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The paper offers a theoretical analysis of the New Group Therapies (NGT) – a group of post-freudian psychotherapeutic movement which appeared in the USA during the 1960s and 1970s. Four main orientations were discerned as the most important: bioenergetic, sociointeractive, cognitive and existential. An analysis of their theoretical postulates, methods and empirical results has demonstrated that in spite of their differences, personality is their common object and concept. The concept of personality on the other hand justifies their theoretical diversity. This is due to the fact that the dysfunctions of personality have four main modes of manifestation: corporal, sociointeractive, cognitive and existential/semantic. The four modes correspond to the basic structure of personality (BSP) or the basic references of personality or "supports". These basic supports of personality are at the core of personal development, relationships, proactivity and crisis or breakdowns. Several psychological instruments were constructed for the assessment of the BSP, among which the questionnaires proved to be the most reliable. The questionnaires of BSP were tested on different samples of normal and psychopathologic cases. After several trials considerable improvements of the questionnaires were achieved. A comparison of the BSP model with the Big Five model and other has been performed. We regard the basic supports of personality as units of a higher level dynamic system called the psychological support system which includes four subsystems, the body, belonging, thinking and the belief system.
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The notions included into the model of psychological support system, as well as the model itself, were gradually created during the last ten years. The initial idea for the model came as a result of an analysis and portrayal of the new directions of psychotherapy (Berger, 1980). Thus, I have written a special study devoted to the psychotherapies created in the USA, during the 1960s and 1970s. On the basis of the criterion of acceptance, I have selected four groups of the "new directions" psychotherapies: bioenergetic, sociointeractionist, cognitive and existential. I have reached the conclusion that these four groups represent a new generation with its own theoretic, methodical and pragmatic characteristics which, actually, represent a broadening of the scope of the contemporary psychotherapy. Namely, these "new directions" blend traditional forms of work with some new elements, thus serving as a bridge between the old time and the new one. Taken together, these four groups demonstrate the scope and efficiency of psychotherapies, as well as their capacity to change the individual and/or collective behavior which became dysfunctional.

The final chapter of the study contains the idea that the diversity of these psychotherapies does not reflect only the situation of psychotherapy itself, but also the diversity of the human being, appearing in the role of the patient. It is well known that every psychotherapy, as well as every pedagogy and education, contains certain ideas about the "human nature". In this case, an additional challenge was provided by the fact that we have compared four modes of psychotherapy which, in spite of their differences, also contain some common elements. Our analysis did not look out for these common elements among methodical aspects of the therapies analyzed; it was rather focused on the content of these therapies and psychological profiles of the patients (personalities). Briefly, we have tried to synthesize these four groups of therapies not on some "meta" level, but on a level closer to the empirical facts. Such a synthesis and logical factorization has given us a new model of the personality.

All four therapeutical directions considered were offered as largely overlapping therapies with a very wide range of indications. Each direction contained a certain number of modifications, yet there was also a dominant common element. In the domain of therapeutic work, each direction relied on its own concepts of the personality and had its own ideas about appropriate therapeutic methods. Each direction, equally, had its own pre-established framework, terminology, classification, repertory of techniques, rules of work and set of goals. Thus, the bioenergetic therapy, for example, centers on body, the sociointeractive therapy stresses the past and future interpersonal relations, the cognitive therapy focuses on the process of thinking, while the existential therapy encourages patients to concentrate on their experiences, time perspectives and the movement from birth and death, as the key points of human life. Since all the patients we had to deal
with were roughly of the same kind, in our therapeutic work we relied on randomly chosen therapies. However, different therapies applied to virtually identical patients (in terms of their personalities and symptoms) produced similar therapeutic effect, which brought us to the conclusion that we had dealt with alternative or "parallel" therapies. This is of no great surprise, since parallel medications are known to exist in somatic and psychological therapies too. Yet, the problem remains: how could qualitatively different therapies produce an identical degree of amelioration of psychological condition? The question becomes even more poignant if we know that each of the therapies considered explains the changes it produces in its own, specific way, while the changes themselves are mainly expressed in general, rather than in some particular aspect of the personality. Quite simply: the general effect of psychotherapies could not be analyzed without a common, mediating construct or without a set of such constructs.

The conclusion makes an evident allusion to the personality, as the common object of all psychotherapies. A general notion of the personality would not be very helpful here, since all considered therapies contain their own visions of the personality. Each of the approaches focuses on one particular aspect of the personality, which is seen as the only one and principal. Of course, each of the therapeutic directions contains ideas about "the total person", but they nevertheless put forward some specific elements, which are deemed essential. If our four-element "logical factorization" is correct, then we can conclude that, within these psychotherapies, the personality is conceived as a four input/output system. The results of each psychotherapeutic direction have confirmed that "there is something there", while the sum of the results justifies the hypothesis that the personality could be conceived as a psychological system, created through development and interaction of the bioenergetic field (the body), socionteractive field (belonging), cognitive operations (thinking), and transpersonally-existential field (hope, faith, purpose).

The most important step in the development of those ideas came as a result of the following key question: what represent these four domains or aspects of the personality? The only plausible answer was the following: the personality appears, functions and grows as a system established upon four basic points of support. The personality could not appear nor survive without these four ingredients - it is formed from and through them. Or to put it in the mildest form: the basic supports represent the elementary characteristics of the psychological system of the personality. Since the psychology of personality had so far produced an impressive number of concepts which all, in their turn, point to some essential or irreplaceable characteristics of the personality, I had to justify my opinion about the competitive value of the basic supports of the personality (BSP). According to the concept, the BSP are particular psychological fields, formed on the basis
of the central organizing elements and their functions. The very development of the BSP is a function of the human nature, while each particular case represents a variation created within a network of complex interactions. Here, the notion of the human nature substitutes a corroborated scientific explanation, which still remains to be found.

In difference with numerous theories of the personality which exert a considerable influence on the academic world, the BSP model stresses the importance of the environment. The central organizers of the basic supports are not conceived as phenomena forming the personality from inside. In fact, the model could be easily labeled as "periferistic", since it pays a great deal of attention to the phenomena which surround or interact externally with the personality. Metaphorically speaking, we can make a legitimate use of the gestalt notions of the figure and the background. The BSP are neither personality traits nor motives or habits. The centralist theories strive hard to reduce their explanations to genetic factors. For that reason, they prefer to study the picture and stress the influences that the figure exerts on the background. From that point of view, the BSP model is closest to interactionism. As the gestalt metaphor of the picture implies, the BSP are formed through interactions between the figure and the background. However, it should also be said that the BSP are not an once-and-for-all established product which should be somehow introjected. The BSP are, in principle, relatively open.

The BSP model is similar to some holistic ideas, because it assumes that the personality is a system which, however, is not always solidly synchronized. The statement forms part of the explanation of the genesis and development of the basic supports, as well as the genesis and development of a larger system called the psychological support system. The personality develops itself as an active organism with biological, psychological and social functions. As a part of this process, the organism establishes relations with its environment, learns and gathers new experiences. The process is regulated by the principles of adaptive economy, as well as by the principles of orientation, protection and development, among others. We are specially interested in the following question: how does this process become regulated, under the assumption that it is not entirely chaotic? Development is more or less directed. The problem could be perhaps explained by the influence of the organizing element which becomes dominant during certain stage of growth. In the second phase of the development of the psychological system, the body becomes the dominant organizing element. Under its influence, growth, learning, experiences and adaptive efforts are directed towards the organizer or become organized according to its framework. Perception of the world and the framework of experience created in that phase form the content labeled as the basic support of the body BSP/Bd. Once acquired, the framework and the organizer become permanent and embrace all elements which con-
stitute the corporal element of the personality. The basic support communicates with the central organizer, mutates and grows in the lifetime.

Simultaneously, with the formation of the BSP/Bd goes a formation of the basic support which is formed through the interaction of the BSP/Bd with the person/persons providing care and protection. The foundation for this basic support is made of experiences acquired through communication with parents (in early years), and significant others (in subsequent years). The constitution of this basic support is a gradual process, exposed to important influences of personal events and immediate experiences. An equally important influence is the manner of the "processing" these experiences through the remaining three basic supports. This means that the experiences from all parts of the personality support system gather in this field. The core of the field was labeled belonging, which is something more than the immediate communication or classical "identification". The creation of the basic support of belonging (BSP/Bl) represents a part of a very complex structuration of the world, or "drawing of the map" which serves as a basis of a life's plan. Belonging is a very important basic support because it is, in the same time, the foundation of orientation and a map of reference groups and personalities. In the framework of our model, the basic supports BSP/Bd and BSP/Bl (the body and belonging) represent the primary basic supports.

Formation of the function of thinking represents the beginning of the basic support of thinking (BSP/T). The organizers of this basic support are intelligence, thinking functions, and development of skills. This support, as well, is created spontaneously but its effect becomes easily instrumentalized. Formation of this subsystem is of great importance for structuration of the acquired experiences within the primary BSPs, but is equally important for an opening toward the processes which transcend the immediate framework of life (the bio-social). Identically to the precedent BSPs, the BSP/T does not exhaust its content in the immediate influence of the organizers but also includes the feedback of the acquired experiences. This means that the results are recuperated by the BSP. They remain there and contribute to the reinforcement of that particular basic support. The example of the BSP/T could well illustrate the principle of mediation. According to that principle, the personality system maintains itself thanks to the fact that each basic support participates in the exchange of experiences and takes part in the internal, external and combined communications.

The psychological field (or framework) called purpose, faith and hope (BSP/pfh) is constituted at the end of the first phase of growth. Chronologically, this basic support comes as the last but its content is, nevertheless, the widest. It contains transpersonal and partly abstract criteria, notions and models through which a person symbolically communicates with itself, other persons and with the world. That
scheme is a broadest one – it serves as a framework for transcendence of one's own and other people's actual selves. No single phenomenon or ability could be seen as the organizer of this basic support. On the contrary, in this case the organizer is composed of symbolized experiences of all three BSPs. The function of this basic support is to embrace, connect and integrate "all that from inside" with "all that from outside" in accordance with the principles of value and priority. It can equally contain the experiences which had not passed a thorough cognitive analysis. This is not heavily surprising if we know that the BSP/pfh appears gradually and most intensely in the period when the human being is youngest, least experienced and most vulnerable. Nevertheless, some corrections are still possible in the subsequent phases, since this basic support remains in principle open. We think that this basic support is similar to the Bern's notion of "exteropsyché". Our basic support is therefore partly open and partly unfinished, which makes it able to follow changes of the life's cycle.

Development of the basic supports

Development of the basic supports starts with four kinds of organizers which gradually take control over a person's life, in various stages of development. As we have already said, the succession of domination is universal. It begins with the body, progresses to belonging, continues with thinking and stops with faith, purpose and hope. Within each of the sequences, the relevant basic support becomes partly constituted and reaches the level characteristic for the given age and conditions of life. This process could be conceived as a rising spiral, since the basic supports grow both horizontally and vertically. Within the horizontal growth, the basic support is formed primarily under the influence of the organizers, and secondarily under the influence of other basic supports. Therefore, the basic supports are not completely closed "personality cells". They are not to be conceived as factors, personality traits or mental instances. Their formation is a process of differentiation, and articulation within a living context. If this assumption is correct, then we could not expect to prove experimentally the existence of a pure BSP the body, or pure BSP belonging, or pure BSP thinking. This assumption was tested in a number of empirical studies. A brilliant example of this horizontal interaction was provided by the tertiary basic support of faith, purpose and hope.

The vertical development of the basic supports is well illustrated by the image of spiral. Development of these sub-systems is well represented by the idea of stages of growth. A most general idea of that kind was contained in the very order of formation of different basic supports. According to that scheme, the psychological develop-
ment passes through at least four different stages: corporal stage, social stage, stage of cognition and development of skills and, finally, stage of the existential value orientation. This scheme, which is not so distant from the observable changes of the life's cycle, could be broken down to several shorter phases, instead of adhering strictly to the ordinary division between childhood, youth, maturity and the old age. Our idea implies a transfer of the influences of earlier phases to recent phases or even to subsequent ones. The transfer is effectuated through an enrichment or impoverishment of the basic supports. Thus, the vertical process is seen as a process through which the quality, functioning and program of the basic supports of the personality are transformed.

The basic supports and changes of states

The basic supports are mental references which effectuate an "unconscious" grouping and orientation of the endless flow of the everyday experiences. Therefore, they could be conceived as broad frameworks or mental schemes which organize the "input". But that would be a rather passive way to imagine functions of the basic supports. There is also an active way, which refers to their ability to orient mental functions and direct behavior and development. The main assumption of the model is that experiences are modifiable — they change over time, even within short periods. This is yet another element which makes them different from personality traits or factors. Change of the mental state of the personality are specifically reflected within the basic supports. Some states are limited to the changes taking place in only one basic support, but there is also a possibility for changes to occur simultaneously within two, three or four basic supports. The regulation of these modifications is combined. They are partly regulated by the principle of homeostasis. All possible experiences occurring in a basic support appear within a certain range of intensity and frequency. Changes or oscillations of these states are bidirectional; the extreme points of each direction are poles of negative experiences characteristic for the basic support in question. Here is a list of these poles:

1. For the BSP/Bd or the body, the poles are "impotence-omnipotence"
2. For the BSP/BI or belonging, the poles are "symbiosis-isolation"
3. For the BSP/T or thinking, the poles are "unthoughtfulness-intellectualization"
4. For the BSP/Phf or purpose, hope and faith, the poles are "fatalism-fanatism"

If we want to analyze a particular experience via this model, we have to identify the basic support which underwent a change. A so-
sultion to this problem would be to observe whether the experience produced an imbalance or a movement toward some of the negative poles. Furthermore, we should discover the exact number of the supports which underwent a change. It is equally important to see whether the homeostasis was reestablished or was there a fixation on some of the negative poles. Usually, the span of the homeostasis is individually defined. Some oscillation within the basic supports is normal or even desirable, since it contributes to the wealth of personal experience. However, a fixation at some of the negative poles is a negative phenomenon which can produce a dysfunction of the personality. Scanning of the changes within the basic supports allows an estimate of the characteristic profile of the personality.

It is quite probable that the BSP model could serve for a detection of specific personal profiles. For example, some nosologically homogeneous persons or groups might prefer the BSP/Bd, while neglecting the BSP/T. A further analysis might identify the pole which was fixated within the dominant BSP, or within all BSPs simultaneously. Thus, the personality and syndromes could be studied in a new, specific way. Such an approach could also be useful for a follow-up study of the changes produced by psychotherapy or some other correctional procedure. If we take into account the theoretical grounds of our model, it is quite possible that it might offer more plausible analyses than concepts like "personality traits" or "tendencies".

The basic supports and the system of support

The BSPs are basic elements of the personality structure. In difference with personality traits, which are not necessarily to be found in every human personality (since some individuals might have them while others might not), the BSPs are the elementary equipment. Individual differences could be found within the functioning of the BSPs, in the preference/neglect of some particular BSP (BSPs) over other(s) BSP (BSPs), or in the program of homeostatic regulation of the BSPs. There is, briefly, a considerable space for individual variations. The model could explain a wide range of changes which characterize personal states.

The label "basic supports" reveals our belief that these elements represent the basic forms of differentiation of the individual psychological system during the process of development. This thesis is related to the concept of the "organizers" of experiences. During a particular stage of successive development, experiences become directed and mutually related under the action of the organizers which are dominant for that particular stage. The organizer acts dynamically – it directs and structures. A growing personality creates its structure within such
psychological field. The structure acts as the basis for recognition, orientation and definition of state and position. The structure is the existential reference for that particular stage. It is the first life form, offering relatively unsophisticated criteria to the psychological system which learns to orientate itself in order to live and grow. The first basic supports are, of course, "external", or sensorial; they are the foundation of primordial life experiences which could be identified by the existing scientific knowledge and equipment. During the second phase, the organizer is a set of mental functions and senso-motorial skills, integrated within the BSP thinking. It is not until the fourth phase that the BSP faith, hope and purpose is formed. It enables the personality to orient and control itself within the transpersonal space, which transcends immediate senso-motorial, or even elementary, operations of the thought.

The model conceives humans as being closely related to their environment. Environment is conceived as being very similar to the gestalt notion of the background. There is no figure without a background; equally, there is no personality without an environment. However, the notion of the basic supports is ambiguous. A basic support forms as the background of a certain organizer and it becomes a frame of reference functioning as a permanent scheme. As a function, a basic support could be conceived in the same way as any other mental scheme. However, by virtue of its content, it is related both to the external and internal surrounding. Thus, the personality always disposes of its environment which is not pre-established but personally created, although in an unconscious and unintentional manner.

Interactions among these four basic systems form a psychological system, a dynamic whole which we label the psychological support system. In the psychological literature, the term "support system" used to signify two things: a) the social surrounding and b) the protective action of environment aimed at satisfaction of individual or collective needs (Cohen and Ashby, 1985). We think that the set of the basic supports, as we have defined them here, is the primary form of the personality support system. In order to protect itself from internal disintegration, the personality does not use only defense mechanisms; it also reinforces itself by forming a permanent psychological field, background or psycho-eco system. Between the personality and the environment (understood in the usual way), there lies the psychological support system which everyone develops in his/her own way. The system is a permanent feature of the personality. Even when we emigrate, move to some very unfamiliar social surrounding, we remain the same persons, since the psychological support system (with its four basic supports) makes the background of our identity. The psy-

1) The BSPs body and belonging are formed in the first phase.
Josip Berger

...ological support system mediates our interaction with the new environment. It acts as a filter, buffer or psycho-immunological system. Psychology had long time insisted that the personality, as a radically different kind of phenomena, should be separated from the group and society. Moreover, all attention was focused to the inter-psychic phenomena; the mentalization, in its turn, had localized psychological events within the body. A possible way out was offered by interactionism. However, interactionism maintained the separation between different domains, in spite of their relationships. These relationships were seen as secondary. The BSP/PSS model represents a correction of such a thinking. Relationships between the organism and its environment are mediated; they pass through the BSP/PSS which is, at the same time, both the organism and its environment, personality and its surrounding. The personality is the figure and the BSP/PSS is the background. The concept supposes a series of concentric circles or mediated phenomena situated between the hypothetical poles of the human being and his/her surrounding. Not all is contained within ourselves and we are not completely contained within our inner selves.

Empirical tests and comparisons

During the last few years, the BSP/PSS model passed through several phases. It was, first, solidly conceptualized and integrated. Then came the phase of "mental testing"; the model served as an intellectual tool for the critique of numerous academic works. As a result, the model was considerably corrected and conceptually refined. The third phase led to its operationalization, or, more precisely, to the construction of some initial instrument(s) based on our model. The first instrument was in fact a test of unfinished sentences, published together with a manual which explained the theoretical grounds of the measuring instrument (Berger, 1983). The test was tried on numerous clinical files, provided by students and clinical psychologists. Since the model was still unfinished by the time of the testing, the results were only partially relevant, but still useful. In the next phase, the model was tested through a series of techniques, such as the observational technique, a derivative of the MMPI/201 and several questionnaires (the BSP questionnaire). The integrative clinical interpretation made on the basis of the battery turned out to be particularly useful (Polovina, 1991). It was followed by a series of pilot-studies, effec-

uated with different techniques, on smaller clinical samples. Contrary to the author's expectations, the questionnaire turned out to be the most reliable means for the operationalization of the model. Therefore, we concentrated on the questionnaire. Thus, seven versions of the BSP questionnaire were tested on several samples of different sizes, with
some of them containing more than 1000 respondents. We concentrated on improvement of psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire. Special attention was given to the construction of a form with a acceptably reliability coefficient for all four subscales. A considerable contribution in that phase was made by Boris Kuzeljevic (Kuzeljević: 1988, 1993). The following table demonstrates the alpha coefficients of reliability for all versions of the BSP questionnaire, for all four sub-scales.

**Table 1: Reliability coefficients of the BSP questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BSP/2</th>
<th>BSP/3</th>
<th>BSP/3a</th>
<th>BSP/4</th>
<th>BSP/4a</th>
<th>BSP/X</th>
<th>BSP/X α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Body</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose, faith, hope</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the different versions of the questionnaire have mainly reached a satisfying level of reliability. The coefficients range from .75 to .92, with the majority going beyond the level of .80, which we find quite acceptable. Yet, the different versions of the questionnaire are not identical from that point of view. Perhaps coefficients of reliability could be further strengthened, but the rationale is lacking, since the basic supports are not personality traits or some stable characteristics, but frameworks exposed to changes and variations. Furthermore, the basic supports were conceived as frameworks containing negative poles, extremely varying qualities or bipolar dimensions. It is very hard to operationalize such concepts with the usual vectorial procedures. Yet, recently we have succeeded in building a version of the questionnaire which might solve the problem we have discussed. Its empirical testing is under the way.

Secondly, the BSP model and questionnaire were tested in a series of pilot-studies. Several authors (Kuzeljević, 1988; Džamonja et al, 1991; Najman, 1990) have tested the differential power of the BSP questionnaire on several smaller clinical groups of patients characterized by syndromes. The results of these studies will be published in some future rapport. Still, for the moment, we can say that the BSP questionnaire has confirmed its power of differentiation by distinguishing among samples of normal, depressed, suicidal, paranoid and schizophrenic subjects. A series of studies effectuated on special samples (patients waiting for surgery, handicapped persons, prisoners, etc.) has confirmed that, besides having a differential diagnostic power, the BSP
questionnaire could also offer specific profiles of particular syndromes. Here too, the relevant research is under the way.

Thirdly, the BSP model and questionnaire underwent a factor analysis of the basic supports scales, taken separately. The analysis, however, could not confirm our initial idea about the polarization of the basic supports. This assumption was shown to be unjustified although the analysis of particular scales has identified some factors which could be explained by our theory. Having discarded the results as being produced by a technical error (inadequate samples, wrong item formulations, erroneous construction of the questionnaire), we proceeded to a correction of the questionnaire. The corrected version was tested again. The new results partially overlapped with the previous ones and we have decided to select the best version of the questionnaire. The authors had to admit that it is very difficult to make a questionnaire which could attain a very high level of reliability while embracing all the complexity of our construct. Still, questionnaires are very useful tools for nomothetic and universalistic studies. However, the BSP model does not fit in that scheme. It is therefore recommendable to use it for empirical research outside the clinical context. In the clinical context, the BSP questionnaire proved unable to verify the claims made by the BSP model.

The BSP model and the "traitist" Big Five Model

The Big Five model is a summary result of the psychology of personality. Its grounds were laid by the work of Guilford, Catell and Eysenck, who conceived personality traits as the essential units. Their usual method was factor analysis, although every scientist had his own preferred version. The main goal of their studies was to identify the essential ingredients of the structure of the personality. The very number of these traits is important for a valid concept of personality (the universal structure). "Traitist" psychology always showed a due respect for genetic and social influences. The genetic factor explained roughly 50% of the variance, while the socio-cultural factor explained a smaller part. The family factor explained the smallest part of the variance.

Some theoreticians have tried to develop an exhaustive list of personality traits. While summarizing the work of the relevant authorities in the field, Digman (1990) created a table, containing the names of personality traits, divided in five essential categories. The table demonstrates which traits were seen as essential by particular authorities and which category they were attributed to. Of course, only the "robust" traits, discussed by several authors, were included in the table. Here is Digman's scheme in a somewhat simplified form:
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The first dimension: extroversion, exvia, sociability, surgency, interpersonal involvement, assertiveness.
The second dimension: kindness, loveliness, the degree of socialization, love, conformity.
The third dimension: reliability, conscientiousness, super-ego strength, will for achievement, self-restraint, self-control.
The fourth dimension: neuroticism, emotionality, affect, emotional control, anxiety, adaptation.
The fifth category: openness, intelligence, inquiring curiosity, independence, culture.

We have chosen one of our surveys effectuated with the questionnaire BSP/4a. The sample contained 342 female respondents from a Belgrade high school. We have obtained the following coefficients of reliability: the Bd scale = .86, the Bl scale = .77, the T scale = .80 and the P,F,H scale = .80. A factor analysis was made together with the analysis of the principal components. The number of items was reduced and the remaining structure was rotated into the oblimin position. We have obtained the following results:

1. There were two factors for the BSP/Bd. The first factor refers to unpleasant corporal sensations and bad corporal functioning, while the second refers to pleasant corporal sensations and good physical health. These results could be understood as the bipolar dimension of corporal sensations and health. It is in accord with the expected hypothetical bi-polarity, but it goes counter to the extreme negative findings which were labeled "impotence" and "omnipotence". However, these extreme states must be very uncommon in the normal population.

Is there any "robust" factor from the Big Five classification that our factor of "corporal functions, states and sensations" could be compared with? A similar factor could not be found in Digman’s classification, although some of its ingredients make it comparable to his fourth dimension (neuroticism, affect, emotional control, anxiety). Still, some differences do exist. Their raison d’être is, perhaps, contained in the fact that the "traitist" thinkers concentrated on relatively permanent features of the personality, while neglecting "states" which could be, and frequently are, changeable. Thus, they neglected good health and pleasant corporal sensations, while paying attention to the opposite pole and negative quality, anxiety and neuroticism. This came as a result of the preference for mentalism in the contemporary psychology.

2. The BSP/Bl scale also yielded two factors. The first is the factor of extroversion. It was interpreted as the horizontal axis of the social space. The second factor represents the vertical axis of the social space. Its content refers to status, domination and submissiveness. These two factors could be also graphically represented and easily compared to Digman’s "robust" factors. This time, there is a congru-
ency between the BSP/B1 and Digman’s first dimension. Does it mean that the congruence is bigger for socio-genetic characteristics than bio-genetic characteristics?

3. Factor analysis of the BSP/T scale has produced four factors: intellectual curiosity or openness, perseverance, intellectual self-confidence and resistance to intellectual engagement. Here too, the polarity hypothesis could not have been strongly confirmed. Namely, the pole of "intellectualization" could not have been identified, but there was the pole of unthoughtfulness. Our results are mainly congruent with the Big Five model. The results of the BSP/T scale are similar to the fifth category, which contains personality traits such as inquiring curiosity, openness, intelligence and culture.

4. The BSP/F,H,P scale (version BSP/4) was tested on a sample of 1283 respondents. A factor analysis has produced three factors: fanaticism, pessimism and realism. A second similar survey has produced two factors: optimism and pessimism. The existence of the hypothetical negative polarization fanaticism-fatalism could not have been confirmed. In fact, we believe, that these extremes of polarity are not present in the normal population. Common points between the BSP/F,H,P scale and the Big Five scheme are missing. This is by no means surprising, since a review of the relevant psychological literature reveals that these aspects of personality (faith, hope, purpose) were almost entirely neglected. However, some elements of the BSP/F,H,P scale could be compared to some elements of the Big Five Model. Thus, the BSP/F,H,P scale factors border on the super-ego strength (the third dimension) and partly sociability (the second dimension).

At the end of this short discussion about the relationships between the two models we can conclude that they share some common points, while remaining partly dissimilar. The Big Five model is backed by a considerably larger tradition and bigger body of research. We should, of course, keep in mind that the Big Five model has been created inductively, starting from a sound empirical basis, while the BSP model was created deductively and hypothetically. While the first one enjoys the empirical strength, the other one displays a higher theoretical sophistication. Therefore, both have to be amended and further developed.
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