

cance in the desired direction. That is to say, the result of the quantitative analysis indicates a slight tendency for the addict to have a life style of low social interest, to be a leaning-dependent type, to view the world as hostile and dangerous, and to lack direction and goals in life.

FOOTNOTES

1. We are grateful to Messrs. H.G. Heinzmann, G.A. Mango, and O. Simmons of Seton Hall University for their assistance in the early phases of this investigation.

2. Dr. Lombardi is also affiliated with the Mount Carmel Guild Narcotic Clinic in Newark, New Jersey.

3. Gratitude is expressed to the Mount Carmel Guild Narcotic Clinic in Newark, New Jersey, for making available the addict and control samples.

4. Gratitude is expressed to Willard Beecher, Co-Director of the Beecher Consultation Service, New York City, for his cooperation in this study. He felt it was difficult "to understand a functioning dynamic process by trying to project it as the sum-of-its-imputed attributes."

5. Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Helene Papanek, Director and Dean of the Alfred Adler Institute, New York City, and Dr. Manford Sonstegard, Professor of Guidance and Educational Psychology, Southern Illinois University, who served as Evaluators 1 and 2 respectively.

REFERENCES

Adler, A. *What life should mean to you* (1931). New York: Capricorn, 1958.

Ansbacher, H.L. and Ansbacher, Rowena R. (Eds.). *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler*. New York: Basic Books, 1956.

Laskowitz, D. The Adolescent Drug Addict: An Adlerian View. *J. Indiv. Psychol.*, 1961, 17, 68-79.

The President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse—Final Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November, 1963.

DIMENSIONS OF THE INTELLECT UNMEASURED BY THE STANFORD-BINET

G. Edward Stormer, Morgantown, West Virginia

[Digest of paper read at ASAP Annual Conference, New York, N.Y., May 1967.]

The study reported here is directed to the problem of the ambiguity of meaning of the intelligence test score and the need for identification and evaluation devices consistent with the new educational programs emerging from various curriculum reforms. The specific goal here is to perform a comprehensive factor-analytic study of the Revised Stanford-Binet, the direct (or indirect) criterion of giftedness.

The data was drawn from administration of the Stanford-Binet, 1960 revision Form L-M, and a 5½ hour battery of reference tests chosen as stable measures of specific intellectual abilities, given to a random sample of typical 15 year old students. The battery included a number of tests labeled as creativity tests. The sample was made up of 428 students, 208 boys and 220 girls at the age 15, primarily ninth-graders. Students were selected from ten different schools located geographically all across the state of Illinois in such a manner as to provide a representative distribution of density of population and socio-economic status.

The results support the hypothesis of a multifactor pattern of the intellect which clearly includes divergent production as a significant factor. Memory and spatial aptitudes are only slightly measured by the Binet; the major portion of the variance in the Binet seems to measure the verbal factors of fluency, reasoning, and production. This would imply that typical identification procedures based

directly or indirectly on the Binet measure primarily the ability to achieve grades and academic recognition in the typical school program. Perhaps of most importance is the conclusion that children of the same chronological age have very different patterns of intellectual functioning.

It is concluded that intelligence is a complexity of inter-related factors and that there is no single test that accurately measures the many components of giftedness. Thus, identification of the gifted should be approached from the position of first establishing the criterion for which identification is needed. That is, first select the product or purpose of identification; then the appropriate measures can be selected more realistically and with greater confidence in their usefulness.

EDITORIAL POSTSCRIPT ON TESTING

The *Individual Psychologist* would like to take this occasion to raise (again) the question of just what it is that “objective” tests really measure. Is it all possible with our present tools, techniques, and “controls”—all essentially *external*—to establish reliability in the “objective” testing and measuring of human capacities, qualities, conduct, and potential? Can we be assured of any significant and meaningful degree of dependability in, let us say, “objectively” determined cause-and-effect relationships involving aspects of human personality? Is it possible with the human equation to isolate “pure” effects assigned with any certainty to specific causes? Dare we trust the reliability of any “objective” test beyond the single and unique setting in which it was run, not only for the group tested but for each individual within the test group?

May not the inherent and infinite variability of each human organism as it responds so sensitively and so *individually* to the innumerable stimuli of outer and inner “environment” at every moment, consciously or unconsciously, reduce the quest for “objectivity” to a chimera? Somewhere in his writings, Alfred Whitehead, observing that most “truths” are half-truths at best, warns that the danger lies in our proneness to receive them as truths indeed. “Objectivity” may be on no more solid ground than the “truths” Whitehead suggests we challenge and keep under active scrutiny.

Regina Seidler’s article on testing in this issue of the *Individual Psychologist* concedes the many values that “objective” tests may offer the therapist, but she cautions:

“... the philosophy underlying all this objective testing included most essentially the concept of permanence of results. The dynamic philosophy underlying Adler’s theory, for instance, was not taken into account. *Nor the attitude of the subject toward the testing situation, which cannot be limited by norms or standardization.* [Italics ours]. The subject may be cautious, daring, scared, hesitating, aggressive, withdrawn, confident, and so on. Thus, such clearly subjective items contribute to our so-called objective examination of life-style.”

Denying that any tests are objective because of the *subjective attitude* of each and every individual toward any given test, Miss Seidler points out that “the results of all the many test-batteries administered teach the Adlerian examiner what the subject *may be* capable of doing momentarily under certain conditions.” Having included just about all the “standard” test-batteries in the armamentarium, she concludes, most provocatively, that she “would call the so-called objective tests *temporarily objective*, if this were not a sacrilege.”

In the given context, Miss Seidler's conclusion is strikingly supported by the conclusions of a pair of studies (over a period of time) whose formidable "statistics" appear to be impeccable—but whose conclusions are utterly at odds in an area of considerable importance to Adlerian psychologists and psychotherapists. In 1936, Nahum E. Shoobs¹ titled an article "Position in the Family and School Achievement: A Statistical Study"; in 1967, Oberlander and Jenkin call theirs "Birth Order and Academic Achievement."²

Asking whether there are "trends and tendencies to success or failure in school achievement in accordance with the child's chronological position in the family," Shoobs declared that "the statistical probability is that there are such trends." And the accuracy of his statistical procedures was confirmed by two authorities, Dr. Mary Harnett and Dr. Joseph Justman.³ Similarly, Oberlander and Jenkin offer careful tables that "show that there are indeed meaningful differences between birth order groups among the variables used for comparison."

Oberlander and Jenkin go on to conclude that first born children are found to surpass later borns, supporting the hypothesis "that first borns, including only children, are superior to later borns in school achievement."⁴ Shoobs, however, found that "from the statistical angle, the probabilities are that the youngest and the second children are more likely to be advanced and to show less retardations [e.g., completing only 5 terms work in a school stay of six terms]." And it is at this point that Shoobs cautioned, "Of course, a survey of this kind being limited to one school, in one city, is not proof that these trends would hold everywhere; only a nationwide study would prove this conclusively. Our findings show that a statistically significant difference existed. How can we account for this? Is it a function of position or procedure? [My] statistics were drawn up in 1936. Would they hold true today?" Writing again in 1954, Shoobs asked, "Has there been a change in human environments, viewpoints and aims since 1936? If so, would these differences hold true today?"

In light of the school situation today, in 1967, particularly in our large urban centers, Shoobs' questions must be raised again and again. We agree with Dr. Heinz Ansbacher, editor of the *Journal of Individual Psychology*, who believes that Shoobs' findings and conclusions should be brought to the attention of those who have read the Oberlander-Jenkin article, but for present reconsideration rather than "for potential further consideration at some future time." This, we believe, would be consistent with the long-standing view on testing held by experienced Adlerians.

The title alone of G. Edward Stormer's article is most provocative: "Dimensions of the Intellect *Un*measured by the Stanford-Binet." The study, which he reports was "directed to the problem of the ambiguity of meaning of the intelligence test score and the need for identification and evaluation devices consistent with the new educational programs emerging from various curriculum reforms." Yet, despite the care with which his 428 subjects were selected, tested, studied, and compared in "a comprehensive factor-analytic study of the Revised Stanford-Binet," Stormer can only conclude that "intelligence is a complexity of inter-related factors and that there is no single test that accurately measures the many components of giftedness," ostensibly measured by Stanford-Binet.

[In the next issue of the *Individual Psychologist*, we shall publish Don Dinkmeyer's "Study of Adlerian Child Guidance Counseling As Measured by Child and Mother Responses to Problem Inventories," an article which we feel will offer further pause for thought on the question initially raised.]

Thus, considering the nature of the problems and materials in psychology and the present status of our tools and control techniques, it is our belief that all Adlerians should keep their minds open and continuously challenging in the presence of the findings and conclusions of "objective" tests in our field. Surely, such conflicting and paradoxical conclusions as have crossed the pages of this section on Testing should encourage such an attitude.

Andrew Lavender, Ph.D.
Associate Editor

1. See Shoobs, N.E. and Goldberg, G. *Corrective Treatment for Unadjusted Children*. New York: Harper and Bros. 1942.

2. Oberlander, M. and Jenkin, N. "Birth Order and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Individual Psychology*, Vol. 23, No. 1. May 1967.

3. Drs. Harnett and Justman were members of the Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education, New York City, N.Y.

4. Oberlander and Jenkin, pp. 109-110.

THE LIFE TASKS III. THE FIFTH LIFE TASK

Harold H. Mosak and Rudolf Dreikurs
Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago

In two previous papers we have discussed Adler's three life tasks (13) and a fourth task, coping with oneself (14). In addition, Adler alluded many times to *the fifth life task*, but he never specifically identified it. This life task may go under several names—the spiritual, the existential, the search for meaning, the metaphysical, the metapsychological, and the ontological. Yet with Jahn he wrote a book on religion and *Individual Psychology* (25). Even more puzzling, in his pioneer efforts, parallel with the Gestalt school, he titles one of his books *What Life Should Mean to You* (6) and still speaks only of *three* life tasks. In *Understanding Human Nature*, he briefly alludes to the fifth task, starting a sentence with "By situation we mean his place in the cosmos..." (5, p. 41) and drops the subject. Adler's most explicit reference occurs in *Social Interest*, in which he remarks, "They [the life tasks] arise from the relationship of man to human society, to the cosmic factors, and to the other sex" (4, p. 14) and "human beings, as products of this earth, could subsist and develop in their cosmic relationship only by union with the community, by making both material and spiritual provisions for it" (4, p. 43).

Psychologists traditionally have been loathe to discuss this task, their reluctance deriving partially from the feeling in some quarters that such a topic is more legitimately within the provinces of philosophy and theology. Freud, in contrast with Adler, did not feel that the development of a new *Weltanschauung* was the task of psychoanalysis (21). Yet for many individuals the existential tasks are perhaps the most important they face. As Pope Pius XI writes in *Cari-tate Christi Compulsi*, "For God or against God, this once more is the alternative that shall decide the destinies of all mankind...." Adler, in a wry observation, quotes Lichtenberg, who observes how many people are willing to fight for their beliefs and how few are willing to live up to them (8, p. 35). Since the individual's relationship to the tasks of existence involve belief, conviction, and behavior, are these postures not also objects of psychological concern? Certainly these topics emerge from the lips of patients in the consultation room with a frequency equal to that devoted to the more mundane life tasks. Moreover, the subjective overlap between the philosophical and psychological aspects of these tasks