

Please note these are semi-edited transcripts and may contain some inaccuracies

GORDON ALLPORT:

-don't hear about except in academic circles; chair of psychology department at Harvard much longer than anyone else -- taught the first class on personality in the U.S. and wrote the first textbook on personality -- his students have been the people who carried on personality research more than anyone else in the world.

Background: father - medical doctor - unusual - compassionate - took in injured/sick homeless people; family extremely religious - Protestant piety - emphasis on good works. Do works like Jesus; emulate that life style. 4th son in family and had older brother, physicist - built first atomic bomb - Allport felt he did not match up to older brother - brilliant student - spelling - self-effacing, quiet, learned all people equal before God - psych faculty at Harvard had to wait while he finished conversation with janitor - studied in Germany/England/U.S. - taught at Istanbul Born 1897, came of age intellectually in late teens and 20's. Age of roaring 20s which started end of WWI - 1918- time of ideas o Einstein & Russell were popular, but also took in the first inklings of the quantum theorists. They talked about the next stage of the evolution of physics, particularly around relativity, Bohr/Heisenberg - popularization of quantum theory centers around the idea of Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty. This is mathematical expression in physics, but popularization of it is you can't know everything and some things are in principle unknowable. In physics this means that if you measured this, you can't measure something else, cause measurement of the first thing will interfere with the measurement of the second thing and the other part of it is some things simply can't be told - they are probabilistic - that is they aren't determined in any way that we can know - but in a certain proportion of the time they happen this way.

So, here's Allport who comes from this family doing its best to emulate Jesus and he comes into a world of relativity, a world in which all systems are self-contradictory - Einstein/Russell and a world in which, at least in principle, some things are unknowable. So what kind of theory did he develop from that point of view? Is reality dependent on the point of view of the observer? Are all logical systems contradictory? Are some things in principle unknowable, so you can only predict them in a probable way and never really in a deterministic way?

The first thing is he wanted to disagree with Murray. Murray said that personality is essentially in the eye of the beholder, personality is a construct of the observer. Allport said that can't be right. The question he asked is did Robinson Caruso have a personality before Friday comes to his island. Allport says yes of course he does. What do we mean by personality? We mean the things that organizes and governs within us.

"We must have something inside our skins that constitutes our true nature. Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine characteristic behavior and thought." Allport

It's an organization. What goes on in us is not random, but there is some kind of predictability about it. There is some orderly aspect to it. It's dynamic. The organization we have of ourselves is constantly changing. So that the self or the person you are today, is not the person you were six months ago or a year or 5 years or 10 years because you are constantly changing. What this internal organization does is it determines characteristic, behavior and thought. Characteristic - is the probabilistic point of view. He doesn't think that things are entirely predictable, but what we can do is we can observe trends and tendencies, both in individual and group behavior. This is what his characteristic means.

So we have some kind of changing organization in ourselves that nonetheless is predictable to the extent of talking about trends and probabilities. He suggests that personality is very different for adults than it is for children. Infants don't have personality as adults do. They have temperament, their different instinctual and physical states that we are born with, but they don't have personality. Personality is that very personal development that organizes what we do in the world and every person as far as we know is different from every other person so that we are all different from one another. So you as an individual in some ways are unlike every other person, however there are

some ways in which you can be grouped with other people, and some ways in which each of us is like everyone else and we need to understand all three levels if we want to understand the person. Now understanding this, we note that the individual is actually so complex that we can't really predict behavior very well. I talked to one of Allport's students and he said that behavior is about 50% predictable. We cannot fully predict because people are simply too complex to really predict.

What do we want to do? We have to uh that there IS no way we are going to understand people that is going to capture that full complexity . No model is adequate or will ever be adequate. No model in principle can be adequate. So his theory from the get-go he's saying I know it's not the real thing, so what good is it? We have to adopt a model of personality according to the problem we are trying to solve. We are never studying personality in an abstract way, we are always doing it for some purpose and we should adopt a theory of personality that best lets us understand what we want to know.

Instead of having a theory of personality -- we have to have a modifiable one. So just as in physics when you are building a bridge might want to use Newtonian physics, and if you want to measure the path of light of gravitational fields, you'll want to use relativistic physics and if you want to study the relations between sub-atomic particles, you want to use quantum theories. With personality what we would have to do is we have to adopt a flexible point of view, knowing that different ways of thinking about it will work best for different problems. So that in essence, no single theory of personality is truly possible. What we are doing is trying to do particular things, rather than getting a picture of the whole personal universe. Allport said there is no unified theory of personality.

There is no theory that will ever be adequate. We have to think of the kinds of theories there are at the early part of the century. The dominate points of view were psychoanalysis and behaviorism. Allport said that these models that assume absolute universe and absolute truth and causality are merely absurd. Any theory which adopts a positivistic are primarily absurd.

There is a big difference between understanding normal and abnormal personality and understanding normal personality is by far the larger and more important task (in agreement with Murray) he is interested in studying normal people. He says that we take normality for granted and truly we understand it but little.

His research focused on what he called the qualities of wholesome individuals. He said we truly don't know what they are and we need to do that before we start worrying about pathology .

"Every mental function is embedded in personal life and in studying people's functions in life without the coordinating concept of a self it is impossible to account for the interaction of psychological processes. A person or personality is the originator, regulator and the medium of the states and processes which psychologists examine." So we are not trying to analyze relationship between observable behavior and things outside of us and our actions. We are not looking at visual and auditory space, we are looking at my space and the space of experience. Personality is a complex thing. It's the thing that unifies the various diverse parts of mental function.

This unity is an attainment that is never quite complete. We are trying to put together the diverse parts of our mind into some kind of personal whole. The way we tend to do this is by having some kind of goal or goals in life. The pursuit of those goals affects unification.

What kind of a personality theory can you come up with ? It's clear that we have some kind of organizing units in ourselves and he usually called \$e traits. Sometimes this psychology is called Trait Psychology, although he didn't like that designation himself. As a matter of fact, he wrote a book called Personality and devoted 4 chapters to describing the problems with trait psychology . But what are traits? Traits are both structure and process. Traits both are something and do something in the mind. These are there, are really in peoples minds, not just constructs, although the constructs we use to describe them will never fully capture them. Traits: Traits are neuro-psychic structures able to render many stimuli functionally equivalent and to guide equivalent behavior. "

Neuro-psyche means it is in both the physical part of us and the mental space of us. He doesn't think you can ever explain the mind purely from the physical states of the brain, although they are very closely linked. So even if you knew what every neuron in someone's brain was doing at any particular time, that would not necessarily tell you what was in their mind. ( ex. computer - software structure) You need both the psyche and the neuronal. You cannot understand a person without both.

What do these neuro-psyche structures do ? they render many stimuli functionally equivalent many stimuli: we never have the same stimulus twice in our lives. Everything is always new and unique. Even if there is someone we have known all our lives both them and our experience of them is constantly changing. The same is true of classes of things. ( ex. recorders on desk - black things )

What happens is the way we are organized leads us to make different kinds of stimuli the same in our mind. (ex. friend- perceived rejection in bar). Traits lead us to make things the same - we think this is one of these things. (tape recorder, table, etc.) we create meaning out of the world and we have some kind of organization in us that brings order to it. What it does is make these things equivalent when they are actually quite different.

To some extent our organizations are like everybody else. The way we organize things is both shared to some extent and individual to some extent. We tend to agree on the more simple sorts of things, the things that occur with frequency than the more complex and personal things there seems to be more of a difference.

Traits are what lead us to render things equivalent. Then we react to them. People react with great differences. ( ex. freeway - cars) You can think of traits as ways we describe people. They are descriptive both of the behavior and of the process that brings the behavior about. They bring about determination and external stimuli attitudes so when we are talking about attitudes we are talking about ways we render classes of stimuli equivalent. You can also talk about behavior. How many traits do you have? If we are going to study personality, for practical reasons, are we going to study a billion traits? Of course not, how many traits do you need to study to understand someone? There are some traits that determine more of our perceptions, that are called into play more often, so that if we were thinking about traits, some are important, more important in determining our thoughts and behaviors than are others. We have to take into account what we are studying. If we are studying personality in general, then for most people we can understand them most of the time by studying some kind of central traits. For most people there are 5 - 10 kinds of central traits or dispositions. ( disposition is a tendency towards action brought about by a trait )

Central dispositions are highly characteristic of the person and they are often called into play in the person's life. They are highly characteristic of the person - the most visible ones. Some of our traits are only occasionally called into play -- these *J* also a hierarchy of traits. Can be in conflict - need organization *j*

Some people are very dominated by a single trait or disposition, he called this a cardinal disposition- but this is unusual- so tht!QfRerins to this disposition.  
( ex. Scrooge - character )

else r t m open ent of one another. We have to integrate them. What you see over the course of a life is the attempt to integrate these diverse dispositions. If you want to understand someone, you need to know their intentions rather than actions. The intention tells you about their disposition and their actions are easy to misinterpret. People can do the same thing for widely varying reasons.

"Neonates don't have personality, they have physique and temperament. If you want to explain their behavior, you can refer to these, as well as the law of effect."

Law of effect: rewarded behavior tends to be repeated. Little kids do what gets them what they want. They lack distinctive characteristics which constitute personality or our true selves.

What is the chief difference between humans and other animals? We are self-aware. We think about ourselves in an abstract way. So we intellectually at least get outside of ourselves and look at ourselves doing things. Part of that is we create a sense of path. We have a sense of ourselves projected into the future and what we do as adults certainly is mostly a result of this sense we have of ourselves.

We develop this idea that there's an us and we think about ourselves. Our motives are a function of this reflection at least as much and maybe more than they are our circumstances or the temperament we have inherited. What we do is think about ourselves, not exactly an objective thinking -- we objectify ourselves--the way we think about ourselves has to do with how we are structured now, what we want, what we hope for, what we hope to avoid, what we remember about our past. So our motivations then occur within the framework of all this self-reflection that we are doing and that comes from the reflection and the experience we have had.

The result of this is that the motivations we have now, although they came from our past, are independent of it. The motivations we have developed thought our past, but actually are independent of it. So that if we did something for some reason when we were 10, we may want to do the same thing now, but it will be a very different kind of wanting that same thing now. Because we have been thinking about it since we were 10, and our wanting or appreciating that thing is now very different. and the motive for it is different than it was. In one of his books Allport gave an example of an old man who had been a sailor, he sailed the seas, because he was afraid he would starve if he didn't find a way to live and that was the best way he could find to live. At the time he was Allport's subject he was in his 50's and a President of a bank. And he described his longing for the sea.

Was his longing for the sea in his 50s the same as it was in his 20s? No it was a very different sort of thing. Originally he went there for one set of motivations and now he sailed his boat for very different motivations.

What we want may not change, but why we want it does. So it's not as Freud supposed that we develop these motivations as a child and keep them, rather we keep some of them, but they are all different. They are different because we've had so many years of thinking about ourselves and the world and all sorts of things and the motives are more and more as we age a result of this thinking about, rather than either external circumstances themselves, or our biological temperament per se. So in a sense he said we have more and more personality as we age. Newborn infants really don't have much of any personality. They have biological systems and temperament, but their unique personhood is just beginning. Whereas you and I have had decades of this personal development. The result of this is what he called the principle of functional autonomy. "Functional autonomy regards adult motives as varied and as self-sustaining contemporary systems growing out of antecedent systems but functionally independent of them. "

Antecedent systems: prior systems

Allport once said all motives occur in the present. So it is not the case that we are having the same motives over and over again. They may lead us towards the same thing, we may act in the same way, but the motives themselves are now. They are different from the motives in the past because we as a person have grown, changed, and developed, primarily as a result of thinking about things, so that now it is a different motive.

Allport also once wrote that the most important year for understanding a person is last year . The least important year is their first year .

However you are now, you could have had different first year experiences and still got to where you are now. What's more whatever your first year experiences you could have gotten somewhere else then you are now from them.

What he is doing is putting into psychological terms, quantum theory . So what's happening now could have happened for different reasons and whatever the earlier states they could have resulted in different states now. Whatever is left over or whatever effect that first year has had on you has kind of come through a whole succession of steps and each one of those steps could have altered the direction of that, either a little or a lot, so that what is true now is you have motivations and

you could trace them back in a train when you were 1, but they are not caused by 1 or 2, 3, 4 etc. up to now. You can always change. You can change at any age. So the effect that happened when you were 1 could be altered by your reflection, what goes through your mind.

If you really want to understand someone, you can't tell what someone's like now from what happened when they were one, although there usually is some kind of relationship. The truth is to understand someone you have to understand them in the present. Our past has been altered by our self-reflection. Otherwise, we are doomed and victims of our circumstances. Therapy has no chance. This is not the case. Our motives now are different in time, rather than just in degree because our motives depend, not so much on our biological background, but on our history of contemplation, our history of thinking about things. There is kind of a momentum in our thoughts about ourselves and about the world.

These are self-sustaining systems. We come to view the world this way and this shapes what we see, feel, experience, how we think about it. So we construe circumstances according to whatever we have done before to a large extent and we go forward from here, always with the certainty that we can think differently than we have in the past. If this is not the case, why are you wasting your time in this room? We do change the way we think. We always are changing it in small ways, and sometimes we change it in larger ways.

There is value in personal development. We all have some capacities that we do need to develop. These self-reflections that we have give us a sense of what these capacities and that direction is for us. What we decide the way is good that we want is what leads us to do the things that we do.

We differ in the ways we think. As adults we are much more different from one another than we were as small children. If you look at 1 yr old, 5 yr. old, and then go up to 25 and up what we see is an exponential curve in the different ness of people. The difference among 1 yr. olds is much smaller than the difference among 31 yr. olds. and the reason for that is because we do derive these cognitive systems in which we think about ourselves and ourselves in the world and who we are is a result of that thinking about you might call it learning, it's not independent of our circumstances, but it could be different given our circumstances. So more and more we diverge from each other when we age. In some sense, 60 yr. olds have more personality than 30 yr. olds. They are more different than each other, they are more individual.

So that motives occur in the present, they grow out of the past but because they are now embedded in our cognitive system, they are independent of the past. WE have many types of motives and these thought processes about things are the forces that are most effective, that is the ones that are most powerful in our minds. Not all motives become independent of their past. We all have the motive to breath, thirst, the same motive happening over and over again during our life, it starts getting mixed up with things, certain brands, etc.

People go different directions because of the way we think about things. There is a continuous branching off, a continuous differentiation of people.

We have some central ideas about ourselves. The things that are most personal and important to us and these he called the PROPRIUM. They develop in stages. You might think of this as our self. - the most important part of our self.

If were to ask you who you were - what would you say? What is the first sense of self, of.

1. **I as a body.** This is to most of us very central and it is like our first classification of the world. The first differentiation between what's me and what's not me. ( ex. spit on a spoon - outside - not part of you - becomes not me)

2. **I am continuous.** We have the believe that we are the same person we were when we were five. There is some sense of continuous identity . This is quite an irrational assumption. It is quite likely that there is no atom in your body that was there when you were five. Quite literally our atoms come and go. This idea we have about a self is actually an idea. If we could somehow label atoms and look for them 20 yrs. later, where would they be? 99.99% would be different. We all believe we are real, most of the time. This is a thought pattern. The evidence for it is not absolute, but this is what we all think. We make the inference that I is continuous.

3. **Self-esteem/Pride.** We are self-seeking. We want to get the good things. We want to preserve our self. We want to see ourselves as one up on other people, we want people to think

positively of us; we like to be good to ourselves. Infants haven't thought that far ahead. This is something that develops.

These first 3 things happen in roughly the first 3 years of life, but they overlap and they go on.

4. **Self-extension.** Sense of mine. What's mine and not yours. We connect ourselves with other people especially with nonliving things as well. They (some of them) become part of our sense of who we are. My tricycle, my BMW. Some things are part of our sense of self and other things are not. (ex. clothes, what someone thinks of us)

Our experience and thinking of our experience.

Around the time we start grade school we develop a self-image. This is seeing ourselves as an object. Before this time, children see themselves from inside out mainly. Around age 4 - 6 we begin to see ourselves from the outside and we begin when we do that to be able to think about the ways we might be that are different than the ways we are. And we begin thinking of ways we would like us to be. We develop an ideal self and we compare ourselves with this ideal. This ideal is not fixed, it changes. The important thing is the objectification of self. See ourselves from the outside in. Objective in that we think of ourselves as an object.

Proprium & development of proprium (develops in steps, not really stages)

8 aspects to self or Proprium development.

5. Self-image. Comes to include idea of what we want to be. requires that you are looking at yourselves. have image of self as an object. have image of what we are like, and expect others to react to us as we wish to be. we wish we were different at least in some ways because in this objectification of self having that image of self allows us to compare that image with alternative images in our own mind. some of these images we compare ourselves with are outside of us, we compare ourselves with other people. But most importantly we form an ideal of self and we want us to be like that. What does that do for us? Makes most of us feel inadequate. Also it gives us a sense of direction, gives us a sense of where we want to go. That sense of direction is very important.

6. Self-awareness. Our capacity to think about ourselves and what we are doing as we are doing it. We not only have this objective view of self, but we begin to watch the way we do things and we begin to think about is that the way I want to do things. is that the best way to do things -- the best way to think, feel and look at things? This allows us to use a whole variety of strategies in coping with the world. We can think about what we are doing and we can decide is that something that works. If not, can I do something different. If do that what will happen. This is what we need to engage in more complex kinds of tasks. (ex. word problems - harder than regular math problems - require you to think about what do I have to do - if you see plus or minus - that tells you what to do )

To solve difficult problems, you have to make an assessment of your capacities and the resources you have and their applicability to the problems. This kind of self-reflection is what this stage is about and it gets more complicated. .Qm-.:This is the stage of self that tends to happen after we have that first sense of the capacity to see ourselves as object. ee okLa.nd we can look at how we solve problems, whether they are internal or external.

This takes us up through grade school. that's our development of self and then we hit puberty. What do we begin to do then? We begin thinking about ourselves not in a narrow way, but why do I want to do.... and is that something I really want to want.

7. Propriate striving. (adolescence) So what we begin doing in adolescence is, we have our self as an object, we have the capacity to think about our self as a process, and we begin to think about what are the ends that I want to work towards having these capacities to work. He once said that as a propriate striver, we become a fighter for ends. That is, we seek the ultimate ends of human life. We think about how to get them and how to get in these long range directions that we want to go. We begin to think about very remote purposes. What are the ends towards which I am going to move. This is the thing that organizes our adult personality for the

most part. Our adult personality is organized around the long-range goals that we have, and beginning in adolescence we begin to do long range planning. You all have a long-range plan. This plan has to do with what you think is valuable in life. This is not a given. If we did a poll we would find we would differ with somebody on what is important in life.

As we pursue these goals and they are different, we become more different from each other and having the various traits that we do, and the means to organize them, we use our long-range goals as a way of organizing those traits and those traits as a way of pursuing the goals.

8. Self as knower. happens and continues in adult life. (sometimes included, sometimes not)

Typically becomes prominent only in middle-age or later. begin to know that I am the one that has actually done all the other 7 (steps of development), so I'm the one who's set up these long-range goals for myself, who's planned all this stuff, who reflects on these plans, who has made up an objective view of myself and the ideal with which I compare myself, I am the one who connects me to all the others, it's my mind. The truth is here we are in class and we have different senses of connection between people in the class and people outside the class. In some sense they are not real, we made them all up. Are you connected with your mother? No you're not, you're right there, she's somewhere else. It's not real, there's nothing there.

It's us who thinks we should win the lottery, it's us who thinks we're continuous, it's us who thinks we are somehow different from everything else. Having both the appropriate striving (the sense of self of someone who has a sense of direction) and the self-reflection on it, ends up developing the personality even further. What happens is that we form intentions that are teleological, that is our goals end up being ones that develop our self. Because we are thinking about our self now: we think I'm this way now, I was that way; and I now want to be that way, these are the things I am going to do that are going to lead me in that direction.

Also, they are in our minds, no where else. We make them up. We can take your genes, body, same nourishment, everything and transplanted to 1,000 years ago and these ideas would all be different--they are in no way inherent in you. The ideas you have about the ends you want to strive towards and this ideal self you want to become are no way inherent in you. Contrary to Jung, who said it was all there, Allport says we make it all up.

So what is it you are trying to become? It's something you can make up. If you were born in 1900 it would be different; if you were born in a different culture it would be different. The similarity is in that we set these up. That's what it is to be human is to set up these kinds of things. If you lose them, you are in real trouble. You ever have a sense of your dreams being gone? It's a terrible place to be.

The final aspect of these directions or goals or emphasis, they are not only teleological, but they are tension maintaining. They give us a sense of need. They keep us moving towards these ends that we've selected. They maintain us in a state of tension, so that even if all your physical needs are met, you'll still wake up with reasons to get out of bed. You make up some purpose for your life. If you don't have these, then you don't have reason to get up in the morning. They maintain us in a state of tension, which motivates us to move towards them.

quote from Allport: "Mature appropriate striving is linked to long-range goals which are strictly speaking physical. The devoted parent never loses concern for his child. The scientist creates more and more questions. One measure of our intellectual maturity is our capacity to feel less and less satisfied with our answer to better and better problems."

What happens is in the course of doing this we develop our Personal Maturity. This has several aspects. definition of maturity . this is what happens when we engage in appropriate striving and come to know that we are making it up. So we are both striving for our self and know we are striving for our self - the last two stages of development. We know our self in our appropriate striving--striving to develop what is most important in us and to us. Maturity is the result of that appropriate striving and our examination of our self as appropriate strivers.

What we get out of this is unifying philosophy. From his point of view our direction in life is cognitive, it's our ideas, what we've made up. Our philosophy of life ends up allowing us to make sense of whatever comes our way, as well as giving us a sense of justification for the way we are

living. This philosophy has to include satisfying self-extensions to work, to a variety of people, spouse, family, friends, as well as to activities, like hobbies, pastimes, groups, directions. So that this self-extension in maturity leads to a sense of connection with all others. "We develop the capacity for compassionate and loving relationships free of crippling possessiveness and jealousy."

Part of this mature capacity for compassion and its self extension includes the dissolving of our prejudices. In being prejudice we all think that only these kind of people are appropriate for me to be caring about. We might think that we are free of these prejudices, but the truth is we are mostly not. We group people into those we matter and those that don't. We actually begin to have a sense of compassion and connection with everybody - condemned murderers, pimps, thieves. We begin to have compassion for the kinds of people we really don't like.

Next, we begin to develop emotional security or balance. This includes acceptance of self and our knowledge of self. In particular this balance is related to the self as knower. What are you put off balance from? frustration - people don't do what we want; we don't get what we want. Sense of frustration with the way you want yourself and others to be.

how you think about things - setting up expectations - how people should act.

Almost all the things we want are our own creations. So we create almost all of our own frustrations. Our frustrations are not real, they are in our minds. they are the consequences of these thoughts that we have and these thoughts are this is who I am, this is where I go, at some point we can begin to reflect on all that - here I am, I am frustrated again. why am I frustrated? because I made up these rules about myself and the world or I had these expectations. Are your expectations met in life? sometimes, and sometimes not You get balance when you realize, I have this expectation that hasn't been met. so, there it goes, is this a bad thing in life? no because it is all something I'm doing. You are always going to end up frustrated. We have these unattainable goals, we get this thing, we want that thing then the next thing.

Frustration is almost all of this stuff we make up, our own creations, inevitable. We are always going to be frustrated as long as we are wanting things. \* \* \* \*

The purpose of having these whole cognitive structures is to keep us in some state of frustration. without frustration - no tension to keep us moving in life.

Humor - compassionate - mature rather than biting. always going to want to be different because of capacity to see greater ideals. made-up ideals. want to live life by - but just a way of structuring life. the frustrations of not being what I want to be is just because I selected this ideal. as we become self-accepting we develop emotional security and are not bothered by frustration frustration is just opportunity to progress in direction we set out for

We become more realistic. We are less caught up in our idealism about ourselves and the world and we especially become more realistic about our own strengths and weaknesses.

realism leads us to more and better striving - sense of connection and capacity to do things - do things for own pleasure - boring not to do this. Spend less time spinning wheels in idealistic frustration.

These thoughts that we have and these thoughts are this is who I am, this is where I go, at some point we can begin to reflect on all that - here I am, I am frustrated again. why am I frustrated? because I made up these rules about myself and the world or I had these expectations. Are your expectations met in life? sometimes, and sometimes not You get balance when you realize, I have this expectation that hasn't been met. so, there it goes, is this a bad thing in life? no because it is all something I'm doing. You are always going to end up frustrated. We have these unattainable goals, we get this thing, we want that thing then the next thing.

Frustration is almost all of this stuff we make up, our own creations, inevitable. We are always going to be frustrated as long as we are wanting things. \* \* \* \*

The purpose of having these whole cognitive structures is to keep us in some state of frustration. without frustration - no tension to keep us moving in life.

Humor - compassionate - mature rather than biting. always going to want to be different because of capacity to see greater ideals. made-up ideals. want to live life by - but just a way of structuring life. the frustrations of not being what I want to be is just because I selected this ideal.

as we become self-accepting we develop emotional security and are not bothered by frustration  
frustration is just opportunity to progress in direction we set out for  
We become more realistic. We are less caught up in our idealism about ourselves and the world  
and we especially become more realistic about our own strengths and weaknesses.  
realism leads us to more and better striving - sense of connection and capacity to do things - do  
things for own pleasure - boring not to do this. Spend less time spinning wheels in idealistic  
frustration.

## **Glossary**

Cardinal Disposition – a personal disposition which dominates the personality such as Ebenezer Scrooge's greed or Captain Ahab's pursuit of the white whale – most people do not have cardinal dispositions.

Central Disposition – a disposition which is highly characteristic of the person and is often called into play in dealing with a variety of situations.

Disposition – an individual organization which leads them to behave in somewhat predictable manners and leads them to perceive situations in characteristic ways.

Traits – shared commonalities between people used when using the nomothetic approach to thinking about personality.

Functional Autonomy – a motive that originally had a particular goal that later becomes an end in itself.

Idiographic – in depth study of individuals and their functioning.

Nomothetic – study of groups of people searching for general rules.

Propriate Striving – setting and pursuing long range goals that are practically unattainable but which give meaning and direction to life.

Proprium – what is most personal and important to the person.

### Stages of the Development of the Proprium

1. Bodily Self – intellectual understanding of our self as a distinct entity.
2. Self Identity – belief that we continue without break across time.
3. Self Esteem – pride, self seeking and self-preservation, competitiveness.
4. Self Extension – sense of connection of self with other things and people.
5. Self Image – objective view of one's self.
6. Self Awareness – capacity to use self awareness to solve problems
7. Propriate Striver – creation of long range goals and the motive to move towards those goals.
8. Self as Knower – knowing that the other aspects of self are intellectual creations of self.