

MOVING TOWARDS, AGAINST AND AWAY FROM PEOPLE: THE RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN KAREN HORNEY'S INTERPERSONAL TRENDS AND THE ENNEAGRAM

by

**Raymond William Nettmann**

submitted in accordance with the requirements for

the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS**

in the subject

**PSYCHOLOGY**

at the

University of South Africa

**SUPERVISOR: Prof. Vasi van Deventer**

June 2013

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration .....	v
Acknowledgements .....	vi
Abstract .....	vii
List of Tables .....	viii
List of Figures .....	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Statement of the problem .....	2
Research approach .....	4
Significance of the study .....	4
Scope of the study .....	5
Overview of the chapters .....	6
CHAPTER TWO: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE .....	7
Introduction .....	7
The Enneagram symbol .....	7
The three laws .....	8
The passions .....	10
The nine Enneagram types .....	12
Karen Horney .....	18
Moving against people .....	19
Moving toward people .....	19
Moving away from people .....	19

Neurotic needs .....	20
Karen Horney meets the Enneagram.....	21
Don Riso and Russ Hudson.....	21
Jerome Wagner.....	24
Conclusion.....	31
CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	32
Through the lens of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends.....	32
Measures to validate Enneagram type.....	32
Studies of construct validity .....	37
The Enneagram explores human phenomena .....	47
Conclusion.....	55
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	56
Hypotheses .....	56
Research Design.....	57
Population .....	57
Sampling .....	58
Sampling method.....	58
Sampling procedure.....	58
Sample bias.....	59
Research instrument .....	60
The Test of Object Relations (TOR) .....	60
Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Indicator (HCTI) .....	63
Method of data analysis .....	64
Screening and cleaning the data. ....	65
Preliminary assumption testing .....	65

Conclusion.....	68
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS .....	69
Sample characteristics .....	69
Frequencies .....	70
TOR Frequencies.....	72
HCTI Frequencies .....	72
Independence of categories .....	73
Gender and Enneagram type .....	74
Convergent validity of the TOR and HCTI.....	76
HCTI Compliance .....	77
HCTI Aggressive.....	78
HCTI Detached.....	78
The Hornevian groups and the HCTI.....	79
The Hornevian groups and the TOR .....	82
TOR Narcissism .....	83
TOR Separation Anxiety .....	83
TOR Social Isolation .....	84
TOR Symbiotic Merging.....	84
TOR Egocentricity.....	85
TOR Fear of Engulfment.....	85
The nine Enneagram types and the HCTI.....	85
HCTI Detachment .....	87
HCTI Aggression.....	87
HCTI Compliance .....	88
The nine Enneagram types and the TOR .....	89

TOR Separation Anxiety .....	91
TOR Narcissism .....	91
TOR Social Isolation .....	92
TOR Symbiotic Merging .....	92
TOR Fear of Engulfment .....	93
Conclusion.....	93
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION .....	95
The Moving Toward group (Type 1, 2 and 6: Reformer, Helper, and Loyalist)	95
The Against Group (Type 8, 7 and 3: Challenger, Enthusiast and Achiever) ...	99
The Away Group (Type 4, 5 and 9: Individualist, Investigator and Peacemaker)	102
Convergent validity between the TOR and the HCTI.....	105
Limitations .....	107
Recommendation for future research .....	110
Conclusion.....	111
REFERENCES .....	112
APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM .....	118
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES .....	119

## Declaration

Student number: **5178525**

I declare that Moving Towards, Against and Away from People: The Relationship Between Karen Horney's Interpersonal Trends and the Enneagram is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

---

SIGNATURE

(Mr RW Nettmann)

---

DATE

## **Acknowledgements**

I must thank the people who have supported me with their encouragement and belief that I would eventually complete my dissertation. Above all I thank Ishvara, my partner of 14 years who has had to endure broken commitments and hours of me huddled away in my study.

Thanks to my mom and family for their support.

My colleagues, friends and fellow students, especially Madri Jansen van Rensburg, Sydney Butler and Catherine Blanchard and Linda Masters who have supported me in their special way.

My friends in the Nameless and Spontaneous Group who have lifted me each time my confidence flagged and I was tempted to give up.

Thanks to my supervisor Professor Vasi van Deventer for his belief in my ability.

Finally, I must thank the Enneagram Community and the people of the Enneagram Face Book Group who agreed to participate in my study. Their interest in the results and their encouragement to continue is much appreciated.

## **Abstract**

Different theoretical approaches and interpretations offer diverse delineations and clusters of Enneagram type in terms of Horney's interpersonal trends of moving toward, moving against and moving away from people. The present study reports the results of an empirical investigation into the relationship between Enneagram type and Horney's interpersonal trends. A sample of 253 participants completed the Test of Object Relations (TOR) and 125 of these participants completed the Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI). Two one-way, between-groups multivariate analyses of variance revealed differences between Enneagram types for each of the HCTI interpersonal trends of compliance, aggression and detachment and the TOR dimensions of separation anxiety, symbiotic merging, narcissism, egocentricity, social isolation and fear of engulfment. For each trend, an Enneagram type could be identified as a unique marker or benchmark of the trend. However, the empirical result does not offer clear support for one theoretical approach or viewpoint rather than another.

**Keywords:** Karen Horney, Enneagram, Interpersonal trends, Compliance, Aggression, Detachment, Separation anxiety, Symbiotic merging, Narcissism, Egocentricity, Social isolation, Fear of engulfment



## List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Karen Horney's trends in relation to the Millon-Illinois and Myers-Briggs scales.</i>	48
Table 2 <i>Significant biserial correlations between the Hornebian group and Cattell's 16PF</i>	50
Table 3 <i>Means, standard deviations and alpha for TOR Dimensions (N = 442)</i>	70
Table 4 <i>Scale means, standard deviations and Cronbach's alpha for HCTI Dimensions</i>	73
Table 5 <i>Demographic characteristics of sample</i>	78
Table 6 <i>Frequencies and percentages of participant's relation to the Enneagram</i>	80
Table 7 <i>Means and standard deviations on all scales by gender</i>	84
Table 8 <i>Pearson's Correlations between the HCTI and TOR scales</i>	86
Table 9 <i>Means and standard deviations of the HCTI scales and the Horney groups</i>	88
Table 10 <i>Means and standard deviations on TOR scales by Karen Horney type</i>	91
Table 11 <i>Means and standard deviations of the Nine Enneagram Types by HCTI Scales</i>	95
Table 12a <i>Means and standard deviations of TOR scales by Enneagram type</i>	98
Table 12b <i>Means and standard deviations of TOR scales by Enneagram type cont</i>	99

## List of Figures

<i>Figure 1. The Enneagram Symbol (Riso &amp; Hudson, 1999)</i>	7
---	---

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### Introduction

A man may be quite alone in the desert and he can trace the Enneagram in the sand and in it read the eternal laws of the universe. And every time he can learn something new, something he did not know before (Gurdjieff cited in Ouspensky, 1965, p. 294).



**Figure 1: The Enneagram Symbol (Riso & Hudson, 1999)**

Gurdjieff's words speak to modern day proponents of the Enneagram who see in its triangular and hexagonal structure a universal symbol that has the potential to synthesise and integrate different theories of personality and human development. Gurdjieff, a Greek Armenian born around 1875, introduced the Enneagram symbol to the West after discovering it during his travels throughout the Middle East. During the 1950s, Oscar Ichazo, a Bolivian living in Argentina, allocated personality types to the nine points on the Enneagram symbol. In 1970, Claudio Naranjo, after being exposed to the work of Oscar Ichazo, developed the Enneagram further by synthesizing the nine types of personality into other psychological types (Riso & Hudson, 1999). Claudio Naranjo was the first to explore the nine personality types of the Enneagram in terms of Karen Horney's model of interpersonal trends (Maitri, 2000).

Karen Horney (1946, 1991) developed a model of different interpersonal trends that people use to maintain social security. These are defined as moving toward people, moving against people and moving away from people. Each group's behaviour is characterised by compliance, aggression and withdrawal, respectively. The integration of Horney's three interpersonal trends into the Enneagram are a natural fit, as the nine Enneagram types are also divided into different sets of three, or triads.

### **Statement of the problem**

Since Naranjo, other Enneagram authors have also drawn on Karen Horney's work to deepen understanding of the nine Enneagram types. However, different authors have formed their own configurations of the nine types and Karen Horney's three interpersonal styles. In forming these different configurations, each author emphasises different aspects of the two approaches.

In his article *Karen Horney Meets the Enneagram*, Wagner (2001) shows how various authors correlate the enneagram with Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. Beesing, Nogosek and O'Leary (1984) and Chou (2000) accept that Enneagram Type Two, Six and Seven correlate with Horney's Compliant type, that Type One, Three and Eight correlate with Horney's Aggressive type and that Type Four, Five and Nine correlate with Horney's Withdrawn type. Thomas Chou suggests, however, that, at a deeper level, the types use different tactics to achieve their goals. At this deeper level, Type Two, Five and Eight are aggressive, Type Seven, Four and One are withdrawn and Type Three, Six and Nine are compliant.

By contrast, Riso and Hudson (1999), two very influential Enneagram authors, divide the nine Enneagram types into triads: thinking, feeling and instinctive. In terms of this model, Enneagram Type One is a Compliant type and Enneagram Type Seven is an Aggressive type. Hurley and Donson (1991) agree with Riso and Hudson's structure, but their defining categories are based on expansive, enlightened or temperate solutions to life's problems. In their understanding, an expansive solution is due to the suppression of the emotional center, which results in aggression. The enlightened solution is due to the suppression of the instinctive center, which results in withdrawal and isolation, and the temperate solution is due to the suppression of the mental center, which results in compliance. Last, Levine (1991) groups the nine Enneagram types according to the three centers: body, mental and emotional. Therefore, Type Eight, Nine and One are Aggressive, Type Two, Three and Four are Compliant and Type Five, Six and Seven are Withdrawn.

The different theoretical understandings of the relationship between the two systems presented an opportunity to engage in empirical research to substantiate some of these hypothetical postulations. This study was an acceptance of the gauntlet thrown down by Wagner to “start down the yellow brick road of research” (Wagner, 2001, pg.12).

The intent behind this study was to contribute to this discourse by empirically investigating the relationship between Karen Horney's interpersonal trends and the nine Enneagram types. The purpose of the study was twofold: first, to see whether there is in fact a relationship between the two systems and, second, to investigate the nature of the relationship. This study, therefore, addressed the following questions:

- Is there a relationship between Karen Horney's interpersonal trends and the nine Enneagram personality types and, if there is, what is the nature of the relationship?

- Which of the several theories of the nature of the relationship between the two systems is best supported by the empirical evidence?
- Can the nine Enneagram personality types be distinguished from each other in terms of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends?

Specifically, the study inquired into the relationships that exist among the nine Enneagram types and Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends in terms of the TOR dimensions of Separation Anxiety, Symbiotic Merging, Narcissism, Egocentricity, Social Isolation and Fear of Engulfment, and the HCTI dimensions of Compliance, Aggression and Detachment. Last, this study presented an opportunity to explore the convergent validity of the TOR and the HCTI.

### **Research approach**

The study employed a quasi-experimental, cross-sectional design. Two measures, the Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory (HCTI) (Coolidge, 2004) and the Test of Object Relations (TOR) (Zvelc, 2000), were emailed to randomly selected members of an Enneagram Facebook group who had self-identified their Enneagram type. Participant demographics were collected. A one-way, between-group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyse the data. Ad hoc comparisons, using Turkey's HSD test, were used to determine how the nine Enneagram types differ with regard to the three Karen Horney interpersonal trends of moving toward, against and away from people.

### **Significance of the study**

There is growing interest in and diverse use of the Enneagram. Kamineni (2005) highlights the increased use of the Enneagram in strategic management and human resource

development as he introduces it as a psychographic segmentation tool in marketing. Professionals and lay people use the Enneagram system in their assessment of people (Newgent, Parr, Newman, & Higgins, 2004). Matisse (2007) suggests correlations between the Enneagram personality types and the categories of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-IV and suggests the therapeutic relationship with a client can be adapted according to the client's Enneagram type. Enneagram authors (Riso & Hudson, 1996, 1999; Wagner, 2001; Whillans, 2009) also use Karen Horney's approach to develop their ideas about the Enneagram.

The literature reveals that the theoretical understanding of the relationship between the Enneagram and Karen Horney's interpersonal trends has been articulated, explored and developed by various Enneagram authors. However, there has been no empirical research conducted to substantiate these theories. The present study hopes to contribute to the empirical foundation of these theories. The growing popularity and development of the Enneagram system will be supported by this empirical investigation.

### **Scope of the study**

This study was designed to focus on the relationship between Karen Horney's interpersonal trends and the nine Enneagram types. The results were interpreted in terms of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends to determine which Enneagram types could be allocated to each of the three trends. As such, the study does not investigate the reliability and validity of either the Enneagram system or Karen Horney's model. It is assumed that these two systems can indeed discriminate between different types of people. It is also assumed that people have the capacity to identify their own Enneagram personality type and the method of self-typing is adequate.

## **Overview of the chapters**

This chapter has provided a short introduction to the Enneagram and Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. The statement of the problem has shown the different theoretical approaches to the relationship between the nine types and the interpersonal trends and the need to engage in empirical research to clarify the nature of the relationship. Chapter Two and Three review the literature, including theoretical understandings of the Enneagram and Karen Horney's interpersonal trends, and research conducted on the Enneagram. The two chapters thereafter deal with the research method and the results of the study. The final chapter discusses the findings, reflects on the limitations of the study and provides possible directions for future research.

## **CHAPTER TWO: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE**

### **Introduction**

Enneagram authors have used Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends of moving toward, against and away from people to enhance and develop the Enneagram system. It is, therefore, useful to present a brief historical and theoretical overview of both the Enneagram and Karen Horney's approach to contextualise the study. First, however, this chapter will highlight the properties of the Enneagram that make it a universal symbol. A discussion of the structure of the Enneagram symbol will illustrate its symmetry and the interconnection between the nine points of the Enneagram. An exposition will follow of how the Enneagram types are rooted in the nine passions. Last, Karen Horney's approach and its relation to the Enneagram will be discussed by showing how two Enneagram authors have explicitly used Karen Horney's interpersonal trends to further the understanding of the Enneagram.

### **The Enneagram symbol**

The Enneagram diagram is more than a triangle and a hexad structure enclosed within a circle. It is a symbol that hides a dense philosophy. The Enneagram is a representation of the divine order of the universe and the place of humanity within it (Stevens, 2010). It has the capacity to map the progress from inception to completion of any event in the material world (Palmer, 1988). The symbol not only reveals the compulsions and laws that humanity slaves under, but is also shows the path to liberation (Rohr & Ebert, 2001). To substantiate these claims Enneagram authors turn to the mystical mathematics of Pythagoras, Plato and some of the Neoplatonic philosophers (Riso & Hudson, 1999; Rohr & Ebert, 2001; Stevens, 2010).



According to Koetsier and Bergmam (2005), (as cited in Stevens, 2010) the basic premise of mystical mathematics is that it transcends its practical and quantitative applications and is actually a reflection of the divine order of the universe. Mathematics operates as a link between the changing material world and the unchanging immaterial world (Stevens, 2010). Based on this understanding, the exposition that follows considers the Enneagram diagram as “a geometric and arithmetic representation of a continuous, universal unfolding that conforms to mathematical principles” (Stevens, 2010, p. 128). The continuous, universal unfolding is governed by the Law of One, the Law of Three and the Law of Seven.

### The three laws

#### **The Law of One**

The circle represents the Law of One: “all creation emanates from, exists within and will return to single source” (Stevens, 2010, p. 130). Almost every culture understands the unity, wholeness and oneness implied by a circle. Judaism, Islam and Christianity all profess divinity as one (Riso & Hudson, 1999). The circle, much like the wheel of India, suggests the cycles of nature and the ebb and flow of life.

#### **The Law of Seven**

The hexad structure connecting points one, four, two, eight, five, seven and back to one indicates the Law of Seven: “everything in the universe is in continual state of transformation” (Stevens, 2001, p. 131). It has to do with process and development over time. Change is everywhere, but it occurs in a predictable and lawful way (Riso and Hudson, 1999). Gurdjieff maintained that the Law of Seven described every transformative process as unfolding in seven successive steps (as cited in Ouspensky, 1945). He believed that any process, from the generation of an egg to the birth of the universe, adhered to this law. The

law is demonstrated by the multiplication of the numbers that are connected by the hexad within the Enneagram symbol. The mystical mathematical principle of transformation is revealed in the repeating sequence of the digits each time 142,857 is multiplied by any number between one and six:

- $142,857 \times 1 = 142,857$
- $142,857 \times 2 = 285,714$
- $142,857 \times 3 = 428,571$
- $142,857 \times 4 = 571,428$
- $142,857 \times 5 = 714,285$
- $142,857 \times 6 = 857,142$
- $142,857 \times 7 = 999,999$

By joining these numbers with lines on the Enneagram symbol, the hexad emerges with this particular sequence of numbers.

### **The Power of Nine**

This is seen as the Cycle of Transformation and culminates at the end of the seventh cycle where the number 999,999 is produced. Nine is a sacred number that represents the boundary between the mundane and the transcendental. There are nine orders of angels and nine days to pray a novena. Christ gave up his spirit in the ninth hour. Nine is also the number of personality types that the Enneagram describes (Stevens, 2010).

## **The Law of Three**

The Law of Three states: “For every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction – brought to balance by a third balancing principle” (Stevens, 2010, p. 135). This law is illustrated in the Enneagram symbol by the central triangle joining points three, six and nine. As Stevens (2010) illustrates this law is reflected in the Christian trinity, the three Hindu deities of creation, maintenance and destruction, and Hegel's theory of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The inner triangle describes the process of transaction that occurs at each point of the Cycle of Transformation, described in the movement from one through to seven and back to one in the hexad. Movement from each point entails a process of action, stabilisation and crisis to propel the process to the next level.

Gurdjieff believed that the enneagram is a universal symbol through which all knowledge can be included and interpreted (as cited in Ouspensky, 1977). Only once knowledge is interpreted through the Enneagram can it said to be truly understood. Gurdjieff saw the Enneagram as a system in motion (as cited in Ouspensky, 1977). To teach the Enneagram, Gurdjieff drew an Enneagram symbol on the floor and students would move in the direction of the numbers one, four, two, eight, five, seven and nine, three, six and they would turn around each other as the lines intersected (as cited in Ouspensky, 1977). However, Gurdjieff never taught the Enneagram of personality types as is taught today. Oscar Ichazo and Claudio Naranjo would be the first modern-day authors to include and interpret human personality in terms of the Enneagram (Riso & Hudson, 1999).

## **The passions**

The Christian understanding of the seven deadly sins is that a person may be more challenged by one particular human fault, weakness or temptation than any other. The Desert Fathers

were early Christian mystics who lived in the Sinai desert. They offered spiritual guidance to their disciples that included advice and counsel on how to overcome these deadly sins or passions (Rohr & Ebert, 2001). Pope Gregory the Great later identified seven of these passions as sloth, anger, pride, envy, greed, gluttony and lust (as cited in Burke, 2008). During the 1950s, Oscar Ichazo added deceit and fear to the seven passions resulting in nine passions which they then assigned to the nine points of the Enneagram (Bear, 2001; Palmer, 1991; Riso & Hudson, 1999; Rohr & Ebert, 2001).

In a recent study of the origin of the Enneagram, David Burke (2008) examined documents newly discovered in the libraries of Mt Athos. Among the documents was a letter from Evagrius of Pontus to a monk named Eulogios. The letter described a system of nine passions and their corresponding virtues. As life enters the soul, the immature and unformed soul is unable to contain or manage the dynamism of this life force and creates in the person an existential reflex of fear, anger and envy (Burke, 2008). These, in turn, are expressed as the nine passions of love of money, anger, pride, gluttony, listlessness, dejection, vainglory, fornication and jealousy (Burke, 2008). Evagrius believed these passions distract a person from contemplating God and the quest for perfection involved overcoming these passions (Burke, 2008).

The arrangement of the passions on the Enneagram symbol is the foundation of the development of the nine Enneagram personality types. The elegance and symmetry of the symbol allow the passions to be arranged in groups of three that reflect the existential reflex of fear, anger and envy. The nine Enneagram types emerge as a reaction and attempt to resolve the nine passions. As such, the fear-based Type Five, Six and Seven attempt to resolve the passions of avarice, fear and gluttony, respectively. The anger-based Type Eight,

Nine and One resolve the passions of lust, sloth and anger, respectively. The envy or shame-based Type Two, Three and Four resolve the passions of pride, deceit and envy, respectively. Out of this initial arrangement of the passions on the Enneagram symbol, the following descriptions of the nine Enneatypes developed. The work of Helen Palmer (1991) and Riso and Hudson (1999) is presented because their descriptions are the most widely known among Enneagram teachers and enthusiasts.

### The nine Enneagram types

#### **Type One**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this rational, idealistic type the Reformer. The Reformer is principled, purposeful, self-controlled, and perfectionistic. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of being corrupt, evil and defective and the basic desire to be good, to have integrity, and to be balanced. This conflict results in critical perfectionism. The Reformer's passion is repressed anger and impatience, due to dissatisfaction with themselves and the world.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype One as the Perfectionist. The Perfectionist's focus of attention is to evaluate what is correct or incorrect in a situation. They are critical of self and others, and convinced there is one correct way. They feel ethically superior and procrastinate for fear of making a mistake. They use the words *should* and *must* frequently. However, evolved Ones can be critically astute and moral heroes.

#### **Type Two**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this caring and interpersonal type, the Helper. The Helper is generous, demonstrative, people-pleasing, and possessive. Their personality is formed around

the conflict between the basic fear of being unwanted and unworthy of being loved and the basic desire to feel loved. This conflict results in the need to be needed. Their passion is pride; pride that only they have the ability to love, especially where others have failed to love.

Palmer (1991) describes Enneatype Two as the Giver. The Giver's focus of attention is the desire for approving attention from other people. They demand affection and approval and seek to be loved and appreciated by becoming indispensable to another person. They meet other people's needs, but are manipulative and aggressively seductive. However, evolved Twos are genuinely caring and supportive.

### **Type Three**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this success-oriented and pragmatic type the Achiever. The Achiever is adaptable, driven, and image-conscious. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of being worthless and the basic desire to feel valuable and worthwhile. This conflict results in chasing after success. Their passion is deceiving themselves and others that their value lies in success despite feeling worthless.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Three as the Performer. The Performer's focus of attention is to gain positive recognition in regard to tasks and performance. They are competitive. They present an image of being the best in their field. As Type-A personalities, they confuse self and job identity, but can appear to be more productive than they actually are. However, evolved Threes can do well in marketing, and be effective leaders, competent promoters, and captains of winning teams.

## **Type Four**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this sensitive and withdrawn type the Individualist. The Individualist is expressive, dramatic, self-absorbed, and temperamental. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear that they have no identity or personal significance and the basic desire to find themselves and their significance (to create an identity). This conflict results in self-indulgence. Their passion is envy - envy of the things they feel they do not possess but that other people do.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Four as the Tragic Romantic. The Tragic Romantic's focus of attention is on the best aspects of what is unavailable and the worst aspects of what is available. Therefore, they are attracted to the unavailable and the ideal is never here and now. They are tragic, sad, artistic and sensitive, always focussed on the absent lover or the loss of a friend. However, evolved Fours are creative in their way of life and are able to help other people through their pain. They are committed to beauty and the passionate side of life: birth, sex, intensity and death.

## **Type Five**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this intense and cerebral type the Investigator. The Investigator is perceptive, innovative, secretive, and isolated. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of being useless, helpless, or incapable and the basic desire to be capable and competent. This conflict results in useless specialisation. Their passion is greed or stinginess, in that they hold onto the knowledge they have, fearing it is all that they have.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Five as the Observer. The Observer's focus of attention is the wish to maintain privacy. They maintain emotional distance from others and do not get emotionally involved. Doing without is a defence against involvement as they feel drained by commitment and other peoples' needs. They compartmentalise obligations to remain detached from people, feelings, and things. However, evolved Fives can be excellent decision makers, ivory tower intellectuals, and abstemious monks.

### **Type Six**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this committed and security-oriented type the Loyalist. The Loyalist is engaging, responsible, anxious, and suspicious. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of being without support and guidance, and the basic desire to have security and support. This conflict results in an attachment to beliefs and authority. Their passion is fear or anxiety about the future.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Six as the Devil's Advocate. The Devils Advocate's focus of attention is on the environment for clues that indicate the hidden intention of others. They are fearful, dutiful and plagued by doubt. They procrastinate due to their fear of taking action because exposure may lead to attack. Surprisingly, they identify with the cause of the underdog and are quite anti-authoritarian. They are self-sacrificing and loyal to a cause. There are two types of Sixes. The phobic Six vacillates, feels persecuted and caves in when cornered. The counter-phobic Six feels perpetually cornered and, therefore, goes out to confront the terror in an aggressive way. However, evolved Sixes can be great team players, loyal soldiers, and good friends. They will work for a cause in the same way others work for a profit.



## **Type Seven**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this busy and fun-loving type the Enthusiast. The Enthusiast is spontaneous, versatile, acquisitive, and scattered. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of being deprived and in pain, and the basic desire to be satisfied and content and have their needs fulfilled. This conflict results in frenetic escapism. Their passion is gluttony or a belief that they can never have enough.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Seven as the Epicure. The Epicurer's focus of attention is pleasant mental associations and optimistic future plans. They are like Peter Pan, refusing to take on the responsibility of maturity - the eternal youth of the Enneagram types. They have a dilettantish, superficial, adventurous and gourmet approach to life. Having trouble with commitment, they want to keep their options open to stay emotionally high. They are generally happy and stimulating to be around. They may have the habit of starting things, but not seeing them through. However, evolved Sevens are good synthesisers, theoreticians and Renaissance types.

## **Type Eight**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this powerful and dominating type the Challenger. The Challenger is self-confident, decisive, wilful, and confrontational. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of being harmed or controlled by others and the basic desire to protect one's self (to be in control of one's own life and destiny). This conflict results in constant aggression. Their passion is lust or a constant need for intensity and control.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Eight as the Boss. The Boss' focus of attention is any indication of losing control. They are extremely protective over self and friends. They are combative, take charge and love a fight as they make contact through toe-to-toe confrontation and have respect only for opponents who will stand and fight. There are often open displays of anger and force. Their excessive way of life is characterised by too much indulgence, late nights and extravagance. However, evolved Eights are excellent leaders, especially in the adversarial role. They are powerful supporters for other people and often want to make the way safe for friends.

### **Type Nine**

Riso and Hudson (1999) call this easy-going and self-effacing type the Peacemaker. The Peacemaker is receptive, reassuring, agreeable, and complacent. The personality is formed around the conflict between the basic fear of loss and separation and the basic desire to have inner stability and peace of mind. This conflict results in being stubbornly neglectful. Their passion is sloth or the unwillingness to fully engage with life.

Palmer (1991) describes the Enneatype Nine as the Mediator. The Mediator's focus of attention is other people's agendas and points of view. They are obsessively ambivalent, able to see all points of view and readily replace their own wishes with those of others and real goals with inessential activities. They are more in touch with other people's needs than with their own. Despite being agreeable, their anger comes out in indirect ways and passive aggressively. However, evolved Nines make excellent peacemakers, counsellors and negotiators, and achieve well when on track.

## **Karen Horney**

Karen Horney was born in Germany in 1885. She enrolled in a medical school in Freiburg and later joined the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute, for training from 1914 – 1918, and then as a lecturer from 1918 – 1932 (Carducci, 2009). She challenged the accepted views of Freud's Oedipal Complex and, because of increasing resistance to her cultural contextual approach to personality, she founded the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis and, later, the American Institute of Psychoanalysis in America (Carducci, 2009). Karen Horney wanted to promote the study of psychoanalysis in a more democratic and open manner than was practised by the more traditional Freudian approach of that time (Carducci, 2009).

Karen Horney believed that a child exposed to an unsupportive, uncaring and hostile environment develops strategies to cope with the basic anxiety that such environments produce (Horney, 1946). According to Horney (1946), this basic anxiety is solved in one of three different ways: helplessness, hostility or isolation. Healthy people generally rely on all three trends to successfully negotiate interpersonal relationships. At times, a person may need to be assertive and go against another person. A period of reflection and withdrawal may be more appropriate at other times. Still at other times, being able to move toward people may be the best reaction (Horney, 1946). A person who is not neurotic, therefore, should be able to integrate all three trends and use them appropriately, according to the situation. Sometimes, however, these strategies become solidified and, as the child grows older, they become the predominant way of operating. These three interpersonal trends are characterised by moving against, toward and away from people (Horney, 1946).

### Moving against people

The Aggressive type resolves the basic anxiety experienced as a child by accepting his/her hostile environment and pursues a sense of security by moving against people. They develop strategies of protection and revenge to defeat aggressors in their environment. Their attitude that they must fight against a malevolent world implies that they have to be the most powerful, the best and the most successful. They may exploit, outsmart and make use of others to meet their need, so as to feel safe. Their need to have control over others results in strategies that vary from using direct power over others, to manipulation and making people feel obliged or indebted to them (Horney, 1946).

### Moving toward people

The Compliant type resolves the basic anxiety experienced as a child by accepting their feelings of loss and isolation or helplessness, and pursues a sense of security by moving toward people. According to Horney (1946, p. 51) “this type needs to be liked, wanted, desired, loved; to feel accepted, welcomed, approved of, appreciated; to be needed; to be of importance to others, especially to one particular person; to be helped, protected, taken care of, guided”. Their need to feel safe is manifested by their need for affection and approval. Compliant types overemphasise similarities and disregard differences between themselves and others. They are sensitive to the needs of others, while neglecting their own. They live up to the expectations of others, despite their own feelings. They are self-sacrificing, except in their pursuit of affection (Horney, 1946).

### Moving away from people

The Detached type resolves the basic anxiety experienced as a child by withdrawing from the hostile environment into a world of thoughts, fantasy and emotional numbness to cope with

the hostile environment (Horney, 1946). They lose touch with their dislikes, loves, fears and desires. They are estranged from themselves and have an inner need to emotionally distance themselves from other people, situations and objects. They do this by being self-sufficient and resourceful and by restricting their physical and emotional needs. People who move away from others want to be independent, do everything alone and do not want to be intruded on. They have the ability to watch themselves with a kind of objective interest, as one would watch a work of art (Horney, 1946).

### Neurotic needs

Each of the three interpersonal trends of moving against, toward and away from people can also be understood in terms of the neurotic need that each fulfils. Karen Horney (1946) saw these needs as neurotic because they are compulsive, indiscriminate and generate anxiety or despondence when frustrated or not fulfilled. Horney (1946) identified ten of these neurotic needs, but pointed out that her list was not exhaustive. The ten neurotic needs have been arranged below, according to the three interpersonal trends:

- Moving toward (self-effacing compliant solution)
  - The neurotic need for affection and approval.
  - The neurotic need for a “partner” who will take over one’s life.
- Moving against (expansive, aggressive solution)
  - The neurotic need for power, control, omnipotence and/or perfection.
  - The neurotic need to exploit others.
  - The neurotic need for social recognition or prestige.
  - The neurotic need for personal admiration.
  - The neurotic ambition for personal achievement.
- Moving away (resignation, withdrawal, detachment solution)

- The neurotic need to restrict one's life within narrow boundaries.
- The neurotic need for self-sufficiency and independence.
- The neurotic need for perfection and unassailability.

### **Karen Horney and the Enneagram**

Claudio Naranjo was the first to synthesise Karen Horney's system and the Enneagram (Maitri, 2000). Other enneagram authors have since drawn on Karen Horney to illustrate the character traits of the nine enneagram personality types. They have used her three trends of moving toward, away and against people to show how the nine enneagram types can also be arranged into three groups of three. Riso and Hudson (1999) and Wagner (2001), in particular, have integrated Karen Horney's interpersonal trends into their understanding of the Enneagram.

### **Don Riso and Russ Hudson**

Riso and Hudson (1996) coined the phrase the *Hornevian Groups* to acknowledge Horney's contribution to their understanding of the Enneagram. The three interpersonal trends of moving away, against and toward are associated with a "social style" that classifies people as either withdrawn, assertive or compliant (Riso & Hudson, 1996). Riso and Hudson (1996) not only focused on the interpersonal nature of the trends, but extended them to include the inner and outer environment of people. Therefore, the Withdrawn group withdraw from people as well as activity, the Assertive group assert against nature and their own fears, and the Compliant group are compliant to the dictates of their superego (Riso & Hudson, 1996).

Riso and Hudson (1999) also aligned Horney's three trends with the Enneagram to ensure that each of the trends are represented in the thinking, feeling and instinctive triads. Each triad is

composed of an Aggressive type, a Compliant type, and a Withdrawn type (Riso & Hudson, 1999). For example, in the feeling triad, Type Two is *compliant* to the superego's dictate to be always selfless and loving; Type Three is *aggressive* in the pursuit of their goals and in their competition with others; and Type Four is *withdrawn* to protect their feelings and their fragile self-image. In the thinking triad, Type Five is *withdrawn* and moves away from action into the world of thought and speculation; Type Six is *compliant* to the superego's dictates to do what is expected of them by others and by their own high standards; and Type Seven is *aggressive* about engaging the environment and satisfying their appetites. In the instinctive triad, Type Eight is *aggressive* in asserting themselves against others and the environment; Type Nine is *withdrawn*, so that others will not disturb their inner peacefulness; and Type One is *compliant* to the ideals after which they strive (Riso & Hudson, 1996. p. 433-434).

Riso and Hudson (1999) developed their ideas further in *The Wisdom of the Enneagram*. The superimposition of Horney's interpersonal trends on the Enneagram, so that each trend is represented in the thinking, feeling and instinctive triad, enabled Riso and Hudson (1999) to incorporate what each personality type most wants and the strategies they adopt to achieve it. The personality types of the instinctual triad want autonomy. The personality types of the feeling triad want attention, and the personality types of the thinking triad want security. The Hornebian groups indicate that each type will choose a strategy of demanding, earning or withdrawing to meet these needs of autonomy, attention and security. This arrangement allows for the following analysis of the nine Enneagram personality types:

### **Moving against people**

Type Three, Seven and Eight demand attention, security and autonomy, respectively. These Assertive types inflate their egos rather than back down. They are active and direct, as they go after what they need. Type Three demands attention by doing whatever wins attention and recognition. Type Seven demands security and goes after anything that will make them feel secure. Type Eight demands autonomy by insisting and pushing against people (Riso & Hudson, 1996).

### **Moving toward people**

Type One, Six and Two earn attention, security and autonomy, respectively. These Compliant types are ruled by the superego as they try to determine the best way to accommodate the demands of others. They try to be good to get their needs met. Type Ones earn autonomy by being perfect, so that other people will not interfere with them because they are beyond reproach. Type Sixes earn security by doing what is expected of them to feel safe. Type Two earns attention by serving and helping others (Riso & Hudson, 1996).

### **Moving away from people**

Type Nine, Five and Four withdraw for autonomy, security and attention, respectively. These Withdrawn types get their needs met by disengaging from others and entering into a world of imagination and fantasy. Type Nine withdraws, disengages and “tunes out” into an inner sanctum of their own space to maintain autonomy. Type Five withdraws into a complex cerebral world of thoughts, schemes and ideas to feel secure and safe by staying away from people. Type Four withdraws into an idealised and romantic inner world, while going off alone, so that someone will come looking for them to have their need for attention met (Riso & Hudson, 1996).



## Jerome Wagner

Wagner (2001) relates the nine personality types to Karen Horney's interpersonal styles by focusing on the lines that connect the different personality types in the Enneagram symbol. According to the Enneagram system, a person either moves toward a point of security or a point of stress on the Enneagram (Palmer, 1988; Riso & Hudson, 1996). These are movements toward integration or disintegration, respectively. For example, a healthy movement for a perfectionistic Type One is toward the spontaneous Type Seven, and an unhealthy movement would be toward the self-indulgent Type Four. However, as there are levels of integration, or levels of health, in any type, it is possible to move toward either the unhealthy or healthy side of a type that is connected to the primary personality (Riso & Hudson, 1999). Wagner (2001) uses this dynamic of either moving toward the unhealthy or healthy side of either one of the two types that are connected to the primary type and Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends to develop his view. According to Wagner (2001, p.3) "it is possible to move toward, against, or away from people and situations in a healthy or compulsive manner, depending on whether we aim for the high side of each style or miss the mark and hit the low side".

Wagner (2001) groups Type Two, Six and Seven as moving toward people and situations; Type Eight, Three and One as moving against people and situations; and Type Five, Nine and Four as moving away from people and situations. The lines that connect the points on the Enneagram symbol make it possible for each personality type to have a choice of either acting according to their own preferred style or strategy, or adopting the style of either of the two types they are connected to. For example, Type One, often called the Perfectionist or Reformer, can access either personality Type Seven or Type Four, since there are lines

connecting these types on the Enneagram diagram. However, a movement to Type Four is seen as less healthy than the movement to Type Seven, because a healthy move for a perfectionistic One is toward the fun-loving and spontaneous Seven rather than the self-indulgent Four. As each Enneagram type follows the same formation as the example above, Wagner (2001) arranges Karen Horney's interpersonal trends in the following way:

- 1-7-4 (against, toward, away from)
- 2-4-8 (toward, away from, against)
- 3-6-9 (against, toward, away from)
- 4-1-2 (away from, against, toward)
- 5-8-7 (away from, against, toward)
- 6-9-3 (toward, away from, against)
- 7-5-1 (toward, away from, against)
- 8-2-5 (against, toward, away from)
- 9-3-6 (away from, against, toward).

#### **1-7-4 (against, toward, away from)**

Applying Karen Horney's interpersonal trends to this arrangement, Wagner (2001) shows how Type One can move against people in a healthy or unhealthy way. They can either inspire people by moving against the status quo toward a world of possibility, or they can become resentful and critical when reality does not meet their perfectionistic standards. Type One can also adopt Type Seven's position of moving toward people (Wagner, 2001). Here, they can either move toward people in a healthy way and be accepting, affirming and optimistic, or in an unhealthy way and indulge in pleasure as a way to avoid pain and discomfort. Or, they can adopt Type Four's strategy of moving away from people (Wagner,

2001). A healthy moving away is the ability to assess and evaluate a situation without the desire to fix or perfect the situation. An unhealthy moving away is when Type One withdraws and becomes depressed because they feel flawed and imperfect and lose faith in their ability to make the world a better place.

### **2-4-8 (toward, away from, against)**

Type Two moves toward other people and situations (Wagner, 2001). They value being connected to people and, in a healthy state, affirm, embrace and express approval of others. However, they can become over-dependent, suffocating, and flattering and can manipulate people for attention and love. Type Two can adopt Type Four's strategy of moving away from people. Here, they respect the independence of the people they love and are able to recognise that they are lovable because of their own uniqueness. However, they can also adopt an unhealthy moving away by feeling rejected, hurt, misunderstood and unappreciated by others. Just as Type One loses faith in their vision of the world, Type Two loses their belief in their ability to love.

When Type Two takes up the moving against position of Type Eight, they can take a healthy stance of setting boundaries, recognising their need for love and support, and being able to allow those they love to take responsibility for themselves. Here, Type Two are able to engage in tough love. On the downside though, they can become demanding, aggressive and spiteful when they sense they have been taken advantage of, or are not being appreciated for what they do.

### **3-6-9 (against, toward, away from)**

Type Threes move against people and situations by aggressively achieving their goals, removing obstacles and being competitive. Type Three can also be deceitful, manipulative and dishonest. They can overwork themselves to the point of burnout and exhaustion. Type Three can also adopt the moving toward strategy of Type Six. Here, they focus not only on their goals, but are now as committed to people as they are to success. Their achievements are based more on what they personally value and not on other people's expectations. However, they can move to the downside of Type Six, and lose themselves in their achievements. They become “the 'organizational person' instead of an organised person” (Wagner, 2001, p. 5).

If Type Threes adopt the moving away position of Type Nine, they can separate themselves from the goals they pursue and evaluate the impact of these goals on their lives and the wider implication of blindly pursuing them. Type Three is able to separate their sense of self from what they do. However, they may adopt the indolent position of the Nine and numb out, refusing to engage in any activity that reminds them of the possibility of failure. They resign themselves, avoid confrontation and give up.

#### **4-1-2 (away from, against, toward)**

Type Fours withdraw into a world of subjective feelings, focusing on their uniqueness and special creativity. In a healthy space, they are able to reflect these inner musings through art, poetry and other creative expression. If they withdraw too far, however, they believe it is pointless in expressing themselves to a world that misunderstands them. They become self-indulgent and depressed. If they take the position of moving against the world, as Type One does, they cease to withdraw and become more focused. They realise what needs to be done to express themselves in the outer world and take up a proactive and disciplined stance in the world. However, if they take this stance too far, they become critical of the creative

expression of others, arrogant and self-indulgent in their righteous opinions. Type Four can also adopt the moving toward strategy of Type Two. Here, because of their familiarity with their own feelings of shame and aloneness, they can be truly empathetic and exhibit genuine compassion to others. Type Fours can transcend themselves and connect with the other. However, they can become over-involved in the lives others and, like unhealthy Twos, lose all sense of boundaries and become manipulative to force others to recognise their specialness and uniqueness.

### **5-8-7 (away from, against, toward)**

The stance of Type Five is to withdraw. Healthy withdrawal occurs when it allows Type Five to form a holistic impression of a situation, and assess it without getting lost in insignificant details. If they withdraw in an unhealthy way, they become distant and aloof, and more interested in protecting their privacy. Knowledge and information becomes a buttress to protect them against a hostile world. However, like Type Fives, they can move to a healthy Type Seven or a healthy Type Eight. Type Sevens move toward people, so a Five at Type Seven is light-hearted and engaging, often displaying a witty sense humour. If Type Five moves to healthy Type Eight, they use their knowledge to move against the world by asserting their intellectual position with self-assurance and confidence. However, if they adopt the unhealthy stance of these two types, Type Fives merely seek out fun at the expense of doing anything as they move to Seven, or they use their intellect to undermine others and express contempt for those that oppose them at Type Eight.

### **6-9-3 (toward, away from, against)**

Type Sixes move toward people so that they feel secure. They are loyal and faithful friends and companions, bravely supporting others. However, if they feel insecure they are inclined

to ingratiate themselves to people they see as protective and to authority. They try to establish alliances with others to feel safe. When Type Six adopts the healthy position of Type Nine, they withdraw or “step back and say, ‘so what!’ instead of being caught up in their fears which ask ‘What if?’” (Wagner, 2001, p.6.). If they take the unhealthy side of Type Nine, they move from the relaxed, tolerant and trusting part of Type Nine to the part that avoids confrontation, which results in worry and self-doubt.

When Type Sixes move against the world and go to Type Three, they can become proactive and goal-directed and channel their anxious energy into action in a healthy way, or they can become aggressive and attacking in defending their position and beliefs in an unhealthy way.

#### **7-5-1 (toward, away from, against)**

Type Sevens enjoy good company, socialising and having fun. They move toward people to attain these pleasures. When healthy, they can enjoy themselves in moderation. At more unhealthy levels though, they engage only in activities that entertain. They get bored easily and desperately seek out other pursuits that will maintain their interest. When Type Sevens move to the healthier side of Type Five, they withdraw into themselves and are able to reflect on what gives them pleasure, and deepen their experience of it by engaging at a less superficial level. However, they can withdraw too much and become disconnected and remote, instead of reflective. Type Sevens move against people and situations as they move to Type One. At a healthy level their idealism allows them to delay their gratification long enough to achieve something. At a more unhealthy level, they move against people, demanding they have their need for pleasure be met and responding with anger and resentment when their gratification is delayed.

### **8-2-5 (against, toward, away from)**

Type Eights typify Karen Horney's moving against more than any other Enneagram type. They challenge people and situations without backing down, and fight for justice and what is right. They are assertive, but if assertiveness changes to aggression they enter more unhealthy levels of functioning. They can then be vindictive and vengeful. Type Eights move toward people at Type Two. Here they use their energy and power to support others with understanding and empathy. However, at lower levels of functioning, they only help others to create dependencies. Much like the Godfather, they use their strength to exploit the weakness of others. Type Eights withdraw from people and situations as they move to Type Five. A healthy expression of this is when Type Eight is able to stand back and consider the implications of their actions before they act. At the downside of Type Five they lose touch with their compassion and can be cruel and heartless, plotting their revenge on those that have injured them.

### **9-3-6 (away from, against, toward)**

Finally, Type Nines move away from people. Their natural tendency is to escape any tension or conflict by withdrawing into fantasy and imagination. At healthy levels, they make perfect mediators because they can appreciate the opinions and values of others without their own views and prejudices interfering. At more unhealthy levels, however, their fear of conflict forces them to withdraw further into an ideal world, where they do not even recognise that conflict exists. Now they refuse to do anything that may impact upon them. However, when they do act, it is often because they shift toward Type Three position of moving against people and situations. They direct their energy in a healthy and constructive way when they attack their problems with gusto and focus. At the unhealthy level of Type Three, they adopt

Type Three's compulsive need to be active, but retain Type Nine's tendency to numb out; so Type Nines busy themselves with repetitive and mindless tasks.

Type Nines move toward others when they go to Type Six. A healthy move galvanises them to action, as loyalty and support for others motivates them. Type Nine's desire for peace and avoidance of conflict makes them overly concerned about what other people think, and they attempt to placate others to maintain the peace when they are in an unhealthy state. Type Nines then not only lose themselves in a world of imagination, but at unhealthy Type Six they lose themselves in relationships with significant others and teams and group belonging.

### **Conclusion**

The literature reveals that the theoretical understanding of the relationship between the Enneagram and Karen Horney's interpersonal trends has been articulated, explored and developed by various Enneagram authors. However, there has been no empirical research done to substantiate these theories. The present study hopes to determine which Enneagram types best correlate with each of the three interpersonal trends, and if the various theories offered can explain the findings of the empirical research.



## **CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Through the lens of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends**

The aim of this chapter is to review studies that relate to Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. As there is very little research directly related to the relationship between Karen Horney and the Enneagram, the review of the literature extends to research that assessed the convergent validity of the Enneagram by comparing it to measures of established reliability and validity. These studies reveal constructs and functions that illustrate Karen Horney's interpersonal trends and formulate possible relationships with the Enneagram typology. Additionally, research that explores and attempts to explain human experience and phenomena is also reviewed through the lens of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. First, however, early studies attempting to validate instruments to determine people's Enneagram type will be discussed.

### **Measures to validate Enneagram types**

Zinkle's (1974) doctoral dissertation, *A Pilot Study toward the Validation of a Sufi Personality Typology*, is the most referenced by other Enneagram researchers (Dameyer, 2001; Giordano, 2008; Scott, 2010; Wagner, 1981). His attempt to demonstrate not only the existence of the nine Enneagram types in the general population, but that individuals belong only to one of the nine types, resulted in the first instrument to measure a person's Enneagram type. This initial attempt resulted in the accurate typing of 56% of 54 participants who had already predetermined their type (Zinkle, 1974). Nine percent did not correspond with their predetermined type and 35% did not fit into any of the nine types (Zinkle, 1974).

Unfortunately, Zinkle (1974) used percentages rather than statistical analysis to determine the validity of his measure, which undermined his efforts. Despite these unimpressive results, the

research design of selecting participants who had self-identified their Enneagram type became the benchmark used by researchers (Palmer, 1988; Randall, 1979; Thrasher, 1994; Wagner, 1981) to develop and validate other Enneagram measures.

Randall (1979) developed an instrument through asking Enneagram experts to select and eliminate items that did not fit their expert experience of their own identified type. After various stages of further refinement the 95-item questionnaire was administered to 92 participants who already knew their Enneagram type. Of these 92 participants, 99.2% were correctly typed by Randall's instrument. However, administration to a further thirty Enneagram-naive participants resulted in only 23.3% being identified as the same type the Enneagram experts rated them to be. Randall did not compute the inter-rater reliability between the Enneagram experts, which undermined the reliability of the questionnaire as the criterion of external reliability (expert's experience) for the instrument was not met.

Wagner (1981) developed and administered a 135-item measure, the Enneagram Personality Inventory (EPI) to differentiate the nine Enneagram types of 160 participants. Following training on the Enneagram system, the EPI was re-administered to 107 participants. Inter-item correlation for the 15 items that measured each of the nine Enneagram Types before training showed the alpha consistency coefficients ranged from a low of .368 for Type Nine to a high of .782 for Type Five. After training, the alpha coefficients ranged from .628 for Type Nine to .815 for Type Five. Wagner did admit this increase was due to participant's increased knowledge of the Enneagram and, therefore, he was unable to calculate a formal test-retest reliability coefficient. However, the predictive validity of the test showed a significant correlation between the participant's judgement of their own type (external

criterion) and the corresponding scale of the EPI (predictor). The Kappa coefficient was .284 after first administration, increasing to .403 after training.

Wagner has continued to develop and revise the EPI. Now called the The Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales (WEPSS) (1999), (as cited in Wagner, 2008) it measures the different levels of personality functioning within each of the Enneagram types. The 200 items, measured on a five-point Likert scale, capture both the resourceful, adaptive side and the non-resourceful, maladaptive dimension of each style, and gives an overall score for each type. Wagner (2008) notes that the WEPSS (1999) has sufficient standardisation, reliability, and validity data to be reviewed favourably as adequate in the fifteenth edition of the *Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook*.

Seven years later, Cohen and Palmer introduced the Cohen-Palmer Enneagram Inventory (CPEI) to the growing Enneagram community (Palmer, 1988). In their study to determine the predictive validity of the test, they administered the CPEI to 172 participants who knew their Enneagram type and who were familiar with the theory of the Enneagram. The CPEI was shown to predict 26% to 72% of the known Enneagram types successfully. Further discriminant analysis to categorise the nine Enneagram types into nine distinct categories resulted in 97% of participants being allocated into their respective predetermined types (Palmer, 1988).

However, the problem with the preceding studies lies in the choice and selection of research participants. The method of selecting participants who have either self-identified or who have predetermined their Enneagram type to develop and validate Enneagram measures undermines the efforts of researchers. As Scott (2010, p. 24) asks, “do the subjects who know their types merely report on what the typology has told them about themselves, thus reporting

not on themselves so much as on the theory, or do they have knowledge of themselves that the test validly and reliably taps?”. Therefore, despite the statistically significant results, this nuisance variable may negate many of these findings. Furthermore, this endorsement bias may influence the internal validity of the measures because participants choose items that concur with the theoretical descriptions of the Enneagram types they believe they are, rather than who they actually are.

Despite the limitations of these measures, Sharp (1994) conducted factor analyses on a combination of the Palmer and Cohen's (1988) 108-item Cohen-Palmer Enneagram Inventory (CPEI); Wagner's (1981) 135-item Enneagram Personality Inventory (EPI); Zinkle's (1974) 225-item inventory. Sharp (1994) administered the tests to 335 university students aged between 16 and 67 years. Sharp (1994) extracted six factors which accounted for 55% of the variance. The factors were ambition, anxious compulsion, not interpretable, excess, positive extroversion and denial, and they related to the following Enneagram types:

Ambition:	Type 3 and 8
Anxious compulsion:	Type 1, 5, and 6
Not Interpretable:	Type 9, 6, 1, 2, 5 and 4
Excess:	Type 4, 5 and 7
Positive extroversion:	Type 2 and 7
Denial:	Type 6, 7, and 9.

The small number of participants reduced the power of the study, because of the low participant to variables ratio. Once the instruments were combined, over 3000 participants would be needed to perform a meaningful factor analysis (Howell, 2007). However, the factors identified do reflect the theoretical descriptions of the nine types. The factor ambition

indicates Horney's going against type relating to the aggression of the Type Eight. The anxious compulsions of Type One, Five and Six confirm the moving away and/or moving toward type.

Studies to investigate inter-rater reliability highlighted a further challenge to researchers developing measures, namely the limitations of using Enneagram experts. The various theoretical approaches to the Enneagram may also impact on how Enneagram experts conceive the Enneagram types. Gamard (1986) assessed the inter-rater reliability of Enneagram typing experts by presenting to 31 Enneagram experts video-taped interviews of 36 University of California students, who had been determined by Dr Claudio Naranjo and Gamard to represent each of the nine types. Fifteen of the experts had more than fourteen years of Enneagram experience and sixteen had less than seven years of experience. The experts were divided into two groups. Cohen's Kappa was set at .61 as a minimum value of strength of agreement. Results indicated a fair, but not statistically significant inter-rater agreement below .60. In a follow-up study three years later, the videos were shown to seven of the original experts indicating test-retest reliability of moderate for the more experienced experts (.598), and fair (.434) for the less experienced experts. This led Gamard (1986) to question not only the reliability and validity of the Enneagram types, but the accuracy of Enneagram expert typing of people into the nine Enneagram types.

Dameyer (2001) found Enneagram expert inter-rater reliability to range from strong to poor, depending on the Enneagram types. Three Enneagram experts (Don Riso, Jerry Wagner and Virginia Price) assigned one of the nine Enneagram types to each of the 300 personality adjectives on Gough's (1952) Adjective Check List (as cited in Dameyer, 2001). Inter-judge Pearson correlations ( $p < .05$ ) differed between the judges on various combinations of

Enneagram types. For example, there was strong agreement on Type Eight and Nine (.90), moderate agreement on Type One, Three and Seven (.68) and poor agreement (.46) on Type Two, Four, Five and Six. Dameyer (2001) suggests these results are due to the different conceptual frameworks that the judges operate within. Virginia Price is rooted in the “narrative” understanding of the Enneagram and her classifications showed lower levels of agreement than those between Riso and Wagner (Dameyer, 2001).

The above review of earlier studies that attempted to design a valid and reliable measure of Enneagram type is not exhaustive, but does reflect the major challenges and difficulties confronting Enneagram researchers. Other measures, such as the Brent Attentional Style (BASI) (Brent, 1994), and the Essential Enneagram Test (Daniels & Price, 2009) consisting of nine short paragraphs describing the main elements of each type, reflect the growing interest in and use of the Enneagram system.

### **Studies of construct validity**

The earliest exploration of the construct validity of the Enneagram was by Wagner (1981). He administered both the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Form F (1976) and the Millon-Illinois Self-Report Inventory: Form P (1974), (as cited in Wagner, 1981) to 390 participants aged 19 to 81. Most of the participants (323) were from Roman Catholic religious congregations from the Midwest. The participants had predetermined their Enneagram type through attending training courses, reading books and discussions with their peers.

Statistically significant (beyond the .0001 level) and congruent differences among the nine Enneagram types were revealed through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of each of the nine types by the Millon scales, and the Myers-Briggs raw score and converted score

scales. Wagner (1981, p. 716) was able to demonstrate “how each Enneagram type produced a unique profile on the Millon and Myers-Briggs measures, evincing both convergent and discriminant validity”. Some years later Palmer and Cohen administered the Cohen-Palmer Enneagram Inventory (CPEI) (Palmer, 1988) along with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to measure the construct validity of the Enneagram. Palmer (1988) reported that CPEI scores were consistent with scores on the MBTI. Furthermore, these results, though not totally identical to Wagner’s, were similar.

In terms of this study Karen Horney’s trends have been included in Table 1 overleaf to indicate how Wagner's (1981) research supports the classification of the nine Enneagram types into the moving toward, against and away categories.

Table 1.

*Karen Horney's trends in relation to the Millon-Illinois and Myers-Briggs scales*

<b>Karen Horney's trend</b>	<b>Enneagram type</b>	<b>Wagner's type description</b>	<b>Average scores on Millon scales</b>	<b>Average scores on Myers Briggs.</b>
Away	4	None.	None	None
	5	Reserved and retiring.	More detached and less assertive.	More introverted.
	9	Reserved and retiring. Less need for order.	More detached and less assertive.	More introverted. Low discipline.
Toward	1	Need rules, schedules, and structures.	Higher on discipline.	Higher on judging.
	2	Need to be appreciated.		High passive-dependent.
	6	Reserved and retiring. Need rules, schedules, and structures. Need authoritative approval.	More detached and less assertive. Higher on discipline.	More introverted. Higher on judging. High passive-dependent.
Against	3	Sociable, outgoing, and aggressive. Need rules, schedules, and structures. Adequate and competent.	Less detached, more gregarious, and more assertive. Higher on discipline. Higher self-assured.	More extroverted. Higher judging.
	7	Sociable, outgoing, and aggressive. Less need for order. Adequate and competent.	Less detached, more gregarious, and more assertive. Higher self-assured.	More extroverted. Low discipline
	8	Sociable, outgoing, and aggressive. Actively resist any external impositions. Adequate and competent.	Less detached, more gregarious, and more assertive. Higher self-assured.	More extroverted. Low discipline.



Wagner and Walker (1983) did not intend to analyse their findings in relation to Karen Horney's interpersonal trends, but such an analysis is particularly applicable to the current research project as it contributes to the development of a hypotheses of the relationship between moving away, toward and against people and the nine Enneagram types. Type Five, and Nine can be seen as moving away or Withdrawn types, as they scored as more detached and less assertive than the average on the Millon test and more introverted on the MBTI. Notably, Type Six also scored higher than average on the detached and less assertive scale. This points to Type Six's ambivalence where they can either be accommodating or challenging depending on the context. However, their motivation to keep themselves' safe remains. Lastly, Type Four, normally assigned as a Withdrawn Type, did not differ significantly from the other Enneagram Types.

Type Three, Seven and Eight, who scored as less detached, more gregarious and more assertive on the Millon test, and more extroverted on the MBTI, can be described as Aggressive types or moving against people. The scores for Type One, Three and Six indicate that they move toward people, or are Compliant types, as they scored higher on Millon's discipline scale and have a preference for judging on the MBTI. Both scales reflected a liking for structure for these types. Thus, a need for rules, schedules and structures for these types to function well is confirmed. It is understandable that Type Three falls under both moving against and moving toward, as this types prefers to go against people, but is highly self-disciplined and focused in achieving their goals.

Type Seven and Nine scored lower on the Millon discipline scale. Both Type Seven and Nine appear to be scattered jumping from one activity to the next. Both are known to keep their options open. Type Seven is afraid to commit, because they might miss out on another

opportunity, and Type Nine does not commit because they need to take all alternatives into consideration.

High scores on the Millon passive-dependant scale indicate a Compliant or moving toward stance. As predicted, Type Two who need to be appreciated and depends on approval of others, and type Six who depend on authority for a sense of security, both scored high on this scale. Conversely, the Aggressive, or moving against types, are predicted to score low on this scale and high on the Millon self-assured scale. The results indicate Type Three, Seven and Eight to be Aggressive types.

As mentioned earlier the main limitation of the Wagner and Walker (1983) study was the selection of participants who knew their Enneagram type. To overcome this limitation, Warling (1995) selected 153 Enneagram naïve participants for her study by excluding any respondent who reported to having an understanding of the Enneagram or knowledge of their Enneagram type. Warling (1995) compared the results of the Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (RHETI) (Riso & Hudson, 1994) to the results of the Cattell 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF).

More relevant to the current study is Warling's analysis of the 16PF in relation to Riso and Hudson's (1999) Hornebian Groups, which are based on their understanding of Karen Horney's approach. Once Warling (1995) had analysed the correlations between the two measures, she collapsed the nine Enneagram types into Riso and Hudson's Hornebian Groups. Discriminant analysis was performed using Cattell's personality factors (independent variables) as predictors of membership to one of Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends (dependent variables). Results confirmed convergent validity between the two. Significant

results are presented in Table 2 overleaf and demonstrate that, as a group, Type One, Two and Six (moving toward) are warm, rule conscious, perfectionistic and low in abstractedness. Type Five, Nine and Four (moving away) are low in dominance, liveliness, rule consciousness and social boldness and high in self-reliance. Type Eight, Seven and Three are more emotionally stable, dominant, lively, socially bold and open to change than the other types. According to Warling (1995), these results are in alignment with Riso and Hudson's description of the Hornebian groups.

Table 2.

*Significant biserial correlations between the Hornebian group and Cattell's 16PF*

Personality Factor	Moving Toward	Moving Away	Moving Against
Warmth	.17*		
Emotional Stability			.28**
Dominance		-.34**	.42**
Liveliness		-.19*	.25**
Rule Consciousness	.23**	-.18*	
Social Boldness		-.38**	.42**
Sensitivity			
Vigilance			
Abstractedness	-.23**		
Privateness		-.17*	
Apprehension			-.33**

Openness to Change		.22**
Self-reliance		.20*
Perfectionism	.25**	
Tension		

---

\*p < 0.05 \*\*p < 0.01

A study conducted by Brown & Bartram (2005) explored the relationship between personality traits measured by the Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ32) and Enneagram types. Multiple discriminant analysis (MDA) was used to classify the OPQ32 scales into the nine Enneagram types. A convenience sample of volunteers who had established their Enneagram type through training courses and interviews run by the Enneagram Institute was provided by Riso and Hudson's Enneagram Institute. The 241 participants came from different countries, but were mainly white middle-class Americans. Participants were aged between 22 and 76 years ( $M = 49.3$ ;  $SD = 10.3$ ); 27% were male and 73% were female. Enneagram types of the participants were distributed more or less evenly, with the smallest group being Type Eight ( $n = 16$ ) and the biggest being Type Four ( $n = 35$ ).

Multiple discriminant analysis revealed six functions that were statistically significant: conscientiousness, extroversion and openness to experience, agreeableness, emotional stability, data orientation, and competition. These functions, evaluated at group means, indicated which functions best identify each of the nine Enneagram types:

Type One: High conscientiousness.

Type Two: Neither particularly high nor low on any of the six functions.

Type Three: High competition and relatively high extroversion and openness to experience.

- Type Four: Relatively low conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability.
- Type Five: Low agreeableness and high data orientation.
- Type Six: High agreeableness and relatively low emotional stability.
- Type Seven: High extroversion and openness to experience and relatively low conscientiousness.
- Type Eight: Very high extroversion and openness to experience, high conscientiousness and relatively high emotional stability.
- Type Nine: Low extroversion and openness to experience and high emotional stability.

The reliability of participants identifying their own Enneagram type was tested by using these discriminant functions and comparing these with the Enneagram type participants predicted themselves to be. A high number (75.5%) did predict their type correctly. Of the Type Eights 97% had predicted their type correctly, as did 70% of the other types, except for Type Two where only 51% had predicted their type correctly.

In relation to the current research on the relationship between Karen Horney's interpersonal trends and the Enneagram, it is important to note that the functions of the OPQ scales are in line with Karen Horney's descriptions of the three interpersonal trends. Moreover, Enneagram theory postulates that certain Enneagram types will fall into one of the three Karen Horney interpersonal trends. The arrangement of the following types in terms of their functions provides support for this. Type One's high conscientiousness and Type Six's high agreeableness point to the Compliant or moving toward type. Type Three's high competition and relatively high extroversion, and Type Eight's very high extroversion and openness to experience point to the Aggressive or moving against, type. Last, Type Four's relatively low conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability, and Type Nine's low extroversion

and openness to experience and high emotional stability point to the Withdrawn or moving away type.

A study by Nathans and Van der Meer (2009) questioned the validity of the popular descriptions of the personality characteristics of the different Enneagram types. They focussed on descriptions of problem solving and creativity pertaining to different Enneagram types by administering the Kirton Adaption Innovation Inventory (KAI), a 33-item paper-and-pencil inventory designed to measure the preferred behaviour of an individual regarding problem-solving, to 124 participants. The KAI is a less well-known, but thoroughly validated, measure used across different cultures. Cronbach alpha ranged from .86 to .90 in fourteen independent studies. Test-retest reliability ranged from .82 to .91 in five independent studies (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009).

In their findings, Nathans and Van der Meer (2009, p. 78) concluded, “We see a strong correlation with a very well-validated questionnaire. If the Enneagram was not valid, we would not find any correlation”. This argument underpins many other attempts to validate the Enneagram, but such reasoning justifies only the concurrent validity of the Enneagram; it cannot be interpreted to mean that nine distinct Enneagram types do occur in the general population.

The design of Nathans and Van der Meer’s (2009) study required participants to be certain of their Enneagram type. The researchers justified the small sample of 124 as follows: “To get valid results we needed to distribute the Kirton Adaption Innovation Inventory (KAI) to people who had identified their type correctly. We needed to be absolutely sure of the accuracy of the subjects’ types” (p. 67). Therefore, they drew their 124 participants from the

Enneagram Business Network in Europe, from the Enneagram Professional Training Program (the professional training program of Helen Palmer and David Daniels), from participants of the annual conference of the Association of Enneagram Teachers in the Narrative Tradition, and from the Enneagram Foundation Netherlands, with the assumption that these experts would be certain of their Enneagram type.

The scores on the KAI categorised people as either Adaptors or Innovators (Nathans & Van der Meer (2009)). Adaptors are characterized by precision, reliability, efficiency, prudence, discipline and conformity. They are seen as sound, conforming, safe and dependable. They seldom challenge rules and, then, only when assured of strong support. They tend to have high levels of self-doubt and react to criticism by closer outward conformity. They are vulnerable to social pressures and authority and are compliant. They are also sensitive to people (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009).

On the other end of the continuum are the innovators. Innovators are seen as abrasive, creating dissonance in settled groups and irreverent of consensual views, and they take control especially in unstructured situations (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009). They often challenge rules and have little respect for custom and tradition. They do not need consensus to maintain certitude in face of opposition and may appear insensitive to people (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009).

An analysis of the KAI's three factor traits or sub-scores of originality, efficiency and conformity in relation to the nine Enneagram types revealed a statistically significant relationship between Enneagram type and adaptive versus innovative style (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009). The ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference between Enneagram types and their scores on KAI at a significance level of 0.05 or better (Nathans &

Van der Meer, 2009). Type One tends to an Adaptive style and is the most conforming type. However, Type One differs statistically only from Type Four and Eight, the least conforming types (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009). Type Four and Eight tend to Innovation, with Type Four being significantly less conforming than Type One, Two, Five and Nine (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009). Type Eight scores as the most nonconforming type and the difference in this measure with Type One, Two, and Nine is significant. Type Seven tends toward Innovation (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009).

The descriptions of the Adaptor and Innovator (Nathans & Van der Meer, 2009), which are based on the Adaption and Innovation theory of Kirton, bear a strong resemblance to Karen Horney's moving toward, or Compliant type, and the moving against, or Aggressive type, respectively. If the findings of Nathans and Van der Meer's (2009) study are interpreted with Karen Horney in mind, Type One displays a moving toward or Compliant trend and Type Three, Four, Seven and Eight display a moving against or Aggressive trend. These findings do concur with the Enneagram system, except that Type Four is most often classified as a moving away or Withdrawn type and not as an Aggressive type.

### **The Enneagram and human phenomena**

Whillans (2009) used grounded theory to investigate the presentation of chronic pain and how people with different Enneagram types deal with chronic pain. She demonstrated significant type-related differences in the manner participants experience and present with chronic pain and in how practitioners respond to their chronic patients.

Whillans (2009) only included participants who she was certain belonged to a particular Enneagram type. Her novel way of typing the participants included the direct use of Karen



Horney's interpersonal trends. She used Riso and Hudson's (1999) Hornebian Groups, the Assertives (Type Seven, Eight, Three), the Compliers (Type One, Two, Six), and the Withdrawns (Type Four, Five, Nine), to assess how her patients automatically tended to cope with long-term stress resulting from chronic pain. She used a further two triadic formations, the Body-Heart-Mind triad (Type Eight, Nine, One and Type Two, Three, Four and Type Five, Six, Seven, respectively), and Riso and Hudson's Harmonic or positive outlook group (Type 9, 2, 3), Competency group (Type 3, 1, 5) and Reactive group (Type 6, 4, 8) to divide each of the 63 participants into one of the nine Enneagram types. Whillans (2009) did acknowledge that, to effectively type participants using this method, requires applied knowledge of the Enneagram triads, understanding of coping strategies and therapeutic listening abilities. However, this approach does foreground the dangers of subjective bias in the typing process and undermines the validity of the study.

To increase the validity of the study, only research findings with a consistency 84% or higher were included in the findings (Whillans, 2009). As such, only chronic pain experiences common to 84% of a particular type were reported. The study did reveal significant type-related differences between personality types and how they coped with chronic pain (Whillans, 2009). Whillans (2009) notes that the Assertives (Type Three, Seven and Eight) have a tendency to move into the stressful situation, to make their presence known and to assert their will. The Compliers (Type One, Two and Six) attempt to decrease stress by becoming compliant to external demands and conditions, or to internal ones (superego), or to rules. The Withdrawns (Type Four, Five and Nine) attempt to withdraw from the source of stress. They do this by either physically removing themselves, or by removing their awareness onto other matters, or zoning out (Whillans, 2009).

The limitations of Whillan's (2009) study are related to the method used to identify Enneagram type. As indicated by Gamrand (1986) and Dameyer (2001), Enneagram expert judgement regarding a person's Enneatype is suspect. However, to increase the reliability of expert judging, Whillans did exclude any participant who had independently predetermined their type if that type did not agree with Whillans classification. As the sample was limited to 63 participants (39 females and 24 males) the results cannot be generalised. However, the nature of the analysis and the grounded theory approach does not require a large sample to make relevant observations (Whillans. 2009).

Wagner (2008) questioned whether the different Enneagram types favour certain cognitive schemas over others. According to Young (1999), (as cited in Wagner, 2008) Schemas are mental maps by which the world is understood. The nine Enneagram types can be understood as nine different schemas or maps to understand the world. Schema can be either adaptive or maladaptive. Schema can either accurately represent reality and can adjust to this reality, or can distort reality to comply with the established schema. In the same way, the nine Enneagram types can either engage with reality or, at an unhealthy level, distort reality. Moreover, certain maladaptive schemas are more likely to be adopted by certain Enneagram types. Young (as cited in Wagner, 2008) identifies eleven of these maladaptive schemas or "life traps".

To explore the relationship between the eleven maladaptive schemas or life traps and the nine Enneagram styles, Wagner (2008) administered the Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales (WEPSS) and the Lifetraps Questionnaire to 125 participants (44 males and 81 females aged from 27 to 72) from his Enneagram Spectrum Training and Certification Programs. The participants did not need to know their Enneagram type.

The Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales (WE PSS) measures the different levels of personality functioning within each of the Enneagram types. The 200 items, measured on a five-point Likert scale, capture both the resourceful, adaptive side and the non-resourceful, maladaptive dimension of each style, and give an overall score for each type. The Lifetraps Questionnaire measures the strength of the eleven life traps: abandonment, mistrust and abuse, emotional deprivation, social exclusion, dependence, vulnerability, defectiveness, failure, subjugation, and entitlement. The Lifetraps Questionnaire has not been standardised and there is no information on its validity and reliability.

Pearson correlations revealed significant results at the .01 and .05 levels of significance (Wagner, 2008). The results indicate a degree of concurrent validity as the correlations confirmed the theoretical relationship between cognitive schema and Enneagram theories (Wagner, 2008). A consistent profile also emerged of the Enneagram types in relation to Karen Horney's interpersonal trends; however, the statistical significance was small (Wagner, 2008). For example, Type Two (.325), Four (.345) and Six (.201) identified with the abandonment life trap when in a maladaptive space, and Type Four (.285) even when in an adaptive space (Wagner, 2008).

Wagner (2008) comments that these small, but statistically significant, relationships between Enneagram type and the eleven cognitive maladaptive schemas may have had a greater mean difference if the participants were drawn from a clinical population of long-term psychotherapy patients. As the participants were drawn from the Enneagram training courses, they are possibly mostly high-functioning individuals and, therefore, would not endorse the items on the Lifetraps Questionnaire very robustly (Wagner, 2008). Despite participants not

needing to know their Enneagram type most participants were enrolled in the Enneagram training programmes offered by Wagner, were familiar with the Enneagram system and knew their Enneatype. This may not only have resulted in endorsement bias, but participants may have indicated higher levels of functioning due to socially desirable responses.

Arthur, Allen, and Tech (2010, p. 6) mention that “over the past several years, there has been increasing interest in understanding Enneagram type development in the context of already existing theories of human development”. In their attempt to develop a sound, scientifically-based theory of the development of the Enneagram types, they explored how attachment theory can be used to explain Enneagram type development. Each of the nine Enneagram types has different points of focus and these focal points, together with the attachment categories of anxiety and avoidance, are the basis of their developmental model.

The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) is designed to measure adult attachment-related anxiety and avoidance. Arthur *et al.* (2010) distributed the ECR-R to a purposeful sample of 150 potential participants who had received extensive training in how to determine their own Enneagram type. The researchers wanted test subjects who had received training in how to observe their own thoughts and emotions. They based their decision on previous Enneagram researchers successfully using this sampling method to identify significant relationships between Enneagram types and other personality measures (Brown & Bartram, 2005; Palmer, 1988; Wagner & Walker, 1983).

The final sample consisted of 69 participants, ranging from fourteen Type Ones and Nines to two Type Twos (Arthur *et al.*, 2010). Mean anxiety for the sample was 3.22 ( $SD = .99$ ). The minimum anxiety score was 1.22, and the maximum was 5.83. Mean avoidance for the

sample was 3.02 ( $SD = .88$ ). The minimum avoidance score was 1.14 and the maximum was 5.35.

A t-test was used to compare the mean level of avoidance between the groups on the right and left side of the Enneagram symbol (Arthur *et al.*, 2010). Mean avoidance for the group on the right was 2.78 and for the left was 3.35 ( $t = -2.67, p < .05$ ). The central location of Enneagram Type Nine was dealt with by aligning it with the types that occur on either side of it. This resulted in Type Nine (wing Eight) and Type Nine (wing One). Analysis of the other two groups, consisting of Enneagram Type One, Three, Five, Seven, and Nine (wing one) and Enneagram Type Two, Four, Six, Eight, and Nine (wing eight) resulted in a mean level of anxiety of 2.88 and 3.63, respectively ( $t = -3.35, p < .01$ ) (Arthur *et al.*, 2010).

These researchers hypothesised that Enneagram types on the left side of the Enneagram symbol, who are characterised by “moving away” from people (Type Five, Six, Seven, Eight and Nine (wing Eight)) would score higher in attachment related avoidance when compared with the types on the right side who are characterised by “moving toward” people.

Furthermore, based on theoretical descriptions of the attachment strategies of the Enneagram, Type One, Three, Five, Seven and Nine (wing One) would score significantly lower on attachment related anxiety than Type Two, Four, Six, Eight and Nine (Eight Wing).

The research method of auto-ethnography was used by Asdornnithee (2010) to document changes of mental and emotional perception, cerebral processing, thirst for information, and self-withdrawal of a Type Five. These were analysed to determine if they are in agreement with the Enneagram system (Asdornnithee, 2010). Adornnithee’s (2010) article is written from the perspective of a Type Five.

The texture and wealth of information that auto-ethnography produces is apparent from the author's analysis of the Type Five's interpersonal trend to “move away or withdraw from people”. This tendency to move away from people is described by Webb (as cited in Asdornnithee, 2010). Type Fives detach from all kinds of emotion, stay in the background as observers and love their privacy. They also become exhausted and restless if they do not have enough time to process information or events that have just passed. The following passage describes the author's, who is a self-identified Type Five, experience of childhood:

*I had had my own bedroom since I was around ten years of age, while my brothers shared a room for many years. As I got, little by little, more and more opportunities to manage my own space—my own locker, my own bed, and then my own room—somewhat fascinating feelings about self-withdrawal were slowly forming internally. I felt that I was like an absolute ruler of a small kingdom with absolute autonomy to do anything within my land. Because of this, I couldn't help thinking that security, power and freedom were surely attainable once I got myself out of the mess of the outside world and came back into my autonomous territory. Since the material wealth of my family allowed me to possess many things, my “private land” was quite rich and full of much worth engaging with. This provided me with a colourful and never-boring experience on my own that I could enjoy. Meanwhile, the defence mechanism of self-isolation gradually developed.”(Asdornnithee, 2010, p. 91)*

Asdornnithee (2010) shows how his experience of childhood resonates with Riso and Hudson's (1999) description of how Type Five children often do not feel safe in their families and have a fear of being overwhelmed by their caregivers. These children adopt strategies to feel secure, safe and confident. They retreat from their families and caregivers into their own private space – mentally, physically and emotionally.

Despite not being able to generalise auto-ethnographic research findings beyond the experiences of the researcher, Asdornnithee's (2010) experience of childhood and Riso and Hudson's (1999) confirming descriptions are pertinent to this research because they confirm the consensus in the literature that Type Fives can be categorised in terms of Karen Horney's Withdrawn types.

Thomas (2010) used the archetype theory of depth psychology to explore the images, symbols and metaphors of Enneagram Type Three, Six and Nine, since both archetypes and Enneagram type act as perceptual lenses which filter and structure our experience. A content analysis (phenomenological approach) was conducted on the narrative and expressive artwork of twenty three subjects who had identified their own Enneagram type. Data were obtained in small focus groups, where participants used metaphor and imagery to describe their experiences through the lens of their core Enneagram type. The participants then drew or sculpted an image that had emerged for them during the discussion.

Dominant themes specific to each of the three Enneagram types emerged (Thomas, 2010). Themes of bringing order to chaos, an on-off switch, and social lies related to metaphors and images of deceit and vanity emerged for Type Three. Themes of falling, fog and dark clouds, battle, and a buzz related to metaphors and images of fear and doubt emerged for Type Six. Themes of resistance to overflowing energy, withdrawal of the essential self, insulation, invisibility, and tension of opposites related to metaphors and images of sloth and self-forgetting emerged for Type Nine (Thomas, 2010).

As archetypal themes do emerge when Enneagram types are viewed from an archetypal perspective implies that conclusions drawn from depth psychology can also be brought to bear on the Enneagram system. Therefore, if, as Singer and Kimbles (as cited in Thomas, 2010,

p. 76) suggest, “depth psychology shows us that archetypal patterns function not only at the level of the individual, but can also be seen to operate at the cultural level, in family systems, and in organizational structures, the Enneagram types too, can be understood as operating in cultures, nations and groups”.

Thomas (2010) acknowledged the limitation of her small sample of 23 participants and the limitation of relying on self-typing of the participants. However, her choice to focus on only three of the nine Enneagram types allowed her to reach a depth of analysis characteristic of qualitative research. Notably, in terms of the Enneagram system and Karen Horney's trends, the themes of vanity for the Three, fear and doubt for the Six, and self-forgetting for the Nine conform to the moving against, toward and away from people.

### **Conclusion**

This review of the literature through the lens of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends has indicated a relationship does exist between the Enneagram types and the moving away, toward and against trends. Empirical research literature has demonstrated that, despite using participants who were familiar with the Enneagram system and who knew their Enneagram type, construct validity has been established to an acceptable level. However, further research is required to ascertain the nine distinct types in the general population. Furthermore, excluding Warling's (1995) study, no other published empirical investigation into the relationship between these two systems was found. The review of the theoretical literature has presented differing theoretical postulations about the nature of the relationship.



## CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Hypotheses

Six hypotheses were posed for the current study

**Hypothesis one:** The Moving Toward group (Reformers, Helpers, and Loyalists) is significantly different from all the other Enneagram types in levels of compliance, separation anxiety and symbiotic merging. The Reformers, Helpers and Loyalists are not significantly different from each other.

**Hypothesis two:** The Moving Against group (Achievers, Enthusiasts and Challengers) is significantly different from all the other Enneagram types in levels of aggression, narcissism and egocentricity. The Achievers, Enthusiasts and Challengers are not significantly different from each other.

**Hypothesis three:** The Moving Away group (Individualists, Investigators and Peacemakers) is significantly different from all the other Enneagram types in levels of detachment, social isolation and fear of engulfment. The Individualists, Investigators and Peacemakers are not significantly different from each other.

**Hypothesis four:** HCTI Compliance scores will be positively correlated to the TOR Separation Anxiety and TOR Symbiotic Merging scores.

**Hypothesis five:** HCTI Aggressive scores will be positively correlated to the TOR Narcissism and TOR Egocentricity scores.

**Hypothesis six:** HCTI Detached scores will be positively correlated to the TOR Social Isolation and TOR Fear of Engulfment scores.

## **Research Design**

Employing a quasi-experimental, cross-sectional design, the Test of Object Relations (TOR) (Zvelc, 2000) and the Horney-Coolidge Type Indicator (HCTI) (Coolidge, 2004) was emailed to randomly selected members of an Enneagram Facebook group who had self-identified their Enneagram type. Data concerning participant demographics were also collected. A one-way, between-group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyse the data. Ad-hoc comparisons, using Tukey's HSD test, were used to determine how the nine Enneagram types differ with regard to Karen Horney's interpersonal trends in terms of the scales on the two measures mentioned above. Scores from the TOR and the HCTI were also examined to determine if there were any correlations between these two instruments. The positivist and quantitative orientation of this research assumes that the traits of human personality can be meaningfully measured and analysed.

## **Population**

People who have knowledge of the Enneagram and who have identified their Enneagram type made up the population for this study. The population was further delimited to the 5 069 people who were members of the Enneagram Facebook group during the month of May 2010. The Enneagram is postulated to be a universal typology that is applicable to all people. However, Enneagram "enthusiasts" differ in several ways from the general population. They have an interest in personality typologies and a willingness to engage with the Enneagram system. They are familiar with the concepts of the Enneagram and have typed themselves through Enneagram assessment questionnaires, workshops, reading material and other means. This suggests a level of introspection and self-awareness that may be unique to this population.

Moreover, Enneagram “enthusiasts” belonging to the Enneagram Facebook group differ further from the general population because this population is characterised by people who have the inclination to join a social network. As certain Enneagram personality types are more withdrawn and others more engaging, there may be an under-representation and an over-representation of certain types in the Enneagram Facebook group population. Moreover, members of the Facebook group are not only computer literate, but have the financial and social means to access the internet, excluding from the study all those who do not have access to cyber infrastructure.

## **Sampling**

### Sampling method

A variation of simple random sampling, called list or systematic sampling, was used. McCready (2006) indicates that this is as good as classical simple random sampling. As data collection occurred in two waves, two different sampling intervals were set. An initial sampling interval of five resulted in the selection of every fifth person during 2010. A second wave of sampling, with an interval of three, took place in 2012. This method did result in less rigorous simple random sampling because, once the interval had been defined, cases falling between the selected cases were not selected. Despite this shortcoming, this procedure does result in samples that are as good as those using tombola-type procedures and, therefore, “permit the full use of conventional statistical techniques” (Fife-Schaw, 1995, p. 108).

### Sampling procedure

Recruitment began when 1 014 members of the 5 063 members of the Enneagram Facebook group were sent a private message requesting their participation in the study. They were informed of the nature of the study, that their participation was voluntary and that they could

withdraw at any point during the study. No incentive was offered, except that the Enneagram Facebook group's participation would be acknowledged by the researcher and the results of the study would be made available to the participants.

Between May and October 2010, the TOR was emailed to 520 respondents of the original 1014 members of the Facebook group who were initially approached to participate in the study. After two weeks, reminders were emailed to those participants who had not responded to reduce non-response bias. Of the 520 questionnaires emailed, 255 were returned. Only one of the returned questionnaires was rejected because the participant did not indicate their Enneagram type.

During the conducting of the literature review, the researcher discovered an inventory related directly to Karen Horney's interpersonal trends – the HCTI. This was seen as an opportunity to expand the research to assess the convergent validity of the TOR and the HCTI. A request was sent to all the participants who had responded to the initial questionnaire and they were asked to complete the HCTI. The request was sent to 255 participants and 125 responses were returned. Ninety-eight percent of these respondents still retained their initial Enneagram type after two years.

### Sample bias

Females comprised almost 60% of the sample. This confirmed Pallant's (2007) observation that females are more likely than males to respond to questionnaires. Other studies on the Enneagram have reflected similar gender distributions. In Newgent, Parr, Newman and Higgins' (2004) study 78% were female and 22% male. In Wagner's (1981) study 80% were female and 20% male; and in Warling's (1995) study 73% were female and 27% male.

However, the gender distribution of this sample may still not have reflected the gender distribution of the Facebook population.

The sample may be skewed in favour of certain personality types that are more likely to respond to questionnaires. Additionally, people in the Enneagram Facebook group who speak English as a second language may have been less likely to respond to an English questionnaire. This may have not only biased the sample in favour of English-speaking respondents, the non-English-speaking respondents (25%) may have interpreted the questions differently to English-speaking respondents. Finally, some Enneagram Facebook members may not have frequented Facebook often and, therefore, may not have been aware of the invitation to participate in the study.

### **Research instrument**

Two different questionnaires were administered to measure the dimensions related to Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. The TOR was selected because it was considered by the researcher to be the most suitable until the HCTI was discovered. There was, therefore, an opportunity to explore the convergent validity of the two measures and to evaluate how effective the TOR is in measuring Karen Horney's interpersonal trends.

#### **The Test of Object Relations (TOR)**

The Test of Object Relations (TOR) (Zvelc, 2000) was used to measure the six dimensions of interpersonal relations: symbiotic merging, separation anxiety, narcissism, egocentricity, fear of engulfment, and social isolation. Each dimension is measured using 15 items. A further five items are included to indicate social desirability and random answering. The items from each dimension are mixed to form one continuous self-report instrument. Participants

responded using a five-point Likert scale: *completely disagree (1), mostly agree (2), partly agree/partly disagree (3), mostly agree (4) and completely agree (5)*. Examples of the items are statements such as: “I have the feeling that nobody likes me” and “I do not have a permanent partner because that would take away my freedom”.

According to the author, Zvelc (2002), the TOR demonstrates good internal consistency. A test-retest reliability analysis was conducted for 21 students who completed the TOR with a Pearson’s *r* of .76 for Symbiotic Merging, .84 for Separation Anxiety, .92 for Narcissism, .65 for Egocentricity, .84 for Fear of Engulfment, and .65 for Social Isolation (Zvelc, 2002). In further research using the TOR, the TOR was normed on a group of 442 Slovenian students, ages 18 to 34 ( $M = 21, SD = 2$ ). (Zvelc, 2008). The internal reliability for the student sample was also measured with the results shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3  
*Means, standard deviations and alpha for TOR Dimensions (N = 442)*

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Alpha
Symbiotic Merging	41.9	7.5	21	67	0.75
Separation Anxiety	36.9	9.4	15	67	0.83
Narcissism	36.6	8.6	18	71	0.82
Egocentricity	34.6	8.1	17	72	0.83
Fear of Engulfment	32.9	8.7	16	71	0.85
Social Isolation	27.7	8	15	67	0.85

As can be seen in Table 4, the dimensions measured by the TOR have good internal consistency with the Cronbach alphas ranging from .75 to .85. In the current study, the Cronbach alphas were Symbiotic Merging (.79) Separation Anxiety (.85), Narcissism (.83), Egocentricity (.83), Fear of Engulfment (.89), and Social Isolation (.87).

The TOR was considered to be a suitable measure of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends because the six interpersonal dimensions of Symbiotic Merging, Separation Anxiety, Narcissism, Egocentricity, Fear of Engulfment, and Social Isolation are in alignment with the three interpersonal trends of moving against, toward and away from people. This alignment is demonstrated overleaf.

### **Moving toward people**

Karen Horney groups the neurotic need for affection and approval, the neurotic need for a partner who will take over one's life and the neurotic need to restrict one's life within narrow boundaries under the interpersonal trend of moving toward people (Horney, 1991). These neurotic needs are captured by two of the six dimensions measured by the TOR as described by Zvelc (2008): Symbiotic merging and Separation Anxiety. Symbiotic Merging is described as the experience of a weak differentiation between self and the other, as a desire to merge with the other, and feelings of oneness and losing oneself in relationships (Zvelc 2008). The description of Separation Anxiety is a difficulty in tolerating separation from significant others and a fear of abandonment (Zvelc, 2008). Therefore, the 30 items designed to measure Separation Anxiety and Symbiotic Merging can be considered to measure Karen Horney's interpersonal trend of moving toward people.

### **Moving against people**

The five neurotic needs associated with moving against people are the neurotic need for power, control, omnipotence and/or perfection, the neurotic need to exploit others; the neurotic need for social recognition; the neurotic need for personal admiration; and the neurotic need for personal achievement (Horney, 1991). These, in turn, can be measured by the two TOR dimensions of Narcissism and Egocentricity. Narcissism is described as a

grandiose and omnipotent experiencing of self (Zvelc, 2008). Egocentricity describes relationships that are based on manipulation and exploitation. Other people are seen as a means to satisfy one's needs, and people are manipulated to act according to one's desires. There is a lack of empathy and an inability to have a relationship based on reciprocity (Zvelc, 2008).

### **Moving away from people**

The two TOR dimensions of Fear of Engulfment and Social Isolation measure Karen Horney's interpersonal trend of moving away from people. Horney's (1991) neurotic need to restrict one's life within narrow boundaries, the neurotic need for self-sufficiency and independence, and the neurotic need for perfection and unassailability relate to the two TOR dimensions. Zvelc's (2008) Social Isolation refers to the avoidance and lack of relationship with others. It is associated with withdrawal into one's own world. Alienation, a lack of intimate relationships, distrust and self-sufficiency are typical of this dimension. Fear of Engulfment is the fear that one may lose one's own identity, individuality or freedom in a relationship. There is a fear of intimate relationships and the desire to be independent (Zvelc, 2008).

### Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Indicator (HCTI)

The HCTI (Coolidge, 2004) measures Karen Horney's three interpersonal trends as described in *Our Inner Conflicts* (Horney, 1946). The 19 items for each of the trends are scored on a four-point Likert scale. The HCTI was normed on a group of 630 adults (315 males, 315 females) ages 16 to 93 ( $M = 21$ ). Test-retest (one-week interval) reliability scores were: Compliance .92, Aggression .92 and Detachment .91. Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation established three facets for each of the three interpersonal trends. These



are altruism, need for relationships and self-abasement for the Compliance scale; malevolence, power and strength for the Aggression scale; and need for aloneness, avoidance and self-sufficiency on the Detached scale (Coolidge *et al.*, 2001). Internal reliability, means and standard deviations for the sample was measured with the results shown in Table 4.

Table 4

*Scale means, standard deviations and Cronbach's alpha for HCTI Dimensions (n = 630)*

Variable	Mean	SD	Alpha
Compliance Scale	51.1	7	0.78
Aggression Scale	44.6	7.7	0.83
Detachment Scale	37.7	7.3	0.82

As can be seen in Table 4 the dimensions measured by the HCTI have good internal consistency with Cronbach alphas ranging from .78 to .83. In the current study, the Cronbach alphas were Compliance .81, Aggression .82, and Detachment .82.

### **Method of data analysis**

The characteristics of the sample were described with use of frequency distributions and included: gender, nationality, English spoken as a first language, level of education and relationship status. Independence of these characteristics was tested through use of Pearson's chi-square test. The internal-consistency of the TOR and the HCTI scores were tested using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. Once the reliability and validity of the data sets were established, the hypotheses were tested.

Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity

to confirm the suitability of the statistical test used. A one-way, between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was then performed to investigate the Enneagram type difference in terms of the three HCTI scales and the six TOR scales.

#### Screening and cleaning the data.

Frequencies of categorical and descriptives of continuous data were checked for capturing errors and none were found. However, one missing value from a respondent who did not indicate their Enneagram type was excluded from any further analyses relating to Enneagram type. When conducting the chi-square test for independence, it was discovered that the assumption that the lowest expected frequency in any cell should be five or more was violated. Therefore, the categories within age, education and relationship status were collapsed into fewer categories to conform to the assumption of the statistical test. Negatively worded items on the TOR and HCTI scales were reverse scored, and then total scores for their respective variables were calculated.

#### Preliminary assumption testing

##### **Sample size**

The minimum required number of cases in each cell was six for the TOR and three for the HCTI. Ideally, there needs to be more cases in each cell than the number of dependent variables (Pallant, 2007). The *n* values in the descriptive statistics generated by SPSS showed sufficient cases in each cell for the sample size to be adequate. However, Pallant (2007) recommends that a cell size of over 30 counteracts any violations of normality or equality of variance that may exist. In this study the number of cases in the cells ranged from 18 to 31

cases for the TOR and eight to 23 cases for the HCTI, which increased the necessity that the other assumptions be met.

### **Normality**

Normality of the distributions was assessed by inspection of the 5% trimmed mean, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic, histograms, normal probability plots, detrended normal Q-Q plots and boxplots of the distribution of scores. Visual inspection of the distribution of the scores on the graphs was reasonably normal; however, some problems were detected. Unfortunately, the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic, which is an indication of normality, were significant for all the TOR and HCTI variables except for symbiotic merging, egocentricity and compliance. However, as Pallant (2007) suggests, this is quite common for larger samples. Moreover, larger samples allow for more leniency with this assumption.

### **Outliers**

Outliers were located on inspection of the boxplots, but none of these were classed as extreme. Moreover, the values for the 5% trimmed mean and the mean of the various TOR and HCTI variables were very similar. This indicated that these outlying cases would not present a problem, because these outliers did not have a strong influence on the mean, and they were, therefore, retained.

### **Multivariate Normality**

Calculation of Mahalanobis distances was done to check multivariate normality. Comparison with the critical value using a chi-square table, determined by the number of dependent variables (three for the HCTI: 16.27 and six for the TOR: 22.46), showed no violation of this

assumption. The maximum value obtained from the output was 13.29 for the HCTI and 21.91 for the TOR, and was no cause for concern.

### **Linearity**

To test for linearity, a matrix of scatterplots between each pair of variables and Enneagram type was generated. No obvious evidence of non-linearity was detected and the assumption of linearity was satisfied.

### **Multicollinearity and singularity**

To check for multicollinearity, correlation analysis was used to determine the strength of the relationship between the various dependent variables. With  $r$  ranging between .011 and .578 there were no particularly high correlations (.8 and .9) between the variables and, therefore, no evidence of multicollinearity. As there were moderate strengths between the variables, violation of this assumption did not occur.

### **Homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices**

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices indicated that the data did not violate the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Results showed the significance value for the TOR was .015 and the HCTI was .542, which were both larger than .001.

### **Equality of error variances**

Levene's test of equality of error variances showed no significance values less than .05. Therefore, equal variances were assumed for all variables and the assumption of equal variances was met.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has presented the research problem, the research design, the method of selection and nature of the sample, and the measures and procedures used in the study. The following chapter will present the findings of the current study.

## CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

### Sample characteristics

The average age of the sample was 38 years, with a range of 16 to 71 years and a standard deviation of 11.9. The sample comprised of people from 35 countries, the majority of who came from the United States. Seventy-six percent of the sample reported to have a tertiary education. Only 34% were single, with 55% in on-going relationships. A summary of the sample's characteristics can be found in Table 5.

Table 5.

*Demographic characteristics of sample*

Variable	Measurement	Frequency		Percent	
		TOR	HCTI	TOR	HCTI
<b>Gender</b>	Male	110	55	43.1	44
	Female	145	70	56.9	56
<b>English as 1<sup>st</sup> Language</b>	Yes	189	98	74.1	78.4
	No	66	27	25.9	21.6
<b>Top 5 Nationalities</b>	USA	120	62	47.1	49.6
	Denmark	19	7	7.5	5.6
	United Kingdom	16	9	6.3	7.2
	South Africa	14	9	5.5	7.2
	Canada	13	9	5.1	7.2
<b>Education</b>	Secondary	36	20	14.1	16
	Trade Training	20	9	7.8	7.2
	Undergraduate	92	46	36.1	36.8
	Postgraduate	107	50	42	40

Table 5.

*Demographic characteristics of sample*

<b>Relationship Status</b>					
	Single	86	37	33.7	29.6
	Steady	32	15	12.5	12
	Cohabiting	30	15	11.8	12
	1 <sup>st</sup> Marriage	67	40	26.3	32
	Remarried	12	5	4.7	4
	Separated	3	2	1.2	1.6
	Divorced	23	10	9	8
	Widowed	2	1	0.8	0.8
<b>Enneagram Type</b>					
	Type One	21	11	8.3	8.8
	Type Two	18	8	7.1	6.4
	Type Three	23	14	9.1	11.2
	Type Four	48	13	18.9	10.4
	Type Five	35	23	13.8	18.4
	Type Six	23	13	9.1	10.4
	Type Seven	31	14	12.2	11.2
	Type Eight	24	11	9.4	8.8
	Type Nine	31	18	12.2	14.4

**Frequencies**

The analysis of the items related to the respondents' experiences of and attitude toward the Enneagram are presented in Table 6 over leaf.

Table 6

*Frequencies and percentages of participant's relation to the Enneagram*

Variable	Measurement Level	TOR		HCTI	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Male	110	43.1	55	44
	Female	145	56.9	70	56
How long have you self-identified as your Enneagram Type	Three months	8	3.1	1	0.8
	Six months	13	5.1	7	5.6
	One year	24	9.4	7	5.6
	Two years	34	13.3	16	12.8
	Longer	176	69	94	75.2
Method of identifying Enneagram Type	RHETI Sampler	32	12.5	14	11.2
	Full RHETI	47	18.4	23	18.4
	Workshop	81	31.8	44	35.2
	Books	59	23.1	31	24.8
	Other Means	36	14.1	13	10.4



Table 6

*Frequencies and percentages of participant's relation to the Enneagram*

Have you ever changed your mind about your type?	Yes	71	27.8	32	25.6
	No	184	72.2	93	74.4
Does the knowledge of your type influence you daily?	Yes	198	77.6	102	81.6
	No	57	22.4	23	18.4

TOR Frequencies

Of the 254 participants (one respondent did not indicate their Enneagram type) who completed the TOR, their self-selected Enneagram types consisted of 21 Reformers, 18 Helpers, 23 Achievers, 48 Individualists, 35 Investigators, 23 Loyalists, 31 Enthusiasts, 24 Challengers and 31 Peacemakers. To the question, “have you ever changed your mind about your type?” 72% said no. The majority of the participants reported they had identified their type through Enneagram workshops (32%), followed by books (23%) and completing the Full RHETI (18.4%). Eighty-two percent indicated their selected type had been the same for up to two years and beyond.

HCTI Frequencies

The percentages for the smaller sample mirrored the larger sample. For example, for the variable age, the information from the 255 TOR respondents was similar to the 125 HCTI

respondents. The range of ages was 16 to 71 years, with a mean of 38.8 and a standard deviation of 12.2. The 125 self-selected Enneagram types for the HCTI respondents consisted of 11 Reformers, 8 Helpers, 14 Achievers, 13 Individualists, 23 Investigators, 13 Loyalists, 14 Enthusiasts, 11 Challengers and 18 Peacemakers. The majority of the participants reported they had identified their type through Enneagram workshops (35.2%), followed by books (24.8%) and completing the Full RHETI (18.4%). To the question, “have you ever changed your mind about your type?” 74% said no. Eighty percent reported their type had remained the same up to two years and beyond. Last, 81% indicated that knowledge of their Enneagram type influenced their daily living.

#### Independence of categories

It was expected that the Enneagram types would be independent from the demographic characteristics of the sample. However, as the participants self-identified themselves as particular Enneagram types it was important that these demographics would not act as nuisance variables in the analysis of the data. Therefore, the chi-square test for independence was used to determine whether any of the categorical variables were related to the Enneagram types. The results do demonstrate independence from Enneagram type for the following categories:

Age:  $X^2(16, N = 254) = 17.1, p = .378, \text{phi} = .280$ ;

Education:  $X^2(4, N = 254) = 3.38, p = .497, \text{phi} = .115$ ;

Relationship status:  $X^2(8, N = 254) = 9.9, p = .273, \text{phi} = .197$ ;

Method to determine type:  $X^2(16, N = 254) = 23.8, p = .093, \text{phi} = .306$ .

However, as the following categories did not meet the assumption of the chi-square test that the lowest expected frequency in any cell should be greater than five, these conclusions of independence should be treated with due care.

Country:  $X^2 (296, N = 254) = .278, p = .760, \phi = -.048$ .

English:  $X^2 (8, N = 254) = 11.3, p = .185, \phi = .211$ .

Type change:  $X^2 (8, N = 254) = 14.25, p = .076, \phi = .237$ .

Enneagram impact on daily life:  $X^2 (8, N = 254) = 9.98, p = .266, \phi = .198$ .

### Gender and Enneagram type

The cross-tab between gender and Enneagram type did meet the required assumptions for the chi-square test. Moreover, the results demonstrated a significant difference:  $X^2 (8, N = 254) = 27.77, p = .001, \phi = .331$ . The researcher, therefore, decided to perform an ANOVA to explore the relationship between gender and Enneagram type in terms of the dependent variables measured by the HCTI and the TOR. The results are presented in Table 7 overleaf.

Table 7.

*Means and standard deviations on all scales by gender*

Variable	<u>Male (n = 55)</u>		<u>Female (n = 70)</u>		<u>F</u>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
HCTI Compliant	3.870	.171	3.900	.158	1.076
HCTI Aggressive	3.720	.186	3.650	.187	3.971*
HCTI Detached	3.730	.194	3.690	.174	1.768
	<u>Male (n = 110)</u>		<u>Female (n = 145)</u>		<u>F</u>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
TOR Separation Anxiety	3.470	.313	3.420	.239	1.547
TOR Symbiotic Merging	3.720	.222	3.690	.232	1.154
TOR Narcissism	3.810	.225	3.690	.240	16.535**
TOR Egocentricity	3.680	.240	3.600	.264	6.797*
TOR Fear of Engulfment	3.530	.316	3.470	.319	2.297
TOR Social Isolation	3.510	.323	3.390	.295	10.347**

HCTI = Horney-Coolidge Type Inventory; TOR = Test of Object Relations. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

HCTI Aggressive, TOR Narcissism, TOR Egocentricity and TOR Social Isolation all showed significant gender differences. The HCTI Aggressive scale has previous reports of lower levels of aggression in females than males (Coolidge, Moor, Tomoko, Stewart & Segal, 2001; Shatz, 2004) and can, therefore, account for this difference. Moreover, the lower levels of

Narcissism and Egocentricity in females are congruent with the prediction that there is a positive correlation between these three scales.

Higher levels for TOR Social Isolation in females appears to have face validity based on the gender stereotype that males are more social than females.

### **Convergent validity of the TOR and HCTI**

The relationship between the HCTI and the TOR variables was measured using the Pearson product-moment coefficient. It was expected that certain relationships would exist: (a) that the HCTI's Compliant scores would be related to the TOR Symbiotic Merging and TOR Separation Anxiety scores; (b) that HCTI's Detached scores would be related to the TOR Fear of Engulfment and TOR Social Anxiety scores; (c) that HCTI's Aggressive scores would be related to the TOR Narcissism and TOR Egocentricity scores. As Table 8 overleaf demonstrates, there were significant correlations in the predicted directions.

Table 8.

*Pearson's Correlations between the HCTI and TOR scales*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Comp	-								
2. Agg	-.109	-							
3. Det	-.386**	.421**	-						
4. Sep Anx	.198*	.256**	.000	-					
5. Symb Merg	.426**	.082	-.198*	.611**	-				
6. Nar	-.020	.363**	0.06	.021	.243**	-			
7. Ego	.017	.419**	.010	.415**	.474**	.408**	-		
8. Fear Engul	-.407**	.313**	.423**	.139*	.170**	.261**	.337**	-	
9. Soc Iso	-.382**	.302**	.474**	.298**	.196**	.159*	.319**	.552**	-

Comp = Compliant; Agg = Aggression; Det = Detached; Sep Anx. = Separation Anxiety; Symb Merg = Symbiotic Merging; Nar = Narcissism; Ego = Egocentricity; Fear Engul = Fear of Engagement; Soc Iso = Social Isolation.

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

### HCTI Compliance

Results indicated that the Compliant scores had a significant positive relationship with Symbiotic Merging ( $r = .426, p < 0.01$ ) and Separation Anxiety ( $r = .198, p < 0.05$ ) with high levels of Compliance associated with high levels of Separation Anxiety and Symbiotic Merging. Moreover, there was a significant negative relationship with Social Isolation ( $r = -.382, p < 0.01$ ) and Fear of Engulfment ( $r = -.407, p < 0.01$ ) with high levels of Compliance associated with low levels of Fear of Engulfment and Social Isolation. In terms of Cohen's (1988) guidelines ( $r$  is between .3 and .49), the strength of the relationships (except separation anxiety) were rated as medium. Finally, the coefficient of determination indicated

that Compliance and Symbiotic Merging share 18% of their variance, Compliance and Separation Anxiety share 14% of their variance, and Compliance and Fear of Engulfment share 16% of their variance.

### HCTI Aggressive

The Aggressive scores had significant positive relationships at the 0.01 level for all TOR variables except Symbiotic Merging. Results indicated correlations with Separation Anxiety ( $r = .256$ ), Narcissism ( $r = .363$ ), Social Isolation ( $r = .302$ ), Egocentricity ( $r = .419$ ) and Fear of Engulfment ( $r = .313$ ). Higher levels of Aggression are associated with higher levels of the variables listed above. Shared variances ranged from 6.6% (Separation Anxiety) to 17.5% (Egocentricity). Despite significant correlations between Aggression and so many of the other variables, it is important to note that Egocentricity and Narcissism accounted for the highest percentage of variance of the six variables. They also demonstrated the highest levels of relationship with Aggression with  $r$  indicating a medium strength relationship. The strength of the relationship conforms to the framework.

### HCTI Detached

The Detached scores had a significant positive relationship with Social Isolation ( $r = .474, p < 0.01$ ) and Fear of Engulfment ( $r = .423, p < 0.01$ ) with high levels of Detachment associated with high levels of Social Isolation and Fear of Engulfment. Moreover, there was a significant negative relationship with Symbiotic Merging ( $r = -.198, p < 0.05$ ) with high levels of Detachment associated with low levels of Symbiotic Merging. Both Social Isolation and Fear of Engulfment displayed medium relationship scores between .3 and .49. The coefficient of determination indicated that Detachment and Social Isolation share 35% of their variance, Detachment and Fear of Engulfment share 17% of their variance. Last,

Detachment and Symbiotic Merging share only 4%, with a small relationship strength with  $r$  between .10 and .29.

### **The Horneviaan groups and the HCTI**

A one-way, between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate the Horney groups' differences in Compliance, Aggression and Detachment. Three dependent variables were used: HCTI Compliance, HCTI Aggression and HCTI Detachment. The independent variable was the nine Enneagram types collapsed into the three Horney groups: toward, against and away from people. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. Table 9 below presents the results.

Table 9.

*Means and standard deviations of the HCTI scales and the Horney groups.*

Enneagram Type	Compliant		Aggression		Detachment		N
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Toward People	3.97	.144	3.68	.163	3.68	.163	54
Against People	3.89	.149	3.72	.196	3.67	.163	39
Away from People	3.84	.169	3.66	.196	3.76	.198	32
Total	3.88	.164	3.68	.189	3.71	.183	125
F Value	6.876**		1.508		3.900*		

HCTI = Horney-Coolidge Type Inventory. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p = .001$ .

There was a statistically significant difference between the Horney groups on the combined dependent variables,  $F(6, 240) = 4.65, p = .000$ ; Wilks' Lambda = .80; partial eta squared = .104. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the only



difference to reach statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .017, was Compliance,  $F(2,122) = 6.88, p = .001$ , partial eta squared = .101.

A follow-up univariate analyses was then performed to identify where the significant difference in Compliance between the Horney groups lay. A one-way, between-groups analysis of variance was conducted and confirmed the statistically significant difference at the  $p < .001$  level in compliance scores for the three Horney groups:  $F(2, 122) = 6.9, p = .001$ .

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .1 which demonstrated a medium to large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Compliance for the Withdrawn group ( $M = 3.84, SD = .169$ ) was significantly different from the Toward group ( $M = 3.97, SD = .144$ ). The Against group ( $M = 3.89, SD = 144$ ) did not differ significantly from either the Withdrawn or the Toward group.

Adopting a less stringent Alpha of .05 for the MANOVA indicated that the Horney groups also differed in levels of Detachment,  $F(2,122) = 3.9, p = .023$ , partial eta squared = .06. A follow-up ANOVA with post-hoc tests demonstrated a medium effect size (.06). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for the Detached group ( $M = 3.79, SD = 1.98$ ) was significantly different from the Aggressive group ( $M = 3.67, SD = 1.63$ ). The Compliant group ( $M = 3.68, SD = 1.63$ ) did not differ significantly from either the Detached or the Aggressive group. However, not using the Bonferroni adjustment does increase the possibility of a Type 1 error.

Further investigation was done into the impact of exchanging Type One and Type Seven, the Perfectionist and Enthusiast, within the three Horney groups. The Compliant group was then made-up of Type Two, Six and Seven, and the Aggressive group was made up of Type One, Three and Eight. A MANOVA was run on the new group matrix to explore any group differences in terms of the three variables.

There was also a statistically significant difference between the new Horney groups on the combined dependent variables,  $F(6, 242) = 4.18, p = .001$ ; Wilks' Lambda = .82; partial eta squared = .95. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the two differences to reach statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .017, were compliance,  $F(2,122) = 4.8, p = .010$ , partial eta squared = .072 and detachment,  $F(2,122) = 4.7, p = .011$ , partial eta squared = .072.

Consequent exploration to determine which of the new Horney groups differed was once again done using two separate ANOVAs for Compliance and Detachment. This confirmed significant difference ( $p = .017$ ) in Compliance and Detached scores for the three Horney groups:  $F(2, 122) = 4.8, p = .010$  and  $F(2,122) = 4.7, p = .011$ , respectively.

The effect size for both Compliance and Detached, calculated using eta squared, was .07 which demonstrated a medium effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Compliance for the new Compliant group ( $M = 3.94, SD = .152$ ) was significantly different from the Detached group ( $M = 3.84, SD = .169$ ). The Aggressive group ( $M = 3.91, SD = .150$ ) did not differ significantly from either the Detached or the Compliant group. Finally, the post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Detachment for the

Detached group ( $M = 3.76, SD = .198$ ) was significantly different from the new Compliant group ( $M = 3.64, SD = .151$ ). The new Aggressive group ( $M = 3.70, SD = .171$ ) did not differ significantly from either the Detached or the new Compliant group.

### **The Hornebian groups and the TOR**

To test the hypothesis that the three Horney groups differed with regard to the six dependent variables, it was intended to run separate one-way, between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) with post-hoc comparisons on each of the six TOR variables, but TOR Narcissism did not meet all the necessary assumptions. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers and homogeneity of variance with no serious violations noted. However, since Levene's test for homogeneity of variances indicated the variable Narcissism violated this assumption ( $p = .031$ ) the non-parametric alternative, the Kruskal-Wallis Test was performed on this variable. One-way, between-groups analysis of variance was then performed on the remaining five dependant variables. Bonferroni's adjusted alpha level of 0.01 determined significance for these tests. Results appear in Table 10.

Table 10.

*Means and standard deviations on TOR scales by Karen Horney type*

Variable	Toward ( $N = 62$ )		Against ( $N = 78$ )		Away ( $N = 114$ )		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
TOR Separation Anxiety	3.51	.288	3.31	.260	3.50	.311	11.980**
TOR Symbiotic Merging	3.74	.227	3.62	.188	3.75	.238	8.921**
TOR Narcissism	3.71	.248	3.81	.195	3.72	.258	4.706*
TOR Egocentricity	3.68	.210	3.63	.276	3.61	.263	1.656
TOR Fear of Engulfment	3.43	.299	3.45	.315	3.56	.316	4.596*
TOR Social Isolation	3.44	.294	3.31	.274	3.54	.317	13.603**

TOR = Test of Object Relations. \* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .000$ .

### TOR Narcissism

A Kruskal-Wallis Test revealed a statistically difference in Narcissism levels across the three different Horney groups (Group1,  $n = 114$ : Detached; Group2,  $n = 78$ : Aggressive; Group3,  $n = 62$ : Compliant),  $X^2(2, N = 254) = 8.99, p = .011$ . The Aggressive group recorded a higher median score ( $Mdn = 148$ ) than the other two groups, which scored median values of 120 and 115 for the Detached and Compliant group, respectively. Post-hoc analysis using the Mann-Whitney U Test revealed no significant difference in the Narcissism levels of the Compliant ( $Mdn = 115, n = 62$ ), and Detached groups ( $Mdn = 120, n = 114$ ),  $U = 3403, z = -.406, p = .69, r = 0.03$ . However, there were significant differences between the Aggressive group ( $Mdn = 148, n = 78$ ) and the Detached group ( $Mdn = 120, n = 114$ ),  $U = 3467, z = 12.59, p = 0.01, r = 0.19$  and Compliant group ( $Mdn = 115, n = 62$ ),  $\underline{U} = 1793, z = -2.622, p = .009, r = 0.22$ , respectively, with the Compliant group showing the greater (medium) effect.

### TOR Separation Anxiety

The first in a series of one-way, between-groups analyses of variance indicated a statistical difference at the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of 0.01 in Separation Anxiety scores for the three Horney Groups:  $F(2, 251) = 12, p = .000$ . A medium effect size of 0.29 was recorded. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that there was no significant difference between the Detached and Compliant groups on separation anxiety, but there was a significant difference between both the Compliant ( $M = 3.51, SD = .29$ ) and Detached Group ( $M = 3.5, SD = .31$ ) in relation to the Aggressive group ( $M = 3.31, SD = .26$ ). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 99% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and an effect size of 0.29 and  $N = 254$ .

### TOR Social Isolation

The results for this test indicated a significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) between the Horney groups in relation to social isolation:  $F(2, 251) = 13.6, p = .000$ . A medium effect size of .33 was recorded. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score on Social Isolation for the Detached group ( $M = 3.54, SD = .32$ ) and the Compliant group ( $M = 3.44, SD = .3$ ) did not differ significantly. The Compliant and Aggressive groups were significantly different only at  $p = .026$  which was above the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of 0.01. There was a significant difference in the mean scores of the Detached group and the Aggressive group ( $M = 3.31, SD = .27$ ) at the .000 level. A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 99% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and an effect size of 0.33 and  $N = 254$ .

### TOR Symbiotic Merging

The results for this test indicated a significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) between the Horney groups in relation to Symbiotic Merging:  $F(2, 251) = 8.9, p = .000$ . A medium effect size of 0.24 was recorded. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score on Symbiotic Merging for the Detached group ( $M = 3.75, SD = .24$ ) and Compliant group ( $M = 3.74, SD = .23$ ) did not differ significantly. The Compliant and Aggressive groups were significantly different only at  $p = .006$  which was above the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of 0.01. There was a significant difference in mean scores for the Detached group and the Aggressive group ( $M = 3.62, SD = .19$ ) at the .000 level. A post-hoc power analysis indicated an 80% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and an effect size of 0.24 and  $N = 254$ .

### TOR Egocentricity

No significant differences  $F(2, 251) = 1.7, p = .193$  between the mean scores of any of the three Horney groups in terms of egocentricity was found: The Detached group ( $M = 3.61, SD = .26$ ), the Aggressive group ( $M = 3.63, SD = .28$ ), and the Compliant group ( $M = 3.68, SD = .21$ ). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 23% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and an effect size of 0.13 and  $N = 254$ .

### TOR Fear of Engulfment

The results for this test indicated a significant difference at the adjusted Bonferroni level ( $p < .01$ ) between the Horney groups in relation to Fear of Engulfment:  $F(2, 251) = 4.6, p = .01$ . A small to medium effect size of 0.2 was recorded. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated no significant differences between the groups at  $p < .01$ ; however, there were significant differences at the .05 level. The mean score for Fear of Engulfment for the Detached group ( $M = 3.56, SD = .32$ ) differed from both the Aggressive group ( $M = 3.45, SD = .32$ ) and the Compliant group ( $M = 3.43, SD = .3$ ). There was no significant difference between the Aggressive and Compliant groups. A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 60% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and an effect size of 0.2 and  $N = 254$ .

### **The nine Enneagram types and the HCTI**

A one-way, between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate the Enneagram type differences in terms of the three dependent variables of the HCTI: Detachment, Aggression, and Compliance. The independent variable was the nine Enneagram types. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices,

and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. Results are presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11

*Means and standard deviations of the Nine Enneagram Types by HCTI Scales*

Enneagram Type	Compliant		Aggression		Detachment		<i>n</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	
Type 1: Reformer*	3.97	.136	3.67	.099	3.70	.164	11
Type 2: Helper	4.06	.109	3.55	.167	3.56	.121	8
Type 3: Achiever	3.95	.069	3.73	.200	3.72	.164	14
Type 4: Individualist	3.89	.141	3.72	.208	3.74	.179	13
Type 5: Investigator	3.70	.114	3.67	.163	3.86	.171	23
Type 6: Loyalist	3.90	.144	3.76	.157	3.72	.164	13
Type 7: Enthusiast	3.89	.150	3.62	.193	3.62	.128	14
Type 8: Challenger	3.80	.184	3.85	.116	3.66	.193	11
Type 9: Peacemaker	3.97	.120	3.59	.214	3.65	.183	18
Total	3.88	.164	3.68	.189	3.71	.183	125
<i>F</i> Value	9.952**		3.251*		4.265**		

HCTI = Horney-Coolidge Type Inventory. \* $p = .002$ , \*\* $p = .000$ .

\*Riso & Hudson Type names.

There was a statistically significant difference between the nine Enneagram types on the combined dependent variables,  $F(3, 24) = 5.1, p = .000$ ; Wilks' Lambda = .401; partial eta squared = .262. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the

differences to reach statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .01, were:

Detachment,  $F(8, 116) = 4.27, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = .227.

Aggression,  $F(8, 116) = 3.25, p = .002$ , partial eta squared = .183

Compliance,  $F(8, 116) = 9.95, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = .407

A follow-up univariate analyses was then performed on those variables that had reached significant levels, to identify where the significant difference between the Enneagram types and these variables lay. The one-way, between-groups analysis of variance that was conducted confirmed the statistically significant difference at the  $p < .01$  level.

#### HCTI Detachment

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .23 which demonstrated a large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 90% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a large effect size of .47 and  $N = 125$ . Further post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for detachment for the Investigator ( $M = 3.86, SD = .171$ ) was not only the highest, but also significantly different from four of the Enneagram types. With their means arranged in descending order, the Challenger ( $M = 3.66, SD = .193$ ), the Peacemaker ( $M = 3.65, SD = .183$ ), the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.62, SD = .128$ ), and the Helper ( $M = 3.56, SD = .121$ ) were all significant.

#### HCTI Aggression

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .18 which demonstrated a large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 79% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a large effect size of .42 and  $N = 125$ . Further



post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Aggression for the Challenger ( $M = 3.85$ ,  $SD = .116$ ) was the highest mean score. The greatest mean difference occurred between the Challenger and the Helper ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = .167$ ), indicating significant lower levels of aggression for the Helper when compared to the Challenger. The Peacemaker ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = .214$ ), as would be hoped, also scored significantly lower than the Challenger in terms of aggression. Last, the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = .193$ ) and the Challenger had the smallest mean difference in levels of aggression, but this was significant, indicating lower levels of aggression for the Enthusiast.

### HCTI Compliance

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .41 which demonstrated a large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 99% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at 0.01 and a large effect size of 0.64 and  $N = 125$ . Further post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Compliance for the Investigator, ( $M = 3.70$ ,  $SD = .114$ ) was the lowest levels of Compliance. The greatest mean difference occurred between the Investigator and the Helper, ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = .109$ ) with significantly higher levels of Compliance for the Helper when compared to the Investigator. The Reformer ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = .136$ ), the Peacemaker ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = .120$ ), the Achiever ( $M = 3.95$ ,  $SD = .069$ ), the Enthusiast, ( $M = 3.89$ ,  $SD = .150$ ) and the Loyalist ( $M = 3.90$ ,  $SD = .144$ ) all scored significantly higher on Compliance when compared with the Investigator. Another notably significant difference was between the Helper and the Challenger ( $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = .184$ ), indicating that the mean score for Compliance for the Helper was higher than that for the Challenger.

## **The nine Enneagram types and the TOR**

A one-way, between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate Enneagram type difference in terms of the six dependent variables of the TOR: Separation Anxiety, Symbiotic Merging, Narcissism, Egocentricity, Social Isolation, and Fear of Engulfment. The independent variable was the nine Enneagram types. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. Results are presented in the following Table 12a and 12b.

Table 12a.

*Means and standard deviations of TOR scales by Enneagram type*

Enneagram Type	TOR Sep Anx		TOR Sym Merg.		TOR Narcissism		<i>n</i>
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	
1. Reformer	3.45	.246	3.69	.230	3.77	.267	21
2. Helper	3.59	.297	3.83	.214	3.65	.237	18
3. Achiever	3.37	.268	3.64	.192	3.76	.214	23
4. Individualist	3.57	.342	3.79	.198	3.79	.206	48
5. Investigator	3.43	.280	3.62	.231	3.66	.293	35
6. Loyalist	3.50	.311	3.70	.221	3.69	.237	23
7. Enthusiast	3.30	.256	3.63	.158	3.85	.201	31
8. Challenger	3.25	.253	3.59	.220	3.82	.162	24
9. Peacemaker	3.45	.274	3.83	.248	3.66	.264	31
Total	3.44	.303	3.71	.228	3.74	.241	254
<i>F</i> Value	4.365**		5.563**		2.884*		

TOR = Test of Object Relations. \**p* = .002, \*\**p* = .000.

Table 12b.

*Means and standard deviations of TOR scales by Enneagram type cont.*

Enneagram Type	TOR Ego		TOR Soc Iso		TOR Fear Engulf		<i>n</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Reformer	3.74	.199	3.52	.302	3.44	.263	21
2. Helper	3.65	.228	3.34	.272	3.35	.354	18
3. Achiever	3.54	.291	3.23	.234	3.34	.314	23
4. Individualist	3.67	.221	3.56	.275	3.56	.281	48
5. Investigator	3.59	.282	3.63	.341	3.68	.314	35
6. Loyalist	3.66	.201	3.44	.291	3.47	.286	23
7. Enthusiast	3.62	.263	3.31	.267	3.48	.317	31
8. Challenger	3.71	.265	3.38	.308	3.52	.300	24
9. Peacemaker	3.56	.291	3.39	.309	3.41	.319	31
Total	3.63	.256	3.44	.313	3.49	.316	254
F Value	1.7		5.856**		3.447*		

TOR = Test of Object Relations. \* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p = .000$ .

There was a statistically significant difference between the nine Enneagram types on the combined dependent variables,  $F(48, 1185) = 3.86, p = .000$ ; Wilks' Lambda = .49; partial eta squared = .112. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the differences to reach statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .008, were:

Separation Anxiety:  $F(8, 245) = 4.37, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = .125.

Narcissism:  $F(8, 245) = 2.88, p = .004$ , partial eta squared = .086

Social Isolation:  $F(8, 245) = 5.86, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = .161

Symbiotic Merging:  $F(8, 245) = 5.56, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = .154

Fear of Engulfment:  $F(8, 245) = 3.44, p = .001, \text{partial eta squared} = .101$

A follow-up univariate analyses was then done on those variables that had reached significant levels to identify where the significant difference between the Enneagram types and these variables lay. The one-way, between-groups analysis of variance that was conducted confirmed the statistically significant difference at the  $p < .01$  level. There was no statistical difference between the Enneagram types and egocentricity:  $F(8, 245) = 1.7, p = .098, \text{partial eta squared} = .053$ . Therefore, no further analysis of this variable was performed.

### TOR Separation Anxiety

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .12 which demonstrated a medium to large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 96% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a medium to large effect size of .35 and  $N = 254$ . Further post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Separation Anxiety for the Helper ( $M = 3.59, SD = .279$ ) was significantly different from the Challenger ( $M = 3.25, SD = .253$ ) and the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.30, SD = .256$ ). The Helper scored the higher mean score and the Challenger and Individualist the lowest, indicating high and low levels of Separation Anxiety, respectively. The Individualist ( $M = 3.57, SD = .342$ ) also demonstrated a significant difference from the Challenger and Enthusiast, demonstrating higher levels of Separation Anxiety than the Challenger and the Enthusiast.

### TOR Narcissism

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .09 which demonstrated a medium effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 82% chance

of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a medium to large effect size of .29 and  $N = 254$ . Further post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the mean score for Narcissism for the Investigator ( $M = 3.66, SD = .293$ ) was significantly different from the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.85, SD = .201$ ). The Investigator showed lower levels of Narcissism in relation to the Enthusiast.

### TOR Social Isolation

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .16 which demonstrated a large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 99% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a large effect size of .4 and  $N = 254$ . Further post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the Achiever ( $M = 3.23, SD = .234$ ) scored the lowest mean score for Social Isolation and was significantly different from the Reformer ( $M = 3.52, SD = .302$ ), the Individualist ( $M = 3.56, SD = .275$ ), and the Investigator ( $M = 3.63, SD = .341$ ). The Investigator scored the highest on Social Isolation of all the Enneagram types and, when compared with the Achiever, demonstrated the most difference in levels of Social Isolation. The Investigator also scored significantly higher than the Helper ( $M = 3.34, SD = .272$ ), the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.31, SD = .267$ ), the Challenger, ( $M = 3.38, SD = .308$ ), and the Peacemaker ( $M = 3.39, SD = .309$ ). Last, there was a significant difference between the Individualist ( $M = 3.56, SD = .275$ ) and the Enthusiast, with the Individualist showing higher levels of Social Isolation than the Enthusiast.

### TOR Symbiotic Merging

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .15 which demonstrated a large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 99% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a large effect size of .38 and  $N = 254$ . Both

the Helper ( $M = 3.83$ ,  $SD = .214$ ) and the Peacemaker ( $M = 3.83$ ,  $SD = .248$ ) scored the highest mean score on levels of Symbiotic Merging. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that these two Enneagram types were both significantly different from the Investigator ( $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = .231$ ) and the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.63$ ,  $SD = .158$ ), with the latter two showing lower levels of Symbiotic Merging than the former two. Moreover, the difference between the means of the Helper and Challenger ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = .220$ ) was the greatest. The difference between the Challenger and the Peacemaker was a close second. Last, there was a statistically significant difference between the Challenger and the Individualist ( $M = 3.79$ ,  $SD = .198$ ), showing the Individualist to score higher on Symbiotic Merging. The Individualist also scored higher on Symbiotic Merging than both the Investigator and the Enthusiast.

### TOR Fear of Engulfment

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .10 which demonstrated a medium to large effect in terms of Cohen's levels of effect (1988). A post-hoc power analysis indicated a 90% chance of finding a difference with alpha set at .01 and a medium to large effect size of .32 and  $N = 254$ . Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that the Investigator, ( $M = 3.68$ ,  $SD = .314$ ) scored higher levels of Fear of Engulfment than the Helper ( $M = 3.35$ ,  $SD = .354$ ), the Achiever ( $M = 3.34$ ,  $SD = .314$ ), and the Peacemaker ( $M = 3.41$ ,  $SD = .319$ ).

### Conclusion

This chapter presented the results from the analysis of correlation between the HCTI and the TOR, as well the analysis of the Horney groups in relation to the two measures. This was followed by presentation of the results from the analysis of the relation between the nine Enneagram types and the two measures. The discussion in the next chapter considers the

results presented here in terms of the six research hypotheses and describes the implications of the findings.

## **CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION**

In the present study, it was hypothesised that Horney's three groups: Moving Toward, Against and Away from people would be differentiated by their scores on the HCTI and the TOR. It was further postulated that there would be a significant degree of convergence between the TOR and the HCTI. The current study does support a relationship between Karen Horney's groups and the Enneagram, as well as convergent validity between the TOR and HCTI. More specifically, the current study produced a unique and significant combination that identifies one Enneagram type within each of the Horney groups as the exemplar, or benchmark, of the three trends of moving toward, against and away from people. The Helper, the Challenger and the Investigator were shown to be the exemplar of the Moving Toward, Against and Away group respectively.

In this chapter, the results of the ANOVA between each Horney group and the two sets of dependent variables, measured by the HCTI and the TOR, will be discussed sequentially. The contribution of each individual Enneagram type that makes up the relevant Horney group will be assessed in terms of the exemplar of that group. The convergent validity of the TOR and the HCTI will also be discussed. The limitations of the study and recommendations for future research will conclude the chapter.

### **The Moving Toward group (Type 1, 2 and 6: Reformer, Helper, and Loyalist)**

The Moving Toward group need affection and approval which manifests in various ways. Some in the group may need intimacy and others may need to belong to a group or organisation. Their self-esteem depends on the approval of others and they are often



devastated by rejection. To avoid rejection they often subordinate themselves and, unlike the against group, leave the limelight to others or take second place (Horney, 1946). So, they avoid confrontation and conflict. Riso and Hudson (1999) describe these moving toward people as Compliers because they are compliant to the demands of others. They are also described as 'responsible' people, always ensuring the correct course of action is followed. Importantly, the Toward group may not necessarily be compliant to everyone all of the time, but they are compliant to the demands of their superego (Riso & Hudson, 1999).

**Hypotheses One:** The Moving Toward group (Type 1, 2 and 6: Reformer, Helper, and Loyalist) are significantly different from all the other Enneagram types in levels of Compliance, Separation Anxiety and Symbiotic Merging. The Enneagram types in the Moving Toward group are not significantly different from each other.

**Results:**

- The Helper was significantly different from only the Investigator and the Challenger in levels of compliance.
- The Reformer was significantly different from only the Investigator in levels of compliance.
- The Loyalist was significantly different from only the Investigator in levels of compliance.
- The Helper was significantly different from only the Enthusiast and Challenger in levels of separation anxiety.
- The Helper was significantly different from only the Investigator, Enthusiast and Challenger in levels of symbiotic merging.
- The Helper, the Reformer and Loyalist are not significantly different from each other.

The ANOVAs to test the three groups in terms of the TOR and HCTI identified the Toward group to be significantly higher in levels of Compliance than the Against and Away groups. The Toward group also scored higher on levels of Separation Anxiety than the Against group. The Toward and Against group did not reach the adjusted level of significance ( $p < 0.01$ ) in Symbiotic Merging, but there was a difference at  $p = .02$ . These findings are consistent with what would be expected, and are in line with the description of the Toward group. The additional ANOVA of the individual nine Enneagram types allowed for a more detailed examination of the relationship between the individual types within the Toward group and identified the Helper as the most Toward type within the group.

All three types belonging to the Toward group had significant differences with at least one other Enneagram type in levels of compliance. The Reformer had higher levels of compliance than the Investigator. The Investigators pride themselves on their original thinking and have been described as iconoclasts. In contrast, the Reformer is determined to represent information perfectly and accurately, which often stifles their creativity. The Helper scored higher on levels of Compliance than both the Individualist and the Challenger. Challengers move against people and, by definition, are not compliant. This difference validates both the Helper and Challenger's respective position in their categories.

Notably, it was only in levels of compliance that the Loyalist was significantly different to any of the other Enneagram types on any of the measures. In this case, the Loyalist scored higher on compliance than the Individualist. Enneagram authors often describe the Loyalist as ambivalent because, in any description of the Loyalist, it is said the opposite description is equally true (Riso & Hudson, 1999; Palmer, 1988; Rohr & Ebert, 2001). For example, the Loyalist demonstrates high levels of compliance by wanting to belong to a group or

organisation, but at the same time mistrusts their own judgement about their ability to discern if the group is worthy of their loyalty. They can be passive and accommodating, but if they feel they are to be betrayed, can become quite aggressive and provoke conflict. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Loyalist did not score significantly differently from the other Enneagram types, except from the most detached type, the Individualist.

Of the three in this group, the Helper is the quintessential expression of the Toward group. The Helper is a 'heart' person priding themselves on their ability to love another person, despite any obstacles or challenges. They move toward people to comfort, help and support them. The Helper in this study scored the highest on Compliance ( $M = 4.06$ ), Symbiotic Merging ( $M = 3.89$ ) and Separation Anxiety ( $M = 3.59$ ), distinguishing themselves as the most moving toward type of the nine Enneagram types. Moreover, they scored the lowest of all the Enneagram types on Detachment ( $M = 3.56$ ), Aggression ( $M = 3.55$ ), Narcissism ( $M = 3.65$ ), and second lowest, by only 0.01 to the Achiever, on Fear of Engulfment ( $M = 3.35$ ).

Zvelc (2002) describes the dimension of Symbiotic Merging as a desire to merge and experience oneness with others, with the tendency to get lost in relationships. There is little differentiation between the self and others. Closely linked to this is the fear of losing such contact from significant others and being abandoned. These dimensions relate most strongly with the Helper. Neither the Loyalist nor the Reformer can be described as moving toward people in this way. The Loyalist does experience anxiety, but this is related to their fear of losing the security that group membership affords. The Reformer is more inclined to move toward people, not to merge with them, but to conform to social norms of politeness and to avoid being criticised for being anti-social.

### **The Against Group (Type 8, 7 and 3: Challenger, Enthusiast and Achiever)**

The Challenger is the most dominant and aggressive of all the Enneagram types. They despise weakness and exert control over all they come into contact with. Horney describes the type that moves against people as having a Darwinian worldview where only the fittest survive. They have “a strong need to exploit others, to outsmart them, to make them of use to [them]selves (Horney, 1946, pg. 65).

**Hypotheses Two:** The Against group (Type 8, 7 and 3: Challenger, Enthusiast and Achiever) are significantly different from all the other Enneagram types in levels of aggression, narcissism and egocentricity. The Achiever, Enthusiast and Challenger are not significantly different from each other.

#### **Results:**

- The Challenger was significantly different from only the Helper, Enthusiast and Peacemaker in levels of aggression.
- The Enthusiast was significantly different from only the Challenger in aggression.
- The Challenger and Achiever are not significantly different, but the Challenger and Enthusiast are significantly different from each other.

The Against group, contrary to expectations, was not significantly different from the Toward and Away groups in levels of aggression. This is in contrast to other research findings that have shown a difference between these groups. The results of a discriminant analysis by Warling (1995) showed the Against group to score higher on the 16PF scales of Social Boldness, Dominance, Liveliness and Emotional Stability than the Toward and Away groups did. In the current study, despite not differing in levels of aggression, the Against group could

be differentiated from the other two groups on levels of Narcissism. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test confirmed the expectation that the Toward and Away group were less narcissistic than the Against group.

An exploration of the nine Enneagram types in relation to the measures presented a fuller picture and highlighted the Challenger as the exemplar of the Against group. Consistent with theory, the Challenger was significantly different to the Helper and the Peacemaker in levels of aggression. In fact, the Challenger and Helper's score had the greatest mean difference in levels of aggression, which confirms Horney's (1946) position that these two types are diametrically opposed. The next greatest mean difference in aggression was between the Peacemaker and the Challenger. As the most important quality of the Peacemaker is to avoid confrontation at all costs, this significant difference was expected. The significant difference in aggression between the Enthusiast and the Challenger is important because it undermines the Riso and Hudson (1999) model that suggests there should be no difference between these two, as they are both Against types. This result points to an alternative grouping of Enneagram types, where the Enthusiast may actually belong to the Toward group.

In an attempt to gain further clarity, the Horney groups were adjusted to comply with the alternative arrangement of Enneagram Types. However, the ANOVA results of the reconfiguration of the Horney groups, where the Reformer and the Enthusiast exchanged places, did not allow for any conclusions to be reached. There was still no significant difference between either the Toward or Away groups and the Against group in levels of aggression.

Interestingly, the only Enneagram types to reach significant difference in levels of Narcissism were the Investigator and Enthusiast, with the Enthusiast being more narcissistic. Narcissism is described as the “grandiose and omnipotent experiencing of oneself” (Zvelc, 2008). Riso and Hudson (1999) explain how the different Against group members experience themselves in relation to other people. The Against group expect people to react to them, because they feel they are at the centre and full of importance. Therefore, Challengers insist people deal with them, and the Enthusiasts feel they are the only ones able to enliven other people. The Achievers are more subtle though, trying to get people to admire them through their accomplishments. Support for this framework was provided by the Challenger ( $M = 3.82$ ) and the Enthusiast ( $M = 3.85$ ) having very similar means. However, only the Enthusiast reached significant difference, and then only with the Investigator, which has been shown to be the most detached type and the least likely to score high in Narcissism. The Achiever ( $M = 3.76$ ) scored a non-significant high mean in Narcissism, pointing to confirmation of the Achiever’s place with the aggressive types.

Riso and Hudson (1999, pg. 61) are very articulate when describing the Against group as ego types: “The assertive types are ego-orientated and ego-expansive. They respond to stress and difficulties by building up, reinforcing, or inflating their ego”. It was expected then, that the Against group would display significantly higher levels of Egocentricity. Egocentricity is a dimension that describes individuals who experience people as a means to satisfy their own ends, who are manipulative and exploitative, and who expand their own ego to dominate others (Zvelc, 2008).

However, there were no significant results between the three Horney groups or between any of the Enneagram Types for levels of Egocentricity. Even though the Challengers and the

Individualists did achieve high levels of Egocentricity, the Reformer had the highest mean score. Despite not reaching significance, it was unexpected that the Reformer would score higher than the other Assertives, because the Reformers are Compliant. Perhaps this points to the belief that the Reformers have that they are always 'right' and their tendency to always operate from the moral high ground.

These inconclusive findings may have been due to respondents providing socially desirable responses. Some of the statements that made up the scale, such as: I believe I was born to do great things; I believe I am truly special; and I would like to be famous, were very obviously measuring a negative characteristic.

### **The Away Group (Type 4, 5 and 9: Individualist, Investigator and Peacemaker)**

**Hypotheses Three:** The Withdrawns (Type 4, 5 and 9: Individualist, Investigator and Peacemaker) are significantly different from all the other Enneagram types in levels of Detachment, Social Isolation and Fear of Engulfment. The Individualists, Investigators and Peacemakers are not significantly different from each other.

#### **Results:**

- The Investigator was significantly different from only the Helper, the Enthusiast, and the Peacemaker in levels of *Detachment*.
- The Investigator was significantly different from only the Helper, the Achiever, the Enthusiast, the Challenger and the Peacemaker in levels of *Social Isolation*.
- The Investigator was significantly different from only the Helper, the Achiever and the Peacemaker in levels of *Fear of Engulfment*.
- The Investigator and the Individualist are not significantly different from each other, but the Investigator and the Peacemaker are significantly different.

There were no significant results at the adjusted Bonferroni level, but after adopting a less stringent Alpha of .05 the Horney groups did differ in levels of detachment. These results were expected, because the Against group was significantly less detached than the Away group. However, contrary to expectations, there was no difference between the Away and Toward group. However, an analysis of the new arrangement of the Horney Against and Withdrawn groups, where the Reformer and Enthusiast exchanged places, showed a significant difference between the Toward and Away group ( $p < .017$ ) in levels of Detachment but there was no difference between the Against and Away group. This points to the possibility that the Reformer and Enthusiast share elements of aggression and compliance, which makes it difficult to categorise them into either the Toward or Against group. Further analysis of how the individual Enneagram types fared in relation to the TOR and HCTI variables follows.

Descriptions of the Investigator capture most perfectly the qualities of moving away from people that Karen Horney describes. Investigators have a capacity to observe themselves with a level of detachment and, so, what is crucial to them is their “inner need to put emotional distance between themselves and others” (Horney, pg. 75). They have a great need for privacy and may become extremely irritated if others violate their privacy. They maintain a complete independence through self-sufficiency (Horney, 1965). It is not surprising then, that the Investigator had the highest mean score for Detachment of all the Enneagram types. Moreover, there was the greatest difference between the Investigator and the Helper, the most affectionate and compliant of the Enneagram types. Last, the Enthusiast belongs to the Assertive group and the significant difference between the Investigator and the Enthusiast confirms their respective positions.



The Investigator also scored the highest mean in levels of Social Isolation of all the Enneagram types. The Withdrawn types move away from the world of engagement into their imagination (Riso & Hudson, 1999). The dimension of Social Isolation captures this trend, as it too describes withdrawal into one's own world, “a lack of intimate relationships, distrust, and high levels of self-sufficiency (Zvelc, 2002). Notably, the greatest mean difference occurred between the Investigator and the Achievers, affirming the position of the Achiever as belonging to the Against group. Both the Enthusiast and the Achiever are described as extroverts. The Achievers are most happy when they are competing against others and the Enthusiasts when they are entertaining others. The Helper's desire to be emotionally engaged with people, so as to be of the greatest help, was reflected by the Helpers scoring significantly lower than the Investigators on Social Isolation.

Fear of Engulfment relates to the fear of being overwhelmed by others and the fear of losing one's identity, individuality or freedom. This relates to Riso and Hudson's (1999) description of the Investigator's tendency to deal with anxiety by withdrawing to feel safe. The Peacemaker withdraws to gain autonomy and the Individualist withdraws in the hope that people will recognise their individuality and drawing them out. Just as with levels of Social Isolation, the Helper and the Achiever scored significantly lower than the Investigator in levels of Fear of Engulfment. Both these types find their individuality and identity through the admiration and validation of others. The Helper's self-concept of being loving is based on 'loving' others and the self-concept of the Achiever is based on being the best.

Contrary to expectations, the Peacemaker is significantly different from the Investigator in levels of Social Isolation and Fear of Engulfment. It was hypothesised that these two types

belong to the Withdrawn group, yet the significant difference challenges this assumption. In fact, it appears the Peacemakers are better suited to be among the Compliers. The Peacemakers are significantly different from as many as four of the other Enneagram types in terms of Symbiotic Merging, a measure of the Compliers. Moreover, the Peacemakers score the same mean value in Symbiotic Merging as the Helper, the quintessential Complier.

### **Convergent validity between the TOR and the HCTI**

An important aspect of this study was to justify the use of the TOR to measure Karen Horney's three tendencies of moving toward, against and away from people. It was initially theorised that the TOR's dimensions would relate to the three groups, but there was no empirical evidence of a significant correlation between the two. Fortunately, the HCTI became the bridge that linked the two. The results of Pearson's correlations demonstrated an empirical justification for using the TOR to test the hypotheses. The correlation analysis indicated that the scores on all the HCTI types are related to the scores on factors of the TOR. Moreover, these results confirmed that the TOR can be used to discriminate between the three Horney groups.

**Hypotheses Four:** HCTI Compliance scores will be positively correlated to the TOR Separation Anxiety and TOR Symbiotic Merging scores.

The TOR dimensions of Separation Anxiety and Symbiotic Merging refer to weak differentiation between self and other, a desire to merge and establish symbiotic relationships, being unable to tolerate separation, and being afraid of abandonment. Karen Horney (1946) describes the Toward group in these terms and suggests members of this group will exhibit high levels of these characteristics. The results confirmed not only that high levels of Compliance were associated with high levels of Separation Anxiety and Symbiotic Merging,

but that high levels of Compliance were associated with low levels of Fear of Engulfment and Social Isolation.

**Hypotheses Five:** HCTI Aggressive scores will be positively correlated to the TOR Narcissism and TOR Egocentricity scores.

The TOR dimensions of Narcissism and Egocentricity describe a 'grandiose and omnipotent' sense of self and relationships, based on manipulation, exploitation, control and lack of empathy. As expected, there was a positive correlation between Aggression, Egocentricity and Narcissism. Moreover, Narcissism and Egocentricity accounted for the highest percentage of variance with the highest levels of relationship strength. However, what was unexpected, was the positive correlation between Separation Anxiety, Fear of Engulfment and Social Isolation and Aggression. It is also notable that there was a significant correlation between Detachment and Aggression. This suggests that the Away group and Toward group share similarities in some way. Possibly, the motivation to be aggressive is rooted in Fear of Engulfment and a desire for Social Isolation, and the tendency is not only to move against people, but also to push people away.

**Hypotheses Six:** HCTI Detached scores are positively correlated to the TOR Social Isolation and TOR Fear of Engulfment scores.

Zvelc (2008) describes the avoidance of intimate relationships because of the fear of losing identity, independence and freedom, as Fear of Engulfment. Social isolation also describes avoidance of intimate relationships, but emphasises the withdrawal into self and alienation from others, resulting in distrust and self-sufficiency. These dimensions relate to Karen

Horney's (1946) depiction of the Away group which is measured by the HCTI Detached scale. Correlational analysis confirmed the positive relationship between these variables. Moreover, there was a significant negative relationship between the HCTI Detached and Compliant scale and, together with the negative correlation with Symbiotic Merging, all showed lower levels of moving toward and higher levels of moving away. These results were expected and the relationships were predicted in the hypotheses.

The convergent validity of the TOR and the HCTI, therefore, confirmed the usefulness of the TOR to measure Karen Horney's trends of moving toward, against and away from people. This was especially true of the moving toward and moving away groups. The correlations for the moving against group, however, were inconclusive because of the unexpected positive correlations between Separation Anxiety, Fear of Engulfment and Social Isolation and Aggression. These results were also reflected in the ANOVA done between the Horney groups and the three dependent variables from the HCTI, where the Against group was not significantly different from either the Toward or Away group. Perhaps the inconclusive results relating to the Against group can be explained by the sample consisting of people who are interested in personality development and committed to the practice of self-awareness, resulting in lower levels of aggression and aggressive behaviour. This possibility opens avenues for further research, which may answer questions relating to the impact of using the Enneagram system for levels of aggression.

### **Limitations**

The major challenge to the reliability of the study was the self-identification of Enneagram type by the respondents. This challenge has been faced by other researchers trying to build a sample of participants who know their Enneagram Type. Attempts to counter the

shortcomings of this approach have included comparing the results of Enneagram naïve and Enneagram knowledgeable participants (Scott, 2010), to use Enneagram experts to determine the Enneagram type of participants (Whillans, 2009), to draw the sample from a population of experts in the Enneagram field (Hebenstreit, 2008), or to use tools designed to measure Enneagram type (Wagner, 2009).

This study attempted to determine the impact of Enneagram self-identification by asking respondents if they had ever changed their mind about being a particular Enneagram Type and how long they felt they were a particular type. Unfortunately, chi-square tests used to determine independence of Enneagram type were not conclusive because the variables violated the assumption that the lowest expected frequency in any cell should be greater than five. Visual inspection of the frequencies did, however, indicate that the reliability of self-identification of Enneagram type was credible. Only 25% of the participants reported changing their minds about which type they were, and 82% reported they had not changed their self-identified type for up to two years and beyond.

There was the potential of endorsement bias because respondents may have suspected certain items were measuring their self-identified Enneagram type and answered accordingly. More alarming though, is a comment by Riso (as cited in Dameyer, 2001) that respondents' answers may reflect the type they wish to be, rather than their true personality characteristics. That the study may have been contaminated in this way is reflected in the lack of statistical significance between the Against group and the other two groups in terms of Aggression. It may be possible that a response set of social desirability was operating. As the Enneagram system promotes self-awareness and personality development, respondents may have under-

reported their 'negative' tendencies toward aggression because these do not reflect 'self-actualization'.

An observation by Brown and Bartram (2005), Giordano (2008) and Thrasher (1994) that some Enneagram types will be more attracted to the Enneagram system and that certain types may be more likely to respond to a request to participate in Enneagram research was also a concern of the current study. For example, the Individualist, the Enneagram type reported to be the most interested in establishing a sense of identity, made up 20% of the sample. The Helper, the Enneagram Type least focussed on self, made up only 7% of the sample. There is, therefore, a possibility that the composition of the sample does not reflect the general population.

This also makes it difficult to predict the incidence of the different Enneagram types in the general population. Further research is needed to investigate the occurrence of each Enneagram type in the population at large. Moreover, power of the statistical tests used was influenced by the unequal numbers within the nine Enneagram types. Research on type incidence may possibly demonstrate that the unequal groups in the current study are in fact a reflection of the actual distribution of Enneagram type in the general population.

Approximately 57% of the participants were female, which may imply that the results of this study are not applicable to males. However, the gender composition of this study did improve on the gender compositions of other studies. In the studies of Giordano (2008), Newgent (2000) and Wagner (1981), approximately 80% of the participants were women. In Warling's (1995) sample, 73% were female. The increased number of male participants in this study may have been due to drawing the sample from the Enneagram group on Facebook, which

may be more representative of gender distribution in the general population. Unfortunately, drawing the sample from a globally accessed website reduced the study's generalisability to the South African population. Sixty-two percent of the respondents were from the United States and only 6% were from South Africa. Moreover, of the 6%, all were from the white population group. This reflects the disproportionate interest in the Enneagram between South Africa and abroad. To enhance the credibility of the Enneagram system in South Africa, a sample that represents the various population groups in South Africa will have to be obtained.

Another limitation of a web-based study is that only people who have access to computers and the internet took part in the study. Not only did this exclude people from the socio-economic bracket who cannot access this technology, it may have resulted in a sample skewed in favour of highly-educated individuals. Eighty percent of the sample either were tertiary educated or were involved in postgraduate studies. In future research, a design that attempts to include a greater variation of educational levels would lead to more generalisable results.

### **Recommendation for future research**

This study has challenged the neat three-by-three arrangement of the Enneagram types into Karen Horney's interpersonal trends. It has demonstrated, however, that there is a strong relationship between at least one Enneagram type within each Horney group, which acts as the exemplar of that group. The arrangement is, therefore, useful at the conceptual level, but further research needs to be done to explore how each type manifests their particular way of going against, away and toward. A second area for future research is to determine which group the Enthusiast and Reformer belong to. The position of the Peacemaker as a withdrawn type has also been challenged by the current study. This is important, because the Enneagram

is promoted as a map to transformation and healing. If the map is even slightly incorrect its directions may increase a person's struggle to understand their behaviour in terms of Karen Horney's interpersonal trends.

### **Conclusion**

This study explored the relationship between Karen Horney and the nine Enneagram types. It has shown that there is a degree of convergence between the HCTI and TOR. It has also demonstrated that one of the three Enneagram types within each Horney group is an exemplar of moving toward, against and away from people.



## REFERENCES

- Arthur, K., Allen, K., & Tech, V. (2010). The nature of love: Understanding the Enneagram types as nine expressions of attachment. *The Enneagram Journal*, 3(1), 6–22, 176.
- Asdornnithee, S. (2010). When a Five wants to grow: Using autoethnography to examine inner changes through the eyes of the Enneagram. *The Enneagram Journal*, 3(1), 87–104, 176.
- Bear, E. B. (2001). *The Enneagram of liberation: From fixation to freedom*. Ashland, Oregon. The Leela Foundation.
- Beesing, M., Nogosek, R., & O’Leary, P. (1984). *The Enneagram: A journey of self discovery*. Denville, NJ: Dimension Books.
- Brent, P. B. (1994). *A quantitative and descriptive study of distinctive and self-consistent attentional styles and their relation to Enneagram typology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Palo Alto, California.
- Brown, A., & Bartram, D. (2005). *Relationships between OPQ and Enneagram Types*. Retrieved June 25, 2012, from:  
<http://www.enneagraminstitute.com/articles/SHLresearch.pdf>
- Burke, D. (2008). The Enneagram of Evagrius of Pontus. *The Enneagram Journal*, 1(1), 77–102, 123.
- Carducci, B. J. (2009). *The psychology of personality: Viewpoints, research, and applications*. (2nd edn.). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chou, T. (2000). A directional theory of the Enneagram. *Enneagram Monthly*, January, 57–63.

- Coolidge, F. L. (2004). *Horney-Coolidge Tridimensional Inventory: Manual*.
- Coolidge, F. L., Moor, C. J., Tomoko, G., Stewart, S. E., & Segal, D. L. (2001). On the relationship between Karen Horney's tripartite neurotic type theory and personality disorder features. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(8), 1387–1400.
- Dameyer, J. (2001). *Psychometric evaluation of the Riso-Hudson Enneagram type indicator*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco.
- Daniels, D., & Price, V. (2009). *The Essential enneagram: The definitive personality test and self-discovery guide*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Fife-Schaw, C. (1995). Surveys and sampling issues. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond & C. Fife-Schaw (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology*, (pp. 99–115). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Gamard, W. S. (1986). *Interrater reliability and validity of judgments of enneagram personality types*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco.
- Giordano, M. A. E. (2008). *A psychometric evaluation of the Riso-Hudson Type Indicator (RHETI), Version 2.5: Comparison of ipsative and non-ipsative versions and correlations with spiritual outcomes*. Maryland: East Loyola College.
- Hebenstreit, R. K. (2008). A call to apply the principles of the Enneagram in organizations to attract, retain, and motivate employees. *The Enneagram Journal, Summer*, 4 – 124.
- Horney, K. (1946). *Our inner conflicts: A constructive theory of neurosis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Horney, K. (1991). *Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.

- Howell, D. C. (2007). *Statistical methods for Psychology*. (6th edn.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Hurley, K., & Donson, T. (1991). *What's my type?* San Francisco: Harper.
- Kamineni, R. (2005). The next stage of psychographic segmentation: Usage of Enneagram. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 6(1), 315–321.
- Levine, J. (1999). *The Enneagram intelligences*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Maitri, S. (2000). *The spiritual dimension of the Enneagram*. New York, NY: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- Matise, M. (2007). The Enneagram: An innovative approach. *Journal of Professional Counselling: Practice, Theory and Research*, 35(1), 38–59.
- McCready, W. C. (2006). Applying sampling procedures. In F. Leong & J. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants*, 2nd edn. (pp. 147–160). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Nathans, H., & Van der Meer, H. (2009). The Enneagram and styles of problem-solving. *The Enneagram Journal*, 2(1), 62–80,174.
- Newgent, R. A., Parr, P. E., Newman, I., & Higgins, K. K. (2004). The Riso-Hudson Enneagram type indicator: Estimates of reliability and validity. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 36, 226–237.
- Ouspensky, P. D. (1965). *In search of the miraculous. Fragments of an unknown teaching*. London: Arkana Penguin Books.

- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows*. (3rd edn.). Maidenhead, England: Open University Press and McGraw-Hill Education.
- Palmer, H. (1988). *The Enneagram: Understanding yourself and the others in your life*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Randall, S. (1979). *Development of an inventory to assess Enneagram personality types*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco.
- Riso, Don, & Hudson, R. (1996). *Personality types. Using the Enneagram for self-discovery*. Boston, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Riso, D., & Hudson, H. (1999). *The wisdom of the Enneagram: The complete guide to the psychological and spiritual growth for the nine personality types*. New York, NY: Bantaan Books.
- Rohr, R., & Ebert, A. (2001). *The Enneagram. A Christian perspective*. Bangalore: St. Paul's Press.
- Scott, S. A. (2010). *An analysis of the validity of the Enneagram*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Sharp, P. M. (1994). *A factor analytic study of three enneagram personality inventories and the vocational preference inventory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, Lubboch, Texas.
- Shatz, S. (2004). The relationship between Horney's three neurotic types and Eysenck's PEN model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(6), 1255–1261.
- Stevens, K. (2010). The Enneagram: Fundamental hieroglyph of a universal language. *The Enneagram Journal*, 3(1), 119–145,178.

- Thomas, G. (2010). Archetype and imagery in the Enneagram. *The Enneagram Journal*, 3(1), 59–78.
- Thrasher, P. (1994). *The Enneagram: Movement between types, an inventory, and a criterion measure*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Wagner, J. P. (1981). *A descriptive validity, and reliability study of the Enneagram personality typology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago.
- Wagner, J.P.. (2001). Karen Horney Meets the Enneagram. *Enneagram Monthly*, April, 1–13.
- Wagner, J. P. (2008). Enneagram styles and maladaptive schemas: A research inquiry. *The Enneagram Journal*, 1(1), 52–64.
- Wagner, J. P., & Walker, R. E. (1983). Reliability and validity study of a Sufi personality typology: The Enneagram. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 39(5), 712–717.
- Warling, D. L. (1995). *An examination of the external validity of the Riso Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (RHETI)*. The University of Guelph, Canada.
- Whillans, P. (2009). Applying the Enneagram to the world of chronic pain. *The Enneagram Journal*, 2(1), 81–103, 174.
- Zinkle, T. E. (1974). *A pilot study toward the validation of a Sufi personality typology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, Kenya.
- Zvelc, G. (2000). *Test of Object Relations (TOR)*. Ljubljana: Institute for Integrative Psychotherapy and Counselling.
- Zvelc, G. (2002). Test of object relations (TOR). Validity of Test of Object Relations (TOR). Basic information for researchers. [Unpublished manuscript]. Ljubljana: Institute for Integrative Psychotherapy and Counselling.

Zvelc, G. (2008). Test of object relations (TOR). Instructions for use. [Unpublished manuscript]. Ljubljana: Institute for Integrative Psychotherapy and Counselling.

## **APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM**

### Enneagram Research Consent Form

I am a student at the University of South Africa (UNISA) conducting research on the Enneagram to complete my dissertation for the Masters Degree in Psychology. I have been inspired by the Enneagram from the day I first discovered it. It has helped me understand myself and I have begun to release some of my fixations. My passion for the Enneagram has motivated me to do this research project and I hope you will agree to join me in this discovery.

You have been randomly selected from the Enneagram Facebook group. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. However, your participation will be highly appreciated. It will contribute to knowledge and research on the Enneagram, so that the Enneagram may gain greater recognition and more people may benefit from its insights. Your responses will remain strictly confidential. Unfortunately, I cannot ensure anonymity because I will have your Facebook profile and your email address. However, confidentiality is assured because your responses will be filed separately from any of your identifying information and your name will not be associated with any of your responses. By completing and returning the questionnaires to me, you are agreeing that your responses can be included in my research study.

There are two questionnaires, the Horney Coolidge Tridimensional Indicator (HCTI) (Coolidge et.al, 2001) and the Test of Object Relation (TOR) (Zvelc, 2000). They will create a personality profile that can be mapped onto the Enneagram. I thank you for your time and co-operation by answering these two questionnaires.

## APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES

### ENNEAGRAM RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRES

#### YOUR BACKGROUND

1	What is your gender? Male/Female	
2	How old are you?	
3	What country are you from?	
4*	What ethnic or cultural group do you belong to?	
5	What language do you speak most often?	
6	<b>What is your relationship status? Select from options below and mark with X</b>	
	Single	
	In a steady relationship	
	Living with partner	
	Married for the first time	
	Remarried	
	Separated	
	Divorced	
	Widowed	



7	<b>Highest education level achieved. Mark with X</b>	
	Primary	
	Secondary	
	Trade training	
	Undergraduate Degree	
	Postgraduate Degree	
8	What is your Enneagram Personality Number (1 to 9)?	
9	Have you changed your mind about your Enneagram type? Yes/No	
10	What Enneagram type did you think you were?	
11	Does your knowledge of your Enneagram type influence your daily living? Yes/No?	
12	<b>How did you identify yourself as your Enneagram type?</b> <b>Mark with X</b>	
	RHETI Sampler	
	Full RHETI	
	Workshop	
	Books	
	Other Means	

13	<b>How long have you known your Enneagram type? Mark with X</b>	
	3 months	
	6 months	
	1 year	
	2 years	
	Longer	

\*Question four, which asks about your ethnic or cultural group, may appear odd. In the past, some questionnaires did not take into account the cultural differences among people.

Decisions were made based on the results from these questionnaires to the detriment of certain groups of people. It is, therefore, important to include this variable to analyse the results more accurately.

## HORNEY-COOLIDGE TRIDIMENSIONAL INVENTORY (HCTI)

Please answer the following items as you see yourself most of the time, or as you view yourself most consistently over the past few years. Your scores are completely confidential, so please be as honest as you can.

	1. Hardly ever. 2. Sometimes. 3. Mostly. 4. Nearly always	
1	I am affectionate.	
2	It's a hostile world.	
3	I prefer to be alone.	
4	I feel better when I am in a relationship.	
5	Life is a struggle.	
6	People say I'm unemotional.	
7	I like to be liked by others.	
8	I like to be in command.	
9	I am self-sufficient.	
10	I like to help others.	
11	Only the strongest survive.	
12	I don't really need people.	
13	I like to give others my sympathy.	

	1. Hardly ever. 2. Sometimes. 3. Mostly. 4. Nearly always	
14	I enjoy feeling powerful.	
15	I could live quite well without anyone.	
16	I am unselfish.	
17	I enjoy outsmarting other people.	
18	I'd rather work, sleep and eat alone.	
19	I am self-sacrificing.	
20	Other people are too sentimental.	
21	I avoid parties and social gatherings.	
22	I am a generous person.	
23	People are inconsiderate.	
24	I am a private person.	
25	I'd rather be with someone else than be alone.	
26	I'll test myself in fearful situations in order to make myself stronger.	
27	I avoid questions about my personal life.	
28	I forgive and forget pretty easily.	
29	I like a good argument.	
30	I like to live independent of others.	
31	I care what other people think of me.	

	1. Hardly ever. 2. Sometimes. 3. Mostly. 4. Nearly always	
32	I am uninhibited and brave.	
33	I avoid long term obligations.	
34	I feel crushed if I am rejected.	
35	Beggars make me angry.	
36	I feel lonely.	
37	Most people are more attractive than me.	
38	To survive in this world, you have to look after yourself first.	
39	I resent people trying to influence me.	
40	I feel weak and helpless when I am alone.	
41	People tend to be untrustworthy.	
42	I try to avoid advice from others.	
43	I try to avoid fighting or arguing.	
44	People tend to be manipulative.	
45	I could live fine without friends or family.	
46	I tend to feel it is my fault if something goes wrong.	
47	Children should be taught toughness.	
48	I like it better when people do not share their thoughts and feelings with me.	
49	I tend to be the one who apologises first.	

	1. Hardly ever. 2. Sometimes. 3. Mostly. 4. Nearly always	
50	It's a fact of life most successful people step on others to get ahead.	
51	I feel I'd be better off without people than with people.	
52	I need the company of others.	
53	People's basic nature is aggressive.	
54	I try to avoid conflicts.	
55	Children should be taught to be kind and loving.	
56	I've met a lot of idiots in my life.	
57	Children should be taught self-sufficiency.	

**TEST OF OBJECT RELATIONS (TOR) (Copyright Gregor Zvelc, 2000)**

Please read through the following statements and decide how much you either disagree or agree with each. Using the scale provided, type or write the number that best indicates how you feel in the box next to each statement.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	2	3	4	5	STRONGLY AGREE	
1	If the person I love left me, my life would no longer have meaning.							
2	I admire myself very much.							
3	I do not have any good friends.							
4	Myself and the person I love understand each other even without speaking.							
5	I have the feeling that nobody likes me.							
6	I am very good and kind to people as long as they are of some use to me.							
7	Contacts with other people are not important to me.							
8	I like doing things that are dangerous.							
9	I usually do the opposite of what others expect of me.							
10	In a relationship I expect my partner to always accommodate me.							
11	I do not want a permanent partner because that would take away my freedom.							
12	I get upset if other people do not behave as I want them to.							

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE	
13	I get distressed if I have to leave a person I am close to, even if for a short time.	
14	I find it difficult to distinguish between my wishes and the wishes of a person I am very attached to.	
15	I am being honest in answering these questions.	
16	If I am on a short trip, I phone the people I am close to everyday.	
17	I am a closed person.	
18	Sometimes in a relationship with others I tend to lose my sense of self.	
19	I oppose others just to prove they have no power over me.	
20	I need another person to feel whole.	
21	I am going to achieve more in life than other people.	
22	“Average” people are uninteresting to me.	
23	I refuse to become attached to other people because I do not want to lose my freedom.	
24	I am afraid that going on a trip will hurt those who are close to me.	
25	Sometimes I manipulate other people.	
26	I am not close to anyone.	
27	I still have a toy or object from my childhood that I am very attached to.	
28	Some people fascinate me so much I cannot stop thinking about them.	



	STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE	
29	Other people are fascinated by me.	
30	I feel bad if the person I love does something that goes against my wishes.	
31	I feel threatened when another person tries to establish a more intimate relationship with me.	
32	When I am in a relationship, I want to control my partner.	
33	I want to merge into ONE with the person I love.	
34	I am better looking than other people.	
35	I do not need other people.	
36	I am worth more than other people.	
37	I would like to always live with my parents.	
38	If the person I love feels bad, I begin to feel bad too.	
39	I am afraid of another person getting too close to me.	
40	I feel bad if the person I love leaves me by myself.	
41	I have visited all the countries of the world.	
42	The most important thing in love is that my partner is always available to me.	
43	Sometimes I claim rights for myself that I am not willing to grant to others.	
44	I have never fallen in love.	
45	Sometimes I feel all powerful.	

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE	
46	I am intimidated by people who want to become emotionally close to me.	
47	I find it difficult to accept that there are not only things in common, but also differences between myself and the person I love.	
48	My relationships are brief with no strings attached.	
49	I feel that there is a barrier between myself and other people.	
50	I often think of the danger of losing the person I am very close to.	
51	I cannot rely on anyone but myself.	
52	It is difficult for me to cope with every separation from the person I love.	
53	Sometimes I feel so strong I think nothing bad can happen to me.	
54	Sometimes I fear that another person will get overly attached to me.	
55	Sometimes I feel so close to another person that I no longer know who I am.	
56	When a relationship with another person involves too much commitment, I withdraw.	
57	I sometimes feel I have special powers that other people do not possess.	
58	Sometimes unpleasant things happen to me.	
59	I cannot become attached to anyone.	
60	Some people really impose themselves on me	

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE	
61	I would like to be famous.	
62	I am mistrustful towards other people.	
63	I have no one in my life on whom I can rely in difficult moments.	
64	If I get too close to another person, I become afraid of losing myself.	
65	An object from a person I feel attached to makes me feel better if they are away for a while.	
66	When with the person I feel close to, I can read his/her mind.	
67	Sometimes I fear the person I am close to may die.	
68	Other people feel so distant from me.	
69	I try to stop the person that I love from doing something I disagree with.	
70	In the past week I have at least one beverage to drink.	
71	The person I feel close to and I have the same opinions	
72	I want to be perfect.	
73	In a relationship, I chain my partner to myself.	
74	I want to escape from a relationship that is getting more and more intimate.	
75	I do not have a lot of contact with other people.	
76	When I go to bed at night, I want to have something with me to comfort me.	
77	I believe I am truly special.	

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE	
78	When I am in a relationship I feel trapped.	
79	When I go on a trip I get homesick.	
80	Sometimes I break all the rules to achieve what I want.	
81	I have told at least one lie in my life.	
82	I experience the person I love as part of myself.	
83	Sometimes I expect other people to know what I need without asking them.	
84	I want other people to be like me.	
85	I feel alienated from other people.	
86	Being alone causes me to feel despair.	
87	I lose interest in a person who no longer can meet my needs.	
88	In a relationship, I do not allow my partner what I allow myself.	
89	I believe I was born to do great things.	
90	I become very angry when my partner does not do what I want.	
91	In company, I like to be the centre of attention.	
92	Sometimes I act in the same way as the person I like.	
93	In a relationship I am afraid of losing my independence.	
94	I often feel as if there are no clear boundaries between me and other people.	
95	I sometimes use other people to get what I want.	

	STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE	
96	As a child I felt closer to my mother than my father.	
97	As a child I felt equally close to my mother and to my father.	
98	As a child I felt closer to my father than to my mother.	

# UMI

## MASTERS THESIS PUBLISH ABSTRACT ONLY AGREEMENT

M(I)  
PAO  
2001

### PERSONAL DATA

1. Last Name First Name Middle Name  
NETTMANN RAYMOND WILLIAM

Abstract no.

2. Year of Birth (Optional) 3. Country of Citizenship  
1966 SOUTH AFRICA

4. Present Mailing Address  
Street address:

29 BELLEVUE STREET, TROYEVILLE

City State/Province Postal code Country  
JOHANNESBURG GAUTENG 2094 SOUTH AFRICA

Future Mailing Address  
Street address:

29 BELLEVUE STREET, TROYEVILLE

City State/Province Postal code Country  
JOHANNESBURG GAUTENG 2094 SOUTH AFRICA

Effective date for future mailing address (11 11 2013)

E-mail address: raymond@nettmann.co.za

Do not write  
in this space

Vol/Issue

School Code

Abst. Length

### MASTER'S DEGREE DATA

5. Full name of university conferring degree, and college or division if appropriate  
UNISA University of South Africa

6. Abbreviation for degree awarded 7. Year degree awarded  
MA PSY 2013

### TITLE/SUBJECT AREA

8. Enter the title of thesis. If thesis is written in a language other than English, please specify which language and translate title into English. Language of text: ENGLISH

Title: Moving Towards, Against and Away from People: The Relationship between Karen Horney's Interpersonal Trends and the Enneagram

9. Subject category of thesis. Please enter four-digit code from "Subject Categories" on following page. 0625

10. Please append an abstract of no more than 150 words describing the contents of your thesis. Your completion and submission of this form through your graduate school indicates your assent to UMI publication of your abstract. Formulas, diagrams and other illustrative materials are not recommended for abstracts appearing in *Masters Abstracts International*.

Author Signature: 

Date: 04 NOVEMBER 2013