

Therefore, asking him sometimes to tell the story even though he has sorted the cards in the acceptable way, is a very good idea because it's quite significant when you have somebody who sorts those cards and then gives you a completely unusual or bizarre story. By the same token, I think you'll be surprised as I've been many times in the past where a low picture arrangement individual, that is someone who has not done well on the picture arrangement test, the rather clever way that they can explain to you why they sorted the cards in the particular way that they did, in many instances with some insight into ways of sorting those cards that are really quite original and quite creative, and that therefore the low picture arrangement individual who has a pretty good idea of what he's doing in the sense of putting the cards together is likely to be a good deal more healthy if you see what I mean than the person who sorts the cards in the popular way but doesn't know the meaning of the test. Also, I have to repeat again in relationship to this that you've got to bear in mind that since there is so much picture completion type performance that can make an individual do well on the picture arrangement test, that anytime that you've got an individual who does very well both on the picture arrangement and the picture completion you've got to be very careful in interpreting this particular kind of an individual because this is not an indication that he is, let's say, healthy necessarily; it is more likely to be an indication that the person is quite suggestible. Suggestibility is the best way to describe

60367

what the fundamental aspect of the picture arrangement, picture completion combination seems to suggest. In that the A+ut, that meaning again the individual who has a very high or high picture arrangement in relationship to his normal level with a very high picture completion in terms of his normal level, this is not an indication of extreme social sensitivity which you might think it would be when you're talking about role adaptability and some of the things that are often associated in most of our minds with what are the characteristics of an A personality. It is much more likely to be an individual who is highly suggestible and not at all appropriately in tune with the meaning of his behavior. And I think I could demonstrate that to you and I always have the intention and I hope eventually in terms of this to bring some of the really sick records anywhere along the line and show you the rather common characteristic for some very sick schizophrenic people to be high picture arrangement individuals. That is, if they have unusually high picture arrangements they are individuals who have been unable to make a successful social adaptation because in many instances they are so suggestible on the surface that their maturation process is more in the eyes of the beholder than it is in the actual maturation of the individual. Because one of the things that is likely to happen with the high A individual, or the high picture arrangement individual, he is so aware and in a sense so sensitive to what somebody else wants him to do that he responds to what other people want him to do in such a manner that people think he understands more about what he's doing and therefore not only in the sick schizophrenic is oftentimes likely to have this very high picture arrangement performance, you find it very common in the old time psychopathic personality. The psychopathic personality

who in one form or another as being a manipulative person. And I'm trying to say that he's not deliberately as much a manipulative person as he is an over-responsive, suggestible individual who is able to perform a social role so effectively that people do not know that he does not understand the meaning of that role. You then get in the psychopathic personality, the sort of thing that has been demonstrated if you read Wechsler's original Measurement of Adult Intelligence, one of the things that he talks about in there with a considerable amount of amazement because he makes no pretense of understanding it either, is that when you get into prison populations, for example, or among young delinquents, practically the only test that shows any significant difference in this group is the fact that the delinquent, or the man in prison, or the psychopath, or ~~the~~ ^{any} other one in terms of this, have an unusually high performance record on the picture arrangement test. As I think most of you know, no one has ever been able to adequately describe what is the psychological makeup of the person called the psychopath or the sociopath. And it's obvious that I'm not doing any better job in it too, because it is a very elusive thing except, and here I'm a little bit on dangerous ground because I don't have enough real good knowledge to be able to define this very well, but the Buhler choice of the word ~~the~~ schizophrenia as an indication of the illness we now refer to as schizophrenia comes from the so-called splitting of the personality. Now the splitting of the personality as I see it in PAS terms is most likely to occur in the individual who, again in PAS terms, has the high picture arrangement, that is, he has a surface social

facade, masking what is in a sense a psychological underpinning that is split away from any particular integration between his social behavior and whatever inner structure that the individual has. Now, the importance of this is that, and again I think I have said this over and over again, whatever the factors that enter into the dynamic development as a result of the high picture arrangement performance as opposed to the low picture arrangement performance is much more likely to occur in the earlier period of a person's life. I mean, that this high picture arrangement performance or what I call A, in terms of this, is going to have infinitely more effect upon a person's development in the early period of his life than it may have at a later period in his life. In the beginning of this, I talked in terms of that if you have an individual who is I, that is the internalizer, the high digit span individual and who is also U, that is the low picture arrangement individual, and if the low picture arrangement begins to indicate a certain amount of negativism, and when I'm talking about negativism now, remember that I'm talking about negativism in relationship to being responsive to the social guidance or the social demands that are being placed upon the individual. The IU individual will manifest his behavior early in his life in what is in a sense of being stubbornly engaged in being non-responsive. Put U in there, in his I, and he will begin to resist any particular awareness of or responsibility to social guidance, social requirements, social interaction. The A individual, if you have the combination of I and A in relationship to this, you're not going to have the individual who will stubbornly resist the social interpersonal guid-

ance -- the suggestibility aspect of this that I've been trying to talk about, but will have a very definite tendency in a sense, to be all things to all people and consequently in terms of ~~to~~ his early development will be consistently thought of as making a social maturation far greater than he is really making. Now in that anytime that you get an individual who has a combination of I and A, one of the things that's almost certain to have taken place in that person's development is that at anywhere from 6 to 12 to 15 this individual is going to have been considered as being mature for his age. And one of the reasons that he's going to have been considered mature for his age is that because anytime any particular demands are made upon him he responds initially but rather ficklely to those particular demands causing him to appear to be making a process of maturation that is not really taking place. The U individual on the other hand during the process of growing up is either stubbornly going to resist the change that is being pressured upon him or the pressure that is being placed on him is going to make him make some kind of modification which in many instances results in the individual by the time he's 17 or 18 to have developed in the direction of being mature. But you can also say in terms of this, anytime you've got I and U in the formula, one of the things that people are going to know, if they look in terms of his early life, one of the things in terms of this they are going to consider or they will think that the IU individual is a slow maturer. He's a slow maturer because

he's resistant in the beginning. He is put under a considerable amount of pressure in terms of making some kind of modification and because of that pressure he makes that modification many times in a very effective way. Consequently, you have this phenomena that I've talked about a great deal in terms of this and run into a lot of problems in terms of this of where people say, "That guy is an A, I know he's an A" as an adult, and then someone will get the test and the test will show that the individual is some form of a U. And therefore they'll be surprised because this man is not fitting or living up to what the A concept is. Or the same thing, somebody will say "I know that person is definitely not an A." And then when you get the test, one of the things that comes out of it is the fact that the individual has a high picture arrangement, and it destroys many people's faith in the PAS as a matter of fact, unless they recognize this phenomena I'm talking about in terms of the U individual because of the early pressure that is placed upon him in terms of modification is quite capable of making a highly effective social adjustment as an adult as long as you recognize that that highly effective social adaptation that he makes as an adult is within an area or a framework or a uniform role in which he has learned over a period of time how to be effective. And again if you read the PAS literature anywhere along the line in terms of describing this and you look at the IRU combinations in terms of this, one of the things that I've tried to say over and over again, this is one of the most deceptive of all of the initial response state constellations because the IRU is likely to be practically anything. Now if you think about what I'm talking about in terms of this as an IRU being practically

anything, what I'm saying is that the IRU if you make any contact with him, that is in the early period of time on the basis of which he's fairly resistant, he's withdrawing, he's refusing to respond, if you ever get him to respond, his response then begins to depend very much upon people teaching him what it is that he's supposed to learn. Therefore, the IRU is much more likely to be a mirror image of his teachers. And he's likely to be locked in to a certain extent, in terms of this. And so I've said repeatedly and will say again, that some of the most stereotyped and in many ways good stereotypes depending upon your attitude, I mean I use examples that the girl who learns to be a baton twirler and to learn to behave in the way baton twirlers are likely to be and if she is physically attractive enough, can become the cute stereotype of the drum majorette because she is likely to be quite dependent, if you will, upon what she is being taught to do and how to perform and if she's taught well, she'll be very good. By the same token in relationship to this, one of the ~~king~~ things I've said repeatedly in terms of this is that an IRU individual oftentimes is capable of becoming something like a good stripteaser because as an IRU if they're taught how to be a stripteaser they're really not very involved in what they're doing and again this is this splitting that I'm talking about in terms of this. As an IRU, she could learn to be a stripteaser because the involvement does not interfere because this is the way that she is taught to be and can be quite different behind whatever her stage presence is. Or the IRU oftentimes is likely to be the very great actor. And I think many great actors are IRU's. And if you look at the

00273

history of the IRU actor, you will find that they become actors because somewhere along the line, either in the beginning they get good coaches and if you've got a good coach and the coach teaches you what to do well and you do it well and can persevere what you've learned how to do well, then get in the hands of a good director and the good director is the one who begins to tell you how to perform and remember again one of the characteristics particularly of the I individual in terms of social behavior is that there is the capacity, remember I've said all along that the I individual has to learn how to show feelings, and I've also said all along in terms of this that the I individual because he has to learn how to show feelings oftentimes has a considerable capacity to be able to show feelings and when they're really healthy, they're likely to be able to be very effective in showing feelings that they don't really have. The A individual, the I-A individual is the one who is likely to be able to do this the most effectively and consequently the IA psychopath is an individual who can look and act in the very appropriate way of being involved with someone so effectively that a person is not aware of the fact that the person is not as involved with him as he appears to be. Therefore, IA is likely to involve with it a certain amount of deceptiveness. There is a danger of the IA individual in his social interpersonal reactions in his relationships, his feelings are likely to be deceptive; if you add U, however, in terms of this, he's going to resist learning feelings in the beginning but he is also more likely to begin to develop some kind of conscientious awareness of what the meanings of his feelings are. And, therefore, an IU is not likely to be as deceptive as an IA or is not as in danger of becoming as deceptive as an IA.

Therefore, in PAS terms, and in temms of the development of an individual and IA individual because he's in danger of becoming deceptive if he makes any particular kind of an adjustment, that is behind this that's he's making any attempt of gaining real maturity, to a certain extent the A individual has to defend against what other people think of him. Now in terms of what other people think of him and how they react to him is so important that one of the things that the A individual if he's going to make a relatively healthy adjustment, he has got to in a sense show some kind of decline if you will, in his picture completion subtest. The picture completion subtest being an indication that the person is compensating a little bit by his reacting against his tendency to be too socially suggestible; bu moving in a direction of developing some other particular kind of skill. And, therefore, in the intellectualizing or the so-called intellectualizing IRA that is the individual who is likely to work very hard in terms of developing intellectual skills to a certain extent, is likely to become an individual who resists something of his social image, reacts against his social image in an attempt to get people to accept him for his intellectuality rather than on the basis of his personality. While the U individual is oftentimes likely to try to get people to accept him personality-wise by developing some particular skill or intellectualizing kind of procedure on the basis of getting a bit of acceptance. So the U individual, the picture completion going up begins to be an indication of the awareness that the individual has to improve his image in order to get acceptance. And the A individual

has to mitigate or disprove his image in order not to let his image cause him to get over-accepted. And again, the corny example I have given some time in the past is the relation of the IFA girl, the IF making her relatively sensitive in a certain kind of way. The IFA girl who moves in the direction of trying to develop some particular kind of intellectual achievement because she is likely to be thought of as a sex object or a sex ~~xxx~~ symbol or whatever the A quality is likely to develop in the young girl growing up in relationship to this. She sometimes has to become very negativistic against her image in an attempt to get somebody to accept her for some other reason than what her image appears to be. Again, we're talking about image because A is the image-maker in a sense of this in that A is the quality which makes people satisfactory at a distance and therefore the A quality is also the quality which is likely to give people ~~charisma~~ charisma. And charisma of the type that let's say President Kennedy had, the kind of charisma that many movie actors have on the basis of which people think of them in certain kinds of ways. These are more likely to be A individuals. That a person who is likely to be very good at being able to, now again I'm getting rambly, but in terms of some of the things that I think are clues to A and U behavior somewhere along the line is this elusive thing that people talk about as a person being photogenic. It's my impression that most people who are photogenic are likely to be A. Because in some way or another, whatever happens in relationship to when their picture is being taken they can relax in a kind of way so that they are likely to come out in whatever the ~~x~~ elusive thing we referred to as being photogenic is. A primary

difference between a movie actor and a New York stage actor could conceivably be that most of the movie actors and actresses are A's and most of the real good stage actresses are U's. This would explain in a sense some of the differences in our folklore in terms of the movie actor or the movie actress and the real stage actors somewhere along the line. One of the things in the checklist we've had of trying to get some kind of idea of whether a person is an A or a U, one of the questions that is asked in terms of that is "Can the person smile on command when his picture is being taken?" Now some of us know full well that when we go to get our picture taken, and somebody says "smile" there are some people who can do this very effectively. There are others that the whole process of being told to smile begins to be a rather grotesque type of activity because a person unless he feels like smiling can't smile. Now to a certain extent it is the EU in many instances who is going to have the most difficulty in being able to smile on command. The photographer oftentimes is going to have to use all kinds if he is going to get a relatively decent picture of the individual, he's going to have to use any of a number of different kinds of ploys in an attempt to try to get that individual to behave spontaneously long enough that he can get his picture taken. And a good photographer is oftentimes very good at being able to pick up a U individual in the process of taking pictures.

Olga: I'm trying to get this straight. If when you go over, evidently, if you want to try to explain why he chose this particular order, like in picture arrangement, are you implying that it's probable that the A+ will not give you as satisfactory story as say a U will

give you?

John: That's exactly what I'm implying.

00277

Olga: So there would be these four types: You will have A's who will give you a good understanding, A's who would give you a poor, U's, I'm sure there would be some U's who would give you an equally bizarre and some who would give you a quite good possibly a creative one. So, you would have not two, really, but four different kinds of performance on that. Of course, ~~you~~ your score only picks up two. So is there anything in the rest of the test which would indicate which of these four you were really looking at.

John: Well, the picture completion is the best one for being able to pick some of this up. Now the, again it gets a little complicated because the picture completion doesn't pick it up all that well. I mentioned that the A+ individual who does extremely well on the picture completion, he's probably done well on the picture arrangement because he's a high picture completion person. Therefore, the higher the picture completion is in the A individual the more likely is he to be the kind of an individual who is not going to give you a very good explanation of his story because he's sorted the story together on the basis of the cues that he's gotten from it because he's looked at it in the way he's looked at it. Not because he's looked at it to get any particular kind of meaning out of it. He sorted it because he's operating on cues not on understanding. Now as the picture completion goes down in the high picture arrangement individual, there is also likely to be a tendency in terms of this for the individual to be a

little slower because now, again, one of the things that's going to make the difference between an A+ individual and an A individual is likely to be speed, isn't it? Because the speed in the last items, and the last items are the ones that are most heavily loaded with picture completion type activities. The A individual who has some kind of defense a little bit about moving too fast and operating on views, is going to slow down because he's going to try to get some meaning of it is, as well as being able to operate and put it on the basis of clues. Now that means, to a certain extent, he will be also somewhat cautious when he gets to the Picture Completion type test. The Picture Completion type test is the high picture completion individual the one who very rapidly looks at that and picks out the best clue that he has without really having much idea or knowledge of why he's picking them out. I mean, he just does them because he operates fast in terms of that. The U individual approaching the picture completion test is likely to go through a rather involved process over a period of time and depending on how evaluative he is, he's ~~gung~~ going to be able to see that there are a lot of things missing in those pictures. And he's likely to be disturbed because they're not drawn well or how do I know in drawing whether this is a failure in the drawing or something else? He's cautious, he's slow and ~~is~~ he's also likely again if he is a relatively creative U somewhere along the line or an imaginative one, he is likely to be the kind of a person who will see sometimes the rather bizarre ~~things~~ things that Dave Saunders was talking about and the business of the pitcher with

the ~~pink~~ pouring in terms of that is not altogether a bizarre ~~thing~~ thing? when an individual says "There's no handle on the pitcher." That's a perfectly legitimate answer in relationship to that and in the old days on the WB 1, I guess you still do it now, the first time somebody gives an answer ~~is~~ like this you used to be told, "well, what is the most important?" Well now, this is a pretty complicated question when you come to it. What is more important, a pitcher hanging in mid-air with water coming out of it -- there ought to be somebody holding it. And you could make a good rational judgment and this is not irrationality in terms of this and the same thing in terms of the rowboat. It's not completely irrational for someone to say "There's no man in the boat." What's missing? They're not seeing other things that are in the boat, but there's something operating causing them to make a judgment, and this again, this is not always a bad type of judgment to the way in which the individual is operating. It's a more evaluative approach to the exercise than the bland, precise kind of thing on the basis of what the high picture completion individual is likely to do, seeing very rapidly something that is relatively obvious to them and not ~~really~~ really being very evaluative about what the meaning of it is.

Olga: That I think I understand a little bit better now about the A, because essentially what ~~is~~ it is is that he has this very rapid way of responding to the cues. They're right there right away. He doesn't have to, he's never been required to, because he has this ability to respond rapidly to cues. He doesn't have to stop and say now, "Hey, what's happening?" in any kind of situation, you know, let me figure this out now, just what's going on? But people think, because most

people do have to stop and think "now what's going on?" they assume that his responses are based on the same kind of reasoning process and it isn't. He's just picking up.

John: He's picking up. This is the suggestability or whatever it is ~~kkk~~ that I'm trying to talk about, is the suggestability of the A individual in the sense he picks up a cue but the fact that he picks up that cue is absolutely no guarantee that he understands the meaning of that cue. The U individual may be really unaware of the cue, and he refuses to respond. But therefore if you're going to put any pressure on the individual, the individual the pressure is put on is the person who is not responding. You don't put the pressure on the person who is responding. And you watch this in behavior groups, and particularly in behavior in groups at ~~nursery~~ nursery school and first grade level. And this is one of the places where you can differentiate A and U perhaps better than any other one point. It's difficult but, I mean it's sometimes misleading. But generally speaking, if you get a child in a situation on the basis of which he responds immediately to what the teacher wants, the teacher pays very little attention other than rewarding attention to that child and spends a great deal of time with hostile reaction to those children who do not respond rapidly enough to the cues that are being given in terms of this. And consequently, you can have particularly in A and I'll go through this again, the EU child in the first grade, because he's E he's going to be an interactive involving and he's also going to have an element of resistance. There are a lot of the social cues that he's not going

**

to pick up.. He is going to in a sense if because he's ER, he's selfish
and let's say he's ER or selfish, or EF in any event, he wants to do
things in his way and the way his things are likely to be behavioral
things. Therefore, the EU is a troublemaker. The EA is going to be
an overactive child, because he's E but he's not going to be nearly
as much a trouble maker because he's going to be much more responsive
to the cues than ~~this~~ is the EU individual, the social cues. The IU is
going to be the child who is not a troublemaker but is essentially the
withdrawn, non-responsive child. He's not a troublemaker, but is
a disturbed child because you've got to gain his attention, and the
teacher will work in terms of getting the IU child's attention. She
will work to calm the EU child down. The IA child is likely to be the
best behaved in the group because they will respond to the social cues
but behind the facade of their social cues will be able to maintain
a certain amount of autistic distance. Therefore, an IA child is in
danger of growing up in a period of time of appearing to be/contact
when they're really autistic and the EA child is in danger of growing
up as the individual who looks very disciplined who really is quite
overactive and undisciplined when out of a particular kind of a control.
It is less likely that the EU and the IU child are going to get away
without being put under a great deal of discipline. Now the EU and
the IU child may react and become negativistic against the discipline
that is being placed upon them, but they will almost always have been
put under more discipline in the early period of their life than will
either the IA or the EA. Largely impressionistic. And the old saw
again, maybe it will make a little sense if I repeat it, about in the

first grade class, at the period in time when the children elect the president of the first grade, it is likely to be the IA who is elected president of the first grade because he is the best behaved. The least involved and therefore not particularly threatening in terms of this, he doesn't engender the same kind of hostility, the same kind of aggression. He is popular and he's popular at a period of time before he's really, before they've developed any particular skill in terms of people knowing what is a good guy and what is a bad guy, other than rather impressionistically in terms of this. But when you get ready to elect the president of the senior class, it is rarely the IA who is elected the president of the senior class. It is almost always the EU who has been working all of his life under a certain kind of pressure to be able to develop the kind of skill on the basis to get the kind of attention that is rewarded. Now to a certain extent, the EU as a high school class president is more mature because he's worked at his maturity and the first grade IA may be at this particular point in time in his high school experience beginning to suffer for the first time on the basis of his lack of image. I'm almost certain in terms of this that if you study overachievers and under\$achievers somewhere along the line that there's going to be a difference in A and U between them. Because IA or EA anywhere along the line is going to have much more possibility in the impressionistic periods of the early period of his education of being overgraded because deportment is so much regardless of what one says in terms of it, deportment is so much a quality of early school performance. It has to be, because

there is much more chaos in a sense in terms of this. Therefore the A has a considerable amount of capacity of moving into a high school period of time and the business of getting by, if you see what I mean, in school and it is not until he gets into college where there begins to be a different kind of pressure being placed upon them in terms of this that the fact emerges that the individual is not as smart as his grades would indicate.

(break)

An ERU is a person who has a great deal of need if you see what I mean, to follow what he is taught. He has the same need to learn what it is that he's supposed to be as the IRU does. Being/ E, there is going to be an element of much more involvement in what he is doing, and now this again is one of these words that I have trouble with, but emotional involvement in the sense that the ERU once he has learned to be something and he feels that he is being something and he's working very hard at being something, and the system that he is in is not rewarding him the way that he expects to be rewarded, the ERU is the one who is most likely to become hostile against the people in his environment that are the system in ~~xx~~ his environment that has not rewarded him the way that he expects. Therefore, the ERU when he is placed in a situation where he is frustrated or denied, the direction of the E is always going to be to act out his feelings. Therefore he moves out. The IRU who is frustrated in the system is much more likely to withdraw within the ~~xx~~ system. I mean, apathy, I mean

00384

he stays in, he quits, he withdraws, we don't see many of them. I mean I'm not saying that IRU's are not frustrated. I am saying that when they are frustrated it usually takes a different kind of a form. So, to me, obviously anyone who has a tendency to act out anywhere along the line, they're going to act ~~somewhat~~ out in the direction of trying to move into the direction on the basis of where they think they're going to get more acceptance. Now in the American system, and one of the primary differences between the Soviet system and the American system, the American system has in it a whole series of ways in which disillusioned and disgruntled ERU's, ERU's because we're talking about these can make other adaptations. I mean in our system, if you started out in one field and you find out at a relatively young age, you find out that you don't like it, you can go into something else and if you don't like that you can go into something else. One of the things that an ERU can do if he's successful is to move around into various places until he finds something that is the most rewarding and the most satisfying to him. If he works in an institution that he doesn't like, he can quit that institution and move to another one hoping that he will get a little bit more acceptance and sometimes he'll be able to get it. If he doesn't get it there, he can move somewhere else. There is a capacity, much more capacity for mobility. You have to understand that in the Soviet system, because of the way that it is set up there is a lot less possibility of being able to make mobile adjustments. I mean if you start out as a military officer it's very hard for you to decide that you don't want to be a military officer. So there are many an ERU, who hate being military officers who are forced to stay in it a long period of time and until such time as they can get into

some other place where they will be allowed to be something else
because their own society won't allow it. Now this could happen
individually in the United States but to a certain extent, the totali-
tarian way in which educational systems, careers and various things
that are decided there cause a bit more of a tendency for the person
to escape his culture. In the United States you can escape your
culture because we've got a lot of different kinds of culture. We
don't like all of them but there's many an ERU who becomes a hippie.

00285

Cleo: The IRU will be just as effective once they learn?

John: Yes, once they learn their role. Or in some cases ineffective
because if they learn their role inappropriately and there is nothing
more ludicrous to me than the IRU or the ERU who have learned an
inappropriate role and continue to persevere it, without any aware-
ness of how bizarre it is. And in a certain extent, ~~if~~ it is their
inability to see how bizarre it is, this is the U characteristic in
terms of this.