



The Males follow the total sample with the exception that there is a negative correlation between **Ego** and **Theory** which may suggest either a self or intellectual interest is a predominate role in males (or certainly in my sample).

	<i>Perform</i>	<i>Ego</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Relating</i>	<i>Loyalist</i>	<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Aesthete</i>
<b>Perform</b>	1.00				<b>Power</b>				<b>Support</b>
<b>Ego</b>		1.00			<b>Defenses</b>		<b>Females</b>		<b>Defenses</b>
<b>Leader</b>	.309		1.00				<b>N = 335</b>		
<b>Manager</b>				1.00					
<b>Theory</b>					1.00				
<b>Relating</b>						1.00			
<b>Loyalist</b>			-0.358		-0.342		1.00		
<b>Mediator</b>			-0.471					1.00	
<b>Aesthete</b>									1.00

We have lost the **Mediator x Performer** correlation and picked up a negative correlation between **Theory** (Intellectualism) and **Loyalist** (Social feeling/identify), which may make sense for women in a traditionalist sense.

The **Defenses** are considered to follow and are usually paired with a particular "underlying motivation" or Dynamic. They move to the forefront when that dynamic is threatened. They are also found in **Trait** theories under the major factor called **NEUROTICISM**. In theory, there is an expectation that a person using a given dynamic would express a "specific defense associated with a specific dynamic." Of course this will be attenuated by the "overall adjustment of the person" in the sense that the more "adjusted" an individual is the less likely they will use any defense. For example, the Leader dynamic uses the Anger defense but you have "Leaders" with various degrees of "adjustment" where the most adjusted seldom exhibit defensive behavior and the less adjusted exhibit it more often. Hence, it logically follows that you would have to only look at Leaders, determine their overall adjustment and see how often they use Anger (as a defense) over the other possibilities.

**Here are the Defenses:**

	<i>Perform</i>	<i>Ego</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Relating</i>	<i>Loyalist</i>	<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Aesthete</i>
<b>Impulse</b>	1.00				<b>Power</b>				<b>Support</b>
<b>Suspicion</b>		1.00			<b>Defenses</b>		<b>ALL</b>		<b>Defenses</b>
<b>Anger</b>			1.00				<b>N = 1109</b>		
<b>Compulsive</b>	-0.348			1.00					
<b>Obsess</b>					1.00				
<b>Suffocate</b>						1.00			
<b>Anxiety</b>	-0.300						1.00		
<b>PassiveA</b>								1.00	
<b>Depress</b>					-0.396				1.00

It would be nice if the defenses were independent in the sense of showing no correlations among them. **Impulsive** (opposite of organized) is negatively correlated with **Compulsive** (organize/structure to eliminate anxiety) and it is used to eliminate **Anxiety** (hence the negative correlation). In addition, the **Obsessive** (think/rethink, obsess to eliminate anxiety) is negatively correlated with **Depression** (obsessive can be an intellectual defense to “remove depressive affects”). It is interesting to note that the classic pair, Obsessive and Compulsive is not positively correlated as many people feel they should. This Theory states they come from two very distinct sources (and one is introverted, the other extraverted).

	<i>Perform</i>	<i>Ego</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Relating</i>	<i>Loyalist</i>	<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Aesthete</i>
	<b>Impulse</b>	<b>Suspi.</b>	<b>Anger</b>	<b>Comp.</b>	<b>Obsess</b>	<b>Suff</b>	<b>Anxiety</b>	<b>PassiveA</b>	<b>Depress</b>
Impulse	1.00				Power Defenses				Support Defenses
Suspicion		1.00							
Anger			1.00						
Compulsive	-0.309			1.00					
Obsess					1.00				
Suffocate						1.00			
Anxiety	-0.312						1.00		
PassiveA								1.00	
Depress					-0.422				1.00

The Males follow the total sample perfectly (of course they are 70% of the sample)

	<i>Perform</i>	<i>Ego</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Relating</i>	<i>Loyalist</i>	<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Aesthete</i>
	<b>Impulse</b>	<b>Suspi.</b>	<b>Anger</b>	<b>Comp.</b>	<b>Obsess</b>	<b>Suff</b>	<b>Anxiety</b>	<b>PassiveA</b>	<b>Depress</b>
Impulse	1.00				Power Defenses				Support Defenses
Suspicion		1.00							
Anger			1.00						
Compulsive.	-0.438			1.00					
Obsess					1.00				
Suffocate						1.00			
Anxiety							1.00		
PassiveA								1.00	
Depress					-0.335				1.00

The Females have two differences. There is a negative correlation between **Suspicion** and **Depression** which may support the notion that if “one projects their hostility” there is less need to “direct one’s anger internally” especially in woman since overt anger is socially unacceptable. We lost the low negative correlation (at the Threshold of 0.30) between **Impulsivity** and **Anxiety** which may be an anomaly in the statistics rather than having significant theoretical meaning.

**Here are the Dynamics x Defenses**

This area will be a little tricky. The Theory suggests that a person who uses the **Performer** Dynamic should show a preference for using the **Impulsive** Defense (or any other pairing). However, any particular Performer may be very well adjusted

(shows limited need to use any defense) to quite maladjusted (shows much defensive behavior). So you really have Performers at all levels of "Defensive need" and if they have that need do they actually "prefer to use" the Impulsive Defense? Hence you really have three factors, (1) the actual Dynamic, (2) the level of overall defensiveness exhibited and the (3) actual Defenses used.

What you don't want to see is high positive correlations between any Dynamic and Defense that should not be paired. This is mostly the case because there is only 1 significant positive correlation between any Dynamics and Defenses (Leader x Impulsive). To really discover actual dynamic-defensive pairing you would need to get all the high Dynamics in one area (e.g., Performers) who were more neurotic and see what Defenses they actually use. Hence, do all the Performers who show high Defensiveness prefer Impulsiveness?

	<i>Perform</i>	<i>Ego</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Relating</i>	<i>Loyalist</i>	<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Aesthete</i>
<b>Perform</b>	1.00								
<b>Ego</b>		1.00							
<b>Leader</b>	0.334		1.00						
<b>Manager</b>				1.00					
<b>Theory</b>					1.00				
<b>Relating</b>						1.00			
<b>Loyalist</b>			-0.402				1.00		
<b>Mediator</b>	-0.312		-0.455					1.00	
<b>Aesthete</b>									1.00
<b>Impulsive</b>			0.313						
<b>Suspicion</b>									
<b>Anger</b>									
<b>Compulsive</b>				0.384					
<b>Obsessive</b>									
<b>Suffocating</b>									
<b>Anxiety</b>	-0.300		-0.395						
<b>PassiveA</b>									
<b>Depression</b>	-0.333								

The first part of the Matrix is a repeat of the above (i.e., Dynamic x Dynamic) and the second part is the Defenses x Dynamics. There are only 3 negative correlations and two positive correlations. One of the two positive correlations makes theoretical sense.

	<i>Perform</i>	<i>Ego</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>Theory</i>	<i>Relating</i>	<i>Loyalist</i>	<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Aesthete</i>
<b>Perform</b>	1.00								
<b>Ego</b>		1.00							
<b>Leader</b>	0.345		1.00						
<b>Manager</b>				1.00					
<b>Theory</b>		-0.314			1.00				
<b>Relating</b>						1.00			
<b>Loyalist</b>			-0.421				1.00		
<b>Mediator</b>	-0.346		-0.447					1.00	

Aesthete										1.00	
Impulsive											0.312
Suspicion											
Anger											
Compulsive											0.370
Obsessive											
Suffocating											
Anxiety											-0.391
PassiveA											0.312
Depression											-0.360

The males repeat this pattern but there is another positive correlation between **Mediator** and **Passive-Aggressive** (which is the expected pairing). The males eliminated the minor negative correlation (it is at the threshold above) between the **Anxiety** and **Performance**, which makes sense because a "high energy often uses activity to mask anxiety.

	Perform	Ego	Leader	Manager	Theory	Relating	Loyalist	Mediator	Aesthete
Perform	1.00								
Ego		1.00							
Leader	0.309		1.00						
Manager				1.00					
Theory					1.00				
Relating						1.00			
Loyalist			-0.358		-0.342		1.00		
Mediator			-0.471					1.00	
Aesthete									1.00
Impulsive	0.315		0.317	-0.316					
Suspicion									
Anger									
Compulsive				0.414					
Obsessive									
Suffocating									
Anxiety	-0.345		-0.404						
PassiveA									
Depression									

The Females picked up a minor positive correlation between **Performance** and **Impulsivity** which makes sense and a minor negative correlation between **Manager** and **Impulsivity**.

**Here are the TRAITS:**

This is the dominant personality THEORY where it is believed that the personality can be factor analyzed into 5 major Factors. Three of the five are shown below (Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion) and each has 3 sub-factors. The fourth (Neuroticism) is covered in the Defenses and the fifth is not included (i.e., Openness).

	AGREE	Trust	Comply	Modest	CONSC	Order	Duty	Achiev	EXTRA	Warm	Extra	Assert	Self-S	Risk
<b>AGREE</b>	1.00													
Trust	0.77	1.00												
Comply	0.77	0.37	1.00											
Modest	0.77	0.42	0.44	1.00										
<b>CONSC</b>					1.00									
Order					0.73	1.00								
Duty	0.37	0.30			0.66		1.00							
Achiev.					0.74		0.39	1.00						
<b>EXTRA</b>	0.51	0.45	0.30	0.45			0.41		1.00					
Warm	0.53	0.47	0.36	0.39			0.36		0.82	1.00				
Extra	0.47	0.37	0.33	0.41					0.85	0.62	1.00			
Assert							0.36		0.69	0.39	0.35	1.00		
Self-S									-0.32		-0.42		1.00	
Risk														1.00
Imag.														0.32

<--- Big 5 Factor :  
Agreeableness

ALL  
N=1109

<--- Big 5 Factor s

From the above Matrix, it pretty much follows all the literature in Psychology and there are no real surprises. The area has been so well researched that there is little to be gained by dwelling on these correlations. The 3 trait "sub-factors" not included in the Big-5 are not correlated with the major factors and they are: **Self-sufficient**, **Risk taking** and **Imagination** (which may be related to Openness). What is interesting is the massive number of positive correlations among the "3 major Factors". **Agreeable** correlates 0.51 with **Extraversion** and the **Duty** sub-factor of **Conscientiousness** correlates with the other two major factors.

	AGREE	Trust	Comply	Modest	CONSC	Order	Duty	Achiev	EXTRA	Warm	Extra	Assert	Self-S	Risk
<b>AGREE</b>	1.00													
Trust	0.78	1.00												
Comply	0.76	0.37	1.00											
Modest	0.77	0.42	0.42	1.00										
<b>CONSC</b>					1.00									
Order					0.74	1.00								
Duty	0.35	0.32			0.64		1.00							
Achiev					0.72		0.34	1.00						
<b>EXTRA</b>	0.49	0.46		0.42	0.31		0.39		1.00					
Warm	0.51	0.48	0.34	0.36			0.34		0.83	1.00				
Extra	0.46	0.40		0.40					0.86	0.62	1.00			
Assert							0.36		0.70	0.41	0.38	1.00		
Self-S									-0.33		-0.42		1.00	
Risk														1.00
Imag.														0.32

<--- Big 5 Factor:  
Agreeableness

Males  
N=774

Big 5 Factor:  
<--- Conscientiousness

Big 5 Factor:  
Extraversion

	AGREE	Trust	Comply	Modest	CONSC	Order	Duty	Achiev	EXTRA	Warm	Extra	Assert	Self-S	Risk
<b>AGREE</b>	1.00													
Trust	0.75	1.00												

Females





	Perform	Ego	Leader	Manager	Theory	Relating	Loyalist	Mediator	Aesthete
AGREE						Big 5 - Agreeableness			
Trust		Females N = 335							
Comply									
Modest									
CONSC				0.46		Big 5 - Conscientiousness			
Order				0.52					
Duty									
Achiev									
EXTRA			0.37			Big 5 - Extraversion			
Warm									
Extra									
Assert			0.54						-0.39
Self-S									
Risk	0.38		0.36						
Imag.									

**Here are the Defenses versus the Traits:**

Here the situation is a little different. As stated above, one of the major factors in the Big-5 is the factor called **Neuroticism**, which is basically the same as my Defenses. Clearly, I did not repeat this factor of the Big-5 since I wanted to measure similar constructs. If you look at the correlations among the sub-factors on the Neuroticism scale of the NEO-PI-R (e.g., Anxiety, Impulsiveness, Depression, Vulnerability) you would expect to find fairly high correlations with similar Defense measures. For example, my Depression scale and that of the NEO-PI-R should be highly correlated since we are measuring very similar constructs. However, in the NEO-PI-R, you would not expect high correlations between the other four factors and Neuroticism which is also the case with my variables.

Below are the correlations among the Defenses and the **Trait** factors (same as the Matrix above but instead of the Dynamics, the Defenses are listed and correlated (the Dynamic that the Defense is paired with is listed above the Defense). It would be informative to see if my Defense measures correlated with the **Neuroticism** scale measures on the NEO-PI-R but that has not been studied.

	Perform	Ego	Leader	Manager	Theory	Relating	Loyalist	Mediator	Aesthete
	Impulse	Suspi.	Anger	Comp.	Obsess	Suff	Anxiety	PassiveA	Depress
AGREE						Big 5 - Agreeableness			
Trust		All N = 1109							
Comply									
Modest									
CONSC				0.54		Big 5 - Conscientiousness			
Order	-0.34			0.67					
Duty					0.31				



Assert		<b>0.34</b>	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-0.32</b>
Self-S				
Risk	<b>0.45</b>		<b>-0.33</b>	
Imag.				

Males and Females follow a similar pattern with some twists on the theme.

**SUMMARY:**

In summary, there is significant support that the **Dynamics** are very different from the typical Big-5 Factors and sub-factors, which clearly dominate much of personality theory.

Use of the DIGITAL COUCH as a personality test shows that there exist other factors that the normal **TRAIT** tests (e.g., NEO-PI-R and 16PF) are missing. Indeed, these factors provide a whole alternative to the Big-5 theory and are more in line with the traditional understanding of “patients” being more complex and having underlying dynamics that dictate much of the actual behavior. Hence, dynamics have additional explanatory power.

For example, just consider four different people who are Assertive (a sub-factor on the Extraversion scale). One is a **Leader** (wants to control social situations), the other is an **Egoist** (controlling events in one’s life sphere is necessary for self-esteem) one is **Relating** (Influencing others to like you) and the last is a **Loyalist** (strong identification with some-thing outside of oneself) can you “see” that their assertion is very different? Do you think the additional Traits will clarify these differences? Indeed, it even raises the question that Assertion is really a sub-factor under Extraversion.

Take two engineers who both have very low scores on an Extraversion scale (major factor) but one is assertive and the other is not. In addition, one is a **Theoretician** (intellectual control) who is very confident but finds people boring and is introverted. The other is a **Loyalist** and a **Mediator** who hates conflict and is afraid of making a social mistake so he is introverted. You will find some difference on the NEO-PI-R scale of Neuroticism but you will never understand it as well as you could if you knew what their respective Dynamics were.

The DIGITAL COUCH can and will add so much more to Personality Theory.