

# THE DISPOSITION TOWARD ORIGINALITY<sup>1, 2</sup>

FRANK BARRON

*Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, University of California, Berkeley*

THERE has been a marked tendency in psychological research on originality to focus attention upon the single original act in itself, rather than upon the total personality of the originator. This is understandable, for the birth and development of the original idea is usually more immediately interesting and dramatically vivid than the birth and history of the man who had the idea. Newton's apple and Archimedes' tub and the well of Eratosthenes are thus naturally the circumstances with which we associate the remarkable insights of these original geniuses; we do not often ask ourselves whether these men were for the most part disposed to express or to suppress erotic impulses, or whether their emotions were fluent or turgid, or how subject to intense anxiety they were, or how much given to violent action. We tend to disembody the creative act and the creative process by limiting our inquiry to the creator's mental content at the moment of insight, forgetting that it is a highly organized system of responding that lies behind the particular original response which, because of its validity, becomes an historical event.

There is good reason for believing, however, that originality is almost habitual with persons who produce a really singular insight. The biography of the inventive genius commonly records a lifetime of original thinking, though only a few ideas survive and are remembered to fame. Voluminous productivity is the rule and not the exception among individuals

who have made some noteworthy contribution. Original responses, it would seem, recur regularly in some persons, while there are other individuals who do not ever depart from the stereotyped and the conventional in their thinking.

If, then, some persons are regularly original, while others are regularly unoriginal, it must be the case that certain patterns of relatively enduring traits either facilitate or impede the production of original acts. Rather than focusing on the immediate conditions which have triggered the original response, the present study was concerned with the underlying disposition toward originality which it may be presumed exists in those persons who are regularly original. The research was directed first of all toward identifying individuals who performed consistently in a relatively more or relatively less original way; when this had been done, the more original were compared with the less original in terms of personality organization. Independent evidence concerning the personalities of the Ss was obtained both through the use of standardized paper-and-pencil tests and through employment of the living-in assessment method, with its emphasis upon observation of the Ss through several days of informal social interaction, situational tests, group discussions, psychodrama, and the like. The observers were of course kept in ignorance of the scores earned by the Ss on tests of originality.

## THE RELATIVITY OF ORIGINALITY

It is a basic assumption of this study that acts are original only in relation to some specified commonality. The original must be defined relative to the usual, and the degree of originality must be specified statistically in terms of incidence of occurrence. Thus the first criterion of an original response is that it should have a certain stated uncommonness in the particular group being studied. A familiar example of this in psychological practice is the definition of an original response to the Rorschach inkblots, the requirement there being that the response should, in the examiner's ex-

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledgment is made to the Rockefeller Foundation for its generous financial support of the program of research being carried on by the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, of which this study is a part.

<sup>2</sup> This research is supported in part by the United States Air Force under Contract No. AF 18 (600) -8, monitored by Technical Director, Detachment #7, (Officer Education Research Laboratory), Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Permission is granted for reproduction, translation, publications, use, and disposal in whole and in part by or for the United States Government. Personal views or opinions expressed or implied in this publication are not to be construed as necessarily carrying the official sanction of the Department of the Air Force or of the Air Research and Development Command.

perience, occur no more often than once in 100 examinations.

In the present study, we propose to deal with a relatively low order of originality, its limits being set by the nature of the sampling of Ss. The Ss are 100 captains in the United States Air Force, and originality as discerned here is originality in relation to the usual responses of only 100 persons. Furthermore, these 100 persons are not themselves especially selected for originality in relation to the population in general. Nevertheless, as we shall show later, some of the 100 captains are regularly original in comparison with the remainder, while others are regularly unoriginal in relation to the entire group. Apart from their military status, the sample may be described as a group of normal, healthy young men, of average intelligence, socioeconomically of the lower middle class in their pre-army background, and similar to young men in general in terms of the usualness and the unusualness of their responses to the tests of originality employed in this experiment.

A second criterion that must be met if a response is to be called original is that it must be to some extent adaptive to reality. The intent of this requirement is to exclude uncommon responses which are merely random, or which proceed from ignorance or delusion. An example of the application of this second criterion may be taken from the scoring of one of the measures of originality used in this experiment: the measure is a count of the number of uncommon and correct anagram solutions to the test word "generation." Many Ss did not hesitate to offer solutions that were incorrect, and that were usually unique. In such instances, the application of the second criterion of originality was straightforward and decisive. Not all of the tests called for such purely cognitive responses with unambiguous denotative meaning, however: in the case of inkblot tests, e.g., we come closer to the problems involved in evaluating fantasy or works of art, and verification cannot be had by recourse to a dictionary. Instead, when *E* himself cannot "see" the form pointed to by *S*, he must have recourse to other psychologists who have given many Rorschachs and who can be considered fairly open to suggestions as to what the blots might reasonably look like. Consensual verification is thus sought for such imaginings. Poor

forms, or uncommon responses that did not sufficiently respect the inkblot reality, were not credited as original in this study.

### THE MEASUREMENT OF ORIGINALITY

Eight test measures were accepted here as indicative of originality. They are described below. The first three of these measures are taken from the creativity battery developed by Guilford and his associates (5, 6) in the Project on Aptitudes of High-Level Personnel at the University of Southern California. These three tests had significant loadings on the Originality factor in the Guilford researches.<sup>8</sup> Of the remaining five measures, two are derived from commonly used projective techniques, the Rorschach Psychodiagnostic (10) and the Thematic Apperception Test (9); another is a commonly used anagram test, and the remaining two tests were devised by the writer.

1. *Unusual Uses*. This test calls upon the subject to list six uses to which each of several common objects can be put. It is scored for infrequency, in the sample under study, of the uses proposed. Odd-even reliability in this sample is .77.
2. *Consequences B*. In this test, *S* is asked to write down what would happen if certain changes were suddenly to take place. The task for him is to list as many consequences or results of these changes as he can. The responses are scored according to how obvious the imagined consequences are, the less obvious responses receiving the higher scores. Interrater agreement is .71.
3. *Plot Titles B*. Two story plots are presented, and *S* is asked to write as many titles as he can think of for each plot. The titles are rated on a scale of cleverness from 0 to 5. The number of titles rated 2, 3, 4, or 5 constitutes the cleverness score. Interrater agreement in this study was .43.
4. *Rorschach O +*. This is a count of the number of original responses given by *S* to the 10 Rorschach blots and adjudged by two scorers, working separately, to be good rather than poor forms. Standard Rorschach administrative procedure was followed. Interrater agreement was .72, and only those responses scored by both scorers as *O+* were credited.
5. *Thematic Apperception Test: Originality rating*. Two raters, working independently of one another, rated the TAT protocols of the 100 Ss on a 9-point scale, using approximate normal curve frequencies for each point along the scale. Interrater agreement was .70. The *S*'s score was the average of the two ratings.
6. *Anagrams*. The test word "generation" was used, and the anagram solutions were scored for infrequency of occurrence in the sample under study. If *S* offered a solution that was correct and that was offered by no more than two other Ss, he received one point for originality. Total score is therefore the number of such uncommon but correct solutions.
7. *Word Rearrangement Test: Originality rating*. In this test, *S* is given 50 words which were selected at random from a list of common nouns, adjectives, and

<sup>8</sup> The present writer is indebted to Dr. Guilford and the personnel of the Project not only for permission to use the tests, but also for the actual scoring of the protocols.

adverbs. He is told to make up a story which will enable him to use as many as possible of the listed words. His composition is rated for originality on a 9-point scale, just as the TAT was. Interrater agreement in this instance was .67.

8. *Achromatic Inkblots*. This is a set of 10 achromatic inkblots constructed locally. The *S* is asked to give only one response to each blot. Responses were weighted according to their frequency of occurrence in the sample under study, the more infrequent responses receiving the higher weights. Score is the sum of the weights assigned to *S*'s responses on all 10 blots. Odd-even reliability was .43.

It is worth noting that all eight of these tests are free-response tests; the respondent is not presented with alternatives devised by the test maker, but must instead summon from within himself his own way of solving problems, seeing the blots, interpreting the pictures, putting together the words or letters, and so on. There is considerable latitude allowed for self-expression and for idiosyncratic interpretation.

Furthermore, diverse media are presented for the respondent to express himself through. The two inkblot tests allow for original visualization, or original perceptual organization of visual forms. The TAT and the Word Rearrangement Test permit originality of verbal composition to show itself. Consequences and Unusual Uses call for bright ideas in more or less discrete form. Plot Titles evokes epigrammatic or sloganistic originality, while Anagrams requires a combination of word fluency and ease of perceptual reorganization.

If originality is indeed a dimension, and if some persons are regularly original while others are regularly unoriginal, we should expect the intercorrelations of these measures to be positive and to be statistically significant; we should not, however, expect the coefficients to be very high, for it is reasonable that the dimension of originality would have its vari-

ance apportioned to several media of expression. Even regularly original persons can be expected to be outstandingly original in only one or two ways. The extent to which these expectations are confirmed in the present study may be seen from Table 1, in which the Pearsonian correlation coefficients of all eight test measures with one another are given. (With an *N* of 100, a Pearsonian *r* is significant at the .05 level if it is .20 or greater; an *r* of .26 is significant at the .01 level.)

As Table 1 shows, the correlations of the eight measures with one another tend to be positive and to be significantly different from zero. The inkblot tests alone appear to bear little relationship to the other measures; indeed, they do not even correlate significantly with one another. If the two inkblot tests are excluded, however, two-thirds of the intercorrelations of the remaining six measures are significant at the .05 level, and all are positive. Table 1 thus provides satisfactory evidence of the expected coherence or regularity of the manifestations of originality, with considerable reservations, however, concerning the relevance of inkblot originality to the dimension here being measured.

Since it is quite possible that originality is simply a multifactorial dimension in which certain factors bear little relationship to other factors but yet are positively related to the underlying dimension as a whole, it would probably be premature to exclude the inkblot measures from this battery of tests of originality. Considerable doubt must be entertained concerning their validity, however, and there is another piece of evidence which reinforces the doubt. The staff psychologists who conducted the three-day living-in assessments were particularly interested in two theoretically central variables which they sought to

TABLE 1  
INTERRELATIONS OF EIGHT ORIGINALITY MEASURES

Test Measures	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Unusual Uses	—	.42	.37	.08	.17	.29	.06	.17
2. Consequences B	.42	—	.46	-.02	.21	.21	.16	.09
3. Plot Titles B	.37	.46	—	.17	.26	.17	.16	.07
4. Rorschach O+	.08	-.02	.17	—	.21	.03	-.05	.17
5. TAT Originality	.17	.21	.26	.21	—	.36	.41	.02
6. Anagrams	.29	.21	.17	.03	.36	—	.33	.38
7. Word Synthesis Orig.	.06	.16	.16	-.05	.41	.33	—	.09
8. Inkblot Originality	.17	.09	.07	.17	.02	.38	.09	—

TABLE 2

RELATIONSHIP OF EIGHT TEST MEASURES TO RATED ORIGINALITY AND TO COMPOSITE TEST ORIGINALITY

Test Measures	9	10
1. Unusual uses	.30	.60
2. Consequences B	.36	.59
3. Plot Titles B	.32	.62
4. Rorschach 0+	.18	.38
5. TAT: Originality	.45	.59
6. Anagrams	.22	.62
7. Word Synthesis Originality	.45	.51
8. Inkblot Originality	.07	.46
9. Staff Rating: Originality	—	.55
10. Composite Test Originality	.55	—

rate on the basis of their observations: one of these variables was Originality (the other was Personal Stability). The correlations between this final over-all rating on Originality and the eight test measures of originality are shown in Table 2. Also given in Table 2 are the correlations of the eight measures individually with a variable which is the sum of the standard scores earned by each *S* on each of the eight tests; in other words, each test measure is correlated with a composite of which it is itself a part. The correlations thus show the relative contributions of each test to the total score on the battery of tests.

Table 2 provides evidence that the test battery is in substantial agreement with the staff psychologists who gave ratings on Originality without knowledge of the test scores. The correlation of .55 between the test composite and the observers' ratings is encouraging evidence that inexpensive, objective, and efficient measurement of originality is possible.

Again, however, the inkblot measures have relatively little relationship to these composite variables. The staff rating of Originality correlates significantly with six of the eight measures (well beyond the .01 level of significance with five of them); but neither Rorschach Originality nor Inkblot Originality is significantly related to the staff rating. As would be expected, these measures also have the least contribution to make to the test composite.

In spite of this situation, both inkblot measures were retained in the battery for purposes of identifying regularly original and regularly unoriginal *Ss*. The reasoning was as follows: On the face of it, uncommon responses to inkblots are original acts within the definition of

originality being employed here. Tendencies toward uncommon visual perceptions are of course not readily recognized in ordinary social situations, since they have to be verbalized to be socially visible. Hence the failure of inkblot tests to correlate with the staff rating of Originality, based on observations of social behavior alone, should be discounted. The lack of a verbal component in perceptual originality, and its conspicuous presence in the other originality tests, may also account for the relative independence of the inkblot tests in the test composite. Finally, if the inkblot measures contribute only error variance to the composite, their retention will result in failure of some true relationships to appear, but this will be an error on the conservative side; and if they do in fact contribute true variance not contributed by any other test, they may add appreciable validity to the picture of the personality correlates of originality. They were therefore retained for the purpose of identifying regularly original and regularly unoriginal subjects.

A dual criterion was now established for calling a given subject regularly original: (a) he had to be at least one standard deviation above the mean on the test composite; (b) he had to be at least two standard deviations above the mean on at least one of the eight measures. Fifteen regularly original *Ss* were thus identified; more than half of them were at least two standard deviations above the mean on two or more of the eight tests.

For comparison purposes, the 15 lowest scorers on the final distribution of summed standard scores were selected; all of these *Ss* also met the criterion of being at least two standard deviations below the mean on at least one of the eight measures. They will be referred to as the regularly unoriginal subjects.

#### SOME HYPOTHESES SUGGESTED BY PREVIOUS WORK

The existence of a very general attitude toward experience, of a sort which disposes toward complexity of outlook, independence of judgment, and originality, has been suggested by the results of studies reported earlier by the present writer. It was found, e.g., that individuals who refused to yield to strong pressure from their peers to concur in a false group opinion described themselves, on an adjective

check list, as "original" and "artistic" much more frequently than did subjects who yielded to such group pressure (1). In addition, the independent (nonyielding) Ss showed a marked preference for complex and asymmetrical line drawings, as opposed to simple and symmetrical drawings. This preference for the complex and asymmetrical had been shown previously to be highly correlated both with the choice of art as a vocation (3) and with rated artistic ability among art students. Furthermore, in a sample of Ph.D. candidates in the sciences, preference for the complex and asymmetrical figures proved to be significantly related to rated originality in graduate work (2). This same relationship was found among graduating medical school seniors who were rated for originality by the medical school faculty. Other evidence indicated that the opposed preferences, for complexity or for simplicity, were related to a generalized experiential disposition: the preference for complexity is associated with a perceptual attitude which seeks to allow into the perceptual system the greatest possible richness of experience, even though discord and disorder result, while the preference for simplicity is associated with a perceptual attitude which allows into the system only as much as can be integrated without great discomfort and disorder, even though this means excluding some aspects of reality.

From all of these considerations, certain hypotheses as to the characteristics of original persons were derived and put to the test in the present study. The hypotheses, and the ways in which they were tested, or partially tested, are described below.

### *Hypothesis 1.*

That original persons prefer complexity and some degree of apparent imbalance in phenomena.

*Test 1a.* The Barron-Welsh Art Scale of the Figure Preference Test. Preference for complex-asymmetrical figures earns the subject a high score.

### *Hypothesis 2.*

That original persons are more complex psychodynamically and have greater personal scope.

*Test 2a.* Psychiatric interviewer rating on "Complexity and Scope as a Person." The Ss

receiving high ratings are those who were diagnosed by a psychiatric interviewer, on the basis of a two-hour interview, as having a "more complex personality structure and greater potential for complex ego-synthesis." Ratings were on a 9-point scale with approximate normal curve frequencies being assigned to each point along the scale.

### *Hypothesis 3.*

That original persons are more independent in their judgments.

*Test 3a.* The Independence of Judgment Scale. On this inventory scale, which was developed against the criterion of actual behavior in the Asch group pressure experiment in previous studies, high scores indicate similarity to persons who manifest independence.

*Test 3b.* A modification of the Asch group pressure experiment.<sup>4</sup> This is a situational test in which Ss are put under pressure from their peers to agree to certain apparent group judgments. High scores indicate yielding to such pressures; regularly original persons should therefore have lower scores.

### *Hypothesis 4.*

That original persons are more self-assertive and dominant.

*Test 4a.* Dominance-submission ratings in a psychodramatic situation especially designed to elicit such tendencies in the subjects. Ratings were on a 9-point scale.

*Test 4b.* The Social Dominance scale of the California Psychological Inventory (4). This is a thoroughly studied and validated scale for the measurement of dominance in real-life social situations.

*Test 4c.* Staff rating on Dominance, based on three days of observation of social behavior. Dominance was defined for the raters as follows: "Self-assurance, ascendance, and self-confidence in dealing with others; forceful,

<sup>4</sup> This version of the group pressure experiment retains the prototypical psychological situation used by Asch, but introduces novel methods of experimental control and greatly expands the kinds of judgments on which group pressure is brought to bear. The new technique was devised by Richard S. Crutchfield, who has reported its details in his presidential address, "Conformity and Character," before the Division of Personality and Social Psychology, American Psychological Association, New York City, September 4, 1954. (*Amer. Psychologist*, 1955, 10, 191-198.)

authoritative, resolute, not easily intimidated." A 5-point rating scale was used.

*Test 4d.* The Self-assertiveness scale of the California Psychological Inventory.

*Test 4e.* The Phallicism scale of the Personal Preference Scale (8). This scale is intended as a measure of the derivatives and residuals in the adult personality of propensities which were highly cathected in the phallic stage of psychosexual development. High scores indicate an emphasis on personal power and desire for recognition.

#### *Hypothesis 5.*

That original persons reject suppression as a mechanism for the control of impulse. This would imply that they forbid themselves fewer thoughts, that they dislike to police themselves or others, that they are disposed to entertain impulses and ideas that are commonly taboo, and in general that they express in their persons the sort of indiscipline which psychoanalytic theory would ascribe to a libidinal organization in which derivatives of

the early anal rather than of the late anal stage in psychosexual development predominate.

*Test 5a.* An index of suppression-expression on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (7) is obtained by adding the *T* scores on the Lie, Hysteria, and *K* scales and subtracting from that sum the sum of *T* scores on Psychopathic Deviation and Hypomania. On this index, regularly original Ss should obtain lower scores.

*Test 5b.* The Policeman Interest scale of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (11). While this is bound to be a somewhat derivative measure of the personality tendency toward suppression of outlawed impulse, it does at least reflect the similarity of the subject's interests to those of persons who are regularly employed at maintaining law, order, and civil discipline—who, in short, seem vocationally suited to policing. Regularly original Ss should earn low scores.

*Test 5c.* The Early Anal and the Late Anal scales of the Personal Preference Scale (Gry-

TABLE 3  
TESTS OF HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses	Originals ( <i>N</i> = 15)		Unoriginals ( <i>N</i> = 15)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
1. Preference for complexity						
Test 1a. Barron-Welsh Art Scale	19.40	12.28	12.67	10.69	2.16	.02
2. Complexity as a person						
Test 2a. Psychiatric rating: "Complexity as a person"	6.40	1.82	4.00	1.67	3.58	.001
3. Independence of judgment						
Test 3a. Independence of Judgment Scale	9.60	1.67	8.00	2.94	1.74	.05
Test 3b. Group pressure situation*	5.00	1.87	8.60	1.80	3.93	.001
4. Self-assertion and Dominance						
Test 4a. Psychodrama: Dominance rating	41.13	11.70	38.40	7.78	0.72	.23
Test 4b. CPI: Social Dominance Scale	36.60	3.74	28.87	4.75	4.74	.001
Test 4c. Staff rating: Dominance	34.40	7.10	25.40	4.06	4.05	.001
Test 4d. SCPI: Self-Assertiveness Scale	15.73	1.44	15.07	2.74	0.78	.22
Test 4e. PPS: Phallicism Scale (VIK)	13.20	2.37	9.13	4.27	3.08	.01
5. Rejection of suppression; tendency towards expression of impulse						
Test 5a. MMPI: (L + Hy + K) - (Pd + Ma)	43.47	26.24	58.87	12.30	1.78	.045
Test 5b. SVIB: Policeman Interest Scale	44.67	9.87	55.00	10.81	-2.61	.01
Test 5c. PPS: Early Anal Scale (IVB)	20.33	4.57	17.87	2.90	1.66	.06
Late Anal Scale (VB)	23.53	4.59	26.80	4.85	-1.81	.05
Test 5d. CPI: Impulsivity Scale	23.13	7.86	16.60	6.08	1.98	.03
Test 5e. Staff rating: Impulsivity	32.27	6.41	27.80	5.42	4.74	.001

\* For the test of this hypothesis, only eight Ss in each group (eight Originals and eight Unoriginals) were available. This occurred because half of the subjects in the study were used as controls in the Crutchfield experiment, and hence made the judgments without being under pressure to conform to group opinion.

gier revision).<sup>5</sup> If the scales are valid and the hypothesis is correct, regularly original Ss should score higher on Early Anal and lower on Late Anal than do regularly unoriginal Ss.

*Test 5d.* The Impulsivity Scale of the California Psychological Inventory. Since high scorers are those who express impulse readily, the regularly original Ss should earn higher scores than the regularly unoriginal Ss.

*Test 5e.* Staff rating: Impulsivity. Again, regularly original Ss should receive higher ratings.

The group comparisons specified in these predictions are presented in detail in Table 3. As that table shows, 12 of the 15 predictions proved correct. A fairly conservative criterion of confirmation was adopted: significance at the .05 level when the two-tailed test was applied. The theoretical formulation suggested by the previous work on complexity-simplicity and on independence of judgment is substantially confirmed by these results.

### DISCUSSION

The five major hypotheses in this study have been stated in terms derived directly from previous observations. There is another way of looking at them, however, which permits the results to be considered in somewhat other terms, and in a broader context. Since the hypotheses have already been stated and to some extent justified, it may be appropriate in discussing these results to venture somewhat beyond the literal meaning of the findings to date.

We have spoken here of the disposition toward originality, with originality being so measured as to be equivalent to the capacity for producing adaptive responses which are unusual. But unusualness of response may be considered a function as well of the objective freedom of an organism, where this is defined as the range of possible adaptive responses available in all situations. As the response repertoire of any given organism increases, the number of statistically infrequent responses, considered relative to the population of like organisms, will also increase. Thus the ability

to respond in an unusual or original manner will be greatest when freedom is greatest.

Now freedom is related in a very special manner to degree and kind of organization. In general, organization, in company with complexity, generates freedom; the more complex the level of integration, the greater is the repertoire of adaptive responses. The tendency toward organization may, however, operate in such a fashion as to maintain a maladaptive simplicity. We are familiar in the political sphere with totalitarian states which depend upon suppression to achieve unity; such states are psychodynamically similar to the neurotic individual who suppresses his own impulses and emotions in order to maintain a semblance of stability. There are at hand enough case histories of both such organizations, political and private, to make it clear that the sort of unity and balance that depends upon total suppression of the claims of minority affects and opinions is maladaptive in the long run.

Suppression is a common way of achieving unity, however, because in the short run it often seems to work. Increasing complexity puts a strain upon an organism's ability to integrate phenomena; one solution of the difficulty is to inhibit the development of the greater level of complexity, and thus to avoid the temporary disintegration that would otherwise have resulted.

Originality, then, flourishes where suppression is at a minimum and where some measure of disintegration is tolerable in the interests of a final higher level of integration.

If we consider the case of a human being who develops strongly the disposition toward originality, we must posit certain personal characteristics and personal history which facilitated the development of such a disposition. In our hypotheses, the term "dominance" was used to describe one trait of the regularly original individual. This may be translated as a strong need for personal mastery, not merely over other persons, but over all experience. It initially involves self-centeredness, which in its socialized form may come to be known as self-realization. One aspect of it is the insistence on self-regulation, and a rejection of regulation by others.

For such a person, the most crucial developmental crisis in relation to control of impulse comes at the anal stage of socialization. What

<sup>5</sup> The form of the Personal Preference Scale used in this study is a revision made by Tadeusz Grygier. The revision consisted chiefly of the addition of items to certain scales, including the Early and Late Anal scales.

our hypotheses have suggested is that there is a positive rebellion against the prohibition of unregulated anal production, and a carrying of the derivatives of anal indiscipline into adult life. The original person, in adulthood, thus often likes things messy, at least at first; the tendency is toward a final order, but the necessary preliminary is as big a mess as possible. Viewed developmentally, the rejection of externally imposed control at the anal stage is later generalized to all external control of impulse, with the tendency toward socially unlicensed phallic activity, or phallic exhibitionism in its more derivative forms, being simply another expression of the general rejection of regulation of impulse by others, in favor of regulation of impulse by oneself.

The disposition toward originality may thus be seen as a highly organized mode of responding to experience, including other persons, society, and oneself. The socially disrated traits which may go along with it include rebelliousness, disorderliness, and exhibitionism, while the socially valued traits which accompany it include independence of judgment, freedom of expression, and novelty of construction and insight.

#### SUMMARY

This research was directed first of all toward identifying individuals who performed consistently in a relatively more or relatively less original way. The Ss were 100 captains in the United States Air Force, who took part in three days of living-in assessment at the house of the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research. Originality was defined in terms of uncommonness of response to eight tests which could be scored objectively or rated reliably. To be called original, a response had to be uncommon in the sample under study, and at the same time be adequate to the realistic demands of the problem situations. For the most part, the eight tests proved to be significantly correlated with one another and with an over-all staff rating of Originality based on observation of the Ss through three days of social interaction. Two groups of Ss, the

regularly original and the regularly unoriginal, were then defined, and were used to test a set of five major hypotheses which generated 15 predictions concerning originality and which were suggested by previous findings from studies of independence of judgment and of the preference for complexity as opposed to simplicity. Twelve of the predictions were confirmed. Originality was found to be related to independence of judgment, to personal complexity, and to the preference for complexity in phenomena, to self-assertion and dominance, and finally to the rejection of suppression as a mechanism for the control of impulse.

#### REFERENCES

1. BARRON, F. Some personality correlates of independence of judgment. *J. Pers.*, 1953, **21**, 287-297.
2. BARRON, F. Complexity-simplicity as a personality dimension. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1953, **48**, 163-172.
3. BARRON, F., & WELSH, G. S. Artistic perception as a factor in personality style: its measurement by a figure-preference test. *J. Psychol.*, 1952, **33**, 199-203.
4. GOUGH, H. G. *A preliminary guide for the use and interpretation of the California Psychological Inventory*. Berkeley: Research Bull. Institute of Personality Assessment & Research, 1954.
5. GUILFORD, J. P., WILSON, R. C., CHRISTENSEN, P. R., & LEWIS, D. J. *A factor-analytic study of creative thinking: I. Hypotheses and description of tests*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1951, Psychol. Lab., No. 3.
6. GUILFORD, J. P., WILSON, R. C., & CHRISTENSEN, P. R. *A factor-analytic study of creative thinking: II. Administration of tests and analysis of results*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1952, Psychol. Lab., No. 8.
7. HATHAWAY, S. R., & MCKINLEY, J. C. *Manual for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis: Univer. of Minnesota Press, 1943.
8. KROUT, M. H., & TABIN, J. K. Measuring personality in developmental terms. *Genetic Psychol. Mongr.*, in press.
9. MURRAY, H. A. *Thematic Apperception Test Manual*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univer. Printing Office, 1943.
10. RORSCHACH, H. *Psychodiagnosics*. Bern: Huber, New York: (Grune and Stratton, Distributors), 1942.
11. STRONG, E. K., JR. *Vocational Interest Blank for Men*. Palo Alto: Stanford Univer. Press, 1938.

Received October 29, 1954.