

POSSIBILITIES FOR A FOURTH DIMENSION

Charles J. Krauskopf

The most vital and controversial issue discussed at the October 1981 PAS Conference at Hyannis, Massachusetts involved work being done with the "Fourth Dimension". Research done with this topic by Saunders, Krauskopf and Heyman strongly suggest that the concepts upon which the Fourth Dimension is based unquestionably have a place in the traditional Personality Assessment System. Contention presently exists in regard to where that place will be. In response to queries about the "Fourth What-ever" as we've been fondly calling it since the October meeting, Chuck Krauskopf wrote the following.

Perhaps the best name at the moment for the Fourth is Mike's (Heyman) suggestion of "Coping Factor". There are several possibilities for its place in the general theory. The first possibility is a full rank dimension. This possibility is attractive because of its conceptual simplicity, but it would require more behavioral and psychometric evidence before we would have a persuasive case. It should be held open as a possibility of the three dimensional scheme.

A second possibility is a "modifier" similar to the one John (Gittinger) has used Digit Symbol. The additional subtests give a more complete and perhaps more understandable scheme. This is probably the best stance to take now until we develop more behavioral data. We have given the extra subtests to several people and are looking for pairs where the coping factor is the major difference.

A third possibility is what I suggested at the Fall meeting, that may be a prelude to some clarification I think we need at the surface or contact level. The current PAS is very neat for three dimensions at the primitive level. The I-E dimension retains conceptual clarity at the surface level. The surface levels of R-F and A-U are not so neat.

The surface levels of R-F and A-U are not so neat. The use of Comprehension and Object Assembly in interpretation often as a modifier rather than simply a reversal or extension of the basic style of behavior. Since we find in the data bank mathematicians, engineers, and music talent award winners with highly similar profiles (e*f*u), it would appear that content, as well as personal style, can be an important differentiator. I think we are going to have to examine some behavioral content before we can decide just what to do with the new "Coping Factor".

This is straying off the important point that the PAS is not only impressive at its current state of development, but has built-in suggestions for its own improvement. The Coping Factor promises to be one of its improvements, but, as Mike has put it, we have not completed our conceptual homework to decide just how it fits. We have only some preliminary suggestions of interpretation.