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I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Fame is vapor; popularity an accident; riches take wings. Only one thing endures, and that is character. — Horace Greeley

I'm going to live forever. Baby, remember my name. — from Fame, a popular song

The screen biography occupies a unique place among the genres of American feature films. It is a hybrid of fact and fiction, Hollywood and history. Unlike the purely fictional movie, it purports to show us the "true story" of real people and events. Unlike the non-fiction film, it recounts this story using the same dramatic conventions as the traditional Hollywood potboiler: glamorous stars, sweeping musical scores, dazzling sets and costumes, and most importantly, a formula script which values box office appeal over historical accuracy. And unlike Hollywood features based on historical incidents, the biography concentrates its glitter on the life story of a single character (or in a few cases two), a character whose name we associate with fame, success, "greatness."

Perhaps this is a name whose exploits we have learned about from history books or school lectures. Perhaps not. But the fame, the "greatness" of this person has been validated, if for no other reason, than by the simple fact that Hollywood has chosen this life for a movie. And for as
long as Late, Late Shows are on television, and video cassettes and disks feature Hollywood films, the biographical film will provide its subjects with a certain measure of media immortality.

In this respect the screen biography represents to the contemporary viewer a highly visible and impressive case study in success, and its subjects may be viewed as powerful role models for achieving fame and status. J.P. Mayer (1946) wrote in Sociology of Film "...in one way or another films may do a great deal to provide patterns of behavior, to stimulate the imagination, and to determine conceptions of life...To many people the film appears to be an authentic reflection of life, and to question the values which are implicit in its presentations would never occur to them." (p. 168) Writing about the importance of teaching film in Art Education, Vincent Lanier (1969) noted: "...the motion picture appears to have some unusual capacity to involve the observer's emotions and allegiance. It is at least as powerful as, and perhaps even more powerful than, any of the other arts." (p.318) Given the importance of the motion picture in general, the screen biography in particular may well have added impact in shaping our conceptions of right behavior by virtue of its factual base. Its characters represent real people, many born of average circumstances, who rise above the crowd through a series of actions, value
judgements, and decisions dramatized in these films.

The question then arises: What types of people are presented in screen biographies? Are their lives indeed worthy of emulation? According to the Production Code of the Motion Picture Association of America, the governing standard for movie content between 1929 and 1967, "If motion pictures consistently hold up for admiration high types of characters and present stories that affect lives for the better, they can become the most powerful natural force for the improvement of mankind." (p. 276) The Code produced an explicit list of rules describing how controversial subjects such as sex, crime, drugs, and violence should be treated, or avoided, to carry out this mandate. It did not, however, provide any specific guidelines on what constitutes "high types of characters." Generally, it was a "good citizenship" code, what Kevin Brownlow calls in Behind the Screen a list of "Don’ts and Be Carefuls", which mentions characters only to the extent that those representing the law and social institutions should be treated with respect, while criminals and evil-doers should not.

Boorstin, where once fame was the hard-won product of great accomplishment, it is now an instant commodity, easily bestowed by the media producers:

Discovering that we (the television watchers, the movie goes, the radio listeners, and newspaper and magazine readers) and our servants (the television, movie, and radio producers, newspaper and magazine editors, and ad writers) can so quickly and so effectively give a man "fame," we have willingly been misled into believing that fame -- well-knownness -- is still a hallmark of greatness. (page 47)

Boorstin contends that this manufactured fame has lead to the advent of the "human pseudo-event", a person whose renown results not from greatness in deed or high character but rather from the accomplishment of becoming well-known. The "human pseudo-event" is a celebrity, not to be confused with the hero. As Boorstin puts it: "The hero was a big man; the celebrity is a big name." (page 61) As an object of emulation, the celebrity represents a danger to society because he is morally neutral, vague in character, and perhaps even passive in achieving his well-knownness: "His relation to morality and even to reality is highly ambiguous." (page 58) Such a condition was unknown to the true hero of past times where: "A man's name was not apt to become a household word unless he exemplified greatness in some way or other. He might be a Napoleon, great in power, a J.P. Morgan, great in wealth, a St. Francis, great in virtue, or a Bluebeard, great in evil." (page 46)
Christopher Lasch (1979) reaches much the same conclusion in *The Culture of Narcissism*: "Most Americans would still define success as riches, fame and power, but their actions show that they have little interest in the substance of these attainments...They crave not fame but the glamour and excitement of celebrity. They want to be envied rather than respected." (page 59) And Michael Wood takes an even more sinister view of Hollywood's depiction of success in his book *America in the Movies* when he says: "Success in American movies...is almost invariably linked with an unscrupulous disregard for decency and fair play, and successful people are projected as weird, fascinating monsters, King Kongs of the worlds of business and theater and sports and politics." (p. 77)

Certainly the screen biography is a preeminent example of the mass media portrayal of fame and success in modern American society, and to the extent that movies influence our concepts of correct behavior, educators need to understand as much as possible about how the subjects of these films are depicted. Are they indeed a powerful social force for "the improvement of mankind", or do they reflect the vacuous "human pseudo-event" of Boorstin's indictment?

And how does one measure the attributes of "greatness"? Or devise a scale that gauges the intellectual brilliance and moral fortitude of a dramatic film character?
Certainly amorphous terms such as "good" and "bad" or "positive" and "negative" are not entirely adequate to resolve these issues in content analysis study. And such heady quantitative insights as age, sex, hair color, or favorite salad dressing may define the flesh, but leave many dimensions untold about the spirit.

During my investigation of this topic, I encountered two behavioral methodologies from the social sciences which seek to measure both moral and intellectual development. These are the O.J. Harvey Belief Systems and the Kohlberg Moral Stages. Although neither was designed for analyzing dramatic characters, the categories they produce for real subjects would appear to be very appropriate and relevant schemes for examining these questions. (1)

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study is to examine how the central figures in a representative sample of American screen biographies have been portrayed, particularly regarding their moral and intellectual character. The study looks at these screen figures as possible role models, whose behavior may affect the viewing public's concepts of fame and success. It seeks to address such questions as: What kinds of moral and intellectual characteristics do these figures have in common? Can behavioral science methodologies designed to measure these characteristics,
specifically the O.J. Harvey Belief Systems and the Kohlberg Moral Stages, be applied to film subjects? And if so, to what extent? Do these characteristics represent productive social values, and taken as a whole, do they portray "heroes" or "celebrities" in the Boorstin sense, or something in between? And is the achievement of fame and success depicted as the product of great accomplishment or unscrupulous conduct?

Another aim of this study, although secondary in importance, is to examine the American screen biography in historical perspective: to look for trends and changes in the characterization, plot development, theme, and selection of subjects. This area is explored, however, only within the limited framework of the sample films used to carry out the study's primary purpose of character analysis.
FOOTNOTE

1. Of course using research that scales morality and mental development means acknowledging a certain element of bias. Both Harvey and Kohlberg believe that some behavior is more productive, more satisfying, more "moral" that other, and they have based their classifications on these assertions. I freely admit my own bias in choosing to accept these assertions as a basis for drawing conclusions. But the rightness or wrongness of Harvey and Kohlberg is not the real issue in this investigation. Whether or not their assumptions on morality and intellectual development represent universal truths about human nature is best left to the philosophers and social scientists. This study views their classifications at a more pragmatic level: as convenient models for relating the behavior of screen figures to certain characteristics of cognitive development observed in real life.
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II. METHODOLOGY

DEFINITION OF SCREEN BIOGRAPHY

There are hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of feature films which are based on historical or biographical material. However, "pure biography", as defined by Thrall and Hibbard (1960) in *A Handbook to Literature*, "...centers its whole attention on the career and character of its subject." (p.55) Therefore, films which include biographical characters but which concentrate on a particular historical event (i.e., *All the President's Men*, *The Longest Day*, etc.) are not included, and the screen biography is defined as a dramatic feature film which centers its whole attention on the life and character of one non-fictional subject.

UNIVERSE

To assure that the chosen films are "about" someone, the universe is limited to those films which make reference to the subject in the movies' titles, either directly by name (*Wilson*, *Lenny*, *Patton*, etc.), or indirectly by description (*Coal Miner's Daughter*, *Yankee Doodle Dandy*, *Man of a Thousand Faces*, etc.)
Certain other qualifications were imposed to concentrate the scope of the study:

1. The film must be a dramatic feature produced by a major American studio during the "talking picture" era (roughly, since 1928.) These are the films which have been most widely seen by the American public in theatres and on television. Consequently, they should represent the group of films which have had the most potential influence on the American audience.

2. The subject of the film must be a relatively contemporary figure. The study wanted to single out figures who were perceived by the audience as contemporary models of behavior, people who had struggled and achieved fame or recognition by operating under roughly the same circumstances of modern civilization that confront the viewing public. Therefore, the universe was limited to films about persons who have lived since the formation of the United States government, roughly two hundred years.

3. The "fame" or recognition of the film's subject is self-achieved and not the result of some extraordinary circumstance such as a special birth right or an act of God. Again, the study wants to examine the type of success which is accessible within the practical realm of aspirations to the ordinary viewer. This excludes films about royal subjects, people who experience "miracles" or "callings",
and so forth.

SAMPLE

The sample of films for analysis consists of the screen biographies which were nominated for a major Academy Award (Best Picture, Best Screenplay, Best Direction.) These three categories are chosen because they most concern the content of the film as a whole, rather than the various stylistic elements (for example, Best Musical Score, Best Acting, Best Editing, etc.) Because these awards by the Motion Picture Academy of Arts and Sciences are generally acknowledged as the highest honors in the American film industry, films thus nominated should reflect what Hollywood considers the best of its product and what films are most likely to be emulated and used as standards for comparison in future productions. The films selected for the sample are:

Disraeli, 1929
The House of Rothschild, 1934
Viva Villa, 1934
The Great Ziegfeld, 1936
The Story of Louis Pasteur, 1936
The Life of Emile Zola, 1937
Young Mr. Lincoln, 1940
Edison the Man, 1940
Dr. Ehrlich's Magic Bullet, 1940
Sergeant York, 1941
The Pride of the Yankees, 1942
Yankee Doodle Dandy, 1943
Madame Curie, 1943
Wilson, 1944
Dillinger, 1945
The Stratton Story, 1949
Jolson Sings Again, 1949
Pride of St. Louis, 1952
Viva Zapata, 1952
The Glenn Miller Story, 1954
The Eddy Duchin Story, 1956
Man of a Thousand Faces, 1957
Freud, 1962
Funny Girl, 1968
Patton, 1970
Lady Sings the Blues, 1972
Serpico, 1973
Lenny, 1974
Coal Miner's Daughter, 1979

METHOD

The O.J. Harvey Belief Systems and the Kohlberg-Dewey Moral Stages are means of classifying levels of cognitive
development. The Harvey Systems measures logical reasoning (how people assimilate new information and form their beliefs), while the Kohlberg Stages measures moral reasoning (that thinking process which is applied to ethical issues and questions). Together they should provide an integrated means of analysing the whole character, both morally and intellectually. Each research method is described individually in the following sections.

THE O.J. HARVEY BELIEF SYSTEMS

The development of the Harvey Systems results from a body of behavioral science studies conducted by O.J. Harvey of the University of Colorado with others under contracts with the Office of Naval Research and the National Institute of Mental Health. Harvey (1970) contends that a major goal of education should be to produce students who are better able to cope with the new and the unexpected, "to withstand uncertainty and stress, to behave flexibly, to be committed to openness, to avoid over-generalization" (p. 67-68), and to base decisions on facts rather than stubborn opinionation. Students who possess these skills are characterized by Harvey as being more "abstract" and are better equipped to deal successfully with a constantly changing world, while students who lack this objective flexibility in their reasoning process are labeled more "concrete". The degree
of difference between "abstract" and "concrete" thinking are determined by four Belief System classifications posited and tested by Harvey on a wide range of subjects, including school children of different ages, teachers, and juvenile delinquents.

The studies were performed primarily by using the "This I Believe" test, a semi-projective sentence completion test developed specifically to measure conceptual or belief systems. In this test, the subject is asked to indicate his beliefs about a number of social and personally significant concepts, such as "religion", "friendship", "the American way of life", "sin", "education", "the family", "capital punishment", and "world government". The responses are evaluated in both structure and content to classify the subject into one of the four principal Belief Systems or into some admixture of two or more systems.

Harvey (1970) defines a Belief System as "a set of predispositions to perceive, feel toward and respond to ego-involving stimuli and events in a consistent way." (p.68) It acts as a kind of "psychological filter" which determines how a person reasons and discriminates when confronted with new ideas or situations. Of the four classifications, System One and System Two individuals represent "concrete" belief structures, while System Three and System Four subjects are "abstract". Harvey describes the
characteristics of the various System members as follows:

(1)

SYSTEM ONE persons have: 1. a simpler cognitive structure in domains of high ego-involvement, 2. A greater tendency toward more extreme, either-or and good-bad judgements, 3. A greater reliance on status and power than information and expertise as guidelines for judgements, 4. A greater intolerance of ambiguity and uncertainty, expressed in higher authoritarianism and dogmatism and in the tendency to form judgements quickly from novel stimuli, 5. A greater need for cognitive consistency and a greater negative arousal from experience with inconsistency, 6. A greater inability to change set and hence greater rigidity in the solution of complex and/or changing problems, 7. A greater insensitivity to subtle cues in the environment and a greater susceptibility to obstrusive clues even when they provide false leads, 8. A poorer capacity in role-playing of others and to act and think in make-believe or hypothetical situations, 9. A stronger hold on opinions and greater certainty that the opinions will not change, 10. A higher dictatorialness, reflected in such behavior as a high need for structure, low flexibility, high rule orientation, high dictation of procedure, high frequency of the use of unexplained rules, and low encouragement of individual responsibility and originality, 11. A greater tendency
toward trite and normative behavior and thus a lower tendency toward innovation and creativity, and 12. A greater tendency to form and generalize impressions of other people from highly incomplete information.

SYSTEM TWO persons, also classified as concrete, can be characterized by these same traits with one major difference: They are negatively influenced by many of the cues, especially those relating to established custom and authority, which are used as positive guidelines and signs of validity by System One individuals.

SYSTEM THREE representatives are more abstract, less dogmatic, less pro- or anti-establishment, and less evaluative than persons from System One and Two. They are more concerned with interpersonal harmony, empathic understanding, mutual dependencies and highly developed skills of interpersonal manipulation aimed at averting social isolation, aloneness, interpersonal rejection and failure when having to perform alone.

SYSTEM FOUR individuals, the most abstract of the four groups, are characterized by 1. high task orientation, 2. information seeking, 3. low dogmatism, 4. creativity in offering solutions which are both high in novelty and appropriateness, 5. openness to inputs from diverse sources, and 6. a high independence of judgement.
THE KOHLBERG MORAL STAGES

These stages, a means of categorizing moral development, were developed and researched by Dr. Lawrence Kohlberg, Director of the Center for Moral Education at Harvard University. Kohlberg (1975) defines his approach to moral education as cognitive-developmental:

The approach is called cognitive because it recognizes that moral education, like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the active thinking of the child about moral issues and decisions. It is called developmental because it sees the aims of moral education as movement through moral stages. (p. 670)

Kohlberg’s stages are founded on the theoretical work of educational philosopher John Dewey, who postulated three levels of moral development: (2)

1. The Preconventional, or Premoral -- This is the level generally associated with the period of early childhood, where morality is understood only in terms of rewards and punishments, and exchange of favors.

2. The Conventional -- At this level, moral considerations are based on conformity and loyalty to the social order. The Conventional level individual accepts the standards of his reference group with little critical reflection.

3. The Principled, or Autonomous -- At this level, conduct is guided by the individual thinking and judging for himself whether a purpose is good, and does not accept the
standard of his group without reflection.

Since 1955 Kohlberg has worked to redefine and evaluate these levels through longitudinal and cross-cultural studies in the United States, Turkey, Taiwan, India, Israel, and other nations. He claims to have validated these levels, subdivided into six moral stages, and three empirical characteristics which are fundamental to his theory of stages. These characteristics are:

1. Stages are "structured wholes," or organized systems of thought. Individuals are consistent in levels of moral judgement.

2. Stages form an invariant sequence with individuals always moving up (except in extreme trauma) and without skipping stages.

3. Stages are "hierarchical integrations". Thinking at a higher stage includes lower stage thinking, and individuals tend to prefer the highest stage available.

Thus, in the course of life, a young child begins operating at the first stage of the Preconventional Level and moves upward as his intellect and maturity develop. The stages within each level are:

Preconventional: Stage 1, The punishment and obedience orientation, and Stage 2, The instrumental relativist orientation. Conventional: Stage 3, The interpersonal concordance or "good-boy-nice girl" orientation, and Stage

As an illustration, this is how Kohlberg describes the concept of justice at the different stages:

At every moral stage, there is a concern for justice. The most damning statement a school child can make about a teacher is that "he's not fair." At each higher stage, however, the conception of justice is reorganized. At Stage 1, justice is punishing the bad in terms of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." At Stage 2, it is exchanging favors and goods in an equal manner. At Stages 3 and 4, it is treating people as they desire in terms of the conventional rules. At Stage 5, it is recognized that all rules and laws flow from justice, from a social contract between the governors and the governed designed to protect the equal rights of all. At Stage 6, personally chosen moral principles are also principles of justice, the principles of any member of a society would choose for that society if he did not know what his position was to be in the society and in which he might be the least advantaged. (p.673)

Ideally, each child would develop intellectually and morally into an adult who reasons at the highest, or Principled, level. At this point, the individual is able to understand and appreciate the value of social contracts (Stage 5) and moral principles (Stage 6), such as the Golden Rule, which Kohlberg contends are universal to all cultures and peoples. Unfortunately, this is not the case: "Today, as in the time of our founding, the majority of our adults are at the conventional level, particularly the "law and order" (fourth) moral stage. (Every few years the Gallup Poll circulates the Bill of Rights unidentified, and every
year it is turned down.)" (p. 674)

Kohlberg's primary method of testing is the use of stories which present a clear moral dilemma to the subject. They involve, as Robert Craig (1975) describes them, "a conflict of values of specific kinds, especially those between obedience to legal, social rules and the needs or welfare of human beings." (p. 122.) The subject is then asked a battery of questions, numbering fifty to one hundred, and records of these interviews are examined in detail against thirty different aspects of morality, such as the conception of justice, rights, moral intentions, and consequences of the actions proposed by the subject.

It should be noted that Kohlberg is not without his critics. (3) His approach and conclusions reject other prominent theories of moral development, in particular the maturationist idea of directing a child's innate "good" and "bad" and the behaviorist view of motivating correct moral action through rewards and punishments. And his research has been accused by some of not providing the breadth in testing material or sufficient number of subjects to demonstrate conclusively all of the assertions he makes. However, no work in the inexact field of social science is without some controversy, and these criticisms deal primarily with testing subjects in the real world. Films subjects, on the other hand, are not nearly so ambiguous or complex. They do
not go home after the movie and change into a different person. The sum of their existence is what they say and what they do on the screen in a two hour film. Also, the portion of Kohlberg's work which this study uses, namely the division between Conventional and Principled levels of behavior is generally agreed on as socially desirable, even by Kohlberg's detractors. As one prominent critic, Marvin Bressler (1976), writes: "Even sociologists are prepared to concede the moral superiority of the principle of justice over, let us say, the 'punishment and obedience' and 'law and order' orientations. This proposition is roughly as controversial as the demand that we shall prefer truth to falsehood, beauty to ugliness, and health to sickness." (p.8)

This study focuses on the separation between Conventional and Principled levels of moral development for several reasons. First, the Principled moral level is obviously the most desirable for social models who represent success and prominence. Second, as noted earlier, Kohlberg asserts that most Americans operate at the Conventional or "law and order" stage. Therefore the acid test of moral "greatness" in the Boorstin thesis is to ascertain whether film biography subjects operate at or above the moral norm, in this case at the NonPrincipled or Principled level. An equivalent "breaking point" in the Harvey scale is to determine if these characters reason at the "concrete" or
"abstract" stage, and particularly if they represent the autonomous judgement of Stage Four individuals.
FOOTNOTES

1. These descriptions were condensed from Harvey (pp. 70-71). Harvey's descriptions include specific studies which support each characteristic.
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III. ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

VIEWING AND DATA COLLECTION

Each film in the sample was carefully screened under controlled conditions where the projection could be stopped for note-taking between scenes, and the audio track of each film was recorded for later reference. Comprehensive notes were taken on the major character's decisions, actions, and dialog exchanges.

Most of these notes were made during the first viewing of the film, and no attempts were made during this time to judge the various characters or screen the data collected for its applicability to the Kohlberg and Harvey classifications. This approach was taken for two reasons: First, I wanted to simulate as closely as possible the viewing experience of the average viewer; that is, I wanted to register the material that was most likely to impress the one-time viewer rather than the scrutinizing researcher. Second, I wanted to take an open-minded "System Four" approach and minimize the human tendency to jump to conclusions and form prejudgements early in the film based on incomplete data. Therefore, to the extent which was humanly possible, I attempted to divorce myself from all
thoughts of Kohlberg and Dewey during the screenings of the films and take all pertinent notes of what was dramatically impressive on the first viewing. Subsequent viewings were then used to substantiate the accuracy of these notes, flesh out the details, and record exact lines of dialog. All of the films were viewed at least twice.

DESIGNING THE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Each major character in a dramatic feature film may easily have several hundred lines of dialog, plus numerous actions, gestures, and movements. It is not difficult to see how complicated analysis of all this material might become. Even if it were feasible to analyse every word and gesture for every character against Harvey's fifteen or so character traits, for example, such a system would probably raise more questions of validity than it would answer. It could mean treating all actions and statements equally, regardless of how minor the event or statement.

On the other hand, a completely random or subjective selection of actions and statements would be just as inconclusive. Any judge could build a strong case for his or her bias simply by emphasizing certain data and ignoring other. Or two judges could use the same data and arrive at different conclusions by interpreting the Harvey and Kohlberg research differently. This last possibility seems to warrant the most concern since neither body of research
was designed for film analysis.

Therefore, before analysing the data, it was necessary to design a systematic scheme which would do the following:

1. **Define the most relevant content.**

2. **Transform the findings of behavioral research** (Harvey and Kohlberg) **into content analysis instruments for film characters.**

3. **Devis e a workable format for listing and evaluating the relevant content of each film that is readily comparable and efficient in organizing the information concisely.**

1. **DEFINING RELEVANT CONTENT**

Relevant content in this study for Harvey was defined as **situations of high ego-involvement: incidents where the character's life, career, or loved ones are seriously affected by what he says or does.** The basis for using this definition is grounded in the fundamentals of Harvey's research. As Harvey points out, high ego-involvement is a necessity for valid Belief System classification:

*The stress on ego-involvement should be noted. On the basis of considerable evidence we have come to assume that the different belief systems produce different effects only in ratio to highly involving stimuli and that their effects are therefore minimal on stimuli that are affectively neutral. (p.68)*

Thus we may expect film characters to reveal their true system differences only in statements and actions which
represent this high ego-involvement. It would also seem logical that these moments of higher drama would be the ones which would most impress the viewing audience.

Relevant content for the Kohlberg classifications was defined as situations where accepted social, legal, or peer norms conflict with a higher moral good, or principle. Again, the reasoning for this criterion comes from the original research. In the Kohlberg studies, the researchers presented subjects with moral dilemmas that would force the respondents to choose between clear alternatives. These same moral or ethical conflicts were deemed as a necessary condition to analyse the film characters; otherwise the classifications would be venturing beyond the bounds of Kohlberg’s research and into the area of unsupportable speculation.

2. CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

To apply the behavioral research of Harvey and Kohlberg to use in film content analysis, both bodies of research were streamlined to their essential points, and a classification key was devised to list the most prominent characteristics of each.

In the case of Harvey, many of the characteristics were similar to the point of being mutually inclusive. Each group of these similar traits were consolidated under a general descriptive heading for the common condition or
circumstances where these traits overlap. These headings, along with a breakdown of the characteristics represented by each System, are listed in Figure 1.

These characteristics were then organized into a classification key which was used to analyse the major actions and decisions of each film subject. This key is illustrated in Figure 2.
REACTION TO NEW IDEAS, PEOPLE, AND INFORMATION:

SYSTEM ONE AND TWO (CONCRETE)
1. A simpler cognitive structure in regard to domains of high involvement.
2. Tendency toward either-or, all good or all-bad judgements.
3. A greater intolerance of ambiguity and uncertainty.
5. Greater need for cognitive consistency.
6. Higher negative arousal from the experience of inconsistency.

SYSTEM THREE AND FOUR (ABSTRACT)
Opposite of the above.

INFLUENCE IN FORMING JUDGEMENTS:

SYSTEM ONE AND TWO (CONCRETE)
7. Higher reliance on status and power than upon information and expertise in making judgements. (Positive for System One, negative for System Two.)

SYSTEM THREE
8. More concerned with interpersonal harmony, and more susceptible to peer group than to authority influences. (Harvey, 1970, page 91.)

SYSTEM FOUR
9. Information-seeking, openness to inputs from diverse sources and a high independence of judgement.

SPEED IN FORMING JUDGEMENTS:

SYSTEM ONE AND TWO (CONCRETE)
10. Tendency to form judgements quickly of novel stimuli.
11. Greater tendency to form and generalize impressions of other people from highly incomplete information.

SYSTEM THREE AND FOUR (ABSTRACT)
Opposite of the above.

Figure 1. Breakdown of Harvey characteristics
Figure 1 (continued)

ABILITY AT ROLE-PLAYING:

SYSTEM ONE AND TWO (CONCRETE)
12. Greater inability to change set.
13. A poorer capacity for role-playing.

SYSTEM THREE AND FOUR (ABSTRACT)
Opposite of the above.

BEHAVIOR IN PROBLEM SOLVING:

SYSTEM ONE AND TWO (CONCRETE)
14. Greater rigidity in the solution of complex or changing problems.
15. Greater tendency toward trite and normative behavior, and thus, a lower tendency toward innovation and creativity.

SYSTEM THREE AND FOUR
Opposite of above.

SYSTEM FOUR
16. High creativity in the sense of offering solutions to problems that are high in both novelty and appropriateness.

PERCEPTION OF PEOPLE AND TRENDS:

SYSTEM ONE AND TWO (CONCRETE)
17. Greater insensitivity to subtle cues in the environment and hence a greater susceptibility to obtrusive clues even when they provide false leads.

SYSTEM THREE AND FOUR (ABSTRACT)
Opposite of above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: H. Harvey Key</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**REACTION TO NEW IDEAS, PEOPLE, AND INFORMATION:** (1,2,3,4,5,6)

- Close-minded, negative, dogmatic: 1, 2
- Open-minded, flexible, tolerant: 3, 4

**INFLUENCE IN FORMING JUDGEMENTS:** (7,8,9)

- Status, authority over information:
  - Pro-establishment: 1
  - Anti-establishment: 2
- Dependent on peers, loved ones: 3
- Independent, critical judgement: 4

**SPEED IN FORMING JUDGEMENTS, DECISIONS:** (10,11)

- Snap judgements, decisions: 1, 2
- Reserved, deliberate: 3, 4

**ABILITY AT ROLE-PLAYING:** (12,13)

- Non-adept: 1, 2
- Adept: 3, 4

**ABILITY IN PROBLEM-SOLVING:** (14,15,16)

- Trite, normative, or inept: 1, 2
- Creative, innovative, appropriate: 3, 4

**PERCEPTION OF PEOPLE, EVENTS, TRENDS:** (17)

- Insensitive to subtle clues: 1, 2
- Sensitive to subtle clues: 3, 4

**APPROACH TO PROBLEMS, WORK:** (18)

- High task orientation: 4

**Figure 2. Harvey Classification Key**
As noted earlier, the primary aim of using Kohlberg was to determine if the biography subjects operated at the Principled or NonPrincipled (Conventional and below) level of moral development. From the general descriptions in the Kohlberg studies, three characteristics were gleaned which reflect Principled behavior. Evidence of these characteristics were considered statements and actions by the subjects which showed:

1. Self-critical judgement. Examples where the character evaluates or criticizes his actions on the basis of personal conscience, independent of peer norms or social, legal conventions.

2. Awareness of injustice. Examples where the subject perceives a situation where social, legal rules violate the underlying concepts of social contracts (Moral Stage 5) or principles such as the Golden Rule (Moral Stage 6).

3. Personal sacrifice. Examples where the subject sacrifices his own best interests or personal gain for a larger common good or the welfare of others.

The necessary condition for demonstrating any of these characteristics, obviously, is a situation where social norms and principles come into conflict. In the above examples, the Principled individual shows independent moral judgement by siding with conscience and the higher concerns
of justice and equality (i.e., the principle of the Golden Rule.) Conversely, evidence of Nonprincipled behavior would be shown by blind obedience to the social norm, without critical reflection or an understanding of the basic conflict (the Conventional or "law and order" stage), or by even lesser development, such as the Preconventional motivations of revenge and rewards and punishments. For analysing the film characters, a classification chart noting key behavior of these characteristics was created. (See Figure 3.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>KOHLBERG KEY</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPLED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-critical, condemning of wrong actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(chooses) Principle over conformity, convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(chooses) Welfare of others, Principle over personal gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPRINCIPLED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(chooses social, legal) Convention over Principle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(reacts by) Revenge, rewards and punishments (Preconventional behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(chooses) Personal welfare over larger good, welfare of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Kohlberg Classification Key
3. ANALYSIS FORMAT

The format devised to analyse each film consists of two parts: a classification chart on the biographical subject (Figures 2. and 3.) and a summary of the findings from the chart, along with a general analysis of the supporting characters. These charts, as illustrated earlier, were developed after extensive trial and error as the best means of outlining the major dramatic incidents efficiently and concisely. In this chart, each episode of relevant behavior is summarized and listed chronologically, followed immediately by a Harvey or Kohlberg classification of the characteristics which apply. In this fashion, patterns or lack of patterns could be readily observed as they develop in the films. The accompanying analyses then elaborates on the conclusions reached about the film subjects. And to the extent possible, the lesser characters are examined and classified.

In an effort to maintain objectivity, all the relevant events for each major character were extracted and charted first, without any assignment of characteristics being made. The classification keys to both Harvey and Kohlberg were then applied individually to each independent event, giving equal weight to each. The similarities or changes were then reviewed and interpreted in the summary analysis.
One purpose of this study is to establish the extent to which these film characters can be analyzed by the Harvey and Kohlberg schemes, and not to force them into arbitrary classifications for the sake of neatness. Consequently, another division was created, one which tries to draw a line somewhere between characters which clearly fit into a behavioral sort and those which are contradictory or ambiguous. Each character was therefore divided into one of two categories: Consistent or Inconsistent for the Harvey Belief Systems, and Conclusive or Inconclusive for the Kohlberg Moral Stages.

Because qualitative analysis uses looser measuring systems than quantitative, no separations such as these can be clear-cut. But the following definitions indicate what the study strived to achieve in making these distinctions:

Conclusive and Consistent are classifications where, taking the whole body of evidence, the character’s behavior fits into one System and/or Stage, with few exceptions, or moves from one System/Stage to another during the course of the film. These are considered the classifications open to the least amount of subjective interpretation and where most judges, using the criteria developed in this study, would be expected to come to the same general conclusions. In the case of Conclusiveness, it also requires that one or more
prominent conflicts between social convention and principle exists in the respective films.

Inconclusive moral classification generally signifies the absence of a clear-cut moral dilemma in the film, where great social harm or good results from the subject's decisions, or a case where there a very few number of conflicts and the subject failed to act with any consistency. Without such conflict, it was often possible to make a sound case for either Principled or Nonprincipled development based on lesser incidents, and these cases too were considered Inconclusive. For example, a character in a film shows personal integrity by always honoring his word in business matter, but faces no clear confrontations with social injustice or wrongdoing. Although such integrity is an admirable trait, a strong case could be made for either side because he is operating completely within the Conventional environment of business. He could be honoring his word because he wants peer respect or considers it good business practice (Conventional morality) or because he understands the concept of social contracts (Principled morality.)

Inconsistency in the Harvey classification indicates that the character acted in a largely random manner, demonstrating characteristics from both Concrete and Abstract categories without any discernable pattern of change or
growth. For example, a character makes instant judgements about people and situations that are always correct, demonstrating both snap judgement (Concrete) and sensitivity to subtle clues (Abstract.)

After the individual analyses, a summary chart was created for all the characters in each film. This sheet lists the classification results for Harvey and Kohlberg, Consistent/Inconsistent, and Conclusive/Inconclusive. It also shows movement or growth between stages/systems when the subject changed during the course of the film. These charts were used as a reference for finding trends and similarities in characters. A sample of the summary chart follows on the next page. (Figure 4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOLSON SINGS AGAIN</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

| Al Jolson          | 3,1          | XXX        |

**ANTAGONIST**


**SPOUSE, LOVER**

| Ellen               | 4            | XXX        |

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

| Steve (manager)     | 4            | XXX        |

**OTHERS**

| Jolson's Father     | 4            | P          |
| Mr. Bryant (producer) | 4         | XXX        |

**NOTE:** A line between assignments indicates the character changes during the film. For example:

| Emiliano Zapata     | 4-1-4        | P          |

Figure 4. Summary Film Chart
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IV. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Because this study involves several disciplines, this chapter will try to draw together the few important studies from the different areas which lay the background for this research. These areas include general film research, film content analysis, biographical study in mass media, sociological research in film, and use of the Harvey and Kohlberg tools for content analysis.

In 1961, Daniel Boorstin wrote: "The literature on the history of celebrities and of celebrity worship is meager." (p. 273) That statement remains valid today, also in the areas of film content analysis and biographical film studies. Of the fourteen-hundred twenty theses and dissertations on film cross-listed in the University Film Association Journal (1979), only eleven are reported as content analysis studies. (Compared with two-hundred fifty-three critical studies of films and film makers.) No studies are listed for research on the biographical film.

The study most closely related to this one was performed by Dr. H. Wayne Schuth for his doctoral dissertation, The college milieu in the American fiction film with emphasis on the work of Mike Nichols (1974). Schuth analysed a sample of American feature films that had a
college setting to ascertain the image of the university and educators as presented by the movie industry. This study used the O.J. Harvey Belief Systems to classify the major characters and the anthropomoric character of the university institution. This work represents the first, and to my knowledge, the only attempt to use the Harvey scheme as a tool for film content analysis. (1) The methodology employed by Schuth, given its pilot nature, is somewhat loose in that he does not explain how the data for making his classifications was weighed for importance. Each film is analysed in essay fashion, including only the episodic material which supports his arguments. The importance of this study is not to be denied, however, because it clearly shows that the actions and statements of dramatic film characters can be related to the techniques of behavioral science classifications, and as such, it represents a landmark contribution to the demystification of film content analysis. In his findings, Schuth reports that most of the students and teachers, as well as the universities themselves, are depicted as System Ones. Most protagonists are presented as System Fours or as characters who change from System Ones to System Fours by the end of the films. Antagonists are primarily System Ones and System Threes. From these evaluations, Schuth concludes: "Judged solely from American theatrical films, the American college milieu
as a whole, has few, if any redeeming features." (p.175)

The Kohlberg Moral Stages have been applied to content analysis in a study of Supreme Court decisions by Frank J. Lower and Jerry L. Winsor (1981). Lower and Winsor selected four court opinions dealing with the First Amendment issue of obscenity between 1957 and 1973. After reading extensively to train themselves on Kohlberg, they reviewed the material independently and compared results, with what was described as "an impressive percentage of agreement." (p.12) Their findings support Kohlberg's contentions that the majority of moral reasoning in the court opinions was at the Stage Five level. The next most frequent level was Stage Four, and there were only two examples of Stage Six reasoning found in the four cases. While allowing that the sample data was small, the authors report "...we believe there is considerable scholarly potential in a Kohlbergian analysis."

The principle study of popular biographical media was performed by Leo Lowenthal in 1943. This study is mentioned prominently by Daniel Boorstin in The Image and is used as a model example in Bernard Berelson's Content Analysis in Communication Research, long regarded as a standard reference in this field. In this research, Lowenthal analysed all of the biographical articles in two magazines for one year. The material was grouped into categories
where quantitative analysis could be employed: subject’s profession, inheritance and parents, home and social life, hobbies and food preference, personality traits, and language used to describe the subject. Lowenthal’s finding showed a shift in emphasis from serious artists in the past to entertainers and celebrities, much the same trend Boorstin argues to exist in his discussion of the “hero” and the “celebrity.”

One important sociological study relating to the influence of film on public behavior is the Motion Picture Research Council study of 1933. It was financed by the Payne Research and Experiment Fund, a private foundation, under the direction of Dr. W. W. Charters of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University. In all a series of 12 studies were performed by psychologists, sociologists, and educators, using such methods as physiological experiments, rating scales, questionnaires and interviews. Subjects were classified by age, sex, economic and social status, and cultural background, among others. Several researchers concluded that the viewing of certain motion pictures had a bad effect on some young people under certain circumstances. Not all studies agreed, however, and these findings were carefully qualified.

The real importance of this research was in its effect on the motion picture industry, and in particular, on the
Motion Picture Production Code. Henry James Forman used the results of these studies to write Our Movie-Made Children, a popular book of times which sensationalized the negative findings and, according to Robert Stanley, caused the industry to tighten up the enforcement mechanism of its self-regulatory code. Stanley writes: "Whereas many of the researchers had been cautious to qualify their findings, Forman treated them as gospel intended to bring moviemakers to redemption." (1978, p. 193.)

While no other research that I have found had the scope or impact of the Payne studies a good source for additional sociological research and discussion on the influence of movies is I.C. Jarvie's Movie as Social Criticism (1978). Starting with the earliest days of film criticism and theory, Jarvie provides a historical summary of the various arguments, theories, and types of research dealing with the effects, good and bad, of film on the viewing public. (pp. 5-43) While acknowledging that the debate over film’s influence remains unresolved, Jarvie concludes that movies are more important to the adolescent subculture than to other segments of the audience and that adolescents use them as a "means of group formation and of identity reinforcement." (p. 39)

Although numerous articles have been written about the screen biography, they are generally limited in scope to the
review of a popular film or the depiction of a certain biographical subject. (For a bibliography of magazine and journal articles, see Richard Dyer McCann's reference book (1975.)) One article in particular however, by Joseph Freeman (1941), deserves mention as an excellent discussion of the screen biography as an emerging art form. Freeman connects the film biography to its historical antecedents and theorizes on its sociological functions in shaping popular opinion. As Freeman notes: "...to touch biography is to touch history, and to touch history is to touch society at its roots." Writing on the eve of World War II, he concludes that "the biographical film has only begun" (p.905) and that its power lies in illuminating history and its moral problems "with the upmost dramatic intensity." (p. 905)
FOOTNOTE

1. Harvey has been used in at least one other study that I found, this being a master’s thesis in vocational guidance: See Goldberg (1973).
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V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. No attempt was made to measure the audience effect of these films or to analyse the motivations of the film makers. It is hoped, however, that the results of this study will provide insights useful to future investigations of these two important areas. (See Review of Related Literature.)

2. No attempt was made to evaluate the historical accuracy of these films. The films are compared among themselves for similarities and not against the historical record. The screen biography's lack of fidelity in presenting the facts is near-legend and has been well-documented by numerous critics. (1)

3. Because of the nature of the Harvey and Kohlberg instruments, the study was very limited in its ability to analyse certain elements of cinematic style normally associated with direction and post-production. These elements include composition, editing, and use of music and sound effects. Certainly these areas make a significant contribution to any film; however, the Harvey and Kohlberg instruments are designed to measure people, not style. The emphasis of the study will be to examine the overall
behavior of the characters, as exhibited throughout the entire film, and not to concentrate on a few key scenes which are enhanced by a particular camera angle or strain of music. Therefore, cinematic style was analysed only in broad, general terms, in the overall treatment it gives to each character. But the results of this study should prove helpful to research which more closely examines these stylistic elements.

4. This study, like its predecessor performed by Wayne Schuth, is a qualitative analysis. Essentially, this means that it uses a looser counting method than is permitted in strict quantitative analysis. "Qualitative methods," explains Martin Maloney in An Introduction to Graduate Study in Speech and Theatre, "...involve a somewhat less systematic study of the message, and depend to a greater extent on the analyst's subjective perceptions of content significance." (1961, p. 321) Therefore, the results of this study are not as readily verifiable by other observers as with quantitative research. And as a consequence, the study does not attempt to quantify every classification, that is, to force every character into an arbitrary assignment to produce numbers. The value of using Kohlberg and Harvey lies in its exploration of a new technique for film analysis and in the determinations which can be drawn from trying this approach.
FOOTNOTE

1. The factual infidelity of the screen biography has been often lamented by film critics and scholars. Some better references are Boyajian (1970), Crowther (1946), Freeman (1941), Hartung (1943), Hill (1955), Kaufman (1945), Knight (1952), Roman (1961), Tyler (1954), and Wald (1959).
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VI. ANALYSIS OF THE FILMS

DISRAELI
(1929)

This film is unusual in that it does not cover a substantial period in the biographical figure's life, but instead concentrates on a single crisis by which we can extrapolate the full measure of the man. George Disraeli is confronted with a compounding series of dilemmas which threaten to destroy his homeland, his career, and his loved ones. The plot may seem contrived and unsophisticated by today's standards, but it is certainly the stuff of which high-ego involving stimuli is made.

And as George Disraeli comports himself as a perfect System Four, he demonstrates the nimble mind of a Herculean creative problem-solver, outwitting the Russian spies, the negotiators for the Canal, and even the president of the Bank of England. He shows high task-orientation and independent judgement by his continued determination to complete the Suez Canal negotiations in the face of opposition by the House of Commons.

Disraeli also displays Principled behavior in his sense of duty. He acts solely for the welfare of his countrymen, enduring ridicule from his colleagues in Parliament and even
anti-Semitic insults from the Bank of England president in order to complete the Suez negotiations. He alone seems to understand the importance of the Canal to British peace and security when his fellow Parliament members wish to institute an isolationist foreign policy.

Disraeli's wife is a System Three, totally devoted to her husband, uninterested in politics, willing to accept his opinions as gospel. Although in poor health, she hides her condition from Disraeli because she doesn't want to worry him. At one point, she tells him that whatever affects him is all that matters to her.

Clarissa Disraeli and her suitor, Charles, are System Ones. Charles is an impetuous young scatterbrain, eagerly jumping to conclusions at every occasion. Disraeli sends him off as a negotiator because he is "so simple and honest, no one will believe him." He displays little knowledge in matters either of politics or romance. Clarissa defends her father's policies out of loyalty, but shows no greater savvy or understanding of the world than Charles. They are two pleasant, naive children, content to follow the instructions of their elders.

The president of the Bank of England is System One, pompous, bigoted, influenced entirely by status and authority in making judgements. Mrs. Travers is also a System One. Unperceptive and easily influenced by
appearances, she is a perfect foil for Disraeli's clever machinations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>GEORGE_DISRAELI</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He is the only member in the House of Commons to perceive the danger of Russian expansion to England’s interests and counsels against an isolationist foreign policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He advocates the building of the Suez Canal to protect Britain’s interests in India.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He plays along with his secretary and Mrs. Travers, knowing they are Russian spies, to learn what they are planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adept role-playing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He chooses Charles to negotiate for the Canal because the lad is &quot;so simple and honest&quot; no one will believe that he isn’t a shrewd negotiator putting on an act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he learns that Myers, his principal backer for the Canal is bankrupt, he refuses to give up. Instead he sends Myers back to sit in his office and &quot;look prosperous&quot; because &quot;something may happen.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate, reserved in judgements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He delays Mrs. Travers from spreading the news that Myers is bankrupt by pretending to be sick.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARACTER ___ GEORGE DISRAELI, CONT.  

He endures anti-semitic insults from the president of the Bank of England without losing his composure or defending his personal honor in order to protect the Suez Canal project and the welfare of England.

Welfare of others over self

He bluffs the president into guaranteeing the project by playing on his ignorance of Parliamentary powers.

Creative problem-solving
Nathan Rothschild is portrayed as a System Four man who is briefly reduced to System Two behavior by acts of anti-Semitism. But he is also portrayed as a man whose high principles will not let him remain at that level for very long. His first major decision in the film is one that shows both independent critical judgement and Principled morality. He secures a very risky loan to help the Allied Forces fight Napoleon. None of the other lenders will do it, but Rothschild shows his Principled sense of priorities when he values the welfare of Europe over good business practice. The very people he helps return his altruism with anti-Semitic prejudice: he is snubbed by everyone except Wellington, not invited to their celebration party, and cheated out of the biggest loan in Europe because he is a Jew. At this point, he lashes back in anger, demonstrating close-minded, Concrete behavior. He reneges on his promise to let his daughter marry the gentile Capt. Fitzroy, displaying the same irrational prejudice and Conventional morality that his enemies have used against him. This is the only time in the film that he shows less than System Four behavior. But when he takes revenge on Count Ledrantz and his bigoted associates, using shrewd business methods to force them to sell him the large loan, he still maintains a consistency in his professional System Four behavior.
Even when his motives are Nonprincipled, wanting in this case to get back at the man who cheated him, he never loses his Abstract intellect or his ability to solve problems with emotional detachment. Rothschild's anger is brief, however, and his moral standards are too high for him to resort to personal vengeance for long. Even when Ledrantz and his partners harass the Jewish ghetto and put his family's life in danger, he refuses to accept Napoleon's lucrative loan proposition, believing, as he tells his brothers, that peace is more important than money. Instead, he agrees to support Ledrantz and the Allied forces in spite of the way they have treated him. Here, and throughout the rest of the film, he shows himself to be an extremely Principled man who understands that the welfare of others is more important than personal profit.

Rothschild's antagonists, headed by Count Ledrantz, are consistently System One and Nonprincipled. They value status over information and expertise, as shown by their anti-Semitic behavior toward Rothschild. They have no regard for his courage, his principles, or his brilliance. They are close-minded bigots who, rather than showing gratitude to, or even begrudging civility to, the one man who saved them from Napoleon's conquest, seek to cheat him instead. Unscrupulous as they are, they prove no match for Rothschild, showing themselves to be trite, unimaginative problem solvers in financial competition.
Only Wellington stands out as a Principled System Four among the Allied supporters, having the open mind and independent critical judgement to regard Rothschild for his character. And he has the conscience to apologize for his government's unwarranted behavior. He has the Principled perception to recognize the injustice of Rothschild's mistreatment.

Nathan Rothschild's brothers are generally Concrete System One and Non-Principled. They are in favor of taking the most lucrative offer Napoleon makes, and do not see beyond Conventional standards of morality in their business practices until Nathan points them out. Nathan's wife, Hanna, is Abstract and apparently Principled, showing total devotion to, and support for, his beliefs. On the one occasion when he makes an irrational Concrete decision, not to let their daughter marry Fitzroy, she does not insist on changing his mind. Instead, she lives with his mistake, seeming to prefer the interpersonal harmony of a System Three. Nathan's father and mother are System Four, Principled. At the beginning of the film, the elder Rothschild displays his creative problem-solving ability when he tells his sons to go to the five different countries and exchange letters instead of money to circumvent unfair taxes. And when Nathan tells his brothers that they must fight for peace, Mrs. Rothschild remarks: "That is exactly what your father would have said."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>NATHAN ROTHSCHILD</th>
<th>HARVEY</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

He accepts the bad risk other bankers refuse of loaning money to the Allied forces, believing that the defeat of Napoleon is more important than protecting his money.
- Welfare of others over self-gain
- Independent, critical judgement

He learns of the biggest loan in history through his "magic source" and manages to make the lowest bid, outsmarting his competitors.
- Creative problem-solving

He allows his daughter to accept a proposal of marriage from Capt. Fitzroy, a gentile, letting his daughter’s happiness take precedence over religious prejudice.
- Open-minded, flexible
- Independent, critical judgement

When he is disqualified from the big loan on the "technicality" that he is Jewish, he changes his mind and stubbornly refuses to let his daughter marry Fitzroy, telling him: "You are not of our race."
- Close-minded, inflexible
- Revenge, rewards and punishments

He forces his foes to sell him the bond loan he was cheated out of by lowering the price of his competitive bond issue.
- Creative problem-solving
- Revenge, rewards and punishments
When Napoleon escapes from Elba and offers the Rothschilds 450,000 francs for their support, he stands against his brothers in refusing the offer. He believes, again, that helping the people of Europe is more important than personal gain. "We are more than five rich Jews looking for money. We must fight for peace, not war."

Principle over conformity
Welfare of others over self-gain
Independent, critical judgement

He bluffs his enemies into freeing the Jews from the ghetto and agrees to loan the Allied forces money when no other bank will take the chance.

Principle over conformity (revenge)
Creative problem-solving

He changes his mind and allows his daughter to marry Fitzroy.

Open-minded, flexible

He risks his entire fortune buying stocks to support the market when everyone else is selling. "I made a deal I won't go back on my word... I am giving everything for peace."

Principle over conformity
Welfare of others over self-gain
Independent, critical judgement

He goes to the market, helping to suppress the panic by his presence. He reveals his "magic source" of information, carrier pigeons, and saves the economy by announcing that Napoleon is defeated.

Creative problem-solving
Welfare of others over self-gain
VIVA VILLA
(1934)

Pancho Villa is portrayed as a System Two with a moral development that is both Principled and Nonprincipled. He has a negative attitude toward, and is distrustful of, authority; in this case the Mexican government, an attitude that stems from the murder of his father by the corrupt domos and soldiers. He is rash and impulsive, prone to snap decisions, and trite in his approach to problem-solving. His predictable response when faced with a dilemma is to settle it with a gun. His anti-establishment behavior is obviously demonstrated by his rebellion against the Mexican government. To Villa, all soldiers and domos are enemies. Even after the revolution succeeds and he is President, he is suspicious of his own ministers. His moral development is less consistent and believable. On the one hand, he lives by the most primitive concepts of justice -- rewards, punishment, and revenge. He does not understand the need for laws and social order, why he should not shoot his prisoners, why he should go to jail for robbing a bank, or why any of his actions are considered criminal. His dying words express this incomprehension: "What I done wrong, Johnny?" However, mixed with this Preconventional logic is the remarkable and improbable Principled understanding of social equality. Villa fights against the corrupt government because he believes that the land should belong to the people who work it. He never seeks personal gain and
readily sacrifices his all for the good of the cause. He gives up the presidency because his lack of competency is hurting the people. He is totally devoted to Madero because he sees him as the man who can institute land reform.

Villa's chief antagonist is the sinister General Pascal, whose excessive villainy displays traits from both Concrete and Abstract systems. As a System One, he is dogmatic and insensitive in his quest for power, ruthlessly eliminating anyone who stands in his way. However, he pursues his goals with social manipulation and adept problem-solving, and certainly with high task orientation, by pretending to support Madero and waiting for the revolution to succeed before launching his coup. In short, he seems to be too much the stereotypical villain to form a logical pattern, combining whatever nasty qualities are needed at the moment. Certainly his moral development is demonstrably Nonprincipled. He is totally self-directed, having no regard for people, laws, or social mores. He operates at the base of the Preconventional scale, without even a child's understanding of justice or fair play.

Madero is more than simply Principled; he is a veritable Christ-figure embodying all of the virtue and decency that Villa admires but doesn't understand. If the bulb went out in the film projector, he would no doubt glow in the dark on the screen. In the film, he is even called "The Christ-Fool." His Belief System is Four, with minor
incongruities. He is open-minded and flexible, trusting the peasant Villa without regard to his low social station. He can be independently critical and resolute in his judgments, refusing to accept Villa's help unless he agrees not to shoot his prisoners, an indication also of Principled behavior. But he is also a naive man, insensitive to Pascal's treacherous nature, something Villa senses at once.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>PANCHO VILLA</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a boy, he avenges the death of his father by stabbing the man who killed him.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snap, impulsive decision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-establishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tells his men to kill two domos for every peasant he finds slain in a mock trial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-establishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He casually agrees to marry Rosita when she insists that marriage is the only way she will have him.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He decides to kidnap Johnny Sikes so that the reporter will write stories about his exploits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status-conscious</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is impressed with Madero at their first meeting and agrees to follow him. He immediately senses that Madero is a good man. &quot;You brings great dreams to my heart.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snap judgement</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive to subtle cues</td>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He decides to attack Santa Rosalia against Pascale’s orders to fulfill Johnny Sikes’ new story claiming he had already captured the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Status over facts</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He listens to Madero and agrees to reform his savage fighting tactics and even to give up his army after the revolution is successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He allows himself to be arrested for the accidental murder of the bank teller, a crime he doesn’t understand, because he has given his word to Madero that he will obey the law.

- Authority over facts
- Principle over personal welfare

He loses his self-respect and becomes a drunken bum in El Paso after he is banished from Mexico.

- Trite, inept problem-solving
- Close-minded, negative

He decides to return to Mexico to avenge the death of Madero, which he does by raising the peon armies and marching to the capital.

- Revenge
- Anti-establishment

He finds himself unable to comprehend or solve the problems of running the country.

When his ministers tell him Mexico needs more money, he tells them to print it.

He is distrustful of all ministers.

- Trite, inept problem-solving
- Anti-status over facts

He steps down from office because he decides he is unfit for the job.

- Facts over status
- Welfare of others over self-gain
The opening of this film tells us that it was "suggested by romances and incidents" of Ziegfeld's life. And perhaps these anecdotal origins help to explain the inconsistencies in his screen characterization. In his major decisions and actions, Ziegfeld behaves like a System Four personality. He handles his professional affairs with a great degree of creativity in problem-solving, with flexibility, independent judgement, and high task orientation. But he is also portrayed as extravagant, impulsive, and status-conscious, all traits of System One behavior. Perhaps these later characteristics were needed to match the legends of the real-life Ziegfeld. In the screen depiction of his character, though, they are little more than window dressing, minor excesses that give him flamboyance without detracting from his Abstract behavior in situations of high ego-involvement.

As seen on his chart, Ziegfeld's most prominent System Four traits are creative problem solving and high task orientation. He works tirelessly to outdo himself, to produce constantly bigger and better shows. Even as he dies at the end of the movie, he dreams of a new Follies, and his last words are: "more steps...higher, higher..."

Ziegfeld faces no major moral dilemmas in this film that would clearly force him to choose between convention
and principle. He is a man capable of endless chicanery and subterfuge in getting the best for his shows. He double-talks customers, lies to reporters, and steals acts from Billings, all seemingly indicative of NonPrincipled behavior. However, the world of show business in which he operates is presented as a contest of wits, where normal standards of morality do not apply, like a game of poker, where lying is really bluffing and stealing an act is just winning a hand.

In his personal relationships, Ziegfeld proves to be more Principled and honor-bound. He never lies to his wives or his employees, never misrepresents himself to those who put their trust in him. And when he makes a promise, he keeps it. He insists on honoring his verbal contract to pay Sandow the strongman. He stands by his promise to star Audry in a show even when she proves difficult. He remains faithful to Anna Held, even though she accuses him of acting otherwise. This personal code of honor suggests a Principled moral stage.

Bilings, Ziegfeld's chief rival, is more of a friendly competitor than a true antagonist. Although he lacks Ziegfeld's cleverness in problem-solving and is thus constantly outwitted, he demonstrates the same open-mindedness, flexibility, and independent critical judgement of a System Four. When he is outsmarted and Ziegfeld takes his acts, even his chauffeur, he never becomes spiteful or vindictive.
In fact, he is the only one willing to back Ziegfeld's radically new idea for the Follies. He shows adeptness in role-playing throughout the film, pretending to be Ziegfeld's archenemy while always supporting him in times of true trouble. At the end of the film, Billings even offers to back Ziegfeld in a new show, a pretense to bolster his competitor's hopes, when he is, himself, destitute. In this manner, he seems to be Principled, like Ziegfeld, understanding that their professional rivalry is a game and demonstrating true compassion when a real need arises.

Anna Held, Ziegfeld's first wife, displays less consistency in her System behavior. She is extremely dependent on others for her beliefs, and is easily swayed from one opinion to another, especially by Ziegfeld and his glibness. However, this same ease with which she changes her mind demonstrates her impulsiveness and her penchant for snap-decisions. She makes up her mind with the finality and dogmatism of a System One, only to change it an instant later. Because she has no regard for interpersonal harmony and no instinct for social manipulation, her flexibility seems uncharacteristic of a System Three. And she shows absolutely no tolerance for ambiguity—her switches in judgement are always polemic and extreme. Thus, her reactionary behavior argues more logically for a Concrete System One classification. She seems to mature to a more Abstract stage in her last scene in the film, when she calls Flo to
wish him happiness in his new marriage. She chokes back the tears to wish him all the best, indicating a new awareness of her appearance to others. Throughout the rest of the film, she wore her every emotion on her sleeve, oblivious to the guile of others, but here she demonstrates adeptness at role-playing and a sensitivity to subtle nuances in Ziegfeld’s conversation.

Billy Burke, Flo’s second wife, is a strong-willed, level-headed System Four, unimpressed by status and certainly by Ziegfeld’s flamboyant manner. She is not attracted by his mere celebrity status, but is, in fact, wary of it, and prefers to make her evaluation of him on the basis of facts. She is flexible and sensitive to his extravagant nature, but critically independent in the crunch. She insists on selling her jewelry and going back to work when he falls into financial ruin.
He turns his almost-bankrupt show with Sandow into a success by promoting the strong man’s sex appeal to the women and giving them a chance to touch his muscles.

Creative problem solving 4
Open-minded, flexible 4

He decides to leave the music conservatory to a try in show business, even though his father threatens to disown him. He knows he will not be happy in the conservatory.

Independent, critical judgement 4
Facts over status and authority 4

When his competitors get suspicious about the fight he arranges between a bear and a lion, he calls up the Humane Society anonymously to get it cancelled.

Creative problem solving 4

He tricks Billings into revealing who he is trying to sign, Anna Held, and then talks her into signing with him, even though he is broke and admits he can’t pay her.

Creative problem solving 4

He turns Held into an overnight star by sending her orchids and 20 gallons of milk a day to bathe in, creating a glamorous image for the press.

Creative problem solving 4

He conceives the idea for a new kind of Broadway show, the Follies, using girls and music, and tricks Billings into financing it.

Independent critical judgement 4
Creative problem solving 4

He arranges to meet Billie Burke at the masquerade party and plays along when she doesn’t know his identity and him as a third party.

Creative problem solving 4
Adept at role-playing 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: FLO ZIEGFELD, CONT.</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he has no money to pay the costumer, he tricks the man into providing the dresses by threatening to refuse them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He becomes so irate when he overhears four men call him a has-been that he hocks his wife's jewels and produces four hit shows just to prove them wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees through the deception but plays along when Billings offers him money for a new show, knowing that Billings is just as broke as he is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adept at role-playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He dies dreaming that he is producing a new show, bigger and more lavish than ever. “I’ve got to get more steps... Higher, higher...”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Little needs to be explained about the classification of Louis Pasteur after examining his chart. He is the veritable embodiment of System Four behavior: a relentless investigator, objective, open-minded truth-seeker, and creative problem-solver. He is also extremely Principled, always working for the good of humanity and putting that good above outmoded laws or his personal welfare.

Perhaps the clearest illustration of his Principled character occurs when he decides to give both Johnny and the Russian peasants the rabies vaccine before it has been approved. He knows that the decisions can mean imprisonment, even a death sentence, but he also knows that the vaccine is their only chance to survive. He breaks both the law and established scientific procedure to obey a higher moral dictate.

Pasteur’s antagonists are the physicians of the French Medical Academy, led by Dr. Charbonnet. They are as uniformly System One as Pasteur is System Four: complacent, inflexible, content with the status-quo and negatively aroused by new ideas and information. Not only do they reject Pasteur’s theory of microbes without investigating it, they convince the King of France to have his work stopped. They show strong religious dogmatism. The question of immunity, states the chairman of the Agricul-
tural Board, "goes beyond the scope of science. When you ask how or why, I must refer you to the theologians."

Charbonnet makes a rather abrupt transformation to System Four at the end of the film when he accepts Pasteur's theory and asks to be given the rabies vaccine. He also shows Principled behavior when he refuses to hold Pasteur to their bargain. He has the legal right to make Pasteur disclaim his vaccine, but tears up the agreement in order to allow Pasteur to continue his beneficial work.

Pasteur's wife, Marie, is a System Four, despite her seemingly domestic System One role as a devoted housewife who cooks and cleans and worries about her family. In moments of high emotional involvement (when Louis faces a crisis), she demonstrates independent judgement and open-mindedness. She is never afraid to express her views or disagree with her husband, but she is also flexible enough to understand the importance of his work. She voices her concern but ultimately supports, even encourages, his decisions to defy the establishment.
CHARACTER__LOUIS PASTEUR_________ | BELIEF | MORAL
| SYSTEM | STAGE

He directs his assistants to continue
looking for the microbe after the
French Medical Academy denounces his
work.
  Independent judgement  | 4
  High task-orientation  | 4
  Information over authority  | 4

When the Emperor of France orders him
to stop his research, he leaves his
comfortable life in Paris for a cottage
in the country, rather than comply.
  High task-orientation  | 4
  Information over authority & status  | 4

Working in Arbois, he develops a
vaccine for anthrax.
  Creative problem-solver  | 4

He accepts the French Academy’s
challenge to test his vaccine.
  Open-minded, flexible  | 4

He seeks no personal triumph in
proving his vaccine successful but works
only for "the sake of France."
"Benefits of science are not for
scientists. They are for humanity."
  Welfare of others over self-gain  | Prin.

He drives himself and his assistants for
a year working on a cure for hydro-
phobia. He refuses to give up, even
when Charbonnet seems to disprove his
work by injecting himself with
rabies serum.
  High task-orientation  | 4
  Reserved, deliberate judgement  | 4
  Independent judgement  | 4

A chance remark by his wife triggers
him to conceive the attenuated vaccine
theory.
  Creative problem-solving  | 4
  Open-minded, flexible  | 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: LOUIS PASTEUR, CONT.</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He spends a long time at Johnny’s bedside considering whether or not to give him the vaccine before making a decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved, deliberate judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He decides to give Johnny the vaccine as the only chance to save his life, knowing that failure will mean prison or death.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare of others over self</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He believes so strongly in his germ theory that he agrees to reject his rabies so that Charbonnet will wash his hands before attending his daughter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He insists on leaving his sick bed to treat the Russian peasants personally, at the risk of his own health. Again, he administers the untested vaccine as their only hope, risking prison or death.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare of others over self</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the ceremony honoring his work, he tells the young doctors and scientists to be tolerant and open to criticism. &quot;Do not be skeptical or discouraged... Be not angry at your colleagues who disagree with you...No theory is accepted without opposition.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He also tells them that their job is &quot;to contribute to the welfare and happiness of mankind.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principle over convention</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emile Zola is portrayed as a man who slips from System Four to System One because of success and changes back to System Four because of his Principled conscience. As an unsuccessful writer at the beginning of the film, he makes his first Principled judgement when he decides to write about social injustice rather than "perfumed lies." From then on, he becomes a fierce, independent spirit, attacking government hypocrisy and incompetence wherever he finds it. However, the success of these books makes him a rich man, and the easy life of wealth brings complacency. He becomes more concerned with status-symbols than social issues.

While the controversy of the Dreyfus trial rages in the streets, Zola is shown buying lobsters with his wife. He tells Mrs. Dreyfus, who comes to beg for his help in proving her husband’s innocence, that "the case is officially closed. I’ve lived my life. I’ve had enough of turmoil, of strife." He has become a close-minded System One, more influenced by authority and status than information. He is also, however, a Principled man who, try as he might, cannot turn his back on injustice. Finally, he tears up his invitation to the French Academy and writes a public letter of accusation to the French military, showing that he is once again the independent, task-oriented System Four man he was in the beginning of the film.

While Zola fights bureaucratic hypocrisy everywhere,
his primary antagonist is the French military command, which is presented in this film as a group of close-minded, self-serving, incompetent System Ones. Rather than admit a mistake, they try to keep an innocent man in jail in order to protect their image. As one general puts it earlier in the film: "The army doesn’t make mistakes." Colonel Picard, the one officer who thinks that the army should admit its failing, and who proves that Dreyfus is innocent, receives no praise for his astute detective work, but is instead reprimanded for "exceeding his duty." He is then prevented from telling the truth in Zola’s trial with the aid of the French court, which proves to be as close-minded and protective of the status-quo as the Army. Its behavior is also consistently Nonprincipled, sending an innocent man to jail, covering up the truth, even inciting rioters to intimidate Zola and beat up his supporters.

Zola’s wife is Abstract, flexible, devoted to her husband and generally content to follow his decisions, indicating a System Three personality. However, she shows independent critical judgement and Principled understanding when she argues against Zola leaving France after the trial. She tells him that to flee would be against his purpose, against what he stands for, implying a highly ethical System Four development.
He decides not to write any more "perfumed lies" (popular material), but instead to attack social injustice.

Independent, critical thinking
Principle, welfare of others over conformity

Prin.

He refuses to stop writing about social injustice when threatened by his boss and quits his job.

Independent, critical thinking
Principle, welfare of others over self-gain

Prin.

He scours Paris investigating social problems and writing about unpopular subjects -- poverty, poor safety conditions, prostitution, etc.

High task orientation
Principle, welfare of others over conformity

Prin.

He listens to Nana, a streetwalker, as she tells her life story, and writes a book on her exploits.

Information over status
Open-minded, information-seeking

Prin.

He writes a book about the vain, incompetent French generals who caused the Franco-Prussian War of 1970.

Information over status
Principle over social conformity

Prin.

Years pass, and as a rich and successful writer, he points with pride to his fine collection of art.

Status over expertise

1

He refuses to get involved in the Dreyfuss affair. He ignores the controversy, spending his days shopping with his wife.

Close-minded, dogmatic
Status over information
Self-welfare over principle

Nonp.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>EMILE ZOLA, CONT.</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When Mrs. Dreyfuss pleads with him to help her husband, he at first refuses, saying: &quot;The case is officially closed. I have had enough of turmoil, of strife.&quot; Close-minded, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After she leaves, he reconsiders, tears up his invitation to the French Academy. He writes a letter accusing the French Army of a cover-up in the Dreyfuss affair. Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts over status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle, welfare of others over self-gain, conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He fights against the army in a libel case, refusing to be badgered by huge jeering crowds outside the court. Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle over conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He listens to his wife and friends and decides to flee to England instead of going to jail, so that he can continue writing and speaking for Dreyfuss. Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle over legal conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tells his wife, after Dreyfuss has been exonerated that he realizes he had become smug and complacent, that &quot;Wars must be won with ideas.&quot; Self-critical of actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abraham Lincoln is depicted as a thoroughly consistent, Principled, System Four personality. His judgements are always deliberate, reserved, and independently critical. He refuses to go into law until he has thought the matter over thoroughly. He is the only uninvolved party who doesn’t jump to the conclusion that the Clay brothers are guilty when the whole town is ready to lynch them. He shows creative problem-solving in his ability to talk the angry mob out of lynching the Clay brothers by using humor. His biggest problem in the film is proving his clients innocent, which he does by using the Farmer’s Almanac to expose Palmer Cass as the real murderer. His high task orientation is demonstrated by his persistence in fighting his case, refusing to give up even when the judge believes it’s hopeless. And he is constantly open-minded, always pointing out every side of an issue.

There are two episodes in the film that point clearly to his Principled character. The first occurs when he stands up against the angry lynch mob to defend the Clay brothers’ right to a fair trial. Here he is fighting for a moral principle which the law guarantees and which the rest of the town is ready to violate: equal justice and the right of every citizen to a fair trial. The second episode occurs in the courtroom, when Mrs. Clay refuses to pick one of her sons as the murderer. Lincoln supports her defiance even
though she is technically breaking the law. He argues that
complying with the court’s order to answer the question
would be morally wrong because it would be forcing a mother
to choose between her sons. As he tells the judge: "I may
not know so much about the law, your honor, but I know
what’s right and what’s wrong." This statement symbolizes
Lincoln’s concept of moral behavior and the law. He clearly
sees that the law is meant to reflect basic principles, and
when these principles are being violated, then the law is
either being disobeyed or misinterpreted.

Felter, the prosecutor and Lincoln’s principal
antagonist, is just the opposite of Lincoln: a Nonprincipled
System One, a stickler for the letter of the law who shows
no concern for or understanding of the principles at stake.
He supports the status-quo without hesitation or critical
inquiry. He begins his opening argument with the
Nonprincipled, rule-oriented admonition: "Thou shalt not
kill!" He selects the jury on the basis of social prestige
and community standing, valuing status over information
(while, in contrast, Lincoln makes his choices by
disregarding appearances and judging character). And his
prosecution of the Clay brothers is trite, unimaginative,
and riddled with cliched speeches.

Lincoln’s sweetheart, Mary Todd, demonstrates the
Abstract flexibility and dependence on interpersonal harmony
of a System Three. She expresses no strong opinions or
judgements on any of the issues Lincoln deals with in the film. Her coy demeanor around Lincoln suggests adeptness at role-playing and social manipulation. However, she also displays a preoccupation with parties and the social life, which suggests the status-consciousness of a System One personality. Therefore, it is arguable whether she is attracted to Lincoln because of his character or his rising prominence.

With the possible exception of Stephen Douglas, no one else in the film rises above a Concrete level. Douglas remains more cautious and guarded toward his potential adversary Lincoln than Felter. He carefully studies Lincoln throughout the trial and after its outcome remarks: "That's the last time I will underestimate Mr. Lincoln." This statement suggests a perceptive, critical thinker who learns from his experiences. Because he stays in the shadows for much of the film, posing as more of an observer than a participant in the moral issues between Lincoln and Felter, his moral stage is not clearly definable. Mrs. Clay and her sons appear to be decent but ineffective System One characters, unable to save themselves without Lincoln's help. When Scrub White is murdered, each brother jumps to the conclusion that the other one is guilty. Mrs. Clay shows high religious dogmatism, entrusting her fate entirely to the Lord. The trial judge demonstrates a curious mixture of System One and System Four behavior characteristics that
detract from his credibility as a believable character. At one moment, he acts like a dim-witted yokel, slow to catch a joke; then, in the next, he possesses the wisdom of Solomon. His is a stereotypical caricature, seemingly drawn more from burlesque comedy than from real behavior.
CHARACTER: ABRAHAM LINCOLN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

He carefully weighs all of the negative arguments about a law career at the grave of his sweetheart before making a decision.

- Open-minded, flexible
- Reserved, deliberate judgement
- Independent, critical judgement

He agrees to defend the Clay brothers when the rest of the town immediately assumes the two boys are guilty.

- Open-minded, flexible
- Independent, critical judgement

He uses humor and quotes from the Bible to dissuade the angry mob from lynching the brothers.

- Creative problem solving
- Adept at role-playing
- Moral principle over social conformity

He supports Mrs. Clay when she refuses to choose between her sons on the witness stand, even though her defiance violates the law. "I may not know so much about the law, your honor, but I know what's right and what's wrong."

- Independent critical judgement
- Moral principle over legal conformity

He refuses to conclude the case is lost when it looks hopeless and the judge suggests he turn the defense over to a more seasoned lawyer.

- Reserved, deliberate judgement
- High task orientation

He wins the case and traps Palmer Cass as the real murderer by using the Farmer’s Almanac to prove Cass was lying about the night being "moon bright."

- Creative problem solving

Prin.
Dr. Paul Ehrlich is a model of System Four and Principled behavior throughout this film. He demonstrates open-mindedness, high task-orientation, and creative problem-solving in his constant fight to cure disease. And he demonstrates independent, critical judgement in his persistent fight with the established medical community. His Abstract thinking and Principled dedication enable him to make discoveries his contemporaries think impossible: staining microbes, developing vaccines for snakebite and dyptheria, and using chemicals to cure syphilis. He is a man driven to find the truth, refusing to accept the narrow-minded judgements of his superiors. He persists in his work to find a cure for syphilis against incredible odds: when his work is ridiculed, when his funds are cut off, when his best friend, Emile, doubts him, and even when he performs over six-hundred experiments without success. He is always shown as an extremely Principled man who understands the moral obligations of his research. His dedication stems from the Principled concept of helping humanity by wiping out disease and never from the slightest thought of personal gain. The most dramatic example of this Principled attitude occurs when he has developed his yet-untested vaccine for dyptheria. The hospital supervisor orders him to follow standard experimental procedure and vaccinate only half of
order, risking criminal charges and his reputation, to innoculate all of the children. He is guided by a principle rather than conformity to the norm, refusing to let half of the children die simply to satisfy a scientific procedure.

Ehrlich's major antagonist is the stodgy, close-minded scientific community, personified by the hospital supervisor and the budget committee. They are System One protectors of the status-quo, hostile to his ideas because they contradict traditional scientific opinion. Their moral development is lodged in Nonprincipled rule-oriented conformity. The hospital supervisor fires Ehrlich because he disobeys an order and attends Koch's lecture to seek information. The budget committee cuts off his funding at the foundation because they can't see the financial benefits of his research on syphilis. Their concepts of right and wrong are determined by the rule book or the checkbook, respectively.

Emile Von Behring, Ehrlich's closest friend and associate, is portrayed as a Principled man who moves from Concrete to Abstract development by virtue of his conscience and dedication to the same ideals held by Ehrlich. As a man of conviction, he shares Ehrlich's passion to better the human condition, but lacks his deductive abilities and calm judgement. He is emotional and quick to jump to the wrong conclusions. He lashes out at Ehrlich for continuing to work on the seemingly insignificant problem of snake bites instead of serious disease, not perceiving that Ehrlich's
discoveries in immunization can be applied to dyptheria. He grows lazy and complacent, finally refusing to support the value of his old friend's research into a chemical cure for syphilis. However, at the end of the film, he realizes that he was wrong not to trust Ehrlich. He comes to Ehrlich's defense in the libel suit and admits that he had become short-sighted, forgetting that "Science is the search for the truth."

Ehrlich's wife, Hedwig, appears to be a System Three, a woman who shows devotion to and deference toward her husband without an expression of critical judgement as to why she holds him in such high esteem. She is more a personal attendant than an equal partner in marriage, keeping the house, caring for him and the children, worrying about his health, and playing the piano on command, even at his death.
CHARACTER: PAUL EHRlich |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He disobeyes the irrelevant hospital procedure and lets a patient discontinue steam treatments that are making the patient too weak to hold his job.

- Independent, critical judgement
- Welfare of others over conformity
- Information-seeking over authority

He spends all his free hours after work experimenting on staining microbes.

- High task orientation
- Information-seeking

He is prepared to quit his job, but changes his mind after his wife slyly comments about the rising cost of their daughter’s milk.

- Sensitive to subtle clues

He goes to the Koch lecture against his superior’s orders and speaks up at the meeting, knowing that his supervisor is there and that it will cost him his job.

- Information-seeking over authority

He continues working on his staining research to the point where he ruins his health and contracts tuberculosis.

- High task orientation

He becomes curious about why an old man doesn’t die of snake bite and uses this phenomenon to develop a theory of immunization.

- Creative problem-solving
- Independent, critical judgement
- Open-minded, positive to new ideas

He applies his immunity research to find a cure for the larger threat of dyptheria.

- Creative problem-solving
- Open-minded, positive to new ideas
When the hospital supervisor instructs him to test his diphtheria vaccine scientifically by innoculating only half the children, he disobeys to save all the children, risking his reputation and imprisonment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle, welfare of others over conformity, self</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He continues to work for a cure for syphilis even when the foundation cuts off his support and his best friend, Emile, doubts the value of his research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle over convention</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He starts a libel suit against the medical establishment to vindicate his vaccine and save lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare of others over conformity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alvin York embodies too many different and contradictory characteristics to classify him significantly into any Belief System during much of this film. At the beginning, he is reckless, anti-establishment, and insensitive. But he is also highly task-oriented and a creative problem-solver. One moment he is an irresponsible drunkard, shooting up the yard of the church, the next he is diligently working night and day to buy a farm.

His moral stage is no easier to interpret. When lightning strikes his gun on his way to seek revenge, definitely a Preconventional motive, he immediately assumes that he has experienced a miracle and becomes a devout Christian. He follows the teachings of the Bible and shows himself to be a selfless Good Samaritan, following the Golden Rule, a sign of Principled development. But here's the rub -- he follows the Golden Rule from the standpoint of a Conventional mentality. He seems not so much to understand it as he does to obey it as an absolute commandment. It is an order from the Bible, which he believes is literally true. This literal interpretation and complete entrusting of his fate to the Deity indicates Concrete religious dogmatism and Nonprincipled, rule-oriented acceptance of authority. In other words, his actions are Principled and Abstract, but his motives are
highly muddled logic, which asks us to accept perfectly
contrived lightning bolts as miracles and Concrete dogmatism
and snap judgements as the way to achieve Abstract
development.

There is, however, one more element needed to complete
this film's illogical equation for Abstract, Principled
development: patriotism, more specifically, American
patriotism. As a conscientious-objector, York cannot
assimilate the contradiction between obeying the law and
obeying the Bible until he reads a book on United States
history, while the strains of "The Battle Hymn of the
Republic" play softly underneath. The book, his captain
explains, is about "protecting freedom." And he agrees to
fight by deciding to trust in "something bigger" than
himself. What this "something bigger" is not explained in
the film. But since it leads him to carry a gun and shoot
at other human beings, the message is unmistakable: killing
people is not always wrong. Killing people to protect
freedom is not contrary to the Golden Rule. Jesus and
Gandhi would carry rifles to fight the Kaiser's army in this
case. York later expounds a more logical explanation (and
raises a headier moral question) when he says he killed "to
save lives, to stop them guns." To argue whether killing is
ever justified is a topic for philosophical debate and is
beyond the bounds of this study. The point is that York's
motives are too ambiguous and fused to make clear the
classification. One could build a strong argument for Concrete or Abstract, Principled or Nonprincipled; because traits from all are blended together. For the sake of forced assignment, I would classify York as a System Two, Nonprincipled character who moves to Principled System Four after getting hit by a bolt of lightning and reading a patriotic book.

York's mother is a System One, a fundamentalist who believes in the traditional values of God and country. Her moral stage is similar to York's: mystically Principled, following the Golden Rule and showing a concern for others out of devout religious dogmatism rather than intellectual understanding.

Pastor Rosier Pile seems somewhat more flexible and, consequently, less ready to condemn, but still clings to traditional religious teachings with unquestioning devotion.

Gracie Williamson is Abstract System Three, not so much concerned with the ethical or social issues York grapples with in this film as she is with how he treats her.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>ALVIN YORK</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He creates a drunken disturbance outside the local church and shoots his initials into a tree, oblivious to the Sunday morning service inside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tells Gracie Williamson that he intends to marry her, irregardless of her feelings. He doesn’t notice her resentment. “There ain’t nothing I can’t do if I set my mind to it.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He determines to raise the money to buy a piece of bottom land, even though his mother tells him it’s impossible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He manages to raise the last part of the money by talking the land owner into an extension and winning a turkey shoot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He goes out to drink, threatening revenge, when the landowner sells the land to someone else.</td>
<td>Trite, inept problem-solving</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When lightening strikes his gun, he immediately interprets the event as an act of God and goes into the nearby church for conversion.</td>
<td>Snap judgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He surprises the landowner and his rival suitor by offering to sharecrop the land, expressing no animosity to either. He also offers to let Gracie out of her marriage commitment.</td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare of others over self-gain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTER</td>
<td>ALVIN YORK, CONT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He teaches his Sunday school class with absolute faith in the literal interpretation of the Bible, saying "There ain't nothing written in the book that ain't the truth."

- Close-minded, dogmatic

He applies for objector exemption from the draft because "The book's agin killing, so the book's agin war."

- Independent, critical judgement
- Close-minded, dogmatic
- Welfare of others over conformity

He agrees to enlist (but not to fight) when his exemption is denied only because the law required it.

- Pro-Authority over information

He refuses a promotion because the service goes against his religious beliefs, but agrees to read a book on U.S. history and think over his decision.

- Independent critical judgement
- Open-minded, flexible
- Principle over conformity or personal welfare

He spends his furlough alone in the woods thinking and finally decides to accept the promotion on grounds of trusting in "something bigger" than himself.

- Reserved, deliberate judgement
- Open-minded, flexible
- Independent, critical judgement

He captures 132 German soldiers alone by adapting an old trick he used in turkey hunting.

- Creative problem-solving

He refuses lucrative offers to exploit his fame, saying "Some of them (fellow soldiers) ain't coming back. Things like that ain't for buying and selling."

- Principle over self-gain
- Independent, critical judgement
Lou Gehrig is a System Four baseball player, but a System One personality. On the field, he displays one recurring trait of System Four behavior: he is highly task oriented, never missing a game in his career, not even on his wedding day. But off the field, he is insensitive to subtle (and sometimes obvious) clues, and rash in making judgements. As a decision maker, he is a willow in the wind -- affable, unquestioning, willing to accept whatever life has in store for him. He is uncritical and eager to conform to authority and social convention. He accepts the tragedy of his disease with the same good grace as he accepts the years of success. He is never confronted with any moral dilemmas in this film that are applicable to Kohlberg-Dewey and thus remains unclassified in Conventional-Principled development.

The major female characters in this film are also System One. Eleanor Gehrig and Lou’s mother are at odds over control of Lou’s life and household. Their values are deeply rooted in the traditional role of the woman as homemaker, mother, and wife. Each competes for domination of Lou. Neither is perceptive of the position of the other, nor is she particularly creative in waging the domestic battle. Eleanor cries when she doesn’t get her way; Mama storms out of the house.

Mr. Gehrig has already been domesticated by his wife,
and his role in the film is something of a System Three peace-keeper. He never argues with Mama, but rather is content to placate her whims. When the struggle for dominance arises between Eleanor and Mama, he is the only one in the family who perceives the true nature of the problem and explains it to the still befuddled Lou.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: LOU GEHRIG</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He turns down an offer from the Yankees because he wants to follow his mother’s wishes and pursue the &quot;respectable&quot; career of a civil engineer.</td>
<td>Status &amp; authority over facts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trite, normative problem-solving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He starts a fight with his fraternity brothers when they tease him about a date.</td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trite, normative problem-solving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He decides to enter baseball as a way of raising money for his mother’s operation.</td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He doesn’t realize Eleanor is mocking him when he takes her dancing, or that she is unimpressed by his feats of strength at the amusement park.</td>
<td>Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is easily duped by the other players into eating Babe Ruth’s new hat.</td>
<td>Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He rushes to ask Eleanor to marry him at four a.m., not realizing the time or that she might be asleep.</td>
<td>Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snap decision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He rushes to the ballpark after his wedding to play a game and subsequently never misses playing for any reason during his entire career.</td>
<td>High task-orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He never realizes the power struggle between Eleanor and Moma until his father and Eleanor point it out.</td>
<td>Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He fights to continue playing as the disease weakens him and decides to quit only when he can no longer hold the bat. He demands to hear the truth of his condition from the doctor and expresses no bitterness over his fate. "I consider myself the luckiest man on the face of the Earth."

Open-minded, information-seeking
George M. Cohan is primarily a System Four, Principled personality in this film characterization. His one inconsistency, or character flaw, is his brash, cocky manner, which sometimes leads to impulsive judgements or actions, a Concrete characteristic. The film puts a decided emphasis upon Cohan's professional life; in fact, given that all of his family and friends are also in show business, his personal and professional life are inseparable. One of his strongest traits is his creative problem-solving ability. Often, he uses his adeptness at role-playing to solve the problem. When he learns that his family can't work because he has been blackballed, he puts on an act to make them believe he has a solo job, freeing them to work without him. He gets his first show produced by pretending to be the partner of Sam Harris. He is portrayed as a man who thinks fast on his feet, completely confident in his ability, never dependent on others for his judgements. And while this impulsive tendency might be construed as System One behavior, two mediating circumstances argue otherwise. First, the situations in which Cohan makes his fast decisions call for quick action. Slow, deliberate judgement would cause him to lose the opportunity of the moment, as when he jumps into the conversation with Harris and the producer, Schwab. And second, when he does make mistakes
based on snap judgements, he soon realizes his error and rectifies it. He doesn’t close his mind once a decisions is made. The best example of this occurs when he begins to write an angry letter to the critics for panning his play, then realizes he is wrong and writes an open letter to the public, putting the blame on himself for writing a bad play. Later in the film, he makes a snap decision that he does not reconsider, and it brings on unhappy consequences. He feels depressed after his father’s death and suddenly decides to quit show business. The decision is a mistake that he does not realize for some time, indicating a change to System One. He is restless and becomes agitated at not being recognized by a group of teenagers. Finally, he decides to return to the stage and outdoes Mary’s ability to read his mind, showing a System Four sensitivity and adeptness for role playing.

Cohan displays Principled behavior when he puts the interests of his family above personal welfare by tricking them into working without him. It is also a Principled gesture when he writes the letter blaming himself for the bad play, showing that he values the truth more than prestige. He is held by no bond except his own conscience. Also, his 30-year handshake contract with Sam Harris suggests a commitment based on principle rather than mere legality.

Mary, Cohan’s wife, is definitely Abstract, but
difficult to classify as a System Three or Four. She is flexible, open-minded, and sensitive to her husband's moods. She can read his behavior, knowing that he is going to ask her to marry him before he asks, and that the flowers and candy he brings home mean he has given her song to Fay Templeton. But she is never made party to any of Cohan's major decisions; thus, she has little opportunity in the film to display either dependent or independent judgement. A System Three dependence is suggested most strongly when Cohan retires from show business. Mary senses his restlessness and knows that he would be happier working again, but she never broaches the matter to Cohan. She waits until he figures it out himself, favoring interpersonal harmony over speaking her mind.

Sam Harris, Cohan's long-time partner, is a Principled System Four. He possesses the deliberate judgement that his impulsive partner lacks and the independence to tell Cohan when he is wrong. He is the voice of reason, who talks Cohan out of writing the letter to the critics and who tries to talk him out of quitting show business. In the first episode, he argues from the Principled basis that Cohan's angry letter would be dishonest, a breach of faith with the audiences that trust him.

Cohan's father demonstrates Principled, System Four judgement at the beginning of the film, when he tells his son that it is more important for him to be a good man than
a good actor.

Schwab, the producer, is a humorous but inconsistent character, alternately Concrete and Abstract, shrewd and dense, wise and bewildered.
When Mary mistakes him for an old man because of his make-up, he plays along and acts like one to make a pass at her.  
Adept at role-playing 4

He gets Mary a chance to perform by getting the dog act drunk.  
Creative problem-solving 4

He loses his job by kicking the manager after overhearing the man insult Mary.  
Snap judgement, impulsive Con.  
Trite problem-solving Con.

When he overhears that the family can't find work because of his bad reputation, he fools them into believing that he has a solo job offer so that they will work without him.  
Adept at role-playing 4  
Creative problem-solving 4  
Welfare of others over self Prin.

He gets backing for his show by pretending to be Sam Harris's partner when he overhears Harris talking with Swab, the producer.  
Adept at role-playing 4  
Creative problem-solving 4

He refuses to fawn over Fay Templeton, and inspite of his brashness, manages to win her for the show by writing a song in her dressing room.  
Independent, critical judgement 4  
Creative problem-solving 4

He tries candy and flowers to soften the blow of telling Mary that he gave her song to Fay, not realizing that the action is a tip-off.  
Insensitive to subtle clues Con.  
Inept problem-solving Con.

In a montage of his marques, we see that he produces an enormous string of hits.  
High task orientation 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: GEORGE M. COHAN, CONT.</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He is completely surprised when his family tells him that they want to quit the act.</td>
<td>Insestive to subtle clues</td>
<td>Con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When his first serious play is panned, his first reaction is to strike out at the critics, but he listens to Sam Harris and realizes his impulsive judgement is wrong and writes an open letter blaming himself for writing a bad play.</td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the service refuses to take him because of his age, he uses his musical talent to help the war effort by writing &quot;Over There.&quot;</td>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has the composure to play along with his dying father when the old man reverts to the past and believes George is a child.</td>
<td>Adept at role-playing</td>
<td>Abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In grief over his father’s death, he suddenly decides to give up show business and travel.</td>
<td>Snap judgement</td>
<td>Con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inept problem-solving</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After posturing strongly against returning to show business, he surprises Mary by telling her he already knows that she has figured out he will work again.</td>
<td>Adept role-playing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The title of this film is deceptive because it is almost as much a biography of Pierre Curie as it is of Marie. Both characters are System Four: objective, information-seeking, task-oriented, deliberate and thorough in their scientific judgement, and creative in solving the problems of their research. It is Marie, however, who shines out as the better thinker of the two. Pierre complements her personality, encouraging her to investigate the mysteries of radium, working by her side in the adverse cold and heat, and providing companionship and support during the years of grueling experimentation.

But Marie is the catalyst and the rock. She generates all of the important ideas: that a new element may exist, that radium might be used for cancer therapy, that the stain in the bowl is radium. And she displays greater resolve, pursuing her studies to physical collapse, winning Pierre's respect with her dedication to science, accepting the squalid quarters offered by the university, and insisting to work on when her health is endangered by radium burns.

Curie reveals her Principled development most emphatically at the end of the film when she explains the reasons for her hard work: science, the search for the truth leads to the betterment of mankind. Her personal sacrifice, her willingness to work under physical hardship for little money or recognition, during most of the film shows only a
dogged interest in solving the unknown. But her explanation here, during her speech to the young students and future scientists, explains her tireless devotion to research as a Principled undertaking for the larger social good. It could be inferred by association that Pierre Curie was also Principled, but because he dies without a similar exposition of purpose, his Kohlberg determination remains Inconclusive.

The Curies’ major antagonist, the University Board members who consistently stymie their work, are System One and NonPrincipled. Their understanding of research is limited solely to budget considerations and appearances, lacking any appreciation of the Curies’ study of radium that cannot be shown on the ledger books. They are also close-minded and negative to the prospects of new knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: MARIE CURIE</th>
<th>BELIEF:</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM:</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She works on her studies to the point of exhaustion, fainting in class.</td>
<td>High task-orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She impresses Pierre by being the exact opposite of his description of &quot;emotional flighty creatures...the natural enemy of science.&quot; Instead she displays great knowledge about his work and carries out her research in a professional, no-nonsense manner.</td>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts over status, conventions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She graduates first in her class at the Sorbonne.</td>
<td>High task-orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She intends to return to Poland but accepts Pierre's marriage proposal when he convinces her she can do more good in France working with him.</td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She decides to do her thesis work on pitchblend because she is fascinated by the mysterious rays it gives off.</td>
<td>Open-minded, information-seeking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When her measurements exhaust all known scientific explanations, she conceives the idea that a new element may exist. &quot;What if there is matter in the world we never even dreamed of?&quot;</td>
<td>Open-minded, information-seeking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts over authority</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She accepts the university's offer of &quot;the abominable shack&quot; to work in, even though Pierre considers it beneath their dignity.</td>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts over status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She and Pierre work for years on the isolation of radium under physically demanding and often dangerous circumstances. She refuses to quit, even when Pierre becomes discouraged and her hands suffer from radiation burns.

- High task-orientation
- Information-seeking

When the final separation produces nothing but a small stain in the bowl and it looks like their work has failed, she conceives the idea that the stain may be the radium.

- Creative problem-solving
- Open-minded, flexible

At a celebration honoring her 25th anniversary of the discovery of radium, she tells her audience to "look for the clear light of truth, for the unknown."

- Open-minded, information-seeking
- Principle over convention

Prin.
Woodrow Wilson is depicted as a consistent System Four with Principled conscience. He is a man who deliberates long and hard over decisions, never rushing into judgements that might be affected by emotion, whim, or expediency. He is both open-minded and independent, seeking out the advice of family, staff, and friends, but always making up his own mind after that advice is received. He is a man who understands the power of his office, of how his decisions may affect the lives of millions. Time and again, he stands up to public and peer pressure, refusing to act until he weighs the moral consequences. He refuses to become a candidate for governor, to release his delegates in the presidential convention, or to enter the war against Germany until, in each situation, he has time to think. And always he acts from a sense of responsibility to the greater public welfare, regardless of the personal consequences. He risks the loss of a presidential nomination by refusing to support Big Ed for another Senate term because he knows the man to be an unscrupulous political boss. He takes an unpopular stand against entering the war because he knows "others will have to do the dying." And after the war, he commits political suicide by advocating support for the League of Nations in the face of strong Republican opposition. Once he has taken a stand, he shows himself to be not only determined and independent, but also extremely task-
oriented. He campaigns relentlessly across the country, to the extent that he collapses with a stroke. And, finally, Wilson shows open-mindedness in accepting his wife's role as surrogate president when he is incapacitated, referring to her good-humoredly as "Mrs. President."

Henry Cabot Lodge, Wilson's major antagonist, shows none of the Abstract flexibility, open-mindedness, or deliberate, critical judgement of Wilson. On the two major issues of this film where he confronts Wilson, entering World War I and joining the League of Nations, his reactions are immediate and close-minded. He jumps to the conclusion that Wilson is a coward for not rushing into the war, and appears to be acting out of spite when he opposes America's involvement in the League of Nations. He agrees to support Wilson during the war only "for the good of the country," which could be interpreted as Principled behavior. However, he shows no depth of understanding about the moral dimensions of the war and its consequences in human lives, only a Conventional sense of patriotism. When the Lusitania is sunk, he expresses instant outrage because "Americans are dead," and he refuses to believe that Wilson's hesitation to enter the war is anything more than political. In the second episode, when he refuses to support the League of Nations, it seems clear that he is acting out of vindictiveness, a Nonprincipled rewards-and-punishments attitude. He is a man whose pride has been hurt because
Wilson did not invite him to the League of Nations conference; and for that reason, he opposes the League.

Edith, Wilson's second wife, proves to as Abstract and Principled as her husband. She is independently critical and deliberate in making major decisions, such as when she agrees to marry Wilson and when she assumes his presidential duties. She demonstrates Principled behavior in her initial refusal to marry Wilson, placing the importance of his reelection above her own welfare. She sees the good he is doing for the country as more important than her own happiness. And she shows her high task orientation in fighting her husband's battles, first at his side and then alone when he suffers the stroke.

Wilson's first wife, Ellen, is more of a minor character and has fewer opportunities to demonstrate classifiable behavior. She is totally devoted to her husband and family. The dramatic highpoint of her film appearance comes at her deathbed, as she makes her daughters promise to look after Wilson so that he can continue his great work. Thus, her devotion apparently stems from an independent, critical judgement of his "greatness," rather than a dependence on interpersonal harmony.

Of the minor characters, Wilson's campaign manager, Joe Tumulty, is an impulsive, quick-tempered, System One with a Principled conscience. He sees the evils of the political bosses like Big Ed Jones but jumps to the conclusion that
new candidate Wilson is part of the corruption. He constantly prods Wilson to action, urging him to make snap decisions. Big Ed is a Nonprincipled System One, slow-witted, insensitive, immediately assuming that Wilson is just playing politics when he vows to oppose Big Ed’s re-election. Big Ed does demonstrate a possibly uncharacteristic problem-solving ability when he supports Wilson’s presidency in order to get him out of New Jersey politics. And he possesses an unctuous flexibility on all political issues. However, as a man without principles, these issues are not matters of high ego involvement. The only issue that Big Ed really cares about is retaining political power, and on that subject he is supremely close-minded and inflexible. He wants to preserve the status-quo at all costs, which, in this case, means keeping himself in office. His moral attitude is one of Nonprincipled exchange of favors and a "one-hand-washes-the-other" mentality.

Wilson’s friend, Professor Henry Holmes, is the opposite of Big Ed, a Principled System Four, who realizes, with canny perception, that Wilson means what he says in his promise to defeat Big Ed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>WOODROW WILSON</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He delays making a decision on running for governor until he has time to think and discuss it with his family. &quot;This is not an overnight decision.&quot; Reserved, deliberate judgement 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tells Big Ed that he will stand behind his decision to oppose him for another Senate term, even though threatened with losing party support in his potential presidential campaign. Principle over self-interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He refuses to release his delegates under pressure until he hears the advice of everyone available. He finally decides to stay in the race. Reserved, deliberate judgement 4 Independent, critical judgement 4 Open-minded, information-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a montage of speeches, he campaigns tirelessly. High task-orientation 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He holds out against growing public pressure to enter the war because, he explains, others will have to fight and he wants to be sure that &quot;the dying is worthwhile.&quot; Reserved, deliberate judgement 4 Independent, critical judgement 4 Welfare of others over convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is angered by the idea that his election for a second term might be affected by remarrying and refuses to conceal his romance. Independent, critical judgement 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although angered by Germany’s treachery, he refuses to ask Congress for a declaration of war until he has had time to think. Reserved, deliberate judgement Principle over convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARACTER WOODROW WILSON, CONT.

He works in the kitchen of a USO hall with his wife, to the surprise of the soldiers, to do his part for the war effort.
   Open-minded, flexible

He goes to the peace settlement alone, without taking the nationalism advisors recommend, because he believes that the days of isolationism are over.
   Independent, critical judgement
   Principle over self-welfare

When rejected by Congress, he wages a barnstorm tour of America in support of the League of Nations, so intense that he collapses with a stroke.
   High task-orientation

He takes no offense during his illness when his wife takes over his duties and calls her affectionately "Mrs. President."
   Open-minded, flexible
   Facts over status
Unlike most of the films in this sample, which are expensive "prestige" pictures produced by the major studios, *Dillinger* is a low-budget "B" film. In its 70 odd minutes of running time, the emphasis is on action, with scant attention to character development. If a mad dog in human form qualifies as a character, then John Dillinger can be classified as a Nonprincipled System Two. To state that his moral development descends to the subhuman would be an insult the animal kingdom does not deserve. No animal is as patently vicious, cold-blooded, and cruel as the Dillinger in this film. Crime is his passion, and revenge is his pleasure. In the course of the film, he shoots, stabs, or ax-murders half a dozen people for various slights, including an elderly couple that had given him refuge and a waiter who had belittled him years earlier. He operates on a Preconventional, rewards-and-punishments level so low that the reward is allowing someone to live.

In terms of System characteristics, he is reckless, prone to snap judgements, anti-establishment, and close-minded. His Pavlovian responses to every problem or situation is violence (an often effective but not particularly creative or socially appropriate method of problem-solving in the eyes of this examiner). He would be the perfect, if incredible, cardboard System Two personality
were it not for two socially unredeeming System Four characteristics that he displays. Number one, he shows extremely creative problem-solving abilities in his chosen vocation of crime. He devises an ingenious plan to break his accomplices out of prison and proves to be a mastermind in robbing a bank everyone else thinks is impregnable. Number two, he is nothing if not the embodiment of high task orientation when it comes to committing felonies. His creativity is not necessarily inconsistent in light of two studies by Harvey, et al, which found that real-life System Twos performed quite well in problem-solving, matching the level of System Fours in some areas, when removed from authority surveillance. However, while it is uplifting to report that the American work ethic prevails on the screen, showing us that even in crime success is the product of elbow grease, his high task-orientation still seems somewhat uncharacteristic except for the purpose of pushing the plot.

With the exception of Specs Green, the shallowness of characterization and the banality of dialogue in this simplistic little potboiler reduce everyone else to Concrete and Nonprincipled stations. System One or System Two is easy to gauge, according to which side of the establishment the character is on. Specs Green shows independent, critical judgement when he points out Dillinger's recklessness, and he appears to be more deliberate and cautious. And while not developed enough to be consistent,
he comes the closest to resembling a System Four.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>JOHN DILLINGER</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He robs a grocery store to pay a bar bill rather than tell his girlfriend he is short of cash.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap, impulsive judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is immediately hostile to Specs Green, then just as quickly turns friendly when he learns Green is &quot;the smartest bank man in the country.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap, impulsive judgement</td>
<td>Status over facts</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>Con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He stages a prison break for his friends by smuggling guns to them in a phoney cement barrel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He makes a special point to take revenge on the waiter who called him a &quot;two-bit chiseler&quot; before he went to prison.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He devises a method to rob a bank which the others consider is impossible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He takes over the leadership of the gang from Specs and ignores the more experienced man's warning that his own plans are reckless and dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-minded, negative</td>
<td>Snap, impulsive judgement</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>Con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After claiming that no small town jail can hold him, he escapes from the jail by fashioning a knife from a soap bar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He shoots Specs for turning him over to the police.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td>NonP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He conceives a scheme to rob another impossible target, this time the heavily-guarded mail train.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He catches Mom and Pop Otto on the telephone and, assuming they are calling the police, shoots them instantly, without a word.

- Revenge, rewards and punishments
- Snap, impulsive judgement

He figures out Tony is running off with Pam when he sees Tony getting the car and kills him with an axe.

- Sensitive to subtle clues
- Revenge, rewards and punishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>JOHN DILLINGER</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He catches Mom and Pop Otto on the telephone and, assuming they are calling the police, shoots them instantly, without a word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap, impulsive judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He figures out Tony is running off with Pam when he sees Tony getting the car and kills him with an axe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge, rewards and punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Al Jolson fits into no Belief System comfortably. At the beginning of the film, he is fairly consistent as a Concrete System One. The movie opens as he learns that his first wife, Julie, has left him. He becomes distraught, bouncing from one snap decision to another: first to look for her, then not to look for her, then to resume performing, and then to give up performing. He is shown as an inept problem-solver, trying to find happiness through aimless leisure, traveling, gambling, and buying expensive things. But after this episode, he fits into no Belief System easily. Perhaps because this film is a sequel to the highly successful Jolson Story, and, consequently, covers the left-overs of his life, the story contains few dramatic crises. Jolson's most distinguishing characteristic for the remainder of this film is his tendency to say no when he means yes. Time and again, when faced with making a decision about returning to the stage, or getting married, or having a movie made about his life, his reaction is always a pretense of self-deprecation. He assumes the role of devil's advocate and becomes his own worst critic, forcing others to take the defensive and talk him into doing what we know he really wants to do. On the face of it, this maddening characteristic appears to make him both close-minded and open-minded at the same time. However, if we
look at this behavior for what it really is, a form of role-playing, then the strongest case can be made for classifying Jolson as a System Three. He is a man highly dependent on others for approval and reinforcement in his judgements. His constant self-criticism is a ruse, aimed at eliciting positive support from his family and associates. And the other characters show that they understand this role-playing by never taking his negative attitude seriously. This understanding is best demonstrated by Ellen at the end of the film, when Al is offered a radio show. True to form, he rejects the idea instantly, saying that the radio audience doesn’t want to hear him. Ellen, sitting beside him, translates his answer by simply saying: "He’ll do it." And the last scene in the film shows him singing for the radio.

Jolson is never confronted with any moral/ethical dilemmas in this film, nor does he voice any Principled or Nonprincipled statements. His closest brush with a moral situation comes when he decides to join the war effort and entertain the troops; but there is no clear evidence to indicate whether he is acting out of national patriotism (a form of social conformity) or adherence to a higher principle.

Jolson’s father, on the other hand, appears to demonstrate the only discernable moral attitude in the film when he sums up his son’s behavior early in the war by saying: "There’s something wrong with a man buying prize
fighters when people are dying." His statement, showing a principled understanding of priorities, condemns Al’s aimless life even though it’s socially acceptable.

Both the elder Jolson and Ellen, Al’s second wife, act with consistent System Four behavior. Ellen is an extremely adept problem-solver, her major and continuing problem being the emotional welfare of her husband. She shows high task orientation and independent critical judgement when she refuses to give up on Al’s return to show business, even though Al and his manager are convinced that he is washed up. She persists not out of blind admiration for his talent, but in order to save his failing spirit. She is always positive, open-minded, and flexible toward new ideas, just as Al always feins pessimism. Al’s father also displays independent critical judgement and a respect for information over status in his assessment of Al’s life. He is not impressed by his son’s success and wealth and realizes that Al is wasting his life.

Steve, the manager, and Mr. Bryant, the producer, also seem to be System Four characters, based on their limited appearance in the film. They are open-minded, flexible, and independent in judgement, treating Al much the same as Ellen does.
He is surprised to find that his wife has left him when he returns home, telling his father: "You saw it coming, Papa, and Steve. Everyone but me."

- Insensitive to subtle clues

He suddenly decides to abandon the search for Julie and do a new Broadway show.

- Snap, impulsive judgement

He just as suddenly decides to quit show business after reading that Julie has divorced him. "The kick is gone."

- Snap, impulsive judgement

He spends the next six years trying find happiness through aimless leisure: traveling, gambling, buying horses and prize fighters.

- Trite, inept problem-solving

He makes a pretense of saying the soldiers don’t want to hear him when he has every intention of performing.

- Adept at role-playing

He works so hard entertaining that he collapses after one of his shows.

- High task orientation

He points out all the negative points of marrying Ellen and agrees only when she talks him into it.

- Dependent on others

He voices pessimism about return to show business, again forcing Ellen to talk him into it.

- Dependent on others

He is similarly pessimistic about the idea for a movie on his life, this time forcing the producer, Bryant, to talk him into it.

- Dependent judgement
He is so nervous about the film, he leaves the premiere. He decides the film is good only when seeing that the audience likes it.

Dependent on others
Monty Stratton is portrayed as a System Four man who changes to a System Two after losing his leg and then comes to grips with his tragedy and builds a new life as a System Four. Before his accident, he leads almost a charmed life, rising from poor farmer to baseball celebrity on a natural talent, with little adversity or conflict. Even so, he is an independent thinker and a highly determined man who rigorously practices baseball during the cold winter and then hitchikes across country just for the chance to try out on a major team. He also displays patient, deliberate judgement in making major decisions. In the most important decision he makes before the accident, his proposal to Ethel, he refuses to marry her impulsively, but rather waits until his future is more secure. He explains to her "A man’s got to know where he’s going." Then, at the pinnacle of his career, he loses his leg in a hunting accident. His response is bitterness and self-pity. He becomes close-minded and negative toward rehabilitation. Whereas he was once determined and highly task-oriented, he is now content to do nothing but wallow in depression. He even shows jealousy toward his baby son for having two legs. There is no dramatic incident which prompts his change of attitude, but he suddenly tells Ethel that his behavior was wrong, making their lives miserable, an admission that signals his
return to System Four behavior. He becomes, once again, highly task-oriented, first in order to learn the use of an artificial leg, then to pitch. He is shown working incessantly, throwing baseballs into a basket. And at the end of the film, he proves himself to be an open-minded, independent thinker, risking humiliation to try to prove he could overcome his handicap.

His moral stage appears to be Principled, but there is limited evidence to make a conclusive classification. During the period of depression after his accident, Monty’s behavior definitely indicates a Nonprincipled moral stage. He shows no understanding of or compassion toward others, only a totally Preconventional selfishness. His moral stage during the rest of the film appears to be Principled, but there is simply not enough evidence to make a conclusive judgement. Before the accident, he shows distress at the way his friend treats his date, a sign that he believes in the Golden Rule concept of treating everyone with respect. After his depression, he expresses self-condemnation and the same concern for others when he tells Ethel that he realizes that he has made everyone’s life miserable by his self-pity.

Ethel is an Abstract System Three for much of the film. Although not impressed with Monty on their first encounter, she has the flexibility and open-mindedness to re-evaluate her opinion. She is content to let her life be dominated by his decisions and career, as when she allows him to set the
time for their marriage. Her behavior after Monty's accident also shows a high need for interpersonal harmony. She indulges his bad-tempered abuse and self-pity without criticism. However, as Monty returns to System Four behavior, she seems to grow with him, becoming more independent and assertive in her judgements. The dramatic example of this comes when Monty's resolution falters before the exhibition game. Instead of blithely agreeing with his change of heart, she convinces him to play.

Of the minor characters, Amanda Stratton, Monty's mother, is an inconsistent mixture of Systems One, Three, and Four. She clings to traditional values and lets her opinions be known, but bows to Monty's will for the sake of family harmony. Barney, Stratton's personal coach and friend, is Abstract, but vacillates between System Four critical judgement and System Three dependence on Monty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: MONTY STRATTON</th>
<th>HARVEY STAGE</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He gives Barney Wile a job and listens to his counsel, even though Barney is a railroad bum and admitted alcoholic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information over status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He decides to leave the security of the farm and hitchhike cross-country for a tryout in the majors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wants to marry Ethel but delays until he finds out whether or not he will make it in baseball. &quot;A man’s got to know where he is going.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved deliberate judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He spends all his free time secretly taking lessons so that he can take Ethel dancing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After losing his leg, he sinks into depression and self-pity, refusing all efforts at rehabilitation and making his family miserable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-minded, negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self over welfare of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He tells his wife that he realizes he has been selfish and wrong in the way he has acted and expresses guilt for hurting her and his mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-condemnation for actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare of others over self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARACTER: STRATTON, CONT.

He struggles to learn the use of an artificial leg and then spends all his time practicing his pitch.

- High task orientation
- Open-minded, positive to new ideas

He asks to pitch in a local exhibition game because, as he tells Ethel, he has to test himself, prove that he can overcome his handicap.

- Independent, critical judgement
- Creative problem-solving
- High-task orientation
Dizzy Dean is portrayed as a System One, Principled man who matures to System Four when his easy life is finally tested by adversity. The film begins with his rise to baseball stardom, during which time he is an impulsive, arrogant, insensitive braggart who thinks the world of himself and expects everyone else to hold the same opinion. He is, as his wife calls him, a child, not so much bad as irresponsible. He is a decent, compassionate person who would not willingly hurt others; but he is too insensitive to notice how his actions affect his fans and fellow players. He doesn't understand why his flashy clothes or boastful manner cause the other players to resent him. However, when the truth is pointed out to him, as when Pat, his wife, makes him realize he is wrong to hold out against paying the fine, he shows Principled concern for others and expresses self-condemnation for his actions. Even though he believes he could win his strike, he pays the fine because he realizes he had been setting a bad model for his fans. When his arm begins to fail, he remains close-minded to the idea that his career might be over. He is an inept problem-solver, choosing to ignore the truth and continue playing in the minors instead of building another career. He slips into heavy drinking and gambling. Finally, Pat leaves him, with the ultimatum that she will not come back unless he
changes. Faced with losing his wife, he reassesses his behavior with independent, critical judgement. He accepts the fact that his pitching career is over and goes to Johnny for a job, showing open-mindedness and flexibility. Although his sportscasting job gives him a new lease on life, he decides to give it up because he believes his poor grammar might "hurt kids," showing again his Principled concern for other.

His wife, Pat, is a Principled System Four throughout the film, independently critical and outspoken of Dizzy's destructive behavior. When Dizzy refuses to pay his fine, she points out that he could win without being right. And when he deludes himself about his sinking baseball career, she leaves him, explaining that he is acting like a child. Paul "Daffy" Dean doesn't seem to suffer from the same Concrete close-mindedness as his brother. He has the Abstract flexibility and independent judgement to realize when his pitching days are over and to accept it with grace.
CHARACTER DIZZY DEAN

BELIEF SYSTEM

MORAL STAGE

When asked by a scout to report to Houston, he immediately wants to go to St. Louis. He considers himself too good for the minors, gives advice to other players, draws stares for his flashy dress, never sensing the resentment he's creating.

- Status over information
- Insensitive to subtle clues
- Close-minded, inflexible

He immediately assumes after one date with Pat Nash that she will drop her other boyfriends and be available every night. He is surprised when she tells him he has no manners and insists on being asked for dates.

- Insensitive to subtle clues
- Snap, impulsive judgements

He suddenly appears at her window and asks her to elope because he's jealous of her other boyfriend.

- Snap, impulsive judgement

He sets up their marriage ceremony on homeplate of the field, never suspecting that she would be horrified at turning their wedding into a carnival.

- Status over information
- Insensitive to subtle clues

He goes on strike rather than pay a fine for missing the train, refusing to abide by the rules because he knows he is a good enough player to get away with it.

- Close-minded, negative
- Self-welfare over principle of equality

He realizes he was wrong to take advantage of his talent to "twist and bend things out of their natural order...like a kid stealing cookies out of a cookie jar," and he agrees to pay the fine.

- Independent, critical judgement
- Self-condemnation about moral wrong

Nonp. Prin.
He refuses to accept the fact that his arm has gone bad and sinks into the minor leagues rather than look for a new career. He turns down several job offers.

Close-minded, dogmatic
Inept problem-solving

He becomes a heavy drinker and gambler, deluding himself into thinking the club will pick him up again.

Close-minded, dogmatic
Status over facts

When Pat leaves him, he goes to Johnny and accepts a job as sportscaster, heeding her admonition that he's been acting like a child all his life.

Independent, critical judgement
Open-minded, positive

When school teachers complain about his bad English, he decides to give up his job because he doesn't want to be responsible for "hurting kids."

Independent, critical judgement
Welfare of others over self

He agrees to keep the job only when his former critics, the school teachers, convince him they were wrong.

Open-minded, flexible
Emiliano Zapata is a System Four person who briefly becomes System One then returns to System Four because his Principled character will not let him abide the corruption and injustice of the establishment. As the film opens, he shows himself to be both independent and critical in judgement when he challenges the President of Mexico. He leads a brief insurrection, but then is persuaded -- or bribed -- into supporting the government. He loves Josefa, who will not marry him unless he can offer her "a respectable life with a rich man." So he tries to adjust to the system. But the system is too corrupt and his sense of justice is too strong. He lashes out in fits of temper, first striking the stable hand who beats a boy, and then killing the soldier who refuses to release an old man he is dragging behind his horse.

Once he assumes the responsibility of leading the rebellion, he returns to System Four behavior. He is a man totally committed to a mission, the mission of freeing the Mexican people. He shows himself to be a brilliant, resourceful tactician, using the peasant women as a subterfuge to capture the fort. Although still a volatile man, he controls his temper and his impulsiveness for the sake of the cause. He measures all of his decisions against what will be best for his people. He learns to read because
he finds it unacceptable that a leader should be illiterate. He sacrifices an old comrade, his brother, and finally his own life for the good of the cause. He is also a sensitive, perceptive observer who understands the temporary nature of his importance in the sweep of events.

Josefa, his wife, and her father are System One characters. Their concern is not with the revolution, but with material respectability. Josefa moderates her attitude somewhat, becoming less status-conscious after her marriage, but she never comprehends why Emiliano must go to his dangerous rendezvous at the end of the film, and remains at most a System Three. Josefa’s father never changes. He wants only for wealth and social prestige, from which ever side is on top.

Zapata’s brother, along with the reporter and General Huerta, Zapata’s main antagonist, are also Concrete characters, anti-establishment when they have nothing, pro-establishment when the tables turn.
He challenges President Diaz and points out the impossibility of making a survey claim on their land while his fellow peons remain silent.

Information over authority 4

He loses his temper and hits a man he sees beating a boy.

Snap, impulsive judgement

Con.

He agrees to apologize to the man after Don Nacio explains the rewards of respectable behavior.

Authority and status over facts 1

He refuses Madero’s offer to lead the revolution, saying "I don’t want to be the conscience of the world", and preferring the comfort of his newfound respectability.

Status over information 1

He loses his temper again and kills a soldier who is cruelly dragging an old peasant behind his horse.

Snap decision

Trite, inept problem-solving

Con.

He gets angry and stalks out when Josefa’s father refuses his marriage offer because he is without money or position. "Let her be mistress of the receipt books."

Snap decision

Trite, inept problem-solving

Con.

He overtakes a heavily-defended fort by using peasant women to plant bombs concealed in their baskets.

Creative problem-solving 4

He concedes to local custom and agrees to court Josefa in the traditional manner.

Open-minded, flexible Abs.
CHARACTER__EMILIANO_ZAPATA__CONT.

He is disgusted with himself for being illiterate, and accepts Josefa's offer to teach him reading.

Open-minded, flexible
Independent, critical judgement

He turns down Madero's offer of a large estate and tells him that his fight was for the peons, not for personal gain.

Welfare of others over self-gain

He warns Madero that the land must be returned to the peons. "I trust you the way my people trust me -- just as long as I keep my promises."

Principle over convention
Sensitive to subtle clues
Information over status

He refuses to spare his old comrade from execution because of friendship when the man disobeys his orders and causes his soldiers to die.

Principle over convention

He circles a peasant's name who questions his motives, then tears up the paper and resigns immediately, realizing that he is becoming like Diaz.

Self-critical, welfare of others
Information over status

He sides with the peons when they tell him that his brother has stolen their land and offers no resistance when they kill his brother to get it back.

Principle over convention

He decides to meet with the federal officer about ammunition, even though he knows it may be a trap.

High task-orientation
He senses his time of leadership is over. When asked how the revolution could go on without him, he answers "Strong man makes a weak people. Strong people don’t need a strong man."

Sensitive to subtle clues
Information over status
Welfare of others over self
Glenn Miller is a dedicated task-oriented System Four who slips into System One behavior because of his marriage and returns to System Four through the efforts of his wife, Helen. As the film opens, he wants more than anything to create a new "sound" and gives up steady work and security to pursue his music.

Then, after two years in New York, he suddenly gives up the quest. He calls Helen and marries her. He takes a steady job and shows no interest in continuing his musical experiments. His motive is unselfish, but misdirected: he wants the security and respectability of a normal life for Helen. But he fails to see that she would be happier without the trappings if he were pursuing his dream. She convinces him to renew his search for a new "sound," but he is totally ineffectual at problem-solving and must depend upon her drive and ingenuity to raise money for the band and to keep it operating. When the band folds, he is ready to give up, calling himself "a no-good, itinerant musician." Helen has to trick him into forming a new band by using Sy Scribman as a front.

Once the new band is formed, Miller returns to System Four behavior. He doesn't give up when his lead horn player cuts his lip the night before the opening. Instead, he solves the problem by changing to a clarinet lead and stays up all
night rewriting the arrangements. The result, of course, is his new "sound." He continues his System Four behavior when he disobeys his superior officer's order and plays swing music during a military revue.

Helen, his wife, is a dominant force in the film and a strong System Four. She is creative, independent, unimpressed by status and authority, and highly task-oriented toward the end of helping Glenn find his "sound." She raises the money to start the bands, keeps the books, arranges the schedules, and most importantly, provides the encouragement to keep Glenn working.

Sy Scribman is System Four by virtue of his single important act in the film, his decision to back Glenn's new band. He shows independent judgement and open-mindedness when he agrees to take a chance on an unknown musician and support his search for a new musical style. Glenn's friend Chum, on the other hand, is a System One, satisfied with the status-quo, content with any steady job, never sharing or appreciating Glenn's dream for something new and different.

None of the characters in this film face the kind of moral crisis that can lead to a conclusive Kohlberg-Dewey classification.
CHARACTER: GLENN MILLER

He insists on playing a swing arrangement even though Chummy warns that he will lose his job.
   Independent judgement: 4
   High task-orientation: 4

He turns down a chance to audition as a musician when he desperately needs the job and instead insists on auditioning his arrangements.
   High task-orientation: 4

He calls Helen for the first time in two years and blithely expects her to break a date with her fiance. He then arrives for their date at three a.m. and doesn’t understand why she has gone to bed.
   Insensitive to subtle clues: Con.

He tells her that he is determined to find a new style for his music. "I know exactly where I’m going and I know exactly what I want to do."
   High task-orientation: 4

He gives up his steady job to spend two years studying and experimenting with arrangements, living hand-to-mouth.
   High task-orientation: 4
   Information-seeking: 4

Hearing "Little Brown Jug" triggers him into calling Helen and ordering her to New York so that they can marry.
   Snap, impulsive judgement: Con.

He returns to a steady band job so that Helen will have security. He gives up looking for the new "sound."
   Status over information: 1
   Trite, inept problem-solving: 1
CHARACTER__GLENN MILLER, CONT.___  | BELIEF | MORAL
| | SYSTEM | STAGE |

He is stumped in finding a way to start his own band until Helen surprises him with the money.
  Trite, inept problem-solving  | Con. |
  Close-minded, negative      | Con. |

After the band folds, he is disheartened and want to give up. Helen has to trick him into starting a new band.
  Close-minded, negative     | Con. |
  Trite, inept problem-solving | Con. |

When the trumpet player splits his lip, he strikes on the idea of using a clarinet lead.
  Creative problem-solving    | 4 |

He stays up all night rewriting the arrangements.
  High task-orientation       | 4 |

In the military review, he goes against orders and substitutes swing music for the standard marches. General Arnold congratulates him for lifting the morale of the troops.
  Independent judgement       | 4 |
  Creative problem-solving    | 4 |

He turns "Little Brown Jug", a song he has always disliked, into a swing arrangement as a Christmas present for Helen.
  Creative problem-solver     | 4 |
  Open-minded, flexible       | 4 |
Eddy Duchin is an immature, irresponsible System One who grows to Abstract intellect through his encounters with personal adversity. He begins the film as a naive, status-conscious young man who wants more than anything to be rich and successful. He doesn’t understand why his future wife, Marjorie, wants to work when she is wealthy and why, as she puts it, "just having money isn’t a reason to live." His musical talent makes the kind of success he covets easy to achieve, but it doesn’t bring the happiness he expects. He is insensitive to Marjorie’s foreboding about death and is caught completely by surprise when it happens. He lashes out bitterly at the world after his wife dies, submerging himself in his work, refusing to face the true reasons for his unhappiness. He makes the snap judgement that he is responsible for his wife’s death, that it was caused by childbirth, and abandons his son to Marjorie’s parents. His transition to Abstract level is slow and painful. The first indication occurs when he finally listens to Lou, his manager, after five years and accepts the truth that he is an irresponsible father, punishing himself and his son out of an irrational guilt. But he is awkwardly unable to relate to young Peter on their first meeting and again escapes from reality by throwing himself into the war. When he returns, he wants to establish a meaningful relationship
with his son, but reacts jealously toward Conchita, showing that emotion still clouds his judgement. Here, however, he shows a System Four flexibility and open-mindedness by swallowing his pride and listening to Conchita's advice. The climactic moment in the film and the point where he finally transforms to System Four comes when he learns that he has a fatal illness. True to form, his first reaction is anger and bitterness: he can't understand why it is happening to him and avoids the inevitable responsibility of telling his son. But he finally accepts the truth when he listens to Conchita, demonstrating open-minded, critical judgement. He faces up to the duty of telling his son about the illness. No longer is he rash, impulsive, or close-minded about his fate. Rather, he possesses a calm, positive outlook on his remaining life, even asking Conchita to marry him.

Although Duchin faces no clear moral dilemmas in this film, it seems obvious from his value-structure that he is Nonprincipled. Up until his illness, he sees fame and wealth as the ultimate goals in life. He shows no higher understanding of morality than what Conventional society expects. He understands only rewards-and-punishments, success being the highest reward society can offer. While I would speculate that his transformation from System One to System Four is matched by a maturity to Principled level, the evidence simply isn't there to prove it by the
methodology of this study. Duchin shows courage and strength accepting his fate, but these qualities, while admirable, are not synonymous with Principled behavior.

Both of Duchin's wives demonstrate consistent System Four behavior. Marjorie has the independent critical judgement to realize what Eddy does not: that money isn't everything. She is sensitive to her husband's status-consciousness, perceiving his disappointment when he learns that he was invited to Mrs. Rutledge's exclusive party to entertain. She is rich, but she insists on working in order to give her life purpose. Conchita is also an independent critical thinker who never hesitates to point out the errors of Eddy's impulsive behavior. She is the voice of reason, who tells him how to win his son's love and who convinces him to face up to his illness.

Minor characters: Lou, Duchin's manager, is also a System Four, showing the same independent critical judgement as Duchin's wives. Although Duchin is his employer, he is never afraid to speak his mind, as when he convinces Eddy to see his son. Duchin's parents appear to be System Threes. Through Eddy, we learn that they were poor immigrants who sacrificed everything to give him music lessons. Mrs. Duchin's statement that "Eddie always had the best, and wanted more," implies that they share Marjorie's concern about his obsession with wealth. They have the sensitivity and open-mindedness to realize that their son's values are
misplaced, but their hesitancy to disapprove openly suggests a System Three dependency on interpersonal harmony.
He arrives in New York expecting a job from a man he has met only once.  
Insensitive to subtle clues

He tells Marjorie that his dream is to return home rich. "I hope money comes right up and bites me."
Status over information

He is surprised to learn that Marjorie knows that he wants to marry her.  
Insensitive to subtle clues

He admires wealth so much that he gives Marjorie a golden key to the front door of their new house, similar to the one he admired when first coming to New York.  
Status over information

When Marjorie tries to tell him she is dying, he misses her point, insisting that he will always be lucky.  
Insensitive to subtle clues
  Close-minded, inflexible

When his wife dies the night of giving birth to their son, he refuses to see the boy for five years, throwing himself into his work to avoid facing her death.  
Close-minded, negative
  Trite, inept problem-solving

When his manager, Sherman, accusing him of "running away from the truth" and rejecting his son, he listens and agrees to change.  
Open-minded, positive
He refuses to accept safe duty during the war, explaining to his captain that the danger helps him with his problems. "A person can get lost in the big reality and forget the personal tragedies."

Trite, inept problem-solving

He acts cold and formal with Conchita because he is jealous of Peter's love for her and doesn't understand how his attitude is affecting Peter.

Snap, impulsive judgement

He listens when Conchita tells him that "Your son judges you by how you treat me." He wants her to tell him all about Peter, however painful it is for him to learn.

Open-minded, information-seeking

High task-orientation

He faces the mistakes he made in his earlier life, thinking that he "lived in a charmed circle." When Conchita wants to marry him even though he only has a year to live, he listens and accepts her argument.

Open-minded, flexible

Independent, critical judgement

He forces himself to tell Peter that he is going to die, realizing that he can't run away from an unpleasant task the way he used to.

Information-seeking

High task-orientation
In his show business work, Lon Chaney demonstrates the System Four characteristics of creative problem-solving and high task orientation. But in his private life, which is what this film is mostly about, Chaney proves to be a System One who finally evolves into a System Four by the end of the film. His work is shown as secondary in importance to his family and personal life. And it is here, at home, where the high involvement conflicts of his film life occur.

He shows himself to be an inept problem-solver in terms of his personal life by his inability to tell Cleva that his parents are deaf and dumb, letting her find out suddenly when the parents come to visit. The resulting shock signals the beginning of her emotional problems, first anxiety over their expected baby, then restlessness, jealousy, and attempted suicide. Chaney appears helpless to save their deteriorating marriage and oblivious to Cleva's emotional problems. After she leaves him, he becomes embittered and intransigent; he vows that she will never see her son, Creighton, again. He also becomes a driven man, working not for the joy of his art, but only, as he puts it, "to get my son out of hock." He sees money as a symbol of the pro-establishment respectability that will convince the court to return his son.

When Cleva returns, wanting only to see Creighton, he
jumps to the conclusion that she must be after money. He is close-minded and inflexible about keeping her away from Creighton and even about letting him know that she is alive. He is so adamant that he finally disowns Creighton when the boy insists on seeing his real mother.

At this point in the film, Chaney undergoes a sudden change in character. He listens to the pleas of Hazel, his second wife, and agrees to a reunion with Creighton. He tells his son that he was wrong for "crowding" his life, demonstrating critical judgement and open-mindedness. This Abstract quality is seen again at the end of the film, when he gives Creighton his make-up kit, reversing his opposition to his son’s acting career.

Chaney faces no outright conflicts in this film between social conventions and principle. However, a strong case could be built for classifying Chaney’s behavior as Nonprincipled when he refuses to let Cleva see her son. Chaney appears to be acting from a Pre-Conventional "rewards and punishments" mentality, taking revenge on Cleva for her desertion. He uses this same tactic on Creighton, expelling him from the house in punishment for going to Cleva. Conversely, he exhibits a transformation to Principled behavior when he admits to Creighton that he was wrong, since he is acting from self-criticism of his previous behavior rather than social or legal condemnation. As his son’s guardian, perhaps he has the legal right to keep
Creighton and his mother apart. But Chaney finally acknowledges the fact that he was morally wrong to act in such a manner.

Although Chaney's transition from Concrete to Abstract and from Nonprincipled to Principled behavior is not explained, the moral of this film seems clear: As a Nonprincipled, System One character, Chaney lost the one thing he valued most — his son. He made his personal life miserable by refusing to face the past. Only by becoming more flexible, as a Principled, System Four person, was he able to win back his son and find peace with himself.

Cleva Chaney also begins the film as a Concrete personality. She is temperamental, prone to snap judgements, insensitive, and hasty to draw erroneous conclusions from first impressions. She expresses immediate horror and disgust upon learning that Lon's parents are deaf mutes and instantly assumes that their unborn child will be a "dumb thing." Again she jumps to a conclusion that Lon is having an affair when she catches him comforting the babysitter. Influenced more by status than by information, she rejects Lon's warnings about Creighton's welfare, preferring to pursue stardom in the theatre instead. After attempting suicide, she runs away from her husband and child, an action that is certainly an inappropriate and inept solution to her personal problems. When she returns, she admits that she was wrong to run away, indicating a
possible change to Principled behavior. But her appearance is too brief to draw any substantial conclusions about her Kohlberg or Harvey classifications. Her salient characteristic is an overwhelming maternal instinct, a trait that could fit into any Stage or System.

The only true System Four characters in this film are Hazel, Chaney’s second wife, and Creighton, his son. Hazel demonstrates the Abstract qualities of independent critical judgement and open-mindedness most prominently. She sees that Lon is wrong in keeping Cleva from Creighton and is not afraid to tell him what she thinks. And she is able to analyze the situation objectively, without feeling threatened by Cleva’s reappearance. It is only through her persuasive reasoning that Lon finally agrees to make amends with his son. She also demonstrates effective problem-solving when she wants Chaney to propose by subtle# suggesting that he would have a better chance of getting custody of Creighton if he were married. Creighton is also flexible and open-minded, willing to accede to his father’s wishes on traditional paternal matters, such as choosing a career. But he also shows independent critical judgement when he refuses to obey Lon’s order to stay away from Cleva. He insists on finding out for himself what his real mother is like. He rebels not out of animosity toward authority but only to seek the truth for himself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LON CHANEY</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He covers for his wife, Cleva, by improvising a pantomime bit in the theatre when she can’t go on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He quits after the act, telling the stage manager: &quot;You fired her. You fired me.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap decision-making Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He can’t find a way to tell Cleva that his parents are deaf and dumb. Instead, he springs it on her when they come to visit, resulting in her terrible shock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trite, inept problem-solving Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Cleva runs away from the hospital, he vows that she will never see Creighton again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap judgement Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-minded, inflexible Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Creighton is made a ward of the court, Lon determines to make as much money as possible to &quot;get my son out of hock.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task-orientation 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While thousands of extras like him are unemployed, he finds constant work by inventing many disguises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He stubbornly refuses to let Cleva see her son or let Creighton know that his mother is alive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-minded, dogmatic Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He summarily refuses to let his son become an actor when Creighton expresses interest in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap decision-making Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-minded, inflexible Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTER</td>
<td>LON CHANEY, CONT.</td>
<td>BELIEF MULT. SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He disowns Creighton when the boy insists on seeing Cleva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap judgement</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-minded, inflexible</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He apologizes to Creighton for &quot;crowding&quot; his life and sees that he was wrong in the way he acted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded, positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On his deathbed, he writes &quot;Jr.&quot; beside his name on the make-up case, reversing his stand against Creighton becoming an actor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded, positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He then dies, providing a logical place to end the movie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sigmund Freud departs only once from System Four behavior: when he reacts with disgust at his patient Schlosser. For the rest of the film, he is consistent in every action and decision: open to new ideas, however disturbing; creative and innovative in problem-solving; constantly questioning of all judgements; and completely task-oriented to the search for the true nature of human psychology. It is a search that is not without pain, constantly forcing him to analyze his own traumas and neuroses with clinical detachment. He is also depicted as a compassionate, Principled man who seeks to understand the human condition in moral dimensions beyond the conventional social mores and taboos of his time. As a product of his environment, he is disgusted by Schlosser’s subconscious lust for his mother. But as a doctor, a man committed to healing, he suffers from the creeping guilt of having abandoned a patient. Subsequently, he refuses to condemn his patients simply because their inner passions may violate conventional sexual mores. Rather, he is an open-minded, information-seeking scientist who uses his observations to formulate theories that will make their behavior understandable.

Marie Freud behaves as a System Three during much of the film, worried about her husband’s intimate contact with
his patients, but afraid to voice her disapproval outright. She displays System Four independent judgement toward the end of the film, when she refuses to accept Freud’s decision to quit his research and convinces him to continue. This episode also demonstrates a Principled understanding of his work, placing the good his theories may do for humanity above her personal jealousy. Thus, through association with him, she seems to have grown from System Three Nonprincipled to Principled System Four.

Dr. Bayer, Freud’s benefactor, consistently behaves as a System Four and a Principled man. He begins research into the therapeutic uses of hypnosis in mental illness when the tradition-bound medical community considers hypnosis a parlor trick. He supports and encourages Freud’s work, even when he disagrees with his protege’s radical conclusions, remaining open and flexible to new ideas.

Except for Bayer, Freud’s contemporaries in medical science are close-minded, unimaginative, and negative in their attitude toward change. They refuse to consider Freud’s theories or even to give them a polite audience. He is greeted with heckles and jeers when he tries to explain his theory of infant sexuality at the end of the film.
CHARACTER: SIGMUND FREUD  
BELIEF:  
MORAL SYSTEM:  
STAGE:  

He disobeys hospital orders and gives medication to a patient who suffers from psychosomatic symptoms. He disagrees with his superiors over the prevailing belief that mental illness cannot create physical ailments.

- Independent, critical judgement: 4
- Facts over status and authority: 4

He leaves a promising hospital career to study mental illness in Berlin.

- Facts over status: 4
- High task-orientation: 4

He is disgusted by a patient who reveals a subconscious love for his mother and abandons the case, leaving the patient to commit suicide.

- Snap decision: 1
- Close-minded, negative: 1

He spends a year out of practice, struggling to resolve the reasons for his revulsion, and devises a general theory of neurosis based on sex.

- Open-minded, information-seeking: 4
- High task-orientation: 4
- Creative problem-solving: 4

He sticks to his belief that sex is the basis for all neuroses over the objections of Dr. Bayer, his mentor, that it goes against established scientific theory.

- Independent, critical judgement: 4

He uses the dreams about his father’s death to devise a new theory that dreams are ideas escaping from the subconscious.

- Open-minded, information-seeking: 4
- Creative problem-solving: 4
he pursues the idea that neurosis can begin in childhood even though it would seem to destroy his theory of sexually-based neurosis.

Open-minded, flexible

He continues a relentless search for a theory that will answer all his questions, even though it means painfully analysing his own neuroses.

Open-minded, information-seeking

Principle over self-welfare

He strikes on the idea of infantile sexuality after long reconsideration of his dreams and experiences.

Creative-problem-solving

Deliberate judgement

He calmly presents his theory of infantile sexuality to a heckling medical academy, confidant of his position.

Independent, critical judgement
There is scant inconsistency in Fanny Brice's System behavior. She begins the film as a well-balanced System Four in both her professional and private life. She regresses to a System One because of her intense love for Nick Arnstein and finally reverts to a System Four when she releases him at the end of the film.

She demonstrates creative problem-solving frequently in the early part of the film by her ability to turn potentially disastrous stage assignments, such as roller skating or singing a serious song, into high comedy. She is independent and ambitious, knowing where her talent lies and determined to become a star. But never does she become blinded by success. She readily gives up her stage career to follow Nick, realizing that a career, however successful, can't take the place of a happy personal life. It is only when Nick's fortunes turn sour that she loses her Abstract, objective qualities. Her overwhelming love for Nick closes her mind to the truth of their predicament. Nick's pride won't allow him to accept living in her shadow, but she refuses to acknowledge the problem. She becomes insensitive to Nick's discontent, learning that he feels humiliated only when her mother explains that it has become obvious to everyone but her. Her attempt to solve the problem, by thinly disguising a gambling partnership, only makes matters
worse. Nick sees through the deal and feels even more humiliated. Finally, when he asks for a divorce, she clings to him, refusing to see the hopelessness of their situation. Only when he returns from prison does she regain her Abstract open-mindedness and critical judgement, which she demonstrates by realizing that he is right and agreeing to a divorce.

This is also one of the two moments where anything resembling a moral dilemma arises in the film. Legally, she is apparently not obligated to give Nick a divorce. And because she still loves him, she could try to hold him on the Conventional Moral grounds that he has a legal and social commitment to their marriage. But she expresses an understanding that holding him to such a commitment would be morally wrong, and she puts his welfare above her own. The other moral dilemma occurs when Nick is arrested for fraud. Here Fanny demonstrates Nonprincipled behavior when she fails to understand why Nick refuses to lie about his participation in the scheme. All she can see is that by lying he can stay out of jail. Therefore, it appears that she changes from Nonprincipled to Principled behavior as well as from Concrete to Abstract by the end of the film.

Nick Arnstein is much less consistent in Belief System behavior. On the one hand, he holds a very Concrete view of the traditional man-and-wife relationship. He believes that the man should be the bread-winner and cannot accept Fanny's
greater success. On the other hand, he is not close-minded to his problem. He is able to analyze it with an open, critical intellect that indicates Abstract thinking. Thus, he remains something of a paradox. He understands himself too well for a Concrete personality, and yet he is too inflexible in his traditional beliefs to be classified as Abstract. Even though he is never able to come to grips with his problem and makes terribly inept attempts to solve it by participating in a stock fraud, he is able to see the hopelessness of his and Fanny’s predicament much clearer than she. He realizes that his pride is a problem, an irrational deficiency in his character that he can’t overcome, and on that basis, I would classify him finally as a System Four. To put it simply and unscientifically, he is a System Four character with a System One hang-up about male superiority.

Nick’s moral behavior is much clearer. When he involves himself in the stock fraud, he commits an unprincipled act. But when he insists on taking responsibility for the wrongdoing, he moves from a Nonprincipled to a Principled stage. He could follow the advice of his eminently unscrupulous attorneys and avoid jail by lying, but he chooses instead to act out of self-condemnation and conscience. He tells Fanny that he has cheated people and that he must accept the consequences.
Flo Ziegfeld is portrayed as somewhat uneven but predominantly System Four. He is opinionated in insisting that Fanny sing a serious song and threatens to fire her when she defies him. And he doesn't comprehend her reasons for wanting to leave the show and follow Nick. But in both situations, he shows a begrudging open-mindedness and flexibility by respecting her reasoning. Later, he shows sensitive, critical judgement in his analysis of Nick's humiliation and Fanny's mistake in trying to hold him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>FANNY BRICE</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

She remains determined to crash show business despite being fired and told that she has no talent. "I am by far the greatest star, but nobody knows it."

- High task-orientation 4
- Independent, critical judgement 4

She turns her inability to roller skate into a comedy routine and steals the show from the star.

- Creative problem-solving 4

When Flo Ziegfeld forces her to sing a serious song over her objections that she's only good in comedy, she defies him by singing the song dressed as a pregnant woman.

- Creative problem-solving 4
- Independent, critical judgement 4

She quits her successful Follies job to sail with Nick to Europe, even though he didn’t ask her to join him. She explains that pride or career aren’t as important as personal happiness: "You can’t take the stage home with you."

- Interpersonal harmony over status 3

She deduces Nick has lost the house before he tells her and saves his pride by making up an excuse to sell it.

- Creative problem-solving 4
- Sensitive to subtle clues Abs.

She doesn’t realize that her success being greater than Nick’s has caused him to lose his self-respect until her mother tells her.

- Insensitive to subtle clues Con.

She backs Nick’s gambling house in an effort to bolster his pride, but Nick sees through it.

- Trite, inept problem-solving Con.
CHARACTER_FANNY BRICE, CONT. | BELIEF | MORAL
----------------------------------|-------|-------
                                      |       | SYSTEM | STAGE

She persists in going to see Nick in jail when Flo wisely warns her that the visit would further humiliate Nick.
   Close-minded, dogmatic
   Insensitive to subtle clues

She refuses to let Nick go when he begs her to "let me be myself again." She is unable to see the truth when Flo explains that Nick is humiliated by her success and his failure.
   Close-minded, inflexible
   Insensitive to subtle clues

After he returns from prison, she agrees to let Nick divorce her, explaining that she finally understands that she was wrong. She agrees to let him go even though she still loves him.
   Open-minded, flexible
   Independent, critical judgement
   Welfare of others over self
George Patton is a consistent System One man with a Conventional sense of morality. On the battlefield, where heroics are called for, he lives up to his reputation as a brilliantly-successful warrior. At first glance, his military strategy might suggest System Four creative problem-solving, but his responses are more Pavlovian than imaginative. His military tactics are always the same: attack, whatever the circumstances, attack. His responses are so predictable that a junior officer in the German high command is able to foretell his every move, and the film attributes Patton's success in large part to the close-minded stupidity of the German generals. They refuse to believe the junior officer's analysis because it makes Patton's strategy too obvious and simplistic for his reputation. Off the battlefield, Patton is authoritarian, dogmatic, a stickler for procedure, and a glory-hound who revels in pomp and ceremony. He lives by the military book, by a code of conduct that leaves no room for gray areas of ambiguity. This lack of tolerance makes him prone to snap judgements and decisions. He slaps the battle-fatigued soldier; he jumps to the conclusion that he has been appointed to lead the Allied Invasion; he even rushes out during an air raid to attack German planes with his pistol. When he is ordered to apologize for slapping the soldier, he complies, but only out of military obedience. He never
understands the severity of his action or why he is passed over for higher command. He is trapped in a Conventional moral stage, where right and wrong are determined by the letter of the military code.

By comparison, Omar Bradley shines out as a sensitive, objective, rational man of conscience. He is both System Four and Principled. He never covets rank or publicity, and he is never vainglorious about his military promotions. He questions Patton’s motives in the Sicilian campaign, accusing him of gambling with men’s lives in order "to make a bigger splash than Montgomery." As he tells Patton, "The difference between us is that I do this job because I was trained for it. You do it because you love it." He is portrayed as a reluctant warrior, a compassionate soldier who understands the necessity of battle, but who is also aware of its tragic consequences.

Patton’s major antagonists are the German high command, which, as mentioned above, is comprised of Concrete System Ones. The one exception is the young officer whose independent critical judgement and open-mindedness in considering all the possibilities suggests System Four behavior. And his appearance in the film implies that Patton’s military achievements might have been greatly diminished had he been confronted with a more Abstract and, consequently, more formidable adversary.
He decides to wear his third star before Congress actually awards it to him. "Congress has their schedule, I have mine."

- Status over facts
- Independent judgement

He runs out into the open during an German air attack and fires at the planes with a pistol.

- Snap, impulsive judgement

On learning that Rommel plans a surprise attack, he stages a counter attack that wins the battle, basing his plan on Rommel’s own strategy.

- Creative problem-solving

He is disappointed because Montgomery is chosen to lead the North African campaign and consequently garners the news headlines.

- Status over information

He swallows his disappointment and gives full support to Montgomery when his alternate plan is rejected because "I am a soldier. I will obey my orders."

- Authority over information

He uses the slowness of communications to full effect to unofficially ignore orders and push on to take Palermo.

- Creative problem-solving

He orders Lucien Prescott to make a dangerous assault, costly in soldier’s lives, so that he can beat Montgomery to Mecina.

- Self-gain over welfare of others

He slaps a battle-fatigued soldier in the injured ward and calls him a "yellow son-of-a-bitch."

- Snap, impulsive judgement
**CHARACTER GEORGE PATTON, CONT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority over information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He follows orders and makes an apology, even though he doesn’t believe that he did anything wrong.  

Authority over information | 1

He jumps to the wrong conclusion and is surprised to learn that he is not chosen to lead the Allied assault.  

Insensitive to subtle clues | 1
Snap, impulsive judgement | 1

He volunteers his unit for a mission  
Montgomery considers impossible and has no doubt he will succeed because of the quality of his soldiers.  

Independent, critical judgement | 4
Information over authority | 4

He puts the objective of the mission over the lives of his men, demanding victory at all costs. "If we’re not victorious, let no man come back alive."  

Convention over welfare of others | NonP.

He refuses to go along with the official policy of goodwill toward the Russians and will toast only to the fact that they are "sons of bitches."  

Close-minded, inflexible | 1
Snap judgement | 1
Independent, critical judgement | 4
LADY SINGS THE BLUES  
(1972)

This depiction of Billy Holiday is a prime example of a characterization that will not fit neatly into either the Harvey or Kohlberg scheme. Holiday begins the film as an independent young woman who supports the conventional values of her day: hard work and Victorian morality. Given better circumstances she would no doubt have become a solid member of society, or at least suffered from the ordinary human frailties of decision-making which these scales are designed to detect. But she is presented as a victim of her times and her environment. Her major antagonists are not people, but rather the circumstances of her birth: She is black, poor, and a woman. And her only allies are the pernicious escapes to drugs and prostitution. In the context of the movie, her turn to prostitution might seem to indicate a logical choice of information over status, of choosing the only road out of hopeless poverty. But this choice is also presented as a weakness of spirit and deterioration of resolve. Similarly, she begins taking drugs to escape the cruel reality of her surroundings after witnessing a black lynching. There is not creative System Four method to beat the system in the milieu of this film. The lynching becomes the final blow in a relentless beating of the spirit: victimized by rape, forced to work in brothels, and constantly subjected
to the dehumanizing spectacle of racism in her first cross-
country tour. Once infected with drugs the logic of her
decisions and moral attitudes are no more applicable to the
Harvey and Kohlberg measurements than administering these same
tests to drug addicts in real life, something to my
knowledge neither research has done. One can conclude,
however, from her sense of horror at the lynching and
subsequent lashing out at the Klansmen that she violently
disagrees with this injustice and is therefore Principled
before her descent into the cloudy world of drugs.

Louis, on the other hand, is System Four. He shows a
preference for information over status by treating her with
equal dignity during their courtship. He is the only man in
the audience to offer her a tip in hand when the others are
clamouring for a lewd display. He realizes both her
dependence on heroin and the evil it causes and provides the
strength to help her regain control. He falters only once,
telling her to leave after she threatens him with a knife
during her drug-induced hysteria. Even then he is shown to
make the decision deliberately. Otherwise, he stands at her
side until the end of the film. But because Louis never
confronts any moral situations his classification is
unresolved.

Jerry, the club owner, appears to be a System Three;
kind-hearted, racially fair, but most concerned with keeping
his club running smoothly. Piano Man, a System Four, is
perceptive, creative, and critically concerned with Billy’s welfare. In the end, however, he lacks the inner strength to help either her or himself and ultimately loses his life to the struggle with drugs. Ray hooks Billy on drugs, then forsakes her when his band nets the radio contract, showing a lack of concern which definitely qualifies as Nonprincipled. Harry, on the other hand, continues to stand behind her throughout the film as a Principled friend. Both show System Four open-mindedness and creativity in choosing Billy, a black singer, to accompany their band.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: BILLY HOLIDAY</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She realizes from a quick look that the rooming house of her mother’s friend is actually a brothel.</td>
<td>Sensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td>Abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She works hard and accept ridicule from her neighbors rather than turn to the easy wages of prostitution.</td>
<td>pro-establishment, conventional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She begs Jerry for a job performing in his club and is so insistent she has to be carried out.</td>
<td>High task-orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She quits her job as a prostitute rather than have her mother discover her occupation.</td>
<td>concern for interpersonal harmony</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She resists the booing of the audience and refuses to participate in the practice of picking up tips with her genitalia.</td>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She agrees to sing with a white band, even though the idea is new and she is initially negative.</td>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>Abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She attacks the tour enthusiastically at first, happy to be traveling and singing.</td>
<td>High task-orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She agrees to quit drugs at Louis’ insistence.</td>
<td>concern with interpersonal harmony</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She realizes her addiction to drugs and checks herself into a sanitarium for a cure.</td>
<td>Independent, critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTER</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM STAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILLY HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After leaving prison, she gives up her career to be a housewife.

- concern with interpersonal harmony: 3

She agrees to go back to work only with Louis' permission and won't tour without his accompanying her.

- concern with interpersonal harmony: 3

She continues to sing after the trauma of witnessing Piano Man's violent death and the refusal of the commission to restore her cabaret license.

- High task-orientation: 3
Frank Serpico is portrayed as a strongly Principled, System Four man caught in a corrupt environment where Pre-conventional "Rewards and Punishments" morality and System One non-critical thinking are the standard practice. It is easy to see from his classification chart that Serpico never varies from his values of honesty and personal integrity, even under the intense pressure of his peers and superiors. He shows creativity, imagination, and high task-orientation in performing his duty. He affects believable disguises working undercover when his fellow plainclothesmen wear "white shoes and black socks", he eagerly seeks all calls in his sector, and he performs the most dangerous assignments fearlessly. But the system in which he works, the Department, will not allow him simply to be "an honest cop."

The most interesting feature of this film is the number and quality of his antagonists. With the exceptions of Bob Blair, Sidney Green, and Inspector Lombardo, every working member of the police force that he encounters, and there are many, are shallow, dishonest, and more concerned with image than values. And even though they are the power structure, charged with upholding the law, their moral attitude does not even rise to the "law and Order" Conventional stage. They operate at the Preconventional level of rewards and punishments, and "good boy-bad boy". They rationalize
breaking the law and taking bribes because "nobody gets hurt." They never question the status quo because they don't want to get into trouble with their fellow officers or their superiors. And the superiors, such as Commissioner Delaney, Captain McClain, and Capt. Kellogg, allow the corruption to continue because they are only concerned with the public image of the department. And when Serpico tarnishes that image by going to "outside agencies", the reaction by the department is uniform at all levels: revenge and punishment. His fellow officers see him as traitor and allow him to get shot. The police administration tries to make him a scapegoat by denying they had any knowledge of the corruption, even though he had been giving information to Capt. McClain for several years.

Inspector Lombardo is depicted as the one honest cop Serpico encounters in his various precinct assignments. Lombardo volunteers to work with Frank and puts his twenty year career in jeopardy by going to the New York Times. He, Blair, and Green are presented as the tiny minority of honest cops in this film.

Serpico's two love interests, Laurie and Leslie, are presented as women in the background of larger events. Both are System Three's, perceptive to his moods and subservient to his career problems, and seeking a harmonious personal relationship. When they each realize that such a relationship is impossible because his preoccupation with the force
is all-consuming, they make the only sensible choice and leave him.
He persuades the rapist to reveal his partners after the detectives fail by using force, and he captures the two men single-handedly when the department refuses to give him support.

Creative problem-solving
High task-orientation

He enrolls in the fingerprinting course and takes Spanish lessons at night because he wants to become a detective.

High task orientation

He allows the patrolmen who shoot at him to take his collar so that they won’t get into trouble.

Welfare of others over self
Facts over status

He deliberates long and hard after being offered the standard weekly pay-off at his new assignment before turning it down.

Deliberate judgement
Principle over self-gain

He refuses to take part in a collar because his partner takes a bribe to lighten the charge.

Principle over convention

He refuses under pressure from Keough and Rubello to take the weekly pad.

Principle over self-gain

He risks his career by going to the mayor’s assistant, Jerry Berman, to tell about the corruption when he can’t get help in the department.

Principle over self-interest

He stands up under the pressure of meeting all the plainclothesmen in the park, still refusing the money.

Principle over self-gain
Independent, critical judgement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>SERPICO, CONT.</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He arrests a loan shark and books him in front of the other men, even though the shark is supposed to be off-limits because he pays off the department. He doesn’t go along with their argument that the shark is &quot;good people&quot;, and learns the shark is a cop killer. Independent, critical judgement Information over authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He stands up to Capt. McClain and refuses to tell his superior what &quot;outside agency&quot; he has been to when the Capt. has done nothing with his information for a year and a half. Independent, critical judgement Information over authority Principle over self-welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He stands up to both the investigators, refusing to testify because their investigation is a &quot;meaningless whitewash&quot;, and to his fellow officers, who threaten him for being a stool pigeon. Independent, critical judgement Principle over self-welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He doesn’t realize that his constant agonizing over his work has ended the relationship with Laurie, his girl friend, until she leaves him. Insensitive to subtle clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is more concerned with getting to the truth in the grand jury hearings than in the promise of a gold shield by district attorney Talbot. Principle over self-gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He finally agrees to reveal his story to the New York Times, knowing he will be ostracized by the department superiors as well as his fellow officers. Principle over self-gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite threats to his life by his coworkers in narcotics, he goes alone to checkout a suspected drug scene and gets shot when the other officers fail to protect him.

- Principle over self-gain
- High task-orientation

He rejects the coveted gold shield and leaves the force because he can’t be an honest cop.

- Principle over self-gain

He testifies at the public hearing because he hopes that “future officers will not suffer the same frustrations... I was subjected to.” He says “Police corruption can’t exist unless tolerated at the higher levels.”

- Principle over convention
Lenny Bruce is presented as a tragic figure, a man who matures from Concrete to System Four behavior and then is tormented back, by the repressive System One society he seeks to change, into a System Two character.

As the film begins, he is a Concrete personality, alternating between System One and System Two behavior. He is an ambitious young comedian, doing trite, innocuous material, hoping for fame and success. But his mind is too sharp and his perceptions too good not to see the social hypocrisy around him. When Sherman Hart lectures him about working "clean" while, at the same time, fondling Honey's leg, Lenny strikes back with a dirty remark on stage the next night. It is an impulsive, anti-establishment gesture, born of frustration, but it launches his personal and professional growth into a Principled, System Four personality.

During the next few years, he remains an ambivalent Concrete character, fluctuating between pro- and anti-establishment behavior. He is a jealous, emotionally confused, and reactionary husband, expecting System One norms of fidelity and respectable behavior from Honey, while, at the same time, encouraging her to follow his example of promiscuity. This tormenting double-standard finally leads to Honey's dope addiction and, consequently,
to an end of their marriage.

It is at this point that we see Lenny mature into a System Four, Principled personality. He is depicted as a sad but wiser father, assuming the responsibility of raising their daughter. The subject matter of his act changes from material that is merely socially rebellious (strip-joint humor) into material that is socially conscious. He is shown as an open-minded, creative social commentator, using taboo language to expose System One hypocrisy. As the professor of theology puts it, testifying in court, "Lenny has a message to convey...He uses words as weapons."

Unfortunately, Lenny becomes a victim of the hypocritical standards he fights. He is arrested and tried on numerous obscenity charges, and the stress of legal harassment causes him to revert to System Two behavior. He becomes a heavy drug user. He develops an obsessive interest in his court cases that destroys his objective detachment. He loses his creative ability to make humorous material out of his experiences and finally dies of a drug overdose.

Lenny's antagonist is the collective System One Establishment, represented by the policemen, court officials, and prosecutors. They are close-minded, uncritical, dogmatic, and negative to change. They show no interest in understanding Lenny's criticisms but only in preserving the law and the status-quo standards of decency,
making them the epitomes of System One and Conventional behavior. When Lenny tries to explain his position in court, the judge has him removed. The local prosecutors hound his act. The policemen stand in the aisles, listening not to his arguments, but only for the dirty words that will signal a bust. They are blind and deaf to the hypocrisy they represent. This attitude is best typified by the policeman who admits to using dirty language in the station locker room but threatens Lenny: "If you ever said that in front of my wife and kids, I'd punch you right out."

Interestingly enough, the citizenry in this film, represented by Lenny's audiences and even members of his jury, understand him very well. They laugh and respond to his social criticisms with System Four objectivity.

The people closest to Lenny -- his wife, his mother, and his agent -- are all System Three. Honey Bruce is a good-hearted but weak-willed follower, constantly seeking Lenny's approval. She does whatever he asks: gives up her act, gets into dope, engages in sex with various partners, all to please her husband. She lives by his command, telling him at one point that she could give up drugs if he would just tell her to do so. Artie, Lenny's agent, is an unctious phoney who keeps his convictions in his wallet. At the end of the film, he laments Lenny's death with studied sincerity, then adds: "And I'm very glad his records are starting to sell again." Sally, Lenny's mother, is the sly
manipulator, saying one thing behind his back and another to his face. She tells Lenny she's happy he's getting married, while using Artie to try to dissuade him.
He decides to marry Honey against the advice of his mother and his agent who don’t like her because she is a stripper.

- Independent, critical judgement: 4
- Open-minded, information-seeking: 4

He perceives that his mother has put Artie up to trying to talk him out of marrying Honey.

- Sensitive to subtle clues: 4

He makes a dirty remark in front of Sherman Hart on stage, knowing that it will cost him his job and a TV appearance on Hart’s show.

- Anti-status over facts: 2
- Snap, impulsive decision: 2

He becomes jealous and possessive of Honey, not wanting her to work alone, after they are married.

- Trite, inept problem-solving: Con.
- Status over information: Con.

He pretends not to be bothered by Honey’s dope problem or her sex with other people by actually encouraging both, but then torments her because it really does bother him. He can’t bring himself to ask her to stop, even though she begs him to do so.

- Insensitive to subtle clues: 2
- Trite, inept problem-solving: 2

He turns down work at a big club until Artie assures him he will have complete freedom in his act.

- Independent, critical judgement: 4
- Information over status: 4
- Deliberate judgement: 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER: Lenny Bruce, Cont.</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

He risks using racial slurs in his comedy act to show the audience the power of words. "It's the suppression of words that gives it the power, the viciousness."

- Facts over status: 4
- High task-orientation: 4
- Independent critical judgement: 4
- Creative problem-solving: 4

He counters accusations of being a sick comedian by pointing to larger social ills in America. "What's really sick: Zsa Zsa Gabor is making $60,000 a week in Las Vegas. "I make a living on social misfortunes. If the world was good, I'd be looking for a job."

- Independent, critical judgement: 4
- Understanding principle over convention: Prin.

He turns his experience in marriage into comedy material by analysing his own experiences with jealousy.

- Creative problem-solving: 4
- Open-minded, information-seeking: 4

When the police monitor his show for dirty language, he substitutes "blah, blah, blah" for "cocksucker" and turns the act into "the dirtiest show I've ever done in my life."

- Creative problem-solving: 4

He becomes so obsessed with his trials that his comedy act turns into a legal recital. He doesn't notice that he is boring the audience.

- Insensitive to subtle clues: 2
- Trite, inept problem-solving: 2
He disregards the advice of his lawyers and finally fires them to handle his own defense. He shouts at the judge and has to be removed from the court.

- Close-minded, dogmatic
- Trite, inept problem-solving

He turns to drugs and ruins his act, rambling incoherently on stage.

- Trite, inept problem-solving
- Status and authority over facts
Coal Miner’s Daughter (1979)

Coal Miner’s Daughter stands out as one of the most honest and intelligent films in this survey. The characterizations are unembellished with high melodrama, but effective in creating modest, believable people. Loretta Lynn is shown as a simple country girl of thirteen who grows into an independent System Four woman as her high-powered career forces her to take responsibility for the direction of her life. During the early part of the film, she is seen as filling the role of a conventional System Three housewife and mother. Dooley is the driving force behind her life, making her decisions and molding her career. She follows his lead uncritically as the almost docile mate, keeping her husband happy. Then she reaches a period of readjustment as her career takes off and Dooley, the man she has always depended on to make her decisions, is left in the background. Finally, at the end of the film, she manages to assert her independence and still preserve her marriage by accepting equality with Doo rather than trying to turn the tables and dominate him. There are no true moral conflicts in this film which would indicate a Kohlberg Stage because the central dilemma turns on her adjustment to balancing both career and family.

Husband Dooley is presented as highly-motivated, self-confident System Four. He shows creative problem-solving
and strong independent judgement by pushing her career in the right direction: recognizing her ability to sing, urging her to learn the guitar, taking her publicity photos, writing letters all night, driving her around the country. He is also perceptive enough to first realize that their roles are reversed once she becomes successful. As he tells Loretta: "Getting here's one thing. Being here's another. My job's done, baby. I'll just get me another." After a brief bout with drinking, he settles into the life of taking care of the children and remaining in the background without bitterness or permanent loss of self-esteem.

In both cases, the characters are shown as people who draw from inner strengths and make the required adjustments to life as events force them from one world to another. The first world places them in the conventional System One roles of breadwinner and wife. The second causes them to reevaluate these traditional social modes and come to grips with a lifestyle outside their experience. The transition is successful because both are, at heart, System Four people who can rise to the challenge.
She disregards her daddy's good advice ("don't throw all them shining young years away") and agrees to marry Dooley at 13.

Interpersonal harmony over facts 3

When she is still mad at Doo for sending her back home, she still gets jealous seeing him talking to another woman and runs her off.

Concern with interpersonal harmony 3

She leaves her family and home to join Doo when he sends her the money.

Concern with interpersonal harmony 3

She practices constantly on the guitar while caring for the house and kids.

High task-orientation 4

She figures out Doo is arranging to have her sing in the Grange before he tells her and tries to climb out the bathroom window.

Sensitive to subtle clues Abs.

Although petrified of audiences, she agrees to sing at Doo's insistence.

Concern with interpersonal harmony 3

She agrees to travel around singing and promoting her record at Doo's direction.

Concern with interpersonal harmony 3

At her father's grave, she chooses to pursue a singing career when Doo asks her to make a decision.

Independent, critical thinking 4

She travels with Doo to many radio stations and overcomes her shyness, forcing herself to give interviews to the disc jockeys.

High task-orientation 4
She tries wearing make-up and refuses to take it off just to obey Doo. Independent, critical judgement.

After working herself to exhaustion, she realizes that "things are moving too fast" and that she has to run her own life. Independent, critical judgement.
The Thomas Edison of this film is one percent inspiration and ninety-nine percent perspiration. He is a hardworking, task-oriented System Four who owes most of his creative success to a determined attitude and an insatiable curiosity. His ideas for the phonograph and the vacuum bulb may come in a stroke of brilliance, but they are portrayed as the end products of long stretches of trial and error.

Edison also demonstrates Principled behavior in his impassioned address to the court when he fights to retain his patents. He tells the judge that he has never been concerned with personal gain in his work, but only with helping humanity. He states that he invented the light bulb "to give the world a brighter, safer light." Throughout the film, his decisions are never affected by wealth or status. For him, money is only a means to an end, something he must have to continue his experiments. He displays his integrity when he refuses to accept Taggert's offer of support. Although desperately in need of money, he is willing to close the lab rather than to work only for commercial ends and lose his freedom to experiment.

Mary Edison is a System Three, supportive of her husband, enduring his long absences from home with only mild, half-hearted complaint. She is sensitive to his moods and subtle in making comments about the time he spends in
the lab. Her only concern is for Tom’s happiness and the welfare of her family.

Edison’s principal benefactors, Taggert and Powell, represent opposite ends of the spectrum. Taggert is a narrow-minded, status-conscious System One who sees Edison’s work only in terms of potential profit. Mired in the Conventional morality of a greedy Robber Baron, he never understands Edison’s humanitarian motives and tries throughout the film to steal or control his inventions. General Powell, on the other hand, is a Principled System Four who supports Edison’s research on higher cause. He is open and receptive to Edison’s ideas, allowing him complete freedom in his experiments. He is also a perceptive judge of character and warns Edison not to trust Taggert. That Powell is willing to listen to the young, unknown inventor and take a chance on backing his ideas is indicative of independent, critical judgement and information-based decision-making. That he supports the work for the good of humanity, and not for the sake of profit, shows that he is Principled.

Edison’s workers, as a group, would seem to be System Four and Principled by virtue of their dedication and loyalty. They match his long hours in the lab, share his dreams and defeats, and even come back to work for free when he tries to lay them off because of his lack of funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>THOMAS EDISON</th>
<th>BELIEF</th>
<th>MORAL SYSTEM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He takes a menial job assisting Uncle Ben so that he can have a place to read and experiment with electricity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Information over status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After fixing the ticker tape machine, he trades the offer of a cash reward for a chance to present his idea for a lab to Powell.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He chooses his men by watching them work rather than by second-hand references.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He gives one man a chance to prove himself, even when the man is convinced he can’t do the required job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information over status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Independent critical judgment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He keeps his mouth shut and lets Taggart and Powell up the bid when he doesn’t know how much to ask for the stock machine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reserved, deliberate judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sets out to invent the light bulb and works on it day and night, ignoring his family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He turns down Taggart’s offer to save his lab because it would mean giving up his freedom to experiment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High task orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Independent critical judgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He gets the idea for the phonograph from a mistake Uncle Ben makes and uses the invention to keep the lab in operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARACTER THOMAS EDISON, CONT.

He refuses to give up on the light bulb when accused of making sensational claims and experiments with hundreds of materials for the filament.

Independent, critical judgement
High task orientation

He gets the idea for using a vacuum from watching his son play.

Creative problem-solving
Open minded, flexible

He gives Johnny a chance to redeem his careless mistake after he breaks the first light bulb.

Reserved, deliberate judgements

He tells the court that he didn’t invent the light bulb for money but to help humanity by giving the world “a brighter, safer light.”

Welfare of others over self-gain

He works to the last minute fixing the dynamoes and fulfills his promise to light up the city in three months, a task his opponents claim is impossible.

High task orientation
Independent, critical judgement
VII. FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

APPLICATION OF METHODOLOGY

The Harvey and Kohlberg analysis schemes proved appropriate for use with dramatic film characters. In the case of Harvey, nearly all of the leading characters exhibited behavior which was consistent with a particular Belief System. Definite Kohlberg classifications were less extensive, but still included well over half of the biographical subjects. The entertainment and sports figures seemed to suffer most in determining a moral stage because these film characters seldom confronted issues of Principle. Problems encountered by these characters were usually domestic: balancing family and career, troubled romances, coping with personal tragedy, and the like.

An unexpected bonus was the ability of Harvey and Kohlberg to pick out characterizations which were overly-contrived and unrealistic. For example, with some characters -- Flo Ziegfeld, Pancho Villa, Al Jolson, and Billy Holiday -- it appears that the film makers were trying to contort the real events of their lives into a System Four mold. This manipulation becomes readily apparent with the analysis of Kohlberg and Harvey because the characters end up with a set of conflicting behavior traits that fit
no consistent pattern.

The last few films on the survey, from Patton to the present, seem to indicate a new direction in the portrayal of biographical subjects. I'm not sure if "more honest" is an accurate description, but certainly they are presented with more warts and less awe. One might assume that these more complex characterizations would pose a tougher problem for Harvey and Kohlberg analysis, but I found that not to be the case. Again, subjects with character flaws and human frailties were no more difficult to classify than the older film subjects -- as long as their portrayals were not manipulated to fit an artificial System Four or Principled mold. Both Lenny Bruce and Loretta Lynn displayed consistent Belief System and moral behavior, while Patton and Billy Holiday did not. The Billy Holiday story in particular is a good example of a muddled characterization where the film makers attempt to twist certain less-than-noble facts about her life, such as drug addiction and prostitution, into a System Four and Principled profile. The result is a lack of believability, a feature which the Kohlberg and Harvey schemes help to ferret out. I believe that this discovery, further pursued, might contribute a significant analytical tool to the area of film research.

While the validity of any content analysis study which depends on a single judge is more questionable
than one with a trained panel, I believe that the use of classification charts as designed for this study relieve this problem in several ways. First, it helps the examiner to become disassociated from preconceptions by forcing him or her to analyse the pertinent events individually and in chronological order. Second, it provides the reader with a documented record of the evidence which was used to reach conclusions.

Based on the results of this study, the potential for further film analysis using Kohlberg and Harvey seems most promising. Two suggestions for research:

1. The Kohlberg scale in this study was designed primarily to separate Principled from Conventional moral development. Hence, many of the leading characters remained undefined because their films lacked clear moral conflicts at the Principled level. It seems likely that the Kohlberg research could produce more determinations by scaling down the classifications to include actions and statements at the Conventional and Preconventional levels. These determinations might prove quite valuable in other types of film study.

2. The question arises: If these scales for behavioral and psychological research can prove useful to film, why not the reverse? What are the possibilities of using films to aid in the understanding of moral and intellectual development of people? Kohlberg uses stories of moral
dilemmas to evoke measurable responses. Certainly there are moral conflicts in some of these sample films every bit as strong and clear-cut as the much-quoted example of the man who can't afford medicine for his wife. Pasteur violates the standard scientific practice to innoculate a child with his untested rabies vaccine. Similar dilemmas arise with Paul Ehrlich, Emile Zola, even Lenny Bruce. Responses to the episode of George Patton slapping the soldier might prove as insightful, or more so, as O.J. Harvey's "This I Believe" test in determining Belief Systems. And certainly no verbal or written story can compete with the attention-holding power and involvement level of a good Hollywood movie. The possibilities of adapting this medium, which embodies state-of-the-art entertainment, to the service of investigating the human sciences seems both exciting and worthwhile.

THE FILMS

Overall the characters in these film biographies represent very positive and socially-desirable models for the American public. Most protagonists are presented either as System Four characters or characters who grow to System Four by the end of the film. And the majority of those classifiable into a Moral Stage are depicted as Principled.

This conclusion may not seem startling considering the dictate of the Motion Picture Code to "hold up for
admiration the highest types of characters." However, the Code, which operated during the period when most of these films were made, is itself a rules-oriented document, reflecting no more than conventional moral and intellectual development. According to these standards it would be perfectly acceptable to have leading characters who were Concrete System Ones or Nonprincipled but representing a "law and order" mentality. In fact, one passage of the Code reads: "law, natural or human, shall not be ridiculed, nor shall sympathy be created for its violation." (Stanley, p. 285) And yet, despite this, almost all of the positive protagonists in these films, the ones who make significant contributions to society and represent success, display or reach System Four thinking. System Four and Principled behavior are presented as more attractive and productive than System One and Non Principled, even though either end of the scale can represent pro-establishment attitudes. Overwhelmingly, the screen subjects are shown to achieve their success by holding to the Abstract qualities that the Harvey studies tell us are so important for coping in the modern world: flexibility, open-mindedness, creativity in problem situations, and independent, self-critical judgment. They are also shown to be honorable and worthy of admiration in moral conflicts by holding fast to their Principled judgement.

Conversely, Concrete behavior, characterized by
inflexibility, intolerance, rash judgements, and the rest, is shown to bring nothing but unhappiness and failure: Lon Chaney and Eddie Duchin both lose contact with their sons because of their close-minded insensitivity; Monty Stratton creates nothing but misery for his family by wallowing in self-pity; Dizzy Dean loses his wife and his self-respect by refusing to acknowledge that his pitching arm has gone bad; and George Patton loses his command by impulsively slapping a soldier.

A more interesting finding in this study is the treatment of antagonists. Before conducting this research, I would have assumed that the most likely candidates for villainy would be the System two personalities: criminals, social outcasts, and rebels who are anti-establishment. Surprisingly, this was hardly ever the case. Almost all of the antagonists in these films were portrayed as System Ones, often as the most prominent members of the establishment: doctors, lawyers, bankers, and politicians. They are not mustachioed bandits or evil geniuses or underworld racketeers, but more generally the respected authority figures of the community, blindly upholding the status-quo against any change. Pasteur, Curie, Ehrlich, Freud, and Edison all must battle an intellectually-hostile scientific community which adamantly opposes any challenge to traditional methods. Lincoln faces a crafty, but dull-witted prosecutor more interesting in a conviction than
the truth. The French military establishment which Zola confronts in the film of 1937 is no different from the New York Police Department in *Serpico*, made thirty-six years later. Both institutions are more interested in status than information and are willing to cover up massive corruption in their ranks to protect their image. The message in these films is ironic: The scientific community, officially charged with advancing knowledge, is depicted as its most active opponent. The police and the military, charged with defending civilization and social justice, are portrayed as more corrupt than the average citizen they are supposed to protect.

The picture is not totally grim, however, and these institutions, while often lead by thick-headed or corrupt administrators, are capable of change. Principled System Four protagonists almost always succeed over NonPrincipled System One opponents. (Two notable exceptions are the stories of Lenny Bruce and Billy Holiday, in which the Principled protagonists are beaten by a NonPrincipled power structure they are helpless to change.) Sometimes, as in the case of Dr. Charbonnet in *The Story of Louis Pasteur* and the medical community in *Dr. Ehrlich's Magic Bullet*, the antagonists see the errors of their ways and mature to System Four open-mindedness. Sometimes, the scoundrels are thrown out of power, and the guilty brought to justice. But the power structure, however sluggish, usually reforms in
the end.

A common trait to all these films is the innate sense of justice and intelligence found in the body public. The common folk are shown as the protagonist’s most powerful ally, and when the protagonists are stifled by the System One establishment, they often succeed by taking their case to the people. Zola writes books, Serpico goes to The New York Times, Edison is vindicated in court, and Pasteur and Erhlich leave the medical community to test their cures on a trusting public. Even when the System is too formidable for change, as in the cases of Lenny Bruce and Billy Holiday, the public is still shown to side with these protagonists, responding to their performances with affection and admiration as long as they are System Four or Principled. Not that the people can’t be mislead, but they always listen to reason: Lincoln turns an angry lynch mob into a cheering crowd with a simple appeal to logic and fairness. Nathan Rothschild calms a hysterical stock market by a similar appeal. Without exception, the people as a whole are shown as having an uncanny perception for separating the saints from the sinners, the truth from the lies, and wisdom from poppycock. Perhaps this show of faith in the common man is indicative of the American character and its democratic heritage. Certainly it acts as a very effective dramatic device which shows us, the viewing masses, which side to root for. But the moral lesson in
this depiction is positive. It tells us that fighting stupidity and injustice is not only a worthy cause, but a productive one. Voices in the wilderness will be heard. System Four and Principled protagonists will triumph over a Concrete and NonPrincipled authority structure with the support of an enlightened public.

The evidence in this study tends to support Daniel Boorstin's notion of a shift in media attention from the hero to the celebrity. Before 1949, the large majority of subjects chosen for biographies were people of great accomplishment in science, medicine, or politics. Only three subjects were in entertainment or sports. After 1949, the majority of film subjects chosen were entertainment and sports figures. The study also found that while most of the characters coming from the fields of science and politics were classified as Principled, few of the entertainment and sports figures could be classified into any Kohlberg stage. The stories in this latter group of films usually lacked the Principled ethical conflicts necessary to determine a moral stage. Thus, the majority of entertainers and sports personalities were found to be "morally-neutral", supporting one of the key distinctions Boorstin makes between heroes and celebrities.

On the Harvey scale, however, the distinctions were not so clear-cut. Fame and success was shown in all groups to be the result of System Four high-task orientation and
creative problem-solving. Or in plain English: the product of hard work, talent, and imagination. Entertainers and scientists, baseball players and U.S. presidents, all display tireless devotion and extraordinary commitment to their work. Nowhere in these films is success portrayed as merely the result of a lucky break, nor are any of the subjects shown to be casual participants in their rise to "greatness." Therefore the results of this research seem to refute an important aspect of Boorstin's conclusions: the definition of a "celebrity" as someone who is passive or unaccomplished or interested only in fame for fame's sake resembles none of the film subjects in the survey.

Nor are these successful people depicted as Michael Wood's "weird, fascinating monsters" lacking any sense of decency and fair play. If anything, decency and fair play abound in these films. Only John Dillinger, the gangster, is unscrupulous. The successful scientists and political figures, as already noted, show endless moral decency and concern for others. Even the entertainers and athletes who are not definitively Principled display a basic goodness and sense of honor. They often sacrifice for their family and loved ones, and almost always maintain a professional integrity.

The portrayal of women in these films differs substantially from that of men. Only four of the twenty-nine film subjects were women, and their emotional dependence on
spouses and lovers is more heavily emphasized than in most of the male-subject films. Male scientists -- Ehrlich, Edison, Pasteur -- work alone, while Eve Curie, the single female scientist, is shown as working in partnership with her husband, Pierre. The dominant theme in the stories of Billy Holiday, Fanny Brice, and Loretta Lynn is the struggle between career and domestic happiness. These women all sacrifice their profession goals at times to keep their relationships intact, something which almost never happens in the male-subject films. While all four women show System Four characteristics to some extent, the overall impression one would get from viewing these films is that successful women are more dependent on their spouses for leadership and more concerned with domestic relationships than their male counterparts.

Women also fare differently from men in the roles of minor and supporting characters. While the male characters seemed fairly evenly divided among the Harvey classifications, the females were presented almost exclusively as Abstract. Their role in these films is relegated mostly to being supportive wives and sweethearts. Seldom, if ever, are they the antagonists, associates, or friends of the film subjects. The lack of women in these parts seems to have created a benign stereotype, in which the woman is intelligent, flexible, perceptive, understanding and gifted in subtle manipulation. These are System Three characteris-
tics, but some women also show System Four independent judgement, creative problem-solving, and high task orientation. But a stereotype, however benign, is still not an honest reflection of any group, and women have not received equal treatment in this film sample.

In summary, there is little that is overtly worrisome or pernicious about the image of fame and success in these films, and certainly much that is positive in a democratic society that values hard work, free enterprise, and individualism. Some films tackle weighty social issues; others are romantic fluff. But there is a similar moral in all. This is what Hollywood is telling us about fame and glory and the screen biography: If you want Marlin Brando or Barbra Streisand to play your life, you have to do something to earn it. And to earn it, and enjoy it, you have to work hard and play fair. You have to be open-minded and flexible. You have to be receptive to new ideas, people, and situations. You have to be creative, and self-decisive, and always questioning of the status-quo.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Of course, reporting on the state of the emperor's clothes doesn't necessarily tell us what the fearful subjects think they see. How much of this message is getting through to the public remains a far larger question, and one untouched in the study. How many people believe that Patton was a great man, regardless of his screen
portrayal, simply because they like George C. Scott? Can a
System One viewer be expected to comprehend the consequences
of Patton’s behavior any more than the film character does
himself? Can the person who is pro-establishment see any
deepen into the film character than the shiny brass buttons
on his uniform. Does the anti-establishment rebel see more
than an image of instant repugnance? Does the System Three
date on the arm of the System Two rebel really give a darn
about any of this, except how to agree with everything the
rebel says when they leave the theatre?

Ironically, if Harvey’s research is right, then the
people who can most benefit from the message in these films,
those with Concrete Belief Systems, are the least likely to
receive it. A valuable way to pursue the issues of this
study might be to examine how students in different Belief
Systems and Moral Stages react to the subjects in some of
these films. This approach might make the most useful
contribution to education by helping students to understand
themselves through the study of film.

2. Another interesting topic for further study might be
The George C. Scott Syndrome, or how stars affect the image
of biographical film subjects. This could be pursued by
analyzing all of the different screen versions of several
historical figures, such as Abraham Lincoln and Jesse James.
These two names come to mind because I know there have been
at least half a dozen films made about each and they represent opposite sides of law and society. It would interesting to see how people react to these different characterizations and also how the portrayals have changed or remained similar over the years.

3. Another topic would be to compare screen biographies to the actual lives of the film subjects or to their literary biographies. Choosing representative films and books from different eras might point up changes in the way Hollywood treats its biographical subjects.

4. Or one could compare the biographical subjects chosen by different national film industries to reflect historical trends and cultural insights? For example, what could the Kohlberg and Harvey schemes tell us about the values of film "heroes" of the Nazi cinema? Were these characters presented as System Four? Principled? What about the Russian cinema? Are their differences between the depiction of a screen Stalin and a Hollywood Lincoln? What are the similarities? The possibilities seem endless.

5. My final implication is a short and improbable vision of the future, in the form of a script. It is offered in response to the question: Wouldn't Hollywood make better movies if the film makers were guided by research from the scholars and critics?
FADE IN:

INT. MOVIE PRODUCERS OFFICE - DAY

The year is 1993. Two writers enter.

    PRODUCER
    Guys, I've just optioned the
    hottest property in ten years.

He tosses them a manuscript.

    WRITER
    The Barker Story? Who's Barker?

    PRODUCER
    This one really packs a
    whallop, fellas. The true story
    of a homespun country boy who
    wins a Nobel prize for his
    dissertation.

    WRITER TWO
    Oh, yeah. The film egghead.

    PRODUCER
    No hype on this one, guys.
    Let's keep it simple, and
    moving, and honest.

    WRITERS
    Right, Jack.

They take the book and start to leave.

    PRODUCERS
    But punch it up a little...

DISSOLVE TO:

INT. ROOM IN HOLLYWOOD - NIGHT

The two writers are working on the script of
the Barker Story.
...so finally, ten months in the jungle, racked with dysentery and malaria, Barker steps into this clearing, see, and there's this kindly old guy there treating the native children. And Barker steps out and he says:

(melodramatically)
'Dr. Kohlberg, I presume…'

I love it!

The second writer begins typing furiously, as we —

MEMO FROM THE KOHLBERG-HARVEY OFFICE, MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA:

"Better Movies through Research"

JUNE 8, 1993

Re: The Barker Story

Subject: Changes for Approval

1. Delete Steve's handshake with President in White House scene. Could be misinterpreted as System One behavior.

2. Rewrite character of Dr. Marantz in Istanbul railway scene. Rule 9, Paragraph 4 of K-H Code reads: "Antagonists must not be presented as System Four or Principled characters during the time when they are in conflict with the protagonist."
3. Not enough women presented as Concrete characters. (Rule 6, Paragraph 7). Change Puerto Rican Hag in gun-running scene or Mother Teresa to System One.

4. Delete...

DISSOLVE TO:

INT. COLLEGE CLASSROOM - DAY

Several months later. A professor is lecturing to a film class.

    PROFESSOR
    ...where Barker’s drinking of the Nestles’s chocolate obviously represents the bourgeois Wall Street running-dog contempt of the Hollywood military-industrial complex for the Third World people’s —

EXT. HOUSE - DAY

A hot summer afternoon. Two bored teenage boys are sitting on the porch.

    FIRST BOY
    Wanna catch the bargain matinee?

    SECOND BOY
    What's on?

    FIRST BOY
    (looks at paper)
    The Barker Story.

    SECOND BOY
    Jeff says it sucks.

    FIRST BOY
    It’s rated R.

    SECOND BOY
    Yeah, but all you get is tits.

The first boy looks at the paper again.
FIRST BOY
How about 'The Thoreau Story'?

SECOND BOY
What's it rated?...

FADE OUT:
## APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTAG.</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>HARVEY</th>
<th>KOHLBERG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONSIST</td>
<td>INCONS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disraeli</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>4-2-4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothschild</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>4-2-4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziegfeld</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasteur</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zola</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>4-1-4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrlich</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehrig</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohan</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curie</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillinger</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>crime</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>sports</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolson</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>sports</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapata</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>4-1-4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchin</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaney</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freud</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brice</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NonP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpico</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>police</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>2-4-2</td>
<td>Prin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>entertainer</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Inconsistent
APPENDIX B. FILM SUMMARY CHARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM_ DISRAELI</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROTAGONIST

George Disraeli  4  P

ANTAGONIST

Bank President  1  NP
Mrs. Travers  1  NP

SPOUSE, LOVER

Mrs. Disraeli  3

ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS


OTHERS

Clarrisa Disraeli  1
Charles  1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>HOUSE OF ROTHSCILD</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>CONC.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
<td>CONC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Rothschild</td>
<td>4-C-4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Ledrantz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Rothschild</td>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothschild brothers</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>NP,P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Rothschild</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Rothschild</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>VIVA VILLA</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td>Pancho Villa</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>P, NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td>General Pascal</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td>Rosita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td>Franscisco Madero</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>Johnny Sikes</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>NP-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>THE GREAT ZIEGFELD</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONC.: INCON.</td>
<td>CONC.: INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

Flo Ziegfeld: 4,1 P

**ANTAGONIST**

Billings: 4,1 P

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

Anna Held: 3,1
Billy Burke: 4

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

**OTHERS**

Audrey: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM STORY OF L. PASTEUR 1936</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Pasteur</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charbonnet</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Medical Aca.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Pasteur</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>LIFE_OF_EMILE_ZOLA</td>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM <em>YOUNG MR. LINCOLN</em></td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>CON.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Felter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Todd</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Clay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Brothers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Douglas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Palmer Cass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>EDISON THE MAN</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>CONS. : INCON. : CONC. : INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTAGONIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Edison</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTAGONIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taggert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPOUSE, LOVER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Edison</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSISTANTS, CO-WORKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Powell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM: DR. EHRLICH'S M.B.</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**
- Paul Ehrlich: 4, P

**ANTAGONIST**
- Hospital supervisor: 1, NP
- Budget committee: 1, NP
- Medical community: 1, NP

**SPOUSE, LOVER**
- Hedwig Ehrlich: Abs. X

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**
- Emile Von Behring: 1-4, P

**OTHERS**
- Fra Speyer: 4, P
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>SGT. YORK</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin York</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,1,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracie Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosier Pile</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE OF THE YANKEES</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**
- Lou Gehrig: 1,4, X

**ANTAGONIST**

**SPOUSE, LOVER**
- Eleanor Gehrig: 1,4, X

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

**OTHERS**
- Mama Gehrig: 1, X
- Papa Gehrig: 3, X
**FILM** _YANKEE DOODLE DANDY_  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

George Cohan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANTAGONIST**

Mary Cohan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

Sam Harris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

Mr. Cohan (father)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Cohan (mother)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>PROTAGONIST</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MADAME CURIE</td>
<td>Marie Curie</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>University Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td>Pierre Curie</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Film: Wilson

**Belief System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Cabot Lodge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ed Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Tomulty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Henry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM: DILLINGER</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Cons: Incon:</td>
<td>Conc: Incon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protagonist**
- John Dillinger: 2,4 NP

**Antagonist**
- Specs Green: 2,4 NP

**Spouse, Lover**
- Girl Friend: Con NP

**Assistants, Coworkers**
- Gang: 2 NP

**Others**
- Police: 1 X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM: THE STRATTON STORY</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>CONS, INCON,</td>
<td>CONC, INCON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTAGONIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monty Stratton</td>
<td>4-2-4</td>
<td>P-NP-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTAGONIST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPOUSE, LOVER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Stratton</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barney</td>
<td>Abs</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Stratton</td>
<td>3,1,4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>JOLSON SINGS AGAIN</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

| Al Jolson | 3,1 | X |

**ANTAGONIST**

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

| Ellen      | 4   | X |

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

<p>| Mr. Jolson (father) | 4   | P |
| Steve (manager)     | 4   | X |
| Mr. Bryant (producer)| 4   | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>THE PRIDE OF ST. L.</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

- Dizzy Dean | 1-4 | P |

**ANTAGONIST**

- School teachers | 1-4 | | X |

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

- Pat Nash Dean | 4 | P |

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

**OTHERS**

- Paul Dean | 4 | | X |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>VIVA ZAPATA</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emiliano Zapata</td>
<td>4-1-4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emiliano’s brother</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefa’s father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Miller Story</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Miller</td>
<td>4-1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Miller</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy Scribman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM: <strong>EDDIE DUCHIN STORY</strong></td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

| Eddie Duchin | 1-4 | NP-P |

**ANTAGONIST**

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

| Marjorie | 4 | X |
| Conchita | 4 | X |

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

**OTHERS**

<p>| Mr. Duchin (father) | 3 | X |
| Mrs. Duchin (mother) | 3 | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>MAN OF 1000 FACES</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**
- Lon Chaney: 1-4, NP-P

**ANTAGONIST**

**SPOUSE, LOVER**
- Cleva Chaney: 1, NP-P
- Hazel Chaney: 4, P

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

**OTHERS**
- Creighton Chaney: 4, X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM: FREUD</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

| Sigmund Freud | 4 | P |

**ANTAGONIST**

| Medical community | 1 | X |

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

| Anna Freud | 3-4 | NP-P |

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

| Dr. Bayer | 4 | P |

**OTHERS**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>FUNNY GIRL</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONS. : INCON. : CONC. : INCON.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**
- Fanny Brice
  - BELIEF SYSTEM: 4-1-4
  - MORAL STAGE: NP-P

**ANTAGONIST**

**SPOUSE, LOVER**
- Nick Arnstein
  - BELIEF SYSTEM: 4-1
  - MORAL STAGE: NP-P

**ASSISTANTS, CO-WORKERS**

**OTHERS**
- Flo Ziegfeld: 1,4
- Mrs. Brice: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM <em>PATTON</em></th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONC.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

George Patton 1 NP

**ANTAGONIST**

German high command 1 NP

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

**ASSISTANTS, CUWORKERS**

Omar Bradley 4 P

**OTHERS**

Young German officer 4 X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM__LADY_SINGS_THE_BLUES</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio sponsors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOUSE, LOVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Man</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
<td>MORAL STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPICO</td>
<td>CONSC.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>CONC.</td>
<td>INCON.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Serpico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANTAGONIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Belief System</th>
<th>Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombardo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>LEVY</td>
<td>BELIEF SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**
- Lenny Bruce: 1-4-2, NP-P

**ANTAGONIST**
- Police prosecutors: 1, NP
- Court officials: 1, NP

**SPOUSE, LOVER**
- Honey Bruce: 3, NP

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**
- Artie (agent): 3, NP

**OTHERS**
- Sally Bruce (mother): 3, Np
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILM: COAL MINER'S DAUGHTER</th>
<th>BELIEF SYSTEM</th>
<th>MORAL STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>CONG. ; INCON. ; CONG. ; INCON.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTAGONIST**

Loretta Lynn | 3-4 | X |

**ANTAGONIST**

**SPOUSE, LOVER**

Dooley Lynn | 1-4 | X |

**ASSISTANTS, COWORKERS**

Patsy Cline | 4 | X |

**OTHERS**


