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Although alcoholism is considered by many to be a monumental problem facing our society (Jellinek, 1960), we have only recently begun to fully utilize our knowledge regarding the heterogeneous nature of the alcoholic population as an aid to the understanding of the etiology and proper treatment of alcoholism (Barnes, 1979). The treatment of alcoholics is a demanding and complex process often characterized by client relapse as well as therapist frustration (Vallient, 1978). The therapist is often faced with an enormous array of social, environmental, and personality factors seemingly unique to each alcoholic client. The therapist tries to categorize clients along certain meaningful and often subjective dimensions in order to facilitate treatment. This categorization is an important aspect of any treatment program. Knowledge of the client not only as an individual, but also as a member of a larger subgrouping within the treatment population can greatly enhance the therapist's ability to function effectively.

The objective identification of the characteristics of subgroupings within an alcoholic treatment population is a vital adjunct to proper therapy (Blume, 1978). If the characteristics of identifiable alcoholic subtypes can be embellished in meaningful ways, the therapist's effectiveness should be greatly enhanced. The present research is designed to expand our knowledge regarding specific personality characteristics of two important and readily identifiable alcoholic subtypes (Blume, 1978).
Nature of the Problem

Primary and secondary alcoholic subtypes have arisen as the most fruitful dichotomization presently available (Fox, 1957; Schuckit, 1973; Blume, 1978). The primary-secondary distinction concerns the role of alcohol in the person's present alcohol related maladjustment. Alcohol is considered central to the primary alcoholic's difficulties, while only another manifestation of the secondary's general maladjustment to society. While categorizing an alcoholic as either primary or secondary is relatively straightforward (Blume, 1978), the problem arises when specifying the more subtle personality characteristics of these two subtypes. It is important that a thorough knowledge of the psychological characteristics of each subtype is obtained so that the understanding and treatment of the heterogeneous population of alcoholics can be enhanced.

Purpose of the Study

The present research is concerned with the specific characterization of primary and secondary alcoholics along personality dimensions that increase our understanding of the two alcoholic subtypes and enhance our ability to offer appropriate treatment. The two personality characteristics chosen for this purpose are Loevinger's (1976) Ego Development Scale and Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. Lower ego levels in the adult are considered indicative of developmental stagnation (Loevinger, 1976). In addition an external causal orientation towards why events occur in one's life (Rotter, 1966) is generally associated
with maladjustment. Secondary alcoholics, because of their pro-
longed history of maladjustment relative to primary alcoholics,
would be expected to show greater personality deficits than pri-
mary alcoholics on the two measures chosen for use in the present
research.

Definition of Terms

Alcoholism

The alcoholic is best described as an individual whose alcohol
ingestion impairs his or her social relationships, health, job
efficiency, ability to avoid legal difficulties or conflicts with
the cultural mores (Vaillant, 1978; Plaut, 1967; World Health

Primary Alcoholism. Fox (1957, p. 164) has eloquently de-
scribed the essence of the primary alcoholic as, "... those persons
not obviously neurotic in their early life, who have slipped in
later life into pathological drinking through some kind of habitua-
tion process. They are often persons of great talent and ability
who have for years been heavy social drinkers. To their dismay,
they find they have lost control. Having once stepped over the
borderline into alcoholic drinking, they can never resume drinking
in a controlled fashion." Schuckit and Gunderson (1975, p. 268)
define primary alcoholism, "... the alcoholic process is the only,
or first appearing, psychiatric illness." The primary alcoholic
is considered to be free of any gross maladaptive symptomatology
prior to their alcoholic abuse.
It is very important that the primary and secondary alcoholic be clearly differentiated. The primary alcoholic, prior to their alcohol abuse and often following, is a stable member of society. In addition they appear psychiatrically stable in terms of gross antisocial behaviors. Certainly they have no police record, no history of delinquent behaviors, aggressive behaviors, gross sexual actions, or any of the behaviors generally associated with the antisocial or sociopathic designation.

Secondary Alcoholism. Fox, (1957, p. 164) has described the secondary as, "... those persons who have been emotionally mal-adjusted since childhood. Alcohol has seemed a godsend to them, helping to solve temporarily their basic social and psychological problems. They usually have become alcoholics at a very early age, and they are more difficult to treat than the (primary) addicts since they have never used the more mature avenues of self-expression. They tend to have the emotional equipment of a child. When every difficulty has been met by evading it through alcohol, they have developed few other, more mature techniques of living. They must be helped to grow up."

In short, the secondary alcoholic appears to be severely limited in almost every aspect of normal personality growth (Madsen, 1974). Madsen has offered numerous descriptors of the alcoholic subtype which fit quite neatly into Jane Loevinger's four facets of ego development: Lack of emotional control/wild swings in mood (impulse control); Passive, alienating, dependent (interpersonal style); Psychosomatic complaints (conscious preoccupation); and finally, Confused (cognitive style).
Schuckit (1973) and Blume (1978) point out that the secondary alcoholic's drinking has been antedated by other preexisting psychopathological difficulties while the primary begins drinking with a history clear of all other psychiatric problems.

In conclusion the secondary alcoholic with respect to their past social behavior is diametrically opposite the primary. They are clearly antisocial/sociopathic in their overt behaviors. Their life history is permeated with antisocial behaviors from an early age. School attendance has usually been truant, often ending in expulsion. Home life has been awkward, often punctuated by running away. Delinquent behaviors as well as adult crimes are often present; work history is poor and uneven. A history of aggressive behaviors is often present. Sexual deviance, promiscuity, even pimping is not uncommon. Thus, it is clear that a person that meets the above descriptors is different in important ways from a primary alcoholic.

Ego Development

Ego development is viewed as an invariant sequence of stages from conceptually lesser to greater levels of differentiation and moving from simple to more complex levels of ego integration, a "Master Trait" (Loevinger, 1970) conceptually distinct from physical, psychosexual, and intellectual development. Each person is assumed to have a typical perceptual view of himself and the world around him. This perceptual view is said to move towards a more and more differentiated perception of one's self, one's social world, and of one's thoughts and emotional responses as they affect
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Impulse control, character development</th>
<th>Interpersonal style</th>
<th>Conscious preoccupations</th>
<th>Cognitive style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presocial</td>
<td>Presocial</td>
<td>Impulsive, fear of retaliation</td>
<td>Receiving, dependent, exploitative</td>
<td>Self v. non-self</td>
<td>Stereotyping, conceptual confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td>Fear of being caught, externalising blame, opportunistic</td>
<td>Wary, manipulative, exploitative</td>
<td>Bodily feelings, especially sexual and aggressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Conformity to external rules, shame, guilt for breaking rules</td>
<td>Belonging, superficial niceness</td>
<td>Self-protection, trouble, wishes, advantage, control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-protective</td>
<td>Self-protective</td>
<td>Differentiation of norms, goals</td>
<td>Aware of self in relation to group, helping</td>
<td>Appearance, social acceptability, banal feelings, behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>Intensive, responsible, mutual, concern for communication</td>
<td>Differentiated feelings, motives for behaviour, self-respect, achievements, traits, expression</td>
<td>Conceptual simplicity, stereotypes, cliches behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious-conformist</td>
<td>Conscientious-conformist</td>
<td>Add: Respect for individuality</td>
<td>Add: Dependence as an emotional problem</td>
<td>Add: Development, social problems, differentiation of inner life from outer</td>
<td>Multiplicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Add: Coping with conflicting inner needs, toleration</td>
<td>Add: Respect for autonomy, interdependence</td>
<td>Add: Distinction of process and outcome</td>
<td>Conceptual complexity, idea of patterning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Add: Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable</td>
<td>Add: Cherishing of individuality</td>
<td>Add: Development, social problems, differentiation of inner life from outer</td>
<td>Increased conceptual complexity, complex patterns, toleration for ambiguity, broad scope, objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Add: Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable</td>
<td>Add: Cherishing of individuality</td>
<td>Add: Distinction of process and outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 'Add' means in addition to the description applying to the previous level.

* From Head and Shayer (1980)
Internal-External Locus of Control

Rotter (1966) has developed a 29-item instrument designed to determine generalized expectancy of a person's internal/external control of reinforcement. An internally controlled person is an individual who has a strong and pervasive belief that reinforcements are contingent on his own behavior. An externally controlled person looks to factors such as luck, fate, and the control exerted by others as contributing significantly to a person's life situation.

Significance of the Study

Because of the demonstrated heterogeneous nature of the alcoholic population (Barnes, 1979), it is important not only to identify valid subgroupings but also to extend and deepen our knowledge regarding those subgroupings. Although the primary-secondary distinction appears to be a viable and valid dichotomization, it is essential that we become thoroughly knowledgeable regarding the nature of these subgroupings. In fact, Emrick (1976) has suggested that a moratorium be placed on studies that do not take into account the basic heterogeneity of the alcoholic population.

It is only relatively recently that the heterogeneous nature of alcoholics has begun to receive substantial research attention (Barnes, 1979). With the advent of the primary-secondary distinction between alcoholics (Schuckit et al., 1969), a significant realignment of the area has become possible. It seems obvious that reliable subgroupings with a clinical population can lead to a significant improvement in our knowledge not only of the subgroup-
ings themselves, but also the etiology and possible treatment strategies to be employed.

The present research is an effort to gain a broader and more thorough knowledge of two major subgroups within the alcoholic population. By doing this it is hoped that a better understanding of the etiology, proper treatment strategies, and prognosis of alcoholism can be achieved.

Limitations of the Study

The present research is designed to investigate the characteristics of primary and secondary alcoholics along two personality variables, ego development and locus of control. The research is not directly concerned with validating the primary-secondary dichotomy, but rather extending our knowledge of this dichotomy. The author accepts the dichotomy as valid and useful, based both on research (Blume, 1978) and personal experience over three years as a therapist at an alcohol treatment center.

Matching the primary-secondary alcoholics on major variables such as socio-economic status, age, education, and poly-drug abuse is difficult. If primary and secondary alcoholics differ on ego development and locus of control, the next logical question is: Are the differences due to the primary-secondary distinction or to the covariates of age, socio-economic status, education, and/or poly-drug abuse.

Secondary alcoholics, presumably because of their demonstrated early difficulties, seldom escape society's notice and therefore tend to become involved with treatment at an early age. Their
obvious antisocial tendencies also restrict their socio-economic development, their educational development, and predispose them towards poly-drug abuse (Schuckit, 1973).

If an attempt is made to match primary and secondary alcoholics on the variables of age, socio-economic status, educational level, and poly-drug abuse, the effort may result in our comparing primary alcoholics with very mild secondary alcoholics. Because of the nature of the primary-secondary dichotomy, secondary alcoholics are almost of necessity younger, lower in socio-economic status and educational level and certainly tend towards poly-drug abuse compared to primary alcoholics. Attempting to match on these variables may effectively remove the true secondary alcoholic from the study.

Another approach to this limitation is to show that each of our variables, ego development and locus of control, are independent of age, socio-economic status, education and poly-drug abuse. Loevinger (1970) has reported very little relationship between ego level and age after twenty years of age. There is no specific research regarding socio-economic level and ego level. Regarding locus of control, Caster & Parsons (1977) reported no significant correlation between age and locus of control in 98 alcoholics using Levenson's (1973) locus of control scale.

Poly-drug abuse is generally considered symptomatic of underlying social or personality disorders (Vaillant, 1978) and of course underlying social or personality disorders is the major characteristic of secondary alcoholics. This effectively negates any serious attempt to match primaries and secondaries on this variable.
In the opinion of the present author, matching on age and poly-drug abuse is impossible while matching on socio-economic status and education is possible.

**Overview of the Study**

The thesis as introduced in this chapter will proceed as follows. Chapter II contains a review of the relevant literature and is concluded by stating the research questions. This is followed in Chapter III by a discussion of the methodology employed in the study. The thesis concludes in Chapters IV and V with a presentation of the results of the study, discussion of the significance of those results, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The literature on personality characteristics of the alcoholic population is extensive (Barnes, 1979). The present review will focus on those characteristics which support heterogeneous sub-typings within the alcoholic population. In addition, the concepts of ego development and locus of control will be discussed in terms of how they may help us to better understand the heterogeneity of the alcoholic population.

Ego Development

Jane Loevinger's concept of ego development provides a complex and rich paradigm for understanding an individual's level of integration and frame of reference. The term 'integration' is an enormous abstraction based upon Loevinger's concept of the fully functioning human being. This striving towards a fully functioning human being is not of course unique to Loevinger's conception of ego development. Others have attempted to delineate a similar or related conception of human behavior (Sullivan, Grant & Grant, 1957; Peck & Havinghurst, 1965; Maslow, 1962; and Kohlberg, 1964). Loevinger conceives of ego development as unidimensional. One broad category of ego development encompasses what Loevinger refers to as "facets of a single coherent process" (Loevinger, 1976, p.26). These four facets are (1) impulse control/moral style (2) interpersonal style (3) conscious preoccupations and (4) cognitive style.
The impulse control facet moves from the impulsiveness of the child to the sophisticated integration of inner conflicts. The facet, interpersonal style, ranges from the almost autistic inability of the infant to differentiate self from others to the individual's cherishing of his and other's individuality. The conscious preoccupation facet extends from the totally egocentric gratification of immediate needs to the individual's coming to an appreciation of his own identity. The cognitive style facet deals with the common sense notion of conceptual complexity ranging from conceptual confusion to a sophisticated ability to deal with complex relationships and ambiguities. In essence Loevinger has conceptualized the development of a dimension of human behavior which she feels is central to the essence of human development. Obviously, not everyone reaches the integrated level of functioning. In fact Loevinger suggests that approximately 1% of the population ever attain this level of ego development.

Loevinger attempts to tap the various levels of ego functioning through a 36-item sentence completion test. The test consists of sentence stems which are to be completed by the client. The completed sentences are then rated according to specific criterion.

Loevinger sees the developmental sequence as invariant and consisting of seven hierarchical stages with three transitions. Hauser (1976) has critiqued the assumption of invariant order by pointing out that the only satisfactory way of testing this is through a longitudinal, repeated measuring of the same individuals over a substantial time period. The only research done to date (Blasi, 1971) bearing on the invariant order question, while showing favorable results, was not a longitudinal study and
thus inadequate. However, even if such a longitudinal study were done, negative results would not be conclusive evidence against invariant order because one could always argue that the time intervals between testing were too long to catch each development. And of course intervals that are too short, thus requiring many testings, introduce considerable error into the whole exercise (Redmore & Waldman, 1975). Martin and Redmore (1978) obtained positive evidence for the invariant order of ego development by retesting Blasi's (1971) sixth graders when they were in the twelfth grade. I-2 (impulsive) was the median for the sixth graders and I-3 (conformist) for the twelfth graders. Thirty of 32 subjects retested showed increases in ego level. Even though the above study argues for invariant order, we cannot be sure of this since six years intervened between testings. Obviously, we cannot be sure if the intervening ego levels of delta (self-protective) and delta/3 were passed through or skipped since there is no data on this. Therefore, even though Martin & Redmore's (1978) results are in the right direction their data is in no way conclusive evidence for invariant order.

Jane Loevinger's concept of ego development can be considered a 'master trait', a frame of reference around which the construction of personality occurs. Ego development is especially useful not only because Jane Loevinger and her colleagues have developed a fairly rigorous tool for its analysis, but also because of the breadth of the concept. Moralization, integration, relatability, self-system, and cognitive complexity are critical notions within the framework of ego development (Hauser, 1976). These aspects provide us with an extremely useful window on a person's function-
Loevinger has redefined the traditional concept of ego usually viewed within a framework of psychosexual or intellectual development with a far richer and broader conceptualization. Its breadth and depth is perhaps one of the greatest strengths of Loevinger's concept. Thus when we apply this paradigm to an individual we are able to gain a depth and breadth of understanding that is not easily matched. This richness, in conjunction with the inherent developmental nature of ego, allows us to not only view a person within the context of time but also within a multifaceted conceptual framework.

Much of the research to date has been concerned primarily with establishing the reliability and validity of ego development. Interrater correlations of between .76 and .92 have been consistently shown (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970; Cox, 1974; Hoppe, 1972). Reliability of the sentence completion test has generally been consistently high (Redmore & Waldman, 1975). Test-retest, and split half measurements of reliability have consistently been obtained in the .79 to .91 range. There is, however, a strong suggestion by Redmore and Waldman (1975) that "motivational sets" can have important influence on rated ego level. It is incumbent on the tester to ensure that the subjects understand that their responses should be a clear and serious reflection of their true thoughts and feelings and not simply responses to the perceived demands of the situation.

A great deal of work has been done concerning the validity of ego development. Paramount among the approaches to the question of validity is, of course, construct validity. Is the construct of ego development a viable and useful one both in its relationship...
to other variables and in terms of its own structural integrity. Several studies (e.g., Frank & Quinlan, 1976; Hoppe & Loevinger, 1972) have been done attempting to relate ego level to real life behaviors. These attempts have not always met with success.

A notable exception is the research of Frank and Quinlan (1976). They investigated the relationship between delinquent behaviors and ego development. Their subjects were 66 minority female adolescents. The study found that the subjects that were categorized as delinquents were found to be at a lower ego development level than those not categorized as delinquent. In fact 85% of the I-2 subjects came from the delinquent group while only 9 1/2% at or above the Delta/3 level were delinquent adolescents. It's also interesting that subjects at Delta and lower reported significantly more incidences of fighting, homosexuality and running away than the adolescents at all the other stages.

Hoppe and Loevinger (1972), another impressive exception, showed that conformity behaviors measured in a variety of ways were maximum in those subjects, middle class adolescent boys, rated by the sentence completion test as falling in the conformist range (Delta/3, I-3, I-3/4) as opposed to pre-conformist (I-2, Delta) and post-conformists (I-4, I-4/5, I-5).

Others have had difficulty showing relationships. De Loach (1976) found that stage of ego functioning as measured by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (Loevinger, 1970) failed to differentiate between subjects who continued in individual psychotherapy for more than one month from subjects who failed to begin or who terminated therapy within the first month. De Loach also reported that the degree of psychopathology (MMPI) and ego
strength were unrelated to ego development level.

Nemroff (1975) hypothesized that sympathy towards women's rights issues would be positively related to ego development while stereotyped domestic sex-role behaviors would be negatively related to ego development level. Although there were expected trends in the data, neither hypothesis was confirmed.

Comeau (1977) hypothesized that ego development would be stimulated by an academic training program involving training in empathy and cognitive complexity. Ego development was found not to increase as a function of this program. The author did, however, point out several inadequacies of the program which mitigated against increase in ego development.

Studies concerned with the relationship between ego level and intelligence or verbal fluency have generally shown satisfactorily low correlation. Blasi (1971), and Hoppe (1972) showed correlation between IQ and ego level of .46-.50 and .14 respectively. Loevinger & Wessler (1970) showed similarly low correlations (.23 to .51) between number of words in a protocol and ego level.

One interesting recent study by Head and Shayer (1980) showed that 12-14 year old girls scored higher on ego development than 12-14 year old boys. However, by age 17 this difference was no longer present. Also, at age 14 boys opting for science showed lower ego levels than boys opting for the humanities.

From the preceding literature review one can hopefully appreciate the potential of the concept of ego development. However, it also seems clear that the notion of ego development is
still in its infancy. There is a continuing need to better define the boundaries of uses to which the ego development tool may be applied.

**Locus of Control**

Rotter (1966) has characterized people's notion regarding degree of control over what happens to them as either primarily internal in orientation or external. Internally oriented people appear to be better psychologically adjusted in comparison to those that view their lives as primarily under the control of external influences (Epstein & Komorita, 1970; Fitch, 1970; Joe, 1971; Seligman, 1973). Phares (1976) has postulated that adjustment and locus of control were really related in a curvilinear way. Extreme internalizers or externalizers are probably poorly adjusted while people who score in the middle are likely to be better adjusted. There has been some criticism of Rotter's scale as assuming an unidimensional nature to degree of perceived control over one's life. Mirels (1970) has noted that Rotter's scale combines control over one's personal life with control over the "system". Levenson (1973) has in fact come up with a version of the scale which separates out these various possibilities. Research with this new scale has failed to resolve the unidimensional vs. multidimensional discussion regarding locus of control. Rotter (1975) suggests many reasons for the confusion besides the possibility of multidimensionality.
Characteristics of the Alcoholic

Although many investigators see no consistent personality characteristics which differentiate alcoholics from non alcoholics (Tremper, 1972; Zucker & Van Horn, 1972; Nathan, 1976, 1979; Lawlis & Rubin, 1971; Tiebout, 1946; Wexberg, 1949), others suggest certain traits or personality characteristics which should certainly be considered. Catanzaro (1967, p. 58) has pointed out the following personality characteristics as being most important to alcohol abuse: (1) a high level of anxiety in interpersonal relations; (2) emotional immaturity; (3) ambivalence toward authority; (4) low frustration tolerance; (5) grandiosity; (6) low self esteem; (7) feelings of isolation; (8) perfectionism; (9) guilt; (10) compulsiveness; (11) angry over-dependency; (12) sex-role confusion; (13) inability to express angry feelings adequately. Catanzaro (1967) while suggesting the above descriptors of alcoholics is certainly not taking into account the clear heterogeneity of the alcoholic population. Therefore, the above descriptors should probably be viewed not as a description of every alcoholic but rather as offering an overview within which there are numerous subgroupings with specific combinations and levels of the above generally maladaptive characteristics.

Williams, (1968) MacAndrew, (1965); Overall & Patrick (1972) and Dahlstrom et al. (1972) among others, have demonstrated that the MMPI is sensitive to severity of alcohol abuse. The MMPI subscales most sensitive were the psychopathic deviate scale, the depression scale, and the psychostenia scale. The alcoholic typically scores high on each of these subscales.
Numerous other tools have been used to identify alcoholic subgroupings. Among them the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), and the Rorschach (Clopton, 1978; Barnes, 1979). One consistent result across numerous studies is the variety of results while still maintaining some general similarities (Barnes, 1979; Clopton, 1978). One apparent explanation for the diverse results appears to be in the heterogeneity of the alcoholic population.

Subgroupings Within the Alcoholic Population

Considerable research has supported the heterogeneous nature of the alcoholic population (Blume, 1978; Jellinek, 1960; Barnes, 1979; Clopton, 1978). Work with the MMPI has shown specific differentiation within the alcoholic population on the psychopathic deviate scale, the depression scale, and the psychasthenia scale (Goldstein & Linden, 1969; Whitelock et al., 1971; Rosen, 1960; Brown, 1950). The 16PF has also been used to differentiate alcoholic subgroupings (Walton, 1968; Lawlis & Rubin, 1971, Nerviano & Gross, 1973). A variety of clusters were found differentiating various subgroupings. One subclassification scheme that seemed especially reliable noted three subgroups; maladaptive-frustrated, sociopathic, and aggressive (Lawlis & Rubin, 1971). Even researchers using the Rorschach have commented on the heterogeneity of alcoholic response profiles (Rudie & McGaughran, 1961; Bertrand & Maslen, 1969). The research to date, although lacking overall cohesion regarding the nature of the heterogeneity of alcoholics, has definitely pointed towards the existence of alcoholic subgroupings. In fact the differences between various subgroupings of
alcoholics is often considered greater than the differences between alcoholics and normals (Rosen, 1960). Certainly a strong distinction that has emerged is the difference between Primary and Secondary alcoholics (Blume, 1978; Schuckit et al., 1969; Schuckit, 1973; Madsen, 1974; Schuckit & Gunderson, 1975; Fox, 1957). In fact Blume (1978, p. 13) states that, "...the most important and productive subtyping is ... primary versus ... secondary alcoholism."

Ego Development and the Alcoholic

The present research is directed toward the application of the concept, ego development to the clinical problem of alcoholism. As previously mentioned the personality of the "alcoholic" has not always been easily ascertained. In fact Franks (1970) has suggested traditional psychometrics is probably inadequate for the task of the investigation of the personality of the alcoholic. In spite of this, some researchers (e.g. Jones, 1968; Armor, Polich & Stanbul, 1976) claim to have isolated certain tendencies such as stress tolerance, dependency, isolation, depression, and impulsivity in the etiology of the alcoholic. Many of the descriptive adjectives relating to the "alcoholic" personality have direct correlates in Jane Loevinger's concept of ego development.

The Ego Development Scale is especially appropriate in view of the personality facets the scale is designed to reveal. Deficiencies in these facets (impulse control/character development, interpersonal style, conscious preoccupations and cognitive style) have all been alluded to as characteristics of subgrouping of persons who abuse alcohol (Cantanzaro, 1967; Poley, 1974). The
present research is focusing on the notion of developmental stagnation, fixity or stuntedness of the secondary alcoholic which should be discernible when applying the concept of ego development to personality growth. Because of the general maladjustment of secondary alcoholics it is reasonable to assume that they would be unlikely to pursue the solution to their problems in a way that would encourage normal personality development. The primary alcoholic, however, would be expected to experience more substantial personality development and generally be better adjusted (Fox, 1957; Blume, 1978). It is hypothesized that the secondary alcoholic's ego level will be significantly lower than that of the primary alcoholic.

There has been very little research on ego development and the alcoholic. Harvey (1976) failed to show any significant differences between alcoholic and non-alcoholic women in their level of ego development. Harvey's research did not distinguish between primary and secondary alcoholics.

Locus of Control and the Alcoholic

Although there have been numerous research efforts directed towards differentiating alcoholics from non-alcoholics in terms of their internal/external locus of control (Butts & Chotlos, 1973; Costello & Manders, 1974; Distefano et al., 1972; Gozali & Sloan, 1971; Donavan & O'Leary, 1975), there has been little research regarding locus of control and alcoholic subtypes. However, because of the confused nature of the results to date (Barnes, 1979) it seems reasonable that an effort to look at the source of hetero-
geneity, i.e., alcoholic subtypes, might produce more consistent results. In fact others (O'Leary et al., 1974, 1976) have found that internally oriented alcoholics tend to be less clinically maladjusted than externally oriented alcoholics. This of course coincides with the present research hypothesis.

Summary

The literature on the personality characteristics of alcoholics has traditionally been a confused area. A reasonable explanation for this involves the notion of heterogeneity, i.e., alcoholic subtypes. The two most impressive subtypes thus far delineated are the primary and secondary alcoholic. Two personality dimensions that can offer the alcohol researcher and therapist increased knowledge regarding the object of their effects are ego development and the internal-external control dimension. Knowledge regarding the differences between primary and secondary alcoholics along these two personality dimensions can offer us a more indepth knowledge of the heterogeneous nature of alcoholism.

The Purpose Restated

The present research is designed to attempt to specify the differences between primary and secondary alcoholics along the personality dimensions of ego development and internal-external locus of control.
Research Questions

The present research hypothesis can be stated in two parts:

1) Primary alcoholics will have a higher average ego level as measured by Loevinger's Ego Development Scale than secondary alcoholics.

2) Primary alcoholics will have a lower average score on Rotter's (1966) Locus of Control Scale than secondary alcoholics.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Subjects

Twenty seven male alcoholics; 13 primary and 14 secondary inpatients at Pacifica Treatment Centre, served as subjects. Groups were matched on mean education, and socio-economic level. All subjects were in residence at the time of completing the ego development sentence completion test which was administered during the second week of treatment. Each subject signed a consent form (see Appendix).

The treatment at Pacifica consists of a four-week, five-day per week, intensive residential program. The client's time is heavily structured and revolves around group therapy. Clients have weekends free. Each client is put in a group of approximately 10 where he stays for the duration of treatment. Two counsellors stay with a particular group for the entire four week program.

Differentiating Primary from Secondary Alcoholics

One hundred and three male alcoholics were screened over a period of four months for designation as either primary or secondary. Twenty seven of these were clearly distinguishable as either primary or secondary alcoholics.

The initial classification was determined on the basis of questionnaires (see Appendix) handed out in group, explained, and
time given for completing them. The primary researcher distributed and collected the questionnaires.

Categorizing a subject as either a primary or secondary alcoholic was accomplished by using a composite of the following criterion. Any cases which were not clear cut were not included.

A person was designated a primary alcoholic if: 1) there was no history of any major psychiatric disorder, e.g., antisocial personality or socio-pathology antedating alcoholic abuse, 2) they had a stable work history prior to alcohol abuse, 3) no police record prior to alcohol abuse, 4) no history of any behavioral instabilities prior to alcohol abuse, i.e., frequent running away from home as a child or adolescent, repeated aggressive, hostile acts; sexual promiscuity, lying, etc.

A person was designated a secondary alcoholic if there was a clear indication of antisocial or sociopathic behaviors prior to the onset of alcohol abuse. At least four of the following behaviors were in evidence before labeling a subject as a secondary alcoholic (Schuckit, 1973): 1) repeated truancy, or suspension or expulsion from school on at least three to five occasions; 2) repeated running away from home for at least overnight; 3) two or more non-traffic police offenses, four or more arrests of any type, or at least one felony conviction; 4) work history characterized by repeatedly being dismissed (three or more) or frequent impulsive job changes; 5) repeated outbursts of rage or fighting (three or more); 6) flagrant sexual promiscuity, e.g., numerous casual sexual partners reported, prostitution or pimping; 7) a period of wanderlust with six months or more of wandering with no arranged job or fixed abode; 8) persistent and repeated lying or use of an alias.
In addition, further interviewing as well as consultation with other therapists, family, and examination of client's records occurred before categorization was finalized. Each categorization was verified by two other therapists and any major disagreement resulted in the subject being removed from the study.

The Clinical Tools, Administration and Scoring

**Ego Development Scale.** The Ego Development Sentence Completion Test consists of 37 sentence stems, including one addition, "Alcohol seems to ________." Male forms of the test were used (see Appendix). The administration of the test was done according to Loevinger, (1976). Item scoring followed the criterion as provided by Loevinger et al. (1970), and total protocol rating used the ogive method (Loevinger et al., 1970). The raters consisted of the author and one other trained rater, a doctoral level psychologist. Rater training is an especially important facet of any study involving the ego development scale. The raters in the present study completed Loevinger's 2-3 month self training procedures as discussed in Loevinger et al.'s., 1970, Vol. 1 Training Manual. Interrater reliability was obtained on practice protocols and was consistently high (90%-95% agreement).

Each item was independently rated by each rater. An inter-rater correlation of .81 was obtained over all items rated. This is in line with previous findings (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Disagreements were identified and discussed. The vast majority of disagreements were modest in terms of assigned ego level, and usually a consensus was easy to reach. If no consensus could be reached in a reasonable length of time, a mean ego level given by the two
raters was used, but this was rarely necessary. Scoring was done using the detailed scoring manual of Loevinger, Wessler and Redmore (1970).

**Ego stages of the scale.** The first stage is hardly worth mentioning in terms of the sentence completion task since it is prelanguage, presocial, and characterized in its later stage by a symbiotic dependence of the infant on the mother. This stage is known as the 1-1 stage and is characterized by the words presocial and symbiotic. The second stage is of more interest. This stage is characterized by the word 'impulsive'. One's **moral character** (impulse control) revolves around the simplistic notion of bad and good, punishment and reward. A person at this level is dependent, exploitative, and extremely self centered (interpersonal). Conscius preoccupations center around bodily impulses, especially sexual and aggressive. The **cognitive style** is one of excessive stereotyping and a general conceptual confusion. There is a lack of understanding of psychological causation. Trouble is not seen as resulting from within but rather as some external event or situation. The sentence stem, "The thing I like about myself is ___________ may be answered with the word "nothing" or the phrase "I am cute" or "I am clean".

The next stage is called Delta and is characterized by the word 'self protective'. Control of impulses is characterized by manipulating and exploitation. Conscious preoccupation is with things, advantages, taking control---generally self protective. Cognitive style is moving, or in transition, from conceptual con-
fusion to conceptual simplicity. A Delta response to the previously mentioned sentence stem "The thing I like about myself is _______" might be "all of me" or "I am so loveable". There is a general denying of faults and defects and an exaggeration of virtues.

The next stage is really a transitional stage between the self protectiveness of the Delta to the Conformist of I-3. This stage is appropriately labelled Delta-3. There is an obedience and conforming to social norms that is simplistic, almost trite (impulse control). Interpersonal style is still characterized by manipulativeness with the addition of obedience. Conscious preoccupation has moved from self protection to physical causation, and concern with the concrete aspects of traditional sex roles. Cognitive style is simplistic and stereotypic. The sentence stem "The thing I like about myself is _______" is often answered with specific reference to one feature of the body such as "my eyes", or "my smile" or "my body".

The next phase is labelled I-3 and centers around the word 'conformist' (stages prior to this level are often referred to as "Pre-conformist"). Impulse is now under the control of external rules. Feelings of shame and guilt manifest themselves at this level. There is a great sense of belonging, especially to specific and well delineated groups. Thus the interpersonal style moves toward concern for the group. Conscious preoccupation is now centered around social acceptability and such banal feelings as happy, sad, and glad. The conformist is developing an inner life, but it is still relatively simplistic. The cognitive style is
still conceptually simplistic, stereotypic and prone to clichés. The sentence stem "The thing I like about myself is ________" centers around responses concerned with sociability, e.g. "I laugh a lot," "I'm a true friend", "I'm considerate".

The next stage is another transition stage. The person is moving from the conformist to the conscientious I-4. This stage is labelled the I-3/4 stage and, according to Loevinger, is the mode for the general population. Impulse control is now coming under more sophisticated control of standards and contingencies. Interpersonal style is moving into a more sophisticated concern for relationships with others. Conscious preoccupation is with the self as separate from the group, and a recognition of an inner life of psychological causation. Cognitive style is now moving from conceptual simplicity to a more complex awareness of differing human attitudes, interests and abilities. The sentence stem "The thing I like about myself is ________" is often answered with such responses as "I try to get along with everyone", or "I get pleasure out of helping others", or "I always try to be honest with others".

The I-4 or conscientious stage has internalized the rules of the game. Impulse control now comes from within in the form of self evaluated standards. Interpersonal style is intensive, responsive and mutual; a genuine concern for communication between people. Conscious preoccupation is with a rich and differentiated inner life. Feelings are more finely tuned. Achievement and self respect are central to the I-4's thoughts. Cognitive style has naturally become more complex. Things are no longer classed
simplistically as right or wrong, but more in terms of polarities such as dependent versus independent. The sentence stem "The Thing I like about myself is ______" may be answered with "that I have perseverance and courage and follow my own convictions".

The transition from conscientious I-4 to Autonomous I-5 is called I-4/5 and is characterized by an increasing ability to cope with inner conflict (impulse control). An interpersonal style which has moved from intensive interpersonal relations to a cherishing of interpersonal relations. Conscious preoccupation is with communicating and expressing ideas and feelings. Cognitive style is not only conceptually complex, but includes an ability to tolerate contradiction and see the paradoxes of life. The I-4/5 client may respond to the sentence stem "The thing I like about myself is ______" with "that I am honest about myself, objective about myself.

The last stage that occurs with any significant frequency is the I-5 level. Coping with inner conflict, needs and duties, becomes more sophisticated at this level (impulse control). Interpersonal style is not only characterized by a cherishing of relationships but also respect for the autonomy of the individual in a relationship. Conscious preoccupation is a vivid and full integration of physiological and psychological causation. And of course the autonomous person is characterized by a sophisticated conceptual complexity, toleration for ambiguity and a more sweeping concern for social ideas and justice (cognitive style). The sentence stem "The thing I like about myself is ______" may be answered with "my sensitivity to the world around me, to people's feelings, and my sense of humor."
The final stage is labelled the I-6 stage and is characterized by the central theme running through the conception of ego development, "integrated". The person at this level has come to grips with inner turmoil, has reconciled inner conflict and renounces the unattainable (impulse control). The interpersonal style not only cherishes interpersonal relations and respects the autonomy within those relations, but now also cherishes the concept of individuality. Conscious preoccupation is with identity. And, of course, as Jane Loevinger has pointed out, the rarity of this stage makes it a difficult one to fully describe and appreciate.

Locus of control scale. Rotter's (1966) Locus of Control Scale consists of a 29-item forced choice instrument with 6 filler items (Appendix). Each item consists of two statements regarding some life situation with each statement describing either an external locus of control or an internal locus of control. One point is given for each question answered with an external emphasis. Total possible score is 23. Degree of external locus of control is positively related to the total score.

Administration. The Ego Development Scale and the Locus of Control Scale were administered sequentially in a counter balanced order within the same period of time. All clients of a particular treatment group received simultaneous instructions and were then given adequate time to complete the forms with the experimenter present.

Analysis of Data

There were two types of statistics used in the present research:
a) descriptive; and b) inferential. The descriptive statistics were: a) means and standard deviations; and b) Pearson r's and point-biserial correlations. The inferential statistics used were t-tests. Ego Development Scores were transformed to numerical equivalents where appropriate.
CHAPTER IV

Results

The essential data along with appropriate statistical analyses are reported in this chapter. Because the ego development and locus of control measures can be considered as quasi-interval scales (Rotter, 1966; Loevinger, 1976), parametric statistical analyses were performed on the data. Probabilities less than .05 were considered significant.

Subject Variables - Age, Education and Income

As indicated in Table 2, the mean age of primary versus secondary alcoholics differed significantly. No significant differences were found in mean years of formal education or in mean gross yearly incomes.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Primary and Secondary Alcoholics' Age, Years of Formal Education, and Gross Yearly Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>7.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>22,230</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22,230</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Neither research hypothesis was confirmed:

1) Primary alcoholics will have a higher average ego level as measured by Loevinger's Ego Development Scale than secondary alcoholics.

2) Primary alcoholics will have a lower average score on Rotter's Locus of Control Scale than secondary alcoholics.

Figure 1 is a scatter plot of each subject's score on ego level and locus of control. Table 3 shows the intercorrelations between ego level, locus of control, and the primary/secondary dichotomy. Figure 1 and the statistical analysis presented in Table 3 confirm that there was no statistically significant correlations among any of the three variables. A Pearson r was performed between ego level and locus of control with non-significant results while similarly non-significant results were obtained using the point-biserial correlation performed between ego level and the primary/secondary dichotomy and locus of control and the primary/secondary dichotomy.

Table 4 presents further results to confirm those presented in Figure 1 and Table 3. No significant differences were found between primary and secondary alcoholics on either the ego development scale or the locus of control scale ($p > .05, df = 25$).

Further confirmation of a complete lack of any differences between primary and secondary alcoholics along the ego dimension is presented in Figure 2. The total number of items rated at each ego level is presented as a percentage of total items rated for primaries versus secondaries. A t test was done on the data ($t = .97, p > .05, df = 915$), and as can be seen with reference to Figure 2,
Figure 1. Relationship between ego level and locus of control scores for each subject (primary - p, secondary - s).
### Table 3
**Intercorrelations of Ego Development, Locus of Control and Primary/Secondary Designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Primary/Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ego Level</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.025**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.083**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pearson r  
** Point-biserial

### Table 4
**Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for Comparisons Between Primary and Secondary Alcoholics on Ego Development and Locus of Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ego Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delta/3=1, I-3=2, I-3/4=3, I-4=4, I-4/5=5
no differences were obtained.

Table 5 shows the Pearson r correlations between ego development, locus of control and each of the subject variables age, income, and education. As can be seen, none of the correlations were large and none were significant.

Table 5

Intercorrelations of Ego Development and Locus of Control With Age, Gross Yearly Income, and Years of Formal Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ego Level</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Percentage of total item frequency for each ego level collated separately for all primary and all secondary protocols (x—x, primary;  o—o, secondary).
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The present research shows that primary and secondary alcoholics do not differ with respect to either ego level or degree of internal/external control as measured in this study. The research hypotheses stated in Chapter II were:

1. Primary alcoholics will have a higher average ego level as measured by Loevinger's Ego Development Scale than secondary alcoholics.

2. Primary alcoholics will have a lower average score on Rotter's (1966) Locus of Control Scale than secondary alcoholics.

Both research questions have unequivocally remained unsupported by the present data. In fact the degree to which both primary and secondary alcoholics responded similarly to the ego level questionnaire and the LOC questionnaire is to some extent startling and worthy of consideration in its own right. The results of the present research significantly extend not only our knowledge regarding primary and secondary alcoholics, but also our notions regarding ego development and locus of control.

The present research was undertaken in response to the now well agreed upon but poorly researched heterogeneous nature of the alcoholic population (Emrick, 1976). Not only do alcoholics differ on many relevant demographic variables (Madsen, 1974) but they also differ on many clinical measurements as well (Barnes, 1979). It is therefore of some theoretical interest that given the present acknowledged heterogeneity of the alcoholic population that two measures of personality dimensions of primary and secondary alcoho-
lies should yield results so dramatically lacking in differences.

Of course no single reason can be offered as an explanation for the present results, but several possibilities can be explored. Among the more salient possibilities are the following:

1. The primary/secondary dichotomy is inappropriate within the alcoholic population.

2. Ego development and locus of control are inadequate measures.

3. The subject population in the present research was inappropriate for some reason.

Appropriateness of the Primary/Secondary Dichotomy

As thoroughly discussed in the introduction and review of literature of the present study the possibility that the primary/secondary distinction is inappropriate seems unlikely (Madsen, 1974; Schuckit, 1973; Blume, 1978; Fox, 1957). It is important to remember that although Barnes (1979) and Clopton (1978) do not specifically mention the primary/secondary alcoholic subgroupings, the basic thrust of their reviews lead directly to such a distinction.

The present research used a fairly rigorous criterion which without question resulted in two very distinct groups of alcoholics. Their mean ages were considerably different (primaries, 49.92 vs secondaries, 31.14) which corresponds to other research (Schuckit, 1973). In fact only one primary overlapped with the secondaries in age. This of course conforms to the earlier onset of the secondaries' problems and their generally greater inability to avoid detection by society compared to the primary alcoholic. The
typical secondary alcoholic in the present study certainly fits the description of social misfit if not sociopath. Their description of their lives, especially their past rarely fails to impress the researcher with a certain sense of tragedy. Typically, stories of childhoods characterized at best by indifference and at worst by abuse are related. Their lives seem especially problem oriented from an early age. The primary alcoholics on the other hand appear much more ordinary in their general life experiences. However, as McCord (1977) has pointed out alcoholics in general are less likely to be the result of secure parental attention. But certainly with reference to the present research the primary alcoholics did not even approach the secondaries in the display of antisocial behaviors at an early age. The primaries' adolescence can easily be described as typical as opposed to one characterized by truancy, running away, fighting, and other atypical sorts of behaviors extending into young adulthood.

As the above discussion indicates the primary/secondary distinction is real enough. However, the larger question is the usefulness of such a distinction. Schuckit (1973) suggests very strongly that secondary alcoholics have a poorer prognosis regarding alcohol abuse than primaries. This, of course, is an important factor when attempting to treat any disorder. The present research was primarily aimed at investigating in more depth the nature of the primary/secondary dichotomy. Obviously with regard to ego development and locus of control the primary/secondary distinction appears useless. Whether this tells us something about primary and secondary alcoholics or about ego
development and locus of control is another question.

If, as the data suggest, that primary and secondary alcoholics really do not differ on ego development or degree of internal/external orientation towards the world, then we have an interesting finding. The results have definite practical application. One can certainly not use the primary/secondary distinction to infer locus of control and thus some specific treatment strategy. Neither can one infer ego level from knowledge of primary/secondary categorization. There is absolutely nothing in the data to allow one any inferences regarding the nature of primary and secondary alcoholics along the locus of control or ego dimension.

Regarding locus of control the heterogeneous nature of alcoholics was confirmed (Barnes, 1979). There seemed to be four groups of people which cut across the primary/secondary distinction. There were seven primaries above the mean of 7.69 and six below the mean. There were seven secondaries above the mean of 8.5 and seven below. It seems surprising that two groups of people with such radically different behavioral background should show no significant mean difference on a measure such as locus of control. Apparently their alcohol abuse is not in any fundamental way related to their view regarding the source of control in their lives. The range in the locus of control data was extreme ranging from 2 to 13 in the primaries and from 0 to 16 among the secondaries. The primaries were slightly more consistent in this study (Sd=3.25 vs Sd=4.85) than the secondaries, but it is difficult to say what, if anything, this
means.

It should be noted that Phares (1976) speculates that locus of control and adjustment may be curvilinearly related. People at the extremes, either internalizers or externalizers, may be poorly adjusted. Regarding the present research, there is a suggestion of more extreme locus of control scores for secondary alcoholics. Certainly the inconclusive results to date regarding locus of control and alcoholism have not been resolved by the present research. The means of 7.79 and 8.5 are slightly higher than the results usually obtained with alcoholics (Barnes, 1979), especially the 8.5 for the secondaries, but the variability overshadows any mean differences.

The ego levels of primary and secondary alcoholics seemed equally unresponsive to quite different behavioral histories in that secondaries had engaged in numerous overt behaviors as adolescents which would generally be considered maladjusted whereas the primaries had not. As Figure 2 shows, remarkably similar results were obtained from both groups.

If primary and secondary alcoholics indeed do not differ in terms of their core ego level, it is especially instructive. Loevinger's (1976) four facets, impulse control, interpersonal style, conscious preoccupation, and cognitive style are certainly valuable aspects of a person's inner workings for one to be aware. The mean protocol rating for both groups was midway between 1-3/4 and 1-4. Certainly the mean ego level and the general distribution of ego levels as reported in the results seem quite typical (Loevinger, 1976). There is absolutely no basis upon which to say
any thing else. The secondary alcoholics who were hypothesized to be in some way stunted in core ego development because of their early experiences seem totally unfounded. As a group as well as individuals they are certainly as articulate and sophisticated in displaying the concerns of the I-3/4 and I-4 level protocol as are the primaries. According to Loevinger's model the majority of primary and secondary alcoholics can be categorized as being close to or at the conscientious (I-4) ego level. If one uses Loevinger's descriptors of this level it certainly appears that both primary and secondary alcoholics in the present study are reasonably sophisticated. The I-3/4 is in transition from the conformist (I-3) to the conscientious (I-4) level. The conformist is characterized as a rather simplistic person in terms of traditional notions of shame, guilt, belonging, being helpful, concern with appearances, displaying rather banal feelings and thinking along rather simplistic, stereotypic lines. The conscientious (I-4) person is characterized by a more internal self evaluated and critical attitude, with more of a mutual concern for communication between people, feelings tend to be more differentiated, and motives more complex, and finally conceptual notions and ideas are more complex.

With reference to the present research, the ego level results put a rather strong emphasis on viewing both the primary and secondary alcoholics as verbalizing at levels which seem to be little impaired by either their alcoholic history or their personal experiences.

The present results concerning alcoholic subtypes allow certain
broad conclusions regarding the etiology and treatment possibilities surrounding the primary/secondary labelling of alcoholics. The radical differences in the life histories of primary and secondary alcoholics in no way appears to prejudice them towards any particular world view centered on an internal or external orientation. Nor does this difference in past history appear to affect the development of ego. And because both the primary and secondary alcoholics scored relatively high on ego level, one cannot conclude that the present group of subjects suffered appreciable stunting in this dimension.

Regarding treatment, it is perhaps comforting to know that as far as the present results are concerned one can disregard the primary/secondary distinction when focusing on perception of control and general sophistication of ego level. It should be added, however, that knowledge of locus of control level and ego level can no doubt be highly useful when applied on an individual basis. In fact, the present research shows quite clearly, especially with locus of control, that there are great individual differences which should not be ignored in treatment.

Certainly a therapist can and should make use of an individual's degree of internality/externality and ego level when pursuing treatment. It seems clear that in the present research all subjects, whether high or low on locus of control or ego level, have adopted a very harmful adaptive response to their environments. Surely by knowing a person's locus of control and ego level one can more quickly pinpoint the nature and complexity of a client's beliefs, feelings, and behaviors, and in turn move the client more quickly and effectively towards different perspectives, feelings and behaviors.
Ego Development and Locus of Control as Inadequate Measures

This question really concerns the validity of both measurements used in the present research. Loevinger and Wessler (1970) suggested rather strongly that the tool may not be appropriate in differentiating groups that clearly differ on other behavioral measures. As mentioned in the review of literature most studies designed to show differences have met with mixed success (Harvey, 1976; Frank & Quinlan, 1976). Hauser (1976) points out quite clearly that the question of validity is a complex one regarding Loevinger's Ego Development Scale. Hauser's general conclusion was, however, favorable in assessing ego level in terms of discriminant validity, predictive validity and construct validity. On the surface it certainly seems surprising that secondary alcoholics scored at the same level as primary alcoholics. If the conformist level (I-3) is considered the mid-point then it would seem that secondaries would score at the pre-conformist levels and primaries at the post-conformist level. This was clearly not the case in the present study. In fact there was not a hint of differences between primaries and secondaries. It could be that the ego development scale is designed to measure not only core ego functioning but also in some sense an awareness of society's requirements and expectations. Thus the present results may be composed of people who completed the sentence stems in a personal way, thus giving a valid window into their ego functioning and those that answered in terms of their awareness of society's requirements and expectations. This problem is, of course, a general concern with these types of tests. However, in
the present situation we are dealing with two groups that differ on age, but have similar incomes and educational backgrounds. These similarities may of course lead to similarities in awareness of society's expectations and requirements. Because we are dealing with alcoholics who are often known to be quite manipulative (Madsen, 1974) and in addition we have specified a subgrouping designated secondaries, we may have stacked the deck against gaining easy access to core ego functioning. After all, secondaries in addition to being alcoholic are also in many ways sociopathic or at least behaviorally very much antisocial. Thus, we might expect them to be even more likely to express answers of a non-personal, perhaps even of a manipulative nature. Many of the sentence stems on the ego development questionnaire have a very strong "pull", as Loevinger says, and in fact may predispose people to answer at more of an intellectual level in terms of their general awareness of the rules of the game rather than responding at a level more consistent with their inner thoughts and feelings.

It should be noted that if in fact the secondary's ego level is an accurate representation of their ego development, then there appears to be some incongruence between the descriptor of the post conformist level and the past behaviors of the secondary alcoholic. Of course, the present research defined primary and secondary alcoholics largely on the basis of their past behaviors. This is consistent with the approach of other researchers (Schuckit, 1973). However, one could argue that some independent tool that validates present personality characteristics in terms of the primary/secondary distinction might prove valuable.
Another potential problem is in Loevinger's notion of the four facets of ego development, i.e., impulse control, interpersonal style, conscious preoccupation, and cognitive style. It may very well be that the secondary's high ego level reflects an emphasis on different facets of ego development than the primaries. Because Loevinger has made no provision for such an analysis it is not possible to pursue such a possibility.

The locus of control results seem less susceptible to the above criticisms since the items are worded in a way that is often ambiguous in terms of relating them to overall societal expectations and injunctions. The locus of control has been criticized as assuming that it is measuring a unidimensional phenomenon (Levenson, 1973). However, attempts at teasing out the confusion in locus of control and alcoholics have not met with much success (Caster & Parsons, 1977; Barnes, 1979). On the surface the locus of control tool seems appropriate for the present research purposes. Some research has suggested a positive relationship between sociopathy and externality (Caster & Parsons, 1977). However, the present research indicates no such tendency. As previously mentioned the locus of control questionnaire failed to show any differences between primaries and secondaries. Although the locus of control scale has been criticized, it seems with regard to the present research the lack of differences is unlikely to be the result of the validity of the locus of control.

And finally, if we are correct in labelling the secondary as sociopathic to a significant extent (Schuckit, 1973), then it may be that other measures would be more appropriate. Perhaps because of the extensive research regarding disorders of affective respon-
sivity in the sociopath (Hare, 1970; Schacter & Latane, 1964), tools which tap this facet may be more appropriate (i.e., Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale).

**Inappropriate Subject Population**

Perhaps any real differences in ego level or LOC were washed out by specific characteristics of the particular subjects used or the specific treatment situation used in the present study. Perhaps an elation effect was present, or the selection process at Pacifica biased in favor of more stable clients, or more motivated clients. Pacifica does require a certain demonstration of stability, i.e., either a recent work history and/or a functioning family support system.

Loevinger (1976) has suggested that it is difficult to temporarily raise one's ego level even after learning about the theory. Since both groups are exposed equally to the above mentioned circumstances these kinds of explanations seem unlikely to get one very far.

One other possibility is that prior treatment in other facilities, outpatient counselling, Alcoholics Anonymous, etc., has raised ego levels. Of course, if this were true, any prior differences between primary and secondary alcoholics should remain constant. As previously mentioned it is not that easy to raise ego level even when giving specific education regarding the topic. In addition, what research has been done has not been able to show substantial results regarding life experiences and ego change (Loevinger, 1976). And finally, the present data were looked at
in terms of the relationship between prior treatment experiences and ego level. A point biserial correlation coefficient was done (treatment/no treatment with ego level) and no relationship was found. Prior treatment was defined as at least several weeks of involvement in a formal treatment program, including Alcoholics Anonymous. The distinction was quite easy to determine since clients without exception either had virtually no prior treatment experiences or a substantial amount.

In conclusion the three possibilities mentioned can all be viewed as contributive to the present results. However, it would seem that the second possibility, that ego development and locus of control measurements are inadequate with respect to the primary/secondary dichotomy, is perhaps the more appropriate explanation for the present results.

Further Research

The present research was an effort to better delineate primary and secondary alcoholics along specific measures of psychological functioning. Of special interest was the utilization of Loevinger's ego development concepts. However, both ego development and the locus of control measurements failed to detect any differences. There are three options at this point: 1. Pursue the present research further, 2. Use different measurements, or 3. Disregard the primary/secondary distinction.

The present author is not enthusiastic about the first option. The present study was done with a great deal of care and it is
unlikely that the obtained results are unreliable. A careful, but informal, item analysis revealed six ego development sentence stems that might be used in a follow-up study. These items might possibly elicit different responses from primary and secondary alcoholics. Of course, if just a few sentence stems were used, it would no longer allow total protocol ratings. However, total protocol ratings may really be unnecessary and somewhat a waste of time. Ego development theory is intriguing and certainly of value when looking at clients and attempting to gain some perspective regarding their levels of psychological functioning. The present author has a suspicion that 6 to 10 items would probably be sufficient in judging a client's ego level. As far as the LOC is concerned it is unlikely that anything further can be accomplished with respect to primary and secondary alcoholics.

The second option seems to have more promise. There are, of course, numerous other tests and in fact some research with the MMPI (Clopton, 1978) and other tests (Barnes, 1979) clearly show subgroupings within the alcoholic population. However, the present research was directed primarily at using the ego development concept because of its depth and richness. Although many of these other tests can no doubt be used, the information to be gained does not somehow seem as potentially useful as data regarding ego development.

The third option, of course, leads us to question the fundamental utility of the primary/secondary distinction. The primary/secondary distinction is clearly well established and provides one
of the presently best available ways in which to categorize clients in terms of their probable initial reaction to therapy as well as their long term prognosis.

As discussed in the literature review there is considerable reason to view the primary/secondary distinction as a valid one (Schuckit, 1973; Blume, 1978). Not only is there considerable interest presently in this dichotomy, but historically beginning with Fox (1957) there seems to have been a clear recognition of this dichotomy. If one looks closely at the basis upon which the primary/secondary distinction was made in the present study, it seems clear that we are dealing with two different kinds of people. Perhaps future research can be even more restrictive in classifying a person as either primary or secondary. However, in the opinion of the author this would probably not produce anything more in relation to the present results. By restricting one's criterion more and more the group that is left would be such a small percentage of alcoholics that their detailed study at this time seems hardly worthwhile. After all, the present research was an attempt to find useful measurements of primary and secondary alcoholics that might be used in their treatment, or at least lead to a better understanding of them. As it was, we had to go through over 100 alcoholics to find 27 that clearly met our criterion. That is barely 25% of the alcoholic population that we are studying.

Another approach could be to develop a primary/secondary continuum model whereby one devises a method of giving an actual score based on a person's past history. This would require a rigorous standardized scoring system perhaps combined with a weighting factor depending upon the sociopathic stature of each
behavior specified in the rating system. This approach is, of course, a research project all its own.

In conclusion the research area of secondary/primary alcoholism seems a fruitful and worthwhile area of investigation. Certainly pursuing the distinction with other tools should lead us to a better understanding of the etiology and proper treatment for such a heterogeneous group. By elaborating the similarities and differences amongst subgroupings within the alcoholic population we can only gain in our knowledge of clinical disorders.
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APPENDIX
I,________________________________________, consent to participate in the present study on alcoholism. I am aware that this will involve one session of approximately one hour. The session will involve filling out three questionnaires—one being a sentence completion task, while the other two are selecting prearranged items that either apply to me or concur with my beliefs. A brief personal interview may occur if deemed necessary for further clarification. As well, a short discussion with my therapist and family members on Family Day may occur, again for clarification. The researcher may also use information which I provided to Pacifica Treatment Center in my alcohol history form and/or intake form.

The information will be gathered and maintained by the principal investigator, Celesta Wilson. I understand that the strictest confidentiality of the information obtained will be maintained and that no individual results will be released. I also understand that participation in this project is voluntary and may be terminated at any time without jeopardy to my treatment.

Signed_________________________
As you know, all clients coming through here arrive under the umbrella of alcoholism. We know there are similarities but also differences in the personalities of alcoholics. The following questionnaires are designed to gain information regarding those similarities and differences.
Of the following items, check off the ones that you feel clearly apply to you: Note if these happened before 16 or after age 16.

(1) repeated truancy (skipping school), suspension or expulsion from school (3 to 5 times).

(2) repeated running away from home for at least overnight.

(3) 2 or more nontraffic police offenses, 4 or more arrests of any type, or at least one felony conviction.

(4) work history characterized by repeatedly being dismissed (3 or more) or frequent impulsive job changes.

(5) repeated outbursts of rage or fighting (3 or more).

(6) sexual promiscuity (lots of casual sex partners).

(7) prostitution or pimping.

(8) a period of drifting with 6 months or more of wandering with no arranged job or fixed address.

(9) use of other drugs besides alcohol on more than an experimental basis.

(10) period of repeated lying or use of an alias (assumed name).

(11) Alcoholic parent: a. 1  b. 2  c. neither

(12) Family of origin – as you grew up:

- 2 natural parents living with 1 or more children
- 2 parents – one not my parent
- single parent
- no parent, but some other adult
- residential care, foster homes

(13) Atmosphere of family when growing up:

- poor
- O.K.
- good

(14) Impressions of mother: Impressions of father:

- warm
- indifferent
- abusive
- warm
- indifferent
- abusive
This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a and b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly BELIEVE to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually BELIEVE to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the ONE you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE LETTER!

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
   b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

6. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

7. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
   b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

8. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

9. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

PLEASE TURN OVER!
10. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

11. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

12. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction of my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
SENTENCE COMPLETION FOR MALES

Name_________________________ Age________

Education____________________ Gross Income 1980____________

Instructions: Complete the following sentences.

1. Raising a family__________________________________________

2. When a child will not join in group activities__________________

3. When they avoided me_____________________________________

4. A man's job_____________________________________________

5. Being with other people___________________________________

6. The thing I like about myself is____________________________

7. If my mother____________________________________________
8. If I can't get what I want

9. When I was younger

10. Education

11. When people are helpless

12. Women are lucky because

13. What gets me into trouble is

14. A good father

15. If I were a king
16. A wife should__________________________

17. I feel sorry__________________________

18. A man should always____________________

19. Rules are_____________________________

20. He felt proud that he___________________

21. Men are lucky because__________________

22. My father and I________________________

23. A man feels good when__________________
24. When I get mad


25. At times he worried about


26. When his wife asked him to help with the housework


27. My main problem is


28. When I am criticized


29. Sometimes he wished that


30. A husband has a right to


31. When he thought of his mother, he
32. The worst thing about being a man

33. If I had more money

34. I just can't stand people who

35. My conscience bothers me if

36. Crime and delinquency could be halted if

37. Alcohol seems to