

E-F E-R : I-F I-R

R and F are the measure of more than just one variable; consequently, it's difficult to be very precise about it, although certain things must be kept in mind in connection with some of the dynamic meaning of R and F.

(Masculinity and femininity: not in the sexual connotation -- rather the characteristics of behavior which are more appropriately masculine or feminine within the American cultural context.) In its initial response state, and particularly in combination with E, R carries certain kinds of behavior and certain kinds of interests that are more masculine than feminine in the American culture. F carries with it, particularly in combination with E, certain kinds of behavior which are more characteristically feminine. The significance of this is that a woman with an R adjustment is going to be under much more pressure to modify and change some of her initial response state characteristics a good deal more actively or violently than a woman who is F. Conversely, a male who is F is going to be under a considerable amount of pressure because the behavior that he is likely to manifest spontaneously is less appropriate or less likely to be condoned than a man who is R. Part of the reason for this is that F carries with it a considerable amount of sensitivity, and that sensitivity is likely to manifest itself in certain kinds of emotional (or lack of emotional) manifestations. In general, an R is less emotional than an F.

This does not mean that an R is unemotional. Rather, the subtle cues, subtle ways, etc. are such that the sensitivity of the F individual

is likely to precipitate certain kinds of emotionality more quickly than it does in the R. And the R individual is going to be harder to arouse; but once arousal takes place, there can be a considerable amount of emotionality.

EXAMPLES: The EF child is likely to cry easily.

The ER girl is likely to be a tomboy.

The EF boy is likely to receive a good deal of pressure to overcome "sissy" characteristics. Since he has insight and the knowledge that he is too soft, he works very hard in the direction of being tough. Consequently, an EF adolescent boy may be quite bullyish, quite tough. A Hell's Angel is likely to be an EF who has been forced to develop some kind of masculinity. The ER is not nearly as likely to have to prove his toughness or masculinity, or to be as defensive about his masculinity, etc.

This leads into one of the more complicated concepts in the PAS --- that of cruelty, and how it manifests itself. An R individual can be cruel, but in most instances, the "R" is cruel because he is unaware of what he is doing. There is likely to be a thoughtlessness involved -- the R individual may be so selfishly involved in his own particular needs, that in his demands to get them, he becomes relatively insensitive to the effect that he is having on the people in his environment. So the cruelty does not have a conceptualized aspect to it; and, often a characteristic of a relatively mature adult R individual who has strongly moved in the direction of learning how to be humanitarian and understanding and perceptive is that he can be strangely cruel in some of his relationships. EXAMPLE: The IR minister who is so zealous and humanitaric

As.

00020

and whose children tell you he is cruel. This is a function of the R individual who is unaware that he is behaving in contradictory ways. The ER male moving in the direction in which he becomes a military officer or policeman, on the basis of which he develops a great deal of conceptualized knowledge of what is right and what is wrong, and subsequently moves very much in the direction of being sure that what he is doing is right. He will be very humanitarian and very loving in his relationships with his wife, his children, and his mother, and perhaps spend a good deal of his spare time helping adolescent boys in an athletic association; and yet, with regard to an adolescent who he describes as a "punk," he can be unfeelingly cruel in the way in which he deals with him; and can be quite unfeeling toward him.

The F individual has to learn to be cruel. Any F individual is likely to find the process of fighting, as an activity when he is growing up, very distasteful and very frightening. The only way he can move in the direction of overcoming this early amount of fear is by learning to control and move in the direction of being quite unfeeling. But, to a certain extent, an F individual when he is "unfeeling," is unfeeling in a very "feeling" way. He does not have the insulation that the R does. The R individual is insulated -- is unaware of what is going on, is not reacting in any way. The F individual is aware of what's going on, and has to react negatively to what's going on. Consequently, to a certain extent, the F individual has a capacity in the extreme sense, of becoming SADISTIC.

Being sadistic is something entirely different than being cruel, because the concept of sadism means, in a sense, that the person enjoys "hurting" someone -- that is, he enjoys his capacity to keep his feelings

in check and to do things to people which would ordinarily be disabling to him. Therefore, in some instances, F individuals have a capacity to be extremely sadistic when they move in a direction of relating or responding to other people.

Many of the conflicts that have existed over the years in connection with educational theory, can be explained partly in terms of R and F behavior in relationship to early learning. An R system of learning is likely to be one on the basis of which the individual is trained in the fundamentals (reading, writing, etc.) and then spend the rest of his life training him to use what he has learned. The F individual is likely to think in terms of training on the basis of the forcing of discipline, the thwarting of spontaneity, the business of keeping someone so busily engaged in dealing with the fundamentals that he actually begins to inhibit the individual rather than causing him to develop in a particularly healthy way.

In conducting research on a long-established educational system to determine its effectiveness, you must seek out and consider the casualties of that particular system. In a system where the primary method of education is the rote learning of the fundamentals, the casualties are the ones who are confused -- the F individuals. In the progressive system of education, the R individual is the casualty. Consequently, there is a tendency to swing back and forth between the two systems rather than take into account the most effective kind of learning style for the individual. However, F individuals learn by insight and R individuals learn by trial and error. Consequently, you have to have both systems.

Mechanical ability is essentially a trial and error type of thing. R individuals tend to be mechanically effective; F individuals tend to be

mechanically inept. In connection with this, the effort necessary to overcome their initial response state becomes important. EXAMPLE: F individuals are likely not to have good athletic ability. If it is important for him to learn athletic ability, he may be so poor at it that he runs away or he may work so hard at it in compensation that he begins to excell. So although most athletes might be R's, the really great athletes might be F's. Most piano players are R's, but the really great pianists might be F's.

Theodore Roosevelt was an IF child -- self-involved, narcissistic, sickly -- who in the process of maturing overcame his IF adjustment to become the epitome of an ER, the outdoorsman personified, the great athlete, etc.

The IF individual in his initial response state is fundamentally the person who is least aware of his external environment because he is so totally aware of his internal environment. If the IF individual is ever made to discover the external world, it begins to be a very exciting kind of thing; and he is likely to spend the rest of his life being so excited because he is constantly discovering things going on outside himself that he didn't know were there.

The EF individual is likely to start by being unduly aware of everything going on in his environment, and may move to control his tendency to be so distracted. The EF might be very proud that he has developed intellectual interests; the older he gets, he might be more and more excited because he is finding new kinds of ways of developing his intellectual curiosity.

Truman Capote is an example of an IFU writer. He was almost a schizophrenic child; but, as an adult, he is extremely effective as a

non-participant observer of everything going on around him and is able to report it in his writing.

The capacity to be vicarious -- the non-participant observer. The EF individual is likely to be an individual who has had to control his tendency to be responsive and to react. He is likely to move in the direction where he begins to use displacement in the sense of being able to be a relatively non-participant observer of things going on around him. An EF individual is going to have considerably more of a capacity to be able to enjoy other people's pleasure. In the extreme, the EF individual is very likely to be a voyeur or "peeping Tom" in that he gains a great deal of satisfaction in being able to see the things going on around him.

An IF, in the extreme, is likely to be an exhibitionist -- by exhibiting himself, he hopes to move someone else in the direction of getting involved with him in an externalized sort of way.

A general characteristic of EF adjustments is that they will have a voyeuristic quality to them -- that is, a capacity to gain non-participant satisfaction. The EF is likely to get more fun out of watching a football game than to play in the game. He may get interested in drama, in a sense, to have the vicarious emotionality of the things happening on the stage. The EF housewife (in an uncompensated adjustment) gains much more emotional satisfaction watching soap operas on TV than an ER housewife.

The IF individual, with his exhibitionist characteristic, is likely to be ostentatious or careful or cautious in relationship to keeping clean. An IF individual is going to have much more awareness of the need to keep clean and of how they look; and be willing to wear a mini-skirt without any element of embarrassment.

00024

The ER and IR individuals are going to have a greater need to participate to gain reassurance that they are a part of something, and they will gain little satisfaction out of voyeurism. An EF might love a pornographic movie, whereas an ER might find nothing interesting about it and might be very hostile to it because it is a non-participating act.

An IR is very likely to be opposed to the exhibitionism of the IF. The IR is likely to be concerned with the IF's exhibitionist tendencies in the same way the ER is concerned about the EF's voyeuristic tendencies.

and this is ^{also} partly a warm-up for A & U ~~f~~ because again with R & ~~F~~
 about R & N the
 and with A & U as I said/ last time it measures so many different things
 that it kind of hard to be ^{very} precise about it but ~~there~~ are certain
 things ~~about it~~ that I think ~~y~~ that you have to bear in mind in connection
 with some of the dynamic meaning of R & ~~F~~ anyway, and the first thing
 that I realized I hadn't talked very much about last time is something
 that had to do with again for want of better terms I going to call
 masculinity and femininity. I want to be very sure that you understand
 that I'm not talking sex now when I'm talking masculinity and femininity.
 I'm talking about the characteristics of behavior which are more appropriately
 feminine at least in an American culture than those things that are
 appropriately masculine in an American culture. And to a certain extent
 and continually as it relates to, when it combines with our - or is
 carried with it in its initial response stage - certain kinds of behavior
 certain kinds of interest, if you will, which are certainly in our
 American culture more masculine than they are feminine. F carries with
 it also ~~p~~ particularly when it's placed with E. But of course this is
 also true as far as I is concerned but not in quite the same way, because
 it's not reflected in the overt behavior in quite the same way. that F
 carries with it certain characteristics, certain modes of behavior which
 are more characteristically feminine. Now the significance of this is
 that a woman with an R adjustment is going to be under much more pressure
 to ~~modified~~ and change some of her initial response state character-
 istics ~~w/it~~ a good deal more actively or more violently than if she
 and conversely, an individual, a male, who is ~~is~~ is going to be
 under considerable amount, much more pressure if you will in the sense
 that the behavior that he is likely to manifest spontaneously is less
 appropriate or less likely to be condoned than if he is R. Now part of

the reason for this is that F carries with it a certain amount of sensitivity, as I mentioned before, in fact a considerable amount of sensitivity and that sensitivity is likely to manifest itself in certain kinds of emotional manifestations or conversely less emotional manifestations and a general rule in terms of this that an R individual in general is, use the word, less emotional than is an F. Now again, I have problems when I talk about this because it sounds as though I'm saying that an R individual is non-emotional and an F individual is emotional. I'm not saying that at all. I'm saying that the subtle ways the various things in terms of this is that the sensitivity the F individual is likely to precipitate certain kinds of emotionality quicker than it is in the R individual and the R individual is going to be harder to arouse but once arousal takes place there can be a considerable amount of emotionality so it could to an extent, in terms of this, try to use it as an example here, the EF child is likely to be prone to cry easily. ~~The~~ When the feelings are hurt, and its very relatively easy to hurt the feelings, likely to be precipitated with some kind of emotional or inappropriate emotional outburst. Now again, in relationship to this a boy who cries easily in a masculine environment is certainly going to have a considerable amount of pressure placed upon him in terms of not being

that particular way. By the same token, the R in R girl, who does not show the appropriate sensitivity or the appropriate emotionality that they had in relation to this is going to be under pressure in a sense to move and learn to be appropriately feminine. Therefore, a characteristic to a certain extent, and I can say it is almost generally in some form although it is very hard to pick up, is that an ER girl will have a history somewhere in her life, in terms of being categorized, called, forced to will be called tomboyish for these

~~Characteristics~~ there will be tomboy characteristics in her relationships in her early adjustment stage, a period of time on the basis of which there will be a tendency for her to be much more willing and much more acceptable to ~~do~~ doing the kind of things that are more appropriate than climbing trees and playing football and being tough, the various things in relationship to this is likely to be an early manifestation of the result. In the same token an EF individual male, in the early period of his time is likely to move in a direction on the basis of what there will be some sissy-characteristics, if I can use that as the word to try to describe the relationship to this, and is likely to be placed under a considerable amount of pressure in the early part of their life in terms of trying to overcome these characteristics. We do get the phenomena in connection with this as an EF boy who is likely to move very far in the direction of becoming very tough because he has had a considerable experience ^{and} has a considerable amount of insight in his attempt that he has to solve therefore he works very hard in the direction of being ~~very~~ tough and an EF adolescent male is very possible for him to become quite a worldish, quite tough and also because he has a certain amount of insight in terms of awareness of other people's behavior in terms of this. The F individual can move very in many instances move in the direction by adolescence. He has a considerable amount of capacity to need other individuals and the phenomena of the guys that are forcing someone to play chicken with ~~the~~ an automobile, and the Hell's Angels kind of male is more likely and EF who has been under strong pressure to move into ^{the} direction of developing some kind of masculinity than not. The ER is not nearly as likely to be under the pressure to have to prove his toughness or be as defensive about his toughness and so forth and consequently this leads in the one of the very complicated concepts of the PAS has to do with the business of cruelty in terms of

trying to find a little bit about what cruel, how it manifests itself. An R individual can be cruel but in most instances an R individual is cruel because he is unaware of what he is doing. If you follow what I mean, there is likely to be ^athoughtless that is involved in it and the R individual may be so selfishly involved in his own particular needs that the demands to get them ~~would~~ he becomes relatively insensitive to the effect that he's having on the people in his environment, so the cruelty does not have a conceptualized aspect of it and you will often find a characteristic of a relatively mature adult or individual who has strongly moved into the direction of learning to be humanitarian in learning to be understanding and how to be perceptive who can be strangely cruel in some of his relationships. Now, again one of the examples that I've tried to give in the past is to a certain extent an R primitive individual going thru a maturation process he might move into the direction of which he developed the considerable amount of humanitarian zeal, if you follow what I mean, he can move in the direction and develop a high sense of social ability, he can move in a direction on the basis of where he becomes a leading minister in a church, I use this as an example in terms of this and being generally known as an extremely good man, but if you talk to his son or his daughter there going to say he shows in many incidences a considerable amount of cruelty or lack of understanding, lack of judgement, and so forth in relationship ~~in~~ to the behavior of those people who are nearest and dearest to him. Now this is a function of the R individual who is unaware of the fact that he is behaving in contradictory ways, in logic type compartmentation. The ER individual for example, might move into the direction and I've seen this as an example in terms of this, the ER male moving into a direction in which he goes into something like a military officer or policeman, which is perhaps a better example to use in

relationship to this, as a policeman he ~~is~~ may be able to develop a great deal of conceptualized knowledge of ~~the~~ what is right ~~because~~ and what is wrong and can move very much in the direction of being ~~the~~ sure that what he is doing is ~~is~~ right and be very humanitarian ~~and~~, he'll be very loving in relationship to his children, very, loving in his relationship to his wife, love his mother in his relational movie sense in terms of this will be active in in spending all of his time in spare time in terms of looking after the interest of adolescent boys for example in terms of this and yet until the very of logic type or the contradictory behavior that once in adolescence is defined as a "punk" he can be unfeelingly cruel in the way in which he deals with an individual when he feels that that individual is defined in such a way that he can be cruel or unfeeling and on the other hand the F individual to a certain extent has to learn to be cruel and I really mean it as a in relationships with them. He really has to learn to be cruel because to a certain extent his inferiority, his anxiety, the variety thing thing in terms of this is that an EF individual is likely to find the process of fighting as an active he is growing up. Very distasteful, very frightening, the only way that he can move in the direction of overcoming this early amount of fear is by learning to control and move into the direction ~~of~~ of being quite unfeeling but to ~~to~~ a certain extent the F individual when he is unfeeling is unfeeling in a very feeling way. Now there is not the insulation, and this is one of the ways of trying to differentiate between R behavior and F behavior is the R individual is insulated, that is he is unaware of what is going on. Therefore is not reacting in any way. The F individual is aware of what is going on and therefore has to react negatively to what is going on so to a certain extent the F individual has a capacity in the extreme sense of becoming sadistic. Now being

moves in the direction and then is sometimes complicated because he does not have the capacity to do rote learning without a considerable amount of effort. Now, again, in relationship with this, you can find an ER individual growing up in a society which is rich in language. The ER individual often times will have a considerable amount of capacity to learn in a rote way the very complex vocabulary of the society that he grows up in but you can get many instances with these particular individuals is that they will know many words but will make a considerable amount of misuse of words that they have learned because they do not have a real understanding. There's likely to be a standing quality in ~~the~~ relationship to this. Again in terms of this, an R individual is often times is able to learn in a relatively rote way without very much effort particularly he's going to have a considerable amount of capacity to imitate what is going on around him and his ~~mental~~ memorization is a requirement in relationship to the world that he lives in. The IR, the combination of being I and R means that the person is likely with very little effort to have a tremendous amount of capacity to learn things like poetry, multiplication tables or alphabets or state capitals or any number of things like this without any particular effort but at the same time will not be able to utilize the amount of material he has memorized unless someone has moved into the direction and may be giving him some kind of understanding. The reason I'm very down on this is that many of the conflicts that have existed over the years in connection with educational theory ~~are~~ can ~~partly~~ be explained in terms of R and F behavior in relationship to early learning. That an R system of learning is largely to be one on the basis of which the fundamentals if you follow what I mean-reading, writing and arithmetic-the fundamentals are the things you train an individual, then you spend the rest of his life training him to use what he's learned. This is healthy R thinking in relationship to how to move into the direction to utilize ~~of~~ something. The F individual, on the other hand, is likely to be thinking in terms of training on the basis of the forcing, the discipline, the thwarting of spontaneity, the business of keeping somebody so busily engaged in dealing with the fundamentals actually begins to inhibit the individual rather than to cause him to develop in a particularly ~~way~~ healthy way, so in one particular period a progressive educational school would develop--let me say this right because this is very important--if you have any given system of education

going on for a period of time and you are going to do research on it to try to find out the effectiveness of that education you are going to sort out the people with the casualties of their education. Consequently if you take the history of education in the U.S. during the first 15 years of this century a period of time on the basis of which education research began to be something that we were going to look into, and the period of time on the basis of ~~the~~ which fundamentals and rote learning and the various things in relation-~~to~~ ship to this was the primary method of education, obviously as you begin looking in terms of this you would find that the casualties of this were essentially the ones who were confused, ~~who~~ the ones who did not have the capacity to be thwarted in the various things in terms of this and that you would then have the feeling in the relationship to changing the method of education would keep being inhibited in effective rote learner would give them an opportunity. So you move over and start the progressive system of education as a revolt ~~as~~ if you will against the former one which was in a sense what happened to the U.S. around the '20s, beginning in the '20s in this country ~~was~~ the type of thing that Dewey and so forth were beginning to come up with in places like in teachers college in Columbia and you taught in a progressive school system and then you began to study the casualties of the progressive school system what you would begin to find is that the R individual where the casualties of the progressive school system. These people were doing in many cases ~~w~~ quite effectively more effectively than what people were giving them credit for in the previous system but as they moved into this one so you have a tendency to swing back and forth into the various systems of education rather than take into account what represented the most effective kind of learning style/^{of} the individual concerned or

the process of assessment, is much more important in terms of this and I know in fact policy in the '30s is the period of time I was trying to work my way through the very complex learning theories as were talked about at that/^{particular}time. I'm not aware or knowledgeable of them now but there used to be a tremendous amount of conflict and real conflict in relationship to whether people, this was largely on rat studies and then later on they began to move in terms of some of the primate studies of learning in relation to this as what a person learned by trial or error or whether he learned by insight. Now actually F individuals learn by insight or individuals learn by trial and error. At least that's the statement that I made in relationship to this that you have to have both kinds of systems to get people to be effective in terms of it and you can not make any given theories in my opinion, any theory of learning which doesn't take into account that insight learning exists in some people, trial and error exists in the other and that you can sit around and argue the point from here to Kazoo and it would only be academic. See what I--You get a little feel--some feel for R and F, both in relationship to things like rote learning, things like insight, things like and something else that they didn't talk about which is mechanical ability. Now mechanical ability essentially is a trial and error type of thing on the basis of which if you've got an individual who learns without understanding many times you can get him to begin--if you are a good teacher--you can get an R individual relatively easy to learn to do certain kinds of things. So in a general sense F individuals tend to be mechanically inept, tend to be. R individuals tend to be mechanically effective. Now again, don't misunderstand me, I'm not saying that everyone who has mechanical ability ~~is~~ and is an adult is an R and everyone who doesn't is an F, but I am saying that in terms

of the effort or the thing ~~that is~~ which is necessary for them to overcome from their initial response state because they have a considerable amount of influence and connection with this. I mean again, an F individual is likely not to have very good athletic ability and this can be used as an example in terms of this. If-if it is important for him to begin to learn athletic ability he may either become so poor at it that he runs away from it or he may work so hard at it over a period of time that he really begins to ~~accept~~ excell at it so altho most athletes might be Rs the really great athlete might be F. Do you follow my reasoning? A thing like learning to play the piano. Rs can learn to play the piano with relatively little effort. F individuals are going to make a considerable amount of effort and consequently they may not learn at all or if they are forced to learn ~~of~~ over a period of time to learn and move into the direction of the basis of which they learn very well in terms of this they will have overcome-we shall overcome--and we are talking about overcoming now-you get the same statement most piano players are Rs but your great pianist might be an F. Painting ability. Most Fs have trouble doing any kind of drawing work. In many instances. On the other hand they may begin to develop in this particular direction on the basis ~~of~~ of which they overcome they get the right kind of training they go through the process of learning how to do it. Make the same statement Most people with drawing ability are all Rs but they are likely to be a great~~y~~ many individuals who are great painters

in terms of this are Fs or FAs. Given an example of this-for example I happen to think that Theodore Roosevelt was an IF and he was an IF who grew up in a relationship as often an IF as a relatively narcissistically self-involved, sickly child who began to move into the direction of overcoming his IF initial response state and consequently when you move into the direction^{of}/where youre getting as a young adult

he begins to be the outdoorsman personified²- the ER personified--and a very effective one and a great athlete, a great all kinds of things in relation to this. The same thing, I happen to think -oh who wrote the "Oregon Trail"--Francis Parkman, I think Parkman is right, that doesn't sound right to me right now. Parkman, was a fellow who again was an IF who in direction on the basis of which he lived in the-New England difficulty seeing, was very sickly, was sent on a tour of the praries in order to regain his health which was a positive thing to do in the 40s and 50s in connection with this and was able to endure ~~and~~ extremely well in relationship to this because he had a great number of things he had to overcome. Henry Melville, Moby Dick, Richard Dana all of these are to me early examples of for example IF who worked because they were were moved out into a direction which they had to overcome certain kinds of tendencies they had and then became extremely effective I mean one $\frac{1}{2}$ of the things in relationship to this, the IF individual in what I'm talking about and his initial response state is fundamentally is least aware of his external environment. Because he is so totally of his internal environment. Now one of the things that can happen in the IF individual is that the IF individual if he is ever made to discover that world out there it begins to be a very exciting thing and he is likely to spend the rest of his life being so excited because and it would not be unusual for and EF individual to become very preoccupied and very proud of the fact that he had developed intellectual interests and the older he or she gets might become more and more excited because they're finding new kinds of ways of developing their intellectual curiosity so its not at all $\frac{1}{2}$ unusual for EF adults to be intellectually very curious and not particually interested environmentalist and IF individual to be extremely and fantastically ^{curious} but environmentally

kind of a term but in an externalized sort of a way. Now in terms of this the a general characteristic of EF adjustment and I'm going to use the general term voyeuristic characteristics. By voyeuristic I'm talking in terms of this a considerable amount of capacity to gain non-participant satisfaction the EF is likely to get more fun out of watching the football game than playing in a football game. Now that's an accent to what I'm talking about in relationship to this. He may become very much interested in drama for example, in the sense that they have the vicarious emotionalities of what is going on in the stadium. The EF relatively uncompensated EF housewife is going to ~~be~~ gain a suitable amount of much more emotional satisfaction, empathy ~~by~~ and so forth by watching soap operas all day long on television in relationship than maybe an ER ~~by~~ likely to do in relationship to this because there is a movement of identification as they psychodynamic is likely to be much more precise, much more fixed to move into the direction in terms of this of The ER or the R individual is going to-IF is going to have exhibitionist characteristics. IF because--exhibitionists characteristics IF because exhibitionist characteristics in terms of this are likely to be people who are ostentatious or careful or very cautious in relationships to keeping clean for example. An IF individual is going to have much more awareness of the need to keep clean and how they look or be willing to a mini-skirt without any element of embarrassment or various things in terms of this that is much more likely to be exhibitionistic characteristic in the extreme in IF. The ER and IR on the other hand in terms of this are going to have to have much more of a need to participate, to be part of to gain as a reassurance of the fact that they are participating in something and they will have relatively little ability for example in some instances of gaining any particular satisfaction. An ER would gain very

little satisfaction out of voyeurism for example. An EF might love a pornographic movie. An ER is likely to find absolutely nothing at all interesting in relationship to it, and be very hostile because of the idea that this is a non-participating act. An IR is likely to be very much opposed to the exhibitionism of the IF. The IR is likely to very concerned to a certain extent about many of the IF exhibitionistic tendencies as the ER is likely to be concerned with the EF's voyeuristic or psychological voyeuristic tendencies.