

**NARCISSISM, FAMILY OF ORIGIN, AND CAREER SELF-EFFICACY:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

NICOLA LABUSCHAGNE

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (CLIN. PSYCH.),
UNIVERSITY OF NATAL,
PIETERMARITZBURG

JANUARY 1996

The author hereby declares that this dissertation, unless specifically indicated to the contrary, is a product of her own work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their assistance with this dissertation:

My supervisor, Clive Basson, for his support, advice and guidance.

The staff and students in the departments of psychology, law and electronic engineering at both the Pietermaritzburg and Durban campuses of the University of Natal, for participating so willingly in this research.

Dr Robert Raskin, for the provision of his Narcissistic Personality Inventory and for his interest in this research.

Morag Duncan, for typing the questionnaire.

Kay Govender, Angela Barr and Stuart Anderson for their help and patience with statistical processing.

My parents, for their ongoing support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	(viii)
CHAPTER 1:	
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2:	
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
2.1 THE CONCEPT OF NARCISSISM	8
2.2 A BRIEF PSYCHOANALYTIC HISTORY OF NARCISSISM	9
2.2.1 Freud and Narcissism	9
2.2.2 The Contributions of Kernberg and Kohut	10
2.3 <i>DSM</i> AND THE NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER	11
2.4 EMPIRICAL MEASUREMENTS OF NARCISSISM	12
2.4.1 The Narcissistic Personality Inventory	13
2.4.1.1 Authority	14
2.4.1.2 Exhibitionism	14
2.4.1.3 Exploitativeness	15
2.4.1.4 Self-sufficiency	15
2.4.1.5 Entitlement	16
2.4.1.6 Superiority	16
2.4.1.7 Vanity	17
2.5 FAMILY OF ORIGIN, NARCISSISM AND CHOICE OF CAREER IN PSYCHOTHERAPY	18
2.5.1 Family of Origin as a Variable of Career Choice	19
2.5.1 Roe's Theory of Vocational Choice	19

2.5.1.1	Family of Origin as a Determinant of Career Choice in Psychotherapy	21
2.5.1.2	Dynamics of the Family of Origin	22
✓ 2.6	NARCISSISM AND CAREER SELF-EFFICACY	25
2.6.1	Holland's Theory of Occupational Choice	26
2.6.1.1	The Realistic Orientation	27
2.6.1.2	The Investigative Occupational Orientation	27
2.6.1.3	The Artistic Occupational Orientation	27
2.6.1.4	The Social Occupational Orientation	28
2.6.1.5	The Enterprising Occupational Orientation	28
2.6.1.6	The Conventional Occupational Orientation	28
✓ 2.6.1.7	Career Self-Efficacy	30
2.7	THERAPIST NARCISSISM	31
2.7.1	Manifestations of Therapist Narcissism	31
2.8	CONCLUDING REMARKS	34

CHAPTER 3:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		36
3.1	PURPOSE	36
3.2	THE SAMPLE	36
3.2.1	Group 1	37
3.2.2	Group 2	37
3.2.3	Group 3	38
3.3	PROCEDURE	39
3.3.1	Psychometric Instruments	40
3.3.1.1	Biographical Questionnaire	40

3.3.1.2	The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI)	40
3.3.1.2.1	Authority	42
3.3.1.2.2	Exhibitionism	42
3.3.1.2.3	Superiority	42
3.3.1.2.4	Entitlement	42
3.3.1.2.5	Exploitativeness	42
3.3.1.2.6	Self-Sufficiency	43
3.3.1.2.7	Vanity	43
3.3.1.3	The Circumplex Model: FACES III	43
3.3.1.4	The Career Self-Efficacy Scale	45
3.4	FORMAL HYPOTHESES	45

CHAPTER 4:

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND RESULTS		46
4.1	DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	46
4.2	DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	47
4.3	ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	50
4.3.1	Psychology students are likely to score significantly higher on measures of narcissism than engineering and law students	51
4.3.2	Psychology students are likely to have experienced significantly more extreme family of origin types than engineering and law students	53
4.3.3	Psychology students are likely to predict career self-efficacy more significantly in socially oriented occupations than engineering and law	54
4.5	SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS	58
4.6	DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSES	59

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION 63

5.1 INTRODUCTION 63

5.2 HYPOTHESIS 1 64

5.3 HYPOTHESIS 2 68

5.4 HYPOTHESIS 3 69

CHAPTER 6:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 76

REFERENCES 79

APPENDICES 88

1: REQUEST FOR COPY OF NARCISSISTIC
PERSONALITY INVENTORY 89

2: *DSM* (APA, 1980, 1987, 1994) DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA
FOR NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER 90

3: BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE 94

4: THE NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY 95

5: FACES III: THE CIRCUMPLEX MODEL 101

6: CAREER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE 104

7: LIST OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES AND HOLLAND CODES ... 108

8: LIST OF WORTLEY JOBS 109

9: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE 119

10: HOLLAND OCCUPATIONAL CODES FOR RESEARCH
SAMPLE 130

11: PEARSON CORRELATIONS: NPI TOTAL SCORE FOR
NARCISSISM AND SUB-SCALE COMPONENT SCORES 131

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
Table 1:	Research sample minimum, maximum and mean ages	46
Table 2:	Breakdown of research sample sex by group	47
Table 3:	Breakdown of research sample race by group	47
Table 4:	Research sample means and standard deviations on the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988), FACES III, (Olson <i>et al.</i> , 1985), and the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991)	48
Table 5:	t-Test comparisons of sample means of the NPI and FACES III with means provided by Raskin and Terry (1988) and Olson <i>et al.</i> (1985)	50
Table 6:	One-Way Anova: NPI Exploitativeness, Self-Sufficiency and Entitlement sub-scales by group	51
Table 7:	One-Way Anova: NPI Vanity sub-scale by race	52
Table 8:	One-Way Anova: NPI Self-Sufficiency sub-scale by sex	52
Table 9:	One-Way Anova: FACES III dimension of family adaptability by group	53
Table 10:	One-Way Anova: FACES III dimension of family adaptability by sex	54
Table 11:	One-Way Anova: Career Self-Efficacy Scale Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, and Social occupational orientations by group	55
Table 12:	One-Way Anova: Career Self-Efficacy Scale Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social occupational orientations by sex	56

	PAGE
Table 13: One-Way Anova: Career Self-Efficacy Scale Realistic occupational orientation by race	56
Table 14: One-Way Anova: High NPI scorers by Low NPI scorers on Career Self-Efficacy Scale Enterprising occupational orientation	57
Table 15: Significant Pearson correlations: NPI and Career Self-Efficacy Scale	58
Table 16: Significant Pearson correlations: NPI and race, sex	59
Table 17: Significant Pearson correlations: Career Self-Efficacy Scale and race, sex	59
Table 18: Classification results of low and high narcissistic scorers on NPI total score of narcissism	60
Table 19: Classification results of subject groups	61
Table 20: Standardised canonical discriminant function coefficients and pooled-within-groups correlations of discriminating variables	62

ABSTRACT

The literature claims that, whilst hindering normal narcissistic development, a family of origin characterised by high levels of cohesion and low levels of adaptability, promotes individual proficiency in interpersonal skills. Coupled with unconscious motivations for interpersonal need gratification, a subsequent predisposition towards a career choice in psychotherapy is likely. This study set out to test these assumptions by comparing family of origin types, levels of narcissism and career self-efficacy in postgraduate Masters psychology students, postgraduate final year law students and final year electronic engineering students currently enrolled in University of Natal training programmes (N=85). Informed by the literature, this study hypothesised that trainee psychotherapists would report more extreme family of origin types, predict career self-efficacy in the direction of social occupations and display higher levels of narcissism than students in other fields of specialisation. The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1988), **FACES III** of the Circumplex Model (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen & Wilson, 1985) and the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991) were utilised to assess the dimensions of narcissism, family of origin and career self-efficacy respectively. This study was unable to find significant connections between family of origin, narcissism and career self-efficacy, thereby failing to provide empirical support for the literature's claims. Results have been discussed in terms of theoretical and practical implications and attempts have been made to account for the general lack of significant findings. Limitations of this study's research design and recommendations for future research in this area have been offered.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since its introduction into psychological literature, the concept of narcissism has received considerable theoretical and clinical attention. As a psychological term, narcissism focuses on the quality of individual self-involvement. Because the notion of *self* is essentially an artificial construct, it is not universally perceived in the same way, making a study in this area somewhat problematic. The current preoccupation with narcissism has led some authors to speculate that it is merely a reflection of the current Western "Me" generation's fixation on the self (Lasch, 1979; Zohar, 1991). However, the concept is anything but new, deriving from the ancient Greek myth of Narcissus and, rather than being considered the 'problem' of our times, should be regarded more as the "concern of certain theoreticians of our time" (Fine, 1986 p.186).

Freud's (1914) paper provided the impetus for psychoanalytic theorising about narcissism. Although this paper was sometimes metapsychologically obscure and was to be contradicted by his subsequent writings (Friedman, 1985), it nonetheless paved the way for people like Kernberg (1970, 1975) and Kohut (1971, 1977), whose contributions have been invaluable in establishing contemporary notions of narcissism. Although sometimes theoretically dissimilar, their achievements in this area have provided clinicians with a theoretically robust framework within which to conceptualise and treat individuals presenting with narcissistic disturbances.

As a result of these two theorists' efforts, interest in this area increased to the extent that the American Psychiatric Association included the construct of narcissism in its diagnostic nosology in 1980. The *DSM-III* (APA, 1980) represented an overlap of both their efforts in this area, describing a distinct group of clients

encountered by mental health professionals (Goldstein, 1985). The development of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988) to measure narcissistic personality traits in nonclinical populations has provided empirical evidence for many of their assumptions, considerably increasing knowledge in this domain. In addition to providing a single score for narcissism, the authors have taken into account the multidimensionality of this construct, providing several interdependent component scores of narcissism in their inventory.

The literature concerning therapist characteristics has proposed that those entering the field of psychotherapy are likely to be narcissistic individuals (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980). The suggestion is that the temperament and constellation of the family of origin that leads to narcissism predisposes individuals to seek careers as psychotherapists. The psychotherapist's family of origin tends to be characterised by a dominant maternal figure who occupies a pivotal position in the family (Ford, 1963). However, due to the mother's emotional insecurity, she is dependent on the child behaving in a certain way in order to maintain her narcissistic equilibrium (Miller, 1987). The child is able to perceive and respond intuitively to this need and tailors its behaviour in order to meet parental demands. The child's successful adaptation to parental expectations means that it is likely to carry over this responsibility to the rest of the family, developing a heightened awareness of other family members' needs.

Because open emotional communication between family members tends not to be encouraged, the child learns to be particularly sensitive to unconscious signals indicating the needs of others (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990). This requires a keen perception of the family's emotional life in order that the child may provide advice and consultation to individual family members and be responsible for resolving arguments and reducing family tensions (Guy, 1987). Because the family's need for cohesion and stability tend to be relatively high (*ibid.*),

the future psychotherapist's function in the family of origin appears to be concerned with maintaining the status quo. This role fosters psychological-mindedness, making a career choice in psychotherapy a familiar one (Farber, 1985; Fussell & Bonney, 1990). However, by assuming this role, the child invariably forfeits the nurturance and caretaking that appears to be necessary for normal narcissistic development (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987).

In her research on the relationship between personality variables and vocational choice, Roe (1956, 1957) states that a severely pathological early environment resulting in the minimal satisfaction of typically higher order needs will result in a defensive avoidance of these needs - characteristically interpersonal needs. Conversely, a psychologically healthy childhood wherein needs are routinely satisfied as they arise, produces minimal unconscious motivators. Between these two environments exists an ambiguous family climate containing both acceptance and rejection wherein needs are partly but not optimally satisfied, thereby becoming unconscious motivators. It is this environment that may predispose one to choose to become a psychotherapist (Fussell & Bonney, 1990).

As a result of this early deprivation, the child may be motivated to choose to enter the field of psychotherapy in an effort to provide the closeness and intimacy lacking in its relationship with its parents (Harris, cited in Guy, 1987). Because the child has been 'trained' from an early age to take care of the emotional needs of others, it seems fair to assume, then, that such an individual may tend to predict career self-efficacy in those occupations emphasising the need for interpersonal skills. John Holland (1966, 1985) classifies such occupations into the Social domain of his occupational typology, characterising people drawn to these fields as being responsible and socially oriented, preferring to deal with problems through the function of feeling and the interpersonal manipulation of others. On the strength of this research, Matsui and Tsukamoto (1991) have proposed using a modified

version of Holland's (1966, 1985) occupational typology as a tool for assessing career self-efficacy, that is, a method of ascertaining those occupational fields in which people will tend to predict career success.

The assumption is not that the majority of individuals entering the field of psychotherapy suffer from an identifiable personality disorder; rather, the literature's suggestion is that narcissistic traits influence occupational choice in order to ensure higher order need gratification. In addition to the above assertions that psychotherapists have been coached from an early age to take care of the emotional life of others and fulfil this role in order to have unconscious needs for love, affirmation and acceptance met, a career in psychotherapy provides additional rewards. Traditionally, the psychotherapist holds an important position in society (Guy, 1987; Marmor, 1953); the career itself is regarded as a high status position with the potential for some financial gain. In addition, as a healer, the psychotherapist is largely regarded with admiration and awe by both clients and the public (Guy, 1987; Marmor, 1953).

The literature seems to submit, then, that due to disruptions in normal narcissistic development as a result of early parenting strategies, narcissistic needs for recognition, affirmation, omnipotence, success, and approval will be satisfied by a career in psychotherapy. Most of the research in this area has largely been based on anecdotal case studies which have lacked both comparison groups and methodological soundness (Clark, 1991; Guy, 1987). Recent studies, however, have investigated the psychotherapist's family of origin (Fussell & Bonney, 1990) as well as levels of narcissism in this population (Clark, 1991). Whereas the former has indicated that psychotherapists tend to experience their families of origin differently from those pursuing other careers, despite the literature's speculations to the contrary, the latter has failed to show significant differences between psychotherapists and other professionals. Clark (*ibid.*) suggests that there is room

for further research in this area. Specifically, she recommends that additional research should attempt to ascertain whether comparison groups differentially endorse any specific narcissistic traits as measured by the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1988). She also suggests that correlations between age, sex and gender would provide valuable information.

Hence, one of the aims of this study is to replicate Clark's (1991) study in an attempt to determine whether South African trainee psychotherapists display significantly higher levels of narcissism than postgraduate and final year students in other fields of specialisation. In addition, the present study sets out to take up Clark's (*ibid.*) recommendations discussed above. In order to empirically evaluate theoretical claims that the psychotherapist's problematic family of origin motivates a career choice in psychotherapy, this research sets out to compare levels of cohesion and adaptability in this population with postgraduate and final year students in other fields of specialisation. Finally, in order to test Roe (1956, 1957) and Fussell and Bonney's (1990) claims that individuals will be motivated to choose a career in psychotherapy in order to have higher order needs met, this study also attempts to discover whether trainee psychotherapists will tend to predict career self-efficacy more frequently in socially oriented occupations than other postgraduate and final year students.

Since narcissism manifests itself through interpersonal relationships (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990), it has implications for therapeutic countertransference. Narcissistic tendencies diminish objectivity and relatedness and tend to obscure the client's issues from view, resulting in potentially harmful therapeutic interactions (*ibid.*). Further manifestations of the psychotherapist's narcissism within the therapeutic relationship include inappropriate measures of authority and superiority, exploitation and manipulation of clients, detachment and distancing, deficits in empathy, chronic helpfulness and professional burnout (Freudenberger, 1990;

Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Marmor, 1953; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980). This problem may be seen not only in psychotherapists, but in a wide variety of occupations that involve some relationship of authority over people, for example, doctors, lawyers, teachers and clergymen (Kriel, 1982; Marmor, 1953).

Because of narcissism's traditionally 'bad' reputation and the literature's suggestion that therapists have more than their fair share of narcissistic traits, one could understandably conclude that such individuals should forget about doing therapy altogether. This is not the suggestion of this dissertation at all. Narcissism is not exclusively a pejorative term since self-interest can be a useful, healthy quality. Thus, when a therapist listens attentively to a client, she or he is operating out of the self-interest of being a good therapist that coincides with the client's need to obtain effective therapy (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990). The ability to maintain an observing ego whilst at the same time merging with the client's unconscious (Casement, 1985; Searles, 1979) is undoubtedly a healthy narcissistic function. Finally, the experience of personal pain may be an asset to the psychotherapist since the successful resolution of this pain engenders optimism and empathy in the therapist (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Guy, 1987). However, unanalysed narcissistic anxieties are at best countertherapeutic and at worst potentially harmful to the client. Should psychotherapists in training be unaware of the effects of these unanalysed early childhood experiences on therapeutic functioning, their capacity for productive intervention will almost certainly be compromised.

Thus, the implications of such a study are meaningful for postgraduate training programmes. Trainee therapists need to be made aware of their susceptibility to narcissistic phenomena and their responsibility for dealing with these issues in personal therapy (Finell, 1985; Freudenberger, 1990; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Norcross, Strausser-Kirtland & Missar, 1988). The therapist does not have to be perfectly adjusted at all times nor a paragon of mental health. Rather, an awareness

of his or her own feelings and a deep commitment to the development of the self is important for effective therapeutic functioning (McConaughy, 1987). The burden of responsibility must also be shared by the trainee's supervisor; knowledge of the dynamics of the therapist's family of origin and the phenomenon of therapist narcissism are important if the supervisor is to provide effective supervision during the psychotherapist's period of training (Guy, 1987; Mehlman, 1974).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 THE CONCEPT OF NARCISSISM

After fading from psychoanalytic attention in the 1920's, the concept of narcissism re-emerged in psychological writing in the 1960's and has continued to receive considerable clinical and theoretical interest. Originally introduced into psychological literature by Havelock Ellis in 1898 to refer to "a tendency for the sexual emotions to be lost in self-admiration" (Ellis, cited in Raskin & Terry, 1988 p. 890), the term derives from the Greek myth of Narcissus. Narcissus is a youth of extraordinary beauty who becomes entranced by his own reflection. Incapacitated by the strength of his desire for the unavailable, he sinks into depression and dies. Even in the Underworld, he is unable to refrain from gazing upon himself in the River Styx. Back on earth, his body is transformed into a flower, the narcissus.

Interpretations of the myth vary. Conclusions are drawn that it warns against the dangers of arrogance, self-love, egoism, preoccupation with fantasies of beauty and ideal love, and pride - character traits consonant with the narcissistic personality (APA, 1994). However, this popular view only touches the surface of a vast and intricate human phenomenon. In fact, there appear to be only two points of consensus amongst theorists: firstly, that narcissism is a primary factor in human development and secondly, that it is a very confusing concept (Pulver, 1970). This is made more apparent when one realises that narcissism is not culturally perceived in the same way; Eastern religions and traditional African cultures are uncomfortable with Western notions of *self* and *ego*, preferring instead to conceptualise the individual as being part of the greater whole or community (Gyatso, 1994; Sow, cited in Alt, 1988).

As a psychological concept, narcissism focuses on the quality of individual self-involvement (Jacoby, 1985). The growth away from self-preoccupation towards a mature understanding of oneself in the context of one's environment is a common maturational experience. Whereas some individuals are able to cope with this process in healthy, adaptive ways, others resort to more pathological measures in their struggle to make sense of this experience. Narcissus' fixation on his image in the Underworld is perhaps an allegorical indication that the narcissistic 'problem' is never entirely resolved; even when it has apparently faded from view, it thrives in the unconscious, ready to be awakened at any time by the emotional tone of certain associations (Jacoby, 1985; Moore, 1992). This is of particular significance to the present study since the therapist's unresolved narcissistic anxieties may emerge within the intense client-therapist relationship with concomitant deleterious ramifications (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Saretsky, 1980; Searles, 1979).

2.2 A BRIEF PSYCHOANALYTIC HISTORY OF NARCISSISM

2.2.1 Freud and Narcissism

In his seminal paper, *On Narcissism: An Introduction* (Freud, 1914), Freud (*ibid.*) conceptualised narcissism as a universal developmental process continuing through life, unfolding through sequential stages. He maintained that every human being was endowed with a measure of narcissism, calling this primary narcissism. As long as the 'measure' of narcissism was not excessive, the child would experience healthy self-regard and primary narcissism would ultimately mature and diffuse into object relationships. Unempathic maternal care was responsible for difficulties in normal narcissistic development, giving rise to perversions, homosexuality, hypochondriasis and schizophrenia. Freud (*ibid.*) distinguished between two interpersonal orientations - narcissistic and anaclitic. In the former, a person is concerned with self-love and self-enhancement, whereas in the latter, the chief motivation is the enhancement and love of another. Since the practice of

psychotherapy traditionally involves the empathic interest in and enhancement of another (Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990), one would assume, then, that an individual entering the field of psychotherapy would have experienced appropriate maternal care, leading to the choice of an anaclitic interpersonal orientation. However, current literature indicates that psychotherapists are particularly vulnerable to narcissistic anxieties (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980) and that helping behaviour often masks narcissistic needs for affirmation and self-enhancement (Jones, 1960; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Rouslin, 1966).

After the 1914 paper, Freud (1914) largely neglected the concept of narcissism. This changed with Kernberg (1970, 1975) and Kohut (1966, 1971, 1977) who revived the whole question in the 1960's and 1970's, renewing theoretical and clinical interest in this area and current concepts of narcissism rest largely on their efforts (Goldstein, 1985). A brief overview of their work in this area follows.

2.2.2 The Contributions of Kernberg and Kohut

Following Freud's (1914) lead, both theorists pinpoint an unempathic mother as the cause of narcissistic pathology in the child. Like Freud (*ibid.*), Kohut (1971, 1977) conceptualises narcissism as an age-related developmental characteristic unfolding during successive phases of normal human experience, with the potential for disruptions at any of these phases. Kohut (*ibid.*) refers to the mother's lack of empathic attunement as a failure to be an adequate selfobject for the child, thereby impeding the development of a cohesive sense of self (Wolf, 1989). Because the child is expected to maintain the mother's narcissistic equilibrium, it functions as a reverse selfobject (Lee, 1988). Excessive reverse selfobject experiences lead to the development of an inflated sense of responsibility, or pseudomaturity, at the expense of natural self-development (Shreeve, 1990).

Both theorists incorporate the notion of the grandiose self into their theories of narcissism. Whereas Kernberg (1970, 1975) views it as an essentially pathological construct, Kohut (1971, 1977) claims that it is a normal part of the child's narcissistic development which, due to inadequate mothering, has not been integrated into overall personality functioning. The grandiose self protects the narcissist from feelings of vulnerability and shame and accounts for self-centredness, superficial interpersonal relationships, needs for praise and tribute, envy, entitlement and episodic outbursts of narcissistic rage (Kernberg, 1970, 1975; Kohut, 1971, 1977). Since aggression is not easily incorporated into the narcissist's overall personality structure, it is split off and projected - usually onto 'safe' targets; the outsider is attacked to preserve the illusion of the all-good self (Finell, 1985).

2.3 *DSM* AND THE NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER

As a result of Kernberg (1970, 1975) and Kohut's (1971, 1977) contributions, clinical psychology's interest in narcissism increased to the extent that the American Psychiatric Association included the construct in its diagnostic nosology in 1980 (*DSM-III*, APA, 1980) (Goldstein, 1985; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Of interest, is Millon's (1981) formulation of this personality configuration; he maintains that the narcissist's early years are characterised by parental overvaluation, leading to the development of an unrealistic sense of selfworth. In later life, experiences which do not confirm this aggrandised self-image are rationalised and the narcissist turns to fantasy in order to provide comfort and consolation. The latter observations are significant since they have been empirically validated by contemporary research (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Raskin & Novacek, 1991; Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991*a*). Further information about this research is provided in Sections 2.4.1.5 and 2.4.1.6.

This study has chosen to use the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988) as an assessment tool for the measurement of narcissism. Although the author acknowledges that the *DSM-III* (APA, 1980) has undergone revisions (*DSM-III-R*, APA, 1987; *DSM-IV*, APA, 1994), since the design of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988) is theoretically and empirically based on the *DSM-III* (APA, 1980) criteria for narcissistic personality disorder, the above classification system will be utilised in terms of a theoretical discussion of the inventory. In addition, since revised editions of the *DSM-III* (*ibid.*) have made negligible changes to the diagnostic criteria for narcissistic personality disorder (Appendix 2), this author feels that the three versions are essentially interchangeable.

2.4 EMPIRICAL MEASUREMENTS OF NARCISSISM

Given the relatively concrete picture that has emerged over 70 years of clinical observation of narcissistic phenomena, it is surprising that there is a paucity of empirical explorations of this construct (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Raskin and Terry (*ibid.*) have offered a comprehensive review of psychology's attempts to develop measurements of narcissism. These efforts traditionally have shortcomings which makes the testing of various hypotheses about narcissism difficult; firstly, such instruments tend to ignore the evaluation of behaviours that can substitute for and mask frankly pathological narcissism such as depression, sexual acting-out, chemical abuse, eating disorders or criminality (Gottschalk, 1988; Miller, 1992). Secondly, most tests involve the production of a single score for narcissism, thereby losing sight of the theoretical and clinical complexities inherent in the construct itself (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Since the concept of narcissism covers a wide range of diverse yet interdependent mental processes and behavioural phenomena, an instrument claiming to measure this construct should reflect its intrinsic multidimensionality (*ibid.*).

2.4.1 The Narcissistic Personality Inventory

Of the various measures of narcissism that have been developed, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (**NPI**) (Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988) has received the most empirical attention to date. The **NPI** (Raskin & Hall, 1979) was originally developed to explore individual differences in narcissism expressed in nonclinical populations. This is of particular significance to the present study for three reasons. Firstly, since normality can be viewed as continuous with abnormality, maladaptive narcissism should be apparent to some degree in nonclinical populations (Raskin & Hall, 1981). Secondly, claims that contemporary Western culture is permeated with narcissistic interpersonal styles (Lasch, 1979; Zohar, 1991) suggests that the trait should be evident in members of the general population. Finally, theories of narcissism have emphasised its emergence within the context of normal development (Freud, 1914; Kohut, 1971, 1977) and, thus, the examination of young nonclinical adults is a valuable means of obtaining information about this phenomenon.

By choosing to utilise the *DSM-III* (APA, 1980) as a conceptual template for the development of their inventory, Raskin and Hall (1979) have relied quite significantly on Kernberg (1970, 1975) and Kohut's (1971, 1977) theoretical work in order to inform their research in this area (Goldstein, 1985). The specific *DSM-III* (APA, 1980) criteria for the diagnosis of narcissistic personality disorder on which the **NPI** (Raskin & Hall, 1979) is based are:

- (a) grandiose sense of self-importance and uniqueness
- (b) preoccupation with fantasies of unlimited success, power, beauty, or ideal love
- (c) exhibitionism; requires constant attention and admiration
- (d) entitlement; expectation of special favours without reciprocating
- (e) interpersonal exploitativeness

(*ibid.*)

Recognising that narcissism is a multidimensional construct and, hence, not adequately conceptualised by a single score on an inventory, Raskin and Terry (1988) have refined and revised the original **NPI** (Raskin & Hall, 1979) by both reducing the number of test items and by providing clinicians and researchers with several interdependent sub-scale components of narcissism in their inventory. This has considerably increased this instrument's utility as a research tool and it has been used extensively in research in nonclinical populations. Work is currently in progress to develop a larger item pool that will sample more exhaustively the domain of narcissistic behaviours and sentiments (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Further information about this instrument is provided in Chapter 3.

In view of the fact that the revised **NPI** (Raskin & Terry, 1988) will be used in the measurement of narcissism by this study, those aspects measured by the sub-scales will briefly be discussed in order to provide a context against which one can understand the dimensional aspects of the construct.

2.4.1.1 Authority

Outward manifestations of dominance and self-confidence are tenuous purely because they are founded on the precarious base of the grandiose self which, in turn, compensates for feelings of vulnerability and shame (Kernberg, 1970, 1975; Kohut, 1971, 1977). Since intimate relationships present a risk of vulnerability, interpersonal associations depend largely on the capacity for power and control (Miller, 1992). In addition, interpersonal dominance and assertiveness are used to manage hostility effectively and regulate self-esteem (Raskin & Novacek, 1989).

2.4.1.2 Exhibitionism

A highly labile self-esteem means that the narcissist is exceedingly sensitive to slights, rejections and perceived failure (Kohut & Wolf, 1978). The slights, no matter

how subtle, produce uncomfortable feelings and, as a result of poor impulse control (Kernberg, 1975), dangerous acting-out and sensation-seeking behaviour may ensue (Goldstein, 1985; Svrakic, 1985). With the undoing of the slight or with praise, the disruptive behaviour may cease as discomfiting feelings dissipate (Svrakic & Divac-Jovanovic, 1994).

2.4.1.3 Exploitativeness

Because the narcissist needs inordinate amounts of praise and tribute in order to maintain the grandiose self, others are perceived as potential sources of gratification and not as people with needs and feelings of their own (Goldstein, 1985; Siomopoulos, 1988). As a result, relationships are often exploitative and parasitic (Kernberg, 1975). The lack of emotional depth and a failure to understand the emotions of others often means a propensity to act without consideration or empathy for others' feelings (Watson, Gresham, Trotter & Biderman, 1984). A defiant social conscience may result in overtly antisocial acts like habitual lying, exploitative behaviour and stealing to get what is needed from people (Siomopoulos, 1988).

2.4.1.4 Self-sufficiency

Modell (1975) and Raskin and Terry (1988) argue that self-sufficiency represents a narcissistic defense against dependency on external sources of affirmation. Since dependency invokes feelings of vulnerability, it must be defended against. This is achieved by the creation of a cocoon-like state of self-sufficiency which maintains the illusion of emotional independence. However, Garfield and Havens (1991) claim that this results in a vulnerability to paranoid phenomena; because the vulnerable self has to be protected at all costs, innocuous stimuli may be misinterpreted.

Because the potential for self-affirmation inherent in close relationships is compromised by the narcissist's attempts at emotional self-sufficiency, sources of self-affirmation that come without the risk of interpersonal vulnerability are pursued. These activities are primarily self-contained and intrapersonal and include: chemical substance abuse; food (in the form of eating disorders); extreme exercise programmes; hypochondriasis; obsessions with possessions or status; excessive control or influence over others, resources or information; inordinate devotion to self-instruction; adherence to rigid idealised values which are inconsistent with those of contemporary society; obsessions in the quest for the perfect mate or guru (Gottschalk, 1988; Miller, 1992).

2.4.1.5 Entitlement

Since the grandiose self-construct is maintained by notions of entitlement and privilege (Raskin & Novacek, 1991), behaviour may be tailored to ensure that these needs are met. Should any obstacles be encountered, aggression and acting-out behaviour may ensue (Russell, 1985). However, because society tends not to endorse these views of entitlement and may prove intractable to demonstrations of will, the narcissist may have to resort to fantasy in order to maintain illusions of specialness (Raskin & Novacek, 1991; Svrakic & Divac-Jovanovic, 1994). Fantasy serves to protect the narcissist from uncomfortable feelings of inadequacy and shame, thereby effectively regulating self-esteem (Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991*a*; Raskin *et al.*, 1991*b*).

2.4.1.6 Superiority

Notions of superiority appear to be consonant with Pulver's (1970) concept of 'bad' narcissism, involving defensive pride in which self-centredness and high regard are used to defend the self against unpleasant evaluation. Kernis and Sun (1994) argue that, following negative feedback, narcissism is related to perceptions of the

evaluator as being less competent and likable - in effect, externalising blame. In addition, contempt or disdain for the evaluator indicates the hostility associated with narcissism, since animosity is often aroused by perceived threats to self-esteem (Kernberg, 1975). The need to accentuate positive interpersonal feedback derives from the constant need to inflate the ego beyond normal levels of ordinariness and to regulate self-esteem (Horner, 1994; Raskin *et al.*, 1991*b*) since perceptions of entitlement result in the narcissist setting him or herself apart from the general populace.

2.4.1.7 Vanity

Because self-concept is concerned with both psychological and physical judgements of self (Berger, 1980), one would assume, then, that the grandiose self-image would extend to the narcissist's perceptions of his or her physical attractiveness. Thus, in order to preserve grandiose self-representations and illusions of perfection (Kohut, 1971), perceptions of physical endowment are not unlikely and measures may be taken to maintain physical appearances in the form of extreme exercise programmes or obsessions with diet (Gottschalk, 1988; Miller, 1992). Should self-perceptions be verified by societal norms, then dissonance is unlikely and all that has to be feared is ageing. However, because the grandiose self is dependent on constant affirmation, situations will inevitably be manipulated in order to ensure that the narcissist receives the gratification that he or she craves. Should physical attributes be inconsistent with societal expectations of attractiveness, dissonance is unavoidable. This may be managed either by reactions of envy (Kernberg, 1975), which may be defended against either by devaluation and narcissistic withdrawal, or by the glorification of obvious shortcomings and flaws (Siomopoulos, 1988).

2.5 FAMILY OF ORIGIN, NARCISSISM AND CHOICE OF CAREER IN PSYCHOTHERAPY

The effect of the therapist's personality on the practice of psychotherapy has been of interest from the inception of psychoanalysis. Freud (cited in Fussell & Bonney, 1990) stressed the importance of personal psychoanalysis for trainee analysts in order to militate against the negative effects of childhood experiences. Although initially dismissed as unnecessary (Haley, cited in McDaniel & Landau-Stanton, 1991), family-systems theorists have also focused on the therapist's family conditions as an important part of effective training (Framo, 1976; Guerin & Hubbard, 1987; McDaniel & Landau-Stanton, 1991).

Literature surrounding the issue of therapist characteristics has suggested that psychotherapists are likely to be narcissistic individuals (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980). Narcissism in the psychotherapist is likely to lead to therapeutic 'blind spots', resulting in treatment errors (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990). If one takes the aetiological stance on narcissism postulated by Freud (1914), Kohut (1971, 1977) and Kernberg (1970, 1975), then the implication seems to be that a particular family constellation leads to disruptions in normal narcissistic development and the subsequent potential choice of psychotherapy as a career. Alice Miller (1987) claims just this, putting forward the hypothesis that less than optimal experiences in the family of origin are thought to be particularly influential in the selection of psychotherapy as a career.

These observations do not mean to imply that all those training to be psychotherapists suffer from an identifiable personality disturbance; rather, it appears that narcissistic traits and trends come to bear on the choice of a career in psychotherapy. It is therefore worthwhile examining the literature on the role of

the family of origin in the choice of career since it serves to provide a framework for the present study.

2.5.1 Family of Origin as a Variable of Career Choice

The choice of a career is a consequence of a number of variables. Fussell and Bonney (1990) have reviewed the diverse studies conducted in this area, siting support for genetic influences, parental occupation, birth order and chance in the choice of career. Entry into a profession requires extensive planning as well as a considerable investment of both time and energy. As a result, intrinsic individual values in the form of personal need satisfaction play a primary role in the final selection of professional specialisation (*ibid.*). Roe (1956, 1957) pioneered research on the relationship between personality variables and occupational choice and although her theories have subsequently been questioned, some of her hypotheses are relevant to the current study and merit an examination.

2.5.2 Roe's Theory of Vocational Choice

Utilising Maslow's (cited in Roe, 1956) theory of personality as a theoretical base, Roe's (1956, 1957) speculative theory evolved out of the concept of the close relationship between early life experiences and the development of occupational interests. She posits that the development of special abilities fundamental to career choice is determined by "the directions in which psychic energy comes to be expended involuntarily" (Roe, 1957 p. 212). According to this theorist, parents create a certain psychological climate by the manner in which they satisfy or frustrate the child's early needs. Needs for which satisfaction is rarely achieved will, if higher order (typically interpersonal needs), become expunged. Conversely, those needs which are routinely satisfied as they present themselves, do not become unconscious motivators. In addition to these two hypotheses, Roe (1956, 1957) claims that needs, the satisfaction of which is delayed but eventually accomplished,

will become unconscious motivators. Roe's (*ibid.*) theory would seem to suggest that a severely pathological early environment will result in a defensive avoidance of higher order needs whereas a healthy childhood produces minimal unconscious motivators for interpersonal need gratification. Depending on the parents' capacity to satisfy the child's early needs, attention is fundamentally directed towards persons or non-persons. This, in turn, results in predictable patterns of specific interests in terms of the career field of application. Roe (1956, 1957) suggests that individuals in service, business, general cultural and entertainment occupations have a major orientation towards persons. This alignment originates out of a response to parents who are emotionally warm and accepting. Conversely, individuals in technological, scientific or outdoor pursuits have a major orientation towards nonpersons, which originates as a response to parents who tend to be emotionally cold, neglecting or rejecting. Between these two environments exists an ambiguous atmosphere - one containing both acceptance and rejection. Under these conditions, the child's needs are partly but not optimally satisfied and therefore become unconscious motivators.

A number of studies attempting to establish the validity of Roe's (*ibid.*) theory have generally failed to confirm her speculations. Predicted relationships did not tend to hold (Hagen, 1959) nor did her hypotheses about the influence of childhood environment on occupational choice (Grigg, 1959; Utton, 1960). Reviewing this work, Roe and Siegelman (cited in Wortley, 1990) observe that the general hypothesis that early relationships affect occupational choice was too strictly drawn. Instead, the authors make the more tentative suggestion that early parent-child interactions and later attitudes towards persons may, along with other variables, play a part in the choice of occupations.

In his evaluation of Roe's (1956, 1957) contributions, Wortley (1990) makes the observation that the inconclusiveness of results should be seen in the light of the

complexity of the factors involved, that is, early experiences against much later entry into the occupational world, birth order, differential parental treatment, and problems inherent in the use of retrospective methods to access early memories. Wortley (*ibid.*) concludes that one is left with the question of whether an orientation towards persons is an interest or a personality dimension, the latter hypothesis deriving from Jung's (cited in Wortley, *ibid.*) work on personality, namely the introversion and extraversion character types.

Of interest to this study is Roe's (1956, 1957) third hypothesis of family atmospheres - the ambiguous climate wherein the child experiences both acceptance and rejection from the parents. Fussell and Bonney (1990) suggest that it is this kind of environment that may foster a choice of career in psychotherapy and their contributions in this area will be discussed later. The literature suggests that a particular family constellation predisposes a career choice in psychotherapy as opposed to a career choice in an unrelated field. Although sometimes speculative in nature and of problematic methodological soundness (Clark, 1991; Guy, 1987), it is important to examine this literature since it is valuable in informing the present study.

2.5.2.1 Family of Origin as a Determinant of Career Choice in Psychotherapy

Clinical theorists have indicated that people drawn to the field of psychotherapy have experienced early emotional pain (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Guy, 1987; Guy & Liaboe, 1986; Miller, 1987). The experience and working through of personal pain allows for insight and empathy into the distress of others and victory over this suffering instills hope for the fortitude of another (Freud, cited in Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Guy, 1987). What is the source of this distress? Assuming that entry into the profession of psychotherapy requires long-term preparation and planning (Fussell & Bonney, 1990), it is likely that emotional

difficulties influencing this choice are of a long-standing nature, possibly having roots in the family of origin. Research in this area appears to corroborate this contention and will be discussed below.

2.5.2.2 Dynamics of the Family of Origin

The psychotherapist's family of origin is typically characterised by poor communication and a high incidence of either physiological or psychological illness (Guy, 1987). Mothers tend to occupy a pivotal, controlling position in the family and have been described as being typically emotionally insecure and narcissistic (Ford, cited in Guy, 1987; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980). Fathers are inclined to be perceived as passive men who contribute little to the emotional life of the family (Guy, 1987).

Separation and divorce in these families, however, is surprisingly rare, as is psychological or psychiatric intervention (Racusin *et al.*, cited in Guy, 1987). This implies an aversion to change or, *morphostasis* (Olson, Sprenkle & Russell, 1979). Thus, family adaptability, or "the ability of a...family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stresses" (*ibid.* p. 5) is relatively low. When developing the Circumplex Model (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen & Wilson, 1985) as an assessment tool of family functioning, the authors utilised the concepts of family power, negotiation style, role relationships and relationship rules in order to measure dimensions of this concept.

Constantine and Israel's (1985) notion of the synchronous family type which emphasises stability, group loyalty and security appears to describe the family structure from which the literature suggests that prospective psychotherapists originate. Such families do not utilise open modes of communication; rather, they

rely on the implicit understanding of prescribed family roles. Thus, family cohesion or "the emotional bonding indicating consensus between family members with regards to family policies" (Olson *et al.*, 1979 p. 12) is high. Within the Circumplex Model (Olson *et al.*, 1985), specific concepts used to diagnose and measure the cohesion dimension are: emotional bonding, boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making, interests and recreation (*ibid.*).

Olson *et al.*, (1979, 1985) claim that adaptability and cohesion are curvilinear with relation to effective family functioning; dysfunction attends the extremes of too much chaos/ rigidity or too much disengagement/enmeshment. Thus, using this model of family functioning, families occupying the central zone, that is, flexibly separated, flexibly connected, structurally separated and structurally connected, tend to be healthier than families occupying the corners of the matrix. However, these assumptions have subsequently been challenged by further research in this area, with evidence to show that the two dimensions are in fact related in a linear rather than a curvilinear fashion (Anderson & Gavazzi, 1990; Green, Harris, Forte & Robinson, 1991). Taking this evidence into account, Olson (1991) recommends that future studies using **FACES III** of the Circumplex Model should assume that it is a linear measurement, with high scores representing balanced types and low scores representing extreme types. Work is currently in progress to develop **FACES IV** which, the authors hope, will reflect a curvilinear pattern (Olson, Green & Thomas, cited in Olson, *ibid.*).

Taking Olson's (*ibid.*) cautionary advice into account, this study has chosen to utilise **FACES III** (Olson *et al.*, 1985) as a measure of family functioning. Because the above literature seems to suggest that prospective psychotherapists tend to describe their families of origin as being extreme, that is, displaying high levels of cohesion and low levels of adaptability, **FACES III** (*ibid.*) appears to be an

appropriate instrument for the assessment of these components of family functioning. More information about the instrument can be obtained in Chapter 3.

Children from synchronous families tend to present as pseudomature, covering their vulnerability and low self-esteem with a veneer of competence (Constantine & Israel, 1985). Sometimes, however, there is a family member, normally a child, who does not 'fit in' with the family ideology and it is usually in such cases that the family presents for therapy. Since the future psychotherapist sometimes adopts the role of negotiator and message carrier between family members (Guy, 1987), one would assume, then, that it is not this individual who does not fit in with the synchronous family; it is his or her implicit role to make sure that other family members do. Because parental demands for stability and cohesion are never explicitly stated (Constantine & Israel, 1985), the child must have well-developed intuitive skills to receive and relay covert messages. The skills of intuition, empathy, and sensitivity required for such a role may be those which will motivate the child to seek a career in psychotherapy since they foster psychological-mindedness (Farber, 1985; Miller, 1987). Why one child adopts this role, leaving its siblings free to pursue other alternatives within the family system, is largely due to the fact that, despite sharing the same family environment, siblings tend to experience and respond differently to both the quality of their parents' relationship and the personality and mental health of their parents; environmental influences that affect development are largely of the nonshared variety (Dunn & Plomin, 1991).

Fussell and Bonney's (1990) study confirms much of the speculation surrounding the psychotherapist's family of origin. They found that psychotherapists tended to perceive their family of origin as less healthy than the other professionals in their sample, namely, physicists. Psychotherapists appeared to have experienced more parent-child inversions and greater communicational ambiguity within the family than the comparison group. In addition, psychotherapists perceived themselves as

assuming a caretaking role in the family more often than their physicist counterparts.

Guy (1987), Herron and Rouslin Welt (1990) and Miller (1987) assume that the caretaking role is assumed out of the child's unconscious hope that by functioning as a reverse selfobject (Lee, 1988), love, care and gratitude will be returned. The impact of this role is difficult to determine. Some theorists have claimed that the child's normal narcissistic development is hindered since it never receives the unconditional selfobject care and affirmation that it needs to develop both a healthy self-esteem and psychological independence from the mother (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987; Searles, 1979). Isolation from other siblings and pressure to be the 'strong one' may prevent the child from seeking out the intimacy and nurturance that it needs. However, the child is in a double-bind situation since relinquishing a designated function in the family is inevitably accompanied by fears of alienation and subsequent existential isolation or, a "loneliness of being" (Large, 1989 p. 27). Thus, although the role of family counsellor may be reluctantly adopted, it is well-carried out and heralds the beginning of what may signal the future therapist's life of service (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990). Nonetheless, needs for nurturance and caretaking do not 'go away' and one is reminded here of the myth of Narcissus and its potentially allegorical relevance to psychotherapists discussed in the opening paragraphs of this chapter.

2.6 NARCISSISM AND CAREER SELF-EFFICACY

Using Roe's (1956, 1957) speculative theory as a basis for their study, Fussell and Bonney (1990) claim that unconscious demands for higher order need gratification may predispose a career choice in those fields which emphasise interpersonal interaction and communication. This claim seems to tie in with theoretical assumptions that, while hindering the child's normal narcissistic development, the

future psychotherapist's family of origin also appears to promote the development of interpersonal faculties (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987). One would assume that such an individual would expect to function effectively in a career which highlights the need for these kinds of skills. This relates to career self-efficacy, or, task- and situation-specific expectations concerning an individual's performance within a certain occupational field (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991). John Holland (1966, 1985) has identified a number of occupational orientations in which people are required to engage in different activities and, since Matsui and Tsukamoto (1991) propose using Holland's (1966, 1985) occupational typology as a tool for assessing career self-efficacy, an overview of his theory is warranted.

2.6.1 Holland's Theory of Occupational Choice

Holland (*ibid.*) claims that occupational choice is a product of the interaction of an individual's particular hereditary with a variety of cultural and personal forces including peers, parents, social class, culture and physical environment. Out of this experience, the person develops a hierarchy of habitual or preferred methods for dealing with environmental tasks. In a sense, in making an occupational choice, the individual searches for situations which satisfy his or her hierarchy of adjustive orientations. Holland (*ibid.*) maintains that members of a particular occupation have similar personalities and similar histories of personality development. As a result, people within the same occupation will respond to situations and problems in similar ways and will create characteristic interest groups.

Holland (*ibid.*) identifies six orientations in which people are required to engage in different types of activities. These orientations are: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising and Conventional. Each orientation represents a somewhat distinctive life style which is characterised by preferred methods of dealing with daily problems and includes such variables as values and interests, preferences for

playing various roles and avoiding others, and interpersonal skills. A brief discussion of these orientations follows.

2.6.1.1 The Realistic Orientation

People within this orientation enjoy activities requiring physical strength, aggressive action, motor coordination and skill. They prefer dealing with concrete, well-defined problems as opposed to abstract, intangible tasks, electing to 'act out' rather than 'think through' problems. They tend to avoid situations which require verbal and interpersonal skills and are often threatened by close relationships with others. Mechanics, engineers and machine operators fall into this orientation.

2.6.1.2 The Investigative Occupational Orientation

People of this orientation generally prefer to 'think through' rather than 'act out' problems. They have strong needs to organise and understand the world, enjoying ambiguous work tasks and abstract activities. Effective solutions require imagination, intelligence and sensitivity to physical and intellectual problems. Although outcomes may be clear, tasks are larger and only gradually completed. Verbal ability is often needed. Typical occupations to which such people may be drawn include the practice of medicine, and social science.

2.6.1.3 The Artistic Occupational Orientation

In general, persons of this orientation prefer indirect relationships with people. The orientation is characterised by tasks and problems requiring the interpretation or creation of artistic forms through taste, feeling, self-expression and imagination. The more complex tasks require great tolerance for ambiguity and imagination whilst simpler tasks require a sense of excellence or fitness. The ability to draw upon all of one's knowledge, intuition and emotional life in problem-solving appears to be a

prerequisite for occupational efficacy. Examples of occupations which fit this orientation are music, art and writing.

2.6.1.4 The Social Occupational Orientation

People of this orientation are required to deal with problems that require the ability to interpret and modify human behaviour and tend to demonstrate an interest in caring for and communicating with others. Generally, the work situation fosters self-esteem and status. These individuals possess verbal and interpersonal skills and their chief values tend to be humanistic and religious. They prefer to deal with problems through feeling and interpersonal manipulation of others. Teachers, social workers and clinical psychologists tend to fall into this orientation.

2.6.1.5 The Enterprising Occupational Orientation

This orientation places emphasis on the capacity to use verbal skills in situations which provide opportunities for dominating, persuading or leading others. Needs for social interaction are largely concerned with power, status and leadership. Politicians, salespeople and lawyers fall into this category.

2.6.1.6 The Conventional Occupational Orientation

Persons falling into this category prefer structured verbal and numerical activities and achieve their goals through conformity. Thus, they avoid the conflict and anxiety aroused by ambiguous situations or problems involving interpersonal relationships and physical skills. Illustrative occupations include secretarial work, banking and bookkeeping.

Holland (*ibid.*) proposes utilising a coded inventory in order to ascertain an individual's occupational orientation¹. For each person, the orientations may be ranked according to their relative strength and the life style heading the rank order determines the major direction of occupational choice. Respondents are then designated a three-letter code corresponding to the rank order of their occupational orientations.

Holland (*ibid.*) then goes on to classify more than 450 occupations into the six occupational orientations describing the occupations with three-letter codes indicating their degree of resemblance to three occupational groups. Based on a six year follow-up survey of South African university graduates currently employed in the market place, Wortley (1990) provides a classification of South African occupations coded in terms of the Holland (1966, 1985) system (Appendix 8). This makes it a particularly useful reference system for this research since both this study and Wortley's (*ibid.*) research have been conducted within the South African context. For example, it classifies the occupation of "clinical psychologist" into Social occupations and describes it with the code **SIE**, thereby meaning that the occupation resembles Social occupations most of all, that it resembles Investigative occupations somewhat less and Enterprising occupations even less. Thus, the three-letter codes can be assumed to reflect the relative importance of the occupational orientations to the respective occupations (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991).

Holland's (1966, 1985) theory has been used extensively in the field of career counselling and current career assessment tools like the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (cited in Wortley, 1990) have reformulated and restandardised their inventories in order to incorporate Holland's (1966, 1985) theory (Wortley, 1990).

1. Holland, J.L. (1970). *Manual for the Self-Directed Search*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist's Press.

2.6.1.7 Career Self-Efficacy

In order to assess career self-efficacy, the basic activity domains underlying various occupations, skills and competencies must be identified before respondents can be expected to predict whether they perceive themselves to be capable of functioning effectively in any one occupation (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991). Matsui and Tsukamoto (*ibid.*) propose using Holland's (1966, 1985) occupational typology as an instrument for assessing career self-efficacy. In order to establish a measure for the above construct, these authors consulted the literature and classified sixty types of work activities into six domains on the basis of Holland's (*ibid.*) definitions of model environments. Subjects were provided with a list of these activities and asked to indicate those activities which they felt they would be able to successfully accomplish were they to receive some training for that particular work activity (Appendix 6). The reliability alpha coefficients of the six domains, each including different skills and competencies, ranged from $r=0.88$ to $r=0.95$ ($M = 0.93$).

Subjects were then provided with lists of thirty occupational titles coded according to Holland's (*ibid.*) typology and asked to predict success in these occupations (Appendix 7). Self-efficacy for the domains corresponded to 28 of the three-letter codes associated with the occupation, indicating a 93.3% fit. Matsui and Tsukamoto (1991) conclude, therefore, that self-efficacy measures in relation to occupational titles are highly reflective of self-efficacy for discrete work activities included in the respective occupations. Thus, their study supports the construct validity of self-efficacy measures in relation to occupational titles. Betz and Hackett (cited in Matsui & Tsukamoto, *ibid.*) found similar patterns using American college students, indicating that Matsui and Tsukamoto's (*ibid.*) findings are not unduly biased by the Japanese cultural context wherein the study was conducted.

On the strength of this research, the current study has chosen to utilise Matsui and Tsukamoto's (*ibid.*) measure of career self-efficacy in an attempt to ascertain whether trainee psychotherapists will tend to predict success in those occupations designated by Holland (1966, 1985) as typically socially orientated. This is of particular interest in the light of the literature's suggestions that psychotherapists tend to have experienced a family of origin constellation which appears to have fostered interpersonal skills at the expense of normal narcissistic development. Further information about this instrument has been provided in Chapter 3.

2.7 THERAPIST NARCISSISM

Psychotherapists have traditionally been reluctant to discuss their own narcissism within the therapist-client relationship (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990). As already discussed in the introduction to this study, the social meaning of narcissism emphasises self-interest and this seems to be antithetical to the role of the psychotherapist as a selfless helper. However, be this as it may, "exploration and open discussion of therapist narcissism are essential to the effectiveness of the psychotherapies" (*ibid.* p. vii), allowing the therapist to participate in the process of psychotherapy with an unencumbered use of self. Thus, although not the focus of this study, this section outlines the potential ramifications of therapist narcissism on the therapeutic relationship since it provides the rationale for conducting research of this nature.

2.7.1 Manifestations of Therapist Narcissism

Although largely theoretical in nature, the literature concerning therapist narcissism makes some interesting speculations. Contributors in this area claim that unresolved narcissistic issues stemming from problematic parenting strategies may result in compromised therapeutic functioning (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980; Searles, 1979). The common thread running through these

arguments appears to be based on Kohut's (1971, 1977) premise that failure of the mother to be an adequate selfobject for her child results in the child functioning as a reverse selfobject in order to receive at least some of the nurturance and caretaking that it needs. This means that the child learns to take care of others so that in turn it will be acknowledged and appreciated. As a result, a career in psychotherapy becomes a logical choice for such an individual since the career itself becomes fundamentally a repetition compulsion of experiences within the family of origin. In the process, however, the complexities inherent in the therapeutic process may become eclipsed by the therapist's need to master a previous problematic relationship.

Since the client often acts as a substitute selfobject for the therapist, narcissistic wishes for approval, echo, and for being taken seriously are satisfied (Marmor, 1953; Miller, 1987). However, if this kind of idealisation is encouraged, the exploration of all feelings, including so-called negative ones, is hindered, thereby protecting the therapist from any potentially anxiety-provoking therapeutic encounters (Finell, 1985; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987; Saretsky, 1980). Transference distortions also make the client particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation with typically damaging sequelae (Eckler-Hart, 1987; Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990).

Because the child was denied phase appropriate narcissistic control over the selfobject (Kohut, 1971, 1977), needs for control may emerge within the therapeutic relationship. Authoritarian, directive therapeutic techniques (Marmor, 1953), power struggles with clients (Cohen & Sherwood, 1991; Marmor, 1953; Searles, 1979), sarcastic or intimidating interpretations (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990), and professional arrogance (Freudenberger, 1990; Marmor, 1953; Persi, 1992) are all illustrative of underlying needs for control within the therapist-client relationship. Because contemporary society tends to perceive the therapist as occupying a

position of status in the community (Guy, 1987; Marmor, 1953), self-perceptions of superiority and authority may be externally validated. Hostility associated with the above traits is likely to be discharged onto 'safe' targets (Finell, 1985), that is, blaming clients for therapeutic failures or engaging in professional competition and institutional politics (Marmor, 1953; Persi, 1992).

Although psychoanalytic psychotherapy traditionally endorsed the notion of objective detachment, contemporary theorists have tended to view this stance as problematic (Searles, 1979; Singer, 1979; Strupp & Binder, 1984). Undoubtedly, enmeshment obscures therapeutic clarity and may foster a potentially harmful alliance, characterised by the therapist's inappropriate nurturance and the client's acceptance of the sick role (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Rouslin, 1966; Saretsky, 1980). However, its opposite - detachment - is no less problematic since empathic attunement with the client is compromised. Inappropriate distancing almost certainly serves the therapist's own emotional needs; by remaining aloof, he or she exists in a cocoon-like state of emotional self-sufficiency (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Marmor, 1953). However, as Modell (1975) and Raskin and Terry (1988) point out, this is an illusion for, within this protective capsule exists a vulnerable, dependent individual whose need to maintain an air of mystery may be a defense against the anxiety of being unable to deal with an emotional relationship with a client (Marmor, 1953).

Consistently unanalysed narcissistic issues may lead to professional burnout (Freudenberger, 1990; Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990). Burnout manifests in physical symptoms, mental and behavioural signs, inability to make decisions, depression, arrogance, cynicism, grandiosity, sexual acting-out and chemical abuse (Farber & Heifetz, 1982; Freudenberger, 1990; Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Kriel, 1982). Of interest is the fact that these symptoms of burnout are consistent with Gottschalk's (1988) and Miller's (1992) descriptions of the varying

pathological means by which underlying narcissism is often masked. Guy (1987) describes those therapists most susceptible to burnout as being controlling, driven, obsessional people with longings for intimacy and closeness. His description seems to link up with Herron and Rouslin Welt's (1990) depiction of the narcissistic obsessional personality type which they claim is often encountered in the field of psychotherapy. In addition, sexual acting-out and chemical abuse sounds very much like the exhibitionistic behaviour of the narcissist (Kernberg, 1975; Raskin & Terry, 1988).

2.8 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The fact that narcissism appears to play an important role in normal psychological development appears to be a consistent claim of the literature in this area. Theorists also tend to be fairly consonant in their formulations of how unempathic maternal care can interfere with this process, giving rise to personality disturbances of a particular nature wherein the self is projected as an extroverted, assertive, egotistical construct. In reality, however, outward manifestations of self-confidence serve as a foil for underlying feelings of shame, hostility, and vulnerability.

Although largely theoretical in nature, the literature has generally indicated that psychotherapists are products of a particular family constellation which emphasises stability, security and group loyalty, placing the future psychotherapist in the role of maintaining the family status quo. This role requires tact, sensitivity and intuition, qualities which, coupled with needs for affirmation and nurturance, act as motivators in the choice of a career in a profession which places strong emphasis on the exploration and fulfilment of interpersonal needs. Other theorists maintain more specifically that disturbances in the continuum of narcissistic development, whilst not leading to personality pathology, may come to bear in the selection of psychotherapy as a career option; the future psychotherapist's choice of career

seems to be motivated by an unconscious desire to undo perceived unempathic parenting. Unfortunately, the therapeutic relationship may suffer as a result.

What remains unclear, however, is the empirical link between these claims, that is, the relationship between the psychotherapist's family of origin, predispositions towards a career choice in psychotherapy and levels of narcissism in this population. Thus, this study seeks to ascertain whether psychotherapists in training display significantly elevated levels of narcissism as compared with other postgraduate and final year trainees and whether these results can be connected to childhood experiences of a family of origin which emphasised cohesion and stasis at the expense of individual individuation. In addition, this research attempts to discover whether those individuals encouraged from an early age to become proficient in interpersonal skills will tend to predict career self-efficacy in careers which emphasise the need for these qualities, thereby unconsciously gratifying unmet interpersonal needs.

A study of this nature has value since it has implications for postgraduate training programmes in psychotherapy; such programmes should at least encourage an awareness of the possible connection between childhood experiences and the selection of psychotherapy as a career in an effort to provide trainees with insight into the role of unconscious motivators in career choice. Narcissistic traits such as those already described, may have deleterious effects on the process of psychotherapy, and trainee psychotherapists and supervisors need to be aware of and monitor their potential emergence during the course of training in psychotherapy. Such an awareness enhances understanding, insight and, ultimately, the development of effective psychotherapeutic skills.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is threefold. Firstly, it aims to compare levels of narcissism in trainee psychotherapists with postgraduate and final year students pursuing careers in two other unrelated fields. In order to test the literature's assertions that psychotherapists originate from families which have fostered the development of narcissistic traits, the psychotherapist's family of origin will be compared with the families of origin of students enrolled in other specialist training courses. Since the literature claims that narcissism and family of origin are motivating factors in the choice of a career in psychotherapy, this study sets out to discover whether psychotherapists tend to predict career self-efficacy in socially oriented occupational fields more frequently than other trainee professionals, thereby demonstrating unconscious desires for interpersonal need gratification.

3.2 THE SAMPLE

The exploration of narcissism, family of origin and career self-efficacy in trainee psychotherapists alone would reveal little; the significance of a study lies in how this population compares with other trainee professionals along these dimensions. This study has chosen to use Roe (1956, 1957) and Holland's (1966, 1985) theories of occupational choice as guides for choosing appropriate comparison groups. While most careers require interacting with both persons and things, they vary in their emphasis. Those careers most orientated toward one or the other way may be assumed to be most different and therefore to attract dissimilar individuals (Roe, 1956, 1957). Similarly, while two occupations may be said to be person-oriented, the interpersonal skills necessary to function effectively in each of these

occupations may diverge (Holland, 1966, 1985). Informed by the above literature, this study has chosen two comparison groups and a brief description and rationale for the choice of each subject group population follows.

3.2.1 Group 1

Group 1 subjects were drawn from fourth year male and female electronic engineering students (N=40) on the campus of the University of Natal, Durban. The rationale for choosing this population to participate in the study derives from Holland's (*ibid.*) claim that engineers fall largely into the Realistic occupational orientation of his occupational typology (code **RIE**), an orientation in which interpersonal skills are not integral to occupational efficacy (*ibid.*). One would assume, then, that this population's interactions with people differ considerably from those individuals motivated to choose a career in psychotherapy which emphasises an interest in human behaviour and the ability to communicate this interest in a caring, empathic manner (*ibid.*). In addition, Roe (1956, 1957) claims that engineers are largely directed towards things rather than people and hence the goals, and interests of this nonperson orientation appear to differ considerably from those of psychotherapists.

3.2.2 Group 2

The second group of subjects comprised male and female law students (LLB) in their fifth year of study on the campus of the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg (N=25). The rationale underlying this choice was based on the literature's inferences that, not unlike psychotherapists, lawyers may be prone to narcissistic behavioural traits due to the inherently authoritative nature of their professional relationships with clients (Marmor, 1953). However, although the professions of psychology and law both involve a considerable measure of interpersonal interaction, the quality of this interaction as well as professional aims differ (Holland, 1966, 1985). Falling into

the Enterprising occupational orientation (code, **ESA**), lawyers tend to use their verbal skills to lead, persuade and dominate others whereas psychologists (code **SIE**) seek to communicate empathy, care and understanding to their clients (*ibid.*). It has been argued that, albeit unconsciously, psychotherapists may indeed utilise their position of authority to manipulate and dominate others (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Marmor, 1953; Masson, 1990; Searles, 1979). However, Holland's (1966, 1985) coding system suggests that such individuals may be inclined to make less use of this mode of interpersonal interaction than lawyers and, on this basis, the above population was chosen as a comparison group for this research.

3.2.3 Group 3

The third subject group comprised fifth year male and female psychology Master's students (M1) on the campuses of the University of Natal, Durban and Pietermaritzburg (N=20). Since the available literature and research on both therapist narcissism and family of origin focuses on those psychologists practising as psychotherapists, only those students registered with the South African Medical and Dental Council as students in one of the professional categories of Clinical, Counselling or Educational psychology were considered as potential subjects. In addition, subjects were required to indicate whether they intended practising psychotherapy once registered with the South African Medical and Dental Council as psychologists. Only those subjects responding in the affirmative were considered for the study (N=20). Hereafter, this subject group will be referred to as psychology students.

3.3 PROCEDURE

Since this study's proposed subject sample consisted of postgraduate and final year students at university, permission for carrying out research of this nature had to be obtained in order to secure access to subjects. Contact was made with the relevant heads of department of psychology, law and electronic engineering on the Durban and Pietermaritzburg campuses of the University of Natal. A request was made for time during a regular class session in which the researcher could make a brief presentation to subjects before administering test materials. Only those subjects reporting for classes on the day of the presentation were considered as participants in the study. Hence, this study utilised the opportunity sampling technique of securing research subjects.

Due to the fact that subjects were enrolled in different faculties at university, three presentations and three testing situations were set up. All three presentations were given in a controlled setting with the relevant lecturer present. The presentation included an assurance of confidentiality and a brief outline of the nature of the research; subjects were informed that the purpose of the study was to explore variables informing career choice and that their results would be compared with students from other disciplines. No mention of narcissism was made.

The nature of the tests was then discussed and subjects were given the necessary information for the completion of test forms. Subjects were instructed not to discuss test items with each other. The researcher was available for questions and comments during and after the session. After completing the questionnaire (Appendix 9), subjects returned their protocols to the researcher. An overall response rate of 100% was recorded. Any response on a test instrument found to have a missing value was discarded. One such subject from the engineering group's response on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991) was

discarded. Finally, subjects were informed that if they wished to be advised of the outcome of the study, they could approach the researcher for feedback on an informal basis.

3.3.1 Psychometric Instruments

A range of psychometric instruments was used to numerically account for the different research variables. What follows is a discussion of these instruments, with reference to the validity and reliability of each. They include: a short biographical questionnaire, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1988), **FACES III** of the Circumplex Model (Olson *et al.*, 1985), the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991). A brief overview of each of these instruments follows.

3.3.1.1 Biographical Questionnaire

A short biographical questionnaire was included in the test administration to provide the researcher with necessary personal data, that is, age, gender and racial identity (Appendix 3). No names were requested in order to allow subjects to respond in an open and uninhibited way, thereby controlling for the element of perceived social desirability.

3.3.1.2 The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI)

Normed on 1018 American college students, the **NPI** (Appendix 4) is a 40-item forced-choice inventory which measures narcissistic personality traits at levels below that which would be clinically designated pathological, making it particularly useful in comparing degrees of the trait in presumably high-functioning postgraduate and final year students (Clark, 1991; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Because of its unavailability in South Africa, the inventory and permission for its use was obtained

from Dr Robert Raskin at the Tulsa Institute of Behavioural Sciences in Oklahoma (Appendix 1).

NPI items sample the domain of narcissistic personality as defined by the *DSM-III* (APA, 1980). Each item consists of a pair statements, one narcissistic and the other nonnarcissistic. Subjects were required to check one of the two statements. By totalling all the responses designated as narcissistic, each narcissistic response being worth one point, one general component score for narcissism was obtained.

Empirical studies have demonstrated the **NPI**'s reliability as a measure of the general construct of narcissism with alpha reliability coefficients ranging from $r=0.80$ to $r=0.86$ (Auerbach, 1984; Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Watson *et al.*, 1984). This suggests that the **NPI** is a viable and promising measure for the general construct of narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Norms and standard deviations have been reported in chapter four.

In addition to providing a general score for narcissism, the inventory also yields seven first-order components of narcissism, namely, Authority, Exhibitionism, Superiority, Entitlement, Exploitativeness, Self-sufficiency and Vanity. Each sub-scale has at least three marker items that clearly define it as such and each component has a sufficient amount of **NPI** variance associated with it to suggest a legitimate subdimension of the response characteristic of the set (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The score for each sub-scale is determined by totalling the individual item numbers associated with that particular scale, each item being worth one point. A brief description of each sub-scale and associated **NPI** items follows below. Norms and standard deviations for each of these sub-scales have been reported in chapter four.

3.3.1.2.1 Authority

Dominance, assertiveness, leadership, criticality and self-confidence appear to summarise the central characteristics that are related to this scale. Item numbers associated with this sub-scale are: 1, 8, 10, 11, 12, 32, 33, and 36.

3.3.1.2.2 Exhibitionism

Sensation seeking, extraversion and lack of impulse control characterise the **NPI Exhibitionism** scale. Item numbers associated with this sub-scale are: 2, 3, 7, 20, 28, 30, and 38.

3.3.1.2.3 Superiority

The Superiority scale evaluates such characteristics as capacity for status, social presence, self-confidence and narcissistic ego-inflation. Item numbers associated with this sub-scale are: 4, 9, 26, 37, and 40.

3.3.1.2.4 Entitlement

Ambitiousness, need for power, dominance, hostility, toughness and a lack of self-control and tolerance for others are associated with this scale. Item numbers tapping these characteristics are: 5, 14, 18, 24, 25, and 27.

3.3.1.2.5 Exploitativeness

Narcissistic exploitativeness appears to be associated with such characteristics as rebelliousness, nonconformity, hostility and a lack of consideration or tolerance for others. Item numbers associated with this sub-scale are: 6, 13, 16, 23, and 35.

3.3.1.2.6 Self-Sufficiency

Self-sufficiency on the **NPI** is related to assertiveness, independence, self-confidence and needs for achievement. Item numbers associated with this sub-scale are: 17, 21, 22, 31, 34, and 39.

3.3.1.2.7 Vanity

Vanity appears to be defined by both regarding oneself as physically attractive and being actually judged to be physically attractive. Item numbers associated with this sub-scale are: 15, 19, and 29.

3.3.1.3 The Circumplex Model: FACES III

FACES III of the Circumplex Model (Olson *et al.*, 1985), hereafter referred to as **FACES III** (Appendix 5), is designed to assess the two major dimensions which constitute the essence of family functioning on the Circumplex Model, that is, family cohesion and family adaptability, (Beavers & Olson, 1983; Bloom, 1985; Olson *et al.*, 1979; Olson *et al.*, 1985). There are four levels of family cohesion ranging from extremely low to extremely high: disengaged, separated, connected and enmeshed. Similarly, there are four levels of family adaptability ranging from extremely low to extremely high: rigid, structured, flexible and chaotic. Balanced levels of cohesion and adaptability are associated with more effective system functioning (Olson *et al.*, 1985). The two moderate or balanced levels of cohesion have been labelled separated and connected. Similarly, the two moderate levels of adaptability have been identified as structured and flexible .

FACES III can be administered on an individual basis, such as when a couple or family is seen in a therapy session or can be administered to larger groups such as students in class (*ibid.*). Subjects are requested to respond to 20 statements,

deciding for each item how frequent, on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always), the described behaviour occurs in his or her family. For the purpose of this study, item tense was changed from the present to the past tense in order to control for the possibility that currently married students would give information regarding the state of their present families and not their families of origin (Appendix 9).

The scoring for family cohesion score was obtained by totalling the sum of all odd items, each item being worth one point, whilst the sum of all even items yielded the score for family adaptability. Norms for both scales as well as cutting points for the individual levels of family adaptability and family cohesion have been provided (Appendix 5).

The internal consistency reliabilities for each scale have proved to be adequate with alpha coefficients of $r=0.77$ for the cohesion scale and $r=0.62$ for the adaptability scale. These results demonstrate the ability of the **FACES III** scale to discriminate between problem and non-problem families; non-problem families tend to be balanced whereas problem families tend to function at the extremes of the two components of adaptability and cohesion, that is, rigid/chaotic and disengaged/connected. The correlation between the two scales has been computed as $r=0.03$ (*ibid.*), indicating that the two dimensions are clearly independent of each other. Taking the above into account, coupled with the instrument's versatility as both a research and a clinical tool, the evidence seems to indicate that it is a particularly useful and valid assessment tool for the present study.

3.3.1.4 The Career Self-Efficacy Scale

Matsui and Tsukamoto's (1991) Career Self-Efficacy scale was utilised as a measure of career self-efficacy by this study (Appendix 6). Since these researchers found the correlation between self-efficacy for work activities and self-efficacy for occupations to be high ($r=0.93$), the latter measure was not utilised by this researcher. Subjects were asked to indicate those occupational activities which they felt they would be able to successfully accomplish were they to receive some training for that particular work activity. Protocols were scored by totalling the number of affirmative responses for each domain, giving 6 scores corresponding with Holland's (1966, 1985) 6 occupational orientations (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, Conventional).

3.4 FORMAL HYPOTHESES

1. Psychology students are likely to score significantly higher on measures of narcissism than engineering and law students.
2. Psychology students are more likely to have experienced significantly more extreme family of origin types than engineering and law students.
3. Psychology students will tend to predict career self-efficacy more significantly in the direction of typically Social occupations than engineering and law students.

CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND RESULTS

What follows is a summary of the results of statistical analyses. All statistics were calculated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+) (Norusis/SPSS Inc., 1988). Apart from descriptive data, significant findings of analysis of variance, discriminant function analyses and correlations have been reported. In some of the tables it has been necessary to make use of abbreviations. In these cases a key will appear immediately beneath the table. All raw data and result print-outs are available from the author on request.

4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Tables 1 - 3 provide basic demographic information on the subject sample. The mean age for engineering students (Group 1) was 22.20 years, for law students (Group 2), 24.80 years and for psychology students (Group 3), 24.85 years. The overall mean age of the subjects was 23.59 (Standard deviation = 2.88). Of the 85 subjects participating in the research, 53 were males and 32 were females. A breakdown of subjects by racial identity revealed that 13 subjects were black, 47 were white and 25 were Asian.

Table 1: Research sample minimum, maximum and mean ages

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Group 1	22.20	21	25
Group 2	24.80	21	39
Group 3	24.85	21	30
Overall	23.58 (SD=2.88)	21	39

SD = Standard deviation

Table 2: Breakdown of research sample sex by group

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Male	38	12	3
Female	2	13	17

Table 3: Breakdown of research sample race by group

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Black	2	10	1
White	17	11	19
Asian	21	4	0

4.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The brief presentation of descriptive statistics provides mean scores of variables as well as standard deviations and minimum and maximum scores (Table 4). Some of these will be discussed in Chapter 5 insofar as they compare with means and standard deviations provided by test authors. Since one of the protocols submitted by a subject from the engineering sample group was found to have a missing value on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991), this protocol was not considered for any statistical analyses concerning this instrument (N=84).

Table 4: Research sample means and standard deviations on the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988), FACES III, (Olson *et al.*, 1985), and the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991)

	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.	N
NPI					
Narcissism (T)	15.22	7.25	2	34	85
Authority	4.51	2.30	0	8	85
Exhibitionism	1.61	1.60	0	7	85
Superiority	2.05	1.34	0	5	85
Entitlement	2.26	1.71	0	6	85
Exploitativeness	1.44	1.33	0	5	85
Self-sufficiency	2.46	1.61	0	6	85
Vanity	.91	1.03	0	3	85
FACES III					
Cohesion	35.22	7.39	14	49	85
Adaptability	23.24	6.70	10	42	85
CAREER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE					
Realistic	3.07	2.95	0	10	84
Investigative	3.17	2.61	0	10	84
Artistic	4.54	3.09	0	10	84
Social	7.58	2.63	0	10	84
Enterprising	8.09	2.05	2	10	84
Conventional	3.22	2.74	0	10	84

S.D. = Standard deviation

Min = Minimum score

Max. = Maximum score

N. = Total number of subjects

T = Total score

t-Test comparisons of this sample's mean scores with those provided by test authors were computed. This sample's means and standard deviations are found in columns 2 and 3 of Table 5. Means and standard deviations provided by test authors can be found in columns 4 and 5. The maximum level of significance was set at 5%. This sample's mean score on **NPI** general score for narcissism as well as **NPI** sub-scales of Exploitativeness and Self-sufficiency did not differ significantly from sample means provided by Raskin and Terry (1988). On these measures, therefore, this sample was comparable with Raskin and Terry's (*ibid.*) sample. On **NPI** sub-scales of Authority, Exhibitionism, Superiority, Entitlement and Vanity, this sample's mean scores differed significantly from those provided by Raskin and Terry (*ibid.*). This sample scored significantly lower on **NPI** sub-scales of Authority ($t=1.4$; $p<.05$) and Entitlement ($t=3.69$; $p<.05$). On **NPI** sub-scales of Exhibitionism ($t=3.06$; $p<.05$), Superiority ($t=3.27$; $p<.05$) and Vanity ($t=3.80$), this sample scored significantly higher than Raskin and Terry's (*ibid.*) sample (Table 5).

On **FACES III** dimension of family cohesion, this sample's mean did not differ significantly from Olson *et al.*'s., (1985) sample. Thus, comparisons between these samples are favourable on this measure. On the dimension of family cohesion, this sample scored significantly higher than means provided by the test authors ($t=7.5$; $p<.05$) (Table 5).

Means and standard deviations for the sub-scales of the Career Self-Efficacy scale have not been provided by test authors, so this study is unable to draw comparisons.

Table 5: t-Test comparisons of sample means of the NPI and FACES III with means provided by Raskin and Terry (1988) and Olson *et al.* (1985)

	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Narcissism (T)	15.22	7.25	15.55	6.66
Authority	4.51*	2.30	4.16*	2.17
Exhibitionism	1.61*	1.60	2.21*	1.74
Superiority	2.05*	1.34	2.54*	1.36
Entitlement	2.26*	1.71	1.67*	1.40
Exploitativeness	1.44	1.33	1.47	1.69
Self-sufficiency	2.46	1.61	2.09	1.50
Vanity	.91*	1.03	1.37*	1.08
Cohesion	35.22*	7.39	39.8*	5.4
Adaptability	23.24	6.70	24.1	4.7

*p<.05

S.D. = Standard Deviation

T = Total score

4.3 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The analysis of results will be reported according to the formal hypotheses generated by this study. Each hypothesis will be restated followed by a brief analysis of significant results. Significant analyses of variance were followed by a multiple ranges test (Scheffe procedure) in order to determine which sample groups differed significantly from each other. The maximum level of significance has been set at 5%. Statistically significant results will be indicated with an asterisk with the corresponding **p** values reported in the key below each table.

4.3.1 Psychology students are likely to score significantly higher on measures of narcissism than engineering and law students

Although a one-way analysis of variance (Anova) failed to find any significant source of variance between groups on the **NPI** general score for narcissism, some significant differences between subject groups emerged on the independent sub-scales. Law students scored significantly higher on the **NPI** Exploitativeness sub-scale than psychology students ($p < .05$) whilst engineering students scored significantly higher than psychology students on the **NPI** sub-scale of Self-sufficiency ($p < .01$). Both engineering and law students scored significantly higher than psychology students on the **NPI** sub-scale of Entitlement ($p < .001$) (see Table 6). The impact of these results will become clearer in some of the correlational results that follow and will be discussed in Chapter 5. Thus, the present study failed to confirm this study's initial hypothesis that psychology students are likely to score significantly higher on measures of narcissism than engineering and law students.

Table 6: One-Way Anova: NPI Exploitativeness, Self-Sufficiency and Entitlement sub-scales by group

	Group 1 (Means) N=40	Group 2 (Means) N=25	Group 3 (Means) N=20	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Exploitativeness	1.47	1.92	.75	4.70	.0116*
Self-sufficiency	2.97	2.44	1.45	6.83	.0018**
Entitlement	2.62	2.68	1.00	8.30	.0005***

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

Prob. = Probability

A one-way Anova indicated a significant source of variation between race and endorsement of the **NPI** sub-scale of Vanity. Black students scored significantly higher than white or Asian students on this measure ($p<.05$) (Table 7).

Table 7: One-Way Anova: NPI Vanity sub-scale by race

	Blacks (Means) N=13	Whites (Means) N=47	Asians (Means) N=25	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Vanity	1.61	.85	.64	4.28	.0169*

* $p<.05$
Prob. = Probability

A one-way Anova showed that females scored significantly lower on the **NPI** sub-scale of Self-sufficiency than males ($p<.05$) (Table 8). No other significant sources of variation between sex and **NPI** measures of narcissism were found.

Table 8: One-Way Anova: NPI Self-Sufficiency sub-scale by sex

	Males (Means) N=53	Females (Means) N=32	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Self-sufficiency	2.79	1.91	6.45	.013*

* $p<.05$
Prob. = Probability

4.3.2 Psychology students are likely to have experienced significantly more extreme family of origin types than engineering and law students

A one-way Anova failed to show significant sources of variance between subject groups on **FACES III** dimension of family cohesion. However, a one-way Anova showed that psychology students scored significantly lower than engineering students on the dimension of family adaptability, indicating more rigid families of origin than the latter ($p<.05$) (Table 9). (Refer to Appendix 4 for cutting points for the four levels of adaptability).

Table 9: One-Way Anova: FACES III dimension of family adaptability by group

	Group 1 (Means) N=40	Group 2 (Means) N=25	Group 3 (Means) N=20	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Adaptability	24.85	23.40	19.80	4.07	.020*

* $p<.05$
Prob. = Probability

A one-way Anova indicated no significant differences between race on **FACES III** dimensions of family cohesion and family adaptability. Although there were no significant differences between sex and the dimension of family cohesion, a one-way Anova indicated that females scored significantly lower than males on the dimension of family adaptability ($p<.05$) (Table 10). However, both male and female scores fell within the moderate or balanced level of adaptability, namely, structured (see Appendix 4 for cutting points for family adaptability). No significant differences between age and the dimensions of family adaptability and family cohesion were noted.

Table 10: One-Way Anova: FACES III dimension of family adaptability by sex

	Males (Means) N=53	Females (Means) N=32	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Adaptability	24.45	21.22	4.86	.030*

* $p < .05$

Prob. = Probability

4.3.3 Psychology students are likely to predict career self-efficacy more significantly in socially oriented occupations than engineering and law students

A one-way Anova indicated a significant source of variance between subject groups' predictions of career self-efficacy in the 6 occupational orientations on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale. Psychology students predicted career self-efficacy significantly more frequently than engineering and law students in the social occupational orientation ($p < .0005$). In addition, psychology students predicted career self-efficacy significantly more frequently than engineering and law students in the Investigative ($p < .005$) and Artistic occupational orientations ($p < .05$). Finally, engineering students predicted career self-efficacy significantly more frequently in the Realistic occupational orientation than psychology and law students ($p < .0005$) (Table 11). Thus, this study confirmed the third hypothesis that psychology students are more likely to predict career self-efficacy in socially oriented occupations.

Table 11: One-Way Anova: Career Self-Efficacy Scale Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, and Social occupational orientations by group

	Group 1 (Means) N=40	Group 2 (Means) N=25	Group 3 (Means) N=20	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Realistic	5.23	1.16	1.15	37.94	.0000*
Investigative	2.64	2.56	4.95	7.02	.0015**
Artistic	3.90	4.40	6.00	3.28	.0426***
Social	6.23	8.36	9.30	13.99	.0000*

* $p < .0005$

** $p < .005$

*** $p < .05$

Prob. = Probability

A one-way Anova showed that male students predicted career self-efficacy significantly more frequently than female students in the Realistic occupational orientation ($p < .0005$). Conversely, females predicted career self-efficacy significantly more frequently than males in the Investigative ($p < .005$), Artistic ($p < .0005$) and Social ($p < .005$) occupational orientations (Table 12).

Table 12: One-Way Anova: Career Self-Efficacy Scale Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social occupational orientations by sex

	Males (Means) N=53	Females (Means) N=32	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Realistic	4.26	1.09	31.46	.000*
Investigative	2.50	4.25	9.85	.002**
Artistic	3.58	6.13	15.84	.000***
Social	6.94	8.63	8.93	.004*

* $p < .0005$

** $p < .005$

*** $p < .05$

Prob. = Probability

A one-way Anova indicated that Asian students predicted career self-efficacy in the Realistic occupational orientation significantly more frequently than black or white students ($p < .0005$) (Table 13). No further significant sources of variation between race and performance on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale were found.

Table 13: One-Way Anova: Career Self-Efficacy Scale Realistic occupational orientation by race

	Blacks (Means) N=13	Whites (Means) N=47	Asians (Means) N=25	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Realistic	2.69	1.91	5.44	16.02	.0000*

* $p < .0005$

Prob. = Probability

A further one-way Anova was conducted in order to determine whether high scorers and low scorers on the general component score of narcissism on the **NPI** differed significantly on **FACES III** dimensions of family adaptability and family cohesion and endorsement of the 6 occupational orientations on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale. The total subject sample was divided along the median for the **NPI** total score for narcissism ($M=15$). Those individuals who scored higher than the median were called the high narcissistic group ($N=39$) while those scoring below the median were called the low narcissistic group ($N=41$). Five cases were eliminated by this procedure, leaving 80 valid cases.

A one-way Anova showed a significant difference between the two groups on the Enterprising occupational orientation of the Career Self-Efficacy Scale. The high narcissistic group scored significantly higher than the low narcissistic subject group on this measure ($p<.05$) (Table 14). No other significant sources of variation between the groups was found.

Table 14: One-Way Anova: High NPI scorers by Low NPI scorers on Career Self-Efficacy Scale Enterprising occupational orientation

	High Narcissistic Group (Means) N=39	Low Narcissistic Group (Means) N=41	F. Ratio	F. Prob.
Enterprising	8.69	7.54	6.70	.011*

*p <.05

Prob. = Probability

4.5 SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS

Statistical treatment of this study's data included correlations of all variables. An inclusive correlation matrix allowed the researcher to analyse the extent of the interrelatedness of variables. In the tables below, significant correlations (at $p < 0.001$; $p < 0.01$) are reported with positive or negative r values indicating correlational directions. The impact of correlational evidence will be discussed more fully in chapter 5.

Table 15: Significant Pearson correlations: NPI and Career Self-Efficacy Scale

	r	p
Narcissism (T) and Artistic	-0.27	<.01
Narcissism (T) and Social	-0.25	<.01
Narcissism (T) and Enterprising	-0.30	<.01
Authority and Enterprising	0.30	<.01
Exploitativeness and Artistic	-0.28	<.01
Self-Sufficiency and Artistic	-0.26	<.01
Self-Sufficiency and Social	-0.29	<.01
Entitlement and Social	-0.28	<.01
Entitlement and Enterprising	0.31	<.01

T = Total score

Table 16: Significant Pearson correlations: NPI and race, sex

	r	p
Vanity and Race	0.29	<.01
Superiority and Race	-0.25	<.01
Self-sufficiency and Sex	0.26	<.01

Table 17: Significant Pearson correlations: Career Self-Efficacy Scale and race, sex

	r	p
Race and Artistic	-0.25	<.01
Race and Realistic	0.52	<.001
Sex and Realistic	-0.52	<.001
Sex and Investigative	0.32	<.01
Sex and Artistic	0.39	<.001
Sex and Social	0.30	<.01

4.6 DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSES

A discriminant function analysis was performed in order to identify those variables most effective in discriminating between those individuals scoring high on the **NPI** total score for narcissism and those obtaining low scores on this measure. The total subject sample was divided along the median for the **NPI** total score for narcissism ($M=15$). Those individuals scoring lower than the median were called the low narcissistic group (Group 1) while those scoring above the median were called the high narcissistic group (Group 2). Of the 85 research cases processed by this

statistical procedure, 6 of these were excluded from the analysis; 5 of these cases had missing or out-of-range group codes and 1 case had one missing discriminating variable. Thus, 79 valid cases were used in this analysis with Group 1 containing 41 subjects and Group 2 comprising 38 subjects.

Due to the small sample size ($N=79$), the seven sub-scales of narcissism on the **NPI** were omitted as variables in the discriminant function analysis since these sub-scales are highly correlated (Appendix 11). This provides greater clarity in distinguishing those variables discriminating between the two groups.

This procedure correctly classified 56 of the 79 cases (70.89%). Of these cases, 27 fell into Group 1 (65.9%) and 29 into Group 2 (76.3%) (Table 18). However, the insignificant Chi squared value ($X^2=14.649$; $p=0.2612$) precludes a meaningful analysis of those variables discriminating between the two groups. This is largely due to the small subject sample ($N=79$) which effectively limits the flexibility of this statistical procedure.

Table 18: Classification results of low and high narcissistic scorers on NPI total score of narcissism

		Predicted Group Membership	
Actual Group	No. of Cases	Group 1	Group 2
Group 1	41	27* 65.9%	14* 34.1%
Group 2	38	9* 23.7%	29* 76.3%

* = Number of cases

A further discriminant function analysis was performed in order to determine which of the research variables were most effective in discriminating between subject groups. Of the 85 research cases, one case was excluded from the analysis due to an incomplete protocol (N=84). This procedure correctly classified 70 of the 84 cases (83.33%). 38 of those correctly classified fell into Group 1, 15 into Group 2 and 17 into Group 3 (Table 19).

Table 19: Classification results of subject groups

Predicted Group Membership				
Actual Group	No. of Cases	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	39	38* 97.4%	1* 2.6%	0* 0.0%
Group 2	25	2* 8.0%	15* 60.0%	8* 32.0%
Group 3	20	1* 5.0%	2* 10.0%	17* 85.0%

* = Number of cases

The discriminant function analysis was able to indicate those variables significantly discriminating between subject groups ($X^2=64.019$; $p<.0005$). In order of rank, the Realistic occupational orientation of the Career Self-Efficacy Scale, racial identity (black), sex (female) and the Entitlement sub-scale of the **NPI** were the four variables which were most able to predict group membership (Table 20).

Table 20: Standardised canonical discriminant function coefficients and pooled-within-groups correlations of discriminating variables

Variable	Standard. Canonical Coefficient	Pooled Within Groups Corr.
Realistic	0.69	-0.47
Race	0.60	0.09
Sex	-0.53	0.47
Entitlement	-0.52	-0.15

Wilk's Lambda = 0.411

p<.0005

Stand. = Standardised

Corr. = Correlations

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

After formulating a number of hypotheses on the basis of available literature, this study has obtained and analysed data relevant to a specific sample of postgraduate and final year university students in South Africa. The aim of this research was to examine the relationship between levels of narcissism, family of origin and career self-efficacy in the above sample. It is with reference to this objective and the subsequent hypotheses generated by this study, that a discussion reflecting research findings follows. This discussion attempts to highlight and account for both significant and nonsignificant results and to communicate both their practical and theoretical implications.

This study's sample mean for NPI narcissism compared closely with norms provided by Raskin and Terry (1988) (Table 5), indicating that the South African sample compares favourably with the American sample on which this instrument was normed. In addition, this finding appears to provide support for Raskin and Terry's (*ibid.*) claim that their instrument is a viable measure of the general construct of narcissism. Although comparisons between means for the two sub-scales of Exploitativeness and Self-sufficiency were favourable, on the whole, the two samples differed significantly on the remaining **NPI** sub-scale measures of narcissism (Table 5).

In addition, this sample's mean score for **FACES III** dimension of family cohesion was significantly higher than the mean provided by Olson *et al.*'s (1985) study. This is probably largely due to this study's small sample size (N=85) as compared with

Raskin and Terry's (1988) and Olson *et al.*'s (1985) sample sizes of 1018 and 2034 respectively. Further research in this area should use a larger sample group in order to draw meaningful comparisons between norms provided by test authors and research sample means.

On the whole, the results of this study do not provide support for the hypotheses. Although confirmation for the third hypothesis was obtained, this needs to be interpreted with caution since both the first and the second hypotheses were statistically rejected, thereby precluding an empirical connection between narcissism, family of origin and career self-efficacy. The discussion which follows attempts to account for these findings as well as for various other significant interactions. Each hypothesis will be restated with a discussion following.

5.2 HYPOTHESIS 1

Psychology students are likely to score significantly higher on measures of narcissism than engineering and law students.

This study failed to provide empirical support for the literature's suggestions that significant narcissistic traits are apparent in those pursuing a career in psychotherapy as distinct from those pursuing careers in other fields of specialisation. It is interesting to note, however, that a one-way Anova showed that law students scored significantly higher than psychology students on the **NPI** sub-scale of Exploitativeness ($p < .05$, Table 6). This suggests that the former tend to be more interpersonally exploitative in their relationships with others than the latter, indicating a greater propensity to act without consideration and empathy for others (Kernberg, 1975; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Watson *et al.*, 1984) than the latter. Prospective lawyers and those involved in postgraduate training programmes should be aware of this propensity since professional ethics may be compromised by interpersonally manipulative behaviour.

Although **NPI** Entitlement was found to be a variable which discriminated between subjects ($r=-0.52$, Table 20), no significant findings of variance between subject groups on this measure emerged out of this study. This clearly warrants further statistical investigation by future research since it is an intriguing research finding.

Following Clark's (1991) recommendations of correlations between race, sex, age and **NPI** scores, this study found a positive correlation between the **NPI** sub-scale of Vanity and race ($r=0.29$; $p<.01$, Table 16) while an inverse correlational relationship was true for race and **NPI** Superiority ($r=-0.25$; $p<.01$, Table 16). Analysis of variance indicated that black subjects were more likely than whites and Asians to endorse **NPI** items associated with narcissistic vanity ($p<.05$, Table 7). This implies cultural differences in self-perception and, in addition, the possibility that black students may be more comfortable reporting perceptions of physical attractiveness than other race groups, that is, they may be less constrained by the strictures of social desirability than other race groups participating in this research. Whatever the case, clearly more research is needed in this area before definitive conclusions can be drawn.

Also of interest is the fact that engineering students scored significantly higher on the **NPI** sub-scale of Self-sufficiency than psychology students ($p<.01$, Table 6). This indicates that engineering students tend to perceive themselves as being more emotionally independent than psychology students. This finding appears to confirm Roe's (1956, 1957) hypothesis that engineering is largely a nonperson oriented occupation. Individuals drawn to this career, therefore, are not dependent on interpersonal interaction for occupational satisfaction. However, the literature suggests that illusions of emotional independence guard against the vulnerabilities inherent in close interpersonal relationships (Modell, 1975; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The ability to form close relationships necessitates a capacity for interpersonal vulnerability and, since the practice of psychotherapy involves the establishment of

intimate relationships with others (Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Saretsky, 1980), this finding should be viewed in a positive light. The Self-sufficiency sub-scale was also found to be positively correlated with sex ($r=0.26$; $p<.01$, Table 16). Analysis of variance showed that females scored significantly lower than males on this measure ($p<.05$, Table 8). However, this finding is almost certainly due to sampling bias since most female subjects fell into Group 3, which scored significantly lower than Group 1 ($p<.01$, Table 6) on this measure.

Clark (1991) proposes that empirical failures to confirm theoretical hypotheses of therapist narcissism should be viewed in a positive light; it would be disturbing to discover those deficits inherent in the narcissistic personality predominating in individuals training for a career which emphasises the capacity for empathic attunement, rapport and deep caring for another (*ibid.*). While this author takes cognisance of Clark's (*ibid.*) comments, it may be premature to reject theoretical assumptions from which this study derives its hypotheses before examining the research design of this study more fully in an attempt to account in part for the lack of empirical support for theoretical claims that psychotherapists are more narcissistic than other professionals.

Although larger than Clark's (*ibid.*) original research sample ($N=52$), the fact that the present study was based on a relatively small sample size ($N=85$) makes it necessary to use some caution in interpreting results. In addition, opportunity sampling did not allow for subject matching in terms of age, sex and racial identity (Tables 2 and 3). With this caveat in mind, a circumspect attitude should be adopted when interpreting the significance of correlational evidence of relationships between race and sex and endorsement of the various component measures of narcissism (Kerlinger, 1986). The low standard deviation score for age ($S.D.=2.88$) demonstrates the homogeneity of this sample, indicating a possible reason for the lack of significant results as far as comparisons between age and **NPI** scores are

concerned. Future research in this area should elicit a larger research sample with matching for subject age, race and sex if results are to be meaningful.

It is important to keep in mind that the utilisation of the questionnaire format in order to evaluate a construct as intricate as narcissism, poses some problems. Since narcissism manifests in interpersonal relationships (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990), the possibility exists that narcissistic traits lie dormant, so to speak, until activated by the emotional tone of certain interpersonal associations (Jacoby, 1985; Moore, 1992). This means that the complexities inherent in this construct may not be adequately tapped by a questionnaire. Thus, assessment should move beyond the realm of this format to interpersonal measures of narcissism. These may include structured interviews, taped psychotherapy sessions in order to tease out and analyse countertransference phenomena, and taped group therapy sessions. Although this method of data collection relies on sophisticated interviewing and interpretive skills (Kerlinger, 1986), such a research design should be taken into account by further investigations in this area.

Since both this research and Clark's (1991) study failed to find significant results with a student subject sample, perhaps further research should focus on obtaining data from qualified professionals, that is, registered and practising psychotherapists, attorneys and engineers. Gaining access to and cooperation from such a research sample, especially utilising the more refined research methods proposed above, would prove to be a demanding task (Kerlinger, 1986). Nonetheless, such an undertaking would almost certainly provide valuable information in this area.

A further consideration to be noted is that, despite not mentioning narcissism in the presentation, due to their training in personality theory and disorder, psychology students may have been aware of the research agenda and tailored their responses

accordingly. The practice of psychotherapy appears to be contrary to the perceived role of the psychotherapist as selfless helper (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990) and, in the interests of social desirability, psychology students may have been reluctant to endorse narcissistic items on the **NPI** (Kerlinger, 1986). Once again, this phenomenon may be circumvented by a more subtle research design involving interpersonal assessments of narcissism.

5.3 HYPOTHESIS 2

Psychology students are more likely to have experienced significantly more extreme family of origin types than engineering and law students.

Although analysis of results indicated that psychology students described more rigid family of origin constellations than engineering students ($p < .05$, Table 9), no other significant sources of variance between subject groups was recorded. Thus, the results of this study fail to confirm the literature's speculations that psychotherapists are likely to have experienced more extreme family of origin types than individuals in the professions of law and engineering.

This finding may be seen in a positive light since it indicates that trainee psychotherapists participating in this study appear not to be hampered by maladaptive family of origin constellations in their professional work with clients. However, perhaps the research design of the above study contributed to the lack of significant findings; the use of retrospective methods to assess the adult's perception of the childhood family environment is always problematic (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Hagen, 1960; Kerlinger, 1986; Wortley, 1990). Confounding variables of selective distortion, bias and inaccurate memory recall may have affected this study's results. In addition, since psychology students are involved in training to identify psychopathology, they may have consciously or unconsciously modified their responses in the interests of social desirability. Thus, a more sensitive

research design involving a personal interview component would possibly be more effective in its assessment of family of origin functioning. Thus, further research in this area should explore this alternative to family of origin assessment.

5.4 HYPOTHESIS 3

Psychology students will tend to predict career self-efficacy in social occupations significantly more frequently than engineering and law students.

This study provided support for the third hypothesis and appears to confirm the literature's speculations that psychotherapists are motivated to choose a career in psychotherapy in order to have unmet interpersonal needs gratified (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Roe, 1956, 1957). However, since this study failed to find significant differences between subject groups' experiences of their families of origin, this study cannot make empirical links between family of origin and career self-efficacy. In addition sample bias almost certainly accounts for the significance of results; one would expect those students registered in the Social Sciences to predict career self-efficacy in typically social occupations. Nonetheless, some interesting findings emerged out of the analysis of results and are worthy of discussion in terms of Holland's (1966, 1985) theory of occupational choice.

Taking sample bias into account, the fact that psychology students predicted career-self-efficacy significantly more frequently than law or engineering students in the social occupational orientation ($p < .0005$, Table 11), indicates that these students are well-placed in their occupation of choice; the practise of psychotherapy involves the capacity to interpret and modify human behaviour and individuals of the social orientation are particularly adept at this (Holland, 1966, 1985). Verbal skills appear to be utilised in order to communicate empathy and caring to others. In addition, although this study found that prospective lawyers tended to be more interpersonally exploitative than trainee psychotherapists, Holland (*ibid.*) claims that

people of the social orientation may resort to the manipulation of others in order to resolve interpersonal conflict. Therapists are often in a position of great influence and power over their clients (Guggenbuhl-Craig, cited in Guy, 1987) and may perpetuate needs for omnipotence by using interpersonally manipulative strategies within the therapeutic relationship (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Marmor, 1953; Masson, 1990; Searles, 1979). This is clearly an area to be examined by trainee psychotherapists and supervisors alike; if the therapist is able to accept the power invested in him or her by both clients and the public with the requisite amount of detachment, then, instead of abusing this position of authority, therapy can proceed satisfactorily (Searles, 1979). The therapist's role as an authority figure, then, does not involve power, direction and control - rather, it becomes an exercise in leadership by remaining outside and separate from clients and by establishing and maintaining appropriate boundaries without engaging personal needs for dominance (Nichols, 1993).

A further interesting result to emerge out of this study is the fact that psychology students predicted career self-efficacy in the Artistic occupational orientation more frequently than law or engineering students ($p < .05$, Table 11). The personal requirements for occupational efficacy in this orientation include the capacity to tolerate ambiguity and the ability to draw on knowledge, intuition and emotions in order to problem-solve effectively (Holland, 1966, 1985). This finding makes more sense when one considers the fact that most schools of psychotherapy support the importance of a tolerance for ambiguity as prerequisites for clinical practice (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990).

The capacity to tolerate ambiguity is clearly an asset for the prospective psychotherapist. Not only does it foster curiosity as to why people behave the way that they do, it also allows the therapist to stay with the client as confusing and perplexing life events are presented (Fussell & Bonney, 1990). In a profession in

which certainties are rare, the clinical value of tolerance for ambiguity is high. However, the trainee psychotherapist needs to be aware that a tolerance of ambiguity may also predispose an inclination towards enmeshment and subsequent boundary problems (Casement, 1985; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990), which may be problematic for the therapeutic relationship.

The general score for **NPI** narcissism as well as the sub-scales of Authority, Exploitativeness, Self-Sufficiency and Entitlement are inversely correlated with both the Artistic and Social occupational orientations on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Table 15). This makes sense when one considers the requirements for efficacy in both these orientations; high levels of narcissism would impede effective functioning in those occupations requiring empathy, sensitivity and the capacity to care for others. This study also indicated that the **NPI** general score for narcissism and its sub-scales of Authority and Entitlement are positively correlated with the Enterprising occupational orientation (Table 15). In addition, those individuals registering high levels of narcissism scored significantly higher than low scorers on this occupational orientation of the Career Self-Efficacy Scale ($p < .05$, Table 14). If one examines the personality traits of the Enterprising orientation described by Holland (1966, 1985), this finding is not unexpected; needs for power, status and dominance are consonant with the narcissistic personality.

Other theorists have claimed that the psychotherapist's experiences in the family of origin have nurtured the potential to tolerate ambiguity and to draw on emotional resources and intuition within the therapeutic relationship (Fussell & Bonney, 1990; Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt 1990; Miller, 1987). Since the above study failed to find significant differences between subject groups on measures of family functioning, similar conclusions cannot be drawn.

The fact that psychology students predicted career self-efficacy in the Investigative occupational orientation significantly more frequently than law or engineering students ($p < .005$, Table 11) indicates a greater capacity for the tolerance of ambiguity and the ability to engage in abstract activities (Holland, 1966, 1985). In addition, the ability to 'think through' problems permits an intellectual appraisal of tasks. This capacity, coupled with the ability to draw on intuitive processes already described above, equips the therapist to deal effectively with the complexities inherent in this helping profession. Reference to diagnosis, case management and referral is particularly relevant here.

A further requirement of the Investigative orientation is the ability to delay gratification since tasks tend to be complex and only gradually completed (*ibid.*). Since the practise of psychotherapy is oftentimes a slow, laborious process with "the proof of [the] pudding...a long time in coming" (Singer, 1979 p. 260), the psychotherapist is often less able than other professionals to obtain immediate, tangible professional satisfaction. Thus, the ability to delay short-term gratification in order to realise long-term therapeutic goals is clearly a prerequisite of effective clinical work since the therapist's own needs for professional gratification may obscure the client's needs, thereby impeding the therapeutic process (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Rouslin, 1966; Singer, 1979).

The need for individuals of the Investigative occupational orientation to organise and manage the world (Holland, 1966, 1985) can, if not monitored, lead to the obsessional behaviour described by Herron and Rouslin Welt (1990). This may become evident in needs for control and order, compulsive needs to be of service and potential burnout (Freudenberger, 1990; Herron & Rousslin Welt, 1990). The trainee psychotherapist needs to be aware of this potential and to closely regulate potentially obsessive behaviour since intrapersonal needs for order and control may

have deleterious effects on the therapeutic relationship (Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990).

This research found sex to be positively correlated with the Artistic, Social and Investigative occupational orientations of the Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Table 17). Analysis of variance procedures indicated that female students were more likely than male students to predict career self-efficacy in these orientations (Table 12). However, when one considers the demographic information of this study, psychology is more subscribed to by female students than male students ($N=13$, Table 2). This also explains why sex emerged as a discriminating variable between subjects on the discriminant function analysis ($r=-0.53$, Table 20). Thus, differences are more likely to be an artefact of sample bias rather than a result of differences inherent in the sexes themselves.

In addition to the above results, this study showed that engineering students predicted career self-efficacy in the Realistic occupational orientation more frequently than law or psychology students ($p<.0005$, Table 11). This indicates that engineering students tend to predict career self-efficacy in nonperson occupations which do not place a premium on interpersonal skills (Holland, 1966, 1985; Roe, 1956, 1957). In addition, the realistic occupational orientation emerged as a variable which most discriminated between subjects ($r=0.69$, Table 20). This confirms the above claim of sampling validity. However, it should also be kept in mind that sample numbers in the engineering group ($N=40$) outweighed those of both the law student sample ($N=25$) and the psychology student sample group ($N=20$).

Race was also found to be positively correlated with the Realistic occupational orientation on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale ($r=0.52$; $p<.001$, Table 17) while sex was found to be inversely correlated with this occupational orientation ($r=-0.52$; $p<.001$, Table 17). Analysis of variance revealed that males predicted career self-

efficacy more frequently in the Realistic occupational orientation than females ($p < .0005$, Table 12) as did Asian students when compared with the other race groups ($p < .005$, Table 13). However, one has to take into consideration the sampling of this research; Asians and males fell predominantly into Group 1 (Tables 2 & 3), making the nature of this correlational evidence largely due to sampling bias. In order to achieve more realistic results, controls for sex, race and gender should be taken into account by future research designs.

Although beyond the scope of this study, it is interesting to briefly compare this sample's occupational codes obtained on the Career Self-Efficacy Scale with Holland's (1966, 1985) occupational codes (Appendix 10). However, comparisons should be drawn with some caution; although the Career Self-Efficacy Scale derives from Holland's interest inventory, the two scales differ in that they measure two distinct dimensions of occupational choice - career self-efficacy and occupational interest respectively.

Engineering students did not conform to Holland's (*ibid.*) coding system for their occupation; the frequency of their responses on the Career Self-Efficacy scale for the various occupational orientations resulted in the code **ESR** being designated by this study to this sample. This occupational code is similar to the law student sample group, who corresponded with Holland's (1966, 1985) **ESA** occupational code.

Psychology students also deviated from Holland's (*ibid.*) occupational code, obtaining a code of **SEA** versus their designated **SIE** code. This means that this sample group was also similar to the law student group. Perhaps the nonconclusiveness of this study's results can also be attributed in part to the fact that sample groups which were purported by the literature to differ in terms of personality and orientation towards persons or nonpersons (Fussell & Bonney,

1990; Holland, 1966, 1985; Roe, 1956, 1957) did in fact not conform to the literature's assumptions of difference. This can perhaps be accounted for by the fact that a wide range of occupational orientations can be followed within the limits of one particular occupational group; in a Scientific career, for example, one may teach, promote, administer, do research or practice a speciality (Hagen, 1960). In order to control for differences of this nature, a useful technique would be to screen subjects on the basis of their orientation within a particular field; for example, only those engineering subjects with a preference for research should be included in future studies.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It would appear that, contrary to theoretical claims, those students training to be psychotherapists in this sample of postgraduate and final year South African university students, display neither significantly elevated levels of narcissism in their personality profiles nor describe a greater frequency of problematic families of origin than those students enrolled in the disciplines of law and electronic engineering as measured by these instruments. Although analysis of results indicated that trainee psychotherapists predicted career self-efficacy in social occupations significantly more frequently than law and engineering students, since this study failed to find differences between the sample group's experiences of their families of origin, it is not possible to empirically confirm theoretical assumptions of a connection between these two dimensions.

Despite the fundamental lack of significant outcomes, this study elicited some interesting findings. The fact that trainee psychotherapists predicted career self-efficacy in Socially, Artistically and Investigatively oriented occupations more frequently than the other sample groups allows one to gain a sense of the type of individuals drawn to the profession of psychotherapy. It would appear that, according to Holland's (1966, 1985) theory of occupational choice, people drawn to this profession are equipped with interpersonal skills designed to communicate empathy to others. Coupled with the capacity to tolerate ambiguity, is an aptitude for intellectual appraisal and curiosity. In addition to the above, these individuals demonstrate a proclivity for interpersonally manipulative strategies in order to resolve conflict as well as potentially obsessive behavioural traits.

This profile is consistent with the literature's descriptions of the psychotherapist's temperament (Guy, 1987; Herron & Rouslin Welt, 1990; Miller, 1987). Theorists in this area claim that this personality is formed in order to manage implicit parental demands for family stability and cohesion. This role develops emotional maturity and the capacity for sensitivity towards the needs of others. However, normal narcissistic development is impeded and a career in psychotherapy may be pursued in order to undo unempathic parenting and satisfy unmet dependency needs. In spite of these assertions, since this study failed to find a significant connection between levels of narcissism and family of origin functioning in trainee psychotherapists, similar conclusions can not be drawn by this research.

This study appears to have challenged the literature's claims that the family of origin's role in the development of narcissistic traits leads to the choice of psychotherapy as a career option. However, it may be precipitous to reject theoretical claims since the lack of significant findings may be linked to limitations inherent in the research design itself. Specifically, the utilisation of interpersonal measurement techniques in order to assess narcissism and family of origin functioning limits the extent to which the intricacies of these dimensions can be evaluated in meaningful ways. This study's relatively small sample size, coupled with the lack of controls for age, race and sex inherent in the opportunity sampling technique of securing research subjects, points to inadequate sampling.

Further research in this field should acknowledge the restrictions of research designs of this nature and should attempt to circumvent these limitations by employing more sensitive assessments of narcissism and family of origin functioning. These include either substituting the questionnaire format for interpersonal measurement techniques or using the latter as an adjunct to the former. Larger sample groups matched for age, race and sex would almost certainly lend greater validity to statistical findings. Finally, it would be interesting to test the

literature's claims on individuals within the profession itself rather than relying on university students as a convenient 'captive audience'.

Although the demands of conducting and co-ordinating research of this nature are high, the practical implications are meaningful; information about the psychotherapist's family of origin and the subsequent potential development of narcissistic traits is invaluable in informing both the theoretical and practical components of postgraduate training programmes.

REFERENCES

- Alt, J. (1988). *Shame and guilt: A study of two groups*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington DC: APA.
- American Psychiatric Association (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed., revised). Washington DC: APA.
- American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington DC: APA.
- Anderson, S.A. & Gavazzi, S.M. (1990). A test of the Olson Circumplex Model: Examining its curvilinear assumption and the presence of extreme types. *Family Process*, 29, 324.
- Auerbach, J. (1984). Validation of two scales for narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 649-653.
- Beavers, W.R. & Olson, D.H. (1983). Epilogue. *Family Process*, 33, 398-405.
- Bennett, J.B. (1988). Power and influence as distinct personality traits: Development and validation of a psychometric measure. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 22, 361-394.
- Berger, K.S. (1980). *The developing person*. New York: Worth Publishers Inc.
- Bloom, B.L. (1985). A factor analysis of self-report measures of family functioning. *Family Process*, 24, 225-239.
- Casement, P. (1985). *On learning from the patient*. London: Routledge.

- Clark, J. (1991). Therapist narcissism. *Professional Psychology: Research and practice*, 22(2), 141-143.
- Cohen, C.P. & Sherwood, V.R. (1991). *Becoming a constant object in psychotherapy with the borderline patient*. New York: Jason Aaronson Inc.
- Constantine, L.L. & Israel, J.T. (1985). The family void: Treatment and theoretical aspects of the synchronous family paradigm. *Family Process*, 24, 525-547.
- Dunn, J. & Plomin, R. (1991). Why are siblings so different? The significance of differences in sibling experiences within the family. *Family Process*, 30, 271-283.
- Eckler-Hart, A.H. (1987). True and false self in the development of the psychotherapist. *Psychotherapy*, 24(4), 683-691.
- Emmons, R.A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 291-300.
- Farber, B.A. (1985). The genesis, development, and implications of psychological-mindedness in psychotherapists. *Psychotherapy*, 22, 170-177.
- Farber, B.A. & Heifetz, L.J. (1982). The process and dimensions of burnout in psychotherapists. *Professional Psychology*, 13, 293-301.
- Fine, R. (1986). *Narcissism, the self, and society*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Finell, J.S. (1985). Narcissistic problems in analysts. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 66, 33-445.
- Ford, E.S.C. (1963). Being and becoming a psychotherapist: The search for identity. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 22, 587-594.

- Framo, J.L. (1976). Family of origin as a therapeutic resource for adults in marital and family therapy: You can and should go home again. *Family Process*, 15, 193-210.
- Freud, S. (1914). On narcissism. An introduction. In *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 14)*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Freudenberger, H.J. (1990). Therapists as men and men as therapists *Psychotherapy*, 27(3), 340-343.
- Friedman, J.A. (1985). The idea of narcissism in Freud's psychoanalysis. *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, 15, 499-514.
- Fussell, F.W. & Bonney, W.C. (1990). A comparative study of childhood experiences of psychotherapists and physicists: Implications for clinical practice. *Psychotherapy*, 27(4), 505-512.
- Garfield, D. & Havens, L. (1991). Paranoid phenomena and pathological narcissism. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, XLV(2), 160-172.
- Goldstein, W.N. (1985). *DSM III* and the narcissistic personality. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, XXXIX(1), 4-16.
- Gottschalk, L.A. (1988). Narcissism: Its normal evolution and development and the treatment of its disorders. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, XLI(1), 4-27.
- Green, R.G., Harris, R.N., Forte, J.A. & Robinson, M. (1990). Evaluating **FACES III** and the Circumplex Model: 2,440 families. *Family Process*, 30, 55-73.
- Grigg, A.E. (1959). Childhood experience with parental attitudes: A test of Roe's hypothesis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 6(2), 153-155.

- Guerin, P. & Hubbard, I. (1987). Impact of therapist's personal family system on clinical work. *Journal of Psychotherapy and the Family*, 3, 47-60.
- Guy, J.D. (1987). *The personal life of the psychotherapist*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Guy, J.D. & Liaboe, G.P. (1986). The impact of conducting psychotherapy on the psychotherapist's interpersonal functioning. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 17, 111-114.
- Gyatso, G.G. (1994). Exchanging oneself for others. In S. Bercholz & S.C. Kohn (Eds), *Entering the stream*. London: Rider Books.
- Hagen, D. (1959). Careers and family atmosphere: An empirical test of Roe's hypothesis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 7(4), 251-256.
- Herron, W.G. & Rouslin Welt, S. (1990). *Narcissism and the psychotherapist*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Holland, J.L. (1966). A psychological classification scheme for vocations and major fields. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13, 278-288.
- Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Terry.
- Horner, A.J. (1994). In search of ordinariness: The dissolution of false pride. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 54(1), 87-93.
- Jacoby, M. (1985). *Individuation and narcissism: The psychology of the self in Jung and Kohut*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, E. (1964). The God complex. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Essays in applied psychoanalysis*. New York: International Universities Press.

- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioural research* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1970). A psychoanalytic classification of character pathology. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 18, 800-822.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Jason Aaronson.
- Kernis, M.H. & Sun, C. (1994). Narcissism and reactions to interpersonal feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 4-13.
- Kohut, H. (1966). Forms and transformations of narcissism. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 14, 243-272.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. & Wolf, E.S. (1978). The disorders of the self and their treatment. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 59, 413-425.
- Kriel, J.R. (1982). Le syndrome du bon-Dieu-A fatal malady affecting doctors. *South African Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 24, 240-244.
- Large, T. (1989). Some aspects of loneliness in families. *Family Process*, 28, 25-35.
- Lasch, C. (1979). *The culture of narcissism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Lee, R.R. (1988). The reverse self-object experience. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, XLII(3), 416-424.

- Marmor, J. (1953). The feeling of superiority-An occupational hazard in the practice of psychiatry. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 110, 370-376.
- Masson, J.M. (1990). *Against therapy*. United Kingdom: Fontana.
- Matsui, T. & Tsukamoto, S. (1991). Relation between career self-efficacy measures based on occupational titles and Holland codes and model environments: A methodological contribution. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 38, 78-91.
- McConaughy, E.A. (1987). The person of the therapist in Psychotherapeutic practice. *Psychotherapy*, 24(3), 303-314.
- McDaniel, S.H. & Landau-Stanton, J. (1991). Family-of-origin work and family therapy skills training: Both-And. *Family Process*, 30, 459-471.
- Mehlman, R.D. (1974). Becoming and being a psychotherapist: The problem of narcissism. *International Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy*, 3, 125-141.
- Miller, A. (1987). *The drama of being a child*. London: Virago Press.
- Miller, I. (1992). Interpersonal vulnerability and narcissism: A conceptual continuum for understanding and treating narcissistic psychopathology. *Psychotherapy*, 29(2), 216-224.
- Millon, T. (1981). *Disorders of personality : DSM-III : Axis II*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Modell, A.H. (1975). A narcissistic defence against affects and the illusion of self-sufficiency. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 56, 275-282.
- Moore, T. (1992). *Care of the soul*. London: Piatkus.
- Nichols, M.P. (1993). The therapist as authority figure. *Family Process*, 32, 163-165.

- Norcross, J.C., Strausser-Kirtland, D. & Missar, C.D. (1988). The process and outcomes of psychotherapists' personal treatment experiences. *Psychotherapy*, 25(1), 36-43.
- Norusis, M.J./SPSS Inc. (1988). *SPSS/PC+ V2.0 Base Manual*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- Olson, D.H. (1991). Commentary: Three-dimensional (3-D) Circumplex Model and revised scoring of **FACES III**. *Family Process*, 30, 74-79.
- Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Marla, M. & Wilson, M. (1985). *Family Inventories*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota.
- Olson, D.H., Sprenkle, D.H. & Russell, C.S. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: 1. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types and clinical applications. *Family Process*, 18, 3-28.
- Persi, J. (1992). Top gun games: When therapists compete. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 22(3), 144-152.
- Pulver, S.E. (1970). Narcissism: The term and the concept. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Society*, 18, 319-341.
- Raskin, R.N. & Hall, C.S. (1979). A Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 45, 990.
- Raskin, R.N. & Hall, C.S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45, 159-162.
- Raskin, R. & Novacek, J. (1989). An MMPI description of the narcissistic personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53(1), 66-80.

- Raskin, R. & Novacek, J. (1991). Narcissism and the use of fantasy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 490-499.
- Raskin, R., Novacek, J. & Hogan, R. (1991a). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 911-918.
- Raskin, R., Novacek, J. & Hogan, R. (1991b). Narcissism, self-esteem, and defensive self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 19-37.
- Raskin, R. & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890-902.
- Roe, A. (1956). *The psychology of occupations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Roe, A. (1957). Early determinants of career choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 4, 212-217.
- Rouslin, S. (1963). Chronic helpfulness: Maintenance or Intervention. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 1, 25-28.
- Russell, G.A. (1985). Narcissism and the narcissistic personality disorder: A comparison of the theories of Kernberg and Kohut. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 58, 137-148.
- Saretsky, T. (1980). The analyst's narcissistic vulnerability-Its effect on the treatment situation. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 16, 82-89.
- Searles, H.F. (1979). *Countertransference and related Subjects*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Shreeve, D.F. (1990). Pseudomaturity in the developmental line of object relations. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, XLIV(4), 536-551.

- Singer, E. (1979). The opiate of the analyst. In L. Epstein & A.H. Feiner (Eds), *Countertransference: The therapist's contribution to the therapeutic situation*. New York: Jason Aaronson.
- Siomopoulos, V. (1988). Narcissistic personality disorder: Clinical features. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 62(2), 240-253.
- Strupp, H. & Binder, J.L. (1984). *Psychotherapy in a new key*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Svrakic, D.M. (1985). Emotional features of narcissistic Personality disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 142, 720-724.
- Svrakic, D.M. & Divac-Jovanovic, M. (1994). Personality disorders: Model for conceptual approach and classification. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 48(4), 562-580.
- Utton, A.C. (1962). Recalled parent-child relations as determinants of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 9(1), 49-53.
- Watson, P., Gresham, S., Trotter, M. & Biderman, M. (1984). Narcissism and empathy - validity evidence for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 301-305.
- Wolf, B. (1989). Heinz Kohut's self-psychology : A conceptual analysis. *Psychotherapy*, 26(4), 545-554.
- Wortley, R.H. (1990). *Personality, interest and occupational choice*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Zohar, D. (1991). *The quantum self*. London: Flamingo.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

REQUEST FOR COPY OF NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY



**Faculty of Social Science
Department of Psychology**

Private Bag X01 Scottsville,
Pietermaritzburg 3209 South Africa
Telephone (0331) 2605369 Fax (0331) 2605809

Robert N. Raskin
1310 West Cliff Drive
Santa Cruz
CA
95060

Dear Dr Raskin

Request for copy of Narcissistic Personality Inventory

I am a Master's student in Psychology at the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg and am conducting research exploring the influence that the family of origin has on the development of narcissism and subsequent choice of psychotherapy as a career.

My research involves the use of postgraduate psychology trainees as an experimental group with postgraduate law and engineering students making up the two control groups. Among other measures, I would like to include your inventory in order to measure potential narcissistic personality traits at levels below which would be clinically designated pathological. The **NPI** would be particularly useful in comparing degrees of these traits in presumably high-functioning postgraduate students. Your article entitled A Narcissistic Personality Inventory, dated October, 1979, in Psychological Reports, 45 indicates that you are willing to offer your inventory for research purposes and I would be very grateful if you could forward a copy to me. In addition, should there be any recent research on the **NPI**, I would appreciate it if you could refer me to the relevant sources. Should you be interested in the outcome of my research, I would be happy to forward you the results of my study via E-mail address or fax.

Yours faithfully

Nicola Labuschagne (Ms)

C J Basson
Associate Professor - Supervisor
Dept. of Psychology (University of Natal)

APPENDIX 2

***DSM* (APA, 1980, 1987, 1994) DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA FOR NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER**

DSM-III (APA, 1980) DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA FOR NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER

Diagnostic criteria for Narcissistic Personality Disorder

The following are characteristic of the individual's current and long-term functioning, are not limited to episodes of illness, and cause either significant impairment in social or occupational functioning or subjective distress:

- A. Grandiose sense of self-importance or uniqueness, e.g., exaggeration of achievements and talents, focus on the special nature of one's problems.
- B. Preoccupation with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love.
- C. Exhibitionism: the person requires constant attention and admiration.
- D. Cool indifference or marked feelings of rage, inferiority, shame, humiliation, or emptiness in response to criticism, indifference of others, or defeat.
- E. At least two of the following characteristic of disturbances in interpersonal relationships:
 - (1) entitlement: expectation of special favors without assuming reciprocal responsibilities, e.g., surprise and anger that people will not do what is wanted
 - (2) interpersonal exploitativeness: taking advantage of others to indulge own desires or for self-aggrandizement; disregard for the personal integrity and rights of others
 - (3) relationships that characteristically alternate between the extremes of overidealization and devaluation
 - (4) lack of empathy: inability to recognize how others feel, e.g., unable to appreciate the distress of someone who is seriously ill.

DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA FOR NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER

Diagnostic criteria for 301.81 Narcissistic Personality Disorder

A pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), lack of empathy, and hypersensitivity to the evaluation of others, beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by at least five of the following:

- (1) reacts to criticism with feelings of rage, shame, or humiliation (even if not expressed)
- (2) is interpersonally exploitative: takes advantage of others to achieve his or her own ends
- (3) has a grandiose sense of self-importance, e.g., exaggerates achievements and talents, expects to be noticed as "special" without appropriate achievement
- (4) believes that his or her problems are unique and can be understood only by other special people
- (5) is preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love
- (6) has a sense of entitlement: unreasonable expectation of especially favorable treatment, e.g., assumes that he or she does not have to wait in line when others must do so
- (7) requires constant attention and admiration, e.g., keeps fishing for compliments
- (8) lack of empathy: inability to recognize and experience how others feel, e.g., annoyance and surprise when a friend who is seriously ill cancels a date
- (9) is preoccupied with feelings of envy

DSM-IV (APA, 1994) DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA FOR NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY DISORDER

■ Diagnostic criteria for 301.81 Narcissistic Personality Disorder

A pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration, and lack of empathy, beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by five (or more) of the following:

- (1) has a grandiose sense of self-importance (e.g., exaggerates achievements and talents, expects to be recognized as superior without commensurate achievements)
- (2) is preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love
- (3) believes that he or she is "special" and unique and can only be understood by, or should associate with, other special or high-status people (or institutions)
- (4) requires excessive admiration
- (5) has a sense of entitlement, i.e., unreasonable expectations of especially favorable treatment or automatic compliance with his or her expectations
- (6) is interpersonally exploitative, i.e., takes advantage of others to achieve his or her own ends
- (7) lacks empathy; is unwilling to recognize or identify with the feelings and needs of others
- (8) is often envious of others or believes that others are envious of him or her
- (9) shows arrogant, haughty behaviors or attitudes

APPENDIX 3

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING :

(For questions 2, 3 and 4 circle the appropriate answer)

1. AGE: -----

2. GENDER: M F

3. RACIAL IDENTITY: BLACK WHITE ASIAN COLOURED

4. DO YOU INTEND PRACTISING PSYCHOTHERAPY ONCE YOU ARE REGISTERED?

Y N

APPENDIX 4

THE NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI)

Thank you for your interest in the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI). Our recent psychometric work with the 54-item NPI has led us to reduce the inventory to a 40-item scale that reflects a general component score for narcissism, and seven first-order component scores for Authority, Self-Sufficiency, Superiority, Entitlement, Exhibitionism, Exploitativeness, and Vanity. Below you will find normative information for the 40-item NPI, and a scoring key and normative information for the seven NPI component scales.

Normative Information for the 40-Item Narcissistic Personality Inventory

College Students	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability (Alpha)	Gender	Age
N = 1018	15.55	6.66	.83	.09	-.01
Males N = 479	16.50	6.85	.84	---	.04
Females N = 539	14.72	6.35	.82	---	-.03

Scoring Key for Seven NPI Component Scales

	Variable	Item Numbers
I	Authority	1+8+10+11+12+32+33+36
II	Exhibitionism	2+3+7+20+28+30+38
III	Superiority	4+9+26+37+40
IV	Entitlement	5+14+18+24+25+27
V	Exploitativeness	6+13+16+23+35
VI	Self-Sufficiency	17+21+22+31+34+39
VII	Vanity	15+19+29

Note: Item numbers for the seven NPI component scales are only relevant to the 40-item version of the scale. *DO NOT* use these item numbers to compute component scores if you use the original 54-item version of the scale.

- 2 -

Intercorrelations, Means, Standard Deviations, Reliability Estimates, Gender and Age Correlations for 40-item NPI and Seven NPI Component Scales (N = 1018)

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
I Authority	---									
II Exhibitionism	.42	---								
III Superiority	.39	.37	---							
IV Entitlement	.34	.34	.25	---						
V Exploitativeness	.34	.32	.20	.29	---					
VI Self-Sufficiency	.39	.19	.28	.24	.25	---				
VII Vanity	.21	.26	.31	.14	.12	.11	---			
VIII 40-Item NPI	.58	.51	.48	.43	.41	.40	.30	---		
IX Gender	.05	-.02	.05	.11	.05	.11	.04	.08	---	
X Age	.00	-.04	.00	.04	-.09	.05	.00	-.01	---	---
No. of Item	8	7	5	6	5	6	3	40		
Mean	4.16	2.21	2.54	1.67	1.47	2.09	1.37	15.55		
Standard Deviation	2.17	1.74	1.36	1.40	1.69	1.50	1.08	6.66		
Alpha	.73	.63	.54	.50	.52	.50	.64	.83		

Note: The correlations presented between the 40-item NPI and its seven component scales were item-corrected to eliminate item overlap.

NPI

Name _____ Date _____

Sex _____ AGE _____ Occupation _____

Instructions: In each of the following pairs of attitudes, choose the the one that you **MOST AGREE** with. Mark your answer by writing **EITHER A or B** in the space provided. Only mark **ONE ANSWER** for each attitude pair, and please **DO NOT** skip any items.

- _____ 1. A I have a natural talent for influencing people.
B I am not good at influencing people.
- _____ 2. A Modesty doesn't become me.
B I am essentially a modest person.
- _____ 3. A I would do almost anything on a dare.
B I tend to be a fairly cautious person.
- _____ 4. A When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed.
B I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.
- _____ 5. A The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
B If I ruled the world it would be a better place.
- _____ 6. A I can usually talk my way out of anything.
B I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.
- _____ 7. A I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
B I like to be the center of attention.
- _____ 8. A I will be a success.
B I am not too concerned about success.
- _____ 9. A I am no better or no worse than most people.
B I think I am a special person.
- _____ 10. A I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
B I see myself as a good leader.
- _____ 11. A I am assertive.
B I wish I were more assertive.
- _____ 12. A I like having authority over other people.
B I don't mind following orders.
- _____ 13. A I find it easy to manipulate people.
B I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people.

- _____ 14. A I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
B I usually get the respect that I deserve.
- _____ 15. A I don't particularly like to show off my body.
B I like to show off my body.
- _____ 16. A I can read people like a book.
B People are sometimes hard to understand.
- _____ 17. A If I feel competent I am willing to take
responsibility for making decisions.
B I like to take responsibility for making decisions.
- _____ 18. A I just want to be reasonably happy.
B I want to amount to something in the eyes of the
world.
- _____ 19. A My body is nothing special.
B I like to look at my body.
- _____ 20. A I try not to be a show off.
B I will usually show off if I get the chance.
- _____ 21. A I always know what I am doing.
B Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing.
- _____ 22. A I sometimes depend on people to get things done.
B I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.
- _____ 23. A Sometimes I tell good stories.
B Everybody likes to hear my stories.
- _____ 24. A I expect a great deal from other people.
B I like to do things for other people.
- _____ 25. A I will never be satisfied until I get all that I
deserve.
B I take my satisfactions as they come.
- _____ 26. A Compliments embarrass me.
B I like to be complimented.
- _____ 27. A I have a strong will to power.
B Power for its own sake doesn't interest me.
- _____ 28. A I don't care about new fads and fashions.
B I like to start new fads and fashions.
- _____ 29. A I like to look at myself in the mirror.
B I am not particularly interested in looking at
myself in the mirror.

Scoring Key of 40-Item NPI

1.	A	21.	A
2.	A	22.	B
3.	A	23.	B
4.	B	24.	A
5.	B	25.	A
6.	A	26.	B
7.	B	27.	A
8.	A	28.	B
9.	B	29.	A
10.	B	30.	A
11.	A	31.	A
12.	A	32.	B
13.	A	33.	A
14.	A	34.	A
15.	B	35.	B
16.	A	36.	A
17.	B	37.	A
18.	B	38.	A
19.	B	39.	A
20.	B	40.	B

The above responses are scored as narcissistic. Each narcissistic response is worth one point. The total NPI score is the sum of narcissistic responses.

APPENDIX 5

FACES III: THE CIRCUMPLEX MODEL

FACES III

David H. Olson, Joyce Portner, and Yoav Lavee

1	2	3	4	5
ALMOST NEVER	ONCE IN AWHILE	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALMOST ALWAYS

DESCRIBE YOUR FAMILY NOW:

- _____ 1. Family members ask each other for help.
- _____ 2. In solving problems, the children's suggestions are followed.
- _____ 3. We approve of each other's friends.
- _____ 4. Children have a say in their discipline.
- _____ 5. We like to do things with just our immediate family.
- _____ 6. Different persons act as leaders in our family.
- _____ 7. Family members feel closer to other family members than to people outside the family.
- _____ 8. Our family changes its way of handling tasks.
- _____ 9. Family members like to spend free time with each other.
- _____ 10. Parent(s) and children discuss punishment together.
- _____ 11. Family members feel very close to each other.
- _____ 12. The children make the decisions in our family.
- _____ 13. When our family gets together for activities, everybody is present.
- _____ 14. Rules change in our family.
- _____ 15. We can easily think of things to do together as a family.
- _____ 16. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.
- _____ 17. Family members consult other family members on their decisions.
- _____ 18. It is hard to identify the leader(s) in our family.
- _____ 19. Family togetherness is very important.
- _____ 20. It is hard to tell who does which household chores.



FAMILY SOCIAL SCIENCE, 290 McNeal Hall, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 5510

© D.H. Olson, 1985

TABLE 6: NORMS AND CUTTING POINTS FOR FACES III

	<u>All Stages</u> (Adults) (n = 2453)		<u>Stages 4 & 5</u> (Families with Adolescents) (n = 1315)		<u>Stage 1</u> (Young Couples) (n = 242)	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Cohesion	39.8	5.4	37.1	6.1	41.6	4.7
Adaptability	24.1	4.7	24.3	4.8	26.1	4.2

	<u>Range</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>COHESION</u>						
Disengaged	10-34	16.3	10-31	18.6	10-36	14.9
Separated	35-40	33.8	32-37	30.3	37-42	37.2
Connected	41-45	36.3	38-43	36.4	43-46	34.9
Enmeshed	46-50	13.6	44-50	14.7	47-50	13.0
<u>ADAPTABILITY</u>						
Rigid	10-19	16.3	10-19	15.9	10-21	13.2
Structured	20-24	38.3	20-24	37.3	22-26	38.8
Flexible	25-28	29.4	25-29	32.9	27-30	32.0
Chaotic	29-50	16.0	30-50	13.9	31-50	16.0

APPENDIX 6

CAREER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

(Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991)

The Career Self-Efficacy Scale (Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991)

Please circle Y for those activities which you would be confident of your capability to successfully accomplish were you to receive some training for them.

Please circile N for those activities which you would not be confident of your capability to successfully accomplish were you to receive some training for them.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Assembling machines | Y | N |
| 2. Repairing heavy machines | Y | N |
| 3. Operating electrical/electronic equipment | Y | N |
| 4. Working with metal tools | Y | N |
| 5. Repairing electric/electronic equipment | Y | N |
| 6. Operating heavy machines | Y | N |
| 7. Processing/modifying materials | Y | N |
| 8. Construction activities | Y | N |
| 9. Measuring, testing and inspecting | Y | N |
| 10. Driving a truck or fork-lift | Y | N |
| 11. Detecting something wrong in small animals/
plants | Y | N |
| 12. Interacting with others on health-related
matters | Y | N |
| 13. Observing/recording the growth of plants | Y | N |
| 14. Observing/recording the growth of small animals | Y | N |
| 15. Working with a chemistry set | Y | N |
| 16. Plant growing activities | Y | N |
| 17. Taking responsibility for one's health-related
matters | Y | N |
| 18. Investing health-related matters | Y | N |
| 19. Testing the effect of medicines on small animals | Y | N |
| 20. Extrapolating tendency through analyses of data
of cultural phenomena | Y | N |
| 21. Designing the cover of a book | Y | N |

22.	Designing company pamphlets	Y	N
23.	Making a design using symbols and letters	Y	N
24.	Designing furniture	Y	N
25.	Designing women's garments	Y	N
26.	Decorating an office room	Y	N
27.	Decorating a company journal	Y	N
28.	Selecting pictures for company guest room	Y	N
29.	Making comfortable layout for an office	Y	N
30.	Choosing music suited to the occasion	Y	N
31.	Listening to a person's sorrows	Y	N
32.	Consulting with others about their problems	Y	N
33.	Pacifying a person's anger	Y	N
34.	Reproving a person without hurting him/her	Y	N
35.	Clearly explaining matters to others	Y	N
36.	Handling a person's anger and criticism well	Y	N
37.	Making a person feel relaxed	Y	N
38.	Developing other's abilities	Y	N
39.	Becoming friends with a stranger	Y	N
40.	Writing a letter to make a person feel better	Y	N
41.	Getting others to cooperate for your purposes	Y	N
42.	Planning jobs efficiently	Y	N
43.	Leading a group to attain goals	Y	N
44.	Utilizing a person to attain your goals	Y	N
45.	Managing people to run your own business	Y	N
46.	Developing an organization to attain your goals	Y	N
47.	Assigning the right jobs to people	Y	N
48.	Getting a job done well by a person	Y	N

5

49.	Persuading others with your ideas	Y	N
50.	Bargaining with others to attain your goals	Y	N
51.	Filing documents	Y	N
52.	Writing a document in accordance with a prescribed plan	Y	N
53.	Book-keeping	Y	N
54.	Following a budget according to a prescribed plan	Y	N
55.	Filing materials	Y	N
56.	Proofreading	Y	N
57.	Computing with a calculator	Y	N
58.	Typing documents	Y	N
59.	Using general business machines	Y	N
60.	Writing a concise memorandum	Y	N

APPENDIX 7**LIST OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES AND HOLLAND CODES**

(Matsui & Tsukamoto, 1991)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 1. Accountant (CES) | 16. Lawyer (EAS) |
| 2. Air traffic controller (RIE) | 17. Library assistant (CSA) |
| 3. Airplane pilot (IRC) | 18. Mechanical engineer (RIE) |
| 4. Architectural draftman (RIA) | 19. Office clerk (CIE) |
| 5. Art teacher (ASI) | 20. Pathologist (IAR) |
| 6. Botanist (IRS) | 21. Pharmacist (IES) |
| 7. Computer programmer (IRC) | 22. Real estate appraiser (ECS) |
| 8. Copywriter (AES) | 23. Restaurant manager (ESC) |
| 9. Counsellor (SEA) | 24. Sales manager (ESC) |
| 10. Dental technician (RIA) | 25. School administrator (SEI) |
| 11. Electrician (RIS) | 26. Secretary (CSA) |
| 12. Elementary teacher (SAI) | 27. Social worker (SIA) |
| 13. Fashion designer (AIS) | 28. Speech and hearing clinician (SAI) |
| 14. Foreign trade clerk (CIS) | 29. Translator (ASE) |
| 15. Journalist (ASE) | 30. TV announcer (EAR) |

APPENDIX 8

LIST OF WORTLEY JOBS

LIST OF JOBS

Record# CASE ISCO HOLLAND JOBNAME

228	W0467	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	408	W0826	011.00	IRE	CHEMIST - INSTRUMENTS
229	W0468	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	492	W1001	011.00	IRE	BSC STUDENT (NATURAL SC)
233	W0475	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER - DESIGN	225	W0460	011.10	IRE	CHEMIST PH D RSCH
234	W0476	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	386	W0787	011.10	IRE	CHEMISTRY RESEARCH
235	W0477	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	401	W0813	011.10	IRE	CHEMISTRY RESEARCH
236	W0480	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	405	W0820	011.10	IRE	CHEMISTRY RESEARCH
237	W0481	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	558	G0033	011.10	IRE	ANALYTICAL CHEMIST
301	W0605	022.10	ISR	CONSTRUCTION ENG	809	N0302	011.10	IRE	CHEMIST
553	G0028	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	434	W0876	011.50	IER	PHARMACIST QUAL CONTROL
555	G0030	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	377	W0768	011.90	IRE	INDUSTRIAL CHEMIST/LAB
574	G0049	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	734	N0032	011.90	IRE	INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY
593	G0068	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	840	N0391	012.10	IRE	PHYSICS - INDUST RSCH
612	G0087	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	319	W0663	012.80	IAS	RADIATION MED PHYSICIST
613	G0088	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	379	W0770	012.80	IRC	REACTOR PHYSICIST
690	G0165	022.10	ISR	CONSTRUCTION ENGINEER	421	W0853	012.80	IRE	PHYSICS NUCLEAR RESEARCH
698	G0173	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	215	W0439	013.20	IRE	ENGINEERING CONS/GEOPHYS
702	G0177	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER	620	G0095	013.20	IRE	GEOPHYSICS - ROCK MECHANIC
703	G0178	022.10	ISR	CIVIL/STRUCR ENGINEER	757	N0174	013.20	IRS	GEOPHYSICIST
718	G0193	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER, PROF MANAG	833	N0355	013.20	IRE	HYDROLOGIST
230	W0469	022.20	ESC	CIVIL ENG SITE MANAGER	257	W0515	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
290	W0580	022.20	ESC	CONSTRUCT MGR	376	W0767	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
298	W0602	022.20	ESC	CONSTRUCT PROJECTS MGR	387	W0788	013.30	IER	GEOPHYSICAL COMPUTING
299	W0603	022.20	ESA	BLDG CONSTR PROJ MANAGER	393	W0799	013.30	IER	GEOLOGICAL COMPUTING
300	W0604	022.20	ESA	BUILDING CONSULTANT	431	W0870	013.30	ISE	RADIO ASTRONOMER
523	W1069	022.20	SEC	TECHNCN - CIVIL. SITE AGNT	433	W0875	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
653	G0128	022.20	ESR	BUILDING PROJ MGR	437	W0879	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
231	W0470	022.30	ISR	CIVIL/TRANSPORT ENGINEER	439	W0883	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGY RSCH
240	W0485	023.00	RIE	ELEC ENG - MICROWAVE	608	G0083	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
710	G0185	023.20	RES	ENGINEER, CONTROL SYSTEMS	671	G0146	013.30	SEC	EXPLORATION GEOLOGIST
239	W0483	023.30	RIE	ELECTRIC ENGR POWER RSCH	770	N0203	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
606	G0081	023.30	RCE	ELECTRONIC ENGG DESIGN	874	N0520	013.30	IRE	GEOLOGIST
687	G0162	023.30	RIE	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	621	G0096	013.50	ISE	ASTRONOMER
694	G0169	023.30	RIE	ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	452	W0904	014.20	IRE	TECHNICIAN - CHEM ANALYTIC
238	W0482	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONIC ENGINEER	669	G0144	014.90	IRS	GEOPHYSICAL TECHNICIAN
242	W0492	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONIC SYSTS ENGR	636	G0111	015.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER
244	W0494	023.90	IER	CONTROL ENGR R & D PROCES	140	W0279	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
246	W0496	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONIC ENGR	291	W0587	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
247	W0499	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONIC ENGR	292	W0592	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
258	W0516	023.90	RIE	ELECTR ENG'R DESIGN & MKTG	585	G0060	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
602	G0077	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONIC ENGINEER R & D	592	G0067	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
619	G0094	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS DEVEL	643	G0118	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
649	G0124	023.90	RIE	ELECTRONIC ENGINEER	675	G0150	021.20	IEA	ARCHITECT
668	G0143	023.90	RES	TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENGINEE	296	W0599	021.30	IRE	TOWN PLANNER - MUNICI
696	G0171	023.90	RIE	SYSTEMS ENGINEER	658	G0133	021.30	IRE	TOWN PLANNER
173	W0345	024.00	RIS	MECH ENGINEER	878	N0043	021.30	ESR	TOWN PLANNER
260	W0519	024.00	RIS	MECH ENG ON MINES	227	W0465	022.10	ISR	CIVIL ENGINEER
261	W0521	024.00	RIS	MECH ENG - DESIGN/PRODU					

294	W0597	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR	268	W0531	028.00	EIR	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEER
295	W0598	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURV- CONTRACT	697	G0171	028.00	EIR	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEER
381	W0772	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR	681	G0156	028.10	IER	MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT
533	G0008	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR	783	N0241	029.00	IRE	AGRIC ENGINEERING
543	G0018	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR	898	N0418	029.30	IRE	AGRICULTURAL ENGINEER
594	G0069	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYING	744	N0066	031.20	IER	GEOLOGICAL SURVEYOR
644	G0119	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR	45	W0086	032.00	RCI	DRAUGHTSWOMAN
706	G0181	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR	77	W0154	032.00	RCI	DRAUGHTSWOMAN
471	W0937	034.00	SEC	TELCOM CLERK	731	N0016	033.10	REI	TECHNICIAN - CIVIL ENG
270	W0539	024.00	RIS	MECH ENG STEEL RSCH	293	W0595	033.20	IRE	QUANTITY SURVEYOR
271	W0541	024.00	RIS	MECH ENG STRUC DYNAMICS	232	W0471	034.10	IRE	ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN
272	W0548	024.00	RIS	MECH ENG - PRODUCT ENG	503	W1031	034.30	REI	TECHNICIAN - TELCOM SYSTEM
274	W0553	024.00	RIS	MECH ENG TEST MINING EQ	624	G0099	034.30	RIE	TECHNOLOGIST, PHYSICS
576	G0051	024.00	RIS	DESIGN ENGINEER	84	W0171	034.90	REI	TECHNICIAN T.V
634	G0109	024.00	RIS	DEVELOPMENT ENGINEER	143	W0285	034.90	RIE	COMPUTER MAINT TECHNICIAN
676	G0151	024.00	RIS	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	250	W0502	034.90	RIE	COMPUTER MAINT ENG (TCHNC)
689	G0164	024.00	RIS	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	266	W0529	035.10	RIE	DESIGN TECHNICIAN -MECH
265	W0528	024.10	RIS	MECH ENG	278	W0558	035.10	RIE	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN
544	G0019	024.20	ERI	ENGINEER, MAINTENANCE	472	W0938	035.10	IRC	TECHNICIAN - MECH ENG
591	G0066	024.20	RES	ENGINEER - TRANSPORTATION	865	N0469	035.10	REI	TECHNICIAN - MECHANICAL
699	G0174	024.20	RES	ENGINEER, MECHANICAL	894	N0389	036.10	REI	TECHNICIAN, CHEMICAL RSCH
127	W0252	024.40	ESR	PROMOTIONS/SALES DIR	864	N0467	039.90	REI	TECHNICIAN - HYDROLOGY
259	W0518	024.60	IRS	AERONAUTICAL ENGINEER	51	W0098	041.20	RIE	AIRLINE PILOT
249	W0501	025.00	IRE	ENG'R PROCESS CONTROL MINE	82	W0165	041.20	RIE	AIRLINE PILOT
217	W0441	025.10	IRE	CHEM ENG DESIGN	737	N0042	041.20	RIE	MILITARY PILOT
218	W0443	025.10	IRE	CHEM ENG DESIGN	813	N0309	041.20	RIE	PILOT
220	W0447	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	384	W0780	050.50	IRS	MICROBIOLOGIST
285	W0568	025.10	RIE	PROCESS ENG	459	W0914	051.00	IRS	GENETICIST
564	G0039	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	760	N0179	051.00	IRS	GENETICIST - PLANT BREEDNG
567	G0042	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER RESEARCH	814	N0310	051.00	IRS	GENETICS RESEARCH
582	G0057	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	860	N0444	051.00	IRS	GENETICIST
682	G0157	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL PROCESS ENGINEER	888	N0266	051.00	IRS	PLANT BREEDER
712	G0187	025.10	IER	PROJECT ENG CHEMICAL PLANT	919	N0506	051.00	IRS	GENETICS, PLANT MOLEC.RSCH
722	G0197	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER, PROCESS	69	W0134	051.10	IRE	BIOLOGY - ENVIRONMENTAL
807	N0300	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	413	W0840	051.10	IRE	BIOTECHNOLOGY
869	N0487	025.10	IRE	CHEMICAL ENGINEER	641	G0116	051.10	IRE	MARINE BIOLOGIST
222	W0454	025.90	IRE	CHEM ENG FOOD INDUST	843	N0401	051.10	IRE	BIOLOGIST
223	W0455	025.90	IRE	GAS APPLICATIONS ENGINEER	532	G0007	051.20	IRS	BOTANIST, RESEARCH
226	W0462	026.00	IRE	METALLURG ENGINEER	870	N0497	051.20	IRS	PLANT PATHOLOGIST
263	W0524	026.00	IRE	METALLURGY STUDENT	475	W0946	051.22	IRS	BOTANICAL RESEARCH
279	W0560	026.00	IRS	ENGINEER - METALLURG	784	N0244	051.22	IRS	BOTANY
280	W0561	026.00	IRE	METALLURGIST, PHD	796	N0272	051.22	IRS	BOTANICAL RESEARCH
281	W0562	026.00	IRS	CONSULT ENG METALLURG	412	W0837	051.30	IRE	RSCH IN FISH FARMING
282	W0563	026.00	IRE	METALLURG ENG	445	W0891	051.30	IRE	ZOOLOGICAL RSCH
283	W0564	026.00	IRE	METALLURG - REDUCTION WKS	614	G0089	051.30	IRS	ZOOLOGY
284	W0565	026.00	IRE	EXTRACTN METALLURGIST	663	G0138	051.30	IRE	ZOOLOGIST, RESEARCH MOLECU
520	W1060	026.00	IRE	METALLURGIST - PHYSICAL	557	G0032	052.30	IRS	BIOCHEMISTRY RESEARCH
554	G0029	026.00	IRE	METALLURGIST	834	N0357	052.30	IRS	MOLECULAR BIOLOGY
496	W1010	027.10	REC	QUARRY MGR DRILLG/BLASTNG	918	N0443	052.30	IRS	BIOCHEMIST - RESEARCH
288	W0576	027.20	REC	SHIFT OVERSEER COAL MINING	921	N0505	052.30	IRS	BIOCHEMISTRY
289	W0578	027.30	REI	MINING ENGINEER	378	W0769	052.40	IAS	PHYSIOLOGICAL RSCH -SLEEP
541	G0016	027.30	SEC	MINING ENGINEER	456	W0909	052.40	IRC	ENVIR PHYSIOL RSCH
219	W0444	027.40	RES	PETROCHEMICAL ENGINEER	476	W0948	052.40	IAS	PHYSIOLOGICAL RESEARCH
255	W0511	028.00	EIR	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEER	391	W0797	052.50	IRS	MICROBIOLO RSCH VIROLOG
256	W0512	028.00	EIR	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEER	403	W0816	052.50	IRS	MICROBIOLOGIST -PHD STUD

745	N0090 052.50 IRS	MICROBIOLOGY RESCH			
753	N0165 052.50 IAS	MICROBIOLOGIST			
351	W0716 052.60 IRE	MEDICAL - PATHOLOGIST			
245	W0495 052.90 IRE	BIOMEDICAL ENGINEER			
791	N0261 053.00 IRS	AGRIC - TECHNICAL ADVISER	322	W0667 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - PAEDIATRICS
825	N0334 053.00 IRS	AGRIC EXTENSION OFF -CITRU	323	W0670 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - PHYSICIAN
728	N0001 053.20 IRE	AGRICULTURAL RSCH	328	W0683 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL PAEDIATRIC
729	N0002 053.20 IRS	ANIMAL NUTRITION	330	W0685 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - ANAESTHETIST
798	N0278 053.20 IRS	ANIMAL NUTRITIONIST	338	W0696 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - PAEDIATRIC
876	N0541 053.20 IRS	AGRONOMIST	339	W0698 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - INTERNAL
755	N0169 053.40 IRE	FORESTRY RESEARCH	349	W0714 061.20 IRE	MEDICAL - HAEMATOLOGY
904	N0518 053.50 IRE	SOIL SCIENCE RESEARCH	354	W0721 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - ANAESTHETIST
645	G0120 053.60 RIS	FARMING BUSINESS	409	W0828 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL - SURGERY
926	N0474 053.60 IRS	AGRICULTURAL ADVISER	572	G0047 061.20 IRS	SPECIALIST PHYSICIAN
435	W0877 054.20 RIE	TECHNICIAN - BIOLOGICAL SC	598	G0073 061.20 ISR	OPHTHALMOLOGIST
97	W0196 054.30 IRE	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIST	607	G0082 061.20 IRS	GYNAECOLOGY
506	W1037 054.30 IRE	MEDICAL RSCH TECNICIAN	627	G0102 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL, ANAESTHETIST
527	G0002 060.00 IRS	ANAESTHETIST	688	G0163 061.20 IRS	MEDICAL, ANAESTHETIST
347	W0711 060.05 IRS	MEDICAL	695	G0170 061.20 IRS	SURGEON
15	W0035 061.00 IRS	MEDICAL INTERN	331	W0687 061.30 IRS	MEDICAL - TRANSPL RSCH
63	W0120 061.00 IRS	MEDICAL STUDENT	341	W0700 061.30 IRS	MEDICAL - ENT
358	W0728 061.00 IRS	MEDICAL STUDENT	357	W0724 061.30 IRS	MEDICAL - TRAUMA
382	W0777 061.00 IRS	MEDICAL STUDENT	721	G0196 061.30 IRS	IMMUNOLOGIST RESEARCH
488	W0990 061.00 IRS	MEDICAL STUDENT	342	W0703 061.90 IRS	MEDICAL - RADIOLOGY
716	G0191 061.00 SCR	MEDICAL OFFICER, CITY HEAL	355	W0722 061.90 ISE	MEDICAL - PSYCHIATRY
334	W0690 061.02 IRS	MEDICAL	575	G0050 061.90 ISE	PSYCHIATRIC REGISTRAR
320	W0664 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	327	W0682 0610.5 IRS	MEDICAL - GENERAL
326	W0681 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	348	W0713 0610.5 IRS	MEDICAL
329	W0684 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	206	W0418 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
332	W0688 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	207	W0421 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
333	W0689 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	208	W0422 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
335	W0692 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	210	W0428 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
336	W0694 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	212	W0433 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
337	W0695 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	213	W0435 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
340	W0699 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	214	W0436 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
343	W0704 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	286	W0572 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
344	W0705 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL - FAMILY	406	W0821 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
346	W0708 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL - GP	482	W0977 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
353	W0720 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	586	G0061 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
356	W0723 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL - GENERAL	664	G0139 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
373	W0759 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL	851	N0422 063.10 IRS	DENTISTRY
470	W0936 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL - GENERAL	911	N0500 063.10 IRS	DENTIST
539	G0014 061.05 IRS	GENERAL MEDICAL PRACTICE	209	W0425 063.20 IRS	DENTIST PERIODONTIST
600	G0075 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL G P	474	W0945 065.10 IRS	VETERINARY STUDENT
609	G0084 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	442	W0887 066.10 IRE	VET NURSE
623	G0098 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	765	N0192 066.10 IRE	VETERINARY NURSE
625	G0100 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	392	W0798 067.10 IER	PHARMACIST
635	G0110 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	462	W0917 067.10 IER	PHARMACIST
638	G0113 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	485	W0980 067.10 IER	PHARMACIST
660	G0135 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	925	N0211 069.10 SEI	DIETICIAN
674	G0149 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	359	W0729 071.20 ISE	NURSING SISTER
677	G0152 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL GEN PRACTITIONER	368	W0748 071.20 ISE	NURSE/ MIDWIFE
678	G0153 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	524	W0727 071.20 ISE	NURSING
724	G0199 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL PRACTITIONER	740	N0050 071.20 ISE	NURSING
785	N0245 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL STUDENT	799	N0280 071.20 ISE	NURSING
868	N0480 061.05 IRS	MEDICAL STUDENT	563	G0038 075.20 IRS	OPTOMETRIST
887	N0236 061.05 IRS	MEDICINE	846	N0412 075.20 IRS	OPTOMETRY
324	W0671 061.10 IRS	MEDICAL - SURGERY			

361	W0737	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
362	W0739	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
363	W0740	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
364	W0741	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
365	W0743	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
366	W0745	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
367	W0746	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST - MUSIC TH	
536	G0011	076.20	SIE	PHYSIOTHERAPIST	
370	W0753	076.30	SRE	OCCUPAT THERAPIST	
371	W0755	076.30	SRE	OCCUPAT THERAPIST	
372	W0758	076.30	SRE	OCCUPAT THERAPIST	
420	W0852	076.30	SRE	OCCUPAT THERAPIST SUPERVIS	
552	G0027	076.30	SRE	OCCUPATONAL THERAPIST	
556	G0031	076.30	SRE	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST	
566	G0041	076.30	SRE	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST	
632	G0107	076.30	SRE	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST	
673	G0148	076.30	SRE	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST	
720	G0195	076.30	IAS	OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY LECTR	
19	W0040	079.90	SAI	SPEECH THERAPIST	
94	W0193	079.90	SAI	SPEECH THERAPIST	
95	W0194	079.90	SAI	AUDIOLOGIST	
96	W0195	079.90	SAI	SPEECH THERAPIST	
98	W0197	079.90	SAI	SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY	
538	G0013	079.90	SIE	SPEECH & HEARING THERAPIST	
615	G0090	079.90	SIE	SPEECH & HEARING THERAPY	
662	G0137	079.90	SER	SPEECH THERAPIST	
147	W0292	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALYST	
165	W0328	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALYST MGR	
216	W0440	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALST	
397	W0808	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALYST/ENGINEE	
407	W0825	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALYST	
436	W0878	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALYST	
450	W0902	082.00	IRE	SYSTEMS ANALYST	
725	G0200	082.10	IRE	COMPUTER PROCESS CNTRL DES	
241	W0487	082.30	IRE	RSCH CNTRL ENG - COMPUTERS	
402	W0815	082.30	IRE	COMPUTER SCIENCE RSCH	
467	W0931	082.30	IRE	COMPUTER SYS SOFTWR ENG	
404	W0817	082.50	ISE	ACTUARIAL ASST	
417	W0849	082.50	ISE	ACTUARIAL STUDENT	
665	G0140	082.50	ISE	ACTUARIAL TRAINEE	
49	W0094	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER ANALYST	
114	W0227	083.10	IRE	INFO SYSTEMS ANALYST	
134	W0266	083.10	IRE	INFORMATION SYSTEMS CONSUL	
145	W0289	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER ANALYST -BUSINESS	
179	W0361	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
196	W0395	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER ANALYST	
251	W0503	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
264	W0526	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER ANALYST DESIGNER	
385	W0785	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER TECHNICAL CONSULT	
394	W0800	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
419	W0851	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER SYST ANALYST	
432	W0872	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
453	W0905	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
461	W0916	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER ANALYST	
511	W1044	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRMM & ANALYST	
517	W1055	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER ANALYST	
579	G0054	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER SYS ANAL MGR	
771	N0208	083.10	IRE	COMPUTER BUS SYST ANALYST	
805	N0294	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
829	N0349	083.10	IER	SYSTEMS ANALYST	
884	N0207	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
897	N0410	083.10	IER	ANALYST PROGRAMMER	
125	W0250	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
130	W0262	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
148	W0294	084.20	IER	COMPUTER SUPPORT/FIN	
163	W0326	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
205	W0417	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER CONSULTANT	
269	W0536	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMR -PUBLISG	
287	W0574	084.20	ESI	DATA PROCESS MANAGER	
345	W0706	084.20	IRS	MEDICAL INFORMATICS	
389	W0794	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER CONSULTANT	
395	W0805	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAM DESIGN	
396	W0806	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER SYSTEMS LDR	
410	W0832	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
411	W0835	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER SYSTEMS PROGRAMMR	
418	W0850	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
425	W0862	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGAM MGR	
428	W0866	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
449	W0898	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER TEAM LEADER	
454	W0906	084.20	IER	COMPUTER SUPPORT MGR	
542	G0017	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER/ANALYS	
622	G0097	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
672	G0147	084.20	SCE	COMPUTER COMMUNICATN CNSLT	
741	N0052	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
758	N0175	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
777	N0223	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMING	
806	N0299	084.20	IRE	PROGRAMMER	
862	N0461	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER DATA PROCESSING	
912	N0490	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	
922	N0516	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER SCI. IN ENG. RSCH	
128	W0258	090.20	SCI	ECONOMIST - MICRO/PROJ EVA	
297	W0600	090.20	IRS	AGRIC ECONOMIST	
460	W0915	090.20	SCI	MINING ECONOMICS ANALYS	
499	W1021	090.20	ESA	OIL BUSINESS CONSULTANT	
795	N0271	090.20	SCI	AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIST	
800	N0281	090.20	SCI	AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIST	
859	N0442	090.20	ESR	ECONOMIST - MARKETING DIV	
155	W0307	090.30	ESR	MARKETER/TARIFF RESEARCH	
43	W0082	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT ARTICLED CLERK	
72	W0141	110.10	RCS	ARTICLED CLERK	
83	W0169	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
106	W0209	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT, DIVISIONAL	
116	W0233	110.10	RCS	C A AUDITOR	
117	W0234	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT/AUDITOR	
119	W0237	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT -SELF EMPLOYED	
122	W0245	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
126	W0251	110.10	RCS	ASST ACCOUNTANT	
129	W0260	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
133	W0265	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT -TAX	
135	W0267	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT/CONTROLLER	

139	W0276	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
142	W0284	110.10	RCS	ASSISTANT ACCOUNTANT	
146	W0291	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
159	W0316	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT - TRAVEL AGENCY	
160	W0318	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTING ARTICLED CLERK	
161	W0319	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
162	W0323	110.10	RCS	C A	
166	W0333	110.10	RCS	C A	
168	W0336	110.10	RCS	AUDIT CLERK	
170	W0339	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT/AUDIT	
171	W0341	110.10	RCS	C A	
175	W0348	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT ARTICLED CLERK	
177	W0353	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
178	W0355	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
183	W0367	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
184	W0370	110.10	RCS	ART. CLERK ACCOUNTANCY	
186	W0371	110.10	RCS	CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT	
187	W0381	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT/AUDIT	
198	W0397	110.10	RCS	C A - MANAGEMENT	
199	W0398	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
202	W0405	110.10	RCS	CA	
203	W0409	110.10	RCS	C A PARTNER	
204	W0411	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT/CONTROLLER	
317	W0659	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT - BANK	
325	W0676	110.10	RCS	C A	
374	W0760	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
430	W0869	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
443	W0889	110.10	IRE	RSCH CHEMIST	
463	W0918	110.10	RCS	ARTICLED CLERK	
479	W0967	110.10	RCS	C A AUDIT	
483	W0978	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
484	W0979	110.10	RCS	C A CONSULTANT	
508	W1039	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT & ADMINISTRATIO	
515	W1052	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
548	G0023	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
549	G0024	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
568	G0043	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
570	G0045	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT/MANAGER OF DEPT	
588	G0063	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT	
597	G0072	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT & AUDITOR	
618	G0093	110.10	RCS	CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT	
640	G0115	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT, GROUP	
654	G0129	110.10	RCS	CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT	
693	G0168	110.10	RCS	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTG, BUDGE	
701	G0176	110.10	RCS	CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT	
707	G0182	110.10	RCS	CHARTERED ACCOUNT STUDENT	
709	G0184	110.10	RCS	CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT	
727	G0202	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANT & AUDITOR	
736	N0035	110.10	RCS	C A	
751	N0157	110.10	RCS	C A	
756	N0170	110.10	RCS	C A	
766	N0194	110.10	RCS	C A	
767	N0197	110.10	RCS	C A	
775	N0221	110.10	RCS	C A	
788	N0251	110.10	RCS	C A	
789	N0256	110.10	RCS	C A	
804	N0291	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTANCY	
820	N0324	110.10	RCS	C A	
821	N0328	110.10	RCS	C A	
848	N0417	110.10	RCS	C A	
855	N0432	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTING & FIN MAN	
873	N0513	110.10	RCS	C A	
889	N0273	110.10	RCS	ACCOUNTING	
138	W0272	110.20	RCS	AUDIT MANAGER	
150	W0297	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR	
169	W0337	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR	
444	W0890	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR, ACCOUNTANT	
446	W0892	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR	
481	W0971	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR	
491	W0997	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR/ACCOUNTANT	
534	G0009	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR	
545	G0020	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR	
580	G0055	110.20	RCS	AUDIT MANAGER	
610	G0085	110.20	RCS	AUDITOR, ARTICLED	
692	G0167	110.20	RCS	AUDIT MANAGER	
121	W0244	110.90	CES	COST ACCOUNTING STUDENT	
131	W0263	110.90	RCS	FIN. DIRECTOR -C A	
136	W0269	110.90	RCS	BUDG'RY CONTROL - VARIANCE	
144	W0287	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL MGR/ACCOUNTANT	
154	W0306	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL ACCOUNTANT	
158	W0314	110.90	RCS	FINANC/COST ACCOUNTANT	
185	W0370	110.90	IER	TAX CONSULTANT	
190	W0385	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL MGR BANK	
201	W0403	110.90	REC	TAX OFFICER -AUDITOR	
321	W0666	110.90	IER	TAX CONSULTANT	
457	W0911	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL CONTROLLER C A	
528	G0003	110.90	ERS	MERCHANT BANKING	
530	G0005	110.90	EIR	FINANCIAL CONSULTANT	
531	G0006	110.90	EIR	FINANCIAL PLANNER	
560	G0035	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL MANAGER	
571	G0046	110.90	ESC	COST AND BUDGET MANAGER	
581	G0056	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL MANAGER	
631	G0106	110.90	ESR	FINANCE & ADMIN MANAGER	
657	G0132	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL ACCOUNTG MGR	
666	G0141	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL ACCOUNTANT	
680	G0155	110.90	ESR	FINA MGMT - GROUP REPORTG	
686	G0161	110.90	IEA	INVESTMENT CONSULTANT	
711	G0186	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL ACCTS MANAGER	
780	N0235	110.90	RCS	FINANCIAL DIRECTOR - TECH	
828	N0348	110.90	RCS	BUSINESS MGMT ACCOUNTANT	
189	W0384	121.00	ESI	TAX LAWYER/ACCOUNTANT	
732	N0019	121.00	CRS	DEEDS CONTROLLER	
7	W0014	121.10	ESA	LAWYER	
8	W0015	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
9	W0016	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
11	W0026	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
16	W0036	121.10	ESA	LAWYER INSURANCE	

18	W0038	121.10	ESA	LAWYER	
33	W0061	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
39	W0072	121.10	ESA	LAWYER	
55	W0106	121.10	ESA	ADVOCATE	
58	W0110	121.10	ESA	ADVOCATE	
60	W0115	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
70	W0136	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
80	W0158	121.10	SEC	LLB STUDENT	
164	W0327	121.10	ESA	LAWYER	
182	W0366	121.10	ESA	LEGAL ART. CLERK	
191	W0386	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
193	W0389	121.10	ESA	LEGAL ADVISER BANK	
194	W0390	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
195	W0391	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
316	W0650	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
318	W0660	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
398	W0809	121.10	ESA	ADVOCATE	
440	W0884	121.10	ESA	LAW STUDENT	
477	W0956	121.10	ESA	LEGAL ADVISER	
507	W1038	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
526	G0001	121.10	ESA	STATE ATTORNEY	
559	G0034	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY, ARTICLED	
595	G0070	121.10	ESA	ADVOCATE	
611	G0086	121.10	ESA	LEGAL DRAUGHTSMN, INSURANC	
628	G0103	121.10	ESA	ARTICLED CLERK, ATTORNEY	
633	G0108	121.10	ESA	ASST LEGAL ADVISER	
646	G0121	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
705	G0180	121.10	ESA	LEGAL ADVISER	
735	N0033	121.10	ESA	LAWYER	
748	N0112	121.10	ESA	LAWYER	
768	N0198	121.10	ESA	LAW	
781	N0237	121.10	ESA	LAW - BUSINESS LEG ADVISER	
811	N0304	121.10	ESA	LAW - COMPANY	
815	N0311	121.10	ESA	LAW	
817	N0314	121.10	ESA	LAW	
832	N0353	121.10	ESA	LAW	
847	N0413	121.10	ESA	ATTORNEY	
850	N0421	121.10	ESA	LAW	
875	N0530	121.10	ESA	LAW	
933	N0059	121.10	ESA	LAW	
28	W0052	131.00	IAS	LECTURER	
71	W0137	131.00	SEC	MGR MGMT TRAINING & DEVEL	
708	G0183	131.00	IAS	LECTURER IN GERMAN	
715	G0190	131.00	IAS	LECTURER, ENGLISH	
902	N0495	131.00	IER	COMPUTER LIAISON, TRAINING	
429	W0867	131.20	IAS	PHYSICS LECTURER	
267	W0530	131.25	IAS	MECH ENG TECHNICON LECTURR	
871	N0502	131.25	RIE	LECTURER IN ELECTRONIC ENG	
426	W0863	131.30	IAS	BOTANY LECTURER	
639	G0114	131.45	IAS	BUSINESS LECTURER	
415	W0844	131.65	IAS	PSYCHO LECTURER	
810	N0303	131.65	IRE	LECTURER IN GEOGRAPHY	
5	W0011	131.70	IAS	ENGLISH LECTURER	
25	W0048	131.90	IRA	COMPUTER MANUAL WRITER	
2	W0002	132.00	SEC	TRAINING OFF IN BUSINESS	
12	W0029	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
34	W0062	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
40	W0073	132.00	SEC	TEACHER - ENGLISH	
44	W0084	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
54	W0105	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
57	W0109	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
65	W0125	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
87	W0175	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
100	W0200	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
107	W0210	132.00	SEC	TEACHER - GEOGRAPHY	
109	W0213	132.00	SEC	TRAINING STAFF IN ADMIN	
113	W0222	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
137	W0271	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
303	W0612	132.00	SEC	TRAINING OFFICER	
312	W0636	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
314	W0640	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
315	W0644	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
388	W0792	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
399	W0810	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
441	W0885	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
497	W1017	132.00	SEC	TEACHER - GUIDANCE	
546	G0021	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
547	G0022	132.00	SEC	TRAINING MANAGER	
590	G0065	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
642	G0117	132.00	SEI	TEACHER-COUNSELLOR	
714	G0189	132.00	SCE	EDUCATION IN COMPUTERS	
763	N0187	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
769	N0200	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
776	N0222	132.00	SEC	TEACHER - HIGH SCHOOL	
779	N0234	132.00	SEC	HUMAN RESOURC. TRAINING	
782	N0239	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
790	N0260	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
812	N0306	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
816	N0312	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
818	N0321	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
826	N0338	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
835	N0370	132.00	AES	PERSONNEL - TRAINING	
836	N0371	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
838	N0381	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
858	N0440	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
861	N0453	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
927	N0527	132.00	SEC	TEACHING	
931	N0326	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
938	N0274	132.00	SEC	TEACHER	
562	G0037	132.05	SEC	TEACHER, ENGLISH	
659	G0134	132.05	SEC	TEACHER OF ENGLISH	
670	G0145	132.05	SEC	TEACHER, ENGLISH & FRENCH	
684	G0159	132.05	SEC	TEACHER, ENGLISH & GUIDANC	
719	G0194	132.05	SEC	TEACHER, ENGLISH & ECON	
305	W0621	132.15	SEC	TEACHER - ZULU	
309	W0628	132.15	SEC	SCHOOL TEACHER - AFRIKAANS	
521	W1063	132.15	ESR	SALES MGR PHARMACEUTICAL	
529	G0004	132.15	SEC	LANGUAGE TEACHING	

738	N0044	132.15	SEC	TEACHER - ENGLISH	
759	N0176	132.15	SEC	TEACHER - H.S. ENGLISH	
774	N0218	132.15	SEC	TEACHER - ENGLISH	
802	N0283	132.15	SEC	TEACHING - ENGLISH FOREIGN	
20	W0042	132.20	SEC	INDUSTRIAL TRAINING	
375	W0761	132.20	AES	BALLET TEACHER	
383	W0778	132.20	SEC	TEACHER -MATHS	
458	W0913	132.20	SEC	TEACHER - MATHS	
578	G0053	132.20	SEC	TEACHER, MATHEMATICS	
584	G0059	132.20	SEC	TEACHER, MATHS & SCIENCE	
841	N0397	132.20	SEC	TEACHER - MATHS	
424	W0861	132.30	SEC	TEACHER - SCIENCE	
466	W0930	132.30	SEC	TEACHER - SCIENCE	
473	W0939	132.30	SEC	TEACHER - PH SCI	
577	G0052	132.30	SEC	TEACHER, BIOLOGY	
616	G0091	132.30	SER	TEACHER, BIOLOGY	
626	G0101	132.30	SEC	TEACHER, GEOGRAPHY	
842	N0398	132.30	SER	TEACHER - BIOLOGY	
74	W0147	132.40	SEC	TEACHER - HISTORY & FRENCH	
422	W0859	132.40	SEC	TEACHER - HIGH SCHOOL ENGL	
468	W0932	132.40	SEC	TEACHER - HIGH SCH HIST EN	
808	N0301	132.40	SEC	TEACHER - HISTORY	
302	W0608	132.50	SEC	TEACHER - MATHS/SCIENCE	
540	G0015	132.50	SER	TEACHER - MATHEMATICS	
583	G0058	132.50	ASE	ART TEACHER	
655	G0130	132.50	AES	TEACHER, HoD, ART	
661	G0136	132.50	AES	TEACHER OF ART	
819	N0322	132.50	ASE	TEACHING - ART, HIGH SCHOO	
537	G0012	132.60	SEC	TEACHER OF ACCOUNTING	
310	W0631	132.75	SEC	TEACHER - HOME ECON/BIOLOG	
651	G0126	132.90	SEC	TEACHER, HoD	
700	G0175	132.90	SEI	TEACHER, REMEDIAL	
857	N0438	132.90	SEC	TEACHING - HIGH SCHOOL	
124	W0248	133.00	SEC	PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHER	
13	W0030	133.30	SEC	TEACHER - PRIMARY SCHOOL	
156	W0309	133.30	SEC	TEACHER - PRIMARY PHYS ED	
306	W0624	133.30	SEC	TEACHER - PRIMARY	
313	W0638	133.30	SEC	TEACHER - PRIMARY	
510	W1042	133.30	SEC	TEACHER - PRIMARY	
37	W0066	134.20	SEC	CRECHE TEACHER	
369	W0751	134.20	SEC	TEACHER - PRE-PRIMARY	
573	G0048	134.20	SEC	NURSERY SCHOOL TEACHER	
650	G0125	135.30	SEC	TEACHER OF DEAF	
308	W0626	135.90	SEC	REMED ED TEACHER	
447	W0893	139.20	IRS	EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH	
448	W0896	139.20	IRS	COMPUTER-BASED EDUC RSCH	
465	W0925	141.20	SAE	MINISTER OF RELIGION	
773	N0216	141.20	SAE	RELIGIOUS STUDIES STUDENT	
900	N0431	141.20	SAE	MINISTER OF RELIGION	
901	N0485	141.20	SAE	MISSIONARY	
913	N0528	141.20	SAE	MINISTER OF RELIGION	
930	N0463	141.20	SAE	MINISTER OF RELIGION	
27	W0050	141.30	SAE	MISSIONARY	
275	W0554	149.90	SAE	ISLAMIC STUDIES TEACHER	
32	W0059	159.00	CSI	PUBLISHING ASSISTANT	
746	N0099	159.00	EAS	PRO FOR INDABA	
797	N0277	159.00	CSI	PUBLISHING	
803	N0290	159.00	EAS	PRO WINE FARM	
929	N0154	159.00	EAS	PUBLIC RELAT - 'DEVELOPMEN	
78	W0156	159.45	AES	EDITOR -EDUCAT'NL MATERIAL	
599	G0074	159.55	EAS	PUBLIC RELATIONS ASST	
605	G0080	159.55	EAS	PUBLIC RELAT / COMMUNICAT	
88	W0180	161.00	AER	SCULPTOR	
89	W0181	161.30	AES	BA FINE ARTS STUDENT	
647	G0122	161.30	AES	ART TEACHG CENTRE SUPERVIS	
934	N0161	161.30	AES	ARTIST	
304	W0620	162.30	AEC	KITCHEN DESIGN CONSULTANT	
685	G0160	162.30	RCS	INTERIOR DECORATOR	
733	N0020	162.30	AES	INTERIOR DESIGN	
852	N0423	162.30	AES	INTERIOR DESIGN	
110	W0215	162.40	ASR	DRESS DESIGNER	
360	W0730	162.40	AEI	FASHION PATTERN DESIGN	
518	W1056	163.30	ESA	COMMERCIAL PHOTOGRAPHER	
596	G0071	163.60	AES	FILM CAMERAMAN	
102	W0206	171.40	AER	CONCERT PIANIST	
103	W0207	173.20	AES	ACTOR/DIRECTOR	
104	W0208	173.40	AES	FILM DIRECTOR/ACTOR/SCRIPT	
3	W0005	174.30	SEC	FILM PRODUCER	
480	W0968	174.30	AES	FILM EDITOR	
38	W0067	179.20	AES	RADIO ANNOUNCER	
652	G0127	179.20	AES	TV PROGRAMME ORGANIZER	
118	W0235	180.50	ESR	MANAGER - MASSAGE PARLOUR	
311	W0634	180.50	ESR	GYM MANAGERESS	
493	W1003	180.50	ESR	GYM OWNER	
31	W0057	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
66	W0126	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN, MEDICAL	
93	W0189	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN, CHILDRENS	
551	G0026	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
604	G0079	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
717	G0192	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN, CHIEF	
792	N0262	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
801	N0282	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
849	N0419	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
863	N0462	191.00	SEC	LIBRARIAN	
90	W0183	191.40	AES	ART GALLERY CURATOR	
14	W0034	192.30	SIE	PSYCHOLOGIST CLINICAL	
36	W0065	192.30	SEI	VOCATIONAL COUNSELLOR	
62	W0119	192.30	SIE	PSYCHOLOGIST CLINICAL	
764	N0189	192.30	SIE	PSYCHOLOGIST - CLINICAL	
824	N0333	192.30	SEI	WORK STUDY - INDUST PSYCHO	
854	N0427	192.30	SIE	PSYCHOLOGIST - CLINICAL	
892	N0377	192.30	SIE	EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY	
932	N0377	192.30	SIE	EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST	
637	G0112	193.00	IAS	SOCIAL WORK LECTURER	
21	W0044	193.30	SEA	COMMUN. SERV. AT RECREAT C	
99	W0199	193.30	SEC	SOCIAL WORKER	
500	W1028	193.90	SEA	CHILD CARE WORKER	
26	W0049	194.20	AES	REMUNERATION MANAGER	

48	W0091	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MANAGER			
50	W0096	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION			
52	W0099	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL OFFICER -REMUNER	123	W0247	219.50 CRS BANK SUPERVISOR
53	W0103	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL RELATIONS	153	W0305	219.50 RCS BANK ACCOUNTANT
67	W0127	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MANAGER	501	W1029	219.50 RCS BLDG SOCY SNR DEP MGR
86	W0174	194.20	AES	INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	743	N0063	219.60 CER EXPORT CONTROLLER - MOVERS
108	W0211	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL CONSULT -ENG'G	61	W0116	219.80 AES MANPOWER MANAGER
188	W0382	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL OFF/I.R.	41	W0076	300.00 CSE ADMINISTRATION OFFICER
414	W0843	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MGR	853	N0426	300.00 ESR ADMIN IN RETAIL MGMNT
423	W0860	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL OFFICER	495	W1007	300.10 ESC COMPANY SECY MEDICAL
451	W0903	194.20	AES	DIV PERSONNEL MGR	79	W0157	321.00 CSE SECRETARY TO MGR
569	G0044	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL PLACEMENT	105	W0209	321.00 CSE SECRETARY/PERS.ASST
589	G0064	194.20	CSE	PERSONNEL AGENCY ADMINISTR	489	W0993	321.00 CSE SECRETARY
630	G0105	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL SELECTION	867	N0478	321.20 CSE SECRETARIAL
656	G0131	194.20	IER	INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS RSCH	752	N0160	331.00 CSR ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN
691	G0166	194.20	EAS	EMPLOYMENT AGENCY MGRESS	22	W0045	331.10 CRE BOOKKEEPER
747	N0104	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	35	W0063	331.10 CRE BOOKKEEPER
786	N0246	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	167	W0334	331.10 CRE BOOKKEEPER
787	N0249	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL CONSULTANT	514	W1051	331.10 CRE BOOKKEEPER
837	N0378	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	151	W0300	331.50 EIR FOREIGN EXCHANGE DEALER
915	N0159	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL - HUMAN RESOURCE	192	W0387	331.50 EIR FOREIGN EXCHANGE DEALER
917	N0214	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL MGMT/ I.R.	519	W1059	331.50 ESR TREASURY ACCOUNTANT
924	N0494	194.20	AES	PERSONNEL OFFICER, SNR	742	N0055	331.70 SEC TELECOM ASST (TEMP)
75	W0152	195.30	ISC	TRANSLATOR & EDITOR	112	W0219	339.40 CSE BANK CLERK
535	G0010	195.30	ISC	TRANSLATOR	390	W0796	339.40 CSE BANK&COMPUTER OPERATOR
73	W0144	199.40	ESA	ADVERTISING ASSISTANT	882	N0156	339.40 CSE BANKING
713	G0188	199.40	ESA	ADVERTISING ACCTS EXEC	276	W0555	342.20 SER COMPUTER OP/SUPERVISER
893	N0383	202.00	AES	DIPLOMAT	56	W0107	391.20 SEC SHIPPING COORDINATOR
603	G0078	202.10	AES	DIPLOMAT	513	W1047	393.10 CSE CLERK, TELEPHONE ETC
601	G0076	211.10	ESR	SUPPLY COORD PETROL, INTNT	550	G0025	393.10 CSE CLERK
262	W0522	212.00	RES	MGR MAINTENANCE PLANT RPRS	872	N0511	393.40 CSE LEGAL SECRETARY
68	W0130	212.10	EIR	CONTRACTS ADMIN, ENGINEERG	928	N0356	393.40 CSE CONVEYANCING SECRETARY
200	W0401	212.10	ESC	MD OF PAINT FACTORY	46	W0088	399.40 CSI PROOFREADER
254	W0510	212.10	IER	PROJECT ENGINEER/ SUBMARIN	157	W0312	400.20 ESR PHARMAC. MARKETING
400	W0812	212.10	ESR	PRODUCTION MGMT IN BLDG	197	W0396	400.20 ESA GEN MANAGEMENT TRADING CO
494	W1006	212.10	RIS	MECH ENG PRODUCTION MG	243	W0493	400.20 ESA WHOLESALE TRADE, SELF-EMP
502	W1030	212.10	ESR	MD MFG COMPANY	509	W1040	400.20 ESR SALES DIR - PUBLISHING
455	W0908	212.12	ESR	PRODUCTION MANAGER	224	W0459	400.30 ERS SUPERMARKET MANAGER
587	G0062	212.12	ESR	PRODUCTION MANAGER	352	W0719	400.30 ERS STORE MANAGER, RETAIL
629	G0104	212.12	ESR	PRODUCTION MGR, CHEMICAL P	778	N0232	400.30 ESR MARKETING SALES MGR AUTO
181	W0365	219.00	ESA	MONEY MARKET DEALER	881	N0139	400.30 ESR SALES MANAGEMENT
277	W0557	219.00	ESA	MGR OF BURSARY SCHEME	149	W0296	410.20 ESC IMPORT/EXPORT BUSINESS
478	W0958	219.00	ESC	B COMM STUDENT	469	W0934	410.20 ESI MD COMPUTER IMPORTING
772	N0209	219.00	ESA	MERCH BANKG - FUTURES DLR	152	W0304	410.30 ESC CLOTHING SHOP OWNER
877	N0026	219.00	IRS	ADMIN. MGR FOR STOCKBROKER	522	W1067	410.30 RSE DIAMOND DEALER
252	W0507	219.20	IER	PLANNING/DEVELOP ENG	561	G0036	410.30 ESR PACKING BUSINESS, OWN
253	W0509	219.20	RIE	PLANT ENG/ DEVELOP MGR	115	W0229	421.30 ESR MOTOR SPARES MANAGER
24	W0047	219.30	ESA	BANK MGR MARKTNG FINAN PRO	6	W0013	422.00 EAS BUYER - CLOTHING/FASHION
59	W0112	219.40	ESA	TRADE SHOW ORGANISER	830	N0351	431.00 ESR MARKETING IND CHEMISTRY
176	W0351	219.40	ESR	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER	47	W0089	431.20 EIS COMPUTER ANAL. AND SALES
350	W0715	219.40	SER	EX MEDICAL NOW MBA STUDENT	211	W0429	431.20 EIS COMPUTER CO MGR (SALES?)
505	W1034	219.40	ESC	UNIV ADMINISTRATION	221	W0452	431.20 ESR SALESMAN - COMPUTERS
704	G0179	219.40	ESC	COMPANY SECRETARY	490	W0996	431.20 ESR ENGINEERING SALES
739	N0047	219.40	ESC	GENERAL COMMERCE	750	N0153	431.20 ESA AGRICULTURAL SALESMAN
839	N0385	219.40	ESC	GENERAL BUSINESS	845	N0404	431.20 ESA AGRICULTURAL SALESMAN

907	N0205	431.20	ESA	SALES AGRONOMIST	
909	N0292	431.20	ESA	SPORTS MARKETING	
81	W0160	432.00	ESR	MARKETING - CONSUMR GDS	
416	W0848	432.00	ESR	MARKETING MBA	
486	W0982	432.00	ESR	MARKETING ASSISTANT	
487	W0983	432.00	ESR	MARKETING BANKING	
762	N0182	432.00	ESR	MARKETING	
823	N0332	432.00	ESA	SALES	
856	N0433	432.00	ESR	MARKETING CONSUMER GOODS	
886	N0230	432.00	ESR	MARKETING	
923	N0492	441.00	ESR	MARKETING INSURANCE WHLES	
1	W0000	441.20	ESR	INSURANCE BROKER	
10	W0024	441.20	ESR	INSURANCE BROKER	
17	W0037	441.20	ESA	INSURANCE SALESMAN	
101	W0205	441.20	ERS	INSURANCE CONSULTANT	
141	W0283	441.20	ESR	INSURANCE BROKER	
248	W0500	441.20	ESA	LIFE INSUR CONSULTANT/SALE	
648	G0123	441.20	ESA	INSURANCE BROKER	
679	G0154	441.30	ESI	ESTATE AGENT, COMMERCIAL	
683	G0158	441.40	ESR	GILTS DEALER - STOCK EXCH	
794	N0267	441.40	ERS	STOCKBROKER	
23	W0046	442.00	ESR	MARKETING CONSULTANT	
172	W0342	442.00	ESR	MARKETING MGR	
726	G0201	442.00	ESR	MARKETING MANAGER	
761	N0180	442.00	ESR	MARKTG & ADVERTSG MGMT	
890	N0323	442.00	ESR	MARKETING MANAGEMENT	
64	W0121	451.30	EAS	BOOK SALES	
111	W0216	451.30	ESA	VEHICLE BROKER	
120	W0242	451.30	ESR	RETAIL STORE MANAGER	
132	W0264	451.30	ESR	RETAIL SHOP MANAGER	
174	W0347	451.30	ESI	PHOTO STORE MANAGER	
617	G0092	500.20	SEC	WARDEN, UNIV RESIDENCE	
920	N0053	510.10	ESR	CATERER, SELF EMPLOYED	
76	W0153	510.30	ESR	RESTAURATEUR	
91	W0185	510.30	ESR	RESTAURATEUR	
899	N0424	519.90	ERS	PROFESSIONAL HUNTER	
4	W0006	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE	
30	W0055	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE	
307	W0625	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE	
438	W0882	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE	
498	W1020	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE	
525	W0022	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE - OTHER UNCERTA	
906	N0538	520.00	SER	HOUSEWIFE	
827	N0345	531.30	ESR	CHEF	
831	N0352	532.10	CES	WAITRESSING (TEMP)	
92	W0187	540.70	RIE	WARDROBE MISTRESS	
914	N0491	570.40	AER	BEAUTY CONSULTANT	
85	W0173	589.90	ESI	LIFE GUARD	
29	W0053	591.20	ESR	COURIER SUPERVISOR	
891	N0358	591.90	ERS	PROFESSIONAL HUNTER	
380	W0771	599.70	ESR	CABIN ATTENDANT SAA	
504	W1032	599.70	ESR	CABIN ATTENDANT SAA	
667	G0142	599.70	ESR	AIR HOSTESS	
180	W0361	600.20	RIS	FARM MGR - DAIRY	
273	W0549	600.20	RIS	FARM MANAGER	
754	N0166	600.20	ESC	MGR POULTRY PROCESSING	
885	N0215	600.20	RIS	FARM MANAGER	
936	N0420	600.20	RIS	FARM MANAGER, GEN FARMING	
730	N0017	611.10	IRS	AGRICULTURE	
793	N0264	611.10	RIS	FARMER	
844	N0403	611.10	RIS	FARMER	
879	N0087	611.10	RIS	FARMER	
896	N0408	611.10	RIS	FARMER	
908	N0542	611.10	RIS	FARMER	
910	N0481	611.10	RIS	FARMER	
935	N0181	611.10	RIS	FARMER, INTENSIVE AGRIC	
916	N0100	612.60	RIS	POULTRY FARMER	
822	N0330	612.70	IRS	HORTICULTURALIST	
880	N0106	612.70	IRS	HORTICULTURE/LANSCP GARDNG	
883	N0178	612.70	IRS	HORTICULTURE	
937	N0248	612.90	RIS	FARMER, TOBACCO	
42	W0077	621.05	RES	AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT	
464	W0920	649.90	RIE	NATURE CONS I.C. NATURE RE	
512	W1045	649.90	RIE	NATURE CONSERVATN STUDN	
749	N0148	649.90	RIE	GAME RANGER	
903	N0496	649.90	RIE	NATURE CONSERVANCY	
516	W1053	954.30	RCE	FILM SET BUILDER	
427	W0865	084.20	IRE	COMPUTER CONSULTANT	
895	N0402	XXX	XXX	UNDECIDED	
905	N0526	XXX	XXX	UNDECIDED	
866	N0470	XXX.00	XXX	UNDECIDED	

APPENDIX 9

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for taking the time to complete the following questionnaire and assisting me in my research. Please read all instructions carefully before answering the questions from each section. Your honest, frank response will be helpful in interpreting the results. Because this is a study of a particular group of students, your anonymity will be preserved. Should you desire any feedback from the results of the study, please do not hesitate to contact me.

NICOLA LABUSCHAGNE

Master's Student (Clinical Psychology)
University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

SECTION 1PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING :

(For questions 2, 3 and 4 circle the appropriate answer)

1. AGE: -----
2. GENDER: M F
3. RACIAL IDENTITY: BLACK WHITE ASIAN COLOURED
4. DO YOU INTEND PRACTISING PSYCHOTHERAPY ONCE YOU ARE REGISTERED?

 Y N

SECTION 2

Please circle Y for those activities which you would be confident of your capability to successfully accomplish were you to receive some training for them.

Please circile N for those activities which you would not be confident of your capability to successfully accomplish were you to receive some training for them.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Assembling machines | Y | N |
| 2. Repairing heavy machines | Y | N |
| 3. Operating electrical/electronic equipment | Y | N |
| 4. Working with metal tools | Y | N |
| 5. Repairing electric/electronic equipment | Y | N |
| 6. Operating heavy machines | Y | N |
| 7. Processing/modifying materials | Y | N |
| 8. Construction activities | Y | N |
| 9. Measuring, testing and inspecting | Y | N |
| 10. Driving a truck or fork-lift | Y | N |
| 11. Detecting something wrong in small animals/
plants | Y | N |
| 12. Interacting with others on health-related
matters | Y | N |
| 13. Observing/recording the growth of plants | Y | N |
| 14. Observing/recording the growth of small animals | Y | N |
| 15. Working with a chemistry set | Y | N |
| 16. Plant growing activities | Y | N |
| 17. Taking responsibility for one's health-related
matters | Y | N |
| 18. Investing health-related matters | Y | N |
| 19. Testing the effect of medicines on small animals | Y | N |
| 20. Extrapolating tendency through analyses of data
of cultural phenomena | Y | N |
| 21. Designing the cover of a book | Y | N |

22.	Designing company pamphlets	Y	N
23.	Making a design using symbols and letters	Y	N
24.	Designing furniture	Y	N
25.	Designing women's garments	Y	N
26.	Decorating an office room	Y	N
27.	Decorating a company journal	Y	N
28.	Selecting pictures for company guest room	Y	N
29.	Making comfortable layout for an office	Y	N
30.	Choosing music suited to the occasion	Y	N
31.	Listening to a person's sorrows	Y	N
32.	Consulting with others about their problems	Y	N
33.	Pacifying a person's anger	Y	N
34.	Reproving a person without hurting him/her	Y	N
35.	Clearly explaining matters to others	Y	N
36.	Handling a person's anger and criticism well	Y	N
37.	Making a person feel relaxed	Y	N
38.	Developing other's abilities	Y	N
39.	Becoming friends with a stranger	Y	N
40.	Writing a letter to make a person feel better	Y	N
41.	Getting others to cooperate for your purposes	Y	N
42.	Planning jobs efficiently	Y	N
43.	Leading a group to attain goals	Y	N
44.	Utilizing a person to attain your goals	Y	N
45.	Managing people to run your own business	Y	N
46.	Developing an organization to attain your goals	Y	N
47.	Assigning the right jobs to people	Y	N
48.	Getting a job done well by a person	Y	N

5

49.	Persuading others with your ideas	Y	N
50.	Bargaining with others to attain your goals	Y	N
51.	Filing documents	Y	N
52.	Writing a document in accordance with a prescribed plan	Y	N
53.	Book-keeping	Y	N
54.	Following a budget according to a prescribed plan	Y	N
55.	Filing materials	Y	N
56.	Proofreading	Y	N
57.	Computing with a calculator	Y	N
58.	Typing documents	Y	N
59.	Using general business machines	Y	N
60.	Writing a concise memorandum	Y	N

SECTION 3

Describe the family you grew up in using the following scale :

- 1 - Almost never
 - 2 - Once in a while
 - 3 - Sometimes
 - 4 - Frequently
 - 5 - Almost always
-
- 1. Family members asked each other for help
 - 2. In solving problems, the children's suggestions were followed
 - 3. We approved of each other's friends
 - 4. Children had a say in their discipline
 - 5. We liked to do things with just our immediate family
 - 6. Different persons acted as leaders in our family
 - 7. Family members felt closer to other family members than to outside the family
 - 8. Our family changed its way of handling tasks
 - 9. Family members liked to spend free time with each other
 - 10. Parent(s) and children discussed punishment together
 - 11. Family members felt very close to each other
 - 12. The children made the decisions in our family
 - 13. When our family got together for activities, everybody was present
 - 14. Rules changed in our family
 - 15. We could easily think of things to do together as a family
 - 16. We shifted household responsibilities from person to person

- 17. Family members consulted other family members on their decisions
- 18. It was hard to identify the leader(s) in our family
- 19. Family togetherness was very important
- 20. It was hard to tell who did which household chores

SECTION 4

In each of the following pairs of attitudes, choose the one that your MOST AGREE with. Mark your answer by writing EITHER A or B in the space provided. Only mark one answer for each attitude pair and please do not skip any items.

- 1. A I have a natural talent for influencing people
 B I am not good at influencing people
- 2. A Modesty doesn't become me
 B I am essentially a modest person
- 3. A I would do almost anything on a dare
 B I tend to be a fairly cautious person
- 4. A When people compliment me I sometimes get
 embarrassed
 B I know that I am good because everybody keeps
 telling me so
- 5. A The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell
 out of me
 B If I ruled the world it would be a better place
- 6. A I can usually talk my way out of anything
 B I try to accept the consequences of my behaviour
- 7. A I prefer to blend in with the crowd
 B I like to be the centre of attention
- 8. A I will be a success
 B I am not too concerned about success
- 9. A I am no better or no worse than most people
 B I think I am a special person
- 10. A I am not sure if I would make a good leader
 B I see myself as a good leader
- 11. A I am assertive
 B I wish I were more assertive
- 12. A I like having authority over other people
 B I don't mind following orders
- 13. A I find it easy to manipulate people
 B I don't like it when I find myself manipulating
 people
- 14. A I insist upon getting the respect that is due me
 B I usually get the respect that I deserve

- 15. A I don't particularly like to show off my body
B I like to show off my body
- 16. A I can read people like a book
B People are sometimes hard to understand
- 17. A If I feel competent I am willing to take
responsibility for making decisions
B I like to take responsibility for making decisions
- 18. A I just want to be reasonably happy
B I want to amount to something in the eyes of the
world
- 19. A My body is nothing special
B I like to look at my body
- 20. A I try not to be a show off
B I will usually show off if I get the chance
- 21. A I always know what I am doing
B Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing
- 22. A I sometimes depend on people to get things done
B I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done
- 23. A Sometimes I tell good stories
B Everybody likes to hear my stories
- 24. A I expect a great deal from other people
B I like to do things for other people
- 25. A I will never be satisfied until I get all that I
deserve
B I take my satisfactions as they come
- 26. A Compliments embarrass me
B I like to be complimented
- 27. A I have a strong will to power
B Power for its own sake doesn't interest me
- 28. A I don't care about new fads and fashions
B I like to start new fads and fashions
- 29. A I like to look at myself in the mirror
B I am not particularly interested in looking at
myself in the mirror
- 30. A I really like to be the centre of attention
B It makes me uncomfortable to be the centre of
attention

- 31. A I can live my life in anyway I want to
B People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want
- 32. A Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me
B People always seem to recognize my authority
- 33. A I would prefer to be a leader
B It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not
- 34. A I am going to be a great person
B I hope I am going to be successful
- 35. A People can sometimes believe what I tell them
B I can make anybody believe anything I want them to
- 36. A I am a born leader
B Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop
- 37. A I wish someone would someday write my biography
B I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason
- 38. A I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public
B I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public
- 39. A I am more capable than other people
B There is a lot that I can learn from other people
- 40. A I am much like everybody else
B I am an extraordinary person

APPENDIX 10

HOLLAND OCCUPATIONAL CODES FOR RESEARCH SAMPLE

Occupational Orientation	Group 1 (Means)	Group 2 (Means)	Group 3 (Means)
Realistic	5.23	1.16	1.15
Investigative	2.64	2.56	4.95
Artistic	3.90	4.40	6.00
Social	6.23	8.36	9.30
Enterprising	8.20	8.52	7.35
Conventional	3.40	3.80	2.15
Holland Code	ESR	ESA	SEA

APPENDIX 11

**PEARSON CORRELATIONS: NPI TOTAL SCORE FOR NARCISSISM
AND SUB-SCALE COMPONENT SCORES**

	Narc. (T)	Auth.	Exhib.	Expl.	Self.	Ent.	Sup.	Van.
Narc. (T)	1.000	.77**	.68**	.68**	.57**	.68**	.67**	.46**
Auth.	.77**	1.000	.44**	.45**	.35**	.40**	.43**	.18
Exhib.	.68**	.44**	1.000	.43**	.14	.32*	.41**	.45**
Expl.	.68**	.45**	.43**	1.000	.34**	.37**	.34**	.29*
Self.	.57**	.35**	.14	.34**	1.000	.41**	.20	.03
Ent.	.68**	.40**	.32*	.37**	.41**	1.000	.38**	.12
Sup.	.67**	.43**	.41**	.34**	.20	.38**	1.000	.43**
Van.	.46**	.18	.45**	.29*	.03	.12	.43**	1.000

* p<.01

** p<.001

Narc. (T) = Narcissism (Total)

Auth. = Authority

Exhib. = Exhibitionism

Expl. = Exploitativeness

Self. = Self-sufficiency

Ent. = Entitlement

Sup. = Superiority

Van. = Vanity