-4,74	-10,48
14	4,97	15,16	0,76	-3,20	-1,25	-4,54
15	-29,43	-0,00	2,39	0,07	-0,23	-6,16
16	-8,68	-0,06	1,63	26,11	-12,62	-3,36
17	1,21	-0,22	2,78	0,93	0,04	18,96
18	4,97	15,16	0,76	-3,20	-1,25	-4,54
19	3,55	6,58	14,79	-1,57	-9,09	0,35
<b>CONSTRUCT</b> No.						
1	2,49	15,71	6,09	-5,36	-8,46	-6,91
2	-3,10	-0,04	1,90	18,16	0,27	-46,09
3	-0,89	23,55	0,33	9,68	3,83	5,78
5	-0,89	23,55	0,33	9,68	3,83	5,78
6	2,49	15,71	6,09	-5,36	-8,46	-6,91
7	8,74	0,21	26,93	-6,24	23,62	0,02
8	11,02	0,01	-2,75	-2,94	7,08	1,92
9	-11,25	0,34	0,78	-7,93	5,06	0,22
10	-11,25	0,34	0,78	-7,93	5,06	0,22
11	10,65	0,46	1,34	20,23	-1,09	3,41
16	17,36	-0,77	0,03	-0,29	0,00	-0,27
17	-1,26	7,01	-5,13	-4,82	-21,43	7,33
18	16,70	-0,24	-2,09	0,13	-0,08	0,71
21	1,92	12,05	-45,43	-1,24	11,72	-14,41

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE  
OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN  
MRS P'S REPERTORY GRID.

APPENDIX F

DATA ON THE V FAMILY

CONSTRUCT NUMBERS	ELEMENTS																		SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE
	Self	Mother	Father	Brother	Sister	Spouse	Ex-flame	Pal	Ex-pal	Rejecting Person	Rejected Person	Accepted Person	Rejected Teacher	Accepted Teacher	Boas	Successful Person	Happy Person	Ethical Person			
1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	17, 18, 19	Down to earth, in contact with reality	Ecstatic
2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	/	0	X	/	/	/	/	14, 15, 16	Do not act like devils	Act like devils
3	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	X	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	10, 13, 11	Perfectionistic, ambitious	Not perfectionists: too timid to go higher, leave things uncompleted
4	/	/	/	/	/	X	0	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	6, 7, 8	More way-out: non-conformist	Extreme conformist
5	/	X	0	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2, 3, 4	Motherly, warm, affectionate	More hard-core: rule with an iron hand
6	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	14, 18, 5	Like to teach Self to preach to Self	Let Self do his thing: brotherly relationship with Self
7	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2, 14, 9	Unequal relationship: teacher-pupil type relationship	Egalitarian relationship with Self, friendship relationship
8	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	0	/	/	16, 17, 3	Unequal relationship: teacher-pupil type relationship	Egalitarian relationship with Self, friendship relationship
9	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	0	/	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	4, 15, 10	Easier to communicate with	More difficult to communicate with
10	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	/	/	/	/	/	5, 10, 15	Involved personally with Self	Taught Self school subjects
11	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	5, 19, 11	Teenagers: young ways	Adults: set in their ways
14	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	6, 7, 2	IMPERMEABLE	CONSTRUCT
15	X	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	6, 7, 3	Disciplinarians	Not disciplinarians
16	/	/	/	X	0	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	8, 13, 9	Let Self do his thing: brotherly relationship with Self	Like to teach Self to conform back to rules: preach to Self
17	0	/	X	X	/	/	X	X	/	0	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1, 4, 5	Extreme conformist	More way-out: non-conformist
18	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	X	/	/	16, 17, 9	Teenagers: young ways	Adults: set in their ways
20	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	0	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	14, 15, 7	Serious involvement in conversation	Light-hearted
21	X	/	X	X	0	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1, 8, 6	Light-hearted like children	Can be more heavy
22	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	Assigned constructs	Like I would like to be	Not like I would like to be



	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	-0,48	**77	,12	-0,40	,09	,10	,75	,75	,70	,75	-0,43	-0,56	,71	-0,75	,88	,59	-0,60
2		,24	-0,33	,12	-0,04	-0,02	-0,39	-0,39	,20	-0,67	,10	,13	,39	,46	-0,51	-0,07	,51
3			-0,37	,36	-0,10	-0,40	-0,67	-0,67	,63	-0,41	,35	,60	,54	,68	-0,78	-0,69	,70
4				,12	-0,04	,66	-0,11	-0,11	,07	-0,11	,10	-0,16	-0,39	-0,26	,33	,24	-0,47
5					,45	,10	-0,61	-0,61	,31	-0,61	,62	-0,07	-0,04	,24	-0,44	-0,29	,31
6						-0,06	-0,14	-0,14	-0,11	-0,14	,44	-0,20	-0,16	,07	,02	-0,42	-0,19
7							-0,13	-0,13	-0,09	-0,13	,08	-0,48	-0,41	-0,28	,32	,23	-0,16
8								**00	-0,61	,76	-0,64	-0,48	-0,41	-0,64	,65	,62	-0,50
9								1,00	-0,61	,78	-0,64	-0,48	-0,41	-0,64	,65	,62	-0,50
10									-0,61	,78	-0,64	-0,48	-0,41	-0,64	,48	-0,63	,61
11										-0,61	,00	,28	,47	,59	-0,48	-0,63	,61
13											-0,34	-0,23	-0,41	-0,64	,65	,36	-0,50
14												,23	,22	,22	-0,47	-0,31	-0,06
15													,87	,55	-0,58	-0,48	,29
16														,50	**	-0,41	,27
17															**77	-0,64	,65
18																,50	-0,62
19																	-0,50

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 13 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }



COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	49,64
2	14,50
3	8,20
4	7,12
5	6,71
6	4,09
7	3,17
8	2,44
9	1,88
10	0,97
11	0,69
12	0,38
13	0,21

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION OF PHILLIP V's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	-10,37	-0,01	-1,01	-1,64	-0,00	-0,19
2	2,40	0,02	13,65	-0,51	25,68	0,56
3	8,01	1,92	-1,32	-1,33	-2,96	-13,06
4	-0,47	-15,34	0,56	16,67	-7,58	0,36
5	1,99	-11,12	-2,01	-4,07	1,95	-3,31
6	0,02	-4,98	-21,59	-9,63	5,24	17,51
7	-0,40	-17,01	7,66	2,60	-1,03	-0,01
8	-10,11	7,32	0,34	-1,12	0,54	1,34
9	-10,11	7,32	0,34	-1,12	0,54	1,34
10	7,56	-0,01	5,65	-3,76	-23,26	11,72
11	-8,08	6,73	-8,37	0,00	-4,57	-6,71
13	1,73	-5,55	-14,59	3,46	6,07	-2,98
14	4,72	7,75	-4,79	16,38	-1,81	-1,97
15	7,44	12,43	-0,00	13,70	2,14	18,16
16	5,50	0,42	0,10	-1,04	-0,00	0,13
17	-10,75	-1,24	0,02	-0,34	-6,89	2,95
18	-5,66	-0,02	10,90	6,58	9,22	-6,77
19	4,67	0,84	7,09	-16,04	-0,49	-10,93
<b>CONSTRUCT No.</b>						
1	0,63	-8,66	-12,55	-2,61	-28,44	-8,53
2	-0,95	-1,27	-1,02	-0,68	2,63	-22,59
3	0,11	9,24	-6,97	-2,21	29,35	-12,13
4	-7,63	2,23	-9,96	-10,86	-0,24	10,30
5	-1,21	-6,79	19,54	-15,94	0,38	9,85
6	11,87	0,21	-3,44	-4,14	3,79	0,47
7	10,31	-4,77	-0,10	0,40	0,02	0,98
8	10,31	-4,77	-0,10	0,40	0,02	0,98
9	-2,64	0,14	-1,17	18,27	7,98	10,82
10	-0,76	-4,29	0,97	-13,21	-0,00	-3,13
11	-8,62	-9,36	-6,08	0,26	1,04	-0,08
15	7,10	-1,39	-18,52	4,37	-2,23	6,97
16	-11,87	-0,21	3,44	4,14	-3,79	-0,47
17	7,63	-2,23	9,96	10,86	0,24	-10,30
18	-8,62	-9,36	-6,08	0,26	1,04	-0,08
20	8,68	-3,28	0,10	-10,09	4,43	2,20
21	-1,05	-31,80	-0,01	1,29	14,37	0,12

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE  
OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN  
PHILLIP V'S REPERTORY GRID.



	2	3	4	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	16	18	20	21
1	1,00														
2		,60		,89	,79	-,60	-,60	,89	,50	,50	,32	,60	1,00	,69	,69
3			,60	,89	,79	-,60	-,60	,89	,50	,50	,32	,60	1,00	,69	,69
4			1,00	,67	,76	-,00	-,00	,67	,84	,84	,19	1,00	,60	,86	,86
6				,67	,76	-,00	-,00	,67	,84	,84	,19	1,00	,60	,86	,86
7				,67	,65	-,67	-,67	,77	,56	,56	,28	,67	,89	,52	,52
9				,89	-,76	-,76	1,00	,89	,63	,63	,25	,76	,79	,88	,88
10				1,00	-,67	1,00	-,67	-,67	,84	-,84	-,19	-,00	-,60	-,86	-,86
11					-,67	1,00	-,67	-,67	,84	-,84	-,19	-,00	-,60	-,86	-,86
12									,56	,56	,28	,67	,89	,78	,78
13										1,00	,16	,84	,50	,72	,72
14											,16	,84	,50	,72	,72
16												,19	,32	,22	,22
18													,60	,86	,86
20														,69	,69
21															1,00

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 7 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MR V'S REPERTORY GRID

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1	,75																		
2		**																	
3		,75	**																
4		**	,75	**															
5		**	**	,75	**														
6		**	**	**	,75	**													
7		**	**	**	**	,75	**												
8		**	**	**	**	**	,75	**											
9		**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**										
10		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**									
11		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**								
12		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**							
13		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**						
14		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**					
15		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**				
16		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**			
17		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**		
18		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**	
19		**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	,75	**

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 7 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MR V's REPERTORY GRID

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	,95	,81	,95	,95	,95	,81	,95	-,76	-,60	-,74	-,67	-,74	-,40	-,95	-,74	,95	,95	-,57	,95
2	,95	,81	,95	,95	,95	,81	,95	-,76	-,60	-,74	-,67	-,74	-,40	-,95	-,74	,95	,95	-,57	,95
3	,79	,65	,79	,79	,79	,65	,79	-,89	-,12	-,96	,05	-,96	,29	,79	-,96	,79	,79	,18	,79
4	,79	,65	,79	,79	,79	,65	,79	-,89	-,12	-,96	,05	-,96	,29	,79	-,96	,79	,79	,18	,79
6	,88	,75	,88	,88	,88	,75	,88	-,73	-,18	-,75	-,59	-,75	-,43	,88	-,75	,88	,88	-,56	,88
7	,88	,74	,88	,88	,88	,74	,88	-,84	-,63	-,84	-,44	-,84	,17	,88	,84	,88	,88	-,06	,88
9	-,79	-,65	-,79	-,79	-,79	-,65	-,79	,89	,12	-,96	-,05	-,96	-,29	-,79	-,96	-,79	-,79	-,18	-,79
10	-,79	-,65	-,79	-,79	-,79	-,65	-,79	,89	,12	-,96	-,05	-,96	-,29	-,79	-,96	-,79	-,79	-,18	-,79
11	,92	,78	,92	,92	,92	,78	,92	-,80	-,63	-,79	-,59	-,79	-,00	,92	-,79	,92	,92	-,42	,92
12	,67	,56	,67	,67	,67	,56	,67	-,56	-,06	-,90	,07	-,90	,27	,67	-,90	,67	,67	,17	,67
13	,67	,56	,67	,67	,67	,56	,67	-,56	-,06	-,90	,07	-,90	,27	,67	-,90	,67	,67	,17	,67
14	,16	,77	,16	,16	,16	,77	,16	-,25	-,21	-,24	-,23	-,24	-,16	,16	-,24	,16	,16	-,20	,16
16	,79	,65	,79	,79	,79	,65	,79	-,89	-,12	-,96	,05	-,96	,29	,79	-,96	,79	,79	,18	,79
18	,95	,81	,95	,95	,95	,81	,95	-,76	-,60	-,74	-,67	-,74	-,40	-,95	-,74	,95	,95	-,57	,95
20	,83	,69	,83	,83	,83	,69	,83	-,87	-,58	-,90	-,06	-,90	,30	,83	-,90	,83	,83	,13	,83
21	,83	,69	,83	,83	,83	,69	,83	-,87	-,58	-,90	-,06	-,90	,30	,83	-,90	,83	,83	,13	,83

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " " } for 7 df  
 \*\*\* " " " " }

CONSTRUCT-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MR V's REPERTORY GRID

COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	74,94
2	13,66
3	4,62
4	2,86
5	2,15
6	1,19
7	0,58

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION OF MR V'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3
1	3,28	0,92	-0,00
2	3,62	1,70	-0,02
4	3,28	0,92	-0,00
5	3,28	0,92	-0,00
6	3,62	1,70	-0,02
7	3,28	0,92	-0,00
8	-12,61	0,20	-2,04
9	-1,47	-9,78	-69,76
10	-17,22	4,54	1,13
11	-0,64	-25,50	0,08
12	-17,22	4,54	1,13
13	0,01	-16,42	17,12
14	3,28	0,92	-0,00
15	-17,22	4,54	1,13
16	3,28	0,92	-0,00
17	3,28	0,92	-0,00
18	-0,13	-23,75	7,56
19	3,28	0,92	-0,00
<hr/>			
CONSTRUCT No.			
1	8,05	13,92	-0,13
2	8,05	13,92	-0,13
3	6,16	-6,17	-1,21
4	6,16	-6,17	-1,21
6	7,02	6,73	-31,18
7	7,81	0,24	15,52
9	-6,16	6,17	1,21
10	-6,16	6,17	1,21
11	8,12	5,10	4,94
12	3,73	-5,40	-3,96
13	3,73	-5,40	-3,96
14	0,35	0,89	-0,04
16	6,16	-6,17	-1,21
18	8,05	13,92	-0,13
20	7,13	-1,81	16,97
21	7,13	-1,81	16,97

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT  
AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF  
COMPONENTS 1, 2 AND 3 IN MR V'S REPERTORY GRID.

C O N S T R U C T	E L E M E N T S																								SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24			
	Self	Mother	Father	Brother	Sister	Spouse	Ex-lame	Pal	Ex-pal	Rejecting	Pitied	Person	Attractive	Accepted	Teacher	Rejected	Teacher	Boss	Successful	Happy	Person	Ethical	Person	17, 18, 19	More religious	Less religious	
1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14, 15, 16	Sweet-natured	Strict	
2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10, 12, 11	Good-hearted	Never give	
3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 8	Understood Self	Did not understand Self	
4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	People with a loving heart	Stern people	
5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14, 18, 5	Do not drink	Drink	
6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 14, 9	Stern	Lenient	
7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16, 17, 3	People that one can get to know well	People that one cannot get to know well	
8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4, 15, 10	Drink	Do not drink	
9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5, 10, 15	Worldly	Serious	
10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5, 19, 11	Young: like worldly pleasures	Old: religious	
11	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 2	Do not come out with things	Outspoken	
14	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 3	Humorous	Sour, serious	
15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8, 12, 9	Religious	More outgoing	
16	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	Speak out	Keep things to themselves	
17	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16, 17, 9	Not as religious	Very religious	
18	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14, 15, 7	Educated	Not educated	
20	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	Make friends easily	Cannot make friends easily	
21	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned	(Like I would like to be	Not like I would like to be	
22	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Like my son	Not like my son		
23	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Authoritarian	Authoritarian		
24	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	construc			

MRS V's REPERTORY GRID

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1	,08	,04	,00	-,06	,44	,03	,06	-,44	-,66	-,66	,00	-,33	,66	-,13	*,89	,03	-,10			
2		,50	,47	*,88	,35	*,89	,19	-,35	-,16	-,16	-,47	,40	,16	,55	,00	,08	-,00			
3			,35	,57	,57	-,44	,24	-,57	-,08	-,08	-,35	,32	,08	,40	-,00	-,08	,16			
4				,37	,62	-,34	,27	-,62	-,34	-,34	-,56	,45	,34	,45	-,11	,11	-,15			
5					,17	*,78	,27	-,17	-,01	-,01	-,37	,31	,01	,44	,12	-,01	,06			
6						-,27	-,03	*,00	-,52	-,52	-,37	,06	,52	,19	-,37	,24	-,28			
7							-,12	,27	,07	,07	,57	-,48	-,07	*,66	-,11	-,17	,05			
8								,03	-,12	-,12	-,27	,21	,12	,33	-,27	-,67	-,24			
9									,52	,52	,37	-,06	-,52	-,19	,37	-,24	,28			
10									*,00	*,00	,11	,20	*,00	,03	*,80	-,17	,05			
11									1,00	1,00	,11	,20	*,00	,03	*,80	-,17	,05			
14												*,67	-,11	*,89	,11	,11	,15			
15												-,67	-,11	*,89	,22	-,26	-,20			
16												-,20	-,20	*,80	*,80	,17	-,05			
17												-,03	-,03	*,80	,00	-,20	-,10			
18																		,11	,15	
20																				,15
21																				,05

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 15 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MRS V'S REPERTORY GRID



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
C	,42	,50	,47	-,53	-,63	,30	-,52	-,53	,57	-,44	-,63	,54	-,25	,47	-,02	-,16	,62	,47
O	,51	-,59	,59	-,53	,14	-,66	,37	-,37	,05	-,65	,20	,52	,48	-,58	,11	,31	,42	,59
N	,34	-,14	,41	-,26	-,01	-,75	,37	,05	,11	-,71	,02	,28	,28	-,24	,06	,17	,31	,41
S	,60	-,31	,63	-,59	-,37	-,51	,38	,20	,26	-,58	-,27	,54	,56	-,34	-,37	,37	,01	,63
T	,35	-,62	,44	-,19	,26	-,64	,38	-,35	,06	-,57	,31	,39	,36	-,65	,13	,30	,33	,44
R	,57	,17	,54	-,76	-,70	-,50	,12	-,03	,38	-,66	-,64	,59	,41	,19	,02	,31	,39	,54
U	-,53	,63	-,52	,51	-,23	,67	-,43	,29	,32	,55	-,33	-,48	-,54	,59	-,13	-,23	-,40	-,52
C	,21	,10	,42	,02	,14	,05	,26	,09	,24	-,54	,18	,15	-,38	-,56	-,62	-,06	,31	,42
T	-,57	-,17	-,54	*,76	,70	,50	-,12	,03	-,38	,66	,64	-,59	-,41	-,19	-,02	-,31	-,39	-,54
S	-,54	-,40	-,59	*,68	*,74	-,24	,55	,56	-,59	,56	*,73	-,66	-,25	-,41	,45	-,33	-,57	-,59
	-,54	-,40	-,59	*,68	*,74	-,24	,55	,56	-,59	,56	*,73	-,66	-,25	-,41	,45	-,33	-,57	-,59
	-,59	,44	-,69	,56	,10	,54	-,51	-,29	,32	,57	-,26	-,49	-,51	,51	,40	,26	-,41	-,69
	,41	-,51	,50	-,29	,39	-,52	,67	,44	-,46	-,35	,52	-,07	,47	-,62	-,33	-,31	-,12	,50
	,54	,40	,59	-,68	*,74	,24	-,55	-,56	,59	-,56	*,73	,66	,25	,41	-,45	,33	,57	,59
	,52	-,55	,65	-,47	,23	-,57	,57	,28	-,43	-,54	,45	,36	,47	-,64	-,38	-,31	,35	,65
	-,48	-,55	-,58	,54	,64	-,41	,52	,45	-,59	,50	,61	-,56	,22	-,42	,43	,18	-,64	-,58
	,26	-,17	-,24	-,28	-,34	-,21	-,25	-,31	-,15	,25	-,36	,38	,50	,42	,45	,50	-,21	,24
	-,55	-,43	-,05	,21	,16	,15	-,47	-,03	,07	,22	,14	,03	,09	,09	,16	,12	,05	-,05

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 15 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

CONSTRUCT-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MRS V's REPERTORY GRID

COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	34,13
2	27,16
3	11,07
4	7,85
5	5,59
6	4,64
7	3,09
8	2,02
9	1,81
10	1,07
11	0,84
12	0,40
13	0,19
14	0,09
15	0,04

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION OF MRS V's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	9,73	-0,53	0,03	0,87	-1,33	2,31
2	0,02	14,10	-5,02	5,07	8,86	2,81
3	8,39	-0,76	-3,34	-0,13	-0,62	0,00
4	-16,25	0,01	-1,41	-1,83	5,81	-4,36
5	-6,51	-8,38	-1,66	-10,56	-0,03	-0,00
6	-2,16	15,80	-12,87	-2,24	-9,98	-1,64
7	-0,01	-15,20	-0,13	7,31	9,59	0,52
8	-2,12	-3,79	-3,03	44,76	0,18	-0,49
9	1,96	4,97	-0,36	-0,98	15,09	-9,61
10	-22,08	1,90	4,58	1,46	-13,18	0,01
11	-4,22	-12,82	-3,33	-5,68	-2,77	1,01
13	7,85	0,03	1,28	-1,21	-1,27	0,04
14	2,92	-3,10	12,82	1,92	-15,84	-4,64
15	-0,01	17,51	4,08	3,58	-1,90	5,61
16	-2,18	-0,01	25,89	-3,41	9,70	23,79
17	0,68	0,18	14,67	-1,45	3,23	-35,40
18	4,52	-0,14	-2,16	-7,40	0,02	7,74
19	8,39	-0,76	-3,34	-0,13	-0,62	0,00
<b>CONSTRUCT</b> No.						
1	6,36	7,72	-1,27	-2,60	0,76	25,28
2	5,58	-6,87	2,71	-15,28	1,41	-0,00
3	1,58	-1,50	0,27	0,01	11,70	0,41
4	8,25	-2,74	0,71	10,72	0,48	-27,13
5	2,37	-6,72	1,49	-20,11	5,77	-1,45
6	9,11	0,05	4,24	9,57	9,84	1,60
7	-4,31	9,80	-3,46	12,17	0,59	-2,77
8	0,86	-0,73	-21,11	-1,26	8,77	-8,30
9	-9,11	-0,05	-4,24	-9,57	-9,84	-1,60
10	-11,16	-6,20	0,09	0,57	3,24	4,64
11	-11,16	-6,20	0,09	0,57	3,24	4,64
14	-5,91	8,98	2,24	-4,15	8,63	-3,58
15	0,82	-14,32	-3,37	5,20	-6,42	0,05
16	11,16	6,20	-0,09	-0,57	-3,24	-4,64
17	3,66	-13,38	-3,83	0,43	-9,17	3,49
18	-7,97	-7,81	8,70	0,69	0,49	-5,43
20	0,20	0,68	41,34	0,29	-10,26	0,29
21	-0,42	0,04	0,76	-6,27	-6,15	-4,70

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE  
OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN  
MRS V's REPERTORY GRID.

APPENDIX G

DATA ON THE F FAMILY

ELEMENTS		ELEMENT NUMBERS																		SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE					
		1	2	3	4	5	7	8	13	14	16	18	Happy Person						Boss								
CONSTRUCTS	5	✓	X	X	0			✓	✓			✓													2, 3, 4	Drinks	Does not drink
	6	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X													14, 18, 5	Works	Is still at school
	17	0	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓													1, 4, 5	Has never become mentally ill	Has become mentally ill
	22	✓						✓																	Assigned constructs	{ Like I would like to be authoritarian	Not like I would like to be authoritarian
	24											✓															Not authoritarian

STEPHEN F's REPERTORY GRID

C O N S T R U C T S		5	6	17
C O N S T R U C T S	5		,30	-,29
	6			-,10
	17			

\* Significant at the ,05 level )  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 3 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " )

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM STEPHEN F's REPERTORY GRID

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	13	14	16	18
1		,27	,27	-,56	-,38	-,56	,27	,27	-,56	-,56	,27
2			*** 1,00	-,87	-,64	-,87	*** 1,00	*** 1,00	-,87	-,87	*** 1,00
3				-,87	-,64	-,87	*** 1,00	*** 1,00	-,87	-,87	*** 1,00
4					,37	*** 1,00	-,87	-,87	*** 1,00	*** 1,00	-,87
5						,37	-,64	-,64	,37	,37	-,64
7							-,87	-,87	*** 1,00	*** 1,00	-,87
8								*** 1,00	-,87	-,87	*** 1,00
13									-,87	-,87	*** 1,00
14										*** 1,00	-,87
16											-,87
18											

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 3 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM STEPHEN F's REPERTORY GRID

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	13	14	16	18
5	,55	* ,95	* ,95	* ,96	-,62	*,96	* ,95	* ,95	*,96	*,96	* ,95
6	,21	,40	,40	-,06	*,95	-,06	,40	,40	-,06	-,06	,40
17	** -,96	,01	,01	,33	,20	,33	,01	,01	,33	,33	,01

C O N S T R U C T S

\* Significant at the ,05 level )  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 3 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

CONSTRUCT-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM STEPHEN F'S REPERTORY GRID

COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	65,59
2	18,10
3	16,31

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION OF STEPHEN F'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3
1	14,14	-62,22	-14,55
2	6,25	2,89	1,77
3	6,25	2,89	1,77
4	-8,72	0,91	-6,28
5	-19,75	-19,68	51,48
7	-8,72	0,91	-6,28
8	6,25	2,89	1,77
13	6,25	2,89	1,77
14	-8,72	0,91	-6,28
16	-8,72	0,91	-6,28
18	6,25	2,89	1,77
<hr/>			
CONSTRUCT No.			
5	88,64	0,46	10,91
6	6,62	23,92	-69,46
17	-4,74	75,62	19,63

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2 AND 3 IN STEPHEN F'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENTS	ELEMENT NUMBERS																		SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18				19
Self	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17,18,19	Church-going people	Not church-going people
Mother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15,16	Speak nicely	Do not
Father	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10,13,11	Good-hearted; help others	Think only of themselves
Brother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 8	Like to go out	Stay at home
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	Social drinkers	Never drink
Stater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,18, 5	Friendly; not arrogant	Arrogant
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2,14, 9	Like to give to and help others	Never give
Ex-flame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 3	Gentle	Coarse; swear when they speak
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4,15,10	Like to go out	Stay at home
Ex-pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5,10,15	Like to go out	Stay at home
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5,19,11	Like to go to church	Do not go to church
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 2	Like to go out	Stay at home
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 3	Like to go out	Stay at home
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8,13, 9	Can make friends with anyone	More shy
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	Give to others readily	Let it be known that they have given
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16,17, 9	Friendly	Arrogant
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,15, 7	Friendly	Arrogant
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	Have male interests	Have female interests
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	(Like I would like to be)	Not like I would like to be
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Like my son)	(Authoritarian)	Not like my son
Refraining	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Authoritarian)	(Authoritarian)	Not authoritarian



	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1	-,21	-,50	,13	-,46	,68	-,21	-,49	,19	-,39	,51	,13	-,49	,04	,13	-,49	-,09	-,49	
2		-,54	,45	,21	-,14	1,00	,15	-,79	-,33	-,16	,45	,15	-,52	,45	,15	,72	,15	
3			-,24	,52	-,20	-,54	-,07	,36	,56	-,46	-,24	-,07	,21	-,24	-,07	-,46	-,07	
4				-,19	-,19	,45	,10	-,61	,08	-,59	1,00	,10	-,82	1,00	,10	,70	,10	
5					,05	,21	-,41	,05	-,02	-,42	-,19	-,41	,22	-,19	-,41	-,03	-,41	
6						-,14	-,74	,33	-,58	,47	-,19	-,74	,34	-,19	-,74	-,39	-,74	
7							,15	-,79	-,33	-,16	,45	,15	-,52	,45	,15	,72	,15	
8								-,52	,30	-,05	,10	1,00	-,48	,10	1,00	,38	1,00	
9									-,00	,20	-,61	-,52	,90	-,61	-,52	,78	-,52	
10										-,34	,08	,30	-,18	,08	,30	-,20	,30	
11											-,59	-,05	,38	-,59	-,05	-,43	-,05	
13												,10	,82	1,00	,10	,70	,10	
14													-,48	,10	1,00	,38	1,00	
15														-,82	-,48	-,74	-,48	
16															,10	,70	,10	
17																,38	1,00	
18																	1,00	
19																		,38

\* Significant at the ,05 level }  
 \*\* " " " ,01 " } for 8 df  
 \*\*\* " " " ,001 " }

INTER-ELEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM MR F's REPERTORY GRID



COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	46,48
2	21,06
3	14,33
4	9,87
5	4,59
6	2,22
7	1,14
8	0,31

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A  
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION  
OF MR F's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4
1	0,92	-21,99	0,12	-10,71
2	-3,10	-1,19	-1,77	10,67
3	1,10	19,98	-4,03	-4,08
4	-3,47	-0,64	-2,49	-5,92
5	0,40	5,21	-28,31	14,36
6	5,12	-19,86	-5,10	-0,01
7	-3,10	-1,19	-1,77	10,67
8	-2,18	1,73	8,16	0,31
9	29,66	1,77	0,17	-7,97
10	-0,22	9,08	0,48	-8,46
11	2,50	-9,48	17,21	5,36
13	-3,47	-0,64	-2,49	-5,92
14	-2,18	1,73	8,16	0,31
15	30,78	1,08	0,44	8,27
16	-3,47	-0,64	-2,49	-5,92
17	-2,18	1,73	8,16	0,31
18	-3,98	-0,34	-0,49	0,48
19	-2,18	1,73	8,16	0,31
<b>CONSTRUCT</b>				
CONSTRUCT No.				
1	1,88	11,42	27,29	-0,02
2	-7,97	-1,72	8,39	-0,51
3	-5,32	-11,62	3,58	0,20
4	-8,92	7,66	-1,27	0,17
5	0,48	-0,59	-6,60	-57,11
6	-4,32	-0,44	-0,14	-0,00
7	-5,32	-11,62	3,58	0,20
8	-7,97	-1,72	8,39	-0,51
9	-8,92	7,66	-1,27	0,17
10	-8,92	7,66	-1,27	0,17
11	1,88	11,42	27,29	-0,02
14	-8,92	7,66	-1,27	0,17
15	-8,92	7,66	-1,27	0,17
16	-4,32	-0,44	-0,14	-0,00
17	-5,75	-6,57	4,53	-0,56
18	-4,32	-0,44	-0,14	-0,00
20	-4,32	-0,44	-0,14	-0,00
21	-1,51	3,22	3,43	-40,06

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3 AND 4 IN MR F'S REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENTS	ELEMENT NUMBERS																			SORTS	EMERGENT POLE	IMPLICIT POLE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19					
Self	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17, 18, 19	Unhelpful	Always help when things go wrong
Mother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10, 13, 11	Not false	False: talk behind one's back
Father	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 8	Helpful	Unhelpful
Brother	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 4	People that one cannot get to know	People that one can get to know
Sister	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16, 17, 3	Approachable: people that one can talk to	People that one cannot talk to
Spouse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5, 19, 11	People from whom one cannot get advice	People from whom one can get advice
Ex-lame	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	4, 12, 9	People that one can get to know	People that one cannot get to know
Pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12, 18, 6	Likes "high society"	Does not like "high society"
Ex-pal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 2	People that one can get to know	People that one cannot get to know
Rejecting Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6, 7, 3	Like chatting, singing, drinking	More quiet
Friend	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8, 13, 9	Helpful	Unhelpful
Happy Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 4, 5	Responsible	Irresponsible
Successful Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16, 17, 9	People with whom one can have a friendship relationship	On too high a level for a friendship relationship
Attractive Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	2, 3, 12	Friendly	Arrogant
Threatening Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1, 8, 6	Do not like to run around	Like to run around
Threatening Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	Like I would like to be	Not like I would like to be
Threatening Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	Like my son	Not like my son
Threatening Person	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Assigned constructs	Authoritarian	Not authoritarian

MRS F's REPERTORY GRID

	3	4	5	8	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	21
1	-.60*	.88*	.11	-.33	.38	-.11	.63*	-.11	-.49	-.70*	-.06	.12	-.34	-.38
3		.51	-.17	.43	-.25	.17	-.72*	.17	.06	.35	.43	-.05	.39	.77**
4			-.07	.25	-.27	.07	-.55*	.07	.38	.79**	-.02	.10	.30	.27
5				-.57*	.44	-1.00**	-.17	-1.00**	-.11	.02	-.17	-.23	.09	-.07
8					-.51	.57*	-.38	.57*	.06	.09	.15	.56*	.39	.25
11						-.44	.24	-.44	-.13	-.31	-.25	-.10	-.30	-.27
12							.17	1.00**	.11	-.02	.17	.23	-.09	.07
13								.17	-.30	-.44	-.04	-.11	-.54*	-.55*
14									.11	-.02	.17	.23	-.09	.07
15										.20	-.21	.17	.34	-.12
16											.09	-.03	.24	.07
17												-.05	.39	.51
18													.45	-.18
19														.30
21														

\* Significant at the .05 level  
 \*\* " " " .01 " } for 13 df  
 \*\*\* " " " .001 " }

INTER-CONSTRUCT CORRELATIONS FROM MRS F's REPERTORY GRID





COMPONENT No.	VARIATION
1	35,67
2	17,80
3	15,25
4	8,54
5	6,70
6	5,54
7	5,01
8	2,06
9	1,72
10	0,77
11	0,47
12	0,36
13	0,11

VARIATION OF EACH COMPONENT AS A  
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VARIATION  
OF MRS F's REPERTORY GRID.

ELEMENT No.	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4	COMPONENT 5	COMPONENT 6
1	5,39	-0,84	-1,61	-1,28	-14,55	-2,50
2	0,02	35,77	-25,48	-0,80	-6,94	-0,26
3	3,96	3,35	-1,83	-18,85	7,50	4,71
4	-16,87	17,89	0,79	22,81	-0,10	10,73
5	1,80	0,99	3,76	0,54	-0,98	-2,18
6	7,55	-0,13	0,09	-0,03	-0,22	1,62
7	-1,56	-6,96	-10,06	9,22	-0,48	-7,61
8	0,66	0,76	25,69	-0,70	-2,53	0,00
9	3,68	-2,00	-0,05	2,42	4,48	1,84
10	-14,05	-0,56	2,06	-0,40	2,08	9,75
11	0,77	0,16	0,92	14,27	14,88	-21,34
12	-24,27	0,10	0,12	-23,02	3,38	-23,90
13	2,90	0,58	15,02	-0,00	-0,73	-1,90
16	0,64	-2,45	-4,02	-0,60	25,07	5,64
17	-0,30	-13,42	-7,83	2,35	-2,23	0,08
18	-8,04	-13,91	0,58	-2,67	-13,63	4,32
19	7,55	-0,13	0,09	-0,03	-0,22	1,62
<b>CONSTRUCT No.</b>						
1	-18,21	-4,68	-0,91	1,31	-2,70	0,47
3	13,15	-0,10	-10,14	2,45	1,71	-5,01
4	16,56	7,33	2,90	-0,57	-1,41	-4,69
5	-0,94	12,54	-2,43	3,78	-2,78	2,97
8	6,80	-16,19	1,96	8,69	-3,02	-3,90
11	-8,16	8,76	-0,99	9,02	2,01	-23,84
12	0,94	-12,54	2,43	-3,78	2,78	-2,97
13	-7,95	-2,09	0,91	-12,50	-0,05	0,04
14	0,94	-12,54	2,43	-3,78	2,78	-2,97
15	3,01	2,61	17,54	3,79	35,15	21,05
16	11,46	9,35	2,05	-11,74	-20,82	-0,02
17	1,91	-5,20	-17,41	-2,05	-2,76	22,34
18	0,24	-5,17	9,13	29,26	-15,44	0,28
19	1,46	-0,01	-0,02	5,77	-1,08	9,24
21	8,29	-0,87	-28,77	1,50	5,52	-0,21

VARIATION OF EACH ELEMENT AND EACH CONSTRUCT AS A PERCENTAGE  
OF THE VARIATION OF EACH OF COMPONENTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 IN  
MRS F's REPERTORY GRID.