Resonance to archetypes in media: There’s some accounting for taste

Michael A. Faber*, John D. Mayer

Department of Psychology, 10 Library Way, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824, United States

A R T I C L E   I N F O

Article history:
Available online 11 December 2008

Keywords:
Personality
Measurement
Preferences
Archetypes
Resonance

A B S T R A C T

Modern mass media typically employ archetypes—prototypical characters—in their narratives. This research proposes that people’s affective reactions to and preferences for these characters in rich cultural media—their “resonance” to archetypes—may be an indicator of their own personality and life themes. In the first of two studies, a Rich Culture Archetype Scale (RCAS) was constructed based on media examples from popular music, movies, and classic art representing certain archetypes. In the second study, the RCAS was compared with other scales of personality and of archetypes. Results indicated that there exist five clusters of archetypes to which people resonate, and that people’s resonance predicts their personal life themes and media preferences.

© 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

People have been cultivating and refining mass communication for centuries (Dominick, 2002). We have long communicated to one another through etching, sculpture and painting, and music. In our contemporary information age, much of our life is dominated by such mass commercial media as movies, television, and the Internet (Bogart, 1991). The stories and characters that appear in these mass media are essential means of sharing human experience with one another. Some people discuss, converse, and analogize about television. Others infuse movie plot analogies and metaphors into their professional presentations in order to communicate a sense of tangible, shared understanding (Downing, 1991). Social institutions such as book clubs and Internet chat rooms often are organized around their respective media (Dominick, 2002). These phenomena suggest that there exist internal, psychological forces that allow us to respond in common ways to stories and story characters.

One part of personality proposed to explain our captivation with cultural phenomena is the archetype. An archetype is an internal mental model of a typical, generic story character to which an observer might resonate emotionally (Jung, 1961–1963/1983). The portions of Jung’s theory of particular interest (e.g., for the Hero, growth, courage, and triumph over adversity). People who hear such stories may respond quite differently to a figure such as the Hero, and those patterns of different responding may represent important personality qualities.

A number of studies have traced proposed archetypes through the stories of various cultures (e.g., Jadot, 1975). Such research, however, typically employs bibliographic, cultural approaches. Using literary approaches, for example, several theories have attempted to organize various specific archetypes into groups. A few studies investigate the connotations of archetypal symbols; several others use self-report scales to infer an individual’s identification with an archetype such as the Explorer (e.g., how strongly a test-taker agrees with the statement “I feel restless”; Pearson & Marr, 2002b). But to what degree do individual judges recognize archetypes? Can they identify archetypes in media, and do they respond to them emotionally?

We first discuss the origin of the archetype concept and update the theory, introducing a “neo-archetypal” approach. Study 1 presents a new psychometric procedure for testing the existence of classes of archetypes (see Goldberg, 1992; Saucier & Goldberg, 2002). Study 2 examines individual differences in people’s emotional responsiveness to such archetypes, linking those differences to personal preferences in mass culture and establishing connections between tastes in media and personality.

2. What is an archetype?

The concept of the archetype may provide important explanations of how people respond to other people, story characters, and media. Archetype theory began with the work of Carl Jung (1875–1961). The portion of Jung’s theory of particular interest...
here is that archetypes represent personifications of behaviors—characters who embody behavior patterns (Jung, 1964, 1968). Jung first proposed the concept of an archetype in the context of his clinical observations and discussion of the collective unconscious. He contended that people employed unconscious or implicit mental models of other people in the world based on a network of “primordial...mythological images” and ancient beliefs that were ancestrally common to all humans and provided the “true base of the individual psyche” (Jung, 1961–1963/1983, pp. 16, 67; see also C. S. Hall & Lindsey, 1978, p. 120).

Any real person, situation, or event could conjure up these powerful and ancient images from the collective unconscious, eliciting a powerful and otherwise inexplicable emotional reaction (Shelburne, 1988, p. 57).

Jung described only a few archetypes systematically, regarding them as “fundamentally unobservable” (Jung, 1961–1963/1983, p. 26; Shelburne, 1988, pp. 56, 63). Later, Joseph Campbell (1949/2004) codified many archetypal images, and contemporary theorists regularly discuss about 12 or 13 archetypes. Many of these, such as the Innocent, have evolved in concept; others, such as the Lover, the Hero and the Magician, have been relatively stable.1

Examples of these are illustrated in Table 1. Several organizational schemes for archetypes also have been proposed, dividing them into groups; for example, oriented by agency and/or communion (McAdams, 1993, pp. 127–131), or oriented by Maslowian needs such as stability, belonging, mastery, or fulfillment (Mark & Pearson, 2001, p. 16).

Jung and others often used archetypes as an explanation for responses to literature and other cultural stimuli—an approach that earned them many admirers in the humanities. As intriguing as many of Jung’s concepts were, however, they were discrepant with mainstream American psychological thinking (and remain as incongruent today as they were in the early 1920s). For example, Jung promulgated a view of archetypes as based on biologically-transmitted primal ideas. More problematically, these archetypes were viewed by Jung as part of people’s collective or racial unconscious, dating back to a prehistoric state and varying somewhat according to the ethnic group concerned (C. S. Hall & Lindsey, 1978; Jung, 1961–1963/1983). So as to distinguish between these earlier views of archetypes—to which many have objected (e.g., McGowan, 1994; Neher, 1996; Pietikainen, 1998)—and our own characterization, the next section introduces “neo-archetypal theory,” which preserves the more useful aspects of archetypal theory while integrating it within contemporary psychological understanding.

3. Neo-archetypal theory

The neo-archetypal theory we develop in this section retains key aspects of Jung’s theory while leaving out its less substantiated parts. We have drawn on the work of several contemporary theorists in the area (e.g., Mark & Pearson, 2001; McAdams, 1993; McGowan, 1994; Pietikainen, 1998), as well as many researchers in related areas. In neo-archetypal theory, archetypes possess five key characteristics. Specifically, archetypes: (a) are story characters, (b) are represented psychologically as mental models like self- and other-schemata and prototypes, and (c) often elicit intense emotional responses when encountered. Also, such archetypes (d) operate at an automatic or unconscious level, and (e) are culturally enduring so as to be easily learned and widely recognizable. We will elaborate briefly upon each of these ideas in turn.

First and foremost, in neo-archetypal theory (as in the original Jungian concept), archetypes are generic story characters. For most people, they represent key figures in story narratives and possess familiar and consistent constellations of traits. Commonly, archetypes are represented directly as recognizable generic characters such as “a mother,” “a criminal,” or “a healer” acting in a given story plot. However, archetypes also can be manifested thematically rather than as discrete story characters. For example, archetypal characters can be depicted in representations such as symbolistic paintings and/or sculptures; additionally, they can be represented even more abstractly, such as a theme, mood, or motif in a piece of music. The function of the archetype is the same in each medium: to serve to convey meaning or tell a story.

Second, in neo-archetypal theory, archetypes are viewed as standard mental models. Much of contemporary personality and social psychology describe the operation of a person’s mental models of themselves and others (Epstein, Pacini, Denes-Raj, & Heier, 1996; Higgins, 1987; Mayer, 2005; Osyerman & Markus, 1990). For example, Markus and Nurius’s (1986) possible selves are a class of mental models of peoples’ actual, ideal, feared, and desired selves. Closer still to archetypes, people often represent others as personality types—as extravers or introverts, for example—and are able to learn and categorize such prototypes very quickly (Andersen & Cole, 1990; Cantor & Mischel, 1977; Glassman & Andersen, 1999; Mayer & Bower, 1986).

Third, in neo-archetypal theory, archetypes are mental constructions that, when triggered, tend to elicit powerful emotional responses in those who are exposed to them. The archetype concept is predicated on a person’s previous emotional encounters and interactions with similar characters or ideas (C. S. Hall & Lindzey, 1978; Jung, 1961–1963/1983; Katz, 1984; Stewart, 1987). The emotional component of mental models can endure across experiences (Scherer, 1992) and even can extend to unfamiliar situations. For example, affective responses to novel consumer products, social groups, and even politicians can be more or less automatically triggered by previous experience (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Similarly, Andersen and Berk (1998) have examined significant-other prototypes—prototypes of other people that incorporate the key characteristics of those one has known closely in early life—and have found that representations from people’s personal past can elicit stronger emotional reactions than those of non-significant others. Personality prototypes and our emotional responses to them thus are inextricably linked, even to the point where the emotional reaction itself may be considered prototypical (Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, & O’Connor, 1987).

The fourth feature of neo-archetypal theory refers to the archetypes’ frequently automatic operation. The processing of some mental models is often viewed as automatic or implicit (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999), and their non-conscious nature may contribute to how people construct and maintain models about themselves and others (Bargh & Tota, 1988; Epstein, 1998). Additionally, the automaticity of some mental models is thought to affect a number of different mental processes and outcomes, including, how people form attitudes and judgments, how they interpret their moods and emotions, and how they behave under various conditions (Bargh, Chen, & Burrows, 1996; Bowers, 1984; Carver, Ganellen, 1

1 As an example of an archetype that has evolved in concept, the Innocent has gone by several names in the archetypal literature: Jung (1968) himself cited a Child God archetype (which some later termed the Elf) but also used the flowery terminology of Puer Aeternus to describe what is almost certainly the same character: the embodiment of renewal, hope, and youth (McAdams, 1993, p. 158). This satisfaction with tranquility is borne out in Mark and Pearson’s (2001) Innocent archetype: a simple, pure, and naive character who holds traditional values and generally exudes innate goodness (Pearson & Marr, 2002a). Many other current archetypes have gone through similar processes of evolution, such as the Creator, the Ruler, and the Jester (see Table 1).
froming, & chambers, 1983; ingram, partridge, scott, & bernet, 1994; jacob, woloshyn, & kelley, 1989; kitamura, 2005; smith & lerner, 1986; strauss & allen, 2006). generally speaking, many researchers believe that the models we construct can affect mental functions even outside of perception or memory (kihlstrom, 1987). this non-conscious activation of such schemas in everyday experience is consistent with jung’s original view that archetypes were recognized unconsciously.

finally, neo-archetypal theory views archetypes generally as learned conceptualizations as opposed to being predisposed through evolutionary history. originally, jung and others believed archetypes were genetically inherited. today, however, most mental models, such as personality prototypes and scripts, are viewed as being acquired through learning (e.g., anderson, 1980; mayer & bower, 1986; schank & abelson, 1977), thus suggesting that the frequency with which we employ such models may speak to their cultural importance. most contemporary researchers who have studied the archetype concept maintain that it is culture, not biology, that imparts archetypal models from person to person (mcadams, 1993, 2006; mcgowan, 1994; neher, 1996; pietikainen, 1998), although there may be partial exceptions (e.g., de silva, rachman, & seligman, 1977). as such, people implicitly learn to recognize the appearance and function of a great many prototypical characters from the roles such characters play in their life narratives (mcadams, 1993, 2006); indeed, the symbolic and affective importance of these story characters derives partially from the fact that they have endured for so long in the culture’s literary, folkloric, and artistic history.

this updated view of archetypes, with their five main characteristics, can be summarized in the following definition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>Represented frequently by the courageous, impetuous warrior. Noble rescuer</td>
<td>Campbell (1949/2004), pp. 34–36, 227–228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and crusader; must often undertake an arduous task to “prove their worth”</td>
<td>C. S. Hall and Lindzey (1978), pp. 121–122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and later become an inspiration. Symbolically the “dragon-slayer”—the</td>
<td>McAdams (1993), p. 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>Represented by the pure, faithful, naive, childlike character. Humble and</td>
<td>Jung (1968), pp. 158–159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tranquil; longing for happiness and simplicity—a paradise. Often a</td>
<td>Campbell (1949/2004), pp. 327–328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditionalist; saintly; symbolizing renewal</td>
<td>C. S. Hall and Lindzey (1978), p. 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McAdams (1993), p. 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark and Pearson (2001), pp. 54–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>Represented by living for fun and amusement; a playful and mischievous</td>
<td>Jung (1968), pp. 255–258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comedian. Usually ironic and mirthful, sometimes irresponsible; a</td>
<td>McAdams (1993), p. 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prankster. enjoys most a good time and diversion from care</td>
<td>Mark and Pearson (2001), p. 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>Represented by the physicist; the visionary; the alchemist. Seeking the</td>
<td>Jung (1968), pp. 35–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>principles of development and how things work; a teacher, a performer</td>
<td>C. S. Hall and Lindzey (1978), p. 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or a scientist. Fundamentalist interested in natural forces,</td>
<td>McAdams (1993), pp. 148–151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transformations, and metamorphoses</td>
<td>Mark and Pearson (2001), pp. 179–181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>Represented in the rebellious iconoclast; the survivor and the misfit.</td>
<td>McAdams (1993), p. 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often vengeful, a disruptive rule-breaker, possibly stemming from</td>
<td>Mark and Pearson (2001), p. 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hidden anger. Can be wild, destructive and provoking from a long time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spent struggling or injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>Represented by a strong sense of power and control: the leader; the</td>
<td>Campbell (1949/2004), pp. 319–322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boss; the judge. Highly influential, stubborn, even tyrannical. Maintains</td>
<td>C. S. Hall and Lindzey (1978), pp. 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a high level of dominance; can apply to an administrator, arbiter, or</td>
<td>McAdams (1993), p. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a manager of others</td>
<td>Mark and Pearson (2001), p. 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understanding. This is the expert and the counselor, possessing wisdom</td>
<td>Campbell (1949/2004), pp. 46–47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intelligent; a mystical and prestigious guide in the world</td>
<td>McAdams (1993), pp. 143, 208–209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>Represented by the violent, haunted, and the primitive; the darker</td>
<td>Jung (1961–1963/1983), pp. 91–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspects of humanity. Often seen in a tragic figure, rejected; awkward,</td>
<td>C. S. Hall and Lindzey (1978), pp. 122–124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>desperately emotional. Can be seen to lack morality; a savage nemesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archetypes are story characters—prototypes of culturally important figures—that are learned and recognized implicitly, and whose historical and personal significance evoke emotional reactions.

4. Research on archetypes

Jung's work on archetypes was initially embraced by many scholars in the humanities, but was welcomed less warmly in the sciences. For example, Jung's theory was extensively explored and developed by Joseph Campbell, in his (1949) seminal text, *The Hero With a Thousand Faces*. By using the metaphor of the "hero's journey," and archetypes such as the orphan, the warrior, and the saint, Campbell traced many archetypes and symbols across the mythological literatures of many different cultures, arguing for their universality.

Personality psychology soon incorporated the archetype concept into its textbooks (e.g., C. S. Hall & Lindzey, 1957), recognizing its possible application to understanding personality and responses to other people. Early clinicians searched for archetypes in their clients' responses to Rorschach inkblots, dreams, and even personal life stories. Many psychotherapists identified and analyzed archetypal responses in these and other productions (Frame, 2002; Lewis & McCully, 1994; Lockhart & Siegel, 1976; McCully, 1978, 1987; Solomon, 1991; Squires & Craddock, 1990; Stevens, 2000).

Archetypal concepts such as the anima and animus attracted some research attention in the 1970s, at a time of considerable gender differentiation and change. Craddock, Thumin, and Barclay (1971) presented the archetypal symbol of the yin-yang—believed to represent, among other things, opposing male and female qualities—to college students, and asked participants to evaluate the symbol on 30 bipolar dimensions such as "beautiful-ugly," "good-bad," and "strong-weak." The experimenters found that participants saw the yin-yang as unifying qualities usually associated separately with men or women, and provided some support for gender differentiation and change. Craddick, Thumin, and Barclay (1991) analyzed archetypal responses in these and other productions (Frame, 2002; Lewis & McCully, 1994; Lockhart & Siegel, 1976; McCully, 1978, 1987; Solomon, 1991; Squires & Craddock, 1990; Stevens, 2000).

Research on archetypes

Some self-report scales have been developed that ask people about themes related to specific archetypes and then try to identify a person with an archetype based on these personal life themes (Marr, 1996; Pearson & Marr, 2002b). Such scales assume the presence of archetypal models, however, without directly testing for them.

To summarize, the concept of the archetype has been used to explain how people respond to other people, story characters, and media. This notion is potentially useful to personality psychology, as well as to media studies and the humanities. However, research on the archetype is sparse. Some evidence suggests that people do reliably associate certain concepts, such as the masculine and feminine, with various animals and symbols, and yet many fundamental empirical questions concerning the archetype remain unexplored. Can people reliably identify archetypes underlying story characters in movies, and art, and related themes in music? What are some fundamental archetypes? Can they be grouped? Do people respond emotionally to certain archetypes more than others?

We conducted our first study to see if people could recognize archetypes within cultural media in a consistent manner, as hypothesized in neo-archetypal theory. Our ultimate aim was to assess whether people show repeated patterns for liking stimuli that all exemplify the same archetype across different media, thus possibly revealing a personal life theme. If so, we hoped to construct an archetype scale using examples of cultural stimuli from three popular culture media: music, movies, and art.

As a first step, descriptions of archetypes from previous researchers were examined (e.g., Campbell, 1949/2004; Jung, 1961–1963/1983; Mark & Pearson, 2001; McAdams, 1993; Pearson & Marr, 2002a), and a list of thirteen conceptual archetypes, with definitions, was developed (see Table 1). For example, the Hero (or Warrior), the Caregiver (or Universal Mother), and the Sage (or Wise Old Man) have been quite consistent across theorists, and these were fairly directly summarized. In some cases, however, the parallels across archetypes proposed by theorists involve some approximations. For example, our operational definition of the Ruler shares some characteristics with the Ruler in Mark and Pearson (2001): (i.e., controlling, authoritarian, a leader), but also draws upon McAdams’ (1993) Arbiter imago (a judge; a manager of others) and Jung’s (1961–1963/1983) Father archetype (highly influential, stubborn, and tyrannical).

If archetypes exist, it then stands to reason that these affective schemas or mental models can be identified in the popular music, movies, television, literature, and classic art of today (Mark & Pearson, 2001, pp. 9–10). It might be possible, then, to measure such archetypes by using stimuli from such sources. For the purposes...
of this research, items in each mass culture medium will be referred to as rich cultural stimuli, or RCS.

5. Overview of Study 1

An important assumption of neo-archetypal theory is the belief that individuals conversant with the theory can correctly identify archetypes (cf., Huston et al., 1999; Lewis et al., 1994; Lockhart & Seigel, 1976; McCully, 1987; Solomon, 1991; Rosen et al., 1991; Squyres & Craddock, 1990; Stevens, 2000). To test that assumption, we identified 156 rich cultural stimuli: 12 examples each of the 13 archetypes identified in Table 1. Of the 12 examples per archetype, four each were drawn from music, art, and film. These 156 stimuli then were presented to the participants in the study, to address a number of hypotheses about archetypes and their identification.

5.1. Hypotheses concerning recognizing archetypes

Hypothesis 1. People can perceive archetypes in rich cultural media.

If people are able to perceive archetypes, they should exhibit interjudge agreement as to precisely which archetypes are represented by which stimuli. Specifically, participants should be able to classify most of the 156 items as being representative of particular archetypes, or archetype blends, with sufficient agreement.

Hypothesis 2. Archetypes can be grouped into clusters.

Most Jungian archetype research focuses on individual archetypes. However, groups of archetypes that overlap might be constituents of larger and more global archetype clusters, as some of the archetypes share various characteristics with each other. For example, despite differences described in some sources (e.g., Mark & Pearson, 2001), the Magician and the Sage are archetypes that both connote a wizard, or wise old man: a guiding spirit; a scientist and a prestigious teacher or grandfather (Jung, 1961–1963/1983; Campbell, 1949/2004). Such similarities prompted us to hypothesize that certain archetypes could form groups or clusters identifiable via factor analysis. Aside from the expected Magician-Sage similarity, however, we had no preconceived notions about which archetypes, if any, might group together into clusters.

5.2. Hypotheses concerning scale development

Hypothesis 3. A Rich Culture Archetype Scale can be successfully developed.

If the above hypotheses were supported, it would then be possible to construct a Rich Culture Archetype Scale (RCAS) that would contain rich cultural stimuli from popular music, movies, and classic art that were predetermined, preidentified representatives of various archetypes. Such a scale could then be employed to measure individual differences in emotional responses to various archetypes in the future.

6. Study 1

6.1. Methods

6.1.1. Participants

100 college students (26 male, 74 female) enrolled in introductory psychology courses participated in Study 1 and received experimental course credit; their responses were identified only by number.

6.1.2. Materials

Each of the 13 archetypes shown in Table 1 was represented with four stimuli in each of three rich cultural media (music, movies, and art), for an overall total of 156 items, which were block-randomized for administration. The 52 music stimuli were contained on audio CDs and played aloud for all participants, while the remaining 104 movie and art stimuli were printed as high-definition color images inside hardcover binders so that, for the majority of the session, the participants could work on the stimuli at their own pace. Participants received the stimulus binders, an answer sheet on which to record their responses, and a sheet of “archetype definitions” (from Table 1), which they had the option to keep when they left the session.

6.1.3. Procedure

The participants were given a list of individually-lettered archetype definitions so that they could become familiar with the archetypes before the ratings actually began. The archetypes were listed alphabetically so as to preclude any notion of certain archetypes being preferable to others. Participants were then given an answer sheet on which they were told to write the letter of the archetype that they thought each rich cultural stimulus (RCS) would best represent.

After allowing the participants to study the definitions list for 2–3 min, the first set of stimuli (music) was presented. The music items were selected from a number of popular musical traditions including classical, punk, jazz, rap, funk, pop, country, metal, and experimental music (see Appendix A for a list of the music items used in both studies). Participants listened to each item for approximately twenty seconds and were requested to select the archetype from the definition sheet that was best represented by the music. The sequential number of each music stimulus (which always was the same) was announced by the researcher before the item was played so as to avoid confusion.

The participants were reminded to try and give an answer for each item, even if they were unfamiliar with it, and to make sure to use all 13 archetypes (though not necessarily equally often). Reminders of this nature could also be found on the answer sheet and in the stimulus binders. Once the music stimuli were all played, the stimulus binders were distributed with the movie and art images. As each participant finished all 156 items, their stimulus binder and answer sheet were collected. The entire process typically took 60–75 min.

6.2. Results

6.2.1. Perception of archetypes in rich cultural media

Our first hypothesis was that participants could identify archetypes in RCS with some agreement. To test this, a matrix was created with the 156 RCS items down the rows and the 13 archetypes across the top. Participants’ responses were then tabulated in the matrix. A segment of the matrix for the previously-classified 12 Caregiver and 12 Jester items is shown in Table 2. As expected, the items selected by the investigators as representative of the Caregiver or the Jester were, on the whole, nominated as such by the participants much more often than they were nominated as other archetypes. Similar nomination frequency item breakdowns for the other eleven archetypes also were observed.

The left side of Table 3 shows the average number of nominations for the 156 RCS items in the initial pool, based on their a priori-classified archetypes. For example, the twelve RCS items selected to represent the Outlaw received a total of 463 “Outlaw” nominations from participants—an average of 38.6 nominations.
per item (Expected Archetype column). The All Other Archetypes column represents the average number of nominations for the other 12 (in this case, non-Outlaw) archetypes for each of the 12 items: 5.0 nominations per item for each “other” archetype. The next highest-nominated category for these items after the Outlaw was the Ruler (averaging 11.7 nominations per item) and the remaining eleven archetypes were nominated even less often. This pattern of “expected” versus “other” archetype nomination totals indicates that participants agreed as to which stimuli represented a given archetype and which did not, Kappa index of interrater agreement (the 50 judges in one group versus the 50 judges in the other) for all stimuli that exhibited a

As a second perspective on rater agreement, we divided the sample into two groups of 50 judges each. For both groups, we calculated the modal categorical response for each item. The resulting kappa index of interrater agreement (the 50 judges in one group versus the 50 judges in the other) for all stimuli that exhibited a modal archetypal categorization was \( \kappa = .79 \). Taken together with the overall nomination frequencies of the archetype items (Table 3), this provided strong evidence that participants can reliably identify archetypes—even across different RCS media.

Examples of two different archetype stimuli, one for the Innocent and one for the Shadow, are illustrated in Fig. 1.

### 6.2.2. Grouping the archetypes into clusters

Table 4 shows the similarities between archetypes based on participants’ nomination answers. These correlations indicated that the thirteen archetypes were sometimes independent of one

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Average number of nominations</th>
<th>Expected archetype</th>
<th>All other archetypes</th>
<th>Next-highest archetype</th>
<th>Final 83 RCS items (6 items/archetype + 5 auxiliary art items)</th>
<th>Expected archetype</th>
<th>All other archetypes</th>
<th>Next-highest archetype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>15.75 (IN)</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>15.83 (IN)</td>
<td>12.57 (SG)</td>
<td>6.57 (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>11.33 (SG)</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>12.57 (SG)</td>
<td>9.71 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman/Everywoman</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>9.25 (EX)</td>
<td>53.29</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>9.71 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>12.50 (EV)</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>11.00 (EV)</td>
<td>12.57 (SG)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>42.17</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>9.75 (EX &amp; RU)</td>
<td>56.14</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>14.29 (RU)</td>
<td>6.86 (CR)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>11.67 (CA)</td>
<td>59.43</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>8.68 (CR)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>7.58 (EV)</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>60.08</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>11.08 (IN)</td>
<td>72.33</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.67 (IN)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>12.50 (EV)</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>15.00 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.67 (RU)</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>8.50 (JE)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>16.67 (SH)</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>15.17 (OU)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>14.42 (MG)</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>12.17 (MG)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>12.17 (OU)</td>
<td>81.14</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>8.71 (OU)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>10.86 (OU)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
<td>5.67 (EX)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
type clusters for characters who were “Knowing and Constructive,” respectively. Rotated solutions for both models indicated archetypes and five-factor solutions explained 51.5% and 60.4% of the variance, five factors. When these factors were varimax-rotated, the four-scat plot suggesting that the archetypes might cluster on four or values (2.1, 1.9, 1.4, 1.3, 1.2, 1.0, and 0.9) and an accompanying latter notion. Principle components analysis yielded initial eigenvalues and (b) that some archetypes are more interrelated than others. An archetypes were mostly representative of very different RCS items, pairs of archetypes, however, had lower relationships; i.e., between that they shared some characteristic similarities. The remaining other, and at other times moderately correlated. Nominations for the Ruler and the Hero overlapped appreciably, \( r(154) = .48, p < .001 \), as did those for the Magician and Sage, \( r(154) = .48, p < .001 \). That is, two particular archetypes (e.g., Magician and Sage) were often nominated highly for the same items, suggesting that they shared some characteristic similarities. The remaining pairs of archetypes, however, had lower relationships; i.e., between \( r = -.2 \) and .2, such as the Lover and Creator, \( r(154) = -.09, \) ns, or the Sage and Explorer, \( r(154) = .06, \) ns.

The correlation matrix supports ideas that both (a) the thirteen archetypes were mostly representative of very different RCS items, and (b) that some archetypes are more interrelated than others. An exploratory factor analysis provided a more detailed look at this latter notion. Principle components analysis yielded initial eigenvalues (2.1, 1.9, 1.4, 1.3, 1.2, 1.0, and 0.9) and an accompanying scree plot suggesting that the archetypes might cluster on four or five factors. When these factors were varimax-rotated, the four- and five-factor solutions explained 51.5% and 60.4% of the variance, respectively. Rotated solutions for both models indicated archetype clusters for characters who were “Knowing and Constructive,” “Caring and Loyal,” “Striving and Driven”, and “Average and Independent.” Table 5 shows the rotated loadings for the five-factor solution, which appeared most encompassing in including the original archetypes.

### 6.2.3. Construction of the RCAS

In order to test how people respond to archetypes in rich culture media, it was necessary to collect clear examples of archetypes into a scale. Study 1 provided detailed information regarding the quality of archetypal RCS; using that information, we built a scale called the Rich Culture Archetype Scale (RCAS).

There were two main criteria for item selection: (a) representativeness of the archetype (i.e., items with the highest raw number of nominations for a particular archetype were usually selected; see individual cell totals in Table 2), and (b) distinctiveness (i.e., items with the largest difference between the highest-nominated category and the second-highest-nominated category were preferred; compare to cell totals of other columns in Table 2). The first criterion was regarded as the most important. Using these selection criteria, two items in each medium (music, movies, and art)

### Table 4

Study 1: Intercorrelations of subjects’ perceptions of the similarity of pairs of archetype categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>EV</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>JE</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>OU</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman/Everywoman</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A given correlation is between the two specific archetypes indicated. For example, the correlation of \( r = -.10 \) between the Caregiver and the Creator represents the correlation between the number of endorsements of each of the 156 stimuli as a Caregiver versus each respective item’s endorsement as a Creator (or, the correlation between the complete Caregiver and Creator columns indicated in part in Table 2). Correlations in bold are significant at \( p < .05 \). CA, Caregiver; CR, Creator; EV, Everyman/Everywoman; EX, Explorer; HE, Hero; IN, Innocent; JE, Jester; LO, Lover; MG, Magician; OU, Outlaw; RU, Ruler; SG, Sage; SH, Shadow.

Image of the Innocent is “Two Cherubs” (Raphael, c. 1513–1514); image of the Shadow is “Saturn Devouring His Son” (Goya, c. 1821–1823). Images reprinted with permission.

**Fig. 1.** Examples of two RCS items used in Study 2, representing the Innocent (left) and the Shadow (right). (See above-mentioned references for further information.)
then were chosen to represent each one of the thirteen archetypes in the RCAS, for an initial total of 78 items. Five additional art stimuli were added to the scale, in anticipation of potential limitations with familiarity effects in that area, resulting in a total of 83 items. Each item was chosen to represent only one archetype.

As seen in the right side of Table 3, the 83 items chosen for the RCAS displayed, on average, large differences between the number of nominations for the archetype they were chosen to represent and their average number of nominations for the twelve other archetypes, \( t(12) = 11.82, p < .001 \). For example, the six items chosen to represent the Explorer in the RCAS were nominated as the Explorer an average of 53.67 times by the participants in Study 1; these six items were only nominated 3.83 times on average for each of the other twelve archetype categories. This difference for each archetype indicates that the RCAS uses a manageable and concise set of stimuli that are distinctively archetypal.

6.3. Discussion of Study 1

Study 1 indicated that people can reliably identify individual archetypes in rich culture media; specifically, in music, movies, and classic art. The study also showed that people can agree fairly consistently on the individual archetypes the RCAS items most clearly represented, even with minimal explicit knowledge of the archetypes themselves. Finally, the thirteen archetypes used in this study were found to be sufficiently independent of each other, although some overlaps were suggested by participants’ patterns of category nomination. What still is required, however, is a demonstration that people will respond emotionally and differentially to such stimuli. In Study 2, we examine whether individual differences occur in responses to archetypes.

7. Overview of Study 2

People’s mental models of the world may influence their feelings about the things they like. For example, people may prefer rich culture media that represent a specific archetype to which they are attracted. Additionally, preferences for specific story characters may relate to socioemotional traits such as the Big Five (Mayer, 1995, 2005; McAdams et al., 2004; McCrae & Costa, 1999). Recalling that people are thought to respond to archetypes by experiencing cognitively-accessible emotions such as fascination, interest, and significance, Study 2 examines the questions, “Do people respond to archetypes in unique patterns?” and “Do these differences relate systematically to individuals’ self-identification with archetypes and/or media preferences?” In addition, we wanted to assess whether people’s reactions to archetypes relate to their personality traits, and whether media preferences can be predicted from archetypes even controlling for these traits. As such, Study 2 investigated two sets of hypotheses: (a) measuring responsiveness to archetypal content, and (b) predictions from that measurement.

7.1. Hypotheses concerning responsiveness to archetypes

**Hypothesis 1.** Resonance is a unitary construct.

Neo-archetypal theory characterizes a person’s response to an archetype as involving a diffuse but potent emotional and spiritual reaction (e.g., Jung, 1961–1963/1983, p. 16). To capture something of that overall response, the RCAS included questions examining participants’ interest, liking, disliking, and familiarity for each item. We hypothesized that these ratings would correlate together and approximate the striking experience of encountering a psychologically meaningful character (cf. Maloney, 1999). This combined reaction to an archetype was termed ‘resonance.”

**Hypothesis 2.** General clustering patterns will be found in the archetype measures.

We expected the RCAS resonance scores to reveal that people respond to groups of archetypes similarly. For example, in Study 1, a “Caring and Loyal” cluster of archetypes emerged consisting of the Caregiver and the Innocent (possibly including the Lover as well). We expected that people would resonate to specific archetypes, and also to the groups in which the archetypes clustered (as suggested by the factor analysis in Study 1).

**Hypothesis 3.** Archetype responses will reliably distinguish individual differences.

A third hypothesis was that people would exhibit reliable individual differences as to archetype resonance. This was a particularly stringent test of the theory, as the RCAS spanned multiple dissimilar media in music, art, and still shots from movies; however, we expected that people would recognize the archetypes across media and resonate to them accordingly.

7.2. Hypotheses concerning predictions from archetypal resonance

**Hypothesis 4.** There will be gender differences in resonance to archetypes.

Jung and others since him have suggested that men and women might differently respond to certain archetypes. Whether these differences are framed as anima/animus dynamics (Bradway, 1995; Brozo & Schmelzer, 1997) or due to social gender schemas

---

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype Factor</th>
<th>I: Knowing &amp; Constructive</th>
<th>II: Caring &amp; Loyal</th>
<th>III: Striving &amp; Driven</th>
<th>IV: Conflicted &amp; Destructive</th>
<th>V: Average &amp; Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td></td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td></td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman/Everywoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Loadings greater than .5 are in bold; loadings smaller than .3 are deleted.
(Archer & Lloyd, 2002; Bem, 1974; Diekmann & Eagly, 2000; Eagly, 1987), research suggests that people will respond to archetypes in a fashion consistent with traditional sex roles. Thus, in the context of this study, we expected that men, relative to women, would respond more to such archetypes as the Ruler, the Outlaw, and the Jester because, on average, they would identify more strongly with power, rebellion, and certain forms of humor. Similarly, we believed that women, relative to men, and also consistent with traditional sex-role conceptions, would respond more to the Caregiver, Lover, and Innocent, because, on average, they would identify more strongly with the compassion, stability, and intimacy that collectively characterize these archetypes.

**Hypothesis 5.** The RCAS will relate moderately to other archetype measures.

Our fifth hypothesis was that a person’s resonance to one or more archetypes would correlate with his or her self-reported life themes, as indicated both by a pre-existing scale of archetypes (the Pearson-Marr Archetype Indicator [PMAI]; Pearson & Marr, 2002b) and self-judged similarity to the various archetypes as they were defined by the investigators.

**Hypothesis 6.** Archetype resonance will relate to entertainment preferences.

Archetypes often are said to exist in artistic works (Mark & Pearson, 2001). We were concerned with whether archetype resonance would predict people’s preferences for groups of leisure activities, and in particular, their preference for certain genres of media that, arguably, emphasize different archetypes. To test this, the RCAS was correlated with a modified scale of entertainment preferences by Rentfrow (2004).

**Hypothesis 7.** Archetypes will correlate with personality traits.

One way to think about archetypal story characters is that each can be defined as a profile of traits. For example, Jesters might display high extraversion but low conscientiousness, while Creators may be high in openness to experience. Assuming that people resonate to archetypes similar to themselves, our final hypothesis predicted that resonance to a given archetype would correlate with participants’ own patterns of Big Five traits.

8. Study 2

8.1. Methods

8.1.1. Participants

Data from 125 college psychology students (52 male, 73 female) were used in all analyses for Study 2. As in Study 1, students received experimental course credit for participating in the study.

8.1.2. Materials

The materials used for analyses in this study were (a) the RCAS, (b) the Pearson-Marr Archetype Indicator (PMAI; Pearson & Marr, 2002b), (c) a scale of self-to-archetype judged similarity, (d) a 100-item measure of Big Five unipolar trait descriptive adjectives (Goldberg, 1992), and (e) a modified scale of media preferences (Rentfrow, 2004).

**Rich Culture Archetype Scale (RCAS).** The Rich Culture Archetype Scale (RCAS) developed in Study 1 consists of 83 art, music, and movie items, representing each of 13 archetypes (see Fig. 1 and Appendix A for examples of these items). Participants were asked the following questions for each item: (a) How interested are you in this stimulus?, (b) How much do you like this stimulus?, (c) How much do you dislike this stimulus?, and (d) How familiar are you with this stimulus? Answers were recorded on each participant’s answer sheet on a six-point Likert-type scale. The RCAS generally can be completed in 30–45 min.

**Pearson-Marr Archetype Indicator (PMAI).** The PMAI (Pearson & Marr, 2002b) consists of 72 items predicting twelve Pearson archetypes (cf. Mark & Pearson, 2001). For this study, six new items were added and staggered throughout the PMAI, which otherwise neglects the Shadow. Examples of the added Shadow items are, “Sometimes people describe me in ways I refuse to accept,” “I sometimes frighten others with the ways I talk and act,” and “Sometimes I really enjoy feeling a bit evil.” These six additional items were intended to match as closely as possible the tone and format of the existing PMAI statements, and all 78 of these self-report items were answered on a standard five-point Likert scale.

**Perceived similarity.** Participants were given an alphabetized list of the 13 archetypes and their definitions (see Table 1) and asked, “Please rate how similar you are to this archetype,” on a scale of 1–7, where 1 was “Not at all similar” and 7 was “Extremely similar.”

**Big Five descriptors.** These 100 unipolar personality markers developed by Goldberg (1992) measure personality traits according to the taxonomic organization of the Big Five, and responses to each trait adjective are reported on a nine-point Likert-type scale. (A second, much briefer Big Five scale was also administered in the study, but dropped from the analyses because it was determined to be redundant.)

**Entertainment Preferences Questionnaire (modified; EntPQ).** The Entertainment Preferences Questionnaire (Rentfrow, 2004) is an unpublished scale, which requests participants to rate, on an eight-point Likert-type scale, their level of liking for a number of genres in mass culture, such as “Folk” and “Rap/hip-hop” (music), “Business” and “Fiction & literature” (books and magazines), “Action” and “Romance” (movies), and “Reality” and “Soap operas” (television). Several modifications to the original Entertainment Preferences Questionnaire were made: for example, the genres “Hardcore” and “Industrial” were added to the music section, and an entirely new section on classic art was added, with eighteen categories ranging from “Prehistoric/Neolithic” to “Modern photography.”

**Demographic questions.** Finally, three general questions were asked regarding each participant’s gender, age, and academic concentration.

8.1.3. Procedure

Participants received an answer sheet containing the response scales for use with the items on the RCAS. Participants were encouraged to answer every item and to avoid global pre-judgments of the stimuli (for example, relying on friends’ opinions of movies that they personally had not seen) and instead to answer based on their initial impressions of what specifically was being presented in the study. In addition to being listed at the top of the answer sheet, the four preference questions (i.e., interest, liking, disliking, and familiarity) were listed next to each image to help participants keep them in mind when they were looking at each item. The 26 selected musical stimuli were presented in a fixed order for about twenty seconds each; participants then answered the four questions for the item after its presentation. Following the last music item, a cover sheet was distributed for the last 57 stimuli in movies and art. Once participants were finished with the items in the stimulus binder, they turned in the binder as well as their answer sheet and received the “life themes” packet, which included the modified PMAI (Pearson & Marr, 2002b), the Goldberg (1992) Big Five descriptors, the modified Entertainment Preferences Questionnaire (Rentfrow, 2004), and the archetype similarity scale, as well as the demographic questions.

8.2. Results

Study 2 was designed to assess participants’ dominant archetypal life themes and to compare these themes to their self-identified
personality traits and their preferences for rich cultural media genres and individual examples therein.

8.2.1. Characteristics of the resonance construct

The RCAS resonance score for each item was developed from an examination of the four participant ratings for each scale (interest, liking, disliking, and familiarity). Recall that each participant rated the 83 stimuli on all four attributes. Examination of the intercorrelations of these ratings on a cross-section of 12 items representing each media type suggested consistent, robust positive correlations between interest and liking (range across items, \( r = .71 \) to \( .87 \)), and negative correlations between both interest and disliking (\( r = -.35 \) to \( -.59 \)) and liking and disliking (\( r = -.39 \) to \( -.66 \)). This consistency encouraged us to construct a resonance score of overall favorable responsiveness to a given item by summing “interest + liking + (reverse) disliking” (\( z = .86 \)). Familiarity was not as consistently associated with the other three ratings, so it was omitted from the final resonance construct. This calculation also preserved a greater fidelity to neo-archetypal ideas of focusing on a person’s emotional reactions to archetypes, for which familiarity is not necessary. For the RCAS analyses in this study, then, resonance scores featured only the first three ratings for each item.

Table 6 shows the mean scores for the thirteen archetypes across the three archetype measures. The Jester and the Hero resonated most according to RCAS scores; the Creator and the Shadow least. In comparison, Pearson-Marr scores indicated that the most prevalent archetypes in participants’ self-reported life themes were the Jester and the Sage, while the least reported life themes were the Shadow and the Everyman/Everywoman. Finally, participants rated themselves as most similar to the Caregiver and the Lover and least similar to the Outlaw and the Shadow.

These rank-order comparisons suggest that the convergence of the RCAS with the other two archetype measures is modest. The correlations between the RCAS rank orderings and those of the other two measures were \( r_{\text{RCAS,PM}} \) (11) = .38, \( r_{\text{RCAS,Self}} \) (11) = .14, \( r_{\text{PM,Self}} \) (11) = .66, \( r_{\text{Self,PM}} \) (11) = .14, \( r_{\text{Self,Self}} \) (11) = .66, \( r_{\text{PM,PM}} \) (11) = .66, \( r_{\text{Self,Self}} \) (11) = .14, \( r_{\text{PM,Self}} \) (11) = .66, \( r_{\text{Self,PM}} \) (11) = .14, \( r_{\text{Self,Self}} \) (11) = .66. These findings indicate that resonance for rich cultural stimuli, as measured by the RCAS, draws on different elements of personality processes than do the other two archetype measures.

8.2.2. Clustering patterns among archetype measures and an application of confirmatory factor analysis

Recall that in Study 1, for each item, there were up to 100 nominations possible from each participant for a given stimulus, in any of the 13 archetype categories. These categories became 13 columns in the data matrix for Study 1. This meant that once we knew the nominations assigned to any 12 categories, the number assigned to the 13th category was determined (excepting cases of missing data). That is, the number of linearly independent vectors—the rank of the matrix—was \( N – 1 \). As such, the determinant could not be calculated, and the matrix was singular (Searle, 1982). Consequently, standard CFA was not applicable for Study 1.

8.2.3. Reliability of individuals’ archetype responses

Inter-item reliabilities for the RCAS also are listed in Table 7. Each final reliability for each archetype in the RCAS was calculated from two music resonances, two movie resonances, and two art resonances (with the exception of the Hero, which included a third art item and only one music item). The alpha coefficients for the individual archetypes of the RCAS were between .38 and .78. For the most part, these are satisfactory for this sort of brief-scale exploratory measure, which draws upon many disparate media examples of each archetype. Alpha coefficients also were calculated for the five archetype clusters of the RCAS, ranging from .74 to .88 (see Table 7). The grouping of archetypes led to greatly improved inter-item reliabilities among the individual scales in the RCAS.

These OCAS overall reliabilities may be somewhat lower than what might otherwise have been the case if only a single form of media (e.g., movies) had been employed. This would occur if people’s overall resonance levels varied appreciably across media. Indeed, people’s average raw scores were slightly higher for movies than they were for music or art (the Striver archetypes were the lone exception; their art stimuli garnered the highest raw scores). To address the significance of these differences, then, we ran a repeated measures ANOVA and confirmed a main effect for media type, \( F(2,226) = 71.89, p < .001 \), as well as a media-archetype interaction, \( F(24,2712) = 69.02, p < .001 \).

We then re-estimated the reliabilities for each archetype by conducting a participant (125) x media (3) x item (2) ANOVA for each single archetype and then estimating their reliabilities using the intraclass correlation formula (\( MS_{\text{part}} = MS_{\text{error}}/MS_{\text{part}} \)). Using this method, we successfully obtained reliabilities equivalent to the initial alphas. The ANOVA approach to reliability has the advantage, in this context, of allowing us to test whether our reliabilities might be higher if we had studied participant responses to just one media type at a time. To pursue this question, we partialled out the main effect of variance due to media type—as well as the item x media and participant x media interactions—for each archetype and archetype cluster, and then recalculated the intracluster correlations. (These interactions were almost always significant: for example, the Outlaw’s item x media interaction was \( F(2,370) = 504.68, p < .001 \), and its participant x media interaction was \( F(24,370) = 1.25, p = .026 \).

The resulting reliability estimate (with the media main effect and two interactions removed from the error term) yielded marginally higher reliabilities for the individual archetypes in several
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>RCAS resonance (scale range: 0–90)</th>
<th>PMAI (scale range: 6–30)</th>
<th>Self-judged archetype similarity (scale range: 1–7)</th>
<th>Average rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td>65.10 (8.63)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.02 (3.00)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>58.39 (11.12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.40 (3.76)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>60.42 (10.39)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.50 (2.73)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>60.65 (8.64)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.03 (2.78)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>58.58 (10.73)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.47 (3.34)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>56.40 (10.89)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.09 (3.75)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>62.94 (9.57)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.60 (3.93)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>53.69 (13.64)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.65 (4.40)</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>61.42 (10.61)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.66 (3.39)</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>57.21 (11.99)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.09 (3.99)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman/Everywoman</td>
<td>56.40 (13.64)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.09 (3.99)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>43.63 (14.63)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.45 (4.27)</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.4. Observed gender differences in archetype scores

The means for resonance to the Knower, Carer, Striver, and Everyperson clusters on the RCAS were, respectively, $M$ = 170.66, 171.80, 121.56, 104.86, and 182.72; their standard deviations were, respectively, $SD$ = 28.57, 31.00, 18.45, 20.45, and 20.95. In our construction of the RCAS, we attempted to balance the items so that the archetypes would be equally represented by both genders (i.e., by including items featuring male caregivers, female heroes, etc.). As predicted by social role theory, though, some notable gender differences were nonetheless found in the archetype score means, for both individual archetypes and for the grouped clusters suggested by the factor analyses. Male participants scored significantly higher than female participants on the Striver cluster of archetypes across all three measures, $t_{(120)} = 2.88$, $p < .001$; $t_{(122)} = 2.48$, $p = .014$; $t_{(123)} = 3.12$, $p = .002$. Men also scored more highly on the Conflictor cluster of archetypes, though in this case the significant score differences were confined to the RCAS, $t_{(120)} = 5.55$, $p < .001$. Contrastingly, women’s scores on the Carer cluster of archetypes were significantly higher than men’s for both the RCAS, $t_{(118)} = 7.95$, $p < .001$, and the PMAI, $t_{(120)} = 2.71$, $p = .008$. Finally, archetypes classified as Knower and Everyperson offered no clear-cut gender differences.

Individuals across the three measures, the hypotheses that men would score more highly on the Ruler and Outlaw and women more highly on the Caregiver and Lover were supported, though some observed differences were somewhat unforeseen (for example, men mainly scored higher on the Hero than did women). Additionally, and somewhat curiously, the expected gender differences in scores for the Jester and the Innocent were seen only in the RCAS, and although these differences were significant in both cases, they were not replicated in the other two measures.

8.2.5. Relation of the RCAS to other archetype measures

We expected that people’s dominant archetypes would correlate moderately across the RCAS, the PMAI, and the archetype similarity self-judgments—three scales which measure similar constructs but allow participants to utilize different response paradigms and somewhat varied interpretations of the archetypes. For example, an individual’s resonance score on the RCAS Magician scale was expected to correlate more highly with his or her scores on the PMAI Magician scale than with his or her scores on the PMAI Ruler scale.

This turned out to be the case, generally speaking: resonance scores on the individual RCAS archetype scales correlated moderately with scores on their corresponding archetype scales across measures while their correlations with non-corresponding archetype scales were lower. For the PMAI, the mean correlation for corresponding archetypes on the RCAS was $r = .27$ and the mean correlation for non-corresponding archetypes was $r = .08$, $t_{(120)} = 2.88$, $p = .013$. Likewise, for self-judged archetype similarity, the mean correlation with corresponding RCAS scales was $r = .33$ and the mean correlation for non-corresponding scales was $r = .13$, $t_{(17)} = 4.20$, $p = .001$.

We also computed correlations for RCAS cluster scores as compared to matching and non-matching clusters on the other two measures. Grouping the archetypes was found to improve, by and large, the correspondence between measures. More specifically, the correlations of the RCAS clusters with their equivalent PMAI clusters ranged from $r = .41$ (for the Knower) to $r = .04$ (for the Everyperson—the only cluster below $r = .27$), and the
correlations for corresponding clusters on self-judged similarity ranged from \( r = .47 \) to \( r = .20 \) (again, for the Knower and Everyperson, respectively).

### 8.2.6. Relation of archetype clusters to entertainment preferences

Factor analyses of the Entertainment Preferences Questionnaire (EntPQ; Rentfrow, 2004) generally yield similar factors across studies (P. J. Rentfrow, personal communication, April 27, 2006). In our principal components analysis (with varimax rotation), we found nine identifiable factors, including: (I) Artful and Cultured, which incorporated preferences for many kinds of art as well as architecture and photography books; (II) Romance and Drama, which included romantic, fashion, entertainment, and health pursuits; (III) Relaxed and Studious, which included preferences for blues and jazz music, documentary and independent films, and philosophy books; and (IV) Action and Comedy, which contained tastes for humor, action/adventure, thrillers, and sports. The nine identifiable EntPQ factors (Factor VIII was found to be unidentified in this analysis) were found, when rotated, to constitute 57.6% of the variance in scores on the scale.

Comparing the individual RCAS archetypes and global archetype clusters with the EntPQ factors revealed some robust zero-order correlations of the EntPQ with the RCAS (see Table 8), possibly because of the media basis of both measures. Notably, the RCAS Knower archetypes correlated \( r(70) = .70, p < .001 \) and \( r(63) = .75, p < .001 \) with the EntPQ Artful and Cultured and Relaxed and Studious factors (respectively). The Carer cluster correlated with the EntPQ Romance and Drama factor, \( r(115) = .68, p < .001 \). RCAS Conflictor archetypes also were predictive of preferences along the Dark and Excitatory factor of the EntPQ, \( r(88) = .58, p < .001 \), and the Striver cluster correlated \( r(108) = .50, p < .001 \) with the Solitary factor of the EntPQ.

The RCAS clusters thus individually predicted several of the EntPQ factors through simple correlations. We next attempted to assess the discriminant validity of the RCAS clusters relative to one another. To do this, we ran five hierarchical regressions for each of the nine identifiable EntPQ factors, with four non-targeted RCAS clusters in the first step and the remaining cluster-of-interest in the second step. These analyses tested whether the isolated cluster significantly added to the prediction of that EntPQ Factor. The results of these regressions supported our hypothesis that the RCAS clusters are somewhat independent of one another (see Table 8). For example, participant resonance scores on the Carer cluster contributed significantly over and above the other four clusters on the EntPQ Romance and Drama factor, \( F_{\text{change}}(1, 105) = 65.62, p < .001, R^2_{\text{inc}} = .31 \), as well as the Religious factor, \( F_{\text{change}}(1, 100) = 17.50, p < .001, R^2_{\text{inc}} = .14 \). Other individual RCAS clusters likewise predicted significantly over the other four on various EntPQ factors (see \( R^2_{\text{inc}} \) values in Table 8), thus supporting the discriminant validity and independence of the five RCAS factors.

### 8.2.7. Relation of the archetypes with personality traits

We also correlated participants’ scores on the RCAS with their scores on the Goldberg (1992) Big Five personality markers (Table 8, lower portion). As with the EntPQ, we performed a set of hierarchical regressions in order to assess the individual contribution of each RCAS cluster to each of the Big Five factors (this time using the Big Five factors as single dependent variables). Again, to predict the separate contribution of each archetype cluster to each Big Five trait, four RCAS clusters were entered in the first step, and the target cluster was entered in the second step. As expected, resonance scores on the archetypes of the Knower contributed heavily (over and above the other four clusters) to the variance in Openness, and the archetypes of the Conflictor played a large part in predicting (low) scores on Conscientiousness. Most other RCAS clusters, however, displayed only modest predictive power at best at explaining variance in Big Five scores: for example, the only individual cluster that added significant prediction to Extraversion scores was the Everyperson, \( F_{\text{change}}(1, 105) = 4.86, p = .030, R^2_{\text{inc}} = .04 \), and even including this, the total variation in Extraversion predicted by the five RCAS clusters was not significant, \( F(5, 105) = 1.91, n.s. \) This lends further support to the notion that the resonance construct is relatively independent of the Big Five personality traits.

One additional finding, in regard to the global cluster-level patterns shown in Table 8, was that many individual archetype-to-trait predictions were consistent with the nature of the specific archetypes. Some of these results indicate that (a) people dominated by the Jester show high Extraversion but low Conscientiousness, (b) those resonating with the Creator and the Sage display high levels of Openness, (c) people loading on the Outlaw show low Conscientiousness, and (d) people high on aspects of the Shadow

---

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster and component archetypes</th>
<th>RCAS Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Reliability Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Knower</td>
<td>II: Carer</td>
<td>III: Striver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster I: Knower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster II: Carer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster III: Striver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster IV: Conflictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlaw</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster V: Everyperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman/Everywoman</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jester</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Order of factors is based on exploratory five-factor solutions from Studies 1 and 2. “Corrected \( \rho_{\text{inc}} \)” column indicates reliabilities when controlling for media effects, as estimated by intraclass correlation.*

### Study 2: Estimated factor loadings of the confirmatory factor analysis for RCAS archetypes and clusters and their reliabilities.
rate low in Agreeableness. Two unanticipated results were that the RCAS resonance scores showed significant and unexpected positive correlations between the Everyman/Everywoman and Extraversion, and between the Caregiver and Openness.

8.2.8. Incremental validity of the archetypes in predicting the EntPQ

It is possible that the RCAS’s predictions detailed above were little different from what might have been obtained by using a measure of the Big Five alone as a predictor of media preference (cf. Dollinger, 1993; Furnham & Bunyan, 1988; Hall, 2005; Rawlings, Barrantes i Vidal, & Furnham, 2000; Rawlings & Biancarelli, 1997; Rentfrow & Gosling, 2003, 2006; Weaver, 1991). To test this hypothesis, we ran another set of nine hierarchies; for the first block, we added RCAS’s archetypes (cf. Dollinger, 1993; Furnham & Bunyan, 1988; Hall, 2005). To test this hypothesis, we ran another set of nine hierarchies; for the second block, we added the 5 RCAS cluster resonance scores.

In Study 2, certain archetypes consistently correlated highly with certain others—even across the different archetype measures and the different media of the RCAS—and factor analyses support our earlier evidence for five archetype clusters. People exhibited considerable individual variation in the archetypes to which they resonate.

The RCAS also demonstrated reliability and incremental validity in predicting patterns of media consumption and in predicting other personality dimensions. The convergence of the RCAS with the factors of the EntPQ in particular provides support for a possible archetype-based model of personal taste, molded somewhat by gender and personality traits.

These five archetype clusters may speak to a taxonomy of personal preferences in rich culture based on a discrete and finite number of well-known themes (e.g., love, violence, self-discovery). Their continuity and consistency across different archetype measures indicates that these archetypal themes may represent an individual’s affective or emotional reactions to culturally universal aspects of human life and the characters—real or fictional—that one encounters across one’s life who fairly embody those aspects.

Table 8

Study 2: Discriminant validity of RCAS clusters in predicting the EntPQ and Big Five Factors (With incremental predictions \(R^2_{inc}\) of each cluster).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent factor</th>
<th>RCAS Cluster</th>
<th>Knower (R^2_{inc})</th>
<th>Caret (R^2_{inc})</th>
<th>Striver (R^2_{inc})</th>
<th>Conflit (R^2_{inc})</th>
<th>Everyperson (R^2_{inc})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EntPQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artful &amp; Cultured</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance &amp; Drama</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed &amp; Studious</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action &amp; Comedy</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark &amp; Excitatory</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childlike</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic &amp; Historic</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(R^2_{inc}\) figures indicate specific contribution of each RCAS cluster to that dependent variable, over and above the other four clusters.

*\(p < .05\), **\(p < .01\), ***\(p < .001\).
9. General discussion

9.1. Summary of findings

At the outset of this paper, we argued that people establish models of themselves and the world (Mayer, 2007), and that some of these concern archetypes—that is, culturally important prototypical story characters (McAdams et al., 2004). In our neo-archetypal theory, such archetypes (a) are story characters, (b) represent mental models, (c) elicit intense emotional responses, (d) operate at an automatic or unconscious level, and (e) are culturally enduring, since they are easily learned and widely recognizable. Research in social cognition has shown that mental models such as these are indeed often processed automatically, and that they can, in fact, be quite emotionally evocative (e.g., Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Furthermore, some evidence exists that archetypes and archetype-like themes can be identified through specific associations with culturally rich stimuli (Craddock et al., 1971; Huston et al., 1999; Lash & Polson, 1987; Rosen et al., 1991); these associations can involve affective judgments as well (e.g., Maloney, 1999).

One of the main aims of this research was to develop an exploratory, reliable measure of archetypal preferences using rich culture media. Study 1 showed that people could indeed recognize and categorize archetypes in RCS and that such a measure could in fact be constructed. The Rich Culture Archetype Scale was created using 83 RCS items that were the most clearly representative of the specific archetypes. Following this, Study 2 demonstrated, first, that we resonate differently to examples of different archetypes—that is, people react to archetypal RCS with varying levels of interest and liking. Second, the different archetypes cluster reliably based on people's resonance to various rich culture stimuli. Third, scores on these archetype scales and clusters predict fairly well patterns of people's personal preferences in rich culture media; essentially, people tend to gravitate consistently towards some archetypes, no matter what the media, though how aware they are of this is uncertain. Finally, these archetypal resonances in personality are relatively distinct from things like gender and the Big Five traits; the RCAS clearly measures manifestations of personality beyond these constructs (see Table 8).

9.2. Future directions and limitations

Such findings offer surprising new evidence for the possible existence of dominant archetypal themes in our lives. These themes appear to run the gamut (for example) from the Carer, who enjoys romance movies and fashion books, and is agreeable and accommodating, to the Striver, who enjoys action movies, sports television, and books about espionage, and may be outgoing yet low on conscientiousness. Such themes may also plumb the sometimes-hurtful depths of the Conflictor, who enjoys hardcore and (heavy) metal music, and horror movies, and is low in Agreeableness.

Archetypal life themes may be used not only to predict personal preferences, but also how we interact socially with others through our interests, and how we identify with archetypal characters. For example, by identifying with a particular archetype, the individual has an automatically-created support group for his or her tastes, since the archetypes unify their constituents with common interests. That is, people exhibiting the general life themes of the Shadow may show high interest in the Dark and Excitatory factor of the EntPQ, preferring horror movies and books, and hardcore and industrial music, and join with one another on that basis.

Understanding a person's archetypal life themes may be useful in planning targeted communications toward the individual, from artwork to public health messages to more prosaic forms of advertising. Organizations from non-profits to movie studios could potentially communicate more effectively if they identified resonances in their target audiences. Returning to personality, understanding the archetypes to which an individual resonates may form an adjunct aspect of assessment, perhaps having applications in understanding personality disorders (might those with antisocial disorders resonate to the Conflictor, for example?). Still, further research will be needed to better understand the concept. The cross-cultural validity of the RCAS is unknown at present, and although this type of media-based personality exploration is especially relevant to college student populations (as these are among the most voracious consumers of rich culture media), more diverse samples are needed to fully assess the scale's utility for determining the resonance of, for example, non-native English speakers or people from other cultures. Moreover, rich cultural tastes often vary from generation to generation (and even across geographic locations), and cohort effects are possible.

9.3. Implications and concluding comments

We have provided evidence that archetypes, as defined within our neo-archetypal approach, are a potentially important form of mental model (and thus, are an important component of personality; Andersen & Cole, 1990; Markus & Nurius, 1986). These archetypes are influential in people's lives and can reveal information about them, be they self-reported life themes or projected through resonance to rich cultural stimuli. Our initial version of a unique and unobtrusive measure of personality, the Rich Culture Archetype Scale, may be used to develop these ideas in further research on personal preferences and personality in general. The tendency of some of these archetypes to correlate across different media and with some personality traits suggests that archetypal influences on thinking may be widespread, and may well extend to people's social and personal identities, in addition to their personal media tastes as demonstrated here.

A culture's cohesive body of interconnected stories, with its popular and repeating characters, is known as its myths; it is especially enduring as told through folklore and the arts. As rich culture continues to be produced at an astonishing rate, it is likely that contemporary examples of archetypes will continue to evolve in music, movies, art, and other media. Understanding such models may be useful to understanding an individual's personality, and his or her preferences and dislikes. Such research on how we resonate to story characters can help us appreciate the significance of myths in all our lives.
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Appendix A

Final selected music items used in the RCAS (Study 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCAS item number</th>
<th>Song title</th>
<th>Song artist</th>
<th>Time played represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“In the Light”</td>
<td>Led Zeppelin</td>
<td>(5:53– Sage 6:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Luxurious”</td>
<td>Gwen Stefani</td>
<td>(1:43– Lover 2:03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCAS item number</th>
<th>Song title</th>
<th>Song artist</th>
<th>Time played</th>
<th>Archetype represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Master of Puppets”</td>
<td>Metallica</td>
<td>(2:37–Ruler)</td>
<td>2:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“You’ve Got a Friend”</td>
<td>James Taylor</td>
<td>(1:11–Caregiver)</td>
<td>1:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“The Joker”</td>
<td>Steve Miller Band</td>
<td>(2:05–Jester)</td>
<td>2:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Ain’t That America”</td>
<td>John Cougar Mellencamp</td>
<td>(1:47–Everyman)</td>
<td>2:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“Take Five”</td>
<td>Dave Brubeck</td>
<td>(0:19–Creator)</td>
<td>0:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Mr. Self Destruct”</td>
<td>Nine Inch Nails</td>
<td>(2:46–Shadow)</td>
<td>3:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Here I Go Again”</td>
<td>Whitesnake</td>
<td>(0:19–Explorer)</td>
<td>0:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>“Crazy Train”</td>
<td>Ozzy Osbourne</td>
<td>(1:43–Outlaw)</td>
<td>2:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>“We Are the Champions”</td>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>(1:29–Hero)</td>
<td>1:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>“The Man Who Loved the Earth”</td>
<td>Peter Gabriel</td>
<td>(0:47–Magician)</td>
<td>1:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>“Breakaway”</td>
<td>Kelly Clarkson</td>
<td>(0:17–Innocent)</td>
<td>0:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>“God Save the Queen”</td>
<td>The Sex Pistols</td>
<td>(0:17–Outlaw)</td>
<td>0:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>“Strokin'”</td>
<td>Clarence Carter</td>
<td>(3:48–Lover)</td>
<td>4:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>“Angel of Death”</td>
<td>Slayer</td>
<td>(0:47–Shadow)</td>
<td>1:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>“Paranoid Android”</td>
<td>Radiohead</td>
<td>(1:25–Sage)</td>
<td>1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>“The Four Seasons: Spring”</td>
<td>Vivaldi</td>
<td>(0:00–Creator)</td>
<td>0:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>“Tear the Roof Off”</td>
<td>George Clinton &amp; Parliament Funkadelic</td>
<td>(0:27–Jester)</td>
<td>0:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>“Walk On”</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>(1:04–Hero)</td>
<td>1:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>“Learning to Fly”</td>
<td>Pink Floyd</td>
<td>(1:43–Magician)</td>
<td>2:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>“A Boy Named Sue”</td>
<td>Johnny Cash</td>
<td>(1:04–Explorer)</td>
<td>1:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>“I Want to Thank You”</td>
<td>Natalie Merchant</td>
<td>(1:09–Caregiver)</td>
<td>1:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>“It’s Oh So Quiet”</td>
<td>Bjork</td>
<td>(2:31–Innocent)</td>
<td>2:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>“Hustla’s Ambition”</td>
<td>50 Cent</td>
<td>(0:41–Ruler)</td>
<td>1:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>“The Dying Miner”</td>
<td>Woody Guthrie</td>
<td>(0:03–Everyman)</td>
<td>0:23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## References


