ORIGINS OF THE PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

John W. Gittinger

The article that follows is in essence, a transcript of a presentation given by John Gittinger at the PAS Foundation Conference at Hyannis, Massachusetts in October 1981. In this presentation, Gittinger tells the story, if you will, of the creative development of the Personality Assessment System. In this editing process, every attempt has been made to preserve the beautifully flowing style of Gittinger's presentation in favor of a focus upon strict grammatical corrections.

I think you want me to talk about the origination of the various interpretations I make against the Wechsler subtests and how these ideas developed. Most have heard the "short order cook story" which explains how Digit Span came to be the first Primitive indicator in P.A.S. That story is important since it is where I developed my initial interest as far as trying to create an interpretive system out of the subtests. The derivation of this really had to do with the work that was being done at Menninger's Clinic in Kansas and with Rapaport and Shafer who were members of the task force which later wrote the "Clinical Application" text. The Menninger group had published their scatter analysis process around 1946 or 1947. Remember, they were dealing with neurotic or psychotic populations and trying to find out what the neurosis or psychosis did to the subtests--this was their point of departure. They had decided a priori that Vocabulary might be the most stable, from which the subtests would scatter. They believed, for pretty good a priori reasons, that the Vocabulary subtest would be the one that would be least likely to be influenced by any kind of illness; that lowering of the scores of the subtest in general was due to the processes of the illness.

Also, at the time Wechsler published his first book on "Measurement of Adult Intel-ligence", which was associated with the Wechsler-Bellevue-1, he also talked a little bit about the derivations he had found. I'll try to come back to this later but, if you don't know it, the P.A.S. itself had its derivation from the old W-B-I.

To return to the Digit Span issue, the Rapaport studies had produced certain indications that the Digit Span, was very much associated with anxiety. The inability to perform on the Digit Span test was, according to them a pretty good indicator of the extent of anxiety an individual would be suffering from. That is a pretty startling point if you think about it. Those of you who have given the Wechsler know that in many instances, people will tell you "if I had felt better or if I wasn't so worried about the test or other things...I know I would havedone better on the Digit Span test". There was certainly a lot of a priori feeling then, that the ability to do the Digit Span was somehow or other related to anxiety. Even though Digit Span was valuable in relation to anxiety all the studies being done on the W-B-I at that time demonstrated time after time that Digit Span (along with Object Assembly) was the most unreliable. Everyone has been worrying about the unreliability of the Digit Span and in subsequent revisions--the WAIS and WAIS-R, they are doing their damndest to

destroy the effectiveness of the P.A.S. It is the unreliability itself of the Digit Span which makes it one of the critical indicators as far as P.A.S. goes!

Another thing that they (Rapaport, et al) began to think about was that Block Design had some relatively peculiar properties. Keep in mind that the Wechsler Block design is a modification of a test developed a long time before the W-B-I which was designed to measure brain damage--to oversimplify its function. It measured mental deterioration in some way related to brain damage, that is, brain malfunction. It is not surprising that they related Block Design performance to a certain number of their neurotics and psychotics. The neurotic's and psychotic's performance was not always related to brain damage but certainly seemed an indication of brain disorganization. It seemed to indicate a certain lack of organization.

So early on we had indications of anxiety from Digit Span and indications of confusion from the Block Design (with strange things happening to Object Assembly.) Those studies never found anything clear cut concerning Picture Completion except if you look at some of the original work, people who were paranoid tended to score a little higher than those not diagnosed as having paranoid features to their illness. In addition to Digit Span and Block Design then, the Rapaport group had a vague feeling that Picture Completion and Object Assembly had some important role in scatter analysis.

To go back to Wechsler's own thinking, he had picked up very quickly the fact that among criminal populations, the Picture Arrangement subtest was operating very strangely. Criminals seemed to do very

well on Picture Arrangement. At the same time Wechsler was making his finding, and unbeknownst to him, a fellow by the name of Estes at Harvard published a scathing article in Psych. Review saying that the Picture Arrangement was no good because bright (and of course there could be no brighter) Harvard undergraduates did not do well on it. He said not only were the Harvard undergraduates bright, but every one of them was an avid reader of New Yorker magazine. Now this is important because the old O. Soglow's cartoons, which are the basis for the Picture Arrangement tests, all appeared originally in the New Yorker, and O. Soglow's "Little King" was the favorite one in there. Now here we had the criminals doing well on the Picture Arrangements subtest when they had never seen the New Yorker and bright, Harvard students doing poorly and being readers of the magazine.

It was this same period of time, after World War II, when I was living my lonely life in Oklahoma as Chief Psychologist of the state of mental health system (which had only one psychologist - Gittinger). Also, at this time the Veterans's Administration and the V.A. hospitals began to hire large numbers of clinical psychologists to work in their hospitals. In fact, the clinical psychology program in this country got started after World War II with the development of the Veteran's Administration programs. People my age (and there were some of us who never really had been in clinical psychology in our lives, like my good friend, Mike Heyman, who got his Ph.D. in rats) were the founders of the psychological community training clinical psychologists. Clinical psychology just grew like Topsy. One of the primary things these psychologists were interested in was projective techniques. The Rorschach was beginning to

get a certain amount of development. Relatively few psychologists got any formal training in it, but got their training in workshops like this one--about this size, as a matter of fact. The most popular one was Murray, operating out of Harvard. He was working on the development of the T.A.T. (There was also a Hungarian woman working on the Szondi). Anyhow, these were the projective tests that were popular then. Sitting off to the side were the intelligence tests. The W-B-I was a great development so you didn't have to give the Stanford-Binet anymore. Suddenly came the information out of Kansas we have been talking about on scatter analysis.

One of the primary training psychologist in the V.A. was a fellow by the name of Jerry Carter. Well, he published a series of articles which conclusively proved for all and forever that there was absolutely nothing to the work of Rapaport, and that scatter analysis with the Wechsler was a waste of time. There was no longer any interest in it, and in fact, there was active hostility toward anyone who was foolish enough to try scatter analysis with the test. Well, there were a few hardy souls who were still working away at it, and as far as I was concerned, I was beginning to use it. The reason I was beginning to become so interested in it at the Oklahoma State Hospital, where we were getting in 350 patients a month, was that if you gave the Rorschach you got nine or ten responses; if you gave the T.A.T. you got blank stares. On the other hand if you gave them the Wechsler you got "if I show them I'm smart, I'll get out of here." So I had hundreds of Wechslers and nothing else, and I was searching the literature. I had the part about anxiety and the Digit Span, but a real turning point was when Shafer published his book "Clinical Applications of the

Wechsler". He pointed out that in the Kansas sample of neurotics and psychotics, the most interesting and significant thing was that in the female schizophrenics, there was a tendency for Digit Span to be higher than Arithmetic. At the time we (I) were not talking about "change" or "Compensation" as we know it now. But suddenly here was a suggestion that something was happening with the Digit Span and Arithmetic.

Now you have to be kind of pragmatic and dogged to keep going on something like this. Concerning this business of the Digit Span and the question of anxiety--well there was a group of so called simple schizophrenics coming into the state hospital at Norman. They were folks picked up on their "tour" back and fourth from California to New York working their way through the hamburger joints. The issue here is that you have a group of these individuals who manifested and showed, I guess the word would be, blandness or depression or indifference. When you look at the subtest scores of these individuals, the ones who were most anxious did not always have low Digit Span. Some had quite well trained Digit Span scores. The important thing that occurred to me was that the Digit Span and Arithmetic were certainly in some way related. Clue? Shafer's work. Empirically looking at the tests that I had, some of my people had low Arithmetic and high Digit Span.

Now of course, there is this issue of determining what scatter was. At the time, I was flirting with using Vocabulary like the Rapaport study did to define what would determine scatter. But being a bit paranoid myself, when I drew these scores on a graph, as I still do, instead of just an average, I could "see" very clearly a line right down that graph which didn't have much

references to anything else. Suddenly it began to occur to me that this is the point of departure; that Vocabulary could fluctuate like anything else but if you put this (line) in the field of scatter, like the scatter grams I developed, you suddenly began to get the feel of where the center point of the graph was. If you tried to take the average, it didn't work. (One of the first things I did was that you took the IQ 145 for instance, and used 145 for instance, and used 14.5, it worked in a lot of ways.) The major thing though, was that line down there which I knew was the point from which the individual was deviating, and that began to be the Normal Level. It wasn't called the Normal Level until a good long time after that, but at least I was beginning to get a feel for the scatter.

Looking again at my people who had low Arithmetic and high Digit Span; part of the rationalization that began to build up over a period of time was that the capacity for an individual to visualize, inside his head, some nonsense numbers, retain them, and repeat them seemed to be the capacity that some people very clearly had and other people did not. What is important is that it did not seem to be related to anxiety except if you look in the clinical data of my hospitalized patients. In those cases also, the people who were manic depressive had more of a tendency to have low Digit Span than people who where called schizophrenics had high Digit Span. At that point, the only thing I had available to me were hospitalized, ill individuals. By the time I left the Norman, Oklahoma State Hospital to go into the work that would give me the opportunity to work with non-hospitalized individuals, it began to crystallize.

At Norman, I did have fairly clearly in my mind three factors. One of them I cannot

really or completely tell you the derivation of. There was that confusion about the role if the Block Design and the not-very-well formulated ideas about the Picture Arrangement. The point is that at the time there was no talk about the Primitives. Once I had caught onto Shafer's discussion about the fact that female schizophrenics did poorer on Arithmetic than they did on Digit Span, I began to kind of look for other things. One of the things I began to pick up was the fact that Similarities seemed to be doing some strange things--a very definite dichotomy. A person came in the hospital and either did extraordinarily well on Similarities or they didn't do well at all. When they didn't do well, there was the same kind of pattern that began to come up like with the Digit Span and Arithmetic There began to be a Block Design/ Similarities combination. If the Block Design was down, it began to be an indication to me that the person was confused so if the Block Design was up it would be an indication of a person who wasn't confused. Critically (on the other hand) I began to pick up that sometimes when the Similarities was down, you were dealing with an individual who had a history of a great deal of confusion. Now, at the time I was at the hospital, we were getting a lot of drunks/ alcoholics. These alcoholics seemed to be individuals who did well, according to my invisible line, on Block Design but were falling down on Similarities. When I studied the clinical patterns of these people, I found that these alcoholics were being put in the hospital not because they were alcoholic, but because of the behavior they manifested when they were drunk. All alcoholics do not necessarily manifest bizarre behavior, but those individuals who we got in the hospital did. I got as one of my first minor reputations that I could go in and say "this guy is an alcoholic who acts very

badly when he is drunk" and the doctors would ask how I knew that and I would say "a high Block Design and low Similarities". So one of the formative patterns was the suggestion that an individual could have control at certain times, and that at other times there could be a loss of control. At the same time, a person could remember nonsense numbers and then if you ask him to use those numbers in a constructive, organized way, he would do badly on Arithmetic. So there was this sorting out; the beginning of the Primitive patterns. From that kind of thinking--high Block Design and low Similarities, we began to pick up other kinds of little things. I didn't know exactly what they meant and it would take a long time to put them in any kind of concrete manner.

One of the interesting things that developed during this period of time was in the use of the Picture Completion subtest. Here I was, in the middle of Oklahoma; there was no water because this was before they built lakes. Here was a picture of a crab with a leg missing, and how they expected anyone from Oklahoma to see that, I don't know, because they had never seen a crab in their lives. There was also a ship without its funnel. Of course I had seen them in newsreels but never in real life, so it didn't surprise me that many of them couldn't see the missing leg, since they had never seen a crab, or the funnel since they had never seen a steamship. Before all this was ever formulated, I was giving Wechslers in a New York hospital overlooking the East River. All those New Yorkers couldn't see that the crab leg was missing either or the steamship was missing its funnel! It finally began to dawn on me that something else was operating here besides experience.

Later after these situations with the W-B-I,

I first gave the WAIS in Vietnam. There was a new item on the WAIS; the one with the snow missing on the logs which first appeared on the WAIS. Over there I was dealing with people that had never been in air-conditioning, let alone ever having seen snow. I thought that since they had never seen snow they would never get the implication of this item. It turned out that the implications of the item were somewhat more complicated than I had ever expected. There was an awareness of a certain number of factors that have nothing to do with snow. Many bright Vietnamese who had never seen snow could tell me what was wrong with the picture, so surely something different was operating here.

There has always been some feeling in terms of "cultural loading" of the information subtest. You do have to carefully look at this when you are thinking of why people are not doing well on that subtest. There are some obvious expectations that are totally American, like Washington's birthday item. If you get to an item like "What is the Apocrypha", though one of the surprising things is that in most cultures, the cultural factor doesn't seem to matter. It is the same kind of intellectual orientation in China or Hindustan that recalls the Apocrypha as it is in the United States. The point is that we do not really consider the Apocrypha a "cultural" item in the U.S. and we realize that a lot of slower Americans are going to miss it. When a Chinese misses it though, there is likely to be a feeling that it is cultural when in fact, it is not cultural--it's intellectual.

In 1950 I left Oklahoma with my very carefully selected Wechsler sample of 100 mental hospital patients which I was going to use to write my doctoral dissertation. I had a general plan on how I was going to

approach the problem that I thought I wanted to do, and my approach was actually a lot of fun. What I had spent many years doing in a number of ways was that I put all my samples on this particular chart. Right away I left Information out of it. The reason was that when I was originally collecting them I was still looking back to the Rapaport work using Vocabulary as the point in determining scatter. As I went on, I found out that I didn't need the Vocabulary line because my paranoid ideas caused me to "see" the other line around which there were definite configurations and patterns. The Rapaport study had also been very much interested in pattern analysis. The patterns I was beginning to be interested in, though, used all ten subtest scores in various patterns. (Information was back in). Remember, I was using the W-B-1, and the scatter was made in the W-B order, not in the WAIS order, and that is the way I learned to look at patterns. I began to sort, or attempt to sort, all of my various patterns, and I was also using the Rapaport data (resorting it) because the Rapaport study carefully printed all of the W-B scores along with a clinical description. So I had the Rapaport group and I had my sample of 100 hospital records plus a lot of other hospital records. I had selected my hospital sample primarily on the basis of age, trying to get five in each of the age pattern group. My title was going to be The Wechsler-Bellevue and Age in Psychiatric Diagnosis.

I had some very bizarre ideas at that time, some of which haven't changed a bit. One of the bizarre notions I had involved the fact that most of the validity studies on any kind of psychological instrument, whether projective or objective, were using critical diagnostic criteria to validate them. My bizarre idea for that time was that it might be possible to turn it the other way around. There might be test patterns which would be better predictors of psychiatric categories than that of the clinical diagnosis. If you could show some kind of consistency, the test pattern became the instrument which gave the diagnosis which you then began to verify. That was the general area in which I was operating.

Another bizarre idea for the time came about because of the popularity of tests like the M.M.P.I. and before that, in my early undergraduate days, the Bernreuter. The thing about these tests was that everything was based upon this idea of rightness and wrongness--on the basis of whether you were low or high. One of the things that interested me quite a bit was that some of the most clinically obvious psychopathic deviants that scored surprisingly low on the Pd (No.4) scale of the M.M.P.I., if you looked at the test profile as a whole, they were the least likely to be psychopathic deviants. Thus, something about the attitude, or the way the person was performing on the test was going to have an influence on whether they got high scores or low scores. To a certain extent, low scores on the M.M.P.I. might be as significant as highscores. In fact, I thought that in many instances they were more significant than high scores. My thinking was beginning to go through all kinds of rebellious and sort of half-baked, half understood ideas!

Consider that when you did a coefficient of correlation in those days, you did it by hand--you drew the straight line and you put in all these dots and you got the cluster. Of course, it is always nice to see the clusters when you had a good coefficient of correlation but you know, the ones who have interested me the most where these characters who were sitting way out here,

away from the straight line. It began to move me in a direction where I was looking for different kinds of things than others were. I sat around for hours when I should have been doing something more productive, sorting all of the Wechsler patterns, looking at them, putting them in piles. By this time I had long since given up writing my dissertation but I presented the first Magnum Opus. I had tried to use a statistic called a "profile similarities" by some person O'Malley or something like that, but it never worked out completely. From my sorting I was trying to find profiles, and I did manage to get four or five basic profiles, so I sat down and wrote up the meanings of the patterns based upon the information.

At this time I wasn't yet talking about E's and I's or of R's and F's or of A's and U's; that developed later on. By the end of 1950 I went to Washington, D.C. and began to deal with other populations. The only thing I was convinced of by that time was that a poor Digit Span was not just an indication that the person was anxious while taking the test. There was a certain amount of verification of this because not only was the validity of the Digit Span the worst, but test re-test reliability was absolutely foul. (Of course this is what made it great for the P.A.S.). I found out that if you gave an Externalizer long enough, he was going to be able (later) to do the task up to the level of his capacity. So I was definitely was getting the feeling that the low Digit Span was pointing to a certain affective features in the person and that these affective features were overt. Remember at this time there was a lot of talk anyway about affective disorders and schizoid disorders in our field. I played around with introversion and extroversion and the schizoid features, which were inner. I had, though, the phe-

nomena of people who were doing well on the Digit Span as well as Arithmetic who were also manifesting a considerable amount of overt, affective behavior. There were also people who were doing poorly on the Digit Span and doing very well on Arithmetic who were beginning to show, very definitely, withdrawing behavior.

I remember clearly - I was sitting in the office we had overlooking the Potomac River, with a wonderful person named Gertrude Reimer, who was always very kind to me in the sense she was interested. There were very few people who were interested, since scatter analysis had been completely discredited and they thought I was wasting my time talking about it. Even the senior man I was working with, when I would talk to him about Digit Span would say, "but that's a totally invalid test. You can't use that test for anything". I would try to explain to him that I was not talking about the validity of the test the way he was talking about it, but until the day he died, he never changed his opinion. Gertrude listened to me. I would stay in the office, and she would ask me what it was about, and I would explain. By then we were using what we now call Normal Level, only we were calling it the Central Trend, that is, the "average". We were also using plus and minus symbols so I said to Gertrude that you could have +Digit Span and +Arithmetic, or -Digit Span, and +Arithmetic. I was trying to explain to Gertrude what I thought the dynamic was when suddenly I put them in this order.

+DS +A		-DS -A
(1)		(3)
+DS -A		-DS +A
(2)		(4)

This became the primary way I introduced people to the PAS--by drawing these particular lines. On the basis of that, groups (1) and (3) had affective features that were different from each other. Suddenly also, came the realization that they were both extraverts. The other two constellations, (2) and (4), in one form or another were introverts. So, for the first time there became a basis configuration! So I told Gertrude that what the one group, was doing, in one form or another, was internalizing, and what the other group was doing, in one form or another was externalizing. Gertrude said, "I think that those are good terms". For the first time I seemed to get it, but it became complicated when you tried to talk about a formula that had a lot of variations. The main thing was to call the bottom two grouped internalizers because these were the ones who, in some way or another, had the capacity to internalize the (test) material very effectively. But the ability to internalize material very effectively does not mean that they can necessarily effetely utilize what they have internalized. Therefore, the difference between this particular individual (-DS+A) and this particular (+DS-A) is an Internalizer. I told Gertrude in my magnificent dogmatism, is that this person (-DA+A) is an Internalizer who has learned to use his internalizing abilities effectively and in an organized way. This (+DS-A) is the one who remains, is still, internalized, but his internalization are not particularly utilized so he is Schizophrenic. The other one is schizoid or withdrawing.

It's the same thing for the top two groups, but these are externalizing. The Externalizer is the person who is very aware of and very responsive to and very alert to all the things going on around him. He can externalize very easily but so then he has a certain inability to internalize. The External-

izer who is (-DS+A), with a high Arithmetic, is an Externalizer because he has learned to discipline and control his initial tendency to be an Internalizer. This other Externalizer, (-DS-A),is still externalizing (from his initial tendency) and does not have any particular control or organization, so he is the Manic.

This is an oversimplification, but it was a beginning to understanding the dynamics of what the subtests indicated, and I began to be able to talk about extraversion and introversion. Instead of saying "now this is a high Digit Span or a low Digit Span person", I could say to those few who were in on it, "this is an I- record and this is an E-record.

I was relatively naive because the language of psychology is always imprecise, but in practically any system there is a great deal of precision in the way certain words are used. Because I was thinking, for example, that some particular individual was controlling his internalizing tendencies and therefore acting out instead of acting in, I began to call him compensated. This is where I started using "words", and God only know how many definitions there are for the word "compensation"--He can use "change" or "control" (he can use "cantankerous!"). My original idea, and it is still my idea, that it is possible for an individual who is an "I" (+DS individual) to totally compensate. If he totally compensates, to use the jargon packed word, it can be a "reaction formation. The individual has so compensated that no matter how much you query that person on a test, or how hard you work, depending upon how strong that compensation is, you are not going to get that individual to be aware of, much less admit, that he is really a Primitive Internalizer.I was hung up on this for

years. Even to this day when I start teaching the P.A.S. to poor, unsuspecting, people, the introduction is that I always start talking about Digit Span and Arithmetic-- and I never get around to talking about anything else. This is partly because it is one of the most important combinations and partly because this is the one I worked with and fiddled with for so long. Other things did creep in, however.

In the back of my mind was still the business of Wechsler talking about criminals having high Picture Arrangement-- remember, higher than bright Harvard Students. This continued to be in the back of my mind and was very important in the development of the P.A.S. Of course at the various times I was operating, we never had the luxury of someone else to give the tests, and therefore, practically every Wechsler that I got was a Wechsler that I gave. Thus, I had, beside this idea in the back of my head, a large number of experiences with a lot of different people whom I had given the Wechsler to. I had picked up, whether I was aware of it or not, a lot of nuances of behavior. When I picked up large numbers of the non-hospitalized group which I had tested in Washington, one of the things I began to notice was that there began to be a series of strange things happening as far as Block Design was concerned. A lot of these people were not confused, as I thought low Block Design people were. Of the people who were confused, some did poorly on Block Design and others were doing very well.

I don't know whether any of you remember or if any of you were around, but somewhere in the bowels of the organization I was operating with, someone developed a "logic machine". I forget exactly how that "logic machine" worked, but it was a very

complicated mechanism to operate. Some people did very well with it and some people didn't do well at all, and the general assumption was that "high"ones were right and "low" ones were wrong. The person who didn't do well didn't have good logic and the ones that did well had pretty good logic. I'm oversimplifying it, but it's essentially correct.

So it was with the Block Design; I began to pick up certain things. I was beginning to get an increasing number of people who, when I gave them the blocks, added the remark "What do you think I am, a kid?" "Your going to have me play with blocks"? And I began to notice a pattern. A number of those people who sat there and did the blocks very well were saying, "What did you have me do that for?" or "What was I doing"? There was another group of people who didn't do very well on the blocks who would say, "What do you want me to do this for"? And when I refused to answer, which I usually did as a matter of fact, it slowed them down. Now if you went back and noticed how well some people were doing on that stupid "logic machine" compared to the patterns on the Block Design, it became interesting. One of the things that was happening, particularly with the bright population in which there was not generally expected to be any pathology, was that you could predict from their Block Design performance those who would get 100% on the "logic machine". The only difference in the Block Design performance of these people was that some of them were doing the Block Design a lot faster than others. The ones who were not doing the blocks too fast were the ones who were a little more cautious; they were a little more sensitive about the situation they were in. This began to be the development of the Block Design constellation.

Remember, I had already recognized that people who did well on the Block Design and had low Similarities were likely to poke you in the nose when they got drunk. I knew there was some kind of relationship between Block Design and Similarities. I had a lot more to compare and think about yet, but because I already had the "I's" and "E's", my own prejudices began to enter into it, so I reviewed the Internalizers and the Externalizers. The thing that seemed to be being pointed to or catching up to me was that it is not the issue of confusion with Block Design. It was a sort of sensitivity, the "flexibility"--a word I began to flirt with, and sort of "rote" performance of the other kind of people who did well on Block Design. I immediately labeled the people Flexible if they had a low Block Design and Rigid if they had a high Block-design. If you look at the P.A.S. literature, you won't find the word "rigid" any longer. All the "R's" objected to that word: I haven't heard any "F's" object to being called flexible but "R's" sure hate to be called "rigid". I forget which "R's" it was, but Regulated, as far as the meaning of the word is concerned, has more to do with what a person does with his R than the fact that he is an R (the Primitive Characteristics). If you take an R individual who is uncompensated, I would call this person rigid and even call him certainly "unregulated". If he is an R individual who does well on the Similarities, this indicated control of his primitive tendency, or change. It is an indication that he regulated because he hasn't really become an F but he has regulated his R in an effective, productive, useful way. In the same way, the F or Flexible individual who does not do well on the Similarities is an individual who is unable to utilize control or adapt. He is moving in a compensated or rigid direction. Consequently,

an F individual without control (low Similarities) is rigid.

(Again, you see why we stop and talk about I and E--we get tired and it doesn't quite fit).

Now this second relationship (Block design and Similarities) can be shown in the same way as with the I and E situation. This is because I have fallen in love with the Gertrude Reimer carbon ring method of presentation, and it didn't come to me on the top of a bus as the carbon ring did.

+BD +S   -BD   -S
   (1)   (3)

+BD -S   -BS   +S
   (2)   (4)

Now we can call a person R if he has a high Block Design and F if we are dealing with a low Block Design and it can be illustrated the way we did with the I's or E's in that it has the same effect in relation to the Digit Span. Theoretically, whether Digit Span is high or low, that is, I or E, the high Arithmetic compensates it. A lot of people really get lost when we start talking about R's and F's because the relationships are a bit different (e.g., low Block Design F's are not compensated by high Similarities).

I don't know whether you can show factor loadings, but the Similarities subtest, because of the nature of the test, requires that you see relationships. You are asked to show a certain amount of flexibility. The F individual, if he is functioning adequately, is going to perform on that Similarities subtest with relatively little stress or anxiety. It is a relatively easy job for him--simple. On the other hand, because the

Similarities require a certain amount of change in focus, seeing relationships, and lack of rigidity, the R finds it very difficult. It takes effort and energy and awareness--it takes learning for the R individual to do well on Similarities.

Consequently, if you start out with an individual who is a high Block Design person and he does very well on the Similarities this is an indication that he had changed or controlled; he has compensated or done something with his initial rigidity. He is now beginning to develop a certain amount of flexibility or a certain amount of change. A good performance, therefore, on the Similarities subtest for him, is an indication of compensation of R tendencies. If a low Block Design is not doing well on that Similarities, it is an indication that he is hostile toward sensitivity. A low Similarities score for him therefore, is an indication of change or compensation of F tendencies. (We are switching at this point and this is why a lot of people get lost when we talk about R's and F's after I's and E's). If you think about this in terms of my own theoretical bias, you would consider that because the F individual has a talent for Similarities, you expect him to do well. If he doesn't do well it is much more significant than it is when the R individual does not do well on Similarities. The R individual might not have learned to see relationships--he must learn to compensate. So an individual who is high Block Design--who is R, and is compensated because he has a high Similarities, can be compared with the low Block Design individual--who is F, and is compensated because he has low Similarities. It is here, at the compensated "Basic" level that I first began to use the term "look alikes". They are "look alikes" because their general behavior, as it is manifested, has very much in common. If

you look at the other two combinations here, the compensated R, or the Rc (+BD +S) and the compensated F, or the Fc (-BD -S), they look different from each other. The Rc will look F and the Fc will look R; they are not "look alikes". Remember that there are "look alikes" also with the I and the E at the Basic level. You couldn't get the Rc individual, in any kind of test, to ever admit that he is an R. There is absolutely nothing wrong with being an Rc, an f*, but there is hardly an R that I know who will fight tooth and nail when you tell them they are an R. This is because of the rigidity and the logic-tight compartmentalization that they have. In therapy they are absolutely certain they understand what the problem is, but they are never going to be very vulnerable to any kind of change. Now the F's are almost always delighted when you tell them they are F. This is something nice to be, except when you tell them they are prone to sexual promiscuity and low threshold emotionality. They cry easily, but when you tell them this they say, "I never cry easily--I overcame it". He has admitted right there that he has cried easily! (For us F's it's really hard to work with R's--us F's have a hard life. I'm convinced that the R's are taking over the world!)

When you get into the compensated or Basic configurations, you get into some nasty things about F's. The Rc and the Ru can in general terms can be described as mean-- not like mean as in average, but like in "mean". You can, however, differentiate the Ru person as being cruel. That cruelty of the Ru is lack of insight. We say to him: "you just don't understand me; you are cruel to me". When an Rc is mean, he is mean for a reason and he is mean for a reason that is highly socially acceptable. He says to us; "I would never punish you

unless you deserve it; it's all for your own good". In "mean" applied to the Fc we will substitute the word "sadistic". The cruelty here is that they really know how to hurt a guy. They are moving in the direction of taking advantage of an individual's vulnerability, and they then stomp on them! The Ru and the Fc are "look alikes". They are both cruel, but for different reasons.

Now the Fu, or the uncompensated F can be mean too, in spite of the fact that they don't like to admit it. Just like the Rc, the Fu is only cruel when necessary. Their sadistic behavior has more of a punitive quality, and they say, "If you do that, you will be sorry. I'll get even with you". They use sarcasm, ridicule, or they ignore somebody. One of the best ways an Fu can be sadistic, especially to the Rc when the Rc gets really mad, is for the Fu to pay no attention to him. Both are operating in their meanness, but operating in two quite different directions. So much for the early development of the R and the F.

Now we still have in the back of our minds the little bit about those criminals; the phenomena of those individuals in prison having high Picture Arrangement. This held up. Whatever the validity studies have been, they haven't ruined that, (but I don't know about the WAIS-R yet). A problem with this did come up on an item in the WAIS, which in my opinion, should be scored in reverse in that it is the A's who miss it and the U's who get it.

Back at the time when all of this was being formulated, I was becoming very convinced that there were people who did very well in the Picture Arrangement and those who didn't do well on the test. This was just like the people who didn't do well in the Digit Span or Block Design that we

have already talked about, and it isn't a matter of lack of intelligence. There was something else I thought was beginning to operate. One time I got hold of four years of back issues of Punch magazine. I was going to find cartoons in Punch which I hoped would be tested out someday and we could get some that U's would do well on and the A's would not. I never found in Punch anything I could use. That was an example of the many side roads I rode on.

Anyway, it was quite obvious that there was something peculiar operating with the Picture Arrangement. Although all of the people I was seeing in Washington were not bright Harvard students, there were a lot of Yale's, Dartmouth's and Brown's, and suddenly, believe it or not, a few coming from Texas A&M for a particular kind of program. About this time I spent some time in a New York hospital, Cornell University Medical School. There was a study made while I was there which, like so many other studies, I promptly lost. I can't remember exactly what it was called, but it was a doctoral dissertation by a maternity nurse from the New York University Maternity Ward. What she was interested in was the initial action of babies. One of the things that came out of this study was that it didn't make any difference if you talked and worked with nurses on a maternity ward, the minute a baby was brought in for final processing before being taken to the mother, a nurse would react positively or negatively to this poor little runt. As far as many of us could see, there wasn't much difference between one newborn baby an another, but there was a definite preference on the part of the nurses. I could remember a period of time when I was a father standing at the window looking at those little babies out there. Others outside were pointing, but it was never my baby they were

pointing at. I would say: "someday you ought to see my baby over there" but it turned out my baby was a U-baby.

The U individual, as an example, is the last one on a baseball team to be picked when in school you choose-up sides. In my own case I was always the last one chosen, so I had two choices. I could either learn how to play baseball so good they would choose me, regardless of whether they hated my guts, or I could go away and have nothing to do with baseball. I chose the latter. There are plenty of examples of where a U individual cannot gain acceptance without a certain kind of demonstrated perform- ance. The U individual must really prove his capacity before gaining acceptance.

In the early grades, the A child can appear to be reading so well that no one ever tests him on it. The U child is likely told that he is not paying attention and he likely is made to prove he can read. Now the very pressure of making that U child prove he can read means by the third grade he can read. They will have to teach the A child to read because he has not been put under any pressure to learn. So now to think back about those bright Harvard students who do not do well on Picture Arrangement; it is not likely that high achieving people come from these U children. People had to be high achieving in order to get into Harvard, so it is not surprising that Harvard would have a high loading of U individuals. Back in the Oklahoma data, the ones that knew the crab leg was missing on the Picture Completion were the U (low Picture Ar- rangement) individuals who were paying attention. They were Uc because although they did poorly on Picture Arrangement, they did well on Picture Completion.

At this point we have groups for what is

both the Primitive and the Basic levels.

The third dimension, Role Adaptive (A) - Role Uniform (U), is not elaborated upon in such a way as to render the reader an "inside" understanding from the transcript of Gittinger's lecture. Risking Presumptu- ousness, we might consider that this group can also be visualized within the Gertrude Reimer style using Picture Arrangement as the Primitive measure and Picture Comple- tion as the compensator at the Basic level.

+PA   +PC   -PA   +PC
   (1)   (2)

+PA   -PC   -PA   -PC
   (3)   (4)

These subtests are the core of the "social dimension" and Picture Arrangement, a measure of initial, or Primitive social intel- ligence. Picture Completion then, reveals the degree to which an individual has either learned to pay attention to social clues (if - PA +PC) or has learned to ignore social cues (if +PA -PC). These two patterns rep- resent the compensated adjustments, the Uc in the former, and Ac in the latter.

As we would expect the Primitive F, be- cause of his ability to see relationships, to do well in the Similarities, we could expect the Primitive A, because of his social awareness, to do well on the Picture Com- pletion. The A views the Picture Comple- tion task in a social context, i.e., zeroing in, so to speak, on the important details. When he fails to do well on the Picture Comple- tion, it is assumed that he also ignores these cues or details in social interactions. In terms of "look alikes", groups (1) and (2) both look A but the difference is that the latter has learned to be Role Adaptive. Likewise, groups (3) and (4) both look U.

"undesirable", but like the R's who resent being called "rigid", the U's also wanted to be called something different. Again, he said, "there's nothing wrong with being a U. I'm one myself. It depends upon what you do with your U". (A.C., Ed.)}.