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THE PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERIOR OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE FIRM:
COPING STRATEGIES, PHANTASY, AND ENDURING ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONALITY

Abstract
by
BARRY A. JACOBS

This inquiry explores the role of individual unconscious coping strategies and phantasy, manifested as personality and defense mechanisms, in the management of organizational culture. It was found that individual methodologies are useful for the discovery of collective reality, and that individual psychological processes have functional outcomes in organizational culture. It was conceptualized that coping strategies could be found that limit the ability of organizational members to understand the organizational culture at conscious and rational levels. Intensity of imagination was found to significantly influence one's perception of the importance that a particular ideology plays in an organization's culture. Those persons who believed that the organization was relatively high in power-orientation were more likely to favorably distort their self-presentation on a personality test. A broad range of personality factors were found to significantly influence the firm members' preference for structure in the firm's culture. It was also conceptualized that cultural norms would be discovered that provide operating space and impose limitations on discussion in order to
support individual coping strategies. It was discovered that the firm provided sufficient operating space for certain widespread individual coping strategies that might be neurotic, and that limitations were imposed on the discussion of these coping strategies. Additionally it was conceptualized that unconscious and confused perceptions of authority would be uncovered that distort interpersonal relations and are sustained by coping strategies embedded the culture. It was ascertained that the founding partner of the firm provided important cues and boundaries for the structure of the organization's culture, and that a distorted view of this leader is maintained through denial of aggression. It was also conceptualized that distorted object relations would be inhibiting of group development. Adequate data about group development were not derived as an outcome of this study. Finally it was conceptualized that if organizational neurosis is identified it would manifest itself as excessive attribution of power or the converse. Organizational neurosis was not identified at the firm. Although clinically descriptive in approach, triangulation research techniques within a case study were also employed. Coping strategies and personality style for members of this firm were obtained by using Cattell's 16PF (n=51) and the Thematic Apperception Test (n=38). Characteristics of the organizational culture were obtained using Harrison's Organizational Ideology Questionnaire (n=51) and an structured open-ended interview protocol (n=38). The firm's culture was found to support personal issues in coping with aggression and autonomy, in important facets of organizing and resistance to change.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction and Theoretical Framework

Introduction

In this essay I explore the role of individual unconscious coping strategies and phantasy, manifested as personality and defense mechanisms, in the management of organizational culture. The study is clinically descriptive, using a psychoanalytic lens to examine the psychosocial dynamics of a professional service firm. It is also interdisciplinary, focusing on the functional outcomes of the dynamic interrelationship between the individual members of an organization and the collective structures they establish to accomplish the organization's technical tasks.

I chose this topic because of both my personal curiosity and a belief that it will advance our knowledge of how organizations function. The genesis of this project lies in my 1988 study of the drama triangle (Jacobs, 1988); the essence of which is a persecutor - victim - rescuer triad of roles dynamically interrelated through a cluster of dysfunctional personal and interpersonal defensive strategies. I found the drama triangle embedded in an organization's culture in a number of subtle variations; and although organizational members seemed to have a preference for a particular role, they collaborated with each other and switched roles as necessary to maintain the integrity of the three part strategy.
Expecting that the elimination of organizational drama triangles coupled with the implementation of "progressive" bottom-up changes, would increase member satisfaction, I was surprised to find that it provoked organizational exit instead. The transformation in membership apparently did increase satisfaction and productivity—but I remained puzzled. Was it an aberration? A blunder? Or was there something worthy of further exploration? This defensive strategy seemed not only to attract certain persons to its roles, but also exert a profound influence on the organization's culture. Psychoanalytic theory seemed to explain these patterns best; and I found myself curious about the broader implications of the relationship between the functionality of individual coping strategies and organizational culture.

A variety of psychoanalytic and neo-psychoanalytic theories have been invoked to explain organizational dynamics. Field studies have been performed using concepts from a number of related domains including projective identification and the shared emotional themes in groups (Bion, 1959); intrapsychic conflict and group development and structure (Bennis and Shepard, 1956) (Slater, 1966); the role of phantasy in organizational culture (Schwartz, 1987); organization as a defense against anxiety (Jacques, 1955); intrapsychic conflict and adaptation to work (Labier, 1984); defensive strategies and organizational learning (Argyris, 1985); defensive behavior in organizations (Ashforth and Lee, 1990); leadership and dysfunctional
organizational culture (Kets de Vries and Miller, 1985); psychodynamics between leadership and organization (Zaleznick and Kets de Vries, 1985); organizational functionality (Levinson, 1981) (Kets de Vries, 1980); leadership gender and group defensive processes (Tischler et al., 1986); clinical diagnosis of an organization (Levinson, 1972); reciprocation and unconscious collusion (Levinson, 1965) (Zaleznick, 1970); and coping strategies and the problems of bureaucracy (Jacques, 1976) (Crozier, 1964). Despite the rich array of clinical and field studies that support the idea that intrapsychic conflict and defense mechanisms are instrumental to explain organizational dynamics and culture, the link between individual coping strategies and organizational culture remains unclear.

Although the concept has been around for some time, the term organizational culture is of relatively recent vintage (Hofstede et al., 1988). As a quasi-anthropological approach to understanding organizations it seems to have survived as an important construct in the field of organizational studies, despite the faddish explosion of interest and subsequent decline in the 1980's popular and academic press. Researchers and writers have addressed culture at a number of different levels including combinations of climate, patterns of behavior, values, artifacts, ideology, and assumptions (Ott, 1989) (Hofstede et al., 1988). Schein's (1985) comprehensive study of the topic reached a conclusion about organizational culture that largely put an end to glib claims of quick fixes. He said that it is extremely difficult to change culture because of the unconscious
basic assumptions which are at the root of its dynamics. And although he described the collaborative process among founding leaders and members involved in the etiology of organizational culture, the specific link, if any, between individual coping strategies and basic assumptions remains unexplored.

The study to be reported in this dissertation is significant for several reasons. First it provides additional clarity on the connection between individual processes and organizational culture and adds to an interdisciplinary understanding of organizational studies. Investigations in organizational behavior are frequently directed at learning about organizational processes and outcomes from a particular level, such as individual or systemic. As a result, such single-level analyses may overemphasize certain aspects, such as person, group, or situation.

Although I have described a rich stream of field research by psycho-dynamically oriented authors, organizational studies more typically have emphasized the rational aspects of persons and situations, and have ignored or down-played the irrational or unconscious aspects. The latter have inferentially been portrayed as unimportant or collectively offsetting, or thought to be more appropriately addressed under the domain of clinical psychology.

Although this is not directly a study of individual pathology, the learnings reported here may be useful in adding to our understanding
of the functional and dysfunctional outcomes of pathology in organizations. A substantial portion of the general population has been found to be affected in one way or another by neurosis or character disorder. Rennie and Strole's 1954 study (cited in Kaplan et al., 1981) estimated 81.5% (23% significantly impaired) of the U.S. population, to be so affected. Each of the various coping strategies associated with pathology, of course, would have different and not necessarily offsetting functional outcomes in the workplace.

I believe also that this study holds important implications for the practice of organization development. In this inquiry I explore the deeper individual issues, that when hidden, serve to support the basic assumptions of an perceptibly outdated culture. Significant changes to an organization's culture are extremely difficult implement (Schein, 1985, 1990) (Ott, 1989) (Hofstede et al., 1988), in part because of complications involved in uncovering the unconscious basic assumptions of the culture. Schein has emphasized using the findings of co-inquiry based clinical studies to gain access to the basic assumptions. I believe that this study offers a way to further demonstrate that individual psychological processes reside within an organizations culture, including its basic assumptions, and that individual methodologies are useful for the discovery of collective reality.

In order to pursue this understanding, I have chosen to dissect the collective patterns of culture and personal systems using qualitative
and quantitative data collection methods to explore organizational as well as individual systems. This choice was due in part to my accounting background and familiarity with traditional issues in such a business as well as the desire to study organizational processes in a setting of limited structural complexity. The site selected was a certified public accounting firm with multiple locations. The nature of work in a professional firm is (as distinguished from say the bureaucracy of a large auto manufacturer) is somewhat simpler in process and structure, and therefore, certain interpersonal and ideological issues may be easier to explore.

The basic instruments of exploration used in the study are Murray's Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Test (16PF), Roger Harrison's Ideology Questionnaire, and a structured interview protocol. The TAT and 16PF are complementary individual assessment instruments; the Ideology Questionnaire and structured interview protocol emphasized firm-wide data and perceptions.

The balance of this chapter is devoted to a review of relevant research and theories. Immediately following is a discussion of the core psychoanalytic theories underlying my theory construction and a summary of how other authors have applied these theories to organizational studies. This is followed by my own theory construction and a setting out of research questions addressed in the study. Chapter two describes my research methodology. My findings in the field are described in chapter three. Chapter four is a
discussion of the major findings, and chapter five describes the implications to the field of the findings, their limitations, and possible future research.
Morgan (1986) used the metaphor of an organization as a psychic prison to explain the role of the unconscious in the formation and sustenance of organizational dynamics. The metaphor supports the idea that organizations are ultimately psychic phenomena, in the sense that they are created and sustained by unconscious as well as conscious processes, and therefore, a projection of some portion of the ego.

The idea of a psychic prison was first explored in Plato's Republic in the famous allegory of the cave where Socrates addresses the relations among appearance, reality, and knowledge. The allegory pictures an underground cave with its mouth open toward the light of a blazing fire. Within the cave are people chained so that they can only see the cave wall directly in front of them. This is illuminated by the light of the fire, which throws shadows of people and objects onto the wall. The cave dwellers equate the shadows with reality, naming them, talking about them, and even linking sounds from outside the cave with the movements on the wall. Truth and reality for the prisoners rest in this shadowy world, because they have no other (Plato's Republic VII, cited in Morgan, 1986, pg. 199-200).

This metaphor encapsulates how we can become trapped by favored ways of doing things. The psychodynamic concepts of the unconscious, the defense mechanisms (especially projection), phantasy, and transference phenomena help us to understand the extent to which organizational life may be similar to unreality of Plato's cave.

The challenge of understanding the significance of the unconscious in organizations carries with it a promise: that it is
possible to release trapped energy in ways which may promote creative transformation and change and create more integrated relations among individuals, groups, organizations, and their environments. And this promise is in perfect harmony with the psychic prison. For Plato, this freedom rested in the pursuit of knowledge about the world. For the psychoanalysts, it has rested in knowledge of the unconscious, and in the capacity of humans to create a better world through an improved understanding of how we construct and interpret our realities, and hence an enhanced ability to change them (Morgan, 1986, pg. 228).

Function of Personality

Personality is essential to the understanding of humans in organization, designating the patterns of behavior and predispositions that determine how a person thinks, feels, and acts. The idea is that personality is a regular or "preferred" means of adapting to the world, therefore, personal style is a limited response, as the preference for a particular mode of operation is defining and limiting. The stronger one's preference for certain behavioral and emotional modes the more limited one's response.

It is well established that for the most part, individual personality patterns maintain themselves in remarkably different situations (Epstein, 1980; Hogan et al, 1977). It can be assumed, therefore, that many people leave organizations pretty much the same way they enter them, and would prefer to maintain patterns of interaction with other organizational members that meet their own preexisting needs. This does not suggest the absence of developmental processes, or organizational or environmental influence, but instead underscores the
need to explore the deeper issues of personality involved in organizing and adaptation.

Freud - The Drive Structure Model

"Who could remain unmoved when Freud seemed suddenly to plunge towards the origins? Suddenly he stepped out of the conscious into the unconscious, out of everywhere into nowhere, like some supreme explorer. He walks straight through the wall of sleep, and we hear him rumbling in the caverns of dreams. The impenetrable is not impenetrable, unconscious is not nothingness."
- D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*

Psychoanalysis is the scientific discipline begun by Sigmund Freud which focuses on the unconscious processes of mental functioning, and therefore by definition, the study of what people do not want to know about. Greenberg (1991) succinctly summarizes Freud's theory as a radical theory of motivation with four motivational principles.

First, all mental activity is motivated - the principle of psychic determinism. Secondly, motives can and do operate outside of general awareness - the unconscious. Thirdly, no mental events have a unitary motive, as human experience is inevitably the product of conflicting tendencies and compromises - intrapsychic conflict. Fourth, all motivation is traceable to the operation of biologically rooted sexual and aggressive instinctual needs, experienced as urges and impulses.

Each of these principles challenge valued aspects of self-concept, and beg us to avoid their examination – particularly in what we imagine to be the rational self-defining confines of the workplace. For example,
psychic determinism precludes the idea of innocent thoughts and comments or impersonal behavior. Unconscious motivation undermines the idea that we are the rational masters of our own destiny, unimpacted by undescrivable forces or psychic ghosts of the past. Intrapsychic conflict theory drives home the complexity and unavoidable incompatibility of "natural" human goals. The idea of instinctually rooted sexual and aggressive needs reminds us of our connection to other animals and the self-deception with which we disguise that notion (Greenberg, 1991). Considering the challenges to self-concept that psychoanalytic theories offer, it is no surprise that application of these theories to organizational life is usually avoided.

Although Freud’s drive/structure model is biologically based, he has been falsely accused of advocating a mechanistic approach to human understanding. Bettleheim (1983) ascribed the popular view of Freud’s model as a rigid and closed to faulty translation and a U.S. medical establishment eager to control the field. Freud clearly imagined humans as subject to environmental influence – parental actions, for example, are instrumental in personality development, for example, and the objective of psychoanalysis is change.

Resistance to environmental forces occurs not because the psychic system is closed but because the defense mechanisms are able to actively resist the environment. Coping strategies try to manage the equilibrium between intrapsychic anxiety and the demands of the
environment, emerging out of biologically based and dynamic processes. They tend to maintain themselves against the wind, and in the face of objective need to change, as they are defensive strategies and thus limit one's ability to understand the environment.

A.K Rice (1969) brought together systems theory and psychoanalytic theory, ascribing to the ego the role of connecting the individual intrapsychic system to organizational life. He described the mature ego as one that can define the boundary between what is inside and what is outside, and can control the transactions between one and the other. Since persons are involved in multiple roles and multiple tasks the ego must manage the process of control among them. He describes the process as having three elements: (1) mobilization of skills and emotions appropriate to the role performance; (2) control of transactions with the environment, so that inputs and outputs are appropriate; and (3) controlling and suppressing available but irrelevant resources.

Ego Psychoanalytic Development

The concern of ego-based psychoanalysts has been to expand our understanding of control processes and function. The initial development emerged primarily from the work of Hartmann (1939) as he was able (apparently sanctioned by Anna Freud) to liberate the development of psychoanalysis from a reactionary interpretation of classical psychoanalysis. He emphasized the interaction of the
individual and environment, and expanded the application of
psychoanalytic theory to normal intrapsychic and interpersonal
processes. This seems quite important for increasing our
understanding of organizational culture.

He focused his work on expanded understanding of ego processes and the
problems of adaptation. More specifically he emphasized the problems
and processes of ego adjustment in the resolution of the intrapsychic
conflicts emerging from the frustration of libidinal and aggressive
energies (drive/structure model) by the development by adaptive
processes both alloplastic (intrapsychic adaptation) and autoplastic
(altering the environment).

The outcome of autoplastic adaptation that is, an intrapsychic
adaptation through the generation of phantasy and other defensive
strategies for coping with intrapsychic conflict. The outcome of
alloplastic adaptation is the alteration of the environment to
resolve the intrapsychic conflict. Certainly these methods of
adaptation work hand in hand to build facilitative social structures -
both familial and work-oriented to reduce anxiety. Creating
organizations is one of the alloplastic ways humans adapt to the
intrapsychic conflicts. In this view a human being (Greenberg &
Mitchell, 1983) is not a purely social animal, but is an animal
innately equipped to become part of an ecological system that has
strong social ingredients. The environmental objects of attention, as
well as the limitations to deal with the reality principle, are rooted
in significant ways as an outcome of these adaptive processes. The obstacles to adaptation as well as the means to adaptation can be realized within the organizational setting. As a result an individual's struggle with interpersonal and task adaptation within an organizational and issues of personal adaptation may be confluent.

Central Role of Anxiety

Psychoanalysts have generally approached anxiety as central to the development of personality and coping strategies. Freud first addressed anxiety as a response to the instinctual impulses of the id. In later writings (Freud, 1926), however, he advanced the idea of two forms of anxiety emerging from the ego: real anxiety and neurotic anxiety. Real anxiety is the result of external factors. Neurotic anxiety is the result of the inability of the ego to deal with the intrapsychic forces, that is, the sexual and aggressive energy of the id sensed only as unknown dangers. In the most common situation, anxiety results from the anticipation of danger rather than real-time danger. This follows from unconscious (or preconscious) recognition of cues in the environment which are similar to previously traumatic situations. Organizations are ripe with such ambiguous cues - issues of authority and aggression abound. If the ego is able to adequately resolve a trauma, the requirement of the ego to respond to similar environmental cues is reduced. Character types and neurotic styles emerge as enduring coping strategies to manage unresolved conflicts.
and tensions in response to generalized cues associated with the traumas of psychosexual development.

Coping Strategies

The ego regulated and enduring responses to anxiety are included in the umbrella term "coping strategies." According to Bellak (1986) the concept of a coping strategy is broader than defense mechanism. In ego psychology, all human behavior including dreams, neurotic and psychotic symptoms and normal behavior can be usefully viewed as attempts at reducing anxiety. Development of coping strategies follows the progress of applicable ego function maturity. So, for example, as defense mechanisms mature they can be incorporated into a person's unconscious repertoire. The broad strategies entail the incorporation and interplay of character (personality traits), transference phenomena, defensive mechanisms, and neurosis etc.

The concept of coping has been defined here as a broad-based and mostly unconscious response to anxiety and the processes of adaptation; and includes both ego-based defense mechanisms and the behavioral and emotional patterns of personality style. The unconscious etiology of neurotic anxiety makes it difficult for a person to resolve directly, and therefore, becomes of paramount importance in the development of coping strategies. Individual coping strategies emerge as a person attempts to reduce the anxiety of these unresolved issues. Personality style (character) is the
manifested residual outcome of a person's repeated attempts to cope with the conflict. These enduring coping strategies are emotionally adaptive to the processes of organizing as well as familial arrangements.

Transference

The concept of transference was discovered by Freud as a way to explain peculiar happenings between him and his patients, which emerged as part of the process of psychoanalytic therapy. Yet it seems certain that the occurrence of this phenomena is such that it is not exclusively created by the process of psychotherapy.

Sullivan (1953) elaborated on the transference phenomena in interpersonal relations, finding it instrumental to phantasy a hindrance to intimacy in everyday relationships, but termed it parataxic distortion. It seems a particularly useful concept to explain the distorted interpersonal relationships that often occur within organizations. Greenon (1967), using the classical psychoanalytic framework defines transference as the experiencing of feelings, drives, attitudes, fantasies, and defenses toward a person in the present which do not befit that person but are a repetition of reactions originating in regard to significant persons of early childhood, unconsciously displaced onto figures in the present. Henry Ezriel (1950) of the Tavistock Institute has observed that a group meeting provides a stimulus much like a Rorschach or other projective
test for the members, bringing out unconscious phantasies and/or wishes for manipulation.

Karen Horney and Interpersonal Direction and Phantasy

Karen Horney emphasized the interpersonal aspects of anxiety and the resulting formulations of neurotic coping strategies. Her work is useful to this study since she focuses on generalized coping strategies in response to anxiety, is able to explain inconsistency between overt behavior and intrapsychic experience, and the formulation of interpersonal phantasy. She describes three neurotic interpersonal orientations developing as inadequate attempts at coping with basic anxiety including: (1) movement towards people (the compliant, self-effacing type) (2) movement against people (aggressive, expansive type), and (3) movement away from people (the detached, resigned type) (Horney, 1937). These concepts are useful both for the elegant summary of distorted interpersonal relations and her discovery of the emergent phantasies guiding the paradoxical relations among people.

The neurotic need for love, is an example of neurotic movement towards people generated by a compulsive need to be loved and approved by all persons, and which paradoxically precludes the ability of the neurotic to experience actual mature love. Although the desire to be loved is universal, a person with this coping strategy requires that everyone love him, including persons he does
not like. Such needs develop as a defense to basic anxiety, and a phantasy which views the self as helpless and vulnerable within a hostile world. The neurotic's disregard of the other is part of his or her style, and results from the projection of hostility that characterizes such orientation. Horney (1945) uses the example of the neurotic likely to be aware of another's need for sympathy, help, approval etc., but insensitive to someone wishing to remain aloof or detached. At the same time they become compliant and overconsiderate, over grateful, persuading themselves that they like everyone, and that others are all "nice" and "trustworthy." They are, however, soon to be disappointed, adding to the anxiety, but never consciously admitting to themselves that they do not care much for others. The phantasy is, "If I can get them to love me, then I will be safe with them" (Horney, 1937).

A second orientation (broad coping strategy) that Horney found people adopt in dealing with basic anxiety is a neurotic need to compete, or gain power, prestige, or possessions, all of which can be bundled together as movement against people. This style can be easily characterized as overtly hostile, although the behaviors are often couched within socially acceptable boundaries. While the quest for power, prestige, and/or possessions, or competitive activity, does not in and of itself indicate a neurotic style, any more than seeking affection is necessarily neurotic - it is the insatiability that determines the neurotic aspect. This orientation seeks safety in "strength" in order to avoid feelings of weakness or vulnerability.
The phantasy is "If I can control them (by power or respect) than I will be safe."

The third broad-based category is the movement away from people. This neurotic style is also emanates from the basic anxiety, and results from a need for emotional detachment, that is the wish to be away from people. As Horney clearly explains, it is not necessarily neurotic to desire to want solitude, or wish to be away from people. In fact everyone who takes life seriously seeks to be alone at times, but neurotics usually have a very difficult time being alone with their own feelings. As with the other two orientations discussed above, this tendency is based on a compulsive desire to remain detached, as a consequence of the intolerable strains of associating with people. Although detachment from people is to some degree a characteristic of each of the neurotic styles discussed, in the movement away from people it is different in that this coping strategy is the overt behavior. Using this style the person seeks to avoid the sense of danger of a "hostile environment", by trying to "draw around himself a magic circle that no one can penetrate." If the world intrudes, so to speak, then the anxiety is increased. In moving away from people the anticipated payoff is serenity and integrity, but the internal feeling is often rage. The phantasy is, "If I can be away from people, than I will be safe."
Melanie Klein and Aggression, Phantasy, and Projection

Melanie Klein's work is instrumental to a number of writers using psychoanalytic theories to explain organizational processes, particularly Bion and others from the Tavistock Institute especially because of her expanded ideas related to splitting and projection, aggression, and phantasy. Her approach to object relations emphasized that adult experiences reproduce the defensive techniques of childhood, and forges persons' relations to the outside world, thereby making it possible to understand a members relationship to his or her organization as a coping strategy.

After World War I Freud (1920) belatedly admitted the importance of aggression to the model of psychoanalysis. A controversial issue at the time, it was seen by many as overly pessimistic, and others as a weak environmentally developed concept. Klein, however, emerged as a strong supporter of the instinctual nature of aggressive energy. By emphasizing the role of unconscious phantasies in the management of instinctual processes, she supported the possibility of the constructive management of aggression. In this aspect of her theory phantasies are the representations of the mental life, and thus serve to channel the direction of aggression.

Another important contribution of Klein to psychoanalytic theory, with particular importance to the understanding of group processes, is
projective identification; a process linked with the defensive processes of splitting and denial (Hinshelwood, 1989). Klein's concept of projective identification was developed to describe extensions of the defense mechanism "splitting," a process in which unwanted parts of the ego are separated from the rest of the self and projected into objects (e.g. another person or a group). The unwanted or wished for part of the self is seen in the other. Projective identification differs from Freud's conception, inasmuch as Freud referred to emotional attachment, while Klein expanded this to include broad segments of the ego (Mitchell and Greenberg, 1983). In ego-based psychoanalytic theory, the broader concept is often identified simply as projection (Sandler, 1987). The broader application of projection is particularly useful in understanding group processes, and was adopted by Bion (1968) in his study of group processes, particularly the application of intrapsychic processes as group phenomena. From this perspective, it is possible to

Projection is particularly useful to the understanding of organizational culture because of its more complex properties, and the complex relationships that emerge from a group's projections. Sandler (1987) has identified a number of key functions of projective identification (projection). (1) Projection adds a dimension to the understanding of transference - as transference reflects not simply a repetition of the past but incorporates a phantasy about the future. (2) The illusion of control is derived through projection - such as living through another. In other words "I am in control of that which
the other is doing." (3) In the attempt to actualize the phantasies derived from projection the other's phantasy sometimes provides complementary identification. For example, one's actions based on phantasy might be a complementary role for another's phantasy needs, such as in the drama triangle. (4) Projection is the basis for empathy.

Defense mechanisms

Anna Freud (1966) compiled the first comprehensive study of defense mechanisms. In the early stages of development defenses emerge as a result of the ego's struggle to mediate between the pressures of the id and the requirements and strictures of outside reality. Each stage of intrapsychic development appears to evoke characteristic defenses (Kaplan and Sadock, 1981). At the point that the ego has matured sufficiently to anticipate intrapsychic dangers, signal anxiety (a cue which warns of danger) mobilizes defense mechanisms in order to avert the danger, and prevent a traumatic situation from arising.

Everyone, normal as well as neurotic, employs a characteristic repertoire of defense mechanisms that are useful in maintaining emotional well-being. For example, sublimation and humor are two mature defenses that are useful for effective living. But even denial can be useful to temporarily avoid overloading the ego during a trauma. The enduring nature of neurotic defense repertoires is dysfunctional since it impairs the ability to understand reality - and
as part of a coping strategy it is reinforcing. In organizational
life the functionality of defensive strategies in the maintenance of
culture has been well explained by Argyris (1990). Extensive use of
defense mechanisms also expends substantial emotional energy and
impairs function. For example, in denying and repressing the
aggressive instincts, the ego uses substantial emotional resources to
deny its existence, and in turn reducing the ability to use that
aggressive drive in constructive ways.

Phantasy

I have chosen to employ a broad-based definition of phantasy which
includes the ego-based cognitive processes associated with flight from
reality. Phantasy results from the problems of waking life (and
adaptation) consequent to intrapsychic anxiety, and the unconscious
images instrumental to object relations. Phantasies take shape in two
form: (1) passive or reflective phantasy, and (2) active phantasy,
that is denial in word or act; which plays an important role in
anticipation of anxiety. In each instance the phantasy is created by
the ego's unconscious defensive process of transforming unacceptable
cognitions and impulses into acceptable ones, blending reality with

Instrumentally connected to defensive or coping strategies,
phantasies are important to this study for several reasons: (1)
accessibility of the cognitive component, and (2) the connection to
social sanction required for phantasy's use as denial in word and act. Such active phantasies provide cognitive scenarios where the person can imagine himself supreme, his needs fulfilled and his identity intact. It is in this dramatization of phantasy in the outside world that requires a social stage providing cues to act on, and a willingness for others to fall in with his dramatization.

Organizations can, of course, serve as stage for a multiplicity of shared and complementary phantasies. Phantasy is also an essential component of ego function of anticipation, which is necessary to the process of organizing. Anticipation can provide protection from the anxieties of phantasy by turning to the reality principle, in the trade-off of small current pleasures for greater pleasures at a later date. As Nunberg has said (cited in Hartmann, 1939), the child renounces his omnipotence and magic only in the hope that he will regain them when he grows up.

Psychosexual and Psychosocial Development

In psychoanalytic theory the process of personality or character development occurs as an outcome of the interaction between predictable biological erotic (sexual) development and the concurrent environmental influences. Erikson (1980) generally accepted Freud's model of personality development but emphasized outcomes emerging from the psychosocial life crises approximating the psychosexual stages. Fixation occurs as a coping response to the unresolved intrapsychic
conflicts emerging from any of the stages. Although development arrested at one stage makes it difficult to complete the next, it seems that there is support for partial development, and thus struggling with more than one issue at a time is not uncommon. The fixation or continuing struggle at one or more stages becomes a defining perspective for the person, inhibiting as he or she continues the futile striving for resolution. For example failure to resolve trust leads to mistrust and an inability to adequately resolve issues of autonomy. In a real sense most of the people that make up organizations are struggling (with various degrees of fixation) - continuing to cope with their own particular but outdated emotional problems, and struggling for resolution in the present. Each person's unresolved intrapsychic struggles becomes a focal lens (in repetitive and futile attempts to resolve) in their perceptions of organizational life as well as at home.

According to Freud, those persons fixated at the oral phase of psychosexual development rely heavily on oral eroticism, and as a result have difficulty giving or taking things from the environment. It is believed that this is a consequence of over or under-indulgence during the oral phase. Those over-indulged are predicted to be trusting, accepting, and gullible - with a tendency to be overly optimistic and pollyanish. In the coping strategies for oral characters, there are inevitable interpersonal conflicts since not everyone is likely to provide the nurturant indulgence that the over-indulged oral character requires. On the other hand, the under-
indulged oral character is likely to cope through manipulation, and have a "something for nothing" orientation, also predictably generating interpersonal difficulty.

Erikson (1980) has described the oral phase in terms of the child's encounter with a psychosocial crisis of basic trust versus basic mistrust. A healthy adjustment is to acquire a favorable ratio of trust over mistrust, which is the cornerstone of a healthy personality. In addition to the potential for psychosis that basic mistrust can bring, Erikson confirms the likelihood of adults emerging from this stage with a basic mistrust manifesting frustration, suspicion, withdrawal, and a lack of self confidence—certainly a potentially distorted view of the world, as well as one ripe for an enduring coping strategy which includes hostility and rage as consequential to interpersonal relations.

The failure to fully complete the anal phase of psychosexual development is said by Freud to result in the anal character. The traits associated with this fixation, include a high degree of concern with orderliness, body cleanliness, and conscientious fulfillment of the most trivial responsibilities. These character clusters are thought to be an outgrowth of reaction formation to the socially unacceptable impulses associated with control and feces. The impulses thought to be instrumentally avoided are those pleasures associated with toilet: withholding and giving of their "prized possessions."

The conscientious attention to trivial detail provides the overt
signals of rigidity that may be more easily socially masked in the other character fixations. Erikson's (1980) development of the psychosocial theory addresses this as a struggle between autonomy and shame and doubt so as to highlight the rigid behavior aspects more clearly.

This whole stage, then becomes a battle for autonomy. For as he gets ready to stand on his feet more firmly, the infant delineates his world as "I" and you," "me" and "mine." Every mother knows how astonishingly pliable a child may be at this stage, if and when he has made up the decision that he wants to do what he is supposed to do. It is impossible to find a reliable formula for making him want to do just that (Erikson, 1960).

His use of the term autonomy refers to the child's ability for the first time to see himself as a person separate from his parents and with the ability to make independent choices. In viewing the struggle as a psychosocial one rather than a psychosexual, Erikson tends to see the issues different than Freud. However, he sees the unhealthy outcome to be the same in terms of the anal character.

The centerpiece of Freud's model of development is the Oedipus complex. As the most complex and emotionally charged of the developmental stages, it is thought to generate the greatest difficulty in adaptation, and significantly contributing to neurosis. The failure to adequately complete the resolution of the Oedipal conflict is said by Freud to result in fixation as a phallic character. Males are said to react with severe castration complex, and through reaction formation or other psychological defense
mechanisms act out the complex through reckless or resolute manner of behavior in order to prove that they are "real men".

In the classical psychoanalytic view the female fixated at the phallic stage is thought to be the castrating female; continuously striving for superiority over the men in her life, as a way to defend against the conflicts associated with penis envy. The concept of penis envy is one of the more controversial aspects of the classical psychosexual development model, particularly among the ego psychologists and other neo-Freudian analysts.

Erikson tends to agree with Freud's perspective of this stage and its behavioral and emotional outcomes. However, he views it in terms of initiative versus guilt and therefore, emphasizes the social aspects rather than the sexual. He believes the child learns to disturb the universe and intrudes into other person's ears, minds, and bodies through increased mobility coupled with a consuming curiosity. Additional traits of the phallic character according to Freud include vanity and exhibitionism.

In the resolution of the Oedipal conflict cultural and environmental implications and influence seem to be important factors in its intensity and outcome. While at first those neo-Freudians with strongly held exceptions to the heavy biological orientation of Freud, resisted acceptance of these ideas, however, apparently even some of
the later ego oriented psychoanalysts acknowledge the adaptive fit in the process (Janis et al, 1969).

The fate of the Oedipus complex is repression. As a consequence of the sexual interest in the parent and the awareness that there is a sexual relationship between his parents, the child becomes aware that the same sex parent a rival, and therefore, dangerous. Consequently, substantial anxiety develops in the child around the dangers of the parental relationships. The child can alleviate the anxiety by identifying with the same sex parent; the strong sexual and aggressive feelings are repressed and shunted into more socially acceptable channels. It is the alternative channels that provide outlets for the ambivalent feeling towards the parent that the child has repressed.

To the extent that the Oedipus complex has not been adequately resolved, the ambivalence is transferred to inappropriate objects seen as "substitute authority figures" during adulthood. Such transference happens outside of awareness, and therefore is not subject to review or revision. In ambivalence the conscious and unconscious feelings surrounding an object are often polar opposites. For example as a consequence of unresolved Oedipal conflict the conscious feelings towards a father substitute (object) may be love and trust and the unconscious feelings may be hostility and distrust. This ambivalence may play itself out in a number of self-defeating patterns as a way to both act on the ambivalence but keep it out of awareness.
The Oedipus complex can also emerge as a family complex and impact the relationships between siblings and generating lasting hostility in other object relations. Freud (1920, 1966) described this situation as one where a newborn child can impact the relative closeness to the mother of the other children, and therefore, emerges as another rival for the mother's attention. The displaced child does not easily forgive the mother and these feelings of embitterment often last into adulthood.

The character patterns and coping strategies developing out the psychosexual and psychosocial processes maintain themselves as adaptive strategies through unconscious processes associated with intrapsychic conflicts. The ego develops coping strategies to continue to avoid awareness of the intrapsychic conflict. Consequently changing these coping strategies cannot be done by willing them away.

**Personality and occupational choices**

Industrial psychologists have developed a number of paradigms to explain the relationship between an individual's career choice and his or her personality. Two of the more widely used frameworks for understanding career choice and personality were created by Roe (1964) and Holland (1973). Each has been grounded in substantial research from a variety of instruments and demonstrates the relationship
between career choice and personality. Roe's paradigm describes vocational choice as an outcome of child-parent relations in the formative years. It divides occupational choices into eight categories in proximity between things and persons, and according to socio-economic hierarchy (Schuerger et al, 1983). Roe found that persons changing jobs tended to limit their career moves up or down within a particular category or its adjacent category, supporting the notion that personality is instrumental in career choice. For example on Roe's scale CPA's fall into the "organization" category at socio-economic level 2 (1 is highest, 6 is lowest), situated slightly closer to people than things. The other seven categories are service (social worker), business contact (salesperson), technology (engineer), outdoor (farmer), science (researcher), general culture (reporter), and arts and entertainment (artist).

Holland's system of vocational choice uses six categories or personality types (close approximation to Roe's) - derived from well-established personal interest inventories, particularly the Self-Directed Search and Strong-Campbell Vocational Interest Inventory (SCVII). According to Schuerger et. al.(1983), one may have substantial confidence that, once a person is of an age at which occupational interest may be expected to have matured, the SCVII is significantly predictive of career fit and, by implication the suitability the predicted organizational context of the job. This presumably applies to the traditional institutionalized version of the vocation. The six categories include: realistic type, characterized
by an interest in mechanical or outdoor activities; investigative
type, characterized by interest in problem-solving and thinking,
particularly math and science; artistic type, characterized by
interests in things of beauty; social type, characterized by
interests in helping persons; enterprising type, characterized by
interests in organizing and persuading people; and conventional type,
characterized by interest in keeping things orderly, counting.
Holland prescribes a three code evaluation of occupations, primary,
secondary, tertiary, the closer the match the higher the predicted job
fit and suitability. The code for CPA's is conventional, social,
enterprising. The 16PF and other personality instruments also have
good job fit predictions (Schuerger, et.al, 1983).

Social Exchange Systems Theory

March and Simon's social exchange theory (1958) emphasizes both
systems theory and the human aspects of organizing. They assume that
an organization is a system of interrelated social behaviors of a
number of participants, and that the participants are bounded in their
rationality. At a fundamental level organizing requires a task, some
interdependence among the actors, and includes individual and shared
histories as well as anticipation about the future. The assumptions
that differentiate social exchange theory from older scientific
management and administrative management theories is their emphasis on
human issues, particularly the notion that people have interdependent
influence on each other (cited in Tosi, 1975). Although couched in
operant conditioning terms, the core of the theory seems to mesh well with psychoanalytic theories of personality, it is just that the process of exchange is much more complicated, since intrapsychic processes are involved rather than reinforcement.

They divide organizational decision-making into two broad categories: the decision to participate (organizational equilibrium); and the decision to produce. The concept of organizational equilibrium is particularly applicable to this study as it blends the human and systemic factors involved in organizing. The underlying concepts of organizational equilibrium state that: (1) The organization is a system of interrelated social behavior of participants; (2) each participant receives inducements from the organization for their contribution; (3) the individual continues to participate so long as the inducements he receives are greater than his contribution, measured according to his own value system; (4) the contributions of various groups are sources from which the organization manufactures inducements to pay the others; (5) equilibrium occurs when the organization can continue to provide inducement to members to obtain their contribution. The balance of equilibrium is affected by the perception of desirability of leaving the job, and the perceived ease of movement from the organization (Tosi, 1975).

Collective Structure
Weick's (1975) concept of collective structure focuses on the order of anticipatory processes associated with organizing. It is derived from Allport's (1962) idea that convergence precedes, and is a necessary condition for the emergence of groups. Thus an initial overlap among people in their beliefs - overlap that looks like behavior controlled by norms makes it possible for more enduring social relationships to emerge. That is when two people encounter each other there is some possibility that they might benefit each other. The first stage of convergence begins with diverse ends, so that persons coming together converge on issues of means rather than ends; wishing to perform some act (including a psychological act requiring another to take a part in one's phantasy), and needs the other person to do certain things in order to make performance possible (Weick, 1979). It seems to me that it is at this point that phantasy and transference take root in interpersonal relations. Persons converging do not have to agree on shared goals - each is a means to the other's, asking only that the other contribute of their actions. It is with retrospective sense-making of the success of the transaction that common ends are described (Weick, 1979).

Phantasies get shared in a similar way. According to Bales (1970, in Zaleznick and Moment, 1964) the process of development occurs as follows: (1) elements are 'selected' for more extended discussion; (2) accidents are 'taken advantage of' for the creation of symbolic meaning; (3) the selected elements and chance combinations are 'elaborated'; (4) the elaboration is performed cooperatively as an
interpersonal process; (5) and the group process has the qualities of a 'chain reaction' - a process which reinforces itself increasingly in an accelerated growth curve of interest, excitement, and involvement. According to Kets de Vries (1985) this chain reaction of shared phantasy creates symbolic reality that resembles what is often described as organizational ideology, culture, imagery, or identity.

Application of Psychoanalytic Theories to Organizations

With the publication of his book Totem and Taboo (1912), Freud set the stage to incorporate psychoanalysis and organizational culture, by trying to connect early psychoanalytic theory to anthropological issues. Although this work was speculative, it provided a very useful starting point in supporting the notion that cultural norms and customs are simply surface outcomes of unconscious processes - rather than rational and self-explanatory behaviors. With his seminal work on group processes, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (1921), Freud expanded on Totem and Taboo, and provided additional clarity about the unconscious processes (especially libido and identification) central to binding the members to their leaders and each other, as well as to groups, and organizations, such as the army and church. According to de Board (1978), Freud's writings on group processes are fully consistent with the whole framework of psychoanalysis, and substantiates that psychoanalytic thought has always been concerned with social psychology (man in relationship) as well as individual psychology (man as a discrete personality).
According to Hall and Lindzey (1968) Kurt Lewin was strongly influenced by Freud, and extended psychoanalysis into academic and applied social psychology. Although a number of prominent psychoanalysts and other behavioral scientists have actively and productively developed our understanding of the role of unconscious processes in the field of organizational behavior, their numbers have been relatively small within the field.

A number of key research topics connecting psychoanalytic theory to organizational behavior have been explored in areas adjacent to the theme of this study. Bion (1959) whose studies were first published in 1943 was instrumental in adapting the work of Melanie Klein to the understanding of group processes. His work was particularly useful in describing the regressive emotions and irrational feelings in the workings of a group when members were confronted with the uncomfortable aspects of reality; the importance of collective reality, and the function of projective identification to the 'group mind'.

Bennis and Shepard (1956) also explored and described the operation of the unconscious processes in group development in t-groups; discovering that group developmental processes called for an order of events and a variety of cogent roles in dealing with authority and interpersonal relations. They found that group development required members to resolve issues with authority before interpersonal issues
among peers could be resolved. Slater (1966) study confirmed Bennis and Shepard's findings and described this unconscious developmental struggle with authority as systemically embedded throughout all social institutions.

Jacques (1955) and Menzies (1970) first highlighted the role of organizations as a defense against anxiety. Jacques emphasized two factors: (1) that organizations are used to reinforce the members' individual defense mechanisms against anxiety, primarily through splitting and projective identification; and (2) the various defense mechanisms among the individuals are complementary and consequently circular and reinforcing. Menzies's study identified how a group of nurses collectively organized around an intrinsically anxiety-provoking task, to reduce their anxiety.

Labier (1984) studied the relationship between individual pathology and a person's adaptation to different roles within a government bureaucracy. His study followed Maccoby's (1976) socio-psychoanalytic research that demonstrated that certain character traits or tendencies are often attracted to certain kinds of work or organizational structures to which these traits are suited; and that the process of socialization selectively reinforces the personality qualities required by others in the organization. Labier identified the outcome as situational congruency for persons both within and without the range of normalcy, depending upon the organizational requirements. He found that the pathologies associated with neurotic need for power and
passive dependency were most likely to be supported and therefore congruent within the government bureaucracy. Normalcy was most likely to be congruent where high degrees of technical know-how were required. Persons whose pathologies were not supported by organizational needs were often able to stay afloat by drifting to settings with unproductive niches and cultural norms that minimize direct confrontation. He found that people who otherwise fall into the range of psychological normalcy, will find themselves reacting to non-adaptive situations, by coping in unproductive ways. For example trait patterns such as loyalty, fairness, authority, and assertiveness into submission, dominance, withdrawal, and destructiveness in a non-adaptive situation. Although character type may have been instrumental in attraction to the career, emotional congruency (pathological or normal) with the structural demands of the organization were significantly related to career success.

With the importance of issues of authority relations prominent in psychoanalytic thinking, a number of researchers have explored the related roles of power, leadership and dependency. Among the more prominent are Zaleznick (1975), and Levinson (1968, 1981). They describe the functionality, etiology, pathology, and systemic connections to the rest of the organization primarily through in depth case studies. Zaleznick emphasized the role of unconscious anxiety and defensive processes in organizational power relations. He ascertained that coalition building patterns and other political processes such as supervisor - subordinate relations are often
unconsciously arranged for persons to act on unresolved issues of envy, rage, and intimacy. Levinson has emphasized the importance of tranference phenomena and individual identity in the psychological reciprocation between an individual and his or her organization. The result he argues is adaptation to organizational life is both reflective of and instrumental to a person's adaptation to and resolution of his or her personal issues of anxiety. It is this deep personal connection to organizational life that makes the processes of organization development so difficult.

Leadership and Organizational Culture

Edgar Schein's (1985) concept of organizational culture is a relatively functional bridge between psychoanalytic theory organizational processes. He defines organizational culture as encompassing three levels of social patterns primarily driven by its deepest level, basic assumptions. These unconscious assumptions are invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaption and internal integration - and have been found to work well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught (in use, not word) to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems, transmitted and embedded in the process of socialization.

Basic assumptions, according to Schein, refer to the unconscious or taken for granted assumptions about the organization's relationship to
the environment; the nature of reality, time and space; nature of human nature, activity, and relationship. These shared ideas and phantasies are likely to be functionally developed and influenced by the individual unconscious phantasies and coping strategies of the members, as they are instrumental in defining one's relationship to the environments - and are also relatively inaccessible to examination.

Out of the basic assumptions emerges a second level which includes more visible and psychologically accessible phenomena, cultural values and ideology. These values and ideologies carry a greater degree of awareness and may be testable in the environment. Since there is degree of interaction between basic values and ideology, there is a relationship but it is not likely to be one to one, since there is a number of different ideologies one could construct out of similar basic values.

The third level is called artifacts and creations - essentially the visible and audible behavior, but not decipherable, patterns, technologies, and art. Again, although there is mutual influence, the relationship is not one to one. For example, there are a number of socially plausible but different meanings the same artifacts might carry, depending on the basic assumptions, and personal coping strategies. Since the driving force is always at the core, unconscious basic assumptions, meaning would often follow behavior, not drive it. Although there is also downward movement (e.g.
developing ideology influencing basic assumptions) the strength of influence is bottom up - since lower levels of awareness would tend to avoid questioning. Accordingly as Schein has emphasized, significant change in an organization's culture would need to challenge the firm's basic assumptions.

In order to discover the basic assumption, Schein has repeatedly stressed the need to explore the organizational culture as a clinical study - as a process of co-inquiry with the members of the organization in order to identify and classify the subtle assumptions that fall into a pattern (Schein, 1985, 1988, 1990). Argyris (1985) also emphasizes the clinical approach to inquiry to break through the defensive loops that provides a defensive or coping strategies as a barrier between theories espoused (values and ideologies) and in use (basic assumptions).

According to Schein (1978, 1983) organizational founders have a particularly important role in the development of organizational culture - lasting well past their tenure. Since they had the original idea, they will typically have their own notion, based on their own cultural history and personality, of how to get the idea fulfilled. The transmission and embedding of culture from the organization's leaders occurs through five mechanisms: (1) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; (2) leaders reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises; (3) deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching by leaders; (4) criteria for
allocation of rewards and status; (5) criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication (Schein, 1985). These factors are applicable only as theory-in-use, as opposed to theory espoused — most often there are marked differences. Also the coping strategies of the leadership, to the extent they come in to play within the organization will influence the implementation of these five factors, by distorting the social transaction.

Manfred Kets de Vries and Danny Miller (1984) theorized the relationship between the neurotic style of leadership and neurotic organizations. It is their thesis that the neurotic style of the leader is often so significant that the projection of the neurosis with all its excesses and limitations becomes the driving force in the organization's culture. Its impact is primarily felt through the shared phantasies and group processes, confused interpersonal relationships — both within and without the organization. The difficulty in accessing the driving unconscious issues — particularly since that is the reason for the neurosis — makes it difficult to manage effective organizational change.
THEORETICAL FRAME

With the above concepts in mind, the following derivative paradigm was used to structure my exploration of the relationship among unconscious processes and organizational culture:

An organization's culture emerges from the projections of the intrapsychic conflicts of its participants. Although the founder's projections are critical inasmuch as his or her coping strategies emerging from intrapsychic conflicts are instrumental in the creation of the organizational culture, the members' attempts to actualize their phantasies are often complementary to each others' projected phantasies. Stability indicates a complementary arrangement. These projections are particularly important in understanding the unconscious basic assumptions of the organizational culture.

Entry into an organization brings the anticipation of congruence between phantasy and experience. Anticipation about a career choice and consequently about a particular organization are derived from phantasy and transference. In phantasy the person anticipates himself supreme, his needs fulfilled, and his identity intact. By using transference he unconsciously distorts and engages with persons in the present based on persons and emotions from the past.
These encounters within the culture demand the utilization of personal coping strategies to ward off the anxiety generated from lack of congruence between phantasy and experience. If the coping strategies are adequate to handle the disequilibrium, the arrangement moves toward equilibrium as part of a continuous process managing anxiety and coping. The coping strategies accessible and used are based on the development of personality and defense mechanisms, although the needs of the organization will tend to reinforce and elaborate particular coping patterns. Interpersonal and task arrangements will be employed to maximize effective utilization of interrelated coping strategies. If one's coping strategies are continually inadequate to respond to the anxiety provoked by the organization or the organization does not provide adequate against anxiety an incongruent situation results. Incongruency also occurs when one's method of coping is provocative rather than eleviating of the anxiety of others within the organization. An extended state of incongruency requires the development of expanded coping strategies (such as primitive denial), dysfunctional adaptation, or personal growth to deal with the incongruency. The alternative is most likely organizational exit.

The coping strategies of the organizational leadership are particularly important in the development and sustenance of organizational culture. The position of authority is instrumental in organizational culture both as an emotional object for transference
and objective power, as coping strategies influence what is being paid attention to and control responses to critical incidents etc.

The implication for an enduring organizational culture is that it is a functional adaptation to recurrently evoked anxieties, requiring repetition and, therefore, cooperation among the participants. Any process of substantive change would evoke unexpected anxieties that require changes in coping strategies, personal growth for adaptation, or dysfunctional adaptation.
Although the research is preliminary and a clinically descriptive study, a number of research questions have been explored in this study. Each question is intended to focus on some portion of the mini-theory described that connects individual coping strategies and phantasy to organizational culture, and provide support for the idea that individual methodologies are useful in the exploration of collective reality.

1. Can personal coping strategies be found that limit the ability of members of the organization to understand organizational veridity at conscious and rational levels?

2. Can cultural norms be discovered that provide operating space and impose limitations on discussion in order to support individual coping strategies, including neurotic symptoms?

3. Are unconscious and confused perceptions of authority uncovered that distort interpersonal relationships within the organization? If such patterns are found, are the interpersonal distortions sustained through collusive coping strategies embedded within the culture?

4. Do the coping strategies of the organization's leadership provide important cues and boundaries to the structure of the organization's culture?
5. Can distorted object relations be identified, and if so, are they inhibiting of group development?

6. Can organizational neurosis be identified, and if so, does it manifest itself as excessive attribution of power or the converse?
CHAPTER TWO
Research Methods

General approach

The primary domains of inquiry for this research are the functional patterns and boundaries between individual personality and organizational culture. Since these interdisciplinary research problems are best explored with a multi-level approach, I sought to triangulate the topic with both qualitative and quantitative data at each level; and draw upon resources from individual and social psychology, as well as organizational behavior. Additionally, because much of the exploration was preliminary, and involved the discovery of subtle interactive processes, factor convergence, and etiology, there was some requirement for an ideographic format emphasizing qualitative data analysis and inductive processes. The data requirements for this research were both complex and inseparable from its complementary context. I chose a modified triangulation design (Jicks, 1984) for a clinical field study of a single organization of sufficient size to draw adequate samples for both qualitative and quantitative analyses. This provided the opportunity for me to explore the interdependent dynamics within a real-life context, economized the cultural variables, as well as producing the accompanying limitations.
Site Selection

To conduct this study I looked for an organization with two characteristics: (1) members must feel relatively free to come or go, and (2) the organization should be relatively undifferentiated. I expected that a high degree of voluntary association would reduce the likelihood that observed interpersonal patterns were influenced in unpredictable ways by sociological variables such as the degree of socioeconomic desperation. Minimal structural complexity ought to reduce variables by minimizing the impact of so-called "task confusion" or "communication problems" due to normative environmental or technological impediments, and accordingly increases the role of personal intentionality in structural organization. Professional service firms (e.g. legal, accounting, medical, architecture firms) seemed to conform to this context for several reasons. First, because of the substantial education and specialized training of many members, they are likely to be able to make choices about whether they join or stay with a firm. Secondly, although the entry requirements are relatively high for the professional positions in such firms, the formal structures and processes of organizing are relatively uncomplicated; for example, compared to advanced manufacturing firms. Professional service firms (as an industrial category) have experienced rapid growth within the U.S. in recent years, and are of increasing economic importance, but without the commensurate organizational research that has been directed towards manufacturing.
Thus this research might have additional contribution to the field of organizational behavior.

Among the various professional service firm types certified public accountants seemed to offer several advantages over the others. First, the level of voluntary association for accountants in public accounting firms is probably higher than the other professions because a CPA's skills are in demand elsewhere. My personal experience as a practitioner in a CPA firm, and as a client offered several advantages: a rich knowledge of the professional norms, language, and traditional professional struggles, and the probability that my credibility as a research would be enhanced. On the other hand, the disadvantage of my having had public accounting experience carried the requirement for special vigilance to avoid entangling my own experiences with the research observations.

Specific site requirements were discussed with persons at the Weatherhead School of Management assisting me with the search, and included:

1) A firm large enough to maintain one or more relatively intact work groups of eight to twelve people (such as audit teams or tax groups) and who had been together for at least six months. This criterion was established to obtain adequate sample size and insure that enduring patterns within established work groups could be explored.
2) Support and participation of senior partners at the firm was expected to minimize resistance to sharing potentially sensitive data, assure that I was able to collect data from the leadership, secure the integrity of the feedback process, and increase the likelihood of high degree of participation under voluntary circumstances.

Letters were sent to six prospective sites, and I followed up by telephone over the next several weeks with the partner in charge at each potential site, providing further explanation of the research strategy and participant requirements as needed. Four of the firms eventually declined to participate, ostensibly due to time commitments or internal reorganizations, although executives at two of these firms held open the possibility of participating at a later date, "when things clear up." The fifth firm agreed to participate, but backed out after the managing partner reviewed the questionnaires saying, "We're in great shape now, and a study such as this may generate problems that we don't currently have."

Karlos Kay & Co. (a pseudonym) agreed to participate without reservation. This followed one long telephone call with the managing partner, and a meeting with the managing partner (Karlos Kay) and personnel partner Rick Borden (also a pseudonym, as are all organization and personal names used in this study). We discussed the structure, history, and organization of the firm, the research process, statement of confidentiality, and agreed on our respective
roles to facilitate the process. Both seemed very eager to support the project, and particularly proud of their "people oriented climate" (providing me with a copy of a recent "climate study" by a psychologist consultant). The managing partner asked that I consider broadening the sample of employees to "avoid leaving people out and "get a fuller picture of this firm." They also asked that I include their Youngstown office in the study, since this location (unlike the Pittsburgh office) seemed to have frequent "personnel" problems. The reasons stated for their enthusiastic participation were: a strong desire to be helpful the Weatherhead School, eagerness to see how they "measure up" against other CPA firms, and the opportunity to gain information which may be useful to the firm, and the chance to let others know what a good job they were doing.

I reviewed the research objectives and determined that in-depth research at two sites of a single organization would provide certain advantages in triangulation compared with small group studies using several different organizations. Accordingly, I advised Kay of the modifications, and followed up with a letter detailing the research plan.

I then prepared a letter introducing myself and the project to all employees in the Pittsburgh and Youngstown offices. It was prepared by me, nominally revised by the managing partner, Mr. Kay, and sent out under his signature within a few days. The project was identified as a voluntary research study of professional service organizations,
examining the roles of imagination and personal style in determining organizational culture. Participation and candor were encouraged, my background summarized, and the rules of confidentiality were explained. The instruments to be administered, the selection process, and time commitments were described. Personal and firm-wide feedback was promised to the participants.

Site structure and basic demographics

Prior to sample selection I obtained a formal organization chart to enable an adequate cross-section sample of the firm population. Karlos Kay & Co. has three offices, Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and Cleveland; and is a regional firm, split off in the late 1970's from a "Big Six" accounting firm. Only five persons remain from those early days, three as partners. The Cleveland office was treated as part of the Pittsburgh office for purposes of this study, because two of its new three person staff were still commuting from Pittsburgh. The main office had 76 persons, 55 of whom were classified as professionals. The Youngstown office had 12 persons, nine of whom were identified as professionals. The firm was divided into four formal work groups: accounting & audit, taxation, special services, and administration. A formal professional hierarchy of four professional levels was in place: partner/ principal, manager, senior staff, and junior staff. Non-professionals were clustered at two levels: managers and support staff. There were six part-time employees (high school and college students) who assisted both the professional and support staffs. This
organization structure is typical for a firm in public accounting, although several of the "Big Six" accounting firms have one or two additional hierarchy levels, and larger percentages of staff in management services groups. Additional demographic details are described in Appendix 13.

Sample Selection and Participation:

The research problem generated two requirements for sample selection: that all types of workers be represented, and that their numbers be large enough to draw reliable statistical inferences. Variations in the time requirements for administration and scoring of the instruments was also a factor in the methodology. I also thought that it would be interesting to have both TAT's and structured interviews from the same persons so as to be better able to explore the relationship between ego function and organizational perceptions. Given these considerations, I decided to proceed at two levels of exploration. I asked all full-time employees and partners to complete two paper and pencil instruments; one of which addressed individual factors (16PF), while the other focused on organizational cultural issues (Harrison Ideology Questionnaire). In addition, all partners and principals, along with one-half of all other employees were to be asked to take the Thematic Apperception Test and participate in a structured interview. Using an organization chart I prepared the selection lists, and chose alternate persons on the alphabetized list. I reviewed my selections with Kay's secretary, and made minor changes.
Several demographic group "orphans" were added to minimize any appearance of exclusion resulting from the study, and two persons were dropped because they were no longer with the firm. In all, 74 people were asked to take 16PF's and HIQ's; and of these 38 were also asked to take the TAT and take part in the structured interview. Fifty-one employees completed the 16PF's and HIQ's, and thirty-six of the thirty-seven chosen for the TAT's and structured interviews complied. Each person participating in the study returned a signed statement of voluntary participation.

**Instruments Used in the Study**

**Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) (1967-68 Edition, Form A, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc.):**

The 16PF was chosen to provide quantitative measures of the basic structure of an individual's personality style and enable normative comparisons among study participants. This instrument is a factorially derived personality inventory, based on self-report. It is available in four versions (two adult and two versions for reduced capacity) and provides a number of personality scales useful for this study. Form A is the version most frequently used for psychological studies among normal adult populations. This instrument has been used in a substantial number of investigations of both normal and clinical populations, and has been proven to be both reliable and valid (Cattell, Eber, Tatsuoka, 1970). The short-term test-retest
reliability of Form A centers with alphas in the high 70's and low 80's, declining to about .60 after one year, but maintaining alphas in the high fifties even after four years. This compares favorably with other general purpose personality instruments. A combined Form A + B version increases the reliability somewhat, but its length makes it more suitable for individual counseling. The stability of 16PF measures supports the theory that personality is relatively consistent over time, and offers an anchor for this research.

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and California Personality Inventory (CPI) were considered as alternatives to the 16PF. Although the MMPI offers certain advantages in classifying clinical patterns and syndromes, it is less reliable in identifying normal personality patterns. More importantly I expected its offputting flavor and extensive time requirement to generate compliance resistance among potential subjects at the firm. The CPI is a newer instrument than the 16PF, has slightly higher test retest reliability, and has several scales which might be useful to this study; but these advantages seemed inadequate to offset my specific training and experience with the 16PF, and the additional wealth of derivative 16PF research.

The 16PF measures 16 relatively independent personality traits, called primary factors; seven second-order factors representing broader patterns of personal style (five of which are well-established) (N = 17,381); five third-stratum factors (supported only
with preliminary research; five proficiency scales (normed to applicable proficient populations); two supplemental scales for modal distortion; and certain occupational similarity profiles (normed to members of the relevant occupation). The answer sheets are template scored and double-checked to determine raw scores; subsequently entered and double-checked for computer processing by a self-designed program (verified for accuracy) using established norms. Scoring is computed in stens, standard scores ranging from 1 to 10, with a mean and median of 5.5 and a standard deviation of 2. Thus 38% of the population is expected to score 5 and 6, and any scores of 8 or higher (or 2 or lower) are unusual (>± 1 1/4 s.d.); accordingly, the total percentage of persons with factor scores of 8 through 10 (or 1 through 3) is only 6.68% of the population, and only 1.2% is expected to receive sten scores of 1 or 10. The sten scores used for primary factors are based on the adult general population tables (males and females combined, age = 30, n = 2984), secondary factors were also based on general population norms, but use gender-based equations, if appropriate. The primary factors are as follows:

Factor A: Warmth (affective reserve versus warmth)
Factor B: Intelligence (Concrete thinking versus abstract thinking)
Factor C: Ego strength (Emotional instability versus higher ego strength)
Factor E: Dominance (Adaptive, submissive versus dominant or ascendent)
Factor F: Impulsivity (Seriousness versus impulsivity)
Factor G: Group conformity (Disregards rules, expedient versus conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid)

Factor H: Boldness (Shy, timid versus bold, adventurous)

Factor I: Emotional sensitivity (tough-minded versus emotional sensitivity)

Factor L: Suspiciousness (trusting versus suspicious)

Factor M: Imagination (Practical versus imaginative)

Factor N: Shrewdness (Naivete versus shrewdness)

Factor O: Insecurity (Untroubled adequacy versus guilt proneness)

Factor Q1: Rebelliousness (Conservatism of temperament versus radicalism)

Factor Q2: Self-sufficiency (Group dependency versus self-sufficiency)

Factor Q3: Ability to bind anxiety (Lack of control versus ability to bind anxiety)

Factor Q4: Free-floating anxiety (Low tension versus high tension)

The second-order factors do not represent original information, but are constellations of the primary factors obtained through factor analysis. Their computation includes three advantages: (1) higher reliability, (2) broader/more quickly grasped concepts, each of which corresponds to well-established construct in personality theory (Q1 through QIV & QVIII), (3) the insight from unusual combinations of data (1983, Schuerger et al; Krug, 1981). The second-order factors computed for this study are:
QI: Extroversion: Introversion versus extroversion: very similar to Jung's concept distinguishing those who are oriented to the inside world versus outside world (includes A+, F+, H+, Q2-).

QII: Anxiety: Low anxiety versus high anxiety: an important indicator of pathology, and ego syntonic trends (includes factors C-, H-, L+, O+, Q3-, Q4+)

QIII: Tough Poise: Low tough practicality versus high tough practicality: indications of alert willingness to handle problems at a dry cognitive level versus emotional influence (includes A-, I-, M-, et al plus male/ female differentiation).

QIV: Independence: Subduedness versus independence: a general indicator of temperamental independence, internal locus of control, and introspective superiority (includes E+, -G, +H, +Q1, et al plus male/ female differentiation)

QVIII: Superego/ control Inadequate restraint (low) versus rigidity and lack of spontaneity (high): consisting of both positive and clinical aspects (includes G+, Q3+).

The two second-order factors with less research support are:
QV: Discretion    Naturalness versus discreetness: a clear second-order factor but only tolerably well defined (mainly N+, A+(females)).

QVI: Subjectivity  Cool realism versus prodigal subjectivity: also clear psychometric but limited definition (I+, M+, H+, -Q1 (females), -Q3 (males)).

The third-stratum factors are also based on limited research by Cattell (1970) and compiled from a factorial analysis of the second-order factors, and include:

1. Strength    Indications that this reflects strength of the nervous system, after Pavlov and Teplov, and based on fundamental social training and genetic background (+QI, +QIII).

2. Self-criticism    Indications of self-criticism, possibly resulting from heavy parental authority (QII+, Q3-, B-, QVIII+).

3. Responsiveness    Responsiveness and alertness to the environment versus a focus on subjectivity and internal responses (-QIII, -QV, -QVI).
4. Self-concern &
   control  Indication of effects of strong religious or
   cultural control (-QIV, +QV, -B,+QVIII).

5. Serenity  Manifestation of a cool detachment with
   intelligence, a serene sense of being above the fray,
   possibly indicative of higher social status (-QIV, -
   QVI, +B).

The proficiency scale calculations were compiled by analyzing
populations deemed to carry the competence described. These include:

Group leadership: Persons identified as particularly effectively
   in leading small groups of men in experimental
   situations. Close fit does not necessarily
   translate to broad indices of organizational
   leadership.

Creativity: Artists, authors, Nobel laureates, and others
   generally agreed to be particularly creative in their
   work.

Achievement: Successful students. Follow-up studies support
   career achievement as well, but most useful for
   school achievement.
Neuroticism: Persons scoring high on the Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire (NSQ) (Scheier & Cattell, 1961) for any of the four neurosis scales.

Adjustment: Persons identified as feeling well-adjusted on the NSQ, principally complementary to neuroticism.

Two additional scales to determine modal distortion were obtained for the 16PF. Developed by Karson and O'Dell (1976), and based on studies of persons attempting to distort their results either favorably or unfavorably, the scores are used for two purposes: identification of persons "faking good" or "faking bad", and to adjust the primary factors for modal distortion. Scores in this study were corrected for modal distortion.

**Thematic Apperception Test** (Morgan and Murray, 1943) (TAT):

The TAT was chosen to supplement the trait based analysis of personality provided by the 16PF with the data that only a projective instrument can provide, namely the exploration of dynamic unconscious processes and ego function material. In addition to accessing the covert and deeper structures of personality, according to Groth-Marnet (1984) the TAT offers less susceptibility to faking, access to complex personality attributes, and ease of rapport with the subject.
Projective instruments such as the TAT have long been a matter of concern to academic psychologists because of the difficulty in making them conform to the usual methods of establishing reliability and validity. Although numerous studies of the TAT have supported both its validity and reliability using different scoring systems, a number of researchers have come to the opposite conclusion. Bellak (1986), a leading researcher and advocate of the TAT, addressed their concerns and the difficulty in establishing research techniques with persuasive arguments that the TAT's very usefulness is in fact what makes this instrument difficult to research. For example a subject may be depressed today and anxious tomorrow; the successful administration of the TAT ought to reflect both situations. His arguments are partially built out of the constructs of ego psychology and psychoanalysis and therefore partially dependent on the veridity of these theories. Lundy's (1985) research supports the reliability, and he ascribes problems others have with test retest reliability to problems in follow-up administration.

Some of the other problems with the TAT include multiple scoring systems (frequently including vague instructions for scoring), lengthy administration and scoring times, the potential for unconscious projection by the examiner, and the possibility that interminable analysis obscures the cogent issues. Psychometrician such as Anastasi (1982) recommend including the TAT with a battery of tests to minimize these difficulties (which I did), but it seems to me that a better solution lies in further development of scoring
systems for the TAT organized under the umbrella of ego psychology, in the way that Bellak (1986) has begun, and which computer technology may be currently capable of supporting. Exner (1974) completed such a system for the Rorschach with apparently excellent success.

Although I opted for the TAT, I also considered the Rorschach test to be a reasonable alternative. Both have clinical and academic research support for their use in exploring the unconscious aspects of personality. Both provide useful data about unconscious drives and ego function. The Rorschach seems much better at illuminating emotional organization, the role of unconscious drives in the structure of personality and pathology, and the Exner (1974) scoring system appears more tightly designed (particularly for diagnosis) and efficacious for research. The TAT, on the other hand emerged superior in its capacity to highlight complex interactions among the ego functions, and also better able to support the ideographic methods which were the focus of this research. Consequently, I decided on the TAT, and completed an independent study course with C.W.R.U. Professor of Psychology Donald Freedheim in order to develop increased competence in scoring the TAT.

Included in the umbrella term TAT are several different instruments, most notably the two picture sets developed at Harvard; one by Henry Murray (Morgan and Murray, 1935), and the other by McClelland (1958). I decided on the card set developed by Murray because it is most often used for clinical and broad-based assessments, and is probably
unsurpassed in generating data about the dynamics of relationships. The McClelland set is more often used in organizational behavior research but has been primarily employed in the exploration of motivation.

The administration of the TAT required the selection of a picture set suitable for this study. Murray's instructions (1943) prescribe a selected set of 20 pictures codified by gender and age. As practical matter, however, the standard administration is 10 pictures, and many clinicians limit their protocol to three to five cards. Since the intention of this study was to test and generate data about a broad range of ego functions, the card selections were intended to include a variety of stimuli, and offer a variety of ambiguity. I chose two sets of ten pictures, gender specific, using the following arrangement of ten pictures:

Order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>TAT Card</th>
<th>Description of picture/ expected issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 1 Young boy with a violin: Frequently generates issues regarding duty (compliance, coercion, rebellion), roles of and relationships with authority, and aspirations (difficulty, hope, achievement).
2. 2 Country scene: Conceptions of family relationships (Oedipal themes, sibling rivalry), issues of autonomy versus compliance, and attitudes towards the environment (giving, supportive versus barren, depriving).

3. 3BM Huddled boy with pistol: problems with aggression (intra- and extra-) and its consequences; sexual orientation.

4. 5 Woman on the threshold of half-opened door looking into a room: attitudes and expectations regarding mother (concern versus reprimand), voyeuristic material, fear of attack (females), rescue fantasies (males).

5. 6BM Short elderly woman with tall young man: mother-son issues (males), Oedipal themes, dependence versus independence, guilt feelings.

6. 8BM Boy in foreground, gun at side, surgical scene in background: direction of aggression (direct, sublimated, etc.), and targets of repressed hostility.
7. 12M Young boy on couch, older man with outstretched arms: attitude towards passive dependence; relationships to male authority figures, homosexual issues.

8. 6GF Younger woman sitting on sofa, older man with pipe addressing her: especially expectations /hopes of (males) and from (females) older dominant men (aggressor, seducer, "idealized father")

9. 16 Blank: tends to elicit material about the current life dilemmas, and expectations of future created in the scene (partic. vital, generative, optimistic versus desolate and flat.

10. 17BM A naked man clinging to a rope: material focusing on success, competition, Oedipal struggles, homosexuality, and implications for the future.

Females:

1. 1 See description above.

2. 2 See description above.

3. 5 See description above.
4. 6EM  See description above.

5. 18GF  A woman squeezing the throat of another at the bottom of the stairs: attitude towards aggression; may also highlight relationship to mother figures (particularly guilt feelings, dependence versus independence, over-protectiveness).

6. 12M  See description above

7. 6GF  See description above

8. 8GF  A woman staring off into space: expectations of the future, although frequently stereotyped.

9. 16  See description above

10. 9GF  Two women at seashore, one running, the other up in a tree: issues of sibling rivalry and competition, Oedipal issues, and locus/ strength of suspiciousness.

I administered the TAT following the standard protocol developed by Murray (1943) for individual administration. The subjects selected for testing were scheduled by the secretaries for seventy-five minute time slots, usually five to seven per day. Each had returned a
permission letter. I was assigned a private office at the site for
the process. The administration was face to face, and responses
recorded with the subject's knowledge using a tie-tac microphone. I
also took concurrent detailed notes regarding their demeanor, and
their responses to me regarding the pictures, their stories, and the
process. I began the meeting by introducing myself, and re-explaining
the purpose of the study, the four instruments involved, and how
subjects were chosen, and the confidentiality of the process, by
paraphrasing the introduction letter that they had previously
received. I offered to answer any lingering questions they might have
about the study. When they seemed ready I focused them on the
objectives for this session, and the recorder was turned on. The TAT
was introduced as a test of imagination (consistent with the letter),
and I continued with a description of their task. The instructions
were to create as dramatic a story as they could; one which includes a
beginning, middle, and ending. They were also told to describe the
thoughts and feelings of each of the characters in their story. They
were advised that there would be ten pictures and each story was to
be approximately 5 minutes for a total of 50 minutes. I also told
them that it is usually best if they create the story as they go.
Before I handed them the first card I also asked for questions about
the process and answered as best I could without adding to the
instructions. The cards were handed to them one at a time to hold
while they told their story. I usually waited for them to overtly
signal the conclusion of a story, although sometimes after a long
pause I asked them if they were through.
I adopted certain modifications to Murray's protocol, particularly certain strategies recommended by Rappaport (Rappaport et al., 1968), Stein (1981), and Bellak (1976). These (non-suggestive) interventions were intended to penetrate surface resistances, identify points of solid resistance and to maximize the subject's story production while increasing the clarity of response. The interventions included advising the subjects of the time taken for each of the first two or three stories; prompting for non-compliance, such as failing to tell a complete story, (e.g. "Can you say more about lead up this scene?") or failing to describe the thoughts and feelings for the characters (e.g. "Can you say more about what the young man is thinking and feeling?").

The response of the subject to the task itself is, of course, important data about the role of the ego, particularly when the response is defensive. Omission is often more important than inclusion in story development. Rappaport noted (1968) that although the TAT may be useful to understand the role of the id, understanding the role of the ego as it struggles to cope with the demands of the task is critical to effective interpretation of results. Thus for each subject, pauses in the story, as well as my interventions and their responses were included in the recording and transcription of the story.

The testing protocol included a short series of questions asked immediately upon their completion of the TAT. The first three questions were aimed at augmenting my understanding of the subject's
response to the test: (1) "How did this test go for you? (2) If you think back to the ten stories, were there any themes that seem to you to have been recurring? (3) Were there times that you found yourself hesitant during the stories?" I then turned off the recorder and asked them for the microphone, in order to begin a winding down process and maintain a more informal atmosphere. I next asked them to name the three persons in the firm who they imagine would produce stories most similar to theirs, and, conversely to name those would produce the most dissimilar stories. Finally, I asked for basic family demographic data including: age, educational background, parents careers, marital status and ages, and age and gender of siblings. At the conclusion, I reminded them of the 16PF, and asked that not discuss the details of the TAT with their co-workers until the process had been completed. I then took a few minutes to complete my notes.

The tapes were transcribed by a professional typist with all hesitations, parlance, measured pauses etc. intact, in order to closely approximate the actual telling of the story. This transcript along with my notes became the basis for each TAT analysis. Using a variation of Bellak's (1986) TAT analysis system supplemented with data from Stein (1981), Rappaport (1968), and McAdams (1988), I established a scoring system and form to identify a broad range of ego function and interpersonal dynamics. I scored for hero identity, needs, and response factors; environmental issues; story types and outcomes; and the quality of object relations. In addition I
established a procedure and form (Illustration 3) to score defense mechanisms based on Mary Haworth's (1965) system to score defense mechanisms for the Children's Apperception Test, as well as Bellak (1986), and Rappaport (1968) systems. After using a complete scoring system for about one-third of the TAT's, two things became apparent: the system was very effective in capturing the intrapsychic experiences of the subjects, and that the data generated was so rich it exceeded the reasonable scope of this research project.

Accordingly, I decided to limit my analysis of the TAT stories to two factors: aggression, and autonomy, both of which had begun to emerge as prominent issues in the first 15 TAT's analyzed. The examination was limited to the stories from cards known to generate these themes: specifically, picture 1 (both men and women), picture 3BM (men), and picture 18GF (women). The stories generated from the other cards were analyzed only to see if they lent thematic support or contradiction to the diagnosis of the three cards.

Organizational Ideology Questionnaire, (HIQ) (Harrison, 1975):

This instrument was chosen to provide quantifiable data about the organization's culture, specifically its ideology defined as the values and beliefs central to a firm's culture (Schein, 1985). The HIQ appeared particularly useful for this study since it provided ideology orientations for the organization as well as the preferred ideology for the individual participants, along with congruence
between the two. This questionnaire measured the ideology through forced choice comparisons among 15 key aspects of organizational life: including supervision, subordination, conflict, and so forth. The ideologies measured were power (control and competition), task/achievement (achieving the task), role (legitimacy and responsibility), person/support (needs of the members). Dominant values and preferences might be equated to a particular but untitled religion for the firm. The instrument was useful not only for the summarized ideology scores but also functional data provided by responses to individual questions. Although not extensively researched for theory building, this instrument has been widely used in organization development projects (Ott, 1986), and carries a certain feedback validity as outcome to such projects, along with normative profiles of archetype organizations. Harrison updated these profiles in 1991 (Harrison, 1991) and expanded the ideology profiles to encompass level of consciousness as well as ideology. I made certain minor modifications to the instructions and several questions to increase clarity and to customize the instrument for the project site. The modified instrument is attached as appendix 3.

Structured Interview Protocol:

Although the HIQ provided rich data on the underlying ideology of the organization and its members, and the 16PF and TAT provided data on the personal styles and intrapsychic experience of the members to the world at large, I also needed to discover more functional detail about
the subjects' world at large, as well as their emotional responses to these experiences. Accordingly I developed a questionnaire for one-on-one interviews to probe for the subjects' perceptions of the individual and collective roles, the organization's environment, key task and interpersonal processes in the small work groups and total firm, and any contemporary issues needing resolution. I also sought to discover any significant differences between those values and theories espoused and those in use, response to and resolutions of paradox, as well as any other recurring internal processes which might be anxiety provoking or undiscussable.

Ninety minutes was allocated for the fifteen question interview (attached as appendix 1). At the beginning of the interview I reintroduced the study, reminded them of the confidentiality and anonymity their statements, and told them of the feedback arrangements. I recorded the interviews by hand and made tape recordings for back-up, although the recordings were not subsequently transcribed. Following Neilsen's suggested model (1984) for organization development interview protocol output, I asked eight questions with follow-up questions as necessary, progressing from the individual issues to interpersonal issues to system-wide issues. I also asked two questions about personal and systemic responses to unexpectedly difficult situations. In addition, having raised the subject's awareness of the firm's culture through the interview process, I asked four questions in metaphoric form regarding the firm, the subject, and the clients to further sharpen the images. The final
interview question asked the subject what questions, if any, he or she would have asked that had not been asked, in order to provide the opportunity to discuss any lingering issues. In closing I asked their opinions about the process, and repeated my request that questions be kept confidential until the interview cycle had been completed.

For the feedback session the data was organized using the ten organizational culture themes provided by Alexander (1978) in his organizational culture assessment instrument. The themes included organizational and personal pride, performance excellence, teamwork and communication, leadership and supervision, profitability and cost effectiveness, colleague and associate relations, client relations, innovativeness and creativity, training and development, candor and openness. A summary statement of the findings was prepared for each theme, along with a list of supporting comments. These data were reviewed along with the results of the 16PF during a two hour meeting with the managing partner and personnel partner. There, I also collected notes on the feedback process and follow-up steps.

The entire process including contracting, administration of the TAT's, 16PF's, HIQ's, structured interview protocol along with the feedback sessions transpired over 25 days and approximately 300 hours. Although the vast majority of time was with individuals, I occasionally wandered about the offices and observed the flow and ambience of the organization. The regularity of my presence also
seemed to make me relatively unobtrusive. Other data were also obtained from the firm. This included a written history, a client satisfaction study prepared by an outside consultant, a limited scale culture survey prepared by an industrial psychologist, all of which were useful in developing clarity about this site.
CHAPTER THREE

Findings in the Field and Data Analysis

Sixteen Personality Factors (16PF)

This instrument is scored in stens, which is a measure of central
tendency, and has a mean score of 5.5, a standard deviation of two,
and a usual range of zero to ten. Thus for example, scores between 5
and 6 are the norm for each of the factors, and approximately 40% of
the population obtain sten scores between 4.5 and 6.5. A sten score
of 7.5 would be one standard deviation above the mean, higher than 84%
of the population. Accordingly, the farther away from 5.5 in either
direction, the more unusual and unlike the general population the sten
score.

Fifty-one people at the firm completed the 16PF and were scored
according to combined gender general adult population norms for the
primary factors. For those secondary and tertiary factors which
differentiated normative scoring by gender, I used the gender
appropriate scoring computation. Normative scores for U.S. CPA's were
obtained from Bowlay, Smith, and Cox's studies of American accountants
(noted in Cattell, 1970). The results of the 16PF are summarized and
described on tables 1 through 3.
Primary Factors:

These 16 factors are the basic personality traits and serve as the building blocks for the broader coping strategies indicated by the secondary factors which follow in discussion.

Factor A - Warmth:

| Total firm | 5.3 |
| U.S. CPA's | 7.1 |

Most segments of the firm tend to be average to slightly below average on this factor, indicating an orientation neither particularly warm nor cool and aloof. American CPA norms are relatively high and markedly higher than the firm for this factor, indicating a tendency to be warmer, more outgoing, easygoing, than the general population and the members of this firm.

Factor B - Abstract thinking:

| Total firm | 7.4 |
| U.S. CPA's | 7.9 |
| Management | 8.3 |
| Support staff | 6.2 |
This can be a useful indicator of intelligence, although individual scores can sometimes be misleading, particularly low scores coupled with high levels of anxiety. The firm's average score was significantly above average, and about the same for CPA's in general. Factor B for the management team is significantly higher for the management team than the support staff.

Factor C - Ego strength:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown office</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh office</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High scores indicate emotionally calm and self-assurance. Low scores indicate persons with less self-assurance, more easily upset and affected by feelings, and changeable. The firm scores were slightly below average and similar to CPA norms. The Youngstown office results were significantly below those of the Pittsburgh office.
Factor E - Dominance:

Total firm  6.2
U.S. CPA's  5.5
Administrative  4.8
Acct.– audit  6.8
Tax & mgt. serv.  7.2
Support staff  5.3
Management  7.0

The total firm score was somewhat higher than average, and higher than CPA's in general. Statistically significant differences between work groups emerged. The results for the tax and management services group indicates a group of persons that are relatively assertive or aggressive, competitive, and stubborn; significantly more so than persons in the accounting/ auditing group, and administration groups. Persons in administrative departments and support positions are likely to be somewhat mild in manner, humble, and more easily led, and/ or accommodating.
Factor F - Enthusiasm:

Total firm 5.7  
U.S. CPA's 4.9

High scores indicate talkative, cheerful, impulsive, happy-go-lucky. Low scores reflect introspection, sober, serious, sticks to inner values. Firm scores were slightly above average, and somewhat higher than CPA's in general.

Factor G - Group conformity:

Total firm 6.3  
U.S. CPA's 6.4

High scores indicate conscientiousness, moralism, and domination by a sense of duty. Low scores reflect expediency, and lack of acceptance of group moral standards. The firm scores were somewhat higher than average and about the same as American CPA's.
Factor H - Boldness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting staff</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High scores indicate social boldness, thick skin, and adventurousness, and low scores shyness, timidity, and threat sensitivity. The total firm scores were about average and very similar to CPA norms, however, management at the firm scored relatively high and significantly above the accounting staff, which scored somewhat lower than the general population.

Factor I - Emotional sensitivity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Males</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Females</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 months</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High scores indicate tender-mindedness, emotional sensitivity, kindly approach, and sometimes seeking help and sympathy. Low scores
indicate tough-mindedness, an unsentimental approach and few artistic responses. Firm scores were about average, and somewhat above CPA norms. Women in the firm are significantly more sensitive than the men, and somewhat more sensitive than the general female population. Newcomers are significantly more sensitive than persons with the firm longer than six months.

Factor L - Suspiciousness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm women</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm men</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High scores indicate suspiciousness, dogmatism, jealousy, demanding that people accept responsibility for errors. Low scores reflect trusting, accepting conditions, tolerance. The firm scores are significantly above average, and about the same as CPA norms. Men at the firm are significantly more suspicious than the women, and higher than the norm for CPA's.
**Factor M - Imagination:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm professionals</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High scores reflect imaginative, unconventional, fanciful. Low scores indicate practical, down to earth concern, and concern with immediate interests and issues. The total firm scores are somewhat lower than average, and significantly lower than CPA's in general. The very practical orientation of the support staff is significantly lower than the average score of the professional staff.

**Factor N - Shrewdness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High scores reflect a polished, socially aware orientation, usually calculating and emotionally detached attitude. Low scores indicate a genuine but socially clumsy demeanor. The firm score was about average, but somewhat lower than CPA norms. The results for professionals was slightly below general population norms, and well below the CPA norms.
Factor 0 - Guilt proneness:

Total firm  5.6
U.S. CPA's  5.7

High scores indicate apprehension, self-reproaching, and worrying. Low scores reflect a self-assured and complacent style. The firm and CPA scores were similar and unexceptional.

Factor Q1 - Rebelliousness:

Total firm  5.4
U.S. CPA's  6.3
Management  6.6
Support staff  4.1
Firm CPA's  6.1

High scores indicate an experimental, liberal, analytical free-thinking orientation, and low scores a conservative and respecting temperament. The total firm norms were about average for the general population, but somewhat lower than CPA norms.
Factor Q2 - Self-sufficiency:

Firm total  6.8  
U.S. CPA's  6.2  
Less than 6 months  8.0

High scores reflect a sense of self-sufficiency and preference for own decisions. Low scores indicate sociably group dependent, a joiner, and sound follower. Firm scores are significantly above average and somewhat higher than CPA norms. Persons with the firm less than 6 months scored significantly higher than the firm norms, as well as the general population.

Factor Q3 - Controlled:

Firm total  6.0  
U.S. CPA's  5.8

High scores indicate an ability to bind anxiety, exacting will power, possibly compulsive. Low scores indicate lax approach, disregard of social rules, and less controlled. The firm scores were slightly above average, and about the same as CPA norms.
Factor Q4 - Tension:

Firm total 6.3
U.S. CPA's 5.8

High scores reflect high level of situational tension, frustration, and a feeling of being driven. Low scores indicate relaxed, tranquil, composed demeanor. Firm scores were somewhat higher than the general population, and slightly higher than CPA norms.

Secondary Factors:

These factors, based on factor-analytic constellations of primary factors, describe the broad and enduring personality patterns and coping strategies.

Extraversion:

Firm total 5.0
U.S. CPA's 5.5

Important primary factors included in extraversion pole for this factor: high (A+) warmth, (F+) impulsivity, and (H+) boldness, and low (Q2-) self-sufficiency. High scores indicate an outgoing style, with
focus on the outer social world and material things. Low scores reflect introversion, that is a concern with the inner world of thoughts, feelings, and ideas. The firm score is slightly lower than both the general population and CPA norms.

Anxiety:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm total</th>
<th>5.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S CPA's</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-management</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important primary factors included in this factor: high (Q4+) tension, (L+) suspiciousness, (O+) guilt-proneness, and low (C-) ego strength and low (Q3-) ability to bind anxiety. High levels of anxiety do not necessarily indicate pathology nor low anxiety its absence, but instead the subject's ego syntonic or dystonic integration. Low scores reflect the subject's sense of internal adjustment and congruence, even if pathological; high scores for second-order anxiety indicate dystonic ego discomfort, or an unconscious plea for help. Firm mean scores are somewhat higher than the general population and CPA norms. Although the population norms are set at 5.5, the normative expectations for professional working adults are scores of about 4.0 to 4.5. Thus scores of 5.9 to 6.3 indicates a relatively high degree of anxiety and intrapsychic
incongruence - and relatively inadequate coping strategies. 13 persons had secondary anxiety scores over 7, and 9 had scores below 4.5. Non-management persons at the firm are significantly more anxious than the general population as well as the management of this firm.

Tough practicality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important primary factors included in this factor: low scores on (A-) warmth, (I-) sensitivity, and (M-) imagination. This characteristic differentiates cool, emotionally detached, and controlled individuals from their sensitive but moody counterparts. The range on the high side indicates a coping strategy of tough practicality and emotional repression, and on the low side a tendency to feel rather than think. The firm mean scores are slightly higher than the general population, and somewhat higher than CPA norms.

Independence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total firm</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CPA's</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm management</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important primary factors included in this factor: high (E+) dominance, (L+) suspiciousness, (M+) imagination, (Q2+) rebelliousness, and (Q2+) self-sufficiency. High scores indicate a coping strategy utilizing a high degree of temperamental and field independence, that is an eagerness to go one's own way; and also usually indicates a high degree of internal locus of control. Persons with high scores are frequently more difficult to get along with, and sometimes a law unto themselves. Low scores indicate a more subdued and environmentally responsive coping orientation; also frequently coupled with high degree of external locus of control. The total firm mean scores are slightly higher than the general population, and about the same as CPA norms, this factor is differentiating among the subgroups at the firm. Males and firm management scored significantly higher on this factor than females and non-management as well as the general population. Females in this firm also scored lower on independence than women in the general population.

Control (Compulsivity):

Total firm 6.4
U.S. CPA's 6.2
Important primary factors included in this factor: high (G+) group conformity, and (Q3+) ability to bind anxiety. High scores indicate a coping strategy emphasize a self-controlled and compulsive approach to anxiety, along with conformity, rigidity, and lack of spontaneity. Low scores indicate flexibility, non-conformity, and lack of restraint. Both the total firm and U.S. CPA mean scores were somewhat above the general population norms.

Discussion of 16PF profiles of two key executives:

Profile of Founding Partner

Metaphor: A warm-hearted bull using his own map in a china shop. Kay is an extremely bright and bold extrovert, and although he likes people very much, is likely to be very threatening to most persons, as well as very difficult to get along with. His 16PF profile more closely approximates a top level executive than a CPA. He sees himself as a law unto himself, yet there is an openness about him that smacks of social naivete (low N). His relatively high anxiety level indicates some intrapsychic incongruence. His style indicates aggressive control and movement to the center of things.
Profile of New Managing Partner

Metaphor: A new-age visionary. Much more subdued personality style. Less extroverted, more reflective; average intelligence for CPA, very independent but less so than founding partner; relatively anxious, uses a relatively flexible and creative style. Also indications of social naivete, but also actively seeks to manage a positive appearance. His style is to blend in with people by being flexible, open and creative yet wary in personal matters and maintains an independent imagination.
Results of Harrison Organizational Ideology Questionnaire:

General

Of the 69 persons given the Harrison Ideology Questionnaire 51 completed the instrument. Two questionnaires were dropped for non-compliance with the instructions, thus leaving a valid sample of 49. The instrument required the subjects to rank order responses to 15 questions, with each inquiry presenting ideological responses to organizational cultural problems. Issues included on the instrument are: (1) supervision, (2) subordination, (3) resolution of controversy, (4) "doing well", (5) human resources, (6) rewards and reinforcement, (7) appropriate control, (8) task assignment, (8) work motivation, (10) teamwork, (11) competition, (12) conflict resolution, (14) information, and (15) nature of environment. Each question (issue) was rank ordered twice: once for their "personal preference as how things would be best at this firm", and separately for "the dominant beliefs at this firm." A summary of responses to the questionnaire are recounted on Table 6 according to the four ideologies measured: power, role (or structure), task (or achievement), and person (or support).
Firm Ideology Preferences:

Primary orientation:

The summary of responses to the Firm Preferences section of the HIQ clearly spell out the perceptions of people in this firm. Rank order is (1) task, (2) role, (3) person, and (4) power. The results indicate that, first and foremost, the firm ideology is seen as task or achievement based. The score of 1579 is 72% of the maximum possible score indicating a very strong cultural perception of commitment to meeting the super-ordinated task or goal - whatever it might be. As Harrison (1972) has noted, if established authority impedes achievement it is swept away with a task orientation, as there is no ideological commitment to authority, respectability, and order as such. That is particularly so for this firm, where the power orientation is seen as the least important ideology. The relatively low (third of four) person (support) orientation also indicates low regard for personal needs and social considerations, particularly if they are seen as impeding the task.
Back-up orientation:

The back-up orientation at this firm is seen as the role or structure orientation. Although markedly lower than task, role or structure is clearly perceived to be an important ideology in this organization. According to Harrison a role orientation carries a preoccupation with rationality and orderliness, manifested in legality, legitimacy, and responsibility. Role and structure are defensive power reaction derivatives: orderliness and rationality are substituted for the unpredictability of competition and conflict.
Personal Ideology Preferences

Primary orientation:

Rank order of personal ideology preferences is: (1) task, (2) person, (3) role, and (4) power. The primary personal preference for task or achievement orientation is consistent with subjects' perceptions of the firm's ideology orientation. They indicate a desire to further increase the task orientation to 78% of maximum, primarily by a further reduction in power orientation, although with a very slight reduction in role orientation.

Back-up orientation:

Although the personal preference score for a role or structure oriented ideology in the firm remained basically unchanged, its rank order moved from second to third. Members of the firm indicated a strong preference for increased attention to a person or support orientation. The trade-offs sought are increased person-oriented ideology at the firm and a further reduction of the power orientation, already perceived to be least important. The hope is that a person or support orientation would provide for needs that the firm members can not otherwise meet by themselves. This orientation carries a hope that people can influence each other more often by caring, helpfulness
and example; and less often by power-oriented authority. Also implicit is a desire for more opportunity for autonomous personal growth, and increased sharing of unrewarding or burdensome tasks.

Paradox: Supervision versus Subordination

Questions 1 and 2 of the HIQ indicate ideological preferences for supervision and subordination respectively. The rank order for the firm preferences for and perceptions of supervisory style in the firm is (1) power (2) person, (3) task, and (4) role. This indicates that members of the firm not only prefer "a good boss" who is mostly power-oriented, and who offers a mixture of benevolent paternalism, and materialistic support, but also believe these are the characteristics of supervisors throughout the firm.

Paradoxically, the rank order for subordination (both as to firm and personal ideologies) was (1) task, (2) person, (3) role, and (4) power. So while a "good boss" operates based on power, responses to this question indicate that paradoxically a "good subordinate" responds primarily based on the task, and lastly to power, and that is the way it is throughout the firm.
Results of the Thematic Apperception Test

General

Of the 44 persons selected for the TAT, 41 persons participated; one person directly refused, and two others reported scheduling difficulties. The tapes of seven persons from the Youngstown office were apparently lost during transcription. Notes compiled during their sessions appear to indicate a full analysis of the missing transcriptions would yield similar findings. Results are based on the 34 transcribed and analyzed TAT's. The TAT findings focus on three cards: 1, 3BM, and 18GF. Stories generated from these cards created useful data on issues of aggression and autonomy. The term "hero" in this analysis indicates the character(s) in the story with which the subject most closely identifies.

Response to TAT Card 1

TAT card 1 (Appendix 6) has been described by clinicians as the most valuable card in the series (Bellak, 1966) because of the rich personality data generated. For purposes of this study, responses were first organized along the two expected paths: (1) drama initiated by the hero, usually as need for achievement or succorance; (2) hero responds to drama initiated by others, usually parental figures, reflecting on the relationship to authority and needs for autonomy
and/ or deference. Table 9 summarized the responses to this card, and additional thematic details are provided in appendix (6).

Of the 32 stories, in 25 instances the hero was respondent, and the story involved a struggle for autonomy or need for deference; and in only 7 stories was the drama initiated by the hero as need for achievement or other initiated need. This indicates a strong likelihood that persons in this firm will construct ambiguous task situations as struggles with authority rather than opportunities for achievement.

In the 25 respondent stories, 19 indicated a strong need for autonomy, however, only 11 maintained the struggle to conclusion; for 7 subjects the struggle was ultimately resolved as need for deference; and one person resolved the struggle by initiating role reversal as need for dominance. For 6 subjects the struggle with authority was sustained without expressed need for autonomy, maintaining only need for deference in 9 cases, and resolved as initiated needs in 3 cases. So although the struggle with authority, particularly autonomy, continues to be cogent for most members of this firm, most are unable to maintain resistance or see themselves truly independent.

In the 7 hero initiated stories, 5 persons expressed strong need for achievement. These persons are more likely to maintain an independent orientation towards authority.
Story outcomes were classified among five categories, according to realism, emotional tone, and clarity. In all instances, although frequently only after prompting, the subjects made some attempt to conclude their stories. In 11 instances (34%) the subjects were unwilling or unable to provide a clear outcome to the story (e.g. "some day the young boy will probably be famous", or "I expect he will come to appreciate this experience"). Story outcomes were realistic for 10 subjects, half emotionally upbeat and half emotionally downbeat. In eleven stories the outcome of the story failed to adequately confront or resolve the central issue of the story (e.g. "Everything turns out fine. I just like happy endings.")., with nine of the 11 unrealistic outcomes upbeat. Thus of the 33 stories, only five (15%) were resolved as upbeat and realistic.

I scored each of these stories for the three most significant intrapsychic defense mechanisms used by the subjects in their story (see table 10). The defense mechanisms most often used in response to these stories were denial and repression (92% of the subjects), the group of obsessive-compulsive defenses (88%), and projection (60%). Primitive defense mechanisms (other than denial) were infrequently used (3%). Therefore, in this organization the most frequent intrapsychic responses to the ego's perception of an impending struggle with authority are repression, the obsessive-compulsive defenses of ambivalence, emotional isolation, and obsessive attention to detail, and/or projection. Based on observations of process, and
flow, and overt emotional reactions, I was able to determine that for the most part the subject's defense mechanisms were adequate to handle the anxiety generated by this card, although at least some struggling was apparent with nearly everyone.

In four cases (12%) the subjects were unable to identify the violin in the picture. Bellak (1986) believes that for subjects without cultural deprivation, this is an indication of attention deficit disorder (ADD). A complete neuro-psychological assessment would be required for accurate diagnosis. An important symptom of ADD is short attention span, often with an underlying learning disability such as dyslexia (reading problems) or discalculia (arithmetic problems).

Response to TAT Cards with Aggressive Cues

TAT Cards 3BM and 18GF

Although not exactly comparable, both of these cards provide aggressive cues for the subject to identify with. Card 3BM is designed for males (a young boy huddled over a chair with a revolver on the floor), and 18GF for females (one woman squeezing the throat of another at the bottom of the stairs). Of 22 men only six were able to respond relatively directly to the weapon; two identified the weapon as being directly owned by the hero, two identified the weapon as owned by another, and two identified the revolver as a weapon but
distorted its identification, one as "half-knife, half-gun," the other as a knife.

In 16 stories there was no weapon mentioned in the story. In two of the stories the revolver was central to the plot but was recast as a benign object (a set of keys, a love token). In 10 stories there was no weapon mentioned in the story, and no attention directed to the examiner regarding the object in the picture. Four subjects actively directed my attention to the revolver in the picture, but did not include the weapon in the story.

The results for female subjects were similar. Of 12 subjects only three were able to identify or create a story with direct or implicit aggressive activity during this scene. In nine stories the "choking" is distorted into "holding up" or "play" with another. Of these, six stories deny direct aggression, but do include accidental deaths, long-suffering injuries, and three instances of follow-up or indirect aggression precipitated by the hero. In no instance did a subject question me about this picture.

The indirect aggression occurring in the stories created by the males in picture 3BM is primarily intrapunitive, that is self-directed aggression. Females divided the direction of direct and indirect aggression relatively equally between intrapunitive and extrapunitive (punitive aggression directed against another). Overall the direction of aggression is somewhat extrapunitive.
There was a significant amount of gender confusion in both of these stories. Males consistently (19 of 22 stories) identified the huddled boy as a woman or lady. Females identified one of the women protagonists (hero or other) in the picture as a man in six of the 12 stories.

Story outcomes for these cards were similar to the responses to Card 1. In 15 stories the outcome was upbeat but unrealistic, and in 11 cases the outcome was ambiguous or ambivalent. The others were evenly divided among the possibilities.

Although a little more dispersed, the intrapsychic defense mechanisms displayed by the subjects in response to these cards are similar to those used with card 1. Primary defense mechanisms used were denial and repression (82% of subjects), the obsessive-compulsive defenses (undoing and ambivalence, isolation, and obsessive attention to detail) (71%), and projection (47%). Rationalization was also used almost one-third of the time (32%). The fact that subjects had a much more difficult time coping with the cues from these pictures was apparent based on the way they handled themselves during these stories, difficulty in managing the story flow, and their self-disclosure. This is also supported by the broader range of defense mechanisms required to cope with the problem.
Structured Open-ended Interview Protocol

I Organizational/ personal pride

Pride was the often the first and certainly the most verbalized emotion during the structured interview protocol at this organization. The members of the firm appear to be virtually unanimous in their strong and sweeping pride about firm as an entity. They are particularly proud of work output that they believe to be "overall" the finest and most creative in the nation. They describe their work product as exceptional at times, and feel disappointed when unable to achieve the high standards that they imagine to be clearly identifiable by the general agreement among the staff. Although some objective indicators support these notions (minor public awards or recognition), a more realistic appraisal from my discussions indicates relatively good quality of work output, with a fair share of excellence in assisting small businesses in their tax and financial affairs. Mistakes emerge more often from inadequate organizing than professional failures. There is, however, little reasonable support for such sweeping pride in accomplishment, particularly in non-financial management consulting (see appendix 5). The pride does not measure up to the facts: This is a small firm (75 persons), smaller than many other firms in the area and significantly smaller than the major firms; it provides limited service to small clients; the rewards received are minor, since they indicate civic support more than competency; its growth rate has been rapid, but so have a number
of other firms, and growth has slowed in recent years. Deeper into the interviewing process the cracks often emerged. Important contraindications include failure to adequately manage date-bound bottlenecks in productive output; resulting in predictable (and unsatisfying) declines in quality, and a number of persons concerns with "excessive" billing rates. There is exasperation among some managers, that those outside the firm are too frequently unaware of the firm's tremendous strength. The results from the 16PF indicating that members of this firm are only slightly higher than the norm for other CPA's in 'creative personality style' generated a defensive storm in the feedback meeting. Concerns about office furnishings were frequently mentioned although current furnishing relatively up-to-date and very professional in appearance. This focus seems to re-encapsulate the self-doubt and incongruence between outside image and thrusting pride mentioned in other ways.

II Performance/ excellence

Nearly all of the members of the firm agree that an excellent rating in performance for a professional in this firm includes some component of technical expertise, client service (making certain the clients do not complain to the applicable partner-in-charge), and practice development (salesmanship). Output quality that is both 'bullet proof' and 'creative' matters to people in this firm, and careers are developed in part by developing expertise in some small area. There
is sense among many of a single standard of excellence. An important and regular focus of anxiety occurs mainly among the accounting/audit staff for the differing and seemingly unpredictable standards of excellence actually put into practice by different key partners when reviewing outputs. Resolution to this problem most often occurs through informal sub-group coalescence by the professional staff to different key partners, although overtly against firm policy, thereby confronting only one standard for completing the work product.

Although the 'smell of pride' on their technical accomplishments fills the air at the firm, paradoxically, however, there is dismay among many on the staff that in the struggle between technical superiority and practice development, practice development almost always obtains the greater career rewards at the firm. Although competence in creative solutions to tax and financial problems for small business is touted, there are only five persons (three partners, two managers) in the firm attributed to be 'people to see' when a creative solution is sought or tough problem occurs.

Effective professional practice is accomplished by the staff by mining these creative resources for solutions in order to provide 'creative service' for one's clients, and operatively taking credit and selling these resources in the pursuit of practice development. They described several standard practices and methods of organizing work that increases the gap between their stated objectives and the realized levels of performance excellence. Most frequently addressed
was a systemic compliance cycle that regularly (and they say unnecessarily) clumped the work into oppressive seasonal overload. This virtually eliminated the opportunity for creativity by overloading the firm's very limited creative resources, as well as (unnecessarily) increasing the error rate on compliance work.

There was also a sharp values division between those who believe that technical know-how drives individual and firm performance excellence, and those advocating the primacy of practice development advocates. I do not believe that there is a clear understanding or awareness about which technical and professional competencies actually drive this business. Such awareness would threaten the professional identity for many persons at this firm since for these persons, highlighting the business aspects somehow reduces the importance of the knowledge aspects of the profession. Client evaluations of the service (as well as service awards) seems to support a high degree of satisfaction in accounting and tax services provided by the firm, but less so in general management consulting. Members of the firm believe that their management consulting services is one of the key success factors for the firm.

III Teamwork/ communications:

They describe a strong sense of personal and professional autonomy which is very much valued and supported by most of the members of this
firm. If asked, the members of Karlos Kay & Co. would describe the organization as very team-oriented. However upon further inquiry it also evident that teamwork operates in a very limited fashion. They believe that they can usually count on each other for reliable support, 'when needed in a pinch.' In order to engage such teamwork it often, however, requires 'a pinch,' and that's the way people like it. Teamwork interpreted as 'help in a pinch, but only in a pinch'; translates 'working together' into respecting and enlarging each other's autonomy.

It appears that work-based reliability by persons sharing responsibility for a client project is a critical factor in the informal social system which develops at the firm. Beliefs in this firm about communications carry a flavor of new age mythology; that is "if we would only able to communicate better, any problems that we do have could be solved." A couple of other problem areas are apparent. There appears to be difficulty in communicating and collaborating on important issues among the partner group. These include inability to candidly discuss performance evaluation, leadership needs and preferences, and financial administration. The new managing partner was chosen by default rather than candid discussion of the firm's needs. There is also serious strain between the tax and accounting groups at times, and status problems between some members of the professional staff and the support group. The generalized complaints about communications which were presented to me seemed to be of the top-down variety.
IV Leadership/ supervision:

The four person dominant coalition includes Karlos Kay, the founding partner, and two other senior partners involved in the original spin-off, and the new managing partner. Karlos Kay commands enormous respect throughout the firm. He is seen as providing important direction with risk-taking ideas for the firm and modeling the difficult double identity of super-star technician and salesman. He also serves two other functions: the angry voice of dissatisfaction from the founding father, and cheerleader for the 'best and most creative accounting firm in the U.S.' The two other senior partners in the dominant coalition also are seen as both technically competent and effective salespersons, but seem to focus their leadership on getting things done within their own client universe. I have included Rick Borden, the new managing partner, although a less powerful partner. He is seen as a hard-working, relatively competent cheerleader, assuming this position only after the two more powerful partners each refused the assignment. His influence appears strongest in his ability to strongly control events within the firm through his influence with Karlos Kay.

There seems to be substantial overt attention devoted to maintaining solid relationships between supervisors and subordinates, discussed in strong human resource terms, but played out in a comfortable arrangement of autonomy. The emotional tone of these relationships is
parental: most often maternal but other times paternal. Unresolved struggles seem to originate most often in subordinates dissatisfaction with inadequate positive feedback, and in the quest for unsatisfied autonomy. Despite the soft friendly relationships among peers, there is, however, an undercurrent of aggressive competition at all levels that is not being addressed, and which seems to be kept in check by the rapid growth of the firm. Ever more business provides ever more career growth and autonomy.

V Profitability/ cost effectiveness:

Most of the members of the firm seem to believe that the billing rates are high but justifiable, although there are a number of notable exceptions. There is substantial avoidance of billing and collection issues. The most recent solution was to relieve the partners and managers of the task by assigning a young clerk and the firm controller to handle collections.

A system-wide pattern of inefficiency emerges from the internal processes of budgeting and accounting for the resource requirements of upcoming client assignments. Middle managers devote substantial time to planning and budgeting the procedures and resource requirements for each client assignment. The process usually begins by the responsible middle managers painstakingly creating a "reasonable scenario" which is gradually changed and reworked to a best case scenario in order to bring down the fee estimates. Developed budgets are always
optimistic, with a high likelihood of unbillable hours. On the other hand here is little individual accountability for time differentials between actual and estimated time requirements because of an time accounting and collection system not fully utilized. Since the fee estimates are probably most often correct, the result is inflated billing rates to compensate for quixotic time estimates. An ambiguous charge-off usually results from predictable underestimation of time requirements and failure to account for the budgeted amount, most often attributed to training, changing requirement, or problems with client's accountant. One defensive advantage of this process is that it provides both personal safety and people to blame if necessary. One problem with the distortions involved in this process occurs when additional work appropriate for billing cannot be isolated from the built-in charge-offs, and is therefore lost. Although this is described as a serious problem by some, the real amount is unknown. This system also provides individuals with autonomy without the conventional trappings of responsibility. There are limitations to deniability, particularly among the junior staff, some of whom mentioned 'shaving hours' to avoid looking incompetent against budget.

The general feeling is that the firm is financially solid and profitable, although a number of managers and partners think that the profit levels should be higher. This is a core point of dispute, and is generally undiscussible. The underlying problems most often noted included uncollected billings, bureaucracy, consistently over-optimistic time estimates, backing down to unjustified client demands
for fee write-downs, and an evaluation system which does not adequately
correct productivity by job.

VI Colleague/associate relations:

There are generally very cordial working relationships among all
levels of the firm. There are two or three persons among the 75 who
are generally disliked— but that is the exception. Colleague
relations were frequently described as one of the important satisfiers
in firm, but minimal expectations of intimacy are the norm. Again,
there are competitive strains among work groups and social cliques but
continual growth in clients seems to minimize any overt conflict over
promotions and financial reward. Two notable exceptions are the
silent disputes among the partners, and the work-load sharing issues
between members of the tax and accounting departments.

VII Customer/client relations:

Maintaining excellent client relations is an important value in the
firm's culture. Virtually everyone in the organization (professional
and support alike) mentioned the high profile which clients
(entrepreneurs) maintain in the firm. When the client's word is taken
over a firm member's in a dispute (the usual case) tension does
develop, usually with unsatisfactory resolution for the staff person.
This is where "the wrath of Karlos Kay" originates, and this
confrontation is an initiation ritual of sorts. While Kay says that
he "only bellows at people that he likes," this possibility is apparently quite threatening, particularly among the younger staff. Seeking and maintaining excellent client relationships, gets everyone's attention at this firm. Sometimes the alliances are close enough between client and contact person at the firm, that the client's position is taken against the firm's in financial matters. Often mentioned as strength is the ability of firm members to provide "sounding board" and management consulting to the client. Interestingly, the client satisfaction survey did not support this, and no one in the firm seemed to notice. Although satisfied with these competencies, the clients were most satisfied with the tax services, followed by accounting services, and thirdly management consulting.

VIII Innovativeness/ creativity:

Although members of the firm place a high value on creativity, and a number of firm members (both support and professional) have personality style profiles similar to persons known to be creative, there are actually only a few persons generating the creative output. The creative core for the firm includes 5 or 6 persons, and is described as three members of the tax department and three of the partners with niche knowledge in taxation and creative financing. There is widespread support for aggressive and creative client tax planning, yet there seems to be a lack of dispersed creative effort.
Although there seems to be a willingness to take the roads less frequently travelled, the firm is organized along traditional CPA firm models of work processing in most respects. One important factor which differentiates this firm from other firms is a willingness to take chances with bright but inexperienced persons, allowing them to take on professional responsibility much more quickly (with commensurate financial rewards) than would be the case in a traditional firm. Computers, however, do not seem to have sparked imagination at the firm, and remain a computational tool for most.

IX Training/ development:

The firm supports formal training and development, and choices appear to be self-directed rather than strategic. The most important technical development comes from on-the-job training, and adequate technical progress is part of an up or out plan for staff development. The critical social skill learned through on-the-job training is maintaining the "appropriate" level of autonomy. Work product is closely reviewed with the expectation that it be 'bullet-proof' as defined by the most senior partner responsible for the client. Learning the idiosyncratic differences among the partners is a requirement for development. The work-group cliques and social support helps alleviate the anxiety. Development is often informally
supported or hindered by early "labelling" (probably self-fulfilling at times), despite official policy to the contrary.

X Candor/ openness:

Members of the firm place a high value on openness, and provide a number of formal structures to support this value, such as frequent performance reviews by all involved on a job, and Monday night discussion groups. They continue to struggle to meet the official standards of candor at all levels of the organization including the partners' group. There are a number of topics which are undiscussible, particularly on issues or requiring aggressive energy, as well as anything which might negatively reflect on the firm's pride.
Interactive Effects: 16PF by Organizational Ideology

Table 11 describes the interactive effects of personality style with members perceptions of the firm's ideology and personal preferences for a particular kind of organizational ideology. T-tests were used to compare the subjects' ideology scores with personality variables measured by the 16PF. The table indicates the mean sten scores for each 16PF factor separately by high and low scores for each of the ideology factors, for beliefs about the firm (e.g. firmpow2) and the subjects preferences for a particular ideology (e.g. mypow2). Also provided is the probability that the differences are due to chance. Significant relationships at the 99% and 95% levels are identified with (**) or (*) respectively.

High and low scores were determined by re-coding raw scores for each of the ideology factors (power, task, role, person) for each subject, using the mean score of the total sample as the division point between high and low scores. The resulting variables were identified as hi-power (any scores above the mean), lo-power (any scores below the mean), hi-role, lo-role, hi-task, lo-task, hi-self (person), and lo-self.

A number of personality factors for persons in this firm are significantly related (at the 95% level) to their personal preference for role or structure in the firm including: primary factors of
intelligence, dominance, emotional sensitivity, self-sufficiency, and secondary factors of extraversion, independence, discretion, as well as neurosis, strength, self-criticism, and cultural control. Persons in the firm with a high preference for structure (role) tend to be less intelligent, less dominant, more sensitive, more self-sufficient, more introverted, less independent, and more neurotic. No statistical significance was identified between personality style and personal preference for power, task, or person (support).

A number of significant relationships were also discovered between personality style and members of this firm's perceptions of the firm's ideology. Significant differences exist between the perception of the importance of power to a firm ideology and individual imagination and modal distortion. Persons who tended to perceive a lower power-orientation and higher task-orientation at the firm scored higher in imagination (factor M).

Persons perceiving high power orientation in the organization were also more likely to try and describe themselves in an unrealistically favorable light when completing the 16PF. Persons perceiving the firm to be more task-oriented were significantly less likely to describe themselves in an unfavorable light.
Persons high in (Q2) self-sufficiency were also significantly more likely to perceive the firm as having higher than average structure-orientation and higher than average task-orientation in the firm ideology.
### TABLE 1: 16PF Scores by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Population Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cons Groups</th>
<th>Cons Positive</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16PF by Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Tests and One-Way Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN POPULATION</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S. CPA'S</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- T-tests for this firm.
- Male: FEMALE.
- More constraints for CONS.
- More positive for CONS.
- More support for CONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1-REBS</th>
<th>Q2-SEL</th>
<th>Q3-CON</th>
<th>Q4-FAKENESS</th>
<th>FAKEGOOD</th>
<th>EXTRAVERT</th>
<th>ANXIETY*</th>
<th>TRUST</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>DISCRETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRM TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.MEAN</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD.DEV.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEPTOSIS</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKINNESS</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN POPULAT</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN STEN</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S. CPA'S</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN STEN</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- TESTS FOR THIS FIRM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX:</th>
<th>3.00**</th>
<th>3.46</th>
<th>3.87</th>
<th>2.74</th>
<th>2.53</th>
<th>3.01**</th>
<th>0.46</th>
<th>0.16</th>
<th>1.36</th>
<th>3.00***</th>
<th>1.92</th>
<th>0.02**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN-MALE</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN-MALE</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME OF EMP.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 5 NO</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 6 NO</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNGSTOWN</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS GROUPS:</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT/AUDT</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX/PRO</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS POSITION</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>5.8*</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1: 16PF SCORES BY DEMOGRAPHICS (CONT'D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTIVE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>NEUROTIC</th>
<th>CREATIVE</th>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>SEL-CRT</th>
<th>RESPONSIV</th>
<th>CULT.COM</th>
<th>DETACHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRM TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. MEAN</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD. DEV.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN STEN</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S. CPA'S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN STEN</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ""-TESTS FOR THIS FIRM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX:</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>1.95</th>
<th>0.99</th>
<th>0.99**</th>
<th>0.59</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>2.17</th>
<th>0.76</th>
<th>2.02*</th>
<th>0.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN-FEMALE</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN-MALE</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;-TIME OF EMPLOY:</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 5 NO</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS 5 NO</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;-LOCATION:</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNGSTOWN</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS GROUPS:</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT/AUD/IT</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;-CONS P/C</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS POSITIC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.02**</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5**</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;-MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.6**</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.3**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3: 16PF PRIMARY SCORES FIRM V. ALL CPA'S

STERN SCORE
### Table 4: 16PF Profile Founder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY FACTORS</th>
<th>RAW SCORE STENS</th>
<th>ADJUST STENS</th>
<th>GP NORMS STENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: WARMTH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: ABSTRACT THINKING</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: EGO STRENGTH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: DOMINANCE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: IMPULSIVITY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: GROUP CONFORMITY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: BOLDNESS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: EMOTIONAL SENSITIVITY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: SUSPICIOUSNESS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: IMAGINATION</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: SHREWDINESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O: GUILTY PRONENESS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: REBELLIOUSNESS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: SELF-SUFFICIENCY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: ABILITY TO BIND ANXIETY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: FREE-FLOATING ANXIETY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB: MODAL DISTORTION UNFAV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG: MODAL DISTORTION FAV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SECOND-ORDER FACTORS:         |                 |              |                |
| I: EXTRAVERSION- BOTH         |                 |              | 8.84           |
| II: ANXIETY- BOTH             |                 |              | 6.47           |
| III: TOUGH POISE- MALE        |                 |              | 6.48           |
| III: TOUGH POISE- FEMALE      |                 |              | 9.82           |
| IV: INDEPENDENCE- MALE        |                 |              | 11.30          |
| IV: INDEPENDENCE- FEMALE      |                 |              | 10.54          |
| VIII: SUPEREGO/ CONTROL- BOTH |                 |              | 5.59           |
| V: NATURAL VS DISCRETE        |                 |              | 1.46           |
| VI: REALISTIC VS SUBJECTIVE   |                 |              | 9.80           |

| PROFICIENCIES:                |                 |              |                |
| SM GROUP LEADERSHIP           |                 |              | 7.41           |
| CREATIVITY- JS                |                 |              | 7.08           |
| SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT            |                 |              | 6.63           |
| NEUROTICISM                   |                 |              | 3.72           |
| ADJUSTMENT                    |                 |              | 7.40           |
| CREATIVITY - KRUG             |                 |              | 6.20           |

| THIRD STRATUM FACTORS-MALE:   |                 |              |                |
| 1. STRENGTH                   |                 |              | 7.86           |
| 2. SELF-CRITICISM             |                 |              | 4.04           |
| 3. RESPONSIVENESS             |                 |              | 5.39           |
| 4. CULTURAL CONTROL           |                 |              | -1.93          |
| 5. SERENITY & DETACHMENT      |                 |              | 4.60           |
TABLE 5: 16PF NEW MANAGING PARTNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY FACTORS</th>
<th>RAW SCORE</th>
<th>STENS</th>
<th>ADJUST</th>
<th>ADJ STEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: WARMTH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: ABSTRACT THINKING</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: EGO STRENGTH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: DOMINANCE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: IMPULSIVITY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: GROUP CONFORMITY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: BOLDNESS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: EMOTIONAL SENSITIVITY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: SUSPICIOUSNESS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: IMAGINATION</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: SHREWINESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L: GUILT PRONENESS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: REBELLIOUSNESS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: SELF-SUFFICIENCY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O: ABILITY TO BIND ANXIETY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: FREE-FLOATING ANXIETY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: MODAL DISTORTION UNFAV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: MODAL DISTORTION FAV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND-ORDER FACTORS:

| I: EXTRAVERSION- BOTH                     | 5.99      |
| II: ANXIETY- BOTH                        | 5.97      |
| III: TOUGH POISE- MALE                   | 4.65      |
| III: TOUGH POISE- FEMALE                 | 5.00      |
| IV: INDEPENDENCE- MALE                   | 3.16      |
| IV: INDEPENDENCE- FEMALE                 | 7.18      |
| VIII: SUPEROGO/ CONTROL- BOTH            | 4.23      |

V: NATURAL VS DISCRETE 1.98
VI: REALISTIC VS SUBJECTIVE 3.20

PROFICIENCIES:

| SM GROUP LEADERSHIP                      | 5.27      |
| CREATIVITY- JS                           | 7.60      |
| SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT                      | 8.10      |
| NEUROTICISM                              | 5.11      |
| ADJUSTMENT                               | 6.00      |
| CREATIVITY - KRUG                        | 6.89      |

THIRD STRATUM FACTORS-MALE:

1. STRENGTH 5.27
2. SELF-CRITICISM 4.66
3. RESPONSIVENESS 5.09
4. CULTURAL CONTROL 0.40
5. SERENITY & DETACHMENT 5.07
TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF HARRISON ORGANIZATIONAL IDEOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE

FIRM IDEOLOGY PREFERENCE SCORES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task (Achievement)</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (Structure)</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person (Support)</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERSONAL IDEOLOGY PREFERENCE SCORES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task (Achievement)</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person (Support)</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (Structure)</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIFFERENTIALS (FIRM PREFERENCE MINUS PERSONAL PREFERENCE):

(Negative = preference that the firm increase emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task (Achievement)</td>
<td>-151</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person (Support)</td>
<td>-303</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (Structure)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO AGGRESSIVE CUES, TAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to aggressive cues:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly handled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial, repression, distortion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of aggression in story:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapunitive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrapunitive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story endings:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upbeat - realistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downbeat - realistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbeat - unrealistic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downbeat - unrealistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous and/ or ambivalent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender confusion of character(s):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No occurrence/ not ident.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Mechanism</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Formation</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undoing and ambivalence*</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation*</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression and denial</td>
<td>17 (77%)</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
<td>28 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive – compulsive*</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive – aggressive</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalization</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting**</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting out**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression**</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Defenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102   (300%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Obsessive-compulsive, total 16 (72%) 8 (67%) 24 (71%)

**Primitive, total 6 (27%) 0 6 (18%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Drama:</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent hero</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative hero</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifest n(aut) total:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(aut) resolved as n(def)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(aut)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(aut) resolved as n(dom)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifest n(def) w/o n(aut):</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(def)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(def) resolved as init. needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total manifest n(aut) and n(def)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifest n(ach)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifest other initiated needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbeat and realistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downbeat and realistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbeat and unrealistic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downbeat and unrealistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous and/ or ambivalent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin not identified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10: RESPONSE TO CUES IN TAT CARD 1
PRIMARY DEFENSE MECHANISMS USED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution - 3 key Defenses</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Formation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undoing and ambivalence*</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation*</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (37%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression and denial</td>
<td>19 (91%)</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
<td>29 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive - compulsive*</td>
<td>9 (42%)</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>14 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>19 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive - aggressive</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalization</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting out**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Defenses</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>96 (300%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Obsessive-compulsive, total 18 (85%) 10 (91%) 29 (88%)

**Primitive, total 0 1 (9%) 1 (3%)
TABLE 11: INTERACTIVE EFFECTS, 16PF BY IDEOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>16PF1</th>
<th>16PF2</th>
<th>16PF3</th>
<th>16PF4</th>
<th>16PF5</th>
<th>16PF6</th>
<th>16PF7</th>
<th>16PF8</th>
<th>16PF9</th>
<th>16PF10</th>
<th>16PF11</th>
<th>16PF12</th>
<th>16PF13</th>
<th>16PF14</th>
<th>16PF15</th>
<th>16PF16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16PF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents the interactive effects of 16PF by ideology, with each cell indicating the value of the interaction effect. The values are not provided in the image.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>firepow2</th>
<th>mypow2</th>
<th>diffpow2</th>
<th>firehol2</th>
<th>myhol2</th>
<th>diffhol2</th>
<th>firetax2</th>
<th>mytax2</th>
<th>difftax2</th>
<th>fireel2</th>
<th>myel2</th>
<th>diffe12</th>
<th>totaldiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-guiltarone</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1-repellent</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s2-self-suffic</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.2**</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.2**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s3-controlled</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q4-fluxanxiety</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.4**</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4-fakefeel</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.3**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4-fakeanx</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4-fakeexc</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough pract</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independence</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlled</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discretionary</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.4**</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se qp lead</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ic</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neurotic</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ic</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-criticise</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ic</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsiveness</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturecontrol</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ic</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9 *</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILLUSTRATION 1: TAT SCORING, CORE NEEDS OF HERO

I Drama Initiated by Hero:

A. *Ach* Achievement: Hero is working at something important with energy and persistence.
B. *Aff* Affiliation: Hero seeks to establish and/or maintain friendly relations
C. *Agg* Aggression: with hate, anger, or acts against another.
D. *Dom* Dominance: Hero tries to influence the behavior, sentiments, or ideas of another
E. *Suc* Succorance: to seek aid or sympathy

II Hero's Response to Action Initiated by Others:

A. *Aut* Autonomy
   1. FREEDOM: Hero escapes or avoids restraint.
   2. RESISTANCE: Hero refuses to do what is demanded of him.
   3. ASOCIAL: Hero does something not allowed with serious consequences.
B. *Avo* Avoidance: Hero fears reproach or punishment, and confesses, atones, reforms, runs away.
C. *Def* Deferece:
   1. COMPLIANCE: to fall in line with wishes of another, or eager to please.
   2. RESPECT: to express admiration, "hero worship of the other."
ILLUSTRATION 2: TAT SCORING, STORY OUTCOME

SCORING FOR STORY OUTCOME

1. Happy (upbeat) and realistic. The story adequately confronts and resolves the issues presented to the benefit of the hero.

2. Unhappy (downbeat) and realistic. The story adequately confronts the issues presented for the hero to resolve, but hero lacks sufficient resources to resolve internal or environment difficulties for his or her own benefit.

3. Happy (upbeat) and unrealistic. The story provides for a "happy ending" without adequately confronting and resolving issues presented.

4. Unhappy (downbeat) and unrealistic. The story provides for "unhappy ending" by imposition or without serious confrontation or attempts at resolution for the issues presented.

5. Ambiguous or ambivalent. The subject either does not provide adequate clarity of story resolution, or a hero with conflicted or ambivalent feelings about the outcome.

6. No ending. The subject omits or refuses to provide an ending to the story.
ILLUSTRATION 3: TAT SCORING - DEFENSIVE STRATEGIES

A Schedule for Identification of Defensive and other Patterned Strategies:
Thematic Apperception Test

I DEFENSE STRATEGIES:

Note: This list was adapted and modified from the Mary Haworth schedule for
the Children's Apperception Test (CAT).

A. Reaction Formation:
1. Exaggerated goodness or cleanliness in story.
2. Oppositional attitudes, rebellion, and/ or stubbornness by hero
(hero's attitude is usually overtly positive).
3. Story tone opposed to picture content (story tone usually overtly
positive).

B. Undoing and ambivalence:
1. Undoing by hero (e.g. something positive magically following
something the opposite done before).
2. Subject gives alternatives; balanced phrases (e.g. asleep-awake;
hot-cold).
3. Two actions the second of which is the opposite of the first (e.g.
"First he went north, then he decided to go south").
4. Indecision by subject or hero.
5. Restates (e.g. "that..., no this..., he was going to but...").

C. Isolation:
1. Detached attitude of subject (e.g. "I don't care": "it couldn't
happen"; it looks like a painting of...").
2. Literal (e.g. "it doesn't) show... so I can't) tell...").
3. Comments on story (e.g. That is a hard one: "I told a good story".
4. Laughs at card, or exclamations.
5. Use of movie, novel, fairy-tale, comic book, or "old-time" themes or
characters.
6. Use of names and quotes (e.g. "This one I'll call John"); or "John
said, "Let's go...").
8. Hero runs away or hides - due to anger, anxiety etc.

D. Repression (oedipal) and Denial (pre-oedipal):
1. Hero waits, controls self, conforms, "is good", learns lesson.
2. Hero accepts fate, (e.g."didn't want it anyway").
3. Prolonged or remote punishments in story.
4. Outcome of story or event discredits story (e.g. "It was just a
dream" or similar.
5. Hero forgets events or loses something.
6. Subject omits or distorts figures or omits objects from story (e.g.
pregnant woman #2, gun #3gf, choking #18gf).
7. Omits usual story content.
8. No fantasy or story.
9. Refuses card.
10. Hero unaware of story-line, or thoughts and/ or feelings.
11. Subject unable to describe thoughts or feelings of characters.
E. Obsessive - compulsive

1. Frequent use of specific details irrelevant for the developed story line ("the vase may be an antique, maybe 100 years old ...")
2. Multiple story lines ("The man may have seen her wants, or may have been a doctor, and...")
3. Descriptions of small details in picture
4. Attention to orderliness of picture ("the plow lines are not straight")
5. Sarcastic attitude towards hero
6. Hero engages in ritualistic behavior to produce or prevent a future state of affairs
7. Hero seeks to resist an activity or idea, but eventually gives in.

F. Deception:
1. Subordinate (child) superior to overseer or authority (adult),
   laughs at authority, is smarter, tricks, sneaks, pretends, hides from,
   steals from, peeks at, or spies on authority figure
2. Authority tricks subordinate, or is not what appears to be.

G. Projection:
1. Attacker is attacked.
2. Innocent party is attacked.
3. Hero is active physical aggressor.
4. Characters blame others.
5. Others have secrets or make fun of somebody.
6. Subject adds characters, objects or details to picture.

H. Passive - Aggressive:
1. Hero ignores or seems oblivious to aggressive actions of character, but acts out or is aggressive against another.
2. Character has accident or untimely/unexpected death or bad fortune following transaction with hero.
3. Unexpected unexplained or incongruent deleterious fate befalls a character who has transaction with hero.
4. "What the character doesn't know won't hurt him"

I. Fantasy:
1. Hero dreams or daydreams in story.
2. Hero contemplates the outcome of possible action in lieu of action.
3. Out of balance object relations involving hero (e.g. romantic interests from afar, or unknown to love interest).
4. Hero seeks isolation or solace without object relations.

J. Rationalization:
1. Subject or character provides reassuring or self-serving explanations for characters' activities.
2. Subject or provides reassuring or self-serving explanations for choice of story and outcome.
3. Excessive attention to explanations about story structure.
M. Splitting (primitive rather than ambivalence):
1. Juxtaposition of story character behavior and/or values as either all good or all bad, separating any extreme affects of love and hate; and without the concurrent presentation of characters who are seen as somewhat good or bad.
2. Alternatively idealizing and devaluing the same character, but not "either this or that". (e.g. affect states of love, hate, devastated, ecstatic, rather than "little annoyed"
3. Attributing extreme blame or affection to separate and undeserving characters without adequate characters.

L. Acting out (primitive):
1. Hero acts without reflection or apparent regard for negative consequences.
2. Characters are acting rather then acting with reflection, i.e. the characters just do different things (e.g. the boy looks at the violin, tries to play it, then puts it down).

M. Regression (usually indicates weakness of ego organization):
1. Following anxiety or frustration the hero returns or seeks to return to period or place with the hope that anxiety or frustration will magically disappear.
2. An adult hero takes on the attributes (emotionally or behaviorally) of a child as a result of anxiety or frustration in the story.
3. The hero decides to "get back to what we really ought to be doing or to where we really belong"
4. Language of subject is childish or at markedly reduced educational level.

N. Mature defenses:
1. Altruism. Includes vicarious but constructive and instinctively gratifying service by the hero to others - distinguished from altruistic surrender where the needs of others are favored to the detriment of self.
2. Anticipation. Realistic planning or anticipation by the hero to reduce future inner discomfort.
3. Humor. Expression of feelings by subject or hero without personal discomfort or immobilization and without unpleasant affect of others, allowing hero to bear and bear what is too terrible to be borne. Differentiate from wit, which distracts or displaces from affective issue.
4. Sublimation. Feelings of hero are acknowledged, modified, and constructively channeled, rather than denied or diverted towards a relatively significant person or goal, so that modest instinctual satisfaction results.
CHAPTER FOUR
Discussion of Major Findings

General

In this study I have emphasized the pivotal role unconscious processes play in the development of organizational culture. Understanding them is important not only because they strongly influence organizational affairs, but also because unconscious nature of enmeshed coping strategies keeps them inviolate, disguised, and the individual and organizational outcomes resistant to change. Accordingly, my explorations and interpretations are often theory driven based on inductive conclusions derived from analysis of self-reports replete with omissions and paradoxes. Only through these methods could I determine the nature of the predominant unconscious mechanisms at the firm, and the implications for functionality of the resulting thematic patterns.

Seven sections follow this introduction. The first section discusses individual anxiety and its organizational consequences; the second the struggles and coping strategies associated with autonomy; the third obsessive and compulsive coping strategies; the fourth apperception distortion; the fifth discusses how the processes of socialization pass on coping strategies at this firm;
the sixth describes in detail how the planning process serves a
defensive function; and the seventh describes how the coping
strategies associated with aggression are embedded into the firm
culture.

Individual Anxiety and its Organizational Consequences

Although not direct indication of intrapsychic conflict, second-
order anxiety on the 16PF is a useful indicator of ego syntonic or
dystonic integration, that is, how well the ego has integrated the
conflict into coping strategies. Because mean firm scores at
Karlos Kay and Co. are relatively high and standard deviation low,
we can infer that a relatively high level of ego dystonic
discomfort exists at this firm; as well as infer the existence of
evidence of unresolved intrapsychic conflict. A low second-order
anxiety score would not indicate the absence of intrapsychic
conflict or lack of pathology, but would indicate the extent to
which the ego has integrated and/ or imbedded its coping
strategies. Only one person had a very low score, and about one-
third had very high scores (over 7 sten). Ego strength is
slightly lower than average, indicating the likelihood that many
of the members feel discomfort during stress.

Assessment of the level of ego-syntonic integration would be
particularly useful in estimating the likelihood of success of an
organizational development effort. Higher levels of anxiety
increases the possibility that change will be sought in order to
decrease the associated discomfort. However, persons with higher
second-order anxiety, are likely to rely very heavily on defense
mechanisms to cope with the anxiety - and may not lack the
requisite ego strength to deal with the problems of change.
According to Karson and O'Dell (1976), a relatively high factor C
(ego strength) coupled with high second-order anxiety is a
reasonably good indicator of the prospects for successful change
in these circumstances. If low ego strength is instrumental to
high second-order anxiety, the prospects for a successful
therapeutic relationship are much more difficult. This
circumstance often requires increasing the client's self-concept
before bridging the task and interpersonal issues. At Karlos Kay
ego strength is slightly lower than average, but not low enough to
be a problem. In Neilsen's (1984) model for managing the client
dialogue, he emphasizes the person-centered and social model to
enhance the other's self-concept by using skills in active
listening, and appears appropriate in these circumstances.

On the other hand, low second-order anxiety, particularly with
high ego strength, indicates that the coping strategies have been
well-integrated into ego function, and although receptivity to
change is initially much lower, their ability to handle the stress
involved in the change process is particularly helpful. Neilsen's
relationship-centered and task based model which emphasizes
"talking the task" by emphasizing skills in logical communication
and increasingly candid levels of discussion would be the most useful starting point in such circumstances.

In my 'walk-around' and interviews, I observed frequent manifestations of tenseness at this firm. In particular telephone communications with clients generated much anxiety. For example, during their meetings with me, firm members on hearing a loudspeaker telephone page would frequently change their demeanor. They would sometimes question me, "Was that me they paged?"; or "Can I take that call?" In follow-up discussions with me after a page, they often indicated that they "may" be getting an important call. Several firm members even interrupted our discussion to call the operator to verify the name of the most recent page. Firm members sitting or standing at their desks also appeared ill at ease when talking on the telephone. The apparent focal source of anxiety in these circumstances is a fear that a client would either make a new demand on them or hold them accountable for a demand not met.

On the other hand, although firm members are clearly tense, they seemed to have little or no self-awareness of anxiety, even when provided with direct opportunity in the structured interview protocol. It seems as though denial and repression has been turned on for so long that members have only a vague awareness that they could be less anxious. Most had a difficult time remembering problematic work situations, and did not see
themselves as panicking. Only rarely would a self-descriptive adjective be used that would imply personal anxiety in the structured interview protocol.

Members of this firm imagine their internal discomfort as originating in the external world. For most the source of discomfort lies in the conflicting demands from "rewarding, demanding, ungrateful, and sometimes angry" clients. For others the inconsistent (and they believe arbitrary) demands of the dominant coalition are uppermost, and for a few family demands are central. The projection of their firm culture extends to the clients' offices, as that is where they spend their working hours (physically and/ or emotionally). The telephone anxiety seem to arise as a response to being away from the control of work flow- and hence being out of control. Although there is acknowledgement that problems are "out there," there is a dominant and magical belief among these people that "positive thinking" can (and is sufficient to) solve any problems that they may be confronted with.

The psychological functionality of anxiety is an awareness that something's wrong. When the members split-off and project the anxiety into the firm's culture the phantasy emerges "I am not anxious but a productive member of a very busy place."

Accordingly, the real dangers (the unresolved intrapsychic conflict) to each members's ego can be denied, "I am not anxious, just responding to a busy situation." The conflict is partially
satisfied when the member responds to the opportunities provided for displacement within the firm. Therefore, responding to the phantasy temporarily lessens the anxiety. Attributing the irrational response to client demands is not to suggest that the clients are not requesting or even "demanding" service. At the same time that the clients demands create tensions, the firm members are unable to discuss unimplemented methods to level the workload - so that mistakes are reduced and space for unexpected requests can be handled easier. In fact it was a frequent frustration (mentioned in the Structured interview protocol) that the firm has not been able to implement plans to better balance the workload. I suspect the tension around work is an indication that coping strategy to avoid deeper and more fragile intrapsychic issues related to autonomy, aggression, and compulsivity are in play.

The struggle for Autonomy

Data were collected at both the individual and firm level in the exploration of issues autonomy. This issue's importance to the intrapsychic experience and conflict for most persons in this firm is clearly identified with the results from TAT card 1. In response to the ambiguous cues of TAT number 1, approximately 78% constructed the situations they created as respondent struggles
with authority over autonomy or deference, rather than a self-initiated opportunity for achievement.

Although a variety of outcomes were organized, most tended to resolve the struggle with repression cognitively constructed as need for deference, facilitated by introjecting the authority object's values. About one-third of those with autonomy stories maintained their resistance (either active or passive) to story conclusion - and might be characterized as maintaining a counter-dependent orientation. A minority of the firm dealt with the issues of autonomy but resolved the issues in a relatively independent manner. Although in these instances the resolution to the problem was different, the complementary theme is focal awareness of the issue and its importance to the firm's culture. Those firm members concerned with other intrapsychic conflicts, such as initiative versus self-doubt might have some trouble coping with their needs for recognition and ambition within the interpersonal aspects of the culture itself because of the dominant reward system in the firm is most attuned to autonomy. An important exception is the rewards associated with the pursuit of new clients - that is the practice development skills critical to the firm, and widely disparaged among the rank and file is well-supported by the partners. Although I do not have adequate data to clearly identify the key practice development personnel from the technically oriented CPA's by TAT, I suspect there are thematic differences in their stories.
The tenuous nature of the resolution for most persons, and thus additional support for continued intrapsychic conflict, is evidenced by the difficulty that most members of the firm had in resolving the stories created. Most handled their confrontation with the emergent conflict by either just tacking on an upbeat ending, or blending in uncertainty and/or fuzziness. Only about one-sixth of the persons created upbeat and realistic endings.

The salience of autonomy is consistent with the results of the 16PF, including generally high second-order scores on independence among the professionals, particularly among management. Second-order independence is not synonymous with need for autonomy or intrapsychic conflict, but it does evidence a person's temperamental and field independence. Its importance is particularly so for the firm professionals, who see themselves unusually independent, more so at this firm than American CPA's in general. It is the defensive aspects of projection and phantasy, emerging as a coping strategy, that enables someone to both continue to struggle with autonomy and see himself as independent.

According to Erikson (1980) too early or too rigid a struggle with autonomy often leads a person to fake progression, pretending an autonomy and ability to do without anybody to lean on which he has by no means really gained. On the other-hand, since I did not compare the individual findings of the TAT with the 16PF, it may
also be that those most independent on the 16PF at this firm are the least conflicted with issues of autonomy. The flow and fit of the other data, particularly the TAT and cultural projections suggests that the struggle for autonomy is an important facet of firm culture. The extensive use of denial of aggression supports the autonomy struggle (A. Freud, 1966).

Although autonomy (versus guilt and shame) emerges out of the second psychosocial crisis, the concurrent psycho-sexual stage (anal) underlying this development focuses on intrapsychic conflict over conflicting action patterns of self-control - that is holding on and letting go. Manifestations of excessive parental control during this psycho-sexual stage include the anal character: a person especially concerned with rigidity, order, stinginess and cleanliness. We may infer that a failure to adequately resolve the struggle over autonomy is also an indication of inadequate resolution of the psycho-sexual anal stage. Anal characters are the caricatures of accountants, because of the extensive focus on orderliness and control. More extreme manifestations include obsessive and/ or compulsive patterns in two forms: ego-syntonic compulsive personality disorder, and ego-dystonic obsessive and compulsive neurosis.

Obsessive - Compulsive Orientation
Ego-syntonic compulsive personality disorder refers to a lifestyle where compulsivity is chronic and pervasive but there is little conscious anxiety or eagerness for change, and little obsession about issues. The 16PF scores are generally in the right direction (Meyer, 1983) for compulsive personality particularly for the firm's professionals: high Q2 (self-sufficiency), Q3 (control), L (suspiciousness), E (dominance), and G (group control), and except for management low A (warmth). Anxiety, however, is higher than expected, indicating ego-dystonic conflict.

According to the DSM-III-R (1987), some of the frequent patterns associated with persons with compulsive personality disorder are: perfectionism, prize work and productivity to the exclusion of pleasure and interpersonal relationships; avoid decision-making; attention to issues of interpersonal control, and are stingy with emotions. Some of these factors are central to this firm's culture, particularly perfectionism, prizing work and productivity to the exclusion of pleasure, and avoiding decision-making. There are enough characteristics to indicate that compulsivity is a common personality pattern at this firm. However, this firm is not stingy, in fact my sense is that since not one person mentioned dissatisfaction with salary or benefits and number described their salaries as substantially higher than peers at other firms - over-generous might be a better description.
Generosity flows from the founding partner (and in some ways the new managing partner) in a number of other ways, particularly in the way the staff is treated - high satisfaction in that regard, and described as unusually 'theory-Y oriented' by an industrial psychologist's study (attached as appendix 4). Some firm members mentioned dissatisfaction with the firm's generosity. Friendly work relationships are also important to people in this firm, although its importance seems would best be described as a friendly ear and respite from the rigors of work. In this sense Bion's conception of the group as nurturing breast seems to fit. The firm provides a place for intermittent nurturing from the toils of compulsive work. Friendly also means reliable, since it clear that empathetic relationships emerge out of a shared history of helping the other out.

The founding partner's very high factor A (warmth) and very low factor (N) shrewdness supports the idea that he is likely to project nurturing. The staff and partners describe him as generous. Interestingly his very high factors H (boldness) and L (suspiciousness) and Q1 (rebelliousness) also coupled with very low shrewdness and very low emotional sensitivity also indicates that his open aggression style projects the power and hostility in the firm. His profile is markedly different the firm norms, with little indication of compulsive personality. This is likely to be an instrumental factor in holding the firm together. His dominant and complementary style is probably useful in maintaining dynamic
equilibrium. The new managing partner is likely to project the nurturing side, but not the power necessary to hold things together in the same way.

Although anxiety levels are higher than expected, the indication on the 16PF of anxiety generated obsessive-compulsive style focuses on the management group. Particularly differentiating are factors B (abstract thinking), M (imagination - high), C (ego strength - high), and L (suspiciousness - high) which Meyer (1980) finds to be the important indicator of the obsessive aspects of this style. Factor A (warmth) is not a differentiating factor as it is in compulsivity. The scores among this group mostly indicate strong direction rather than severe clinical disorder. As a result one would expect the management group projects an obsessive concern with ideas and thinking about the compulsive orientation to work.

The field data support this in a number of important ways - including the planning processes engaged, the preoccupation with self-study of firm practices, ineffective meetings, and devotion to thinking about new ideas (in the upper management group). Although it seems that these practices sometimes generate useful productive outcomes, they frequently do not, and could better characterized as practices providing positive social sanctions and plausibility, incidental productive value and substantial emotional release.
The HIQ indirectly supports the importance and paradoxes associated with autonomy for members of this firm in ideological preferences. First, the desire for a power ideology is extremely low, indicating a particularly strong preference in keeping power (authorities) out of the decision-making processes. Secondly the very high task-orientation along with a wish for even more task orientation is very consistent for the wish for a lifestyle marked by productivity and efficiency. There are indications that power is a much more important force than the scores indicate, although normative scores are not available. But one of the key frustrating issues, particularly among the bottom half of the firm, is their sense of partner-generated arbitrariness associated with the preparation and review process, obviously a power-orientation. In fact against firm policy, staff and managers cluster in informal work-teams to avoid the arbitrary review process. Interestingly, the founding partner denies this exists, although the new managing partner readily discusses the coalescing, but not the reasons behind it.

The firm ideologies are somewhat more consistent with the predictors of compulsive orientation than the preferred orientation. The wish for more support and less structure, however, could reflect the underlying anxiety and awakened needs for more personal support as an outcome of internal change efforts. Yet the intrapsychic struggle is most prominent in the ideological responses to autonomy in their strong and paradoxical
preferences regarding supervision and subordination. The phantasy is an ideology that provides benevolent and paternalistic "bosses", yet provides sufficient autonomy that the "bosses" power ought to be ignored for the benefit of the task. The inherent insecurity seems to speak for itself.

Apperception distortion

I previously described the process of apperception distortion, as an outcome of defensive processes. Although projection is more than a defense mechanism, I expected its defensive aspects to distort their perceptions of facets of culture related to the intrapsychic conflict. Taken one step farther, this apperception distortion would be identifiable in perceptions of organizational ideology. Although less certain of the exact distortions, I anticipated that persons most conflicted about autonomy would find the power-orientation as the most serious threat to their autonomy. In comparing the results of the 16PF to the perceptions of the firm's power orientation on the H1Q, two personality factors emerged as significant: imagination and modal distortion (favorable).

Persons higher on factor M (imagination) see the firm has having more task orientation and less power orientation. Although there is also a similar and significant difference in imagination between support staff and management a one-way analysis of ideology
by position did not support that hypothesis. Since imagination is a key factor differentiating obsessive-compulsive style from compulsive style, this difference may support the difference in projection. Obsessively thinking about the task blends into and becomes the task, power conversely even less a factor. Persons seeing the organization as more power-oriented were also more likely to "fake good" (appear less anxious, more extraverted) on the 16PF. This is reinforced as those most likely to "fake good" are also males in management - objectively the least vulnerable persons in the firm. Although not part of Meyer's obsessive-compulsive profile on the 16PF, presentation management in these circumstances (risk-free evaluation by an outsider), probably is further indication of obsessive thinking: attempting to anticipate and calculate the outcome of the instrument. This also supports their projective notion about managerial task, as the managers spend inordinate time and effort actively thinking and worrying about the tasks to be completed.

Personality variables as measured by the 16PF emerged as important variables in the preference for role or structure-ideology. Statistically significant or directional relationships were identified for almost every personality factor. Persons with a stronger preference for structure in this firm are significantly more introverted, less independent, more discrete, more neurotic, and more subject to cultural influence. Although not quite statistically significant they appear less "tough" and more
controlled than others in the firm. The direction of these factors for high preference of role or structure might indicate generally reduced levels of security, consistent with the predicted direction for those seeking structure. Interestingly, Harrison's (1990) described his study of the relationships among HIQ scores finding a negative correlation from power-ideology to achievement and support ideologies, and the consequent independence of role or structure-ideology. The results at this firm would support the notion that personality is an important determinant of the preference for role or structure-ideology.

The data is strongly argues that the dominant intrapsychic conflict among professional members of this firm at the psychosexual level are anal — involving the contradictory pleasures of holding on and letting go; and at the concurrent psychosocial level — autonomy versus shame and doubt. There is evidence that the projection of these intrapsychic conflicts are projected and embedded into the firm's culture in a number of significant ways. The data supporting this are richest from the structured interview protocol. Accordingly, in the projection of that struggle as actively influencing organizational culture, the expectation is to find the key processes defined by issues of autonomy. In Schein's (1985) treatise on organizational culture, he asserts that the principal test for the basic assumptions (unconscious, fundamental, and instrumental) of culture is the presumption that they work well enough to be taught new members.
Socialization

The critical basic assumptions passed on to newcomers at this firm most importantly establish the shared phantasies pertaining to autonomy and deference. Learning the appropriate range of autonomy is the critical social skill for newcomers, and teaching it is the principal task for second and third year persons, that is those having just passed the test. The basic assumption is that "professionalism" requires one to appear independent (autonomous) by working alone and solving problems through individual persistence, but deferent to the "professional standards" associated with technical competence. As a result the ability to act alone (important for people at this firm) is enabled through the balance of individual persistence and deference.

One learns the "professional standards" (technical competence) by asking enough pertinent questions of the supervisor to discover the exact the output structure expected by the partner-in-charge of the assignment, as interpreted by the managers etc. The process couples the opportunity for new staff to learn objective professional standards and skills as well as the norms about autonomy, but disguises the outcome as technical training. Success or failure from the processes are defined accordingly - "failure" or "success" in learning the requisite technical skills.
Although they are told that they are autonomous, there is little room for a truly autonomous and technically competent person. There are three or possibly four dominant partners - each with particularly independent method of operating within the firm and informal social clique encompassing less senior partners and managers, and even crossing departmental boundaries. This reduces the anxiety emerging from the discongruity of multiple standards. As a result it is highly unlikely that any new but experienced person could successfully join this firm with expectation that their adequate technical competence would allow them to fulfil their wish to become autonomous, since the shared phantasy of the firm is that autonomy emerges out of deference. This firm's history of persistent dissatisfaction with experienced persons hired into the organization to fill technical gaps confirms the conflict when acting on the phantasies emphasizing autonomy - and disconfirming deference. Industrial psychologists have been employed, to no avail, in solving the "selection problem" for this reason.

Persons who fail to socialize into this organization are unable to adapt to these particular autonomy-deference norms, most often acting "too independently" by failing to ask the supervisor adequate questions and therefore, predictably producing an "unsuitable output," discovered on the formal review. Persons with the firm less than six months have significantly higher
scores on self-sufficiency on the 16PF than the others in the firm - either preliminary to the socialization process or a variable predicting the potential for congruence. Although the long-term stability of the 16PF leads to "success factor" as choice, the powerful processes of socialization at this firm immediately following college probably has the potential to alter coping strategies (personality traits). There is no indication that length of service alters response to the TAT, but insufficient data to confirm this.

On the other hand, asking too many questions is seen as "unprofessional" and intrusive on the supervisor's autonomy, and equally disturbing. The process of development transfers the authority from the supervisor to the client - and deference then emerges as client service - that is the product of middle managers. In the course of development the client moves into a figural position from background. Adequate socialization seems to require sharing the projection of intrapsychic conflict as well as coming to terms with the shared phantasies about autonomy.

The appearance of autonomy for the partners and managers is understood and recognized through the different and relatively arbitrary standards each is able to set within the broad boundaries of "generally accepted accounting standards." Each advances his own standards as generally accepted accounting standards. In other words one gets to appear autonomous by acting
deferent, but professionalism requires it to be disguised as
technical competence. Advancement within the firm generates the
need to project the need for deference onto the client as
authority - rationalized it as client service. Thus continuing to
project onto an expanding culture one of the dominant theme in the
TAT's; that the struggle for autonomy is resolved through
deffence. The incongruence emerges as the arbitrary standards
disconfirm the ideas of evolving autonomy emerging through a
single "higher standard."

Planning as a Defense Strategy

Although compulsives are often preoccupied by a life-style of
productivity and efficiency, paradoxically they are often
indecisive and poor planners of their time, a result of their
narrow focus and concern with precision, even though the precision
may be irrelevant (DSM-III-R,1987) and (Meyer, 1983). These
patterns are well-established in the organization, projecting the
compulsive concern with autonomous control. The extensive use of
compulsive defense mechanisms also supports the possibility of a
relatively widespread compulsive personality for persons in this
organization; and inferentially the lingering intrapsychic conflict
emerging from the developmental crises of autonomy and control.

The paradoxical use of planning is a good example of system-wide
projection and response (coping strategy) at this firm; and was
discovered in the structured interview protocol. Advanced staff, managers, and partners spend substantial time on planning and budgeting client "jobs," and many describe this as their primary task at the firm. Yet these "jobs" are virtually always mis-budgeted for time, and in the direction of inadequate time allocation. In other words, firm-wide patterns are consistent with the compulsive personality; they spend a lot of time calculating precise budgets for each client job, yet are almost always wrong. The efforts are redoubled with increasing precision and without effect. The growth of the firm has moved this problem to front stage in recent years as increasing numbers of managers and partners make the incongruence more obvious and the collusion more difficult to ignore the outcomes of this pattern: write-offs, unbilled fees, and difficult collections.

There is little doubt that these highly talented technicians are both overtly interested in making changes in these matters, and able to garner the technical skills necessary to make the changes. It is an example of how unconscious processes generate resistance to change in the face conscious will and competence to change. First the widespread personal use of obsessive and compulsive coping strategies probably as a response to intrapsychic conflict around autonomy, and has been projected onto the firm and integrated into the culture. This conflict with autonomy has at its core a number of inter-related phantasies and coping strategies that would resist changing this pattern due to its secondary
functionality. As part of the intrapsychic coping strategies, the excessive and failed processes associated with planning and collections are not subject to rational analysis; and the ego vigilantly scans the environment for incidental events to elaborate the phantasy, and repress or otherwise distort events which may risk the tenuous strategy.

Freud (1908) pointed out the relationship between the unresolved anal stage of development and stubbornness and rigidity in later life. Therefore, we would expect resistance to change an instrumental part of the coping strategy at the firm. The relatively high anxiety probably softens the stubbornness somewhat.

Changes in planning and accountability attack the widely shared phantasies around independence. Since the independence is for many an outcome of an obsessional neurotic's tendency to turn an unwelcome impulse into its opposite, its holding is tenuous and defensive, since independence is phantasized to be the safe position - from the dangers of authority. Extensive accountability makes it difficult to maintain the phantasy of independence - and risks exposing the ego to the dangers of unwanted impulses and unresolved autonomy.

Compulsives are inclined to be vigilant and hyperalert to criticisms and perceived slights from others (Meyer, 1980).
Realistic planning and accountability brings forth serious potential for criticism; an unwelcome risk even at the cost of espoused values of productivity and financial gain.

Denial of aggression in others, and by inference to the self, which is a widespread defense strategy in the firm would be tested. The current system minimized confrontation both within the firm and without, providing the "friendly" relations, and the firm is secretly (and passively) hostile against with inadequate collections, supporting the shared phantasy that "we are not aggressive," and phantasy of special and relationship with the client. A change in planning and accountability would jeopardize those important phantasies, since enacting such changes would move confrontation among staff, partners, and clients to the forefront, changing coping strategies for aggressive energy, as well as intimacy. The most recent changes at the firm to handle the billing and collections issues by reinforcing the phantasies by shifting these responsibilities to administrative people - further distancing the potential conflicts and aggression.

The phantasies associated with excessive pride are used as a coping strategy to reverse and protect the ego from unwanted feelings of shame and doubt, also resulting from the continuing struggle with autonomy. The predictably inadequate time budgets allow for inflated billing rates to maintain appropriate fee structures (fee budget balances high rates with low anticipated
hours) elaborate the enhanced "pride," avoiding the uncomfortable and repressed feelings of shame. The predictable but "unexpected" time overage is frequently rationalized with social plausibility; blaming the client's bookkeeper, new assistants, unexpected transactions and changing reporting requirements; thus maintaining the equilibrium of distorted relationship with the client. The high billing rate remains justified and therefore, the associated pride. The problem is of course that sometimes these rationalizations are an accurate reflection of unforeseeable events, and could have become additional revenue. This seems to be a critical and sensitive component of the shared phantasy, since the founding partner makes its a point to aggressively advocate the client's position in disputes between client and staff, brought to his attention by the client. The norm overtly presented is client satisfaction - when in any doubt the client is right. The failure to develop systems of accountability minimizes the inherent confrontations likely to result, along with inflated pride.

Issues of Aggression

As can be seen from Tables 7 and 8, the TAT indicated that nearly all the members of this firm have substantial difficulty in handling aggressive cues: responding by repression and denial of aggression in the environment. From the psychoanalytic literature (A. Freud, 1960) we can conclude two important things about these people. First, not only do they have a difficult time dealing with
aggression in the environment, but that they have a very difficult
time dealing with their own intrapsychic aggression; and have not
found other more emotionally productive ways to utilize their
aggressive energy as the emotional charge remains. Accordingly it
is also very likely that the destructive aspects of aggression are
being employed in ways outside of their awareness; such as
identification with the aggressor, or passive-aggressive behavior.
Although the direction of aggression is about evenly split between
intrapunitive and extrapunitive, men in the firm appear more likely
to be intrapunitive and women extrapunitive.

Secondly, the denial/ repression of aggression usually also
carries an emotional "numbing" in other respects, so that
generally flattened affect is an outcome. A first pass of the
other TAT cards, supports the idea of repressed sexuality as well
as aggression, although conclusions are tentative. In my
discussions with them during the Structured Interview Protocol,
they denied that any (with minor exception) romantic relationships
exist or have existed within the organization. The concurrent ego
functions involved are often in themselves emotionally depleting.
That seems to be the case in a number of the obsessive and
compulsive practices employed at this firm in response to
unresolved issues of autonomy. For example, obsessive planning
around client service functions as a substitute for the aggressive
and unwelcome feelings towards authority. The failure of the
planning exercise offers the opportunity for displacement of
aggression to other safer objects - such as the bookkeeper or junior staff members.

The aggressive cues in the TAT cards created discomfort for almost all of the person tested, causing them to utilize a variety of other defense mechanisms in order to cope with the cues. The two most frequently used groups included obsessive - compulsive defense mechanisms, the projection. Defensive projection (i.e. blaming others outside the firm) as well as the obsessive - compulsive strategies previously described interlace the culture in this firm. As an example of the power of these aggressive cues, males in particular (TAT Card 3BM) frequently tried to anxiously engage the examiner to help them with the picture of the gun, and the difficulty in coping with the aggressive cue (pistol) required most to stretch their coping strategies. The difficulties with creating coherent endings is indicative of inadequate coping strategies, and implications results similar to TAT 1. Two traditional explanations exist for the extensive gender confusion of the story characters by both the males and females: (1) sexual identity issues, and (2) primitive denial. The second explanation (primitive denial) seems to fit better because of the difficulty in coping with the aggressive cues. By changing the gender of the hero (or victim) the aggression is projected farther away from the ego source.
The denial and repression of aggression is indirectly supported in the other instruments as well as its projection onto the firm's culture. On the 16PF second-order control is high, indicating a controlled and compulsive approach to anxiety. In addition the tough practicality scale is elevated, which indicates a detached and controlled demeanor. However, if very elevated, tough practicality carries a "masculine aggressive or macho flavor" with it, which is inconsistent with denial of aggression. The HIQ firm and personal ideology scores emphasize task and de-emphasize power, certainly consistent with denial of aggression.

Although my study identified little open aggression within the firm, the founding partner (and the two or three other members of the dominant coalition to a lesser extent) represents the aggressive force that keeps the firm together (or in the case of the two dominant partners, the subgroups together), providing the paternal authoritarianism to the firm, pushing them to extend their performance and aggressively reminding them of firm ethos and values. While he tells them that they are autonomous and the finest accounting professionals anywhere, he also reminds them that they are not. In a feedback meeting he spoke of his anger as directed towards only towards those he cares about. This is consistent with his TAT story which distorted a pistol into a love object. Denial of his aggression allows them to maintain the phantasy of autonomy.
Another important source of struggle over aggression within the firm lies in the conflict between practice development and technical superiority. Maintaining a steady stream of new clients is essential to continued independence and striving for autonomy within the firm - as it provides ever more space, and keeping difficulties over allocations at bay. The struggle, however, is over the "reluctant necessity" to reward practice development over technical superiority. Those persons least able to focus their aggressive energy on the environment (I suspect a combination of introversion and denial of aggression) probably find it very difficult to engage in effective practice development. By emphasizing technical superiority as the critical attribute, they find it easy to maintain their aggression-free phantasies.
CHAPTER FIVE

Implications for the Field and Further Research

In this chapter I will discuss the implications of my findings for the field of organizational behavior, in light of the research questions raised in Chapter One. Additionally I will discuss the general implications and limitations of the study, as well as some possible paths for future research.

A number of personal coping strategies were identified but only some were found to limit the ability of the firm's members to understand their organization at conscious and rational levels.

First, using personality as one manifestation of personal coping strategy, this study found that one's the intensity of one's imagination correlated significantly with perceptions of the firm's ideology, but that other personality factors were not significantly correlated with ideology. Persons with higher imagination were found to see the firm as having higher task-ideology and lower power-ideology, suggesting that a person's response to adaptation (imagination) influences perception of organizational culture. The differences in perception were not accounted for by organizational demographics, although support
staff and women in the firm were found to be less imaginative than professionals and men in the firm respectively. Persons trying to distort favorably their self-presentation on the 16PF (such persons were more likely to be males in management), itself a coping strategy to avoid self-disclosure, were significantly more likely to see the firm as power-oriented, and less likely to see the firm as supportive. Therefore, it appears that those persons who perceive the most power-orientation within the firm are most likely to present deceptive positive self-disclosure. It is not clear if a power-orientation is also a "fake good" presentation for these people. However, there would seem little social sanction for power-oriented responses even though their personalPreferences for a power-orientation were similar to their observations. If this response were found to have generalized applicability it would have important implication for self-reports in power-oriented organizations.

Although I expected a broader range of personality traits to influence perceptions of ideology, several factors may have influenced the results. The small standard deviations and extreme scores at this firm may have made it difficult to generate additional statistically significant scores. Also since ideology is a second level determinant in culture, with a higher level of awareness and reduced level of defense, the effects of apperception distortion might be somewhat tempered. Because of sample limitations, I was unable to compare the dominant coping
strategies discussed below to the perceptions of culture, however, I suspect the results would be quite interesting. A study which also compares an individual's favored defense mechanisms to his or her perceptions of the organization's basic assumption or more specific situations might also generate useful results. I was unable to compare an individual's personality and his perception of the firm's basic assumptions. Although there seems to be several kernels from this aspect of the study worth pursuing, the small sample and single site limits the generalizability of the results from this research.

Three coping strategies emerged as dominant at the site: an obsessive-compulsive personality style; denial of aggression; and a striving for autonomous activity. These coping strategies all seem to have emerged out of unresolved struggles with autonomy, and each are tightly bound into the organization's culture. For example denial of aggression seems connected to the perceptions that the organization is very low in power-orientation. The structured interview protocol indicated that there is strong and firm-wide discomfort around the "arbitrariness" by the partners during the formal work review process, the most significant interpersonal operation in the firm. This indicates the importance of the power dimension to the culture of the firm, yet it the failed to move the power-orientation score for the firm far above the minimum score. Further indication of the incongruity emerged in dominant wish for powerful supervisors
and concurrent beliefs that subordinates ought to respond to task first and power last. The cultural outcome of these anxieties and factors has been an informal and covert practice on the part of subordinates of coalescing around partners with similar review patterns and standards - thus denying that there is a battle of wills going on, and reinforcing the phantasy that "the answers are all in the cards."

I believe that the unrealistic pride about this firm, is itself a coping strategy, a form of reaction formation defending against the underlying feelings of shame. In psychosocial development, the failure to adequately resolve autonomy is shame. As result members of this generalized reaction formation defensively embedded into the firm culture, the members are particularly defensive of and therefore, unable to understand the soft sides of the firm's competency, such as management and computer consulting. They imagine (almost to the person) that, for example, that management consulting is the key strength of the firm, in the face of a client survey indicating that the clients (exhibit 5) see the firm's tax and accounting skills as superior to management consulting. As a result they are unable to make any necessary adjustments.

The firm has provided sufficient operating space for certain widespread individual coping strategies which might be neurotic. Cultural norms have imposed limitations on the discussion of these coping strategies.
Cultural operating space is provided for the obsessive-compulsive coping strategies prevalent among the professionals at the firm. The clearest example of this in this firm's culture is the obsessive planning process discussed in detail in Chapter Four. At its essence, the process provides space for extensive manager and partner time to be devoted to obsessive planning that is predictably inaccurate and unaccounted for. Responses to the resulting difficulties within the firm focus on defensive flight, such as assigning clerks the responsibility to follow up on difficult billings and collections, while the partners and staff continue on as usual. There has been no discussion of the predictable inaccuracies, and no attempt to provide accountability, rendering the entire effort productively useless, but functionally supportive of an obsessive orientation.

Cultural support for compulsivity is also evident. The firm is apparently unable to implement a plan to level the work-load, which is an openly wished for and agreed to firm goal. Although the phantasies about a level work-load are discussed, the serious and adverse implications are not discussed with others, since this strategy conflicts with other "higher" organizational goals, such as quality of work, and "family time." Their discussions with me about this issue were difficult, and they seemed distressed by the state of affairs, but resigned to continuation of the pattern. Several persons mentioned that they thought it strange, but that
they "actually were in some ways disappointed" each year when "busy season" ends. The phantasy remains that the work-load is imposed from without, although a number of persons were paradoxically able to describe processes that would alleviate the problem, yet of a mind that this is unsolvable. Since this group, almost to the person, strongly emphasizes the belief that "personal will and positive outlook is sufficient" to accomplish anything, the apparent incongruity associated with this matter emerges. The compulsive orientation is functionally in both productive and emotional ways. Leveling the work-load would require increasing work interdependence and therefore, reducing autonomy, also a critical value for members of the firm. Since compulsivity is a coping strategy which substitutes rules and duty for emotional attachment, when coupled with the need for autonomy, it is also a form of moving away from people to avoid basic anxiety. This strategy also directs the aggressive energy in external energy outside the self and is very consistent with the widespread denial of aggression (and power) at the firm, and task-oriented ideology. Reduction of compulsivity would therefore, expose a very emotionally fragile and functional (both individually and organizationally) arrangement since it serves bind and support so many individual and organizational issues.

Compulsive orientation to work is, of course, highly prized in many organizations. The fact that this organization provides space for this strategy may, therefore, say little about the
peculiarity of this firm's culture. On the other hand the exaggerated compulsivity puts the lie to the "higher goals", and an inability to discuss the consequences among themselves supports the idea that there is something more going on at this firm than routine organizational support of compulsive workers. Since compulsive work arrangements are well known and widespread among public accounting firms, there is little doubt that it is also part of the career attractiveness for many persons entering the field.

The founding partner's coping strategies provide some important cues and boundaries for the structure of the organization's culture. There also seems to be distorted views of his authority, which is maintained through denial of aggression.

The unresolved intrapsychic struggle for autonomy prominent in this firm carries two hats so to speak. On one hand the members seek autonomy, but the anxiety associated with real autonomy paralyzes them. In this firm the struggle is managed by the coping strategies of the founding partner, particularly his exceptionally high field independence, coupled with a high need to be liked by people and an aggressive need to control and move to the center of things. His high field independence projects the values associated with autonomy, and he empathizes with and overtly supports their needs for autonomy. He wants to meet their needs, tells them they are autonomous, and that they can have more autonomy if they want it. But, on the other hand, if they move
too far from the center of his control, he actively and aggressively reminds them where the end of the string is connected. They are autonomous as long as they stay within his range of control, supporting both the need for autonomy and the need for deference.

Denial of aggression tightly binds this group together, as the founding partner's aggressive actions are defended against, seen by the staff as only applying to people he likes, or as an initiation ritual. The strong parental images, that of aggressive father (shared with two other dominant partners) and indulgent mother (shared with the new managing partner) leads to a family mythology for the firm's culture. This psychodynamic resolution seems to effectively maintain emotional equilibrium and coping strategies, although I suspect it is a fragile arrangement tied into projections of the founding partner. His potential movement into the background raises some questions about how the individuals' deference needs will be met within the firm, particularly since the new managing partner emerged, only after the two other (and probably more powerful) key members of the dominant coalition refused the position.

The founding partner emphasizes rewards for those staff members and partners who are able to focus their aggressive energy on practice development, while maintaining technical competence. This generates resentment among the timid who would prefer that
technical excellence dominate the reward system. Practice
development, however, is the necessary component of grounded
reality, to support the phantasy of autonomy at the firm. An
increase in clients provides for increased career growth, which is
established at this firm as movement from the firm and towards the
clients. Lower level persons are more closely tied to the firm,
higher level professionals more closely tied to the client.
Additional clients provides the space for the limited autonomy
(flight), as the process of organizational growth also reduces the
need to explore issues unresolved and just below the surface of
awareness, and obviates the need to collaborate (fight). On the
other hand, the firm provides a very nurturing, probably over-
generous "group breast" so to speak, to reduce the tensions
associated with autonomy.

The leadership at this firm emphasize client service, which
translates to, "the client is always right." This edict is
strongly enforced with the result that the firm members as part of
their quest for autonomy, cathect through transference to the
substitute authority figures, the clients. Again, this supports
the notion that each one of the members is truly autonomous,
working independently with the clients, the firm providing the
support to be "autonomous." The client satisfaction summary
supports my belief that these object relations are distorted,
because the members still imagine that the management services
that they provide the clients is their strength, while the survey
supports the notion that what they do best is taxes and accounting.

Data were not obtained to adequately determine if group development was hindered as a result of distorted object relations.

Adequate data about group development were not derived as an outcome of this study.

Organizational neurosis was not identified.

This firm is a relatively well functioning firm. It has experienced a prolonged period of growth, the members of the firm are generally satisfied with organizational life. And although I believe that their pride is overstated, it is also clear that they do a very good job in the niche that they occupy, and that their clients are satisfied with the quality of work performed. Although a number of important defensive strategies were surfaced that seriously impairs the firm's performance and environmental adaptation, there is insufficient feedback experience to indicate that the firm is unable to change in the face of the data.
Firm Versus the Normative Profile of Accountants

I have compared the firm in this study to the 16PF norms for accountants. Several personality factors stand out. The members of this firm are more independent (particularly the partners), a lot more reserved (factor A), somewhat more practical (except the partners), and somewhat more anxious, and I believe importantly similar (and high) in second-order control. A CPA whose profile is normative would probably feel more at home in a large "big six" firm, than at this firm. There his or her key interactions with clients would be with staff accountants and executives, and a warm demeanor would be more facilitative to the task of smoothing, than the more practical and independent-minded CPA's at this firm. The task of an audit is not to provide new ideas, but to minimize change. The members of Karlos Kay and Co. know alienation, and their entrepreneurial clients are likely to find this independence coupled with practicality refreshing. The denial of aggression is quite consistent with the emotional expectations for persons in the accounting profession. With an emphasis on score-keeping others' performance rather than active engagement, there is a denial that there is a battle of wills - maintaining a phantasy that the answers are always in the cards. I would therefore expect denial of aggression to emerge as an important coping strategy in other accounting firms. A high degree of control or compulsivity is present both at Karlos Kay and Co. and in the normative CPA
profile. It seems to be the linchpin factor in the profession. The work norms and tasks are supportive of highly controlled personality with the required attention to detail, and normative and institutionalized "busy seasons." The anal character is the caricature of the accountant, with his or her stingy orientation, concern with detail, and focus on control. Yet although this caricature is partly supported by this study - it emerges as incomplete.

Limitations of the study

First, the study is exploratory and involves only one firm, and thus carries the intrinsic limitations of a case study. My discovery that the dominant levels of personal development and organizational structure were in adaptive accord, is obviously only applicable to the one group where that has taken place. Secondly, although the methodology involved substantial qualitative and quantifiable data analysis, including normative data, important segments of the analysis and interpretation emphasized theory-based inductive methods to blend the disparate data. Theory-based inductive interpretations are particularly vulnerable to self-deceptive results. The difficulties inherent in the exploration of unconscious processes further complicates reliability.
Although I am well-trained in the administration and scoring of the Thematic Apperception Test, and double scored it (triple-checked if a difference in results occurred), there is always some danger of projecting one's own intrapsychic conflicts into the analysis of stories. A second scorer would reduce the possibility of contaminated the results. The TAT can be vulnerable to temporary life crises triggering regression, and is therefore most reliable when themes are consistent over a number of cards. The large sample size ought to minimize this issue, although it is possible that a firm-wide crisis triggered ephemeral regressive results. Data from a first pass on the other cards seemed to confirm the importance of autonomy issues. A complete analysis of the TAT would have been useful, however, to discover if other dominant themes emerged to more fully explain the unconscious processes active at the firm.

The problems of scorer projection, of course, occur with the analysis of a structured interview protocol; and while I felt the cooperation was good, and I received some confirmation of the data in my feedback discussions and meetings, the data are in the final analysis, their projection of events, and the focal issues may in fact have been too repressed to be discovered in a 75 minute interview.

There was also some mismatch among levels of exploration. At the individual level I examined their basic assumptions, but at the
organizational level the cultural emphasis was at the second and third tier of awareness: namely ideology and its manifested structure and process, interpretation of which requires the inference of basic assumptions.

Finally, the high and low ideology scores were derived by dichotomizing mean scores, and mean scores on the 16PF were employed using as normative and representative. There may be factorial clusters that better identify the dominant issues. For example, the high independence score on the 16PF may be more meaningful as two or three disparate factored clusters.

Summary and Future Research:

Despite its limitations, this study was a useful exploration into the psychosocial interior of a relatively well-functioning professional service firm. It supported the idea that our understanding of organizational culture is best understood when addressing both the individual and systemic levels, the two levels being interdependent.

The idea that an organization's culture is better understood to be a projection of the personal coping strategies has important ramifications for the field of organizational development. In their study of group development, Srivastva, Neilsen and Obert (1977), connected the issues of psychosocial development
(inclusion, influence, and intimacy) to group development. They suggested that each of these issues must be dealt with in order to move on the next - each with important influence of the processes and outcomes of organization development. My study suggests that the processes of group development is limited ultimately by the unresolved issues of personal development, the members seeking to create structure and processes within the organization to resolve their own developmental issues. Although a group may temporarily move to more effective and efficient patterns of interaction, enduring personal coping strategies limit rational strategies for change. The implication is that in order to be effective, changes in organizational structure and process need to be consistent with the intrapsychic struggles of the organization's membership. Fundamental change in an organization needs to take into account members' individual issues. Effective organizational development often will require simultaneous attention to members' personal developmental needs.

Future research ought to first be directed towards developing typologies of culture, so that the research process can develop into more formal hypothesis testing. For example, an instrument that identifies and categorizes the basic assumptions of an organization's culture would be particularly useful. The same is, of course, true for the individual issues. The challenge to capture the issues without losing the underlying human being.
I believe the package of instruments used in this study was enormously useful in developing an understanding of this firm. On the other hand they involved substantial time and expense. Further research into relationships among the instruments may yield a way to pare them into a smaller package.
APPENDIX 1: STRUCTURED OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Questionnaire:

1. Please tell me about your job. What do you do? Who does it involve?

2. Are there any skills or other topics that would be important for you to learn more about? Any skills that you have which seem under-utilized?

3. What are the things here that keep you up, going, and enthusiastic?

4. What are the things that get you down, frustrated, and tense?

5. What are the things that you learned in order to get along here? How and where did you learn them?

6. Who are the people that you work most closely with? What do you expect of them, and what do they expect of you? How well are these expectations being met?

7. Please describe a difficult situation here, which involved you, and where things turned out right? Were you close to panic? Who else was involved? What did they do? Would this be unusual?

8. Please describe a difficult situation here, involving you, and where things didn't turn out right. Were you close to panic? Who else was involved, and what did they do? Would this be unusual?

9. What does it take to really succeed here? to get fired? to get along?

10. Suppose you had three magic wishes about how to change this firm in any way that you wanted. What would they be?

11. I would like for you to imagine the firm as an organism that you can clearly observe as a person, animal or other life form. What does it look like? What are 3-4 things it might say to you?

12. When _____ is at its best what 3-4 words would you use to describe it? At its worst? What things about it never seem to change?

13. What 3-4 words would it use to describe the clients at their best? at their worst? Things which never seem to change?

14. What 3-4 words would it use to describe you at your best? at your worst? Things which never seem to change?

15. Are there any questions that you would ask that I have not, in order to help me get a clearer sense of what its like for you at this firm?
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APPENDIX 4: INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGIST REPORT

INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

TO [Redacted] DATE August 25, 1988
FROM KARLOS KAY SUBJECT Organization Profile

Two or three weeks ago each of you were asked to answer questions on a grid relative to your perception of 18 organization characteristics of as laid out on a grid from 1 to 20. The reason this was done was so, as the professional psychologist who distributed the form indicated, that the partners' perception of how a firm was being run was different from the staff's perception. This small exercise proved two things which I am delighted to report to you:

1. In the case of [Redacted], there is not a perceptible difference in the manner in which the partners believe the firm is being run and the manner in which the other employees believe the firm is being run. The attached sheet has the average answers listed and compared to typical responses, the answers are remarkably close.

2. As you might guess, the firms scoring to the extreme left of the grid use Type X management philosophies. Answers to the extreme right use Type Y. As you know, Type X firms are those that are very authoritative with powers concentrated at the top, the organization is very structured and there is very little flexibility. Type Y firms are those firms that are loosely structured and solicit and use input from employees at all levels, have policies that are subject to change and are flexible as to the application of existing policies.

The average CPA firm is generally right at the middle of the grid. We are proud of the fact that most of our answers are significantly to the right of that mark.

Please let me know if you have any questions about any of the above.

/dmm
## APPENDIX 4, CONTINUED

**PROFILE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES</th>
<th>SYSTEM 1</th>
<th>SYSTEM 2</th>
<th>SYSTEM 3</th>
<th>SYSTEM 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence is shown in subordinates?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free do they feel to ask for opinions about you?</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not very</td>
<td>Rather true</td>
<td>Fully true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are subordinates' ideas sought and used, if worthy?</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is participation open to all employees?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, occasionally 4</td>
<td>4, some 3</td>
<td>4, some 3 and 5</td>
<td>6, 4, based on group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?</td>
<td>Mostly at top</td>
<td>2, 3, and middle</td>
<td>Fully general</td>
<td>At all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much supportive treatment exists?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Great deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the direction of information flow?</td>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>Mostly downward</td>
<td>Down and up</td>
<td>Down, up, and sideways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is downward communication accepted?</td>
<td>With suspicion</td>
<td>Peasably with suspicion</td>
<td>With caution</td>
<td>With a receptive mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How accurate is upward communication?</td>
<td>Often wrong</td>
<td>Considered for the boss</td>
<td>Limited accuracy</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do supervisors know problems faced by subordinates?</td>
<td>Know little</td>
<td>Some knowledge</td>
<td>Quite well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what level are decisions made?</td>
<td>Mostly at top</td>
<td>Partially at top, same delegation</td>
<td>Broad policy at top, more delegation</td>
<td>Throughout but well integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Occasionally consulted</td>
<td>Generally consulted</td>
<td>Fully involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does decision-making process contribute to motivation?</td>
<td>Nothing, often weakens it</td>
<td>Relatively little</td>
<td>Some contribution</td>
<td>Substantial contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are organizational goals established?</td>
<td>Goals issued</td>
<td>Goals, some consensus invited</td>
<td>After discussion, by group action</td>
<td>By group action, invited in other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much covert resistance to goals is present?</td>
<td>Strong resistance</td>
<td>Moderate resistance</td>
<td>Some resistance at times, little or none</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How concentrated are review and control functions?</td>
<td>Highly at top</td>
<td>Relatively high at top</td>
<td>Moderate concentration</td>
<td>Only lower levels, quite moderate shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an informal organization reacting the formal one?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Non-same plan is formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are costs, productivity, and other control data used for?</td>
<td>Punishing, punishment</td>
<td>Reward and punishment, some self-regulation</td>
<td>Self-regulation, program-solving</td>
<td>Non-same plan is formal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5: CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

Would you rate KAPLAN Company's:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF EXPERTISE</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Auditing Expertise</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Accounting/Auditing Expertise" Comment:
- Good in accounting; don't know about auditing. ("Good" rating)

Tax Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Tax Expertise" Comments:
- Premier firm in this area. ("Excellent" rating)
- We had one bad year; not their fault. ("Excellent" rating)

Data Processing Consulting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Data Processing Expertise" Comment:
- Just getting started. ("Don't Know" rating)

General Business Advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"General Business Advice" Comment:
- Cannot rate; they give overview instead of detail; it doesn't mean information is fair or poor—just too general. ("No response" rating)
APPENDIX 5, CONTINUED

AREAS OF EXPERTISE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF EXPERTISE</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Value of Service Relative to Cost" Comment:

- Bill runs up a lot because of too much repetition. ("Fair" rating)
- But dragging. ("Excellent" rating)
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APPENDIX 13: FIRM DEMOGRAPHICS

DEMGRAPHICS OF FIRM AND SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>16PF</th>
<th>HIQ</th>
<th>TAT</th>
<th>SIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employees</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 months</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff: accountants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners &amp; principals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; audit</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax &amp; management services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(1) Total represents all full-time employees of the two offices studied. 5 part-time employees were not included in the study.

(2) 16PF is the Sixteen Personality Factor Test by Cattell.

(3) HIQ is the Harrison Ideology Questionnaire.

(4) TAT is the Thematic Apperception Test.

(5) SIP is the structured interview protocol.

(6) 7 TAT's for Youngstown were mishandled in transcription and not included in the study.

(7) Pittsburgh office includes 2 persons recently re-located to Cleveland as part of a start-up operation.

(8) Tax and management services includes the tax departments as well as two other smaller management services departments.
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