

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

### University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA  
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green  
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

7902551

**NIBLE, ROBERT THOMAS  
INTERACTIONALLY BASED MODELS OF PERSONALITY  
IN A THERAPEUTIC SETTING.**

**CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, P.H.D., 1978**

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1978

ROBERT THOMAS NIBLE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

INTERACTIONALLY BASED MODELS OF PERSONALITY IN A THERAPEUTIC SETTING

by

ROBERT T. NIBLE

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate  
Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1978

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

9/14/78  
date

*Larry Chevelf*  
Chairman of Examining Committee

9/14/78  
date

*Reginald Bennett*  
Executive Officer

*Jorge Castro*

*William Lombardi*

*Mr. Brown*  
Supervisory Committee

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This analysis is the product of many people. Those whose thought directed and helped to focus mine. And those whose support and encouragement gave me the energy to continue.

To Edmund Husserl, Alfred Schutz, and Harold Garfinkel goes the credit for the theoretical tradition utilized here.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to Lindsey Churchill whose aid, direction, guidance and encouragement (both local and transatlantic) focused this task over the last several years. I am only now beginning to realize the effectiveness of his "method of production."

My thanks to William Kornblum, George Psathas, and especially Michael Brown for their valuable and penetrating comments concerning the content of this analysis.

My gratitude to Muriel Bennett whose professional expertise greatly contributed to the preparation of the manuscript.

I would particularly like to thank my friends: Patrick Tarantino, Nathaniel Wright, Winifred Frankel, Jay Silverman, and Richard Frankel. Their continued support has made this task possible.

And finally, I am especially grateful to, and thankful for, Lynda whose love, faith, and consistent putting-up-with has sustained me through this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK . . . . . 9

III ANALYSIS: CONFERENCE #1 . . . . . 37

    TRANSCRIPT: CONFERENCE #1 . . . . . 193

IV ANALYSIS: CONFERENCE # 2 . . . . . 218

    TRANSCRIPT: CONFERENCE #2 . . . . . 261

GLOSSARY OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF PERSONALITY WORK . . . . . 267

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 275

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 276

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

"J: I think in this case it is the best thing to do. I think "E"s case because then, I mean, the wall can only stand so long, right? I mean if more and more pressure comes in, that wall has got to crumble.

R: Or it may get stronger..

J: No, I don't believe that in "E"s case. I mean that "E" is leaving because the pressure is great. Now I mean that clicked with "ML"s thing..

R: That's what I'm saying..

J: Beginning to break..

R: That's why that kind of pressure..

J: The kids are beginning to pick up, "LU"s right, the kids are begging to pick up on "ML"s..

R: That's what I'm saying, exactly that. That kind of pressure is not going to break her. She'll run. She won't break. She'll just split, go someplace else, turn off, switch, dodge, duck.. you are not going to push the wall over.. you have to ease her out from behind it.."

Case Conference 1/30/76

Such "personality talk" is common in the course of day-to-day interaction. Through such talk common sense members in the world are able to "make sense" of others (and as we shall see, themselves). Members experience no difficulty in this "doing" of personality. Although the specific nature of a given personality may be subject to debate, the existence of a personality is taken as unquestioned fact.

The focus of this research will be the nature of the process of the common sense production of personalities. The analytic stance assumed here will assert that personality is not what it appears to be. It is not

a clear, objective, real thing in the world that directs a member's action. It is we suggest, rather a construct, an accomplishment, and very much built rather than discovered. While this perspective clearly runs counter to the common sense notion of personality, the analysis presented here will display that this common sense notion of personality is an illusion. This analysis will focus on the common sense notion of personality and attempt to explicate some of its essential features and dynamics. It will not take the form of a theory of personality, but rather will seek to examine the ways in which members in the world orient to the notion of personality. Further, it will display a conceptual framework which, hopefully, allows the observer to witness the creation of a personality. This act of creation, we suggest, is not the act of discovery but rather the act of construction. The personality, both as concept and specific description of an individual, is the product of the application of a set of rules. It is the product and the artifact of those rules. It is the product of a method.

For the reader this analysis will perhaps be a difficult experience. It requires a reorienting, for it requires the reader to "watch" the interaction in what may be a novel way. First the reader will note that language is used in unusual and what may seem inappropriate ways. A glossary of major terms and ideas has been provided (see Appendix 1). Further in the theoretical section of this analysis the framework utilized will be outlined.

The setting of this research is a rehabilitation program for adolescent drug abusers (see "Setting"). In this setting "personality" becomes a highly distilled and focused phenomenon. It comes to stand in relief and in such a way that analysis is facilitated. The rehabilitation

program may be seen as a social repair station. Its function is to locate those members who are malfunctioning in the social world and, through the application of a set of practices, to repair them.

The specific focus of this analysis will be the features of what we will call "personality work." Personality work is a set of practices or rules that create the notion of personality and, in this setting, go about repairing the created personality. For members the experience of personality work is that of discovery. There is the sense that the personality exists in the individual and that others can come to "see" this personality. The sense very clearly is that the personality exists in the member and not the observer. This analysis means to show that, in fact, the personality is a "story" told about the individual in order to provide an explanatory framework that "makes sense" of his/her behavior. It is important that the member may tell this story about himself as well as he/she might tell it about others. This analysis will attempt to explicate the dynamics by which this "story" is produced.

Personality work is an essentially social activity. Its existence is grounded in the rules that maintain the integrity of interactive social order. Perhaps the most essential of the skills displayed by members in the world is the aforementioned ability to "make sense" of events. It appears that this "sense" is made through the application of a set of rules, a grammar that accomplishes the description. The sense that the description of the specific event is "real" is apparently an artifact of this same set of rules. This analysis will attempt a beginning explication of this set of practices.

The specific data examined for this set of practices consist of transcripts of case conferences held concerning the clients of the

treatment program described above. As will become clear these data are indeed rich in such practices.

The reader should note that this analysis should be considered research in progress. The dynamics of personality work and reality construction in general are bewilderingly complex. The accomplishment of the common sense notion of personality is a marvel of interacting and overlapping dynamics. For members in the world the activity appears effortless; for the analyst the "simple" task of seeing the personality in an individual becomes complex almost beyond description. This analysis will attempt to outline the beginnings of a framework for the systematic organization of these dynamics. This framework is admittedly incomplete and tenuous, but it is a beginning. It will become clear that a full description of the dynamics of personality will constitute the work of a lifetime. The following analysis represents the beginning of that work.

#### Setting

The setting chosen for this research is a drug abuse prevention/intervention program located in the East Harlem area of New York City. For reasons of confidentiality this agency will be referred to here as "the program."

The function of the program is to provide service to drug abusing and so-called "drug abuse prone" adolescents. Adolescents with these problems are identified by staff members in the area schools and are then routed to whatever service is deemed appropriate. Clearly all of this jargon glosses a highly complex process and is itself fertile ground for study. This research, however, focuses on a different phase of the program.

One of the several types of possible service provided is an alternative school. The stated function of the alternative school is "academic and behavioral remediation." The program model states that a child moves into the area of drug abuse as the result of his or her failure to compete successfully in the traditional classroom. Due to academic insufficiency and/or maladaptive interactional "skills" the child is seen as unable to derive emotional satisfaction from the classroom. The program asserts that as a result of this "cycle of failure" the child turns away from the classroom as a source of satisfaction. Drug abuse as both activity and life style is seen as an alternative for the child and it is the program's function to either prevent or retrieve the child from that drug abuse. As such, then, drug abuse is seen by the program as both problem and symptom.

Treatment in the alternative school consists of academic remediation through an emphasis on basic skills (reading, writing, and math). Remediation is individually programmed and conducted in small groups. The primary evaluative tool is standardized testing.

Comcomitant with the academic program are regularly scheduled individual and group counselling sessions. Here the client is expected to discuss and thereby better understand his/her emotional needs. Constructive, i.e. pro-social, mechanisms for the satisfaction of these needs are presented. The utilization of these mechanisms is "reinforced" through staff and peer pressure.

Through the application of this bimodal treatment format it is expected that cooperative clients will upgrade functioning to a level sufficient to allow their successful return to the traditional classroom. Typically the duration of this treatment is four to nine months.

The staff of the program is an admixture of professionals and paraprofessionals. The bulk of the paraprofessionals are described as "ex-addicts," i.e. rehabilitated drug abusers. The "ex-addict" phenomenon is one unique to the substance abuse field. The fact of an individual's former pathology is taken as a qualification for the treatment of others. In fact, such experience is often substituted for all other credentials. The remainder of the paraprofessional staff share a broad base of what might best be referred to as community-based "anti-poverty" experience.

With such a heterogeneous staff there exists a variety of competing conceptual models ranging from traditional psycho-medical models to what we will come to call "folk positivism" (see Glossary). By this is meant a common sense model that shares the view of the fact of personality as existing in people, but is seen by members to lack the programmatic elegance of the more formal models. As we examine the personality work done at the program we will find the two models closely allied as methods.

The researcher is employed by the program as an administrator. His specific functions include funding proposal preparation, data collection and reporting, program design and modification, program evaluation, staff training, and general program development. In this role the researcher must assume at various times both the status of member and observer. That is, he performs the same personality work as other members of the staff and at other times assumes an analytic stance vis-à-vis that work. His presence in both roles in no way jeopardizes the validity of the research.

One of the major duties of the researcher is to conduct case conferences. These conferences which are held monthly for each client serve as the evaluative and policy-making setting. Conferences consist of all relevant staff and loosely follow a written format. As the conference parallels different phases of the client's career in the program its emphasis shifts. At the initial or intake conference the first ascription of personality is performed. It is here that a "base line" is established against which all future evaluations are made. At this conference the question confronted is, "who is the client?" It should be noted that this question is present in all conferences, though in some the answer appears less problematic for members.

A second agenda item at conferences along with the determination of the client's personality is the location of a specific problem. The fact of a client's dysfunction is in and of itself not considered specific enough for treatment. Problems must also be translated from organizational to personality terms. For instance, a "disruptive" child may be redefined as "hostile to authority" thereby precipitating a treatment strategy commensurate with such a problem.

Another central function of the conference is the evaluation of change in the client's personality. Here, if no positive change is "found," the treatment plan is modified or the client may be deemed inappropriate for this setting and referred to some other service agency.

It is also in the case conference setting that the formal determination of cure is made and the client is recommended for replacement into the traditional school.

The case conference then is the setting in which much of the personality work is brought into relief. It is there that the staff are

forced to be theoretic about the clients in a way that produces a record suitable for analysis. As such it distills and focuses the kind of personality work we are seeking to research. We assert, however, that this setting is not qualitatively different from most of the personality work in the world.

## CHAPTER II

### THEORETIC FRAMEWORK

#### I

In examining a phenomenon as complex as personality it perhaps is useful to explicate some of the basic assumptions or assertions of the research. If one were to, for one week, record the number of different contexts in which personality as an issue or topic were to occur, then its complexity would be more evident. There are individuals displaying personality through behavior, individuals attempting to make sense of that behavior through the location of personality. There are situations in which personality is the focus of employment as in behavioral rehabilitation programs. There is academic research seeking to examine the inner dynamic of personality. And there are myriad other contexts that offer personality as one of their features.

Let us talk then for a few moments about the view taken here. To do that we will utilize a "focusing" technique. We will start with a "wide angle" shot of social order and try to locate personality within it. Gradually we will try to refine the focus solely to personality while remembering that, as a process and phenomenon, it is totally grounded in that social order. It will be asserted here that social order is itself a product of a method. That is, the reality of the social world is "created" among its members. This creation incorporates not only the content of social order (e.g. specific proscriptions concerning specific behaviors),

but its form as well. The very structure of social order is assumed here to be a product.

This perspective follows from the phenomenological tradition as formulated by Husserl.<sup>1</sup> It finds the world to be the methodic accomplishment of its members and the product of techniques applied by them in the formation of meaning. This tradition has found current sociological grounding in the work of Schutz<sup>2</sup> and Garfinkel.<sup>3</sup> The reader is referred to these authors for a detailed grounding in this position. This analysis will not try to replicate the formulation of this tradition. Nor will it try to resolve critiques or other issues concerning these perspectives. Here the orientation of phenomenology as it is currently grounded in the ethnomethodological<sup>4</sup> tradition is utilized as a vehicle of analysis of the common sense notion of personality. The focus will be on common sense members of society accomplishing the everyday sense of personality and through such a sense sustaining a sense of social order. The orientation identifies members as producers of social order.

Having produced the structure of social order, members proceed to assume the external and concrete nature of that order. This externalized social order then comes to affect these same members as if it were real. Humans, it would seem, possess the peculiar talent to perform this task in a seemingly effortless way. Clearly such an ability must rank with the opposable thumb, language, and the ability to abstract as the most important of human talents.

The impetus for this "reality construction" appears to be the human need to understand, to "make sense" of the world around him/her. In making a particular "sense" of that world, the member finds him/herself bound by the constraints of the conclusions reached. Having defined a

world s/he must then live within it. Such a position would find reasonably wide acceptance in terms of the "content" of society, e.g. having "defined" a behavior as wrong, then one will act as if it were wrong (the sociological notion of definition of the situation). Here, however, we will assert that this process is much more fundamental in that it operates as well in terms of the form or structure of social order. In terms of the topic at hand not only is the content of a personality a production (e.g. what kind or type of personality a person possesses), but the fact of personality itself as a phenomenon in the world is an accomplishment. This latter assertion is the focus of this research.

We take social order, then, to be an illusion perpetrated by members upon themselves. In the tradition of Husserl, Schutz and Garfinkel we find members to be engaged in the day-to-day work of building and maintaining the social order in ways that are not completely self conscious and, therefore, not completely available to them. We assert in fact that social order could not be otherwise. Society is not possible without the ability to share the meaning of events (Schutz's "congruence of images"<sup>5</sup>). Such meaning is achieved as a constructed, co-produced, externalized, and seemingly concrete reality.

To reiterate we assert that social order may be seen as the product of a method. That method has been called by others "reflexivity."<sup>6</sup> By reflexivity is meant the process by which social reality is co-produced between members and then externalized by those members and reified to a status of external, objective reality. (For a detailed description of this process see Garfinkel<sup>7</sup> and Garfinkel and Sacks.<sup>8</sup>)

To define this process abstractly belies the staggering complexity of its operation. How, one asks, could social reality be an illusion?

The question itself flies in the face of our common sense member's knowledge. The question itself seems a paradox. The world around is so concrete, so clearly real. Could it be a product, an accomplishment? Could it be arbitrary? If social reality is not found but in fact produced, then it could be otherwise. The very notion of alternative realities, of relativity in social order, is disquieting.

A principal constituent feature of the reflexive process is the phenomenon described by Garfinkel as the "documentary method of interpretation."<sup>9</sup> In a notion originating with Mannheim and reaching maturity with Garfinkel it is defined as the search for "an identical homologous pattern underlying a vast variety of totally different realizations of meaning."<sup>10</sup> In this view members are able to establish the meaning of events through the location of underlying patterns or themes that "explain" the nature of specific events. Specific phenomena then are seen to be indexically related<sup>11</sup> to the context in that action derives its meaning in terms of the setting or context and likewise the nature of a context may be defined by extant actions. Thus the documentary method of interpretation accomplishes the common sense notion of making sense.

It is then this process of documentary interpretation as grounded in the phenomenon of personality that will serve as the focus of this analysis. What we will come to call personality work will describe a set of practices that form the practical accomplishment of the documentary method.

This research asserts that personality is a skilled activity utilizing the entire range of reflexive and documentary processes. It is the accomplishment of the application of a method that remains unself-conscious to the members using it. Clearly personality as a phenomenon

is available to virtually all members of society. Even the newest initiates in society are able to "find" personalities in themselves and others. Personality incorporates one of the most basic of all making sense skills, i.e. "thematicity." Personality in fact may be thought of as thematicity found. It is experienced as a theme that underlies behavior and stands in a documentary relationship with behavior. Personality is seen as a guiding force and principle for action. It is seen by members as available to all for close inspection. Functionally it may be seen as the resolution of ambiguity. In doing so it provides members the predictability so necessary for interaction.

Experientially, personality is viewed to be an ever-evolving though, simultaneously, constant feature of individual identity. It, like other social phenomena, is essentially contextually bound in that features of any given personality vary in emphasis according to situationally defined contextual needs. Like a caricature it is constantly in flux with an ever-shifting emphasis and de-emphasis of features. In the process of personality ascription members choose from a myriad of individual behaviors to determine those most "significant" to an individual personality. Like ever-shifting relief maps individuals are defined and redefined while the sense of some thread of consistency is retained. In applying such a perspective, questions appear of annoying complexity. How, for example, does one choose from thousands of behavioral displays those "significant" in terms of personality? How does one "see" an evolving personality as in a child or a psychotherapy patient? How are similarities between two personalities noted? Having once defined basic features of an individual's personality, how is conflicting evidence handled? For instance, how many dishonest acts can

an honest person perform before his/her personality need be reassessed? Such analysts' questions are indeed complex though in day-to-day interaction they find "easy," effortless solutions.

The "fact" of personality is not, in the world of experience, subject to debate. It is a foregone conclusion, a totally non-problematic concept and, in fact, an interactional "article of faith." It is unquestioned in interaction. In many ways it is for members unquestionable as well. The possibility of the existence of personality is essentially an analyst's question. It, by definition, disrupts action. Members cannot do personality work if they in fact doubt the existence of the phenomenon. They have to have faith in its existence.

Interaction demands the reflexive illusion of personality just as it demands the illusion of social reality. Without either, action becomes fundamentally problematic and members fall prey to the ultimate insanity of complete solipsism. People must claim to find "in" one another these personalities and with personality comes consistency. Without it predictability (or the illusion of it) collapses.

What is this prediction? It posits that for a specific stimulus there is a specific response; for an action--a reaction, for a behavior--a motive (personality). It assumes the ability to identify and isolate these particular phenomena. But what if even these social facts are subject to interpretation? If, in fact, the link between them is manufactured? And what if the very evidence that "proves" a personality paradigm or theory is arbitrary and forcibly made to fit the circumstances? What happens to this neat behavioristic model when its forthright structure is made arbitrary and problematic?

For members this doubt is not an issue. As Schutz has noted, common sense concepts (including personality) solve this problem for members of society.<sup>12</sup> Common sense objectifies, clarifies, simplifies, and ultimately eliminates these issues in the accomplishment of day-to-day interaction. Personality work is but one form of common sense activity. Like common sense it solves the problem of meaning in everyday life.

Personality work appears effortless. For members common sense constructs like personality "cover their own tracks," and the production of social order obscures and finally obliterates the experience of its production. The elegance of the solution lies in its simplicity. What is for the analyst an abyss of paradox and logical discontinuity is for the member, quite simply, nothing at all. It is not an issue, not a question, not a problem. For action is essentially non-problematic and unself-conscious. For the most complex of problems there is the simplest of solutions: ignorance.

For the analyst, however, the question remains: how does this obfuscation occur? How is it members could not know of the existence of their own methodic actions? The key may lie in the common term: relevance. As Schutz noted with his notion of "domains of relevance,"<sup>13</sup> production as a phenomenon may be irrelevant to action. That is, the route over which the mind travels in the journey to a common sense solution like personality may not be appropriate to the task for which personality is the solution. Thus personality solves the problem of interaction. The mechanism by which it is produced is literally not relevant to the situation at hand.

We postulate sets of human orientation: Member and Analyst. It will be necessary here to explicate this distinction for it is central

to the examination of personality. Even given members' unself-consciousness it is possible to capture experientially the steps of the process of personality formation, but not as experience--only as analysis. For as we have said the experience is unself-conscious--of necessity so. To focus on the method confabulates action. To focus on action obscures method. One cannot simultaneously be member and analyst. One may do either but not both simultaneously.

In the experiential world there exist two categories of human orientation, two statuses for the location of meaning: Member and Analyst. The first category is that of "member." Members orient to action as in Garfinkel's terms "masters of natural language."<sup>14</sup> That is, they are either engaged in action or in finding meaning for that action. In either case they are unself-conscious concerning the nature of their actions. In the members' stance there are actors and theoreticians. Actors produce action. Theoreticians seek to find meaning in action, i.e. make sense. Members may occupy either status at any instant. Both actor and theoretician reinforce the concrete world, their action made possible by the definition of the situation and hence sense of prediction realized through the theories that "make sense" of that concrete reality. The experience of membership is positive. Positive of the external reality. Positive of common sense access to that reality. Positive that the world of experience is the true, real, concrete world.

The second category of human orientation is the analytic. Its focus is the sense of reality that is the product of the interrelationship of actor and theoretician. (Or more accurately, the roles of actor and theoretician.) The nature of the analytic task is to do violence-through-examination to this relationship. In ways its examination is

like that of the theoretician (certainly in form). It differs however in its breach of faith with reality as self-evidently available. It uses the same reflexive and documentary process but is self-conscious concerning them. It asserts that all accounts (including its own) are methodically produced. All meaning the accomplishment of an applied set of practices. Its focus is that method and those practices. It seeks to examine the techniques members use in maintaining the reality of everyday life.

It is essential, as we have said, that members remain unself-conscious not only concerning the nature but also the method of the production of social reality. If the method were to be available as method, the availability of the sense of reality as reality would be threatened. The method must remain unavailable to members so that the reality it produces is unavailable. As previously stated, for members to be theoretic about a specific personality or theorize about the nature or dynamics of personality does not threaten personality as a fact. As we will see it reinforces its reality. In order for action to occur members must maintain the sense of a concrete, available and intersubjectively for-all-practical purposes shared reality. Analysis in its frontal assault on method as method and reality as accomplished product jeopardizes that reality (in fact rejects it as reality). While analysis is, of course, theoretic it remains aware of its methodic nature. That is, its accounts are accounts. For the analyst sees the selective, construction of reality through the assignment of meaning is not a breach of faith, but rather recognizes that it could not be otherwise. External reality for the analyst exists but is irrelevant. What is relevant is the determination of meaning. For it is in meaning that members "find" reality. It is

that process of the construction of reality that serves as the analytic focus.

The analyst is interested in method and methodic accomplishments. As Analyst s/he must use theoretic method to explicate theoretic method. In this foreshortening of focus care must be taken. The analyst as analyst recognizes the contrived nature of the social order and indeed recognizes that its nature could not be otherwise. The analyst may choose to examine his/her own analytic method and institute the problem of regress (see Zimmerman and Pollner<sup>15</sup>). This problem is "solved" for the analyst through the simple device of choosing a subject and being non-problematic as to its method. In this way the analyst may be likened to the member. It is important to note that the theoretic member simply suspends doubt concerning the subject and in so doing allows for the possibility of the problem. This the analyst and the member share. What they do not share, however, is the same subject. The analyst's subject is the very common sense action that makes the social world possible. S/he doubts and examines that in which the member, by definition, must have implicit and perfect faith. The analyst's breach of faith is with common sense and the reality that is its product. When we assert that one may not simultaneously occupy both roles (member and analyst) it is for this reason. When the analyst leaves his/her analytic role s/he picks up that of the member with its concomitant faith in reality and s/he is once again able to unself-consciously create a reality and act within its constraints. But both roles are separate and fundamentally incompatible. It is essential that they be so.

Analytically the problem at hand is an attempt at analysis that borders on the edge of a member's experience. How close can one come,

as analyst, without falling over into the realm of a member's experience and in so doing becoming lost in the data? It is at times very thin ice and one finds oneself continually falling in. This analysis will attempt to walk that thin line without getting too "wet."

## II

In the previous section we attempted to outline the theoretical grounding for this analysis. In it we described the general notion of reflexivity as the activity that co-produces and co-maintains the social order. Within the general phenomenon of reflexivity we identified the constituent process referred to as the documentary method of interpretation. Through the day-to-day application of this method, meaning is "discovered" in events. As a specific focus for the explication of the processes of this method we identified the phenomenon of personality work. In this section we will attempt to outline a framework for the examination of the common sense notion of personality through, what we will come to call, "personality practices."

Personality is the production of the sense of theory and hence order in the context of personal interaction. It consists of theorizing about human interaction in a largely retrospective way. Through the mechanism of the coherence model (see Glossary) the sense of correspondence is sustained. As such this process utilizes the essential features of all sense-making activities.

Let us briefly elaborate upon some of the key features of this definition. By "production of the sense of theory and hence order" is meant that through personality work there exists between members the perception that behavior is somehow conceptually linked to some underlying and comprehensive theme. Members believe that as they discover

more and more about this theme in themselves and others, that action becomes more predictable; that meaning is established (the documentary method). The theme is thought to be linked to behavior in that it somehow "causes" it.

Important in the sense of order is that it is essentially vague. That is, while members would most likely subscribe to the description just given, when pressed they appear to be unable to describe in detail the features of the personality mechanism. One is able to talk about personalities as lists of certain characteristics, but it appears to be much more difficult to discuss the workings of personality as an interactive phenomenon. There is clearly a suggestion here that there is another, perhaps more productive, way to view this phenomenon. What we suggest is, quite simply, that this sense of order produced by and through personality is an illusion. By illusion is meant that while there is general agreement that there are personalities (as there is "order"), specific information about them seems unavailable. Members seem to "believe in" personalities as an article of faith without benefit of what they themselves would consider acceptable "evidence." Most simply stated, the assertion is that personalities are other than they appear to be. Not that members are wrong in their notions concerning personality but rather upon examination the phenomenon of personality may be seen to be other than it appears in everyday life.

In personality work the features of the activity to which this analysis refers are most certainly available to experience. Hopefully the reader "recognizes" the features of personality work described herein as playing an active role in the phenomenon. In addition a question resulting from this analysis is that if the construction of personality as

an activity may be so easily noticed by the reader in this context, why do these dynamics not play a part in conscious everyday life? Why, then, do these features remain unself-conscious in everyday life? One suggests the possibility that one of the features of personality work may be a structural constraint blocking these observations. One of the features of personality work (and all common sense work) may be the maintenance of the activity as unself-conscious. That is, the activity is experientially constrained to be other than it appears to be. In other words, and in this way, personality work is an illusion.

Personality may be seen as the solution to a problem. That problem is the need to make sense of (find thematicity and meaning in) and therefor predict and evaluate human behavior. In order to interact humans seem to require the sense that behavior is not random, but rather conforms to some sort of pattern. That is, humans at least report the need to be theoretic about action. They seem to value meaning as essential to action. What we are asserting here is that one does not need theory to act but rather the sense of theory. That is, members constantly theorize about action (in this context, they are able to find a pattern or personality in others) without ever generating a theory. When asked to describe personalities, members will supply a vague and incomplete list of "traits" tied together in the loosest possible way. They produce what we will call a list/theory. It appears that for members the sense of theory is sufficient as a determination of meaning.

The "sense of" phenomenon is one of the most complex and elusive in personality work (and by extension in other documentary and reflexive enterprise). Order is apparently maintained through the faith that it is being maintained. That is, members seem in their ability to locate

meaning in events to be able to externalize that meaning on the external reality and assume its "fit." In personality and other work we find members constantly orienting to different features of situations and linking them in endless series of themes as the practical accomplishment of the location of meaning. With the formation of each theme comes a different meaning and thereby a different experiential reality. Members do not orient to this process as the endless formation of theory and theme, but rather as the location of truth and the true external reality. The themes and theories produced need only be comprehensive enough for-all-practical-purposes and require a life span no longer than the situation at hand. For members the themes and theories created are real and true and comprehensive and most certainly not a process of ascription. For them there is the sense of overall theory (of gestalt) and a kind of consistency that is not time bound. When we look to the detail of personality work we will find such members' notions contradicted by the data. The illusion of personality is sense of consistency, reality, and discovery. It is an artifact of the method of its production and not in fact available in the data. Part of the features of personality work appears to be the ability to produce and maintain the "sense of" aspects of the activity.

Personality is taken for purposes of this analysis to be a "list/theory"; this notion is central and essential to personality work. This list/theory appears to be essentially retrospective in nature. Personality as list/theory is a retrospective interpretation providing a sense of continuity to interaction. One quickly notes, however, that this relationship asserting correspondence of action or behavior to personality becomes elusive in interaction. Any behavior may be made

to fit the theory, e.g. "he's not himself today," i.e. behaviors that don't fit a theory may be discounted.

As we will come to see in the detail of personality work the list/theory serves to document the supposed underlying "dynamics" of the personality. In personality as in other documentary interpretation the list/theory is a loose description designed to maintain the sense of order through prediction necessary to ensure the stability of interaction. The "list" aspects of the description include the set of traits or characteristics that are experienced to be in the individual. These traits are seen by members to stand in an interactive relationship to each other. Some are seen to cause others and some consequently are produced in complex ways by others. The story that is told to link the traits together is the "theory." This theory may be thought of as the situations and preconditions that allow for the possibility of specific traits and characteristics. The list/theory may therefore be thought of as the product and accomplishment of the personality work.

Personality is the production of the sense of order; the sense that in events there is thematicity. This sense of thematicity exists not so much as a rational conclusion but as a faith, an assertion that need not be asserted. Personality is "there" for members not in the way that a door is there, i.e. totally available for inspection, but rather appears to be real much in the style of mental images. An image is not a picture subject to the kinds of inspection that gives up details (as with a photograph) but is rather, the sense of a picture. It provides the same sense as a photograph but in unavailable ways. Similarly personality provides the sense of a gestalt or picture of an individual while not actually providing it (at least not in the way it claims).

Personality work is, then, the set of practices that accomplish the maintenance of the reality of personality.

Having described some of the generic features of personality work let us move to its detail. For the purposes of this analysis personality work is described as displaying certain consistent features which we will call "personality practices." These personality practices may be seen to be a set of features that establish, perpetuate, and maintain the common sense notion of personality. They should be seen to constitute part of personality work. The personality practices are methodic accomplishments and the focus of this analysis will be to ground them in the day-to-day formulation of personality. As we have noted before, personality work is one of myriad examples in the world of everyday life of the process of documentary interpretation. What we call here personality practices may very well inform the more general notion of documentary interpretation and, we suspect, may be found in other contexts and settings. This analysis, however, makes no claim outside of personality work.

What follows is a set of brief "definitions" of the personality practices included in this analysis along with some discussion of the issues associated with those definitions.

#### PERSONALITY PRACTICES

1. Thematicity: The ability of the observer/theoretician to "find" a theme in the actor's or events' behavior. This "skill" is one of the most essential for the maintenance of social order.
2. Thingness: The ability of the observer/theoretician to establish and maintain the real, objective, facticity of personality. The fact of personality appears "self-evident" to the members.

3. Discovered: The ability of the observer/theoretician to maintain the sense that personality is discovered "in" the individual.
4. Scientific: The sense on the part of those engaged in personality work (both formal and informal) that the activity has the orderly and organized character of science. This includes the sense that "evidence" may be found of and for personality.
5. Essentially incomplete: The sense that personality is both consistent and changing and that a personality may never be fully "known." Hence, personality work is never ending.

Let us examine briefly this set of practices that constitute some features of personality work. It should be clearly noted here that this set of practices is by no means limited to personality work. If, as we have said, the goal of personality work is the establishment of the sense of order, then the set of practices that accomplish that goal here may (and we suspect do) serve the same function for other social phenomena. The practices herein described do not constitute a hierarchy but the beginnings of a system for the formulation of personality.

#### 1. Thematicity

A constituent practice in personality work is the location of thematicity in action. Among the most important of human "skills" is the ability to conceptually organize seemingly disparate information and thereby find meaning. One finds when approaching the innumerable behaviors displayed by an actor, an apparently untitled collage. There is the assumption that the behaviors in this collage are linked to some sort of causal framework but it is the task of the observer to find that framework. It should be noted here that by observer is meant the member

witnessing behavior for purposes of theorizing. This observer may be the member him/herself. Personality work is not only inter-personal but also intra-personal.

In this process of thematizing, the member again creates the sense that relevant behaviors have been tied together within the framework of the personality model. This process is, by definition, retrospective and, as we shall see (like all sense-making activities), essentially vague. Questions to be discussed in this analysis may include: what constitutes relevant behavior, i.e. are there behaviors that are not or may not be seen to be displaying personality? Is there a theme or merely scattered connections? Does the theme have a "life span"? How, and is, the theme utilized interactionally?

In some ways thematicity may be seen as the most elemental and fundamental of the personality practices in that it is through the ability to find order and meaning that the possibility of personality exists.

## 2. Thingness

A second practice in personality work is the maintenance of the thingness of the personality. By "thingness" is meant the sense that personality really exists in the member. There seems little doubt on the part of members that personalities exist. The only real debate appears to concern what features are to be included in the list/theory that is a specific personality. That is, while there may be strenuous debate as to the nature of an individual personality, there is none as to the fact of personality.

### 3. Discovered

A third practice in personality work is the maintenance of the personality as discovered. It is clear in virtually all personality talk that members claim to be able to find personality in each other. Again the sense is that personalities are "seen" in members. While it may be a "perceptive"

### 4. Scientific

A fourth personality practice is the maintenance of the sense that personality work is "scientific." There appears to be the perception that personality work is similar to the "scientific method." For instance, one finds in personality talk what might be referred to as rules of evidence. Particularly when discussing the nature of a specific personality, members find certain types of "evidence" and certain methods of presentation of that evidence as more or less acceptable. One finds that personalities come to be "agreed upon" in the same way as scientific theories. This phase of the analysis will be in two parts. The first will be the ways in which personality work is seen as scientific (as a validation). The second will be the ways in which the sense of order found in personality work and in science are an artifact of their set of practices as opposed to their "truth."

### 5. Essentially incomplete

The fifth personality practice is the sense that personalities are both constant and changing. While members feel that personalities display some primary or core features that remain stable over time, they seem to believe that in mostly minor ways personalities do change. Since

personalities do continue to change, personality work becomes a continuous and ultimately endless activity.

In the final part of this section we will focus on the essential notion of personality repair. Personality repair may be taken to be a set of features that establish, perpetuate, and maintain the common sense notion of the repair of personality. Personality, as we have said, is the sense of theme or patterns that underlies human action. In personality work one periodically experiences "trouble." Typically these troubles are of one of two types: the first occurs when members find themselves unable to find the pattern in themselves or others. There is the sense that behaviors are not linked to any discernible pattern. The trouble here is obvious--without a pattern there is no prediction and without prediction, no order. When this occurs in others it is threatening; when in oneself the effect is the sense of the loss of control. In either case social interaction is interrupted.

The second major type of trouble occurs when a pattern is discovered that is somehow unacceptable to a specific social context. The troubled member is then seen as acting "inappropriately," though (as seen by members) for a clearly understood reason. When it is determined that either type of trouble exists, one possible course of action is the "repair" of that personality. As with other personality work there is the sense of something happening in repair work. This sense is here, too, the result of a systematic set of practices.

As is often the case the identification of an interactive process is made evident through the deviant or atypical case. In the context of personality work the dynamics of the activity are brought into relief in those settings in which the formal task is personality. In the

selection of "the program" (see Setting) the prime motivation was this focus by members on the features of personality and its repair. While personality work permeates virtually every setting, it is in a repair station that its dynamics stand in such clear view. It is in and through the process of personality repair that many of the features of the phenomenon of personality work first became evident. Such repair activities serve as we shall see as the "data base" for this analysis.

As in the explication of the personality practices, we will first identify through brief definition the features of personality repair and then discuss some of the inherent issues.

#### Personality Repair Practices

1. Troubled Actor Incompetent: The sense that the "troubled" personality is unable to report "accurately" about itself. The effect of this practice is to "disallow" data offered by the member about him/herself.
2. Trouble Location: The ability of the observer/theoretician to locate "trouble" or a malfunction in the individual's personality. This trouble typically takes a thematic form.
3. Link to Treatment: The ability of the observer/theoretician to link a form of repair (treatment) to the specific personality trouble. The trouble is felt to define the necessary form of treatment.
4. Change Recognition: The ability of the observer/theoretician to "recognize" change in the individual's personality, typically, although not necessarily, after the application of the "treatment." One type of change recognition is "getting better."

### 1. Troubled Actor Incompetent

The first in the list of repair practices is the definition of the troubled actor as incompetent to report on his/her own personality. Essential to the repair task as we will see is a shift in theoretic power from the "client" to the repair staff. That is, in personality repair the ascription of the personality is at the heart of the organization's attempt to alter that personality. If the organization and the client disagree as to the nature of the personality and its troubles, then all aspects of the repair are thrown into doubt. Diagnosis, treatment, evaluation and eventual cure cannot operate in a situation of substantive debate. Staff may disagree and debate, but if the client is taken as credible then s/he could determine cure. That is not a desirable situation in a "rational" world. It should be noted that the client is not taken to be totally incompetent (in most circumstances) and is allowed to supply data for the scientific activity at hand. He or she, however, may theorize in only very limited ways.

### 2. Trouble location

A second and obvious repair practice is the ability to locate trouble in the individual. That is, the members sense that they are able to identify in the personality the cause for certain behaviors that are felt to be unacceptable. Members apply a theme to these behaviors that "identifies" a problem that requires repair. In this program it is the goal to find this problem and cure it.

### 3. Link to treatment

A third repair practice is the ability to link a certain program to that facet of the personality in need of repair. Here again one finds

the concrete nature of both the personality and the repair reasserted through the decision on a treatment strategy. Not only is the personality real but so real as to allow modification of its internal dynamics through the application of techniques. Here the theorizing assumes even higher complexity as the staff "tinkers" with the inner workings of the list/theory. Again an issue at hand is the sense of order and reality resulting from the co-produced practices.

#### 4. Change Recognition

Integral to the treatment task is the ability of the repair staff to recognize, through the client's behavior, change in the troubled aspects of the personality. Here, through the accomplishment of amazing theoretic dexterity, staff share the sense of an evolving personality. As we will see, staff gather evidence of that change in what is perceived as stable and changing personality. Judgements are then made as to the "direction" of the change in terms of the "positive" or "negative" features of the change. A possible outcome in this process is the recognition by the repair staff of the cure of the client or total repair of the personality trouble. Here again this conclusion is one made not by the client.

These personality and repair practices, then, may be seen to be the features that operate in the accomplishment of personality work. They are some of the techniques that members use to create the possibility of both personality and its repair. These practices are not meant to be exhaustive but the beginnings of an explication of the phenomenon of personality. We will attempt through the analysis of data to ground these activities in such a way that the reader will be able to recognize their existence and inter-active dynamics.

## III

This analysis is an attempt at the beginning formulation of a framework for the description of personality and its repair. As previously described this framework is to be considered research in progress. Over the course of the research that led to this framework it has become clear that the issues broached are of an order of magnitude and complexity that virtually defy description.

The framework presented here requires some explanation in order for the reader to organize his/her perceptions. This framework represents, as previously described, a perspective that finds the social world (and personality in particular) to be the accomplishment of a massively complex method. This method creates, in effect, the structure that allows for the possibility of this portion of social order.

In the description of the phenomenon of personality work this analysis has noted nine features of the activity and identified them as "personality and repair practices." These nine features are interrelated in complex ways and in a shifting hierarchical framework which makes their simplistic description impossible. It is analytically clear that these nine features (and possibly a variety of others) are linked through an elaborate rule structure. This rule structure constrains the myriad techniques that constitute each of the personality and repair practices.

In the current analysis the reader should orient to the personality and repair practices as interrelated phenomena that impinge on the construction of the sense of personality. This analyst is not, at this point in the research, prepared to exhaustively define the interconnections of the practices. It is clear that in a specific context one or another of the practices may take precedence over the other in an apparent

hierarchical framework. This "hierarchy," it appears, cannot be automatically generalized to other times or contexts. In the grammar for the accomplishment of personality it appears that the process is massively contextually constrained.

In the formation of the sense of personality the personality practices seem to play differing roles in different contexts. In some cases the ability to locate, for instance, "thematicity" begins to sketch the basic outline of the personality while the sense of "thingness" seems to add the sense of depth to the phenomenon. This shifting role for the practices serves to confabulate analysis and obfuscate the process under examination.

In an attempt to clarify the notion of personality work and ground this work in social interaction this analysis will now move to the examination of specific data. The data involved are two case conference transcripts. Each transcript will be analyzed from a different "direction." In the first analysis each personality and personality repair practice will be examined separately throughout the entire length of the transcript. The goal here will be to ground the practice in the data. In scanning the transcript for one practice at a time it is hoped that the various issues and forms of the practice will be made available. Note: The reader should note that no single context of sample data is equally rich in all personality and repair practices. In such a case where outside examples serve to illuminate the material they will be utilized.

In this first analysis the reader will note that each practice occurs extensively through the transcript. In some cases the same incident or comment by the staff members seems to "evidence" a variety of

practices and will consequently reappear several times. It will be necessary for the reader to refer to the transcript and glossary to focus the analysis. The analysis of the first transcript will "walk through" the entire length of the conference noting the features of the specific personality or repair practice under examination. It is suggested that the reader read the first transcript before reading the present analysis of it.

A further caution to the reader is that the theoretical description preceding this section does not constitute the entire theoretical perspective. In the formulation of a framework it is often useful to ground that framework in a specific context as an aid in clarification. Therefore the analysis will extensively elaborate on previous materials and develop concepts that are best clarified in the data.

Upon completion of the analysis of the first transcript the reader will, hopefully, have a firm grounding in each of the personality and repair practices. In the analysis of the second transcript all of the practices will be utilized simultaneously (as much as that is possible) as one moves through the transcript. In this way the reader will experience the interrelationship of the practices as they occur in interaction. (Again, it is suggested that the reader read the second transcript through before reading the present analysis of it.)

In this way the reader will experience in the first analysis the depth and complexity of the individual personality and repair practices. From the second analysis will come an appreciation of the interactive and shifting hierarchical relationship of the practices.

As members we have learned the "skills of membership" well. Our competence at the accomplishment of social order is such that the activity

appears effortless. Our ability to perpetrate an objective, concrete, external reality is staggering. Our ability to perform this feat unself-consciously is astounding. And our resistance to "noticing" the existence of these skills is virtually perfect.

This analysis is an invitation to the reader as analyst. It hopes to display to that reader a beginning examination of the notion of personality work. En route the reader will note references to future research and areas in obvious need of extensive explication. Both announce the ongoing nature of this research and it is hoped do not serve as road blocks.

This analysis is crude relative to the phenomenon it attempts to examine. As noted, personality work employs the same techniques that members use in the production and maintenance of day-to-day social order. It is hoped that this work provides the reader with a beginning set of grounds for the possibility of personality as an activity.

The theoretical stance utilized in this analysis is not original. It purports to apply the traditions of Husserl, Schutz, and most particularly Garfinkel as currently identified in ethnomethodology. Its application to the notion of personality hopefully illuminates some essential features of this common sense phenomenon. The deficiencies of this analysis rest solely with its author. The strengths must be attributed to the seminal thought defined in the ethnomethodological tradition.

## NOTES

1. Edmund Husserl, The Idea of Phenomenology (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964), pp. 13-30 passim.
2. Alfred Schutz, The Phenomenology of the Social World (Evanston, Ill.: North Western University Press, 1967), pp. 15-28 passim.
3. Harold Garfinkel, Studies in Ethnomethodology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967), pp. 1-34 passim.
4. Ibid.
5. Schutz, pp. 26-28.
6. Garfinkel, pp. 30-33.
7. Ibid.
8. Harold Garfinkel and Harvey Sacks, "On the Formal Structures of Practical Actions," in J. McKinney and E. Tiryakian, eds., Theoretical Sociology (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), pp. 337-66 passim.
9. Garfinkel, pp. 78-80.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Schutz, pp. 20-22.
13. Ibid.
14. Garfinkel and Sacks, pp. 334-38.
15. D. H. Zimmerman and M. Pollner, "The Everyday World as a Phenomenon," in J. Douglas, ed., Understanding Everyday Life (New York: Aldine Press, 1970), pp. 178-87.

## CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS: CONFERENCE #1 - January 1, 1976

### Personality Practices

#### Ability to Find Thematicity in Action

A fundamental feature of personality work may be seen to be the ability to find thematicity in action. If personality may be thought of as the production of the sense of theory and hence order in the context of personal interaction, then it appears as critical to this process for members to maintain the sense that they are able to find this thematicity.

In order to ground this process let us move to an examination of specific data. These data consist of transcriptions of case conferences held at the program. These conferences are, as we have described, conversations between staff about a client for the purpose of making organizational decisions concerning that client. As such these conferences tend to focus in more intense ways on the phenomenon of personality and in doing so they tend to bring into relief some of the constituent features. It should be noted that while there is a format under which the conference operates, this format acts primarily as a guide for the order in which questions are asked and constrains the participants in only the most limited ways.

Let us move, then, to a conference transcript and attempt to locate this first personality practice. In Conference #1 one finds

early (1/41\*) the first attempt at the location of thematicity. A staff member describes the client as not participating in a program activity and as explanation is offering an "excuse." This anecdote is offered as data and is treated as such by other staff. It is followed by a request for thematicity/theory in the form of the standard "why?" question. The why-question invites and thereby certifies the possibility that thematicity is possible. It suggests that members are able to "see" in themselves and each other some connecting thread that pulls together action in a causal way. In this specific case two alternative theme/theories are offered as possible solutions to the problem of the client's action. It should be noted here that the anecdote with the evaluation as to the "excuse" nature of the client's theory for nonparticipation were essentially for members nonproblematic, i.e. both were taken as factual accounts of the events "as they occurred." The reportable and external nature of reality is here (as in all action) totally taken for granted.

To return to the data we find that following the invitation to thematize and the pro-offered selection of possible themes, another different theme is introduced as a possible explanation ("laziness"). Here, too, what might be called a qualified theme is introduced ("in terms of a personal comment") as a description of the way the client "sees herself." A qualified theme is one of the most tentative types in which the theorizer appears to remain unsure as to the accuracy of the theme. S/he is seeking validation through another "witnessing" of the theme. This seems to suggest that some themes are more or less available for

---

\* Note: Transcript code should be read as follows:  
 Transcript #/Line #

inspection through action and that, while members seem to believe that themes exist, some may lack sufficient data and require a second opinion/validation.

One finds, amazingly, in action a degree of certainty about thematicity that members might deny upon reflection. When one asks members to talk about personality they typically will speak with less certainty about the concept than they do when actually doing personally work. This contradiction is interesting in that members might actually deny their actions when analytically confronted with them. This takes both the form of a denial about the specific nature of a personality ("I could be wrong, but....") and to the process itself. That is, one doubts if members would (upon reflection) be willing to stand behind their own action. Would they, for instance, be willing to assert unequivocally that the themes that they see are actually in the subject of the theorizing? No, it is the sense of theme that we must keep in mind. For members themes exist although they may be misapplied to behavior.

In this same passage the theory is offered that the client sees herself as "too mature" to participate in the activity. Such a conclusion is reinforced through the assertion that the client "projects" the theme and that this theme is available for public inspection in that both staff members have "seen" it. That the client does not get involved in the physical education activity is taken as a fact/problem for which the solution is the theme that she "sees herself" as too mature to engage in that activity.

In 1/67 the theme is questioned as to its validity. The form of the validation request raises the issue as to the origin of the theme.

The technique used is unusual in that the client is used as a source of theory (did she "express that?"). As we will see the client is often in repair work rendered incompetent as theoretician of his/her own action (see personality repair practices). Here, however, the client has not (as of yet) been declared incompetent and therefore may supply theory as well as data (list).

An important feature of the ability to find thematicity is the sense that multiple themes operate for any piece of action. In 1/89 an additional theme is offered as to the reason for the client's nonparticipation in terms of her femininity ("she seemed to act ultra-feminine... she couldn't see herself getting involved"). In producing the sense of theme there appears to be no problem in action with the presence of multiple themes. As we will discuss (see personality as essentially incomplete) the sense of personality seems to include the possibility of endless possible themes within a single personality. The ability to find so many themes appears to in no way pose a problem for members in personality work.

These multiple themes appear to have some sort of hierarchical interrelationship, a sort of regress that may be initiated by the question, "why?". For instance, in the sequence under discussion the question as to why the client doesn't participate elicits the response that she deems such activity as "beneath her." The next question as to "why" seems to suggest the move in theme to another level and another connection as in the answer "ultrafeminine."

Through the constant allusion to causation in the form of the question "why?" the thread of thematicity is formed. Each step or connection in that thread is an assertion of causation and interpreted

action, that is, a description of what happened and "why" it happened. Often the nature of the thread comes to be turned upon itself in what might be called a tautology ("she seemed to act ultrafeminine...because she's very feminine"). The sense of theme, then, may be built through the question-answer nature of the interaction. Thematicity may be seen as the assertion of causality through its assumption. The sense of theme as opposed to the fact of theme seems grounded in this taken-for-granted method. This "sense" is good enough for all practical purposes.

It should be noted that the theme (or sense of it) is not that of a continuous or single theme. Threads seem to be built and then dropped as other behavior is presented for themification. For instance, in the sequence at hand (1/106) one finds that the theme that led from nonparticipating to a "mature self image" and finally to "ultrafeminine" seems to terminate and a new thread concerning classroom performance is raised as an artifact of the sequential format that the conference follows. Though this shift is constrained from the outside there seems to be little strain produced on the personality work through the shift. Simply new data are raised for theorizing. At some point later the staff may link these two pieces of the theme/theory, though this appears not to be necessary.

In this new interaction the theme of "involved" in the classroom becomes a topic. Here an interesting feature of personality work appears. The notion here of "involved" is complex in that "involved" is both a behavior and what might be recognizably called an orientation. That is, "involved" could be both data (behavior) and a personality trait. It appears that some of the themes have this somewhat marginal status in that they are both action/behavior and therefore subject to interpretation

and placement in a theme/theory. Again, this seems to pose no trouble for the personality work and, in fact, seems not to be noticed by the members in most cases. It is as if the designation "not involved" could swing either way, i.e. as data (behavior) or as theory (personality trait).

In the section 1/106-1/222 we find that "not involved" has been used as data and the interaction seems to seek the thematicity (explanation) for that behavior. Through the use of the same "why" technique the noninvolvement is, by members, seen to stand for something else. It is suggested that the client needs "a lot of personal attention in order to get involved." This, then, leads to the ascription of "lazy." "Lazy," then, is attacked as being a behavior and not a theory/theme, i.e. as inappropriate for use as a theme. This attack seems to be an appeal to the sense that the final theme that is the goal of the conference should be something like the theme that ties behaviors together and not a theme of behaviors.

As previously mentioned there appears to be a sense of a hierarchy in the solutions to the why-question. Interestingly the response to the demand that the theme be extended is the staff description that the client is "detached" (1/152).

Here again the description falls into that ambiguous category as "not involved." Detached may describe either a behavior or a personality feature. There appears to be in personality work constant blurring of this distinction. Here "detached" is specifically defined by the staff member to be a lack of interest in the classroom setting (1/155). Again the why-question is utilized to attempt to push the theme activity to what might be called a higher level of abstraction.

The goal seems to be the ability to tie together the largest number of behaviors. As an aid to that injunction several alternative possible themes are offered for the evaluation of the other staff. Again there appears to be no doubt on the part of the staff involved that the theme-producing task is the location of some preexisting pattern.

In 1/160 we find what might be a potential problem in the theme activity with a staff member saying that he is unable to "locate" a particular theme and therefore unable to choose between the existing alternatives. This points out what may be defined as two differing types of theme work within the personality work. At least from the point of view of this staff member there appears to be a distinction between locating a theme in behaviors and themes in "personal dynamics" (1/163). This distinction appears strange in that so much of the conference is the determination of the latter type of theme (underlying behavior). It is almost as if when personality work becomes too blatant as a production it chastizes itself (see personality as scientific). It is as if some qualitative distinctions are made that are most of the time ignored. The factors that invoke this rule require detailed examination.

In 1/188 we find a good example of thematizing without a specific theme. By this we mean the client is described as having "a lot of personal problems" that "peak at different times" and "affect her performance" in the program. This is interesting in that it describes an opaque theme, namely "troubled" though its detail remains out of focus.

This is an elegant form of what might be called blind theorizing. The determination is made that the theme of troubled or having problems is possible even though the specific nature of those problems is unknown. The staff members claim to be able to see these unknown problems "peak

at different times." This serves as a marvelous example of the ability to thematize your way out of any situation.

A further example of this type of rather ephemeral theme is to be found in 1/240. The client is described as responding to certain types of challenges as long as they are not too difficult. Again we find that marvelous sense of a highly detailed speculation that cannot be anything but very vague being accepted as not. Here form takes precedent over content. The words here are not difficult to grasp but the sense of them as a theme-describing action becomes difficult. As a description of action, it is suggested simultaneously that the client is asked to do something that is difficult but not too difficult. The essentially imprecise nature of such an image seems to be unnoticed by all those present (see personality as essentially vague).

Starting with section 1/270 we find an excellent example of a summary theme. Here the staff member reads from a preprepared report which ascribes to the client various themes simultaneously. This serves as an example of the way themes may be grouped so as to present a case for a general theme (in this case something like a "bad kid").

The various themes are collected in an incremental way so as to suggest in toto a specific type of personality. In 1/301 is an example of a thematic description that summarizes the summary (problems with "authority" and "structure"). As noted elsewhere these summary statements tend to serve as base line or plateau themes in the general thematizing process. They act as touchstones for the following personality negotiations.

In this case the summary is made of "problems with authority and structure." This is a thematic reduction of the previous information

and if it survives the tests (see personality as scientific) it will be accepted as part of the list/theory that will be the client's personality.

Here the summary is supported as accurate with the description of a somewhat unusual image. The client is reported as knowing "no limits." This is a good example of a kind of statement which could not, on the face of it, be accurate (or possible) but yet appears to be acceptable as a personality theme. One questions how literally members take such images to be.

The debate which follows (1/318) examines how it would not be possible for a person to "know no limits." And likewise the specific nature of the "problem with authority" is unexplained. Again and again one is struck by the incongruous nature of the themes and images. The client is described as both defiant (1/276) and indifferent to that same authority (1/319). The point here is not the differing themes but rather the seeming oversimplification of them. While themes are by definition reductionistic they also seem to be so completely so as to hamper interpretation of behavior. This as we will see is one of their most important functions.

A question that appears is, how comprehensive are themes expected to be in personality models. Apparently as we have discussed it is more important to maintain the sense of theme and hence order rather than the fact of it. Take, for instance, the theme "authority problem." Imagine the various factors that might come into play if one were to attempt to use this theme in interaction with another person. When, for example, is an authority figure using his or her authority? Both parties would have to accept that authority is "occurring," that something in the context "announces" authority, in order to determine that both actors would orient to that feature of the context.

Then the members would have to separate issues of personal interaction from what would typically be called role interaction. That is, the hostility or indifference to authority would have to be directed toward the target individual as symbol of authority and not as individual.

One can imagine many, many more features of such a context and none becomes an issue in this theorizing about the client's personality. An inescapable question becomes, what role does the theme play in personal interaction? Are these themes interactionally relevant? As we will see it is difficult to make a case that, in terms of interaction, members do, or in fact can, use these personality themes.

In personality negotiations and particularly in repair negotiations (see personality repair practices) some themes seem to appear repeatedly. The theme of individual ability to control their behavior appears as an important consideration. In 1/332 such an issue appears in the context of the ability to control attention to classroom work. Again, staff make assertions with great certainty as to whether the client exerts this type of control. It is agreed that the client does not pay attention in class but the debate concerns whether the client has deliberate control over this attention. In an interesting combination of themes one staff member describes the client as controlling her attention and not controlling it at the same time (1/334). In his description of an ambiguous theme this staff member seems to be confronting, though in an unself-conscious way, the problem of the contradiction of data to the theme.

The solution to this problem here as well as elsewhere is that "both occur at different times." This solution further exacerbates the problem of interaction in that it allows for the possibility of contradicting behavior which needs to be incorporated into a coherent and

usable-for-interaction model. If personality is to be a predictive model (and we will find that largely it is not) then the incorporation of contradicting behavior becomes a potential interactive trouble. In 1/345 to 1/376 we find a staff member struggling with exactly this issue. He is having difficulty locating an exhaustive theme in the client's behavior due to the fact that he sees her as doing two contradicting things at once ("it seems to be a combination of both"). Other staff attempt to isolate the problem by subdividing the behavior into parts (work with assurance and work without assurance--as two hypotheses) (see personality as scientific).

One hears in the transcript the staff members' real struggle to make sense of these apparently disparate behaviors. Another staff member attempts to resolve the issue by pushing in the direction of "conscious control" with an example of what he takes to be such control (this same staff member then contradicts his own observation 1/373). In the course of doing so he also adds another thematic image to the evolving pictures ("she loves attention from authority").

Again we must ask, is there being built here a list/theory consisting of a single unified theme that interconnects the varieties of displayed behavior? Or, on the other hand, a series of connections of some behavior that produce a sense of a gestalt or holistic view of the individual personality? Is there a slowly evolving picture of an explanatory model or simply the list of themes (and often contradictory ones) connecting some of the client's behaviors? Is there the gestalt, an overriding coherence or merely the sense of it?

To continue with the development of the personality theme in 1/411 we find the resolution of the ambiguous messages through the location of

the theme of "confused" (an effective solution to the contradiction in interpretations). This suggests the view that the client is in some way internally disoriented and therefore produces seemingly contradictory behavior. That is, the contradictory observations are supported through the "discovery" of contradictions in the client (documentary interpretation). Thus, both the coherence and the validity of the personality is sustained.

To this theme is added the description of "closed off" (1/412A). This serves as a good example of the ability to be able to apply thematicity when apparently none is found. The very lack of theme itself becomes a theme (a type of residual category). In this way the process is never stifled, though in this setting it may result in the termination of the client.

Part of the personality-building process as we have seen is the building of the theme (see personality as scientific). In 1/409 to 1/448 we find the rapid building of what might be called the "bad kid" through the supplying of a variety of examples of the "bad kidness." Interestingly this entire passage could be reread as the client as "victim" with exactly the same data at hand. There clearly appears to be some forces that will affect the direction in which the ascription will go. For example, here there are two (at least) distinct and contradictory model/themes ("bad kid" and "victim") that are possible as integrating the client's personality. For whatever reasons the "bad kid" is chosen. Future research will examine those "reasons." Here, however, one suspects this "choice" serves as a justification of the predetermination that the client must leave the program.

The locus of the responsibility for the client's problem is seen to be located in the client. This might be seen as the anti-therapeutic model in that it seems to run counter to the more common societal view that responsibility for the personality problems lies elsewhere (pathology, emotional disturbance, environment, lack of interactive skills, etc.). Here the client is described as assuming the responsibility for her own actions and as such is "bad" in the moral sense. NOTE: This analysis has deliberately avoided the incorporation of such issues as dominant values and other phenomena that would confabulate the explication of the process. Clearly such factors are active and vital in this process. Their examination remains for future analysis.

The alternative interpretation here may have the result in the interpretation that the client was severely disturbed and therefore needed more "professional" treatment. While the fact of termination may have resulted in either the ascription of "bad" or "sick," the upshot of the termination would have had largely different effects on the client and her subsequent organizational contact. While such an observation is not new (Szasz, Goffman, Zimbardo, etc.) this passage shows clearly the essentially arbitrary (it could be otherwise) nature of the ascription of the model.

Over the course of the passage a case is built incrementally using as verification the previous evidence (see personality as scientific) and very little else.

Let us repeat here that this description is not an indictment of this program or the therapy business in general. It is rather a description of those ways in which the sense is brought to what in other circumstances might be considered opaque (meaningless?) behavior.

Although one rarely finds "opaque" as an operational category in interaction. Sense will be made as it always is made though the implication for the actor of that ascription will have dramatically differing effects in the world.

In 1/461 the theme of "control" over behavior seems to have been accepted and the staff move on to talk about the ways of dealing with this person given this problem (see personality and treatment). It seems clear that the client is "bad" and is "in control." Now the issue of the conference is how to deal with that problem concretely.

At this point another interesting dual type of ascription is raised, i.e. "manipulative" (1/478). This theme is interesting in that like "non-involved" it may be interpreted in several ways. Manipulative could either be the result of a pathology (e.g. "she's manipulative because she's afraid") or manipulative is a form of badness. "Manipulative" here suggests a form of conscious control and is therefore a clear follow through on the suggestion that this is a "bad kid." In this case the interpretation of manipulative as either symptom of a problem or an example of badness has been constrained and directed by the prior interaction to suggest the latter. Given that the client is "bad," then the manipulateness is taken as an example of that badness. The activity supplies its own grounds (see McHugh).

As the thematic tempo builds the client's theme starts to change in the sense that previous themes are disowned and discredited. Earlier the topic of the client's "maturity" was discussed (1/54) and again here the issue is raised. In 1/485 this same staff member describes the maturity as an act and as real. Again this same staff member is attempting the resolution of a "conflict" in data. As with the earlier

difficulty with whether the client controls her "attention span" (1/346) the issue here is a question as to what is really going on in the person (see personality as thing and personality as scientific).

Again the existing direction of the theme wins out in that the client is again determined to be deliberately controlling the situation and her action in it. In direct contradiction with an earlier report a staff member asserts that the client will not do what she is told (1/507) when he reported earlier that she would do so (1/142).

What appears to be happening is what may be called a retrospective reorganization of the event so that earlier data is made to fit the present model (see personality as scientific). Through such a reorganization the model maintains both coherence and correspondence.

Personality theme/theory maintains the sense of correspondence to something real through the maintenance of internal coherence. This is accomplished through the elimination of information/data that does not "fit" (or is not seen to fit) the model through a reinterpretation of that evidence that supports the model (see personality as scientific). One thus establishes the sense that the theme/model corresponds to some real thing through the constant updating of both the model to absorb new information (a la Kuhn<sup>16</sup>) and reinterpret the data itself in cases where the data simply cannot be made to fit. In such a way information previously interpreted as "wrong" can be seen in a new light or now understood to be irrelevant to the model.

Here we find an excellent example of such an activity. In the situation discussed the question concerns whether the client will respond to "demands placed upon her." Earlier (1/507) the client was described as complying with such demands both when she was encouraged and without such encouragement.

Now, however, her compliance with demands is described by the same staff member as an example of her manipulation. He agrees with the evaluation that the client responds because it is "easier" (1/518). There is the sense that the client made a calculated decision in her self-interest.

In the earlier context the compliance was taken as symbolic of that fact that the client showed some interest in classroom work and now it is taken to describe the client's manipulative badness--a perfect example of the reinterpretation of a behavior in terms of the new information. The sense is that behavior is "better understood" as representing something different than previously thought.

What seems to have swung the tide in favor of the manipulative model seems to have been at least partly the prior determination that the client must leave the program. That determination throughout this conference in fact seems to shape the "discovery" of the personality (see personality as discovered) as manipulative and bad. In examining this and all the other conferences one is reminded of Garfinkel's allusion to the "boat without a bottom."<sup>17</sup> Here the determination of the personality of the client may be seen to be subject to and the product of a variety of factors and forces that shape the creation of client personality.

As the conference continues the "badness" of the client modulates to some extent in the sense that some softening is expressed by the staff. The client is now seen as controlling her response to demands placed on her to only certain types of demands ("forceful, authoritative, parental") (1/536). Given this new information a specific type of therapeutic interaction is suggested (see personality and treatment).

Here an interesting thing doesn't happen. The suggestion for treatments is to treat the client like a "person" (1/561). This would

seem to suggest that perhaps the "bad" model might be too harsh. There does not appear to be any notice taken immediately of the new "bad" information.

Later (1/596) when asked to formally (for the records) describe the client's behavior the word "good" is used, though up to this point it doesn't seem to fit the model. The possible reason for this softening may be a semi-policy in the agency not to say "bad things" about clients in any official way (as in writing).

It is, however, remarkable that there appears to be these vacillations in the view of the client good/bad description near the end of the conference without anyone appearing to notice.

Again vividly in 1/625 the issue of maturity appears from the staff member who has contradicted himself several times in less than thirty seconds. First the description that the client is mature (1/625) and then in 1/639 the somewhat convoluted description that the "maturity lacks responsibility." The staff member appears to close unsure as to whether the client is "mature" or not. She is perhaps simultaneously mature and should be approached as such while at the same time she is not really mature. This suggests a very interesting notion or view of the personality (see personality as thing). It appears that the personality may successfully be a variety of different things simultaneously.

At the conclusion of this conference the sense of theme seems to have been established. The client is seen as "mature" and "immature," as in control and not in control, as troubled and as bad, as self-conscious and as unself-conscious, and definitely as inappropriate to the program.

With all this contradictory information the question as to the nature of personality as theme and the ability to find theme seems more

clear. Members seem highly skilled at the ability to find themes in situations (even if the theme is a residual category like opaque).

No matter what the information, some sort of connection is made to other information. However, as to the maintenance of a clear, distinct, and consistent personality is concerned, the skill seems to reside in the maintenance of the illusion or sense that such a broad exhaustive model has been produced. That is, upon close inspection the analyst can find no such coherence but rather a set of contradictions.

Before the reader supplies the observation, yes the client could be seen as having a "contradictory" personality. But the issue remains, is that the common sense "sense" of a personality? Could such a personality be used for prediction during interaction? Is the staff saying that the client is unpredictable and this is her problem? Because she lacks coherence and is therefore upsetting to social order that she must go? Is then, unpredictable a residual category that includes in the irreparable list opaque? In this example we find that with theme does not necessarily come the type of prediction that one would anticipate, namely, the prediction that one cannot predict.

One also notes that while all the contradictions and seeming discontinuities are created during the production of a theme, there is never lost the sense of order, of explanation produced through the performance of the process. While analytically the "product" may be a theme, confused and confusing, this theme is clearly and relentlessly sufficient "for all practical purposes." For members, perhaps, the "form" of the process of personality work takes precedence over the "content." For them the theme produced is literally "good enough."

### Maintaining the "Thingness" of Personality

A central feature in the phenomenon of personality is the maintenance of the "thingness" of personality. By this is meant that in the course of personality work there is maintained the sense that personality "really" exists in the actor. That is, for members the action of personality work seems to be "discovery" (see personality as discovered). Members share the sense that they are able to see through behavior to some underlying feature of the individual, a level which motivates and organizes human behavior. While as we have said members can and do debate the specific nature of this personality, they appear to take for granted the fact that such a personality exists in some form.

In 1/89 we find a typical example of the type of "thing" assertion that appears in personality work. Here the client is described as ascribing to herself the characteristic "feminine." This suggests that members seem to believe that intra- as well as interpersonal personality ascription goes on. That is, members make themselves the subject of personality work.

What could be meant as seeing oneself as "feminine"? Perhaps that a theme (see personality as theme) is determined and that this theme exists not in the describer of the theme but rather in the subject of that description. In such a way people are able to do personality ascription on themselves.

In describing the list/theory that is personality one is describing a thing that members believe exists, that has a sort of reality that extends beyond the words. In the production of personality described in "personality as theme" one watched the staff come to decide the nature of the client personality. Their conclusions were not, however,

experienced as conclusions but rather as statements of discovered fact (see personality as discovered). The maintenance of this sense of thingness serves the function of avoiding the possibility of absurdity that might follow from a more relativistic description.

A very complex question that might be raised is what sort of thing is this thing personality? People have a sense, as we will see, that it has parts and that these parts can operate well or with "trouble" (see personality repair trouble). While the parts may be seen to form some sort of whole, the parts may be examined separately. The parts may be inspected, speculated about, and changed (see personality treatment). Like the concept of mind it can't be actually touched but is rather an experience and as such highly ephemeral.

This conference can and does talk about personality with a certain faith and certainly as a conceptual feat is massively complex. For instance, in 1/156 we find a reference to the fact that the client does not find the classroom "interesting." The staff member through a mental maneuver seems to be able to see into the client and determine what "interests" her. Throughout this conference and throughout the world we find members making this and similar assumptions. It is as if we have the sense that we can really "see behind" the behavior to something else. That something else is personality.

The thing personality seems to present itself in different ways. In 1/181 the original description of lazy is substituted by "unmotivated." This seems to suggest that the thing personality may be seen through the behaviors that actors display or in some other way less specifically linked to behavior. That is, some descriptions of personality speak to the behavior (lazy) and some speak to issues "behind" the behavior (unmotivated).

It seems that in certain kinds of personality work evaluations are made about the thing not in behavioral terms but in what might be called personality terms. These personality terms, e.g. "unmotivated," take a behavior like the nonparticipation in the event and rather than stop with only that event move behind it to the thing/personality. This may be accomplished through the building on themes (see personality as theme) and may therefore quickly leave the realm of the behavior and move to the personality.

The thing/personality may be an artifact of the methods we have of talking about it as much as anything else. Again, a term like "unmotivated" describes something but exactly what? A view, a perspective, looking out through someone else's eyes? It (as a thing) clearly doesn't speak to behavior, though its determination is made through behavior (as will be the determination in the change from unmotivated to motivated (see personality repair: change).

In 1/184 the question is asked in the context of motivation, "do you have any idea what it is that moves her?" Again the question implies the ability to see into the client moving hand over hand along the chain of her behavior and somehow make comment on the inner workings of the individual.

In 1/189 the staff member suggests that he is able to see personal problems "peak" in the client. Again we have the question, does the way we talk help to define the nature of the thing/personality or does the nature of the words strike some resonance that validates and therefore legitimizes their use? At this point one can only surmise that we find a combination of both.

In 1/209 we find another reference to the thing/personality which sheds more light on the phenomenon. In addition to the expressed certainty that "something is going on there" is that suggestion that the thing/personality does not operate in one temporal frame. The suggestion is made that the client is somehow affected by outside forces that affect her performance at the program. This suggests that the personality has some existence over time in that its inner workings may be affected by other than the here and now.

This formulation is clearly not news to anyone reading this text but rather it is assertions like this that give the concept of personality the sense of thingness. Again, we must stress that while when pressed members will often disclaim their model of a specific personality they insist that personalities as things exist though their exact nature is essentially vague (see personality as essentially incomplete).

Members talk about personality thingness as an act of faith. The confidence, the totally taken for granted character, the perfect unquestioned belief even in the face of their own inability to describe in detail the phenomenon can be described as nothing else but faith. Here we find talk about a phenomenon as if it existed and through that vehicle we find much of its existence created. That is faith.

In 1/240 we find an example discussing personality as theme. The client is described accepting a "challenge but it has to be within what she is capable of dealing with; if it's just beyond that, you know, forget it, she just won't deal with that at all." This asserts an interesting feature of the thing/personality, namely, that the person/personality can somehow anticipate its own future.

Here it is suggested that the person/personality knows what it can do in a given situation and determines whether to act based on that judgement. The individual would have to know exactly the boundaries of its abilities and be able to determine and evaluate any task based on that ability. This skill (the same skill a cat uses when it tries to decide whether to jump a certain distance) is described as a feature of the client's personality.

The thing/personality seems to be in some way linked to the mind (in the judgement parts at least) and in some way autonomous. Does this suggest that the personality and the mind are different and if so how? Here again the implicit view of the personality is very confusing, at least upon analysis. None of this confusion, however, spills over into the world of action, where these issues are "irrelevant." It is consistently amazing how easy personality work becomes in the world when one simply accepts the "fact" of personality.

In 1/275 we find another example of the thingness of personality. As earlier described in "personality as theme" the client is described as being "resistant and defiant towards authority and structure." While this represents the ability to run a theme or thread through behaviors it also has asserted personality as a thing.

"Defiant" and "resistant" again are descriptions that both describe behavior and something behind the behavior. The defiance can be seen as something independent of the individual example as displayed in the behavior. It is implicitly more than an act. Interestingly, it also appears to suggest the ability of the observer to "see" the client's personality. How would the behavior be described as "resistant to authority" unless the observer could "see" the client to the authority

feature of the setting? What would this orienting look like? What sort of noticing? Again there is the very strong sense of being able to see something other than behavior.

This describes, again, a theme but also some sort of orientation which transcends the situation and can be seen to be a central feature of the client. Certainly the speaker does not literally intend that the client in fact "knows no limits" (is a feral child), but that seems to pose no problem in the conversation. There appears to be a sense that these personality descriptions are not to be taken in their most literal sense but rather in some modulated way. A focus for future research will be the systematic production of this sense of "degree" in personality work. It examines the work that finds seeming literal statements "heard" not literally.

The thing/personality then is not subject to exhaustive and definitive description. As we will discuss in "personality as essentially incomplete" the view of personality is one that is largely vague. Apparently members report on personality in very general terms and understand that the descriptions are to be taken that way. Personality as a thing is a very vague thing indeed.

In 1/318 we find another example of what we call the assertion of personality. In this case the personality gains real status in the fact that specific features of it are subject to debate. Here the discussion rotates around the issue of whether the client is "defiant" or "indifferent to authority." The discussion, in its structure, is asserting that the personality exists and is available for inspection and examination (see personality as discovered and personality as scientific). Though for members there may be ambiguity as to the nature of the specific

personality trait(s), the existence of that trait and the personality remains unquestioned. In 1/333 as well, the description that the client will not "focus her attention" purports a sense of thingness to the personality. Personality is real enough to allow debate concerning its topography. That very debate reinforces the reality.

In the passage 1/341 the thing/personality again appears in the image of the client behaving in a specific "controlled" way that is meant to symbolically communicate a message. This description suggests a type of self-consciousness that selects and presents behaviors in a highly disciplined way.

Though this particular formulation becomes a topic of debate and eventual modification, the thrust as depicting the thingness of personality is unmistakable. This example, again, defines the close common sense conception of personality and consciousness. If the client chooses, for instance, to put up a "wall," then the issues of control and its role are reiterated and in effect the reality of personality is reinforced.

Similarly in 1/347 the issue discussed earlier of control is raised. This suggests that the thing/personality is not always subject to the "will" of the individual. It describes a circumstance in which the client is, or may be, unable to control her own behavior (see personality repair: client as incompetent, and personality repair: personality as troubled). Through this and the aforementioned description the thing/personality continues to assume as a phenomenon a high level of complexity. It is seen as having many parts and an arrangement of these parts in some sort of hierarchical structure.

As described earlier (see theory) the personality is seen as a list/theory, or, a set of traits or characteristics that are held together

through a structure (theory). The personality then becomes a story about how these traits operate within the structure. The personality work, then, becomes the telling of that story, though, of course, for members personality is no story.

All of these features conspire to depict for members a personality as a clearly-available-to-any member thing. This availability of the person is most critical to its status as thing. Staff members claim no magical or secret access to the client's personality but rather have the sense of simply looking in a way that anyone could look. Personality work is, in this way, democratic.

The personality is experienced as being there for all the world to see. While the method of personality work is experienced as organized and orderly (see personality as scientific), it is considered to be available for all competent members of society. It is taken not as a method to be learned but rather a self-evident phenomenon. Again this is not news but the point being made is that through such practices the thingness of personality is both established and maintained. In experience personality work seems to be for members the study of an objective phenomenon and the origin of that experience, we assert, is that method which accomplishes the work.

The thingness of personality is the product of a method in both senses of that phrase. It is the product both in the experiential sense that you have to "look" in a certain way and follow certain procedures to find personality and in the sense that in looking that way and using those procedures causes you to find that personality as real. Much of the reality (the thingness) of personality comes as we have said from the simple fact that in the way we talk about personality we assert that it is real.

Interestingly enough one finds that even problems with the uncovering of personality aids in the production of the sense of thingness. In 1/349 we find the staff member unable to interpret the behavior of the client in terms of the theme (see personality as theme). That is, he doesn't seem to know why the client acts as she does. Is it, he asks, "because of authority" or does "she actually make an attempt"? Even in the questioning, in the search for the answer, the staff member clearly believes that there is an answer, but that simply he doesn't know it.

Another way in which the thingness of personality is established is through the sense that through experimentation (see personality as scientific) theories about personality can be "tested." In 1/351 such an experiment is referred to in the context of the client's "nonparticipation" in classroom work. The sense/theory here appears to be that the client lacks the confidence to perform in the classroom. The staff member reports that by "giving her assurance" the necessary confidence is established and she is able to perform. This experiment serves a dual purpose; first it validates the theory/theme that the client lacks confidence, and second, in doing so implicitly validates the fact of a personality. In other words, yes the client does lack confidence (and clearly there must be a personality) because the experiment "worked." This second assumption is, of course, implicit as the members involved must clearly share belief in personalities or the very action itself would be fundamentally absurd. It is this implicit (as opposed to explicit) assumption that establishes and maintains the thing/personality. Here again the fact that in 1/360 the theory of "lack of confidence" is

questioned as the best interpretation in no way jeopardizes the implicit assumption of personality as thing.

Part of the methodic production of personality as thing utilizes certain types of imagery as a descriptive tool in the examination of a personality. For example, in 1/370 the staff member, in his struggle to establish thematicity for this client (see personality as theme), uses the image, "you know that's why I really can't place my finger on exactly what it is . . . ." Now, of course we do not suggest that the staff member believes that personality is "touchable" but rather that through such an image (even though it is not taken again literally) the sense of personality as a thing is again reinforced. As previously discussed, through such linguistic devices phenomena such as personality tend to appear objective and concrete.

Personality work is a cumulative process. In the accomplishment of the personality as "thing," each act plays a small but "constructive" part. Taken in toto the thingness of personality thus becomes inevitable.

Part of the thingness of personality is its public nature. That is, personality is so real and so objective that it is as legitimate (and in some cases more) (see personality repair: client as incompetent) for others to describe an individual's personality as for the individual him/herself. In 1/389 the client is described as desiring attention from authority even though "she won't openly admit it." Through this device the client is discredited as able to report on, at least this part of, her personality. While such a technique serves specific organizational functions (see personality repair: client as incompetent), it also serves even more to make concrete the thing/personality. Such free

(and in some cases, authoritative) access to personality by the public serves to further enhance its status as thing.

In section 1/396 to 1/429 another feature of the thingness of personality emerges. Having implicitly "agreed" to some extent that personality is real, a question that comes to mind is, "where is it?" During interaction, ideas, concepts, and the like could be said to have a type of "reality," but the member's sense of personality is not that it is an idea, a formulation, but that it in fact is physically located in the individual. This sense is maintained in such passages as the one previously described. A debate is occurring as to whether the client is able to "control" features of her behavior. The model/theory has not yet jelled due to the fact of apparently contradictory behavioral displays.

The client is described as "very confused most of the time and she'll give you a very confused picture." Again the sense is that the picture/personality characteristic is in the client and that she presents it, almost as if to be read by the observer. In this case it is left to the observer to organize and generally make sense of the "confusion."

The client's implied personality is apparently a very "complex" entity. It is partially hidden and partially available (even to its owner). It partially cooperates and partially resists. It is multi-leveled and multi-dimensional. It is a gestalt and is annoyingly disjointed and it is all of these things simultaneously.

Personality is a thing of amazing complexity, though often described in the most singular and unidimensional terms. Its content is the subject of endless debate and its dynamics the subject of endless study, but it is always, always a thing. The sense of its reality is

powerful and for the most part unquestioned and unquestionable. And its "thingness" is an accomplishment.

To encroach for a moment on another section of this paper, namely Personality Repair: Trouble in Personality, let us look to the ways that finding "trouble" in a personality reasserts its thingness. The specific purpose of this conference is to locate and discuss the client's trouble. In 1/416 we find an example of such an activity. The client is described as being "really closed off" and that she "tends to keep a lot of things in." The ability on the part of the staff to be able to locate such problems again reinforces the sense of personality as thing. Staff and clients share the sense that they are about the task of change, change in personalities. They feel confident of the ability (1) to locate among the complex of traits and connecting theory the "flaws" that define a client's problem, (2) to be able, in specific ways, to alter and repair that particular problem (see personality repair: treatment), and (3) to see finally that repair comes to fruition in the client's changed personality. Again (and perhaps ad nauseam) we note that the ability to repair personality gives it the sense of thingness.

One is continually amazed by the level of certainty that members display when discussing personality. For instance, in 1/519 we find a discussion of the various types of settings in which the client will or will not "respond" to demands placed on her by staff. The staff member reports that in different types of situations the client will respond in a variety of ways. What is interesting, however, is the staff member's apparent sense that he can "see" the client respond in the different ways. He seems able to take a variety of readings on the client's personality and integrate them to a model of rather high complexity

about the client's behavior. He does this with a certitude that displays a high level of confidence. Yes, he qualifies and modifies some of his positions, but while he struggles with the content of the list/theory/personality he displays no doubt that the task he is about is perfectly "do-able."

The staff continue in this vein to describe elaborate and specific types of interaction that they feel will motivate the client to "achieve in the classroom." They seem confident that they have a clear enough grasp on the client's personality that they can control the client through the type of information she is given and the way that information is presented to her. The staff are not randomly making suggestions but rather highly detailed and specific advice based on what they must think is a very "clear" picture of the client's personality. Such confidence typifies the way members deal with the concept of personality. It is there, available, and they know about it.

In this section we have tried to point up the ways in which personality is established as a concrete, objective thing. Again we stress that this thing/personality is the product of a method, the result of a set of practices that assert the sense of thingness of personality. No one would argue that members feel that personality has a physical reality like a tree, but clearly they seem to display a sense of the thingness of personality approaching that level of reality. People talk about, argue about, assert, puzzle over and confidently "discover" personalities which certainly suggests that they are expending this effort to some end.

Personality, then, has a thingness that gives it a special sort of reality. It is a reality that is there, but not physically. It can be seen but not touched. It can be changed but not isolated. It is consistent and ever-changing. We have said, too, that personality is an artifact of the language. A language that asserts reality in its very structure and perpetuates it through its use.

Finally, personality is a faith--a faith by members in the external, in the orderly, in the ability of members to make sense of each other. It is all this and, as such, a marvelous and massively complex accomplishment.

Personality, for members, is a thing.

#### Personality as Discovered

A third in the set of personality practices is the maintenance of the sense that personality is "discovered." It would seem critical to the sense of order that we have taken to be personality that it be clearly maintained that personalities are not ascribed and hence possibly arbitrary, but rather that we discover personalities in each other.

Clearly this sense is closely related to the sense of personality as a thing (see personality as a thing). This practice, however, speaks more to the process of production, i.e. the sense that what we learn about others' personalities is discovered as opposed to produced.

Central to this analysis will be the examination of the process of discovery as opposed to the process of production. In order for personality to maintain its "real" status it must be the product of discovery. Were the accumulations of the list/theory that we have come to call personality be recognizable in interaction as productions, then

what we take to be an essential feature of social order would be jeopardized. Personalities must be self-evident and available for all competent members to discover or they become suspect as real. Hence, they must be discoverable.

Here as with other of the personality practices the key is the sense of discovery. Again, if one were to interrogate members as to their method of personality determination, few would suggest that they really go inside another's head and locate the fabled personality. Yet they would report that during the work, during the theorizing about personalities, they have the sense that what they are about is "discovery."

For members, uncovering a personality is not unlike solving a puzzle (see personality as scientific). During the action that is personality work they are certain that they are discovering things about actors and specifically the inner workings of those actors.

Perhaps here again it would be useful to note that personality work not only is interpersonal but intrapersonal as well. When members are engaged in intrapersonal personality work they, too, experience this sense of discovery. They are at once subject and object and even in that tightly closed loop the sense of personality discovery (insight) is maintained.

Even in the privacy of one's own mind the illusion of personality discovery is perpetuated. Even to oneself does personality have the characteristics we have so often described. Here, too, the sense of personality is the sense of order and perhaps while order in the social setting forestalls chaos, order in the mind maintains "sanity." It is perhaps most difficult to display the produced sense of discovery in the inner workings of the mind of one person, so let us begin with the

examination of the process of discovery in the case conference data.

In 1/51 we find a possible first discovery about the client's personality. It is noted that she considers gym "too beneath her" to participate. At this point a potential question might be whether this trait was discovered or produced? The staff member almost in response to this unasked question asserts the client "kind of projects that image." This projection is verified by another staff member, thereby we suspect validating its legitimacy.

At this point we must note that while the description "considering something beneath oneself" is an altogether common one, it is as well a very complex one. How does one "project" such an image? What does it look like? Does it look any different from "having no interest" or "too threatened to participate"?

Again as previously noted (see personality as thing) one finds scattered throughout the language imagery that depicts members as "displaying themselves," being "exposed," or "projecting" this or that. These phenomena one suspects would aid in the discovery of personality; in fact they might be critical to such a process. While one acknowledges such occurrences as common, they remain, however, very perplexing. How does one "project" this sense that "gym is beneath her"? Central to the notion that personality is discovered is the sense that the personality being examined is in the actor. During personality work it appears that members "display" parts of the personality through specific behaviors that stand for or represent the personality. Observers (and again this may be the actor him/herself) then "piece together" the features of the personality from these bits of evidence.

The entire process has the sense that the observers are discovering something about the actor. One constantly finds in such talk phrases such as "you see that..." (1/58). Again through such phrases the language creates the sense that discovery is going on. If the ways that the activity is talked about are ways that members suggest, imply or outright assert that the action is one of discovery, then the sense of the action will be one of discovery.

Clearly in this task of discovery there are various methods or rules that govern the accomplishment of the activity. For instance, there seem to be various levels of legitimacy of conclusions about personality. In most non-patient (personality repair) situations, the member is considered the best or most legitimate source of information about him or herself. That is, in a debate over the content of a specific personality the "owner" of that personality is typically considered as having the best insight and most valuable opinion. The only exception to this, as we will discuss, is the situation in which the member is considered incompetent as in the case of personality repair (see personality repair: client as incompetent). Here the member is disallowed from making such observations.

Normally, however, the member is considered the best source of information and thus information can be accepted on the basis of its position vis-à-vis the member. An interesting situation appears as well in that this rule is not necessarily invariant. Even in cases of incompetence the client may serve as a source of data. In 1/67 we find the situation in which a staff comment is qualified (and therefore diminished in effect) through the question, has the client "expressed that or is that your opinion"? It may be that as we will see in personality

repair the incompetence of the client must be "established" in a specific context before that incompetence may be invoked. Here early in the conference that incompetence has not yet been established (again see personality repair: client as incompetent). Hence, the member is "allowed" to contribute concerning herself.

Another important feature of the discovery process is that of what is referred to in this conference as "significant events" (1/86). Part of the sense of discovery is the sense that some displays are "key" to the understanding of an individual personality (see also personality as scientific). The sense appears to be that of all the possible behaviors displayed by an actor, some are critical to the determination of the personality.

In the production of the personality model (see personality as theme and personality as thing) the sense of discovery is perhaps most vivid when the members determine that a "significant event" has occurred that brings coherence to seemingly disparate information. In such a moment members have a sense that they have discovered something important and at such moments terms such as "insight" are used. Here again the language reinforces the sense of discovery through the words. "Insight" gives the impression that the observer has just seen into the subject. Through such reciprocal relationships the words that are used to describe an experience come in the basic sense to define it. Through such definitions the maintenance of the sense of discovery is perpetuated.

It is interesting the turns that occur in the "discovery" of a personality. For example, in 1/94 there appears a potentially "serious" characterization regarding the client's personality. It is suggested that the client may not be able to recognize some of her actions as

"self-destructive." This description is potentially serious in that it would establish a significant area of incompetence in the client (see personality repair: client as incompetent). If such incompetence were to be established the client would lose the right to comment definitively on her own personality.

A staff member, in his initial response, agrees with this description and thereby takes an important step toward its certification. He immediately recants his support, however, with the recitation of an anecdote (antidote?) in which the client appeared to be "interested in classroom work" and therefore doesn't fit the model. What is interesting here is that through this one example the client is "saved" from the description of an incompetent status. Clearly this described example of excitement over a passed examination (1/98) could have been discounted as an exception and the original description could have stood and retained definitional power over the client.

Earlier we have described the ascription of personality as an arbitrary process. By "arbitrary" we mean that it is subject to a variety of forces that in practice alter the basic sense of the activity. The sense that personality is discovered is central to the activity of personality work. Here we find an example of what might be referred to as the produced nature of the personality. What appears to be a small decision as to whether the client is "self-destructive" could have made a significant difference in the future description of the client. Such descriptions could then have serious impact on the future actions of the client as basically "problemed" or through some other pathological description. A small, largely unsupported decision which passed largely unnoticed is thus highly significant in the client's life.

This example as well points up the fact that in order for data to be incorporated into the personality theme/model it must occur with the sense of discovery. "Self-destructive" did not contain the sense of discovery and lacked therefore the validation necessary to certify the description as true. This is not to suggest that discovery exists only in certain observations, but rather that (for whatever reasons) there was no sense of discovery and hence no truth to the statement. Discovery then or the sense of it plays a critical role in the examination of personality. Further research will explicate the grammar for the invocation of the sense of discovery.

A related phenomenon in the context of discovery is that of what members consider an acceptable entry in the list/theory of personality. For instance, in 1/122 "lazy" as a description is offered as a personality trait. Here the description is attacked not as inapplicable to the client but as inappropriate to personality work. As previous discussed (see personality as thing) "lazy" is described as a description of behavior but not as a description of personality. Other acceptable descriptions are offered ("unmotivated," "depressed," "detached," "afraid to participate" 1/130). The implication here is that one cannot discover "laziness" in personalities but rather the reason for the display of laziness. It may be that laziness is not "discoverable." Further there may be too much of a moral connotation in the concept of laziness and that this conference purports to be about the task of science and the discovery of the client's problem (see personality as scientific and personality repair: trouble).

Essential to the process of discovery is the fact that the negotiations that define personality not be obvious to the participants.

That is, the sense that facts are being "uncovered" must be maintained. As we have said the processes that we have described have aided in the appearance of the personality as discovered, but it should be emphasized that they also obfuscate (necessarily) the negotiated character of the process.

Again here in the discovery process we find a perfect confidence on the part of members that not only is the discovery possible but it does in fact occur. One feature of the process that appears to be somewhat (and perhaps essentially) vague to all involved is the method used by members to "discover" the personalities. While we have described some of the features of that method it appears to be unavailable to the participants in the activity. The authority typically utilized by the members is "feeling." For instance, in a discussion as to whether the client is afraid of "failure" in the classroom setting the staff member responds, "I generally don't get the feeling that she's afraid" (1/171). There is no attempt at proof (as far as that could be possible) and the remark stands as is.

What would constitute proof? In a setting such as this the "feeling" is typically sufficient, though at times evidence may be required (see personality as scientific). The form of this proof is typically anecdotal and often, as we have discussed, subject to various interpretations.

It is perhaps useful to note here that this program is considered a "paraprofessional" agency. What this means basically is that the staff are not trained, licensed and "degreed" professionals. As a paraprofessional agency its operation is considered fairly "loose" as against professional standards. We would however like to make the point that

professional settings operate in exactly the same way as paraprofessional with the prime difference being the level of complexity of the "stories" told about personality. The use of a "projective test" or a "citation" from a lofty theory does little to change the basic sense of discovery and the basic sense of "I feel." The professional process is more complex but we assert that it is essentially the same process. Future research will establish the commonalities of these two methods.

Not only the language but the formal structure of the organization aid in the maintenance of the illusion of the discovery of personality. By "illusion" is not meant some sense of falsity, but rather, as in magic, the activity appears to be something other than it is. We find members conspiring together in ways that are largely unavailable to them to produce a personality through a set of practices that create the vivid sense that this personality is a "discovery" and therefore available for all to see. Viewed in such a light, personality work becomes illusion indeed.

To return to the process of discovery and the example of whether the client is "afraid of failure" we find that the discovery of this trait is based on the most ephemeral of evidence. The question is asked as to whether the client is "afraid of failure" (1/169). The determination that she is not is based on the fact that she once appeared "motivated" (1/173). The implicit assumption here seems to be that if someone is once unafraid (if in fact motivated means unafraid) then that person is for all time unafraid.

So stated, the premise sounds ridiculous, yet in the conference such an observation is in fact verbalized and the premise seems to be accepted as sufficient for the rejection of the suggestion of fear.

What we are suggesting is that this discovery process is indeed an unusual one. Not only does it not discover what it says it is discovering but it is following a method other than it purports. Let us note here that when we suggest that personality work does not "discover" we mean to say that it does not discover what it purports to and certainly not in the way it purports to do it. Yes, the result of the discovery process is a model/theory/personality but it is not the personality found in the client but rather the accomplishment of a method external to the client and in fact having very little to do with the client.

This observation suggests another unusual feature of the personality discovery process. That is, that the client has very little to do with the process of discovery. While she is the subject of the inquiry, she plays virtually no role in it other than as a data base in the most general sense. Definitive statements regarding the central structure of the client are formulated and either accepted or rejected on the slightest of evidence. Even by the rules to which the staff participant would claim adherence (see personality as scientific), the acceptance or rejection of features of the client's personality seem to sway on minimal evidence. One wonders, where is the client? What function does she serve? This is no indictment of the program; it is rather the nature of personality work.

The role of the client is an important factor in the discovery process. In this case she is the subject of the discussion in that it is her personality that is at issue. But what does she provide? She appears in anecdotal form as a set of behaviors thematized by the present staff members (see personality as theme). The theme that connects her behaviors is not her theme but the decision (the product) of the group.

What she reports may be accepted as legitimate, rejected as a "game" or the product of an incompetent individual or as an example of a manipulation. That is, a behavior may be taken at face value in the sense that it (in its interpreted form) may be seen as accurately reflecting the personality. But it can "reflect" the personality in many ways.

Since the client is deemed manipulative (see personality as thing) a display is determined to be not what it appears to be but rather as something else, as an intended display not "spontaneous" and therefore somehow contrived. That display then becomes a sign of the discovered personality in the fact that it represents the manipulative sense of the person. "Manipulative" creates a credibility problem (see personality repair: trouble and incompetent actor). That is, interactionally the client cannot be trusted to be what she appears to be. Her actions become suspect.

In such a circumstance the client has a real problem. She is totally at the "mercy" of the staff in that they will decide on her personality regardless of her behavior. As we have seen, the client's actions are all subject to interpretation.

Since the meaning of the client's action is determined, the client has little or no control on that determination. As we will see in Personality Repair: Treatment, the major task of the organization staff is to convince each other and the client of the accuracy of their production cum discovery of her personality. Again as we will see this action is partly accomplished through the certification of the activity as scientific (see personality as scientific). In the next step of the process and upon the general acceptance of the theory/model of personality, the staff will then proceed to "change" that personality (see personality repair: change).

But where, again, in all of this activity is the client? Here we are examining the discovery of her personality and she awaits the verdict along with the assembled staff. In this case her future is already determined (she will be "referred out"); however, only at the conclusion of this conference will her personality be (at least officially) known.

Again the discovery of the client has virtually nothing to do with the client. She offers data but may be barred from interpreting it. Even those features of her personality which she asserts as "significant" may be discounted. And this is not specific to this institution, to this setting. While this organization is charged with repairing personalities the processes it uses to discover personality are the same as used throughout the interactive world. The reader is invited as she continues to look beyond this agency and this setting to the world of his or her membership and look to the personality work done there.

Is it not the same? Could not this setting just as easily be a cocktail party or a family dinner? Could it not be a discussion of a child or an adult, a friend or an enemy, someone present or someone absent? This research is not an indictment of this organization nor of the staff involved in the activity. They are doing the personality work we all do, using the methods we all use, but they are, in addition, charged with changing those personalities.

The discovery of personality here as with most of the other personality work is the same day-to-day personality work of the members of this society. Here in this setting when the sense of discovery is produced through a method it is the same method, used in the same way

as all other personality work. We have chosen here a setting where personality is the business of the setting and as such operates in a more focused way, but we vigorously assert that all personality work operates in the same basic way. It, we assert, could not be otherwise.

Again, and to return to the specific focus of this section, the sense of discovery of personality may be thought of as the production of personality-masked. It is a faith perpetuated through its ritual and practices. It is the accomplishment of a method.

Key in the production of the sense of discovery is the sense of insight or significant events. In the process of the building of the personality model (see personality as thing and personality as scientific) important corners are turned when staff discover important data. In 1/195 to 1/211 the staff member reports one of these events. Having decided that the client was "indifferent" toward class, he discovers that following a test in which the client got one of her few passing grades, the client becomes "excited" (1/198). This the staff member takes to be significant and as an important discovery about the client's personality. He takes it to be "key" to some feature of her personality (1/205). While he is unable to make a determination as to its meaning (1/206) he knows it is "important."

Such moments are altogether common in personality discovery and also altogether complex. The staff member has chosen one of the client's behaviors (from among untold thousands) and has a clear and vivid (by his own report) sense that this behavior is key in the determination of the client's personality. This single behavior is taken by the staff member to be so significant that he considers altering a major portion of his personality model concerning the client because of it. It should

be noted how quickly the staff member is willing to generalize this behavior saying, "somehow success does mean a lot to her in a certain context" (1/206). In the same way that a single behavior earlier ("non-participation in gym") was generalized as a major feature in the client's personality, so now, too, is this other single behavior able to potentially alter a major portion of the discovered personality model.

In these personality negotiations often so much swings on this sense of "insight," of significant discovery. A question that remains unanswered concerns the factors which determine which behaviors are granted this "insightful" status. As we will discuss in Personality as Scientific it may have to do with the fact of it being a behavior that is flatly opposed to the current personality model. The question remains personality models not considered definitive in practice (it is possible for a "happy" person to be unhappy without jeopardizing his happy status). Why is it that some contrary behaviors are noticed and noticed as significant? Are there moments of insight that produce a significant portion of the sense of discovery? The experience clearly is for members that what they are noticing is significant in some transcendent way.

Again the suspicion is that the experience in some way either clearly verifies, or clearly flies in the face of, the observer's model at a time when the observer is oriented to that model. During interaction there are clearly moments when members are not reflecting on, i.e. theorizing about (see theory), the actions of themselves or others. Conversely there appear to be moments in which members are theorizing and at that time are oriented to their models of personality. At such a moment it would seem much more likely that an "insightful" or "significant" event might be noticed.

Again such pivotal events attain their significance only in relation to the personality model, that is, they are insightful only in the context of a model. It follows, therefore, that they would appear most likely to occur when the actor is so oriented, i.e. when the model is an issue. Such a phenomenon as "noticing" would seem to be unavailable through textual analysis and therefore constitutes a topic for further research.

Another important feature of the production of the sense of discovery is the sense that personality is a "layered" entity and as such discoveries may be made at various "levels." One constantly encounters such terms in personality work as "below," "beneath," "at another level," etc. Such terms both report and create the sense that personality has some sort of internal hierarchical structure (see personality as thing) and that discovery may be made at any of these levels. Surface traits must also give way in significance to deeper more substantial traits. These levels seem to appear to members to be both "vertically" and "horizontally" related and interdependent.

Again, such a view seems to be an artifact of the sense of model used in the discussion of the personality. That is, as the model as model is built, assumption upon assumption, premise upon premise, with a vast array of interconnections, the imagery of the model and the method of its construction are transferred to the subject of that model, namely the personality. The mental imagery utilized in the construction of a model serves as the conceptual framework for the personality being discovered in the client. The representation, in essence, becomes the object; the model becomes the personality.

In the discovery of personality the dialogue concerns the choice of different traits and the degree to which the "chosen" trait exists. For example, in 1/208 we find the client described as being "not as different as she appears." The complexity of the discovery process is through this observation heightened dramatically. Not only do staff debate the presence of the trait but the amount (or degree) of the trait. This added dimension gives the experience of discovery the sense of even more sophistication than previously described.

Implicit in the assumption of the degree to which the trait is present is the sense that exceptional cases may be incorporated into the model with little or no difficulty (see personality as scientific). When the client does something that seems inconsistent with the personality trait assigned this inconsistency can be eliminated through the interpretation that the trait is not 100% binding on the client's behavior. In this example, for instance, when the client does something that seems to deny the ascription that she is indifferent, then the determination is made that she is "not as indifferent as she appears" and this observation is added to the gestalt concerning the client's personality. In this way trouble with the sense of discovery is avoided. Through such an elegant mechanism inconsistency becomes consistent. Also through this mechanism the discovery of personality becomes an endless and ongoing task (see personality as essentially incomplete). Since the degree to which a trait exists and the existence of the trait itself are seen to be ever-changing the work of personality discovery is experienced as requiring constant update. In this way personality might be seen as a sort of interpersonal journalism. There is always "news" about an individual personality.

The sense that personality traits may be present in varying degrees would clearly seem to contribute to the sense of discovery. It certainly adds to the discovery task in that it increases the complexity of the activity and thereby in a sense enhances its importance as an activity. That is, for members, "discovery" is experienced as a difficult task.

A significant feature in the sense of discovery is that this discovery may be shared and reproduced. One of the assumptions-as-task in the case conference is the production of a personality model that may be used by others in dealing with the client. Implicit here is the sense that once the model is discovered it may be rediscovered by others and, incidentally, thus validated.

In 1/212 we find the staff member suggesting that the client's new teacher be briefed "to see...and be able to recognize" traits that the staff of this agency have discovered. Repeatedly it is emphasized that the information discovered by this conference be shared with the staff of the agency to which the client is being referred.

There is suggested a type of efficiency model in which the teachers at the new agency can use the discovered information and not have to "spend three months trying to find that out" (1/218). Again the sense appears to be that the information discovered is so factual that it will survive the transfer to a new setting. Clearly the information gathered here is considered by the staff involved as hard data. Though it may be considered incomplete it is not considered invalid (see personality as scientific). The very sense of "incomplete" reinforces the reality of personality.

It would appear that in the sense of discovery of personality there is implicit the sense that there are types of personalities. In the process of personality certain traits are classed as a type with individuals displaying that trait identified as an example of that type. In 1/237 we find such a description: "you know, some kids, some people try to take on something more difficult than they can handle." This serves the purpose of locating the "type" through anecdotal evidence as a legitimate category and serves to orient the other staff to the specific trait required. Traits are thus identified both through title, e.g. "unmotivated," and through example.

As we will see in personality as scientific and personality repair: treatment, the notion of personality types, that is, as belonging to a class, is critical. Types establish a legitimacy and serve as a reference from which treatment may be determined (a treatment repertoire).

An important feature of the discovery is that the personality discovered is typically organizationally relevant. That is, traits "discovered" are traits relevant to the demands and requirements of a certain context. For instance, in this organization there are specific types of personality traits toward which staff are predisposed to orient (see Setting). That is, the organization is geared to deal with certain types of personality troubles (see personality repair: trouble and treatment); therefore the staff are, to some extent, constrained to locate specific types of traits.

As we have seen in previous analysis such traits as "motivated" and "resistant to authority" are traits which appear as important themes. Such themes run throughout the entire length of transcription data.

We suggest that personality discovery is typically contextually bound. Clearly the client has displayed myriad behaviors during the stay at the agency and often members have chosen for examination only those relevant to the task at hand. That is, those traits that seem to impinge on the client's functioning in the organization setting assume some priority in the discovery process. Other types of traits are included as they relate to the practical task at hand. For example, in 1/210 we find, "I'm sure there's a heck of a lot going on personally, you know, outside of school that's affecting her performance...." And in 1/187, "you see with C there's a lot of things that are happening outside of school...." Such formulations are typically vague and seem to serve particularly as they relate to the task at hand.

The issue raised here is that the sense of discovery of personality (as product) is that it is general, acontextual though the method for its production is distinctly contextual. The sense of personality discovery is the uncovering of facets of a whole, subsets of a total theory. Though at the same time there is a sense of whole.

In this process of discovery we find the image of personality to be highly complex. Not only does it consist of many individual traits existing in various degrees but it is contextually bounded and relevant to specific settings. Given such complexity one wonders as to the ability of the members to be able to grasp an entire personality.

We have alluded to the sense of personality as "thing" and as "theme" as opposed to personality as object. It is perhaps this level of complexity that necessitates these impressions. In order for personality to do its theoretic and predictive work it must be highly complex as a phenomenon. Perhaps due to the need for this complexity the

concept becomes too unwieldy to handle. The need for complexity in order to explain disparate behavior produces a phenomenon that requires an essentially vague and unitary character to be intellectually "manageable."

Part of this complexity is the sense of discovery that a personality has "parts" that operate in different settings. As previously described these parts of personality appear to be context relevant. In addition, however, is the sense that different parts of personality can encroach in other parts and thereby cause a kind of trouble (see personality repair). The sense appears to be that some residue of another feature can "spill over" and cause problems in other settings. The suggestion appears to be that members in some sense orient to other settings while acting in a setting. Such phenomena as mood would appear to do the work of grounding such cross-contextual actions. "Mood" tends to discount some present behavior in favor of other behaviors that serve as "true" evidence of a specific personality ("John is in a bad mood. He's not really like that").

Again as we have stressed there is created the sense that the personality is discovered. The discovery of that personality is a process that entails the interpretation of both the individual behavioral displays and the "motivation" for those displays.

In the examination of the underlying pattern (see personality as theme) there is maintained the sense that the client is able to control the nature of her displays and thus "trick" the observers into an inaccurate interpretation of her personality. In 1/217 we find the staff members entertaining the possibility that such a trick has occurred and what that could mean for the description of the underlying

theme. The client is described as having a "game" (1/218). By this is apparently meant that she is self-conscious about her actions and therefore control the nature of the ascription.

Implicit in such an assumption is the notion that the displays and the interpretation of them is a product of the client and not of the observers. This notion of "game" and the later notion of "manipulative" (1/200) clearly serve to create the sense that the personality process is the product of the actor and that the observers are in fact discovering the true nature of the client just as they are able to see through this pretense to the truth. The simple notion of being "tricked" suggests that the personality is discovered. How would you "trick" an ascription? Constantly the talk of members reinforces the experiential world.

Related to this last phenomenon is the "faith" the members have in the method that discovers the personality. As will be discussed (see personality as scientific) the method used is considered (when it is considered at all) so powerful that it is able to see through the attempts by members to trick observers. The sense appears to be that power to discover is greater than the power to deceive. Hence, "true reality" is located and members' faith is sustained.

We have repeatedly oriented to the issue of the maintenance of the sense of discovery as the accomplishment. Those so inclined might note that perhaps the method emanates from the "fact" of personality and that it justifies that fact. That is, one may note perhaps there is truly a personality and the sense of it is therefore correct. A response to such an observation would be that throughout this analysis we have been unable to find the personality as the actors maintain

it. In all the set of practices described to date and those to be described seem to perpetuate the notion of a phenomenon that appears to be a construct. The methods create the sense of personality and other than that sense there appears there seems to be very little more to personality. There may be personalities of the sort suggested by members but if they exist then the methods we have described will not locate that phenomenon. As we have said and will continue to assert, in terms of interaction there appears to be no such thing as personality, at least nothing like the phenomenon that is asserted by members. Therefore the nature or existence of a real personality becomes irrelevant.

One often notes in the production of the sense of personality apparent violations or modification of some of the methods previously described. For instance in 1/272 we find the statement that the client "didn't want to be in the program and her attitude and performance showed it." The client was previously described as playing a "game," that is, being able to control the nature of her display so as to fool the observer. Here, however, the client's behavior is taken at face value as if she did not have the aforementioned skill.

The question concerns at what point these inconsistencies are noticed. If the client is playing a game then her display cannot be "trusted." If her display cannot be trusted, then on what does the staff base its observations? If you cannot use behavior then what is available for use? And if one discredits that behavior then the staff have placed themselves in the position of the double bind, namely, they cannot trust the behavior and they cannot make judgements without the behavior. The ability to "discover" personality literally "solves" this potential problem.

In 1/304 the client is discovered as having "problems with authority and structure." As previously discussed (see personality as thing), what is the sense of a problem with authority and structure? Such descriptions are clearly organizational terms and refer specifically to a client's relationship to an organization. The difficulty occurs in trying to determine the relationship of the client to an organization. It is of interest that members feel able to discover not only personality traits that relate to other actors but that they are able to determine traits that relate to such abstract entities and organizations. Such is the marvelous arrogance of personality work.

What may appear initially as a very small point in the discovery of personality is the use of such terms as "you know?". One notes that in many of these activities members are constantly "checking" their programs with other members in the activity and in doing so maintain the sense that they are sharing the event. It is clear that the response to "you know" can be a variety of things, that range from explicit distinct agreement as the exact nature of the internal structure and dynamics of the client's personality to the implicit agreement of "yes, go ahead." Through such devices members help to maintain the sense that they are sharing the event and often that they share the same interpretation of events.

Perhaps the strongest case for the maintenance of the sense of personality is the fact that the model or personality produced is often of the vaguest type. It is as we have said inconsistent and at times for the analyst seems to directly contradict itself. In 1/368 the client is now depicted as not being in control of her behavior in terms of concentration in the classroom. Prior to this observation

and subsequent to it the client is described as being "in control" of her behavior in the sense that she is able to control the types of displays she makes. Now we find the client not in control in the classroom and the contradiction remains unnecessary for noticing. In the discovery of the personality is often subordinated to the exigencies of maintaining the ability to make sense of all the data at hand. This "discovered" as we have said repeatedly is not the model of perfect coherence that the production method would lead members to believe.

Incorporated into the members' talk about the discovery of personality is the "psychological" sense of conscious and unconscious. While the concepts suggest that there are behaviors that the client performs but remains unaware of, the staff seem to experience no trouble in "seeing" both of these levels in operation. One suspects that while the terms are an artifact of the extant psychological model (or is the model an artifact of common sense personality work?), the sense that the individual is at least partially unaware of his or her actions seems to be a common one in interaction. It is a valuable phenomenon not only in the discovery process but, as we will see, it is highly important to the process of treatment and repair (see personality repair: incompetent patient and trouble). Again one notes a high level of "confidence" by members in the process of discovery in the sense that the observer can see things unavailable to the client him or herself.

In the process of discovery the location of the "problem" is in this setting very important. As we will discuss (see personality repair: trouble) the staff feel that they are able to isolate key troubles in the client and see ways that those troubles might be stopped. Further, as we will see, it will be essential to the treatment task that the

staff come to convince the client that their view of the client is the "superior" view and the acceptance of that view by the client is taken to be the first stage of the cure.

It appears to be difficult to anticipate the circumstances that the staff will feel have an important effect on the client. In 1/426 the staff member reports that the client's mother beats her while she sleeps. Throughout this section of the conference constant reference is made to the client as having some sort of "difficulty" outside the school which affects her performance in the school; yet when this observation is made there is no notice taken of it except in a joking manner. One assumes that there must be troubles in the method at times as there are "troubles" with the data. When data that don't fit the model are "noticed" they are discounted. Perhaps there are times in the method of discovery that parts of the process are simply skipped, either through human fatigue, disinterest, scheduling, time pressure, or simple not listening. While this may seem an unsophisticated observation, one suspects that certainly it must play some role in the activity. Personality work is constrained in many ways and some are, even for members, mundane.

In the work of discovery it appears that a variety of models are used to describe interaction. These themes are used to describe types of interactive strategies and might in some sense be seen as an interactive "style." For instance, in 1/470 we find the reference to the fact that the client has been able to "outmaneuver any demands made on her." This seems to suggest a kind of "game" model of interaction. It would seem that in the discovery of personality such an orientation as a "game" model might in some way influence the discovery process.

In such a model it is possible to imagine an individual, for instance, "outmaneuvering" another as if there were the moves and rules of the game situation. Again, the descriptive metaphor precipitates and accomplishes its own conclusions.

As we have previously mentioned the process of discovery is closely linked to the process of finding theme. In both of these processes the notion of a "summary" is very important. In section 1/520 we find the staff engaging in this summary process. They are attempting to pull together all the information and "polish off the rough spots" in terms of the theory.

Here contradictions and inconsistencies are confronted in what is experienced as a "refining" process. The inconsistencies are resolved utilizing the mechanisms we have earlier described. The behaviors that we noted as inconsistent are resolved through the redefining of what behavior represents (1/514A). When it is asserted that the client will not respond to demands and when this assertion contradicts other assertions that the client does respond to demands, the discrepancy is resolved through the interpretation that the client will respond when the demand is "impossible to avoid."

In this way both parties are satisfied and the "accuracy" of the discovery about the client is maintained. Again, through such mechanisms, the sense of the process of discovery is maintained.

Upon examination of the text one is able to locate the points at which the discovery process is finalized. For example, in 1/611 we find what might be seen as the "validation" of the discovery. Here the discovery that the client needs to be "made responsible for her actions" is translated into specific action vis-à-vis the client. The staff

members are reminded of their ascription of the client's personality and chided for the fact that they have not acted on their discovery. It is suggested that the client's referral to another institution be used to treat one of her problems. The situation, the staff reports, should be used to make the client accountable.

In such a way the staff are mildly rebuked for not acting on their own discovery. In making the "discovery" the basis for such a request would seem one of the most certain forms of validation of the discovered personality. As we will see the treatment of a personality is perhaps the best certification of the sense of personality (see personality repair: treatment).

This, then, is the process of discovery of personality. The sense shared by members that personalities are things that exist in people is reinforced in the fact that they seem available for such discovery. The "discovery" further seems to certify their existence. The process of discovery is as we have attempted to show a product of the method of discovery. Through linguistic structure, imagery, assertions, and the basic ways that members have of talking about personality discovery, the process gains the vivid sense that members are able to see into each other. In doing so they find the personalities that are thought to guide, direct, and motivate behavior.

This method of discovery tends to "cover its own tracks" and appear to its practitioners to be the location of an objective and concrete phenomenon. While we have shown it to be at times arbitrary, it appears to members to be orderly and rule governed.

It is a process marvelous in its faith in itself. It is a process that claims to locate through behavior a coherent, consistent

model of all individual behavior while never (from an analyst's perspective) doing it; and the fact that it never (analytically) accomplishes this goal remains unnoticed by the members that use it.

We have in this analysis only begun to scratch the surface of this complex phenomenon, but we have at least learned that discovery is not what it appears to be--it is more, it is less, and it is certainly different from what it appears to be.

#### Personality as Essentially Incomplete

Another in the set of practices that maintain the sense of personality is the sense that personality is essentially incomplete. By this is meant the sense that personality is at once constant and ever-changing. And as a result its description is an ongoing process.

The personality model/theory is constantly evolving, changing, and modifying though at the same time the personality is "recognized" as being basically consistent.

While upon first consideration such a sense would appear confusing, we will come to note that it is in fact this very sense of change and consistency that makes the very possibility of personality viable in the interactive world. It is only through this sense of change/constancy that disparate information that might otherwise threaten both the model and concept of personality is, in fact, incorporated into that model.

As we have said, if the personality model cannot or will not explain behavior, then the very reason for being of the entire concept of personality is jeopardized. Personality is meant to explain behavior and therefore bring a sense of order to interaction. If personality

cannot explain behavior then its utility can and would come into question and a central feature of the maintenance of social order would be threatened. As we have repeatedly asserted the illusion of the sense of order is absolutely essential for the maintenance of order.

An interesting feature of the sense of personality is then the sense that members seem to have that that their notions of individual personalities seem to have the sense of coherence even though they are thought to correspond to a constantly changing concrete phenomenon. As we will discuss, this phenomenon is similar to that in science as a descriptive model. In science the task is as well considered to be the study of an ever-expanding phenomenon. There one finds in the method the main products from the "solution" of a problem as the creation of other problems or questions. As such science becomes an ever-expanding activity even in, what some consider, a finite universe.

In personality work, as well as the work of science, the examination and discovery of personality is endless. It is endless due both to the sense that personality is multileveled and largely unknown (and available for "discovery" and to the sense that personality is not constant but ever-expanding in both its content/list and in the dynamics/theory that ties together that list. Personality work then becomes the task of Sisyphus in its endless and repetitive character.

We will here maintain that the fact that personality work is never complete serves the additional function of maintaining its sense as a concrete, objective phenomenon. If personality models were ever to be completed, it appears possible that they might finally appear to members as a construct and ascription as opposed to a "discovery." Besides life would be less interesting, to say nothing of the fact that

members would have a lot of time on their hands if they no longer had the endless task of personality work.

Let us turn to the conference data in an attempt to explicate the essentially incomplete character of personality. Included in the sense that personality is essentially incomplete is the sense that it is constant and changing. As we have described here, the client is described as having the personality trait that she is not involved in her classroom work. This lack of involvement is initially described as "lazy" (1/121).

Again as we have described, the response to this observation is that it is inappropriate (1/122). The staff member responding asserts that "lazy" is a description of behavior and not a description of what we have come to call here personality.

At this point the staff member invokes what we shall call the "why response." By this we mean that the staff member suggests that there is something "behind" the described behavior and that the focus of the conversation should direct itself to that other thing (see personality as thing). Through the "why response" the member is able to establish the possibility of regress. Once the possibility of regress is established, then the possibility of essentially never-ending personality work is established.

The response to virtually any description of personality is the invocation of regress. This regress occurs in varieties of ways in the production of personality. First, it may serve as a challenge to the offered personality model, a version of "prove it."

Apparently the sense of personality work includes the sense that personality observations, though based on behavioral displays,

operate from the "inside out." By this we mean that in personality work the sense that the work is scientific (see personality work as scientific) demands that the theory about personality originate not in the behavior but in the personality itself. That is, one can make inferences about personality through display but that these inferences must originate in the personality itself.

Therefore an assertion like "lazy" may be "challenged" as grounded in personality and not in behavior as it cannot stand the test of "why." By this we mean that if a theory is to be considered valid in personality work, then it must be able to locate motive or the auspices under which the behavior was initiated.

It should be noted as we will discuss (see personality as scientific) in the theorizing, the theory may or may not be challenged but some theory must be available if the observation will be considered invalid. The point here, however, is that through this structure the possibility of personality as essentially incomplete is established.

The regress problem is interesting in that those engaged in personality face having to determine the end of regress, as we have said, the situation of having once invoked the "why?" response. That is, for members the question becomes, "when does one stop asking why?"

As with the regress problem in other areas (see Zimmerman and Pollner<sup>18</sup>) the decision seems to be an arbitrary or practical one. That is, the members simply stop asking. While this may seem a weak observation it suggests that the members must maintain in the sense of personality work the sense that enough is known about the client for the particular purpose at hand (for all practical purposes).

As this conference ends the comment is made, "I think that I want to stress that she does act mature, but that there are times that her maturity lacks responsibility" (1/639). The first observation concerning this comment is that its meaning is opaque. What is, or could be, meant by the phrase "her maturity lacks responsibility"? The point here appears to be that the final comment in the conference as to the client's personality is essentially vague, i.e. it has an impenetrable or unavailable meaning.

It appears that the conference and consequently the formal personality work simply "stopped" at this point. One notes that often the regress problem reaches a solution in just this way. Situational constraints will impinge on the personality work (time, fatigue, interest, etc.) and force a termination to the process. In so doing the probing into the depths of the personality simply stops as well. One of the central features of the essentially incomplete character of personality seems to lie in the resolution of the regress problem. As we have said, the string of "why" questions has the sense that it could go on forever.

It is perhaps useful to subdivide the regress problem as it applies to the phenomenon of personality work. As described earlier the sense seems to be that there is a list of characteristics, and a theory of how those characteristics are tied together (see personality as theme and as thing). In the doing of personality work the examination can focus on the list and/or the theory. Therefore one may find the regress series concerning either one or both of these features.

For instance, in the conference at hand the client has been described as "unmotivated" (1/135). In such a case the focus of the dialogue could be either on the "motivation" as a feature of the list and/or the reason for the lack of motivation.

One can find debate, discussion, examination of the behavior which has been defined as "unmotivated" to determine if this is the appropriate description of the behavior (see personality as thing, as theme, and as discovered). In addition some part of the personality work could focus on the reason why the lack of motivation exists. The sequence could follow an order such as the following:

What was the behavior?

What did the behavior represent?

The offering of possible list entries

The debate of those entries

The selection of a list entry

Why does this list/characteristic exist?

The debate over the reasons for the list/characteristic

Some conclusion as to the reason for the list/characteristic

In examining the personality as essentially incomplete one notes that the regress problem seems to apply in each of the steps described. At what point has each of the steps been determined and how do the members decide to move on in the process (see personality as scientific). Given the complexity of the process it seems clear that the sequence of events could be rather long.

The feature that finds that personality as essentially incomplete seems to be the result of the regress phenomenon operating during each of the stages of the process. Thus the sense that the personality is essentially incomplete seems to be grounded in that process of its production. That is, due to the nature of the production process both the production of personality as an activity and the product of that activity, namely personality itself, must be essentially incomplete.

As mentioned earlier the essentially incomplete character of the personality work serve the phenomenon very well in terms of its interactional utility. If as we have described, personality is the sense of order in personal interaction, then a notion of personality as incomplete and subject to reinterpretation aids in the maintenance of that sense of order. It will be very unlikely that the process of personality work can or would ever break down as long as the possibility exists that the extant model might be subject to modification. Rigidity in a personality description as in a scientific paradigm (see Kuhn) spells the end of that model as a useful explanatory device.

As we have said, not only is personality experienced as a phenomenon of amazing complexity and the work that accomplishes the personality subject to a potentially infinite cycle of regression, but the sense of personality includes the notion of personality change (see personality repair: change). Personalities are experienced as being in a constant and endless state of flux. This process of change is a highly complex phenomenon in which both the list of traits and the theory about how those traits interrelate undergo modification.

The change in a personality can be seen as having two loci. In one case the change is considered due to the fact that the observer has come to "understand" the personality better. This is the case when the process of the sense of discovery (see personality discovery) creates the impression that new information necessitates the need to change the personality description. Again the observer in this case may be the member him/herself if the process of personality is intrapersonal. In such a case new data suggest that the personality is "really" something other than originally assumed.

The second locus of personality change can be the personality itself. In this case the sense is that the personality has undergone some sort of basic structural change. Typically these changes are not total and may range from minor to major. A common context for the "recognition" of such a situation is the therapeutic context and this takes the form of "overcoming" some sort of problem (see personality repair: change). This sense of the ability of the personality to change reinforces the sense that personality is essentially incomplete.

Due to the sense that both the uncovering of information about a specific personality and the sense that the personality itself is in a state of flux make personality work a task that is never ending. As we have mentioned earlier the inability to "nail down" a personality due to its essentially incomplete character seems to serve the purpose of the maintenance of the sense of personality as an objective and real phenomenon.

An implication of the feature that personality is essentially incomplete is the notion that the personality is essentially vague. Due to the ability never to make definitive statements concerning a personality, the sense of personality is perpetuated. We have described the feature of personality that finds it to be "there" but there in a special sense. While a personality is considered to be "real," it is not real in the physical sense. Its power as a concept comes from its ability to explain behavior. The ability to explain is enhanced through the sense that the personality is essentially incomplete, i.e. it could not be anything but incomplete given the process of discovery and the changing nature of the personality.

The notion that personality is essentially incomplete creates the sense in personality that some types of behaviors may be unexplainable

in the typical ways. There appears to be the sense of "wait and see" in many of the available personalities. This phenomenon occurs particularly in personalities that are considered to be undergoing change or development (the emotionally troubled or children or anyone else who seem to be "growing"). Due to the fact that personality is seen as a model explaining behavior, it serves to retrospectively reorganize the behaviors presented in such a way that previously unexplained or mis-explained behaviors now come to make sense (see personality as thing and theory). The "wait and see" phenomenon allows members to suspend personality work until such time as either an explanation may be found or the individual's personality has stopped changing (or reached some sort of plateau). Due to the view that personality is essentially incomplete there appears to be experienced by members no sense of pressure to explain behavior and waiting for some meaning to "present itself" becomes an option.

It should be noted that there are situations in which the wait and see phenomenon must succumb to situational constraints. For instance, in the case of this conference the staff are expected to provide information for and about the client upon her termination and transfer to another agency. The interaction then is constrained to find certain features of the client and, in particular, those relevant to organizational operation.

The sense that personality is essentially incomplete is partly due to the view of members that personality has a variety of distinct and different "parts" and that observers may follow some of these threads out of their logical conclusion and then shift to another thread and follow that as far as possible.

For example, in 1/204 we find the staff member discussing the example of the client who was determined to have no interest in the classroom situation suddenly becoming "excited" after having passed a test. The staff members find this data incongruous but are not sure as to its meaning (see personality as thing). Still they feel that the behavior is significant in some yet undetermined way. In 1/211 this thread becomes "lost" and this serves as an example, we think, of the way that these threads stop. Later in 1/323 this thread is picked up again in the discussion concerning whether the client is able to control her attention in class and behavior in general. The process of personality construction then seems to be the process by which personality "threads" are accumulated. It is an incremental process in which various features of the client's personality are built, though each of the threads is assumed to be unfinished. In this way personality work may be seen as an ongoing project. These threads are an artifact of the nature of the description and constitute a fertile area for future research.

An interesting incongruity in the work of personality construction is the sense that though personality is ever-changing, decisions about the client in the future are made based on the current interpretation of the client's personality. As mentioned earlier a prime agenda in this conference is the determination of personality information for use by staff in other institutions. For instance, in 1/246 the staff are attempting to make an interpretation of a possible placement of the client in a special education format upon her referral to the other institution. The basis of this determination is the past experience with the client. By this is apparently meant the current description of the personality data. As in much of personality the focus, by definition, is and can only be through present interpretation.

If personality is considered to be evolving, then how could one make such projections? As we have said, the sense of personality is both constant and changing and it appears that either feature may be "oriented to" in any specific setting. There appears to be no problem for members in such an orientation process. It is as if they are able to orient to either the constant feature or the changing feature while for the time being "ignoring" the other. There appears to be dissonance or perceived incongruity in such an activity. It is as if there are for members only the present and its constraints. They seem able to choose which of these features of personality toward which to orient, but only in the present. It is through the present formulation that the making sense activity is realized.

The sense, then, that personality is essentially incomplete is the sense that personality is at once constant and changing, defined and undefined, formulated and evolving. It is a feature of personality that aids in the sense of personality as "real" due to the fact that it allows members to solve "trouble" with data without jeopardizing the sense of order inherent in personality. Of particular interest in this process is the ability of members to orient to whatever feature of the completeness of personality seems appropriate to the setting, while successfully "ignoring" the other facets.

#### Personality Work as Scientific

The last in the series of personality practices to be examined here is the sense that personality work is scientific. By this is meant that the methods members use to do personality work is experienced by them as orderly and as an examination of an external, objective phenomenon. This is not to mean that personality work is "science" in the sense of an

academic field of study but rather as the result of a scientific method. Members engaged in personality work see themselves as about the same sort of task as those engaged in formal science. Included for instance are what we will come to call the sense of the rules of evidence and experimentation. Like science, members see themselves able to validate their theories concerning personality through a kind of controlled study. Like science one of the prime products of personality work is the sense of order produced. Like science as well we will examine the ways in which this sense of order is an artifact of the set of practices as opposed to some transcendent version of "truth."

Science as an activity is seen as a set of methods and practices for the systematic examination of reality. It purports through the application of its method not only to discover features of this reality but simultaneously prove the validity of those discoveries. We do not intend here to mount a critique of science and its method but rather to examine some of the similarities existing between these two phenomena.

The scientific method is typically described as a process in which practitioners first clearly define a specific problem or area of study. Through this definition the problem is expected to be brought into relief and, as clearly as possible, a description of the problem's features is to be made. In such a way all interested come to be oriented to the problem in a similar way. Here we find that in personality work the members involved seem to have the sense that they are all sharing the same reality and are clearly orienting to the same feature of that reality and all orienting in the same way. The assumption is that the external reality is essentially unidimensional in that shared intersubjectivity is possible. In both forms of science the assumption is that

through the method access to this external reality is obtainable. As we have described repeatedly, members seem to display a perfect "faith" that personality is at once theme, thing, discovered and most certainly real though in an essentially incomplete form. In the doing of both science and personality work this faith in the external reality and access to it is virtually never questioned. Personality is, as we have discussed, for members definitely a thing.

Like science, personality may be seen as producing theory. In the case of the former it is theory concerning some aspect of the physical world and in the latter a description of behavior called personality. In both cases the process is seen as one of discovery and not as one of production (see personality as discovery).

The theory produced is regarded as representing reality. This theory is seen as essentially a correspondence model in that it reflects or represents some features of the external reality. That is, it purports to be a description of the features of the external reality along with the dynamic (or set of dynamics) that hold that reality together.

In this case the reality under discussion is the phenomenon of personality. Members claim that they are able to discover in each other this theory that describes the essential features of the individual. It is not claimed to be a description but rather the description. Yes, it is evolving (see personality as essentially incomplete) but the point is that it is evolving toward the truth.

The fact of the theory's internal consistency, or rather its sense of internal consistency, is taken to be an artifact of its accuracy. That is the more a theory is, or appears to be, internally consistent, the more the practitioner (proponents) of that theory have the sense that the theory represents the "real" personality.

We have described the phenomenon of "insight" (see personality as essentially incomplete) and it appears that this sense is when the theory gains some further measure of internal consistency. That is, the insight may be seen as the sense that the observer has just seen into the client or made a significant "connection" in the description of the subject's behavior. This connection seems to be the establishment of some level of internal consistency though at the same time it is taken by members to be a display of the correspondence of that theory to the real personality.

As previously mentioned, a central feature of the sense that personality work is scientific work is the notion that this work seeks to define a cause-effect relationship within the individual between action and personality. Personality is seen as a set of causes for action and the work of personality discovery seeks the explication of the causal framework that defines this personality.

Personality work is clearly "rational" work in that it seems to assume that there are no idle actions. By "idle" actions is meant those actions that might occur "for no reason." There appears to be the assumption held by members that all human action is purposeful action. It is the purpose of personality work to discover (see personality as discovered) the order that underlies that action. It should be clearly noted that the sense of science is not that it brings order to the behavior through the production of a conceptual model but rather that through the use of a method order is discovered in the action.

Clearly in this activity the locus of the action is seen to be the member as generating the behavior and not with the observer producing the sense of order. That is, the data (the actor's behavior) is

seen as containing within it the potential for the sense of order that is personality and that through the application of the method of personality that order becomes evident. Again and repeatedly this position asserting that the order lies in the client and not in the ascription is continually reaffirmed through the process of personality work.

In 1/41 we find the basic "scientific" question that defines personality work. It is reported that the client never participates in the gym class and the reporting staff member is asked, "do you know why she was doing that?" In examining this very small incident it is useful to note this assertion of scientific uncovering of a truth about the client. Let us examine the following passage:

J: All right physical education she got an incomplete, OK? and the comment here was that because she generally did not participate in any gym activities. She would go back and just sit by the sidelines or, you know as I recall it, she would use an excuse saying that she was not feeling well or that she could not or she never goes to gym, you know, and she would stay behind.

R: Do you know why she was doing that?

1/35-1/41

This passage describes a clear example of the sense of science produced in personality work. In the passage staff member "J" reports as description of an event and the report of that event is taken to be possible data for analysis in the determination of the client's personality. It is reported not only that the client does not participate in the gym activity but that the client's nonparticipation in this activity may be taken as an example of something. That is, the nonparticipation in the activity is reported as something other than "nonparticipation." Through the use of the term "excuse" the client is described as not participating for reasons other than those she has reported. Such a description

places this incident as requiring interpretation. Through what we might call an "invitation to interpretation" the scientific nature of the activity begins. Through the use of such terms as "excuse" as opposed to "reason" there is created the invitation for those present to interpret the "cause" for the behavior. That is, the way the data is presented suggests the truth of that data and therefore the need for interpretation (see personality repair: trouble).

As in all science there is implicit in the action the apparent "faith" that such ascriptions as "excuse" are legitimate. Though, as we will see, much of the scientific nature of this activity will depend on the sense of "evidence" found in the world, there seems to be an inconsistent application of the rule for the determination of the "validity" of the evidence. For instance, in this example a response to the ascription of "excuse" might have been a request for proof of the validity of that description. Such a request typically sounds something like, "why do you say that?"

Here, however, the ascription of "excuse" is accepted without question and itself comes to serve as data. The focus of the inquiry comes to be not if the client offers an excuse but rather "why" the excuse serves to validate the fact of excuse and focus attention on theorizing about the, now taken-for-granted, fact. Such an activity is essentially scientific in that it purports to be locating in the action some sense of order through an examination of the cause-effect relationship. We must reiterate, however, that this orderly sense of examination seems to be certainly more arbitrary (or practically constrained) than would ordinarily appear to be the case.

In examining personality as scientific, then, it is important that here as in other scientific work an issue is what constitutes the nature of "data." In personality work, as in science, data may be either descriptions of behavior or descriptions of the motive for that behavior and the two can often appear interchangeably. Here the description of the client as giving excuses for her nonparticipation is not taken as a description of behavior but as behavior. Consequently the theorizing concerns the location of the "reason" for the client producing this behavior.

As we will see this bouncing back and forth between behavior and description-as-behavior is common in the scientific practice of personality work though typically it appears not to be noticed by the members at the time. We will note that description-as-behavior may under certain circumstances be challenged as unacceptable data though such challenges appear to be rare.

Another feature of the scientific character of the personality work that seems evidenced in this exchange is the sense that the observer is able to see "into" the personality involved (see personality as discovered). In asking the question, "do you know why she is doing that?" the implication seems to be that the staff member reporting is able to locate the reason for the description-as-behavior of offering an "excuse." The very act of asking the question seems to certify the ability to provide an answer.

The possibility of one member seeing into another and recognizing the reason for an excuse-offering seems totally unquestioned. Further, the sense that the members are in fact discussing some feature of a shared

and objective external reality seems totally taken for granted.

A feature of scientific thinking is the sense that the nature of the information is "what any member could know." That is, the sense of knowledge is "democratic," that is, available to all competent actors who would look. There appears in the question the scientific faith that while the staff member may not know specifically why the client is offering an excuse, he is perfectly capable of knowing. Such an assertion is an essentially "scientific" one.

It is essential to the practice of science that there appears to be order in the external world and that this order be readily available for discovery through the use of the specific methods of science. Science purports to discover the order in things as opposed to the creation of order, i.e. science is the act of discovery. This discovery takes the form of the application of a tentative descriptive framework to data and the determination through trial and error prediction of the efficacy/accuracy of that framework.

The framework claims to be a description of the causal dynamics that produce the data. This "framework" is meant to be a model describing some feature of the data and the accuracy of the model seems to be available through the discovery of "evidence" that supports it. As a model it is taken as describing only some features of the phenomenon and is typically contextually bound to some specific instrumental task. In the case of personality the goal of the model is as we have said to produce the sense of order necessary for social interaction. Through the application of the model members claim to be able to "predict" and anticipate the actions of others and therefore be able to operate in the social world.

Central to this process is the production of a model describing the behavior in some constant though ever-evolving way (see personality as essentially incomplete). In 1/43 we find the beginning of that process in response to the question concerning the cause of the description/behavior "excuse." Two alternative possible explanations/theories are offered for evaluation by the staff members. These are "embarrassed" and "not athletic."

Here we find the suggestion that in the ability to suggest an "explanation" for a behavior is that it is an example of a type of behavior that is found in the world. This suggests the implicit assumption of certain commonalities in the functioning of humans and that the behavior "excuse" falls into a readily available type with a list of possible causes. The staff member was therefore able to offer, sight unseen, possible causal alternatives for the production of the behavior.

Such an implication again maintains that the work at hand is scientific work. Not only is the behavior an example of a personality trait in action; that trait is an example of a type of human trait known and available for recognition by all competent members. What remains is the determination of the validity and applicability of this typology to the current situation.

In the determination of the "validity" of the proffered type or class of behavioral causes, it is again essential that the sense of correspondence be maintained. That is, the acceptance of the model/type/description appears to be experienced as reflecting some "real" thing in the client. That is, the model is not sensed as being "decided upon" but instead validly applied after its determination is verified as accurate.

Here, for instance, the determination is made that a third type of "cause" is moving the client to not participate in the gym activity. It is that the client "sees herself as a little too mature for ..." gym activities. The claim that this is the "cause" is supported through the comment that this is "the kind of image that she projects..." (1/57). Again the clear sense is that the model exists in the client and that the staff are simply uncovering that model.

It is interesting to note that nowhere in the method does the staff describe exactly how they reached their specific conclusions. The verifications for the various decisions about the client are simply asserted through the description of the data used to make the determination. There will be a member's description of the data used but not how that data links to that particular conclusion. It is simply asserted to be the conclusion with no explanation as to how it got to be the conclusion. However mysterious the connection between the data and the conclusion, it is clearly experienced as being based on the data that is the client behavior.

Central to the determination of validity of the model under production is the ability of members to "verify" the model through their own experience. In 1/58 we find the description of the client's non-participation as located in her supposed self-determination that she is "too mature" to participate validated by a second staff member. The specific form of the verification again reinforces the sense that the activity at hand is a "scientific" one. The act of verification takes the form of another staff member's ability to "see" the same trait in the client (the scientific sense of replicability). Through such imagery is maintained the sense that these conclusions are there for all to see if they only look properly.

The personality model is, as we have described, seen to be constantly evolving (see personality as essentially incomplete). It is interesting to note the apparent ease with which the staff are able to shift parts of the model (adjust the paradigm) or redirect their attention to other parts of the client's behavior. In the previous section we describe the determination that the client did not participate in the gym class due in part to her determination that she was "too mature." This description is later challenged and withdrawn as an "impression" (1/68).

Without missing a beat the conference continues to determine that the client sees herself as "ultra feminine" (1/89). The ease with which the old theory is "dropped" and the new direction undertaken serves to obfuscate the act of production and the creation of the sense that the staff is looking at an object and is simply shifting its attention to another facet of that object.

Such actions serve as a constant reminder, a constant litany reinforcing the sense of objective reality. We cannot stress enough that the sense of personality as "real" is maintained through just such mechanisms. It does not simply occur that members see personality as real. It is the product of the ways those members have come to talk about, think about and orient to such a phenomenon. It is the accomplishment of a method.

The scientific nature of the personality work is further maintained in the sense that members seem to have that they are able to assume the perspective of the subject and determine how that subject "sees" the world. Through such an ability the observer seems to be able to justify his conclusions about the client. They seem to be able to become the client and determine what and how the client is thinking. No one, of

course, ever questions how one is able to do that.

As in science there is in personality work the sense of experimentation. One of the ways that a model is "verified" is through the testing of that model on the subject at hand. In 1/106 we find the description that the client is uninvolved in the classroom work. The verification of that determination is made through the staff member's reports that he can make her involved through personal attention. It is asserted that the client can be made "involved" and an example of that ability is reported. When the staff member gives what he sees as an "assurance," he finds that the client is able to participate. He then uses this involvement as the validation that the client needs assurance. It should be noted that the staff member defines the attention as "assurance" and used the client's interpreted response to verify that thesis. This is not to suggest that the thesis is right or wrong but rather that the process may be seen as other than it appears in this context to be. It might be seen as "poor" science, though as others have asserted, Science itself is just as capricious.

The maintenance of the scientific sense of personality is aided by the invocation of what might be described as "rules of order." In an example used in another context earlier (see personality as thing) the attempt to use the description "lazy" (1/121) is disallowed as an unacceptable type of classification. What appears to occur is that "lazy" is considered to be a description of behavior and not a description of cause for behavior.

This seems to suggest that personality work in this type of setting is considered to be the examination of the cause of behavior and not the description only of behavior. In such a way a sense of formality is

maintained in that the activity at hand does conform to a set of explicit rules. That is, this is not considered "idle" talk but the business of describing the client in a specific way. It is the invocation of the formal program of science.

Another scientific aspect to the personality work at hand is the sense that the theory/product derived is in some ways acontextual. It appears that members view the activity as discovering some invariant principles about the client that may be used by others in the future. In 1/146 the staff are reminded that the task they are about is the determination of information that can be used by staff in other settings. It is suggested that the other staff may be able to save time in arriving at the same conclusions and it therefore behooves the staff to pass along this information. The sense that the theory has real utility in the interaction with the client suggests that the theory is both factual and available.

There is clearly the sense that staff feel that they are able to determine factual information about the client. This sense is reinforced in fact due to situations in which sometimes they can't. In 1/159 we find a staff member unable to decide as to the reason for the client's behavior. He offers two alternative theories but appears to feel unsure as to which if either is correct. This difficulty aids the sense that for members the task of personality work is not arbitrary.

As we have said, personality work is not considered by members to be idle but rather the process of discovery and as such at times "difficult." We have pointed out other situations in which staff have perfect confidence in descriptions that appear, at least, open for discussion (e.g. "lazy"). Here, however, the staff member appears to be struggling

with the decision as to which of his possible descriptions is "right." He apparently is unable to verify (an essentially vague concept) either of his possibilities and therefore cannot make a decision.

At this point he is clearly orienting to some rule as to what constitutes sufficient "proof" of a description. The invocation of the rule earlier concerning the definition of "lazy" may have in some way (as yet unexplicated) reminded the staff member of the rule and caused him to be more cautious as to its use. In the ability to invoke rule the activity becomes scientific.

An interesting feature of personality work is that while there is the clear and strong sense that it is scientific, we have seen at times this scientific sense is oriented to; at other times the sense of science seems to be ignored. By this is meant that while the format of the activity remains "scientific" the content (process) appears to often violate the rules of formal science, though such violations seem to go unnoticed. For instance, in the conference immediately following the admonition to remain scientific we have just discussed a staff member describe the client as (in effect) not being afraid because sometimes she seemed not to be (1/171). This seems to suggest that due to the fact that the client was at one time unafraid, she could not ever have been afraid. So stated this premise clearly becomes illogical though the comment seemed to pass unnoticed in the context of the conference. It is through such events that we maintain that personality work maintains the sense of science rather than the fact of formal science. Informed science and personality work seem to share much in method.

Important to the sense of science is the ability to explain broad varieties of behavior in the simplest possible way. As described earlier,

a central feature of this activity is the ability of the staff to summarize the behavior (see personality as theme and thing). These summaries appear to be important in that they seem to determine a plateau in the process of model formation. For instance, in 1/301 we find the description that the client is having a problem with "authority and structure." Such a summary is important in that to this point the staff have related a variety of anecdotes concerning the client and have reached a point when it is difficult to maintain a clear sense of all of the information. Through the summary all this information is reduced to two descriptive terms and therefore organized.

It appears that when such summaries are validated through group acceptance they become features in the client's personality. Having originated in an accumulation of anecdotes, these terms are then used to make sense of a variety of other anecdotes. As described earlier, personality becomes a list/theory and through such summaries essential "corners" are turned in this process.

It should be noted here that the process of personality work is contextually bound. Here, for instance, the discussion defines the client in terms relevant to her relationship with the organization. She is described in such terms as "uninvolved," "unmotivated," and as "having problems with authority and structure." These describe what might be called organizational characteristics in that they define the relationship of an individual to an organization. In this way, as we have said, personality work typically deals with instrumental types of relationships and settings. Personality talk is rarely idle talk but is more often directed toward a specific setting and circumstance and as such is essentially scientific.

In terms of personality work being experienced as scientific, a contributing factor in the process is the sense that the personality involved may be "measured." Not only are the qualitative descriptions used that we have described but in addition quantitative measures are incorporated. For instance, in 1/368 we find the discussion focused on the determination as to the degree of "control" the client has over her behavior. There is created the sense that the staff are able to determine in the client various levels of control. There appears to be little displayed ability to define what constitutes a lot or a little control, though there appears to be a shared sense of these definitions.

As in science a possible upshot of the examination of the subject/data is the ability to provide a description that is not really a description. For example, in the section 1/412 we find that the client seems to perform behavior that runs contrary to the theory that she is not able to "control" her behavior. When such evidence is offered the nature of the interaction (a gloss) is such that this information must be incorporated in some way. Here the solution to that problem of incorporation is the description that the client is confused and therefore acts in "inconsistent" ways. Thus the model is maintained intact through the simple device that it (as description) does not always apply. It should be noted that there appears to be varieties of ways that such contrary data are handled. Future research will focus on such issues of "model maintenance."

As an example of such maintenance we note that if an actor makes a display that seems not to fit the model then this display may be "discounted" through (among other ways) the assertion that this display is not an example of personality but rather of some other category like

"mood." In the case of a "mood" the behavior is seen as somehow transitory or in some way not centrally linked to the client or subject. "Being in a bad mood," "getting out of the wrong side of the bed," and "not being yourself" are the sort of common sense examples that come to mind in such a context. It is therefore considered possible for the individual to make displays that do not reflect personality, though at the same time it appears that virtually any display could be seen as representing personality. Through such a complex system of classification the scientific sense of personality work is maintained and the sense of certainty that comes with the resultant model is preserved.

The use of data in personality in many ways closely reflects that of the scientific method. There appears throughout the work the determination of the nature of the displays made by members as "relevant" to the determination of personality. As previously described there appear to be situations in which displays are taken not to reflect the determination of personality. Similarly individuals appear able to seemingly violate their personality ascriptions without calling those ascriptions into question. The question appears, "how often may a happy person be sad before he becomes a sad person?" Further as in this case at hand the client can be described as having a confused personality and therefore is to be expected to be inconsistent.

As in science the personality is seen to be operating in a world of many forces that affect and alter their functioning. A personality is seen to be affected by environmental conditions and in such a way becomes an even more complex phenomenon. As in science the personality may be opaque and not available for the immediate inspection that is required. Typically it will succumb to the method of analysis at some

later point and become available. The sense appears to be of the methodical uncovering of the personality through the examination of the data of behavior.

A somewhat more subtle similarity to the scientific enterprise is the confidence displayed by members that the external reality (in this case personality) is in fact changeable (see personality repair: change). Members through their determination of various treatment formats implicitly assert that intervention in the personality structure is possible and that thereby change may be effected. This is, of course, the goal of all scientific enterprises.

Personality work, then, clearly is the work of science. It is methodic to its members in that it is seen as applying a specific more-or-less rigorous technique to the study of the specific phenomenon at hand. It is experienced as the examination of a real phenomenon which is thought to have a specific (though at times opaque) structure. It is a phenomenon that is felt to have concrete dynamics available through the application of this method. It is experienced as a phenomenon that is concrete enough to allow intervention and enforced change. Personality is real enough to allow the experimentation that is required for the testing of scientific theory.

Personality work is also like science in that it is a method but a method in ways other than immediately available to the practitioners of science. That is, science is a method within a method. It is the reflexive maintenance of a specific type and kind of external order through the assertion and reassertion of that order (as an article of faith) through its method. Science is experienced by its practitioners as the systematic examination of a concrete external reality. Personality work

is experienced by its practitioners as the systematic examination of a concrete external reality. Both activities maintain such an experience through the endless reapplication of a specific method. In both cases the by-product of the method is the maintenance of the sense of order. In this way personality work is clearly scientific.

These then are some of the practices that maintain the sense of personality as an external concrete reality operant in day-to-day interaction. This list is not taken to be complete. Further research will undoubtedly expand and, in other ways, alter this list. Clearly these practices are interdependent and often overlap. A single activity may evidence several practices. They should be taken as the seminal stages of a conceptual model describing the reflexive production of the sense of personality. As with any model they describe only some features of the specific phenomenon at hand and should be taken only as a form of description. This research does not purport to be "science" in the sense of an examination of reality but rather an analytical description of a possible orientation by members in the course of their everyday "doing" of personality work. This analysis attempts to identify the method by which members maintain the sense that personality is really "there." Further it attempts to describe the ways in which this "personality" may be seen to be the artifact of the method by which members talk about it. It is the examination of personality as an accomplishment.

## Personality Repair Practices

### Introduction

An essential feature in the possibility of the repair of personality is the sense that members are able to locate trouble in personality. Typically, as we have said, this "trouble" seems to fall into two general types. The first type is the sense that there appear to be behavioral displays that do not "fit" any discernable pattern. Such a difficulty may occur in either inter- or intrapersonal interaction. That is, the member may not be able to explain a specific behavior in terms of the list/theory of personality. This type of problem appears to be unsettling to the sense of order that we find to be a product of the personality model. Due to such a problem there appears to be a perceived difficulty in the prediction of behavior.

A second general type of problem to be found in personality work is the description of some feature of the member's personality as "unacceptable" to a specific social context. There is a pattern discovered concerning the client's behavior but this pattern in some ways violates local values. While the member's behavior is "understood" it is seen as inappropriate.

If the determination of the existence of either of these types of problem occurs, then the decision is made that there must be made some basic change in the member through the application of a specific program of repair (see personality repair: treatment). As the program of repair is applied the staff are seen to be able to discern the alteration of the "troubled" feature of the personality (see personality repair: change).

Fundamental to this entire process is the sense that personality trouble exists and may be located in the actor. Clearly as we have said the maintenance of such a sense in members of personality trouble reinforces the status of personality as objectively real.

It should be noted that personality repair is not typically one of the tasks of personality work. While in day-to-day personality work troubles are often described, rarely is there an attempt to describe some program of repair for the alteration of the personality.

"The program" serves as an organization whose formal purpose is the location of personality troubles and the repair of those troubles. Consequently it behooves the staff of the program to locate trouble. That is, they are constrained to find problems in personality and as such, do it with greater regularity than in typical interaction.

In other contexts (e.g. love, or the writing of a recommendation) the constraint is the orientation to personality strengths in either a value sense or in the clear orderly nature of the personality.

In a repair station the orientation must be by definition to a trouble. In the case conference that serves as the data for this analysis the goal is the description of the client's problems for the staff of the program to which she is being referred. It has been predetermined that she has a problem. First, it was so determined in the school from which the client was referred. Then the nature of the specific problem was determined before she was referred to this particular program. It was again determined when she arrived at the program. It was then determined later in her career in the program that she was inappropriate for this particular setting. In this conference this conclusion is re-determined more formally for purposes of referral. It will again be

determined when the client reaches her new destination. In a repair station like this program, much of the staff time is spent in talk determining the client's trouble. The predisposition for members of such a setting, then, is the location of trouble. With such a predisposition, as we shall see, trouble is "easy" to find.

Much theoretical work has been done in the area of labelling theory as the determination of a "negative" description of the client. What we mean to examine here are the ways in which members locate and orient to the possibility of troubles in personality.

Here the focus is not the impact of the "label" of trouble on the client's career in the program but rather the maintenance of that sense that such troubles are possibilities to be discovered.

Further we mean to examine the ways in which the location of troubles in personality perpetuate the sense that personality exists and maintain the sense of interactional order inherent in such a phenomenon. Finally we will examine the reflexive nature of the location of trouble and the peculiar, ambivalent, fluctuating status the "trouble" has in the personality work.

#### Ability to Locate Trouble in Personality

There is maintained in personality repair work as in personality work in general the sense that the troubles in personality are discovered (see personality as discovered). Through examination there may be determined the "trouble" in the list/theory of the personality. There may exist a problem in one of the list characteristics (as exemplified in such notions as "contextually unacceptable") and/or in the ways that these characteristics are structurally related (e.g. "inconsistent," "self-destructive," "unpredictable," etc.).

Clearly the sense remains that no matter how complex the problems or troubles the location of the "problem" lies in the dynamics and structure of the personality. There appear to be entertained (by members) little possibility that the ways that members orient to the possibility of trouble constrains the nature of what they will find.

While there is an acknowledged method for the location of the trouble in the personality, that method is not seen to impinge on the conclusions reached about that personality and its troubles. Members will "admit" that it is possible to "find fault" in others. They "recognize" that one may be predisposed to the location of another's negative features, but they would and do maintain that even in such a case the faults found are in the subject and not (assuming "honesty" on the part of the observer) manufactured by the observer.

The process is not seen by members as arbitrary (or practical) but rather as a "focusing" on the negative features of a personality. While members agree that there are misinterpretations of personality "troubles" ("misperceptions," "lies," "insufficient data," "out-of-date descriptions," etc.), there clearly exist for them "accurate" descriptions of a personality trouble. In fact the entire field of psychotherapy seems to rest on just such an assumption. That is, therapists claim to be "repairing" personality troubles, not redefining or reproducing personality models. There are few "proofs" of personality as strong as the therapeutic cure (see personality repair: change).

The determination of a personality trouble is clearly linked to the language used in the description of the behavior. For instance, in 1/35 we find the description of the client's "nonparticipation" in gym. The client is described as not participating through the use of

an "excuse." Implicit in the term excuse is the sense that the client is not participating for some reason other than the one offered and is therefore "lying." Such a response suggests that the reason offered by the client masks some real reason why she is not participating. This "real" reason, then, becomes the focus of the discussion and the potential for the location of a "problem" is raised.

We do not necessarily suggest that the use of the term "excuse" was accidental (unconstrained) and that the result of the "accident" was the determination of the client's problem. Rather the location of the client's problem begins with such an inference. Through such interlocking imagery a direction for the determination of the client's problem is created. That is, of all possible directions that the discussion concerning the client could go and through the imagery implicit in such terms as "excuse," the focus of the client's problem is defined.

It should be made clear that when the process of personality work is defined as arbitrary (practically constrained), it is not meant as arbitrary to its members. In, for instance, the example just described it is not suggested that the choice of the term ("excuse") was experienced as idle or arbitrary. The use of the term was taken to be deliberate (on the part of the speaker), and as intending to suggest that the client was in some sense lying. That a decision was made to use the term "excuse" is not in question. Rather the issue is the basis for that choice. The basis seems to lie in the sense on the part of the members that they are able to "see into" the actor and "recognize" the excuse making activity as opposed to the client offering a reason.

The rationale for this observation seems to be the fact of the observation. That is, the decision as to the behavior-as-excuse as

opposed to reason appears to be, for members, not a decision-making process but rather an experience of discovery and in some ways self-evident.

It is through the obfuscation of the process of decision making that the sense of discovery is maintained and hence the need for "justification" largely eliminated. If the process appears (to members) to be discovery and thereby available to any competent member the need for justification or other sense of proof is eliminated. The work of doing of personality is not experienced by members as theoretical work but rather action.

In creating a theory one must prove (or create the sense of proof) the paradigm submitted and such a paradigm is often practically called into question. In action, however, the context is not problematic but "self-evident" and available for all to see.

The sense in this example is that for anyone who cared to look the client could and would be seen as offering an "excuse" as opposed to a reason. This self-evident feature eliminates the need for proof and the observations come to be taken for granted. What we suggest is that the sense of certainty seems to be an artifact of the method and orientation to the phenomenon of personality. What is attempted here is not a cause-effect description of the source of the sense of personality but rather an examination of the interactive methods that seem to maintain the sense of it.

It is important to reiterate that the "trouble" that is found in personality is trouble in the method of personality work as an activity and that what sense is maintained that the trouble lies in the individual under observation. It is essential to the maintenance of personality work that this perception be maintained.

When, as we have said, trouble occurs in the form of an inability to find thematicity in the actor, one of two outcomes is possible. First, is the conclusion that there is something wrong with the method of examination in that it cannot explain or make sense of the actor/subject at hand. This would suggest that the method cannot carry out its prescribed function. Such a possibility would severely damage the sense that personality is discovered and hence an objective and external reality.

The very essence of personality work is that it is "method-less," that it is available for all who cared to look. If there occurs "trouble" in the discovery of the personality and due to the fact that there is no member's sense that there is a production of personality, the trouble can only logically lie in the actor under observation. That is, if members cannot discover a theme in an actor, then the problem must lie in the actor. It is imperative to the sense of objective personality that the method of its production be obfuscated. The availability of a method would call into question the entire enterprise and could jeopardize the maintenance of this portion of social order.

Let us look to an example of the ascription of a kind of personality trouble which is ascribed to the actor/subject. In 1/412 we find the client described as giving a "confused picture." After some lengthy discussions as to whether the client is committed to the program and able to control her actions, the observation is made that the client is "confused" and presents a "confused picture." The responsibility for the trouble at hand in making sense of the client is placed on the client in that she is described as presenting a confused picture. There is no suggestion that the problem may be in the model used to describe her. One might just as easily conclude that the list/theory used in connection

with this data is unable to integrate the material behavior ascribed to her. That is, there appears to be no single theme that organizes the data at hand.

In another context such a problem would be seen as the "failing" of the model/theory, certainly not the "fault" of the data. In personality work, however, it seems the only possible problem in the examination of the personality is what might be called "insufficient data." There may be the sense that the reason that something or someone doesn't "make sense" is that the observers have not discovered enough information. There is the clear sense (faith) that with enough information it will all make sense. The entire thrust of personality repair is to learn enough about the client for the staff to then make some changes. There is a faith among members that people are ultimately "rational" and that they do things for reasons and that with enough time and effort these reasons may be discovered. Such an assumption seems implicit in all such personality work.

In personality work, then, there appears at times to be problems in the methodic production of the list/model that describes the behavior of the individual about whom the theorizing is directed. The problem here typically takes the form of the inability of the theorizers to produce a comprehensive theme which describes the action/behavior of the subject. An interesting question appears to be, how comprehensive must a theory be to be considered acceptable?

Personality models typically may be referred to as polythematic, i.e. consisting of multiple themes that interrelate and are experienced as somehow intertwined to form the whole personality. It appears that in the production of the theory there occurs the phenomenon of what we

will call thematic domain. By this is meant the sense of context for a theme.

There appears to be implicit in the negotiations of a personality the sense that some behaviors are linked to a specific personality feature and that some behaviors are linked to other features. It should be noted that one behavior might be seen to represent a variety of personality traits but that there appears to be the sense that there is some thematic integrity. That is, some groups of behavior are linked to a specific trait and so come to represent that trait itself.

In each of these features of the personality negotiations there can appear trouble. Previously we have described the problem of the description of a behavior that is felt to be with a particular thematic domain and while the theorizers present feel that it is somehow linked to other behaviors, they feel unable to describe the nature of the connection. For instance, in 1/206 we find an example of the problem of thematic domain. Up to this point the staff are building a picture of the client as somehow "indifferent" to the classroom. The staff member reports an anecdote in which the client displays what he considers excitement over the passing of a test. The speaker experiences theoretic difficulty in linking this anecdote to the evolving theory:

J: ...she had passed the test and she was really animated, really excited about it. So I think that's a key into something there I can't put my finger on it exactly, but somehow success does mean a lot to her in a certain context....

1/204-1/207

At such a point the negotiations could conceivably move in at least two different directions. One avenue is that the theory is somehow "inadequate" and the other is that the client acts "inconsistently." In the former case the problem is located with the theory and in the latter

in the client. The problem for the speaker seems to be an artifact of the sense that the behavior is somehow linked to the underlying theme. It is this sense of (and demand for) "connection" that creates the problem in the negotiation. The difficulty seems to be in the inability of the observers to integrate this behavior with the others deemed to fall within the thematic domain of "disinterested." In this way the problems of thematic integrity and thematic domain are clearly linked. In the assertion of thematic domain and thereby the relevance of the behavior to the theme at hand, the thematic integrity or internal coherence of the model is called into question.

The troubles in personality work seem to be largely the trouble in the method of the ascription of the personality. The trouble appears in the selection of the data considered "relevant" to the task at hand and in some sense the order in which the data is selected and the ways it is chosen for use. The resolution of these problems constitutes the main task of personality repair work. Repair work, thus, becomes the work of model maintenance, of the ability to make sense.

As we have said, the sense of personality work begins with the perceived ability of the observers to find trouble in the personality. The sense is that somehow the personality is experiencing the trouble due, typically, to some internal structural problem. In the example cited earlier the client is described as "not participating" in the gym class and offering an "excuse" for her nonparticipation. That is, she is seen as not participating (which is in itself at least an organizational problem) and then "lying" as to the reason for her nonparticipation.

In such a brief description the client is charged with a variety of offenses and the remainder of the conferences may be seen to emanate from this incident. One can follow the thread of the conference growing out of the client's inability to get involved in the gym activity. She is first described as "disinterested" and then this disinterest is defined as representing some other deeper problem and finally all of these problems as representing some even deeper problem finding its location in her home and relationship with her family. In the case at hand the ability of the staff to find trouble is clearly displayed in the elaboration of the client's nonparticipation into an entire model of "trouble."

An important distinction must be made in the examination of personality work. This distinction is that between the reason and the cause of an event or behavior. Members are seen to behave in rational ways. That is, actions are not taken to be idle but rather as the solutions to problems. It is felt that members define a situation and having done so act on that definition of the situation. If they, as in this case, see themselves as "above" participation (1/51) then they do not participate for that reason. In personality work such a "reason" may be distinguished from the "cause" for that action. A cause-question in this example might be, "why does she think that she is above participating in gym?" In effect it seeks to know the way the client chose to define the situation. In the location for a problem one often finds that the thrust is the location of the-cause-for-the-reason for behavior. As we will see later (see personality repair: client as incompetent), this cause-reason relationship serves to discredit the client as able to interpret his/her own behavior. That is, s/he may know the reason for his/her behavior but not the cause. Interestingly enough, the staff

will of course locate this cause through the personality negotiation process. The ability to find trouble in personality relies on the ability to look "behind" the reason for behavior to its cause.

In examining this relationship between the cause for behavior and the reason for it, it may be useful to note that reasons are typically experientially available to the member upon reflection and the cause is a theoretic description the member or others may use in describing him/herself in what might be called the abstract.

There is commonly described by members a clear experiential difference between the reason for the action and the cause for that action. In the example at hand the point at which the leap is made from the reason to the cause occurs in 1/41 when, after describing that the client offers an excuse for her nonparticipation in gym, the question is asked, "do you know why she is doing that?" The assumption is made that an excuse masks a cause for the excuse and that the focus of the discussion shifts to the examination and explication of that cause. Personality repair work then is the production of a descriptive model not only of the behaviors displayed by actors but their reasons for those behaviors as well. The repair work attempts to integrate the behavior with the actor's reason for that behavior and the supposed cause for that behavior as well.

In examining the cause-reason relationship one notes that there appears to be a hierarchy of acceptable data for use in determining the trouble. For example, in 1/67 we find an ascription challenged on the basis of whether the client did in fact report the information or whether the staff members discovered it. It appears that clients are allowed to report reasons for their actions and that this information may be used

in the description of the cause for those actions (see personality repair: client as incompetent). It is considered more accurate for the client to report the reason than for the staff members to report/discover it. The reverse holds true in the situation of cause, however, in that the observer is considered the best "judge" of cause.

Implicit in the notion of repair is the sense of an ideal type of personality. That is, there seems to be the sense of the personality of the client as standing in relation to this ideal type and the examination of the relationship of the two. For instance, in 1/56 we find a staff member in a sense referring to that ideal model in the context of the client's nonparticipation in athletics. The client is described as seeing herself as "too mature" for participation in gym. This in itself appears to be judged against the model which finds adolescents typically enjoying such activities. In the location of the trouble the initial problem is defined as the client not participating (which is in itself unusual) and as "projecting the image" (1/57) of the reason for that behavior as being too mature for the participation. Immediately the staff have found a two-level problem. It appears that imbedded in the production of the sense of trouble in the client is the evaluation of the progression of behavior to reason-for-that-behavior to cause-for-that-reason. It appears that the location of trouble in personality work can move along this progression as far as the members deem necessary. By this is meant, in the location of trouble one may stop the exchange with only the behavioral display (e.g. "he acts strangely"). Next the examination may move to the stage of examination of the reason for the behavior (e.g. "what could he be thinking about?"). Finally the examination may move to the cause for the reason for the subject's

action. At any point along this progression the observer can assert that trouble is present. In personality repair work, however, it is important to maintain the sense that the examination move as far as possible along the progression and that intervention be made along the way to correct the troubles. One finds a loose analogy to the progression as follows:

Behavior---Behavior modification  
Reason-----Counselling  
Cause-----Psychotherapy/Psychoanalysis

Typically, of course, most repair work moves easily and continuously between the different levels and rarely is the activity maintained within one level alone. Members doing personality work seem to take little heed of the boundaries as they move through the course of their activity. For example, in the instance just sighted in the conference from 1/35 to 1/68 the move from the description of the client not participating in gym (behavior) to the client seeing herself as too mature and too feminine for gym (reason) to the client nonparticipation due in part to her lack of ability (cause) to the final and most severe problem being her inability to recognize that through her nonparticipation she fails gym and thus is "self-destructive."

In the space of a few moments the staff have established a variety of problems in the client and linked them through the behavior-reason-cause progression. In such a way this client is labeled as severely troubled and in need of much help. We should note here that this model of progression is implicit in the actions of members and rarely if ever made explicit in the talk about personality trouble.

As another phase of personality work the activity is the production of the sense of personality as a thing and little if any attention is paid to the method by which that is accomplished. The personality

of this client is "real" for the staff; that it is a production is apparently unavailable to the members involved in the activity. The personality is real as is the trouble that is located in that personality.

The reification of the process as grounded in some external reality is total and the success of the methodic production lies in the fact that all of the actions appear to members to be self-evident. The reality of personality lies in these conferences and all similar personality work.

An important feature of the activity of locating trouble in personality is the ability of the staff to generalize a certain "trouble progression" (see above) to other situations. For instance, in the progression just described the client was described as engaging in some sort of self-deception concerning her participation in the gym class. This pattern is established in the client's nonparticipation in classes other than gym (1/106). The client is described as being uninvolved in class work in general and this anecdote of the gym class is taken as one example of the larger pattern. It is the pattern of progression through behavior-reason-cause that is taken to be the client's trouble and it will serve as the focus of the entire conference. Much of the rest of the conference may be seen as the detailing of the pattern elsewhere.

It should be noted that trouble in personality typically takes the form of a pattern. Similarly the intervention in that trouble takes the form of a similar pattern (see personality repair: treatment). This pattern is experienced as paralleling the progression of the trouble and in so doing altering it.

An interesting feature of the trouble noted in this client is the sense that it is not always operant. There appear to be times in which she displays a "nontroubled" version of this behavior. In this

case it is reported that there are moments in which this noninvolved pattern appears to be substituted with the more typical involved display. It would appear that such exceptions to "trouble" would be significant to the sense of reparability of the client.

As discussed earlier (see Theory) in the course of the examination of the client there is a determination made as to the reparability of the problem in the personality. One of the most common methods by which this reparability is established is through the location of the potential for the client to respond properly to the situation. In this case, the finding of the fact that the client can and did become involved in the classroom may be seen to establish the fact that the client is capable of (what would be considered by the staff) normal behavior.

The client is described as in need of "assurance" (1/137). That is, when she is encouraged and therefore is able to "see" the potential for successful task completion, then she will find the confidence to fully engage in the activity. Implicit in this assumption is the sense that she really wants to be involved but that her "fear of failure" keeps her from that involvement.

This type of assumption is critical for the establishment of the reparability of the client. If, for instance, the client were described as fundamentally not wanting to participate, then the likelihood of cure would be slight. As earlier described, it is critical to the maintenance of the sense of reparability that the description of the client as "lazy" (1/120) be redefined into some sort of reparable type of term. In describing the client as "unmotivated" there is the implicit assumption that the client does not participate due to her inability to define the benefits to herself of such participation.

Such a description defines not only that nature of the client's problem but the possible avenue of the repair of that problem. It is assumed that if the client were to clearly recognize in some basic sense of the term that such behavior were self-defeating, then she would change her behavior to a type more conducive to personal success and reward. In this way it seems the individual is sensed as rational and therefore basically reparable.

In the process of the location of trouble in the client's personality is reiterated the essentially incomplete nature of the personality (see personality as incomplete). In the description of the behavior-reason-cause progression there is established the potential for much personality work. At each level of the progression there needs to be established the factual information. There is needed verification, agreement as to the sequence, order, and importance of various of the features, and even a basic agreement as to what the client was doing at a specific time. In using this three-level progression model in the location of trouble in personality, one makes even more complex the entire process. Through such complexity the entire process is subject to the debate that shapes its essentially endless nature.

It is clear that in this location of personality trouble the constraints to find such trouble clearly force the kind of detailed personality work we are describing. It is unclear whether in the course of day-to-day interaction members engage in such constraint or complexity. The demands of first describing a personality and then locating troubles within it require an increased intensity of process.

As stated earlier, in the selection of this topic in this setting, it was noted that the personality work done here was of more intense and

focused kind than might typically be found. For instance, there appears often in daily interaction the location of trouble in personality though not in anticipation of the repair of that trouble. This nondirected personality work serves as part of the description of a member's personality though the observers/theoreticians do not expect to locate any sort of treatment with the trouble (see personality repair: treatment and change).

In a setting such as the program, staff are constrained to find personality troubles of a type that are appropriate to the extant treatment "repertoire." Therefore it is imperative that the location of the personality trouble be highly focused and comprehensive. It is much less acceptable in such a setting for there to be data on the client left unexplained. "I don't know" is a response here that requires a much more detailed solution than in less directed and constrained personality work.

It is interesting to note that in this particular example of personality work the responsibility for the client's trouble seems to rest with the client in that it appears that she is not allowed "justification" for her lack of motivation. For example, in 1/171 we find the description of an apparent misunderstanding in which the client felt that attendance in the program would result in her grade promotion in the regular school. Such an understanding is described as her "initial motivation" (1/179).

There is apparently no notice taken of the fact that under such circumstances the client might not perform in the program. This would serve as an external cause for her lack of motivation in the program due to her expectation of a consequence of the participation that could not occur. Rather than describe the client as turned off or disappointed over this misunderstanding and hence "unmotivated" to perform, the members describe her as simply unmotivated and leave it at that.

It appeared that in the description of the client's behavior at this point the attempt was to locate some internal cause for the lack of participation. This anecdote of a misunderstood promise appears to be ignored as irrelevant. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to describe the event as the lack of recognition of potential relevance.

In the construction of this particular theme as the client's trouble the possibility of such a misunderstanding seems to fall outside of what would be described as thematic domain. The description of the client's trouble did not include the possibility of justifiable disenchantment based on a misconception.

What is particularly interesting about this example is that immediately following the discount of the misconception as being a legitimate source of a lack of motivation, another environmental constraint is described in vague terms, such as "there's a lot of things that are happening outside of school..." (1/187). It is suggested that the client is experiencing some unspecified troubles at home and they are affecting her performance in the classroom.

What is interesting is that the specific mechanism that connects the family and the classroom performance is not specified at all and even so the family hypothesis is apparently accepted as legitimate.

While it would seem that the "misconception" hypothesis described the dynamics of a possible trouble in more detail, the "unspecified family trouble" theory came to be accepted. Again here as elsewhere it appears to be the sense of pervasive explanation that holds sway in the negotiations.

We find again this sense of explanation in a later passage in which the client is described in a kind of summary of her troubles:

"At first coming to (the program) C had a negative attitude and wouldn't get involved. She would consistently attend class but wouldn't produce academically. C didn't want to be in the program and her attitude and performance showed it as do her grades for the first quarter. C's attendance and punctuality continued to be poor (absent-13, late-14). After several confrontations, counselling sessions and commitments made by her, C was resistant and defiant towards authority and structure. C was unable to adhere to the (program) structure and rules for the most part in a constructive manner...."

1/270-1/278

This description is a litany of behaviors that run counter to the practical operation of the program. It should be noted that they are descriptions of behavior and reasons for that behavior but fail to list "cause" for the behavior. It is interesting to note that initially the client regularly attended the program, but that this attendance behavior was not noted as representing any type of motivation or otherwise positive attitude. From this data one might conclude that the client arrived at the program motivated but in some way "lost interest."

There is no explanation for this loss of interest or even a noting of it as a possibility. This is interesting in light of the previously discussed sense that the nature of the process of personality work seems to suggest the examination of behavior-reason and cause. In this case the conference seems to serve as a justification for the determination of the nonreparability of the client in this setting.

It is ironic that the reason for the client's entry into the program, i.e. her lack of interest for classroom work, is being used as the rationale for the determination of her nonreparability in the program. That is, the reason for her being in the program in the first place is used as the reason for her termination from the program. It might be noted that the client may be displaying a type of problem that makes her inappropriate for an institutional setting in that her described problem

could be characterized as an inability to operate in complex organizations. The program like the school from which she came is a complex organization.

It appears that at least in this type of repair program there is a need for the client to participate (in approved ways) in the program for the repair to occur and that the perceived inability to do so is grounds for termination. The suggestion on the part of the staff appears to be that the client doesn't want the help being offered to her. Another interpretation might be the need to attempt to motivate the client for such repair.

It appears that in this situation the description of the client as unmotivated is taken as the cause of her behavior as opposed to the reason and there she is deemed to be nonreparable. It may be then that this relationship between reason and cause is critical in the determination of the reparability of clients in general. If the "cause" of the established problem falls into the accepted purview of the extant treatment repertoire, then it may be that the client will be deemed reparable and retained by the organization.

Again this distinction between the cause and reason for behavior is not a distinction made by members in the course of personality work. This is an analytic distinction based on what appear to be implicit assumptions made by members. Implicit assumptions are not ordinarily available to participants during interaction. While this analytic distinction (cause-reason) appears to be a fine one in the course of the determination of personality trouble, it is apparently highly important. The nature and direction of the client's career in the repair setting will be dramatically different depending on which of these determinations is made.

One notes that in the course of the determination of the trouble in personality there appear to be problems described both in terms that might be described as interpersonal and, in the case of the program, organizational. In 1/301 we find the client described as having problems with "authority and structure." Such descriptions of problems are interesting in that they are not descriptions that are descriptions of "personal dynamics" but rather statements of relationship. In the course of the negotiation the client will come to be described in terms that describe the nature of the personality problem that is seen as causing the relational problem. It appears that causal statements are typically made in terms that describe the "inner workings" of the client's personality.

Responsibility appears to be an important issue in the ascription of personality trouble. In the description of the client in 1/334, the trouble located is the "inability to focus attention." The issue at hand is whether the client can control her attention span. The question of responsibility concerns the client's ability to focus and hold her attention on a particular issue for any period of time. Implicit in such a discussion is the assumption that there are actions in the course of the client's display over which she could be seen as having no control. Such a distinction may be important in the determination of the reparability of the client.

What is interesting to note is that the determination of responsibility is not seen to be inexorably linked to the decision as to the reparability of the client. For example, the conclusion that the client is unable to control her behavior might be taken as evidence that she is too severely disturbed to be repaired, at least in this setting. On the other hand, if the conclusion is that she is, for instance, not

participating through a voluntary decision, then she could be seen as not ready for treatment ("unmotivated") and therefore not reparable. Again, the irony appears that the same behavior could be interpreted in several different ways with differing implications for the client.

In the progression from the action to reason to cause one finds that the point of each causal link in the negotiated character of the personality assumes greater prominence. In establishing the link between behavior and reason, one is asserting the causal nature of the relationship and likewise in the location of the cause for the reason another "cause" is established. In the action-reason relationship, as we have said, the causal connection defines the member's motive for the action in the sense of what s/he perceives as the cause for the action.

It is the power of those associated with the repair activity that they feel able to "look behind" the reason to the root cause for the activity.

The proof of the assertion is established in the description of the link between the various levels of the model. For instance, in the case at hand the debate in 1/377 describes the location of the source of the client's behavior in the program. It is agreed that the client exhibits negative behavior, but the discussion focuses on the nature of the client's "motive" for such behavior.

Perhaps more accurately it might describe the origin of the behavior or the determination of the behavior as evidence of some specific cause. The specific action is the client's nonperformance of classroom work. There is no debate that the client does not do classroom work but the question concerns the reason for that action. One hypothesis is the client's need for "assurance" (1/354) as opposed to the client's need

for "attention from authority figures" (1/388). The latter hypothesis asserts that the client deliberately produces "negative" behavior in order to get the attention of the staff. What appears to be happening here is the confusion of the "reason" for the "cause" of the behavior. For instance, one might note that the lack of confidence or need for assurance is the cause for the sought attention from the staff.

There appears very often in the negotiation of personality the confrontation of reason and cause. The reconciliation is typically accomplished through the identification of the difference of reason and cause through the determination of the level of self-consciousness on the part of the member as to the motive for the action. Typically this takes the form that the client "knows" the reason for the action but does not know the cause for the action.

The inability of the client to determine the cause of course serves to eliminate him from the determination of that cause (see client as incompetent). In the case at hand it is determined that the client needs the attention of the staff in order to provide her with the assurance she needs to complete her tasks.

At issue here, however, is the level of control the client has over her behavior (see reparability). Here again there seems to be some confusion as to the role of the "control" as a relevant issue in the discussion. Such a discussion is perhaps an artifact of the program demand that the client be seen as "motivated for change." It is this lack of motivation that is the basic charge against the client and the prime reason for her termination from the program. The premise appears to be that the client is able to control her actions and is therefore not cooperating deliberately. She is then displaying a lack of commitment for change.

The irony here is that in the behavioral dynamic described in which the client acts negatively (and deliberately so) in order to get attention she cannot but be found guilty of the charge of no commitment. If she is deliberately being negative to get attention then that deliberate negativity is taken as evidence of her lack of commitment for change.

Her perceived adaptation for getting attention predetermines her failure in a setting with the need for displayed commitment for change. Unless her commitment can be interpreted in some other way, then she is doomed to failure in this setting. For instance, in 1/391 we find the client described as:

"...But I've seen her come in and really be motivated to do good work, you know, really perform it, deal with all the rules and structure and everything and then there's days when she chooses not to. And I think she consciously chooses not to."

1/390-1/394

Here the emphasis is clearly on the fact that the client will at times choose against repair and that this is evidence of her lack of commitment for change. Clearly the focus could just as easily be placed on the fact that she is sometimes committed to the program and able to work and therefore has potential for change. That is, the issue is her potential for commitment to the program and that determination is made that she is displaying more "lack-of-commitment" than "commitment." It is apparently her having deliberately chosen against the program that is taken as evidence of the supposed lack of commitment.

It appears that there are some types of personality trouble that seem to produce what might be called organizational difficulties. The same sort of problem that created the trouble for the client in the school setting will produce trouble in the setting of the repair station.

It is necessary that the client as well as the student cooperate with the organization to that extent that the organization may determine that the member is "controlled" and able to produce the sort of behavior that is desired.

In a sense it may be seen that the program is a training ground for pro-social behavior. The clients are chosen for their history of anti-social or, more accurately, anti-organizational behavior. They have made displays that have been identified as running counter to the needs of the organization and therefore they are identified as "troubled." This is not to say that the experience is that of defining the clients as "anti-organization" but that the operational definition of troubled is that of acting in ways that are counter to the effective operation of such organizations. The definitions of trouble are always in terms that are (or could be) described as "personal," though the implications of these troubles are for the social operation of a setting.

The first, then, of the personality repair practices is the ability to find trouble in the personality. This ability is a production that defines a set of practices that find the member experiencing some sort of problem in his or her personality in a structural or dynamic sense. The trouble, like the personality, is experienced as objective and concrete and the ability to locate this trouble serves to reinforce the very sense or notion of personality as itself an external, objective and concrete phenomenon.

This ability is elusive in the sense that like other personality practices it is seen as not an accomplishment resulting from the application of a method but rather as nonmethodic and self-evident.

The ability to locate trouble in personality serves as well not only to maintain a consensus in terms of a specific personality but to aid in the illusion of personality as a consistent and ongoing phenomenon. It is through the accomplishment of "trouble" that the coherence of the personality model is maintained and that its sense of correspondence to some external type of reality is achieved. It is only through this sense of trouble that inconsistencies are erased and the personality maintains its wholistic explanatory power.

Definition of the Troubled Actor as Potentially Incompetent to Report on His/Her Own Personality

In order to maintain the possibility of personality repair, it is essential that one of the basic rules of non-repair work be reversed or superceded. That is, in normal non-repair work it is normally accepted that the member is the most "authoritative" witness to his/her own personality. In situations in which there is a dispute over the best reading or definition of a personality it would typically be the case that the "owner" of the personality would be in the position to best describe that personality.

This, of course, creates a problem when personality repair is the task at hand. It is essential that those external to the troubled actor have the final word as to the nature of the personality trouble. Integral to the ascription of personality trouble is the sense that that "client" is no longer able to make evaluative determinations as to the nature of the personality trouble and possibly the entire personality as well. If, for instance, the troubled actor (client) were allowed to be the final arbiter in these situations it would be the client who would make the determination of cure, i.e. that trouble was now "gone." Practically,

then, one would find that the clients would simply announce the cure of their trouble, and release themselves from repair stations. Those with personality trouble are therefore judged to be incompetent in many ways though for purposes of this discussion it is the incompetence vis-à-vis personality that is most relevant.

It appears that in personality work the sense of trouble is one which is seen as altering the individual's perception or weltanschauung in that it produces for that individual a view of the world different from the bulk of the society. Due, then, to this differing view of the world the client in a repair station is believed to be seeing the "wrong" world and therefore can't make proper evaluation decisions about that world. There appears to be the sense that personality trouble is so concrete and self-evident that external observers are equally competent to make evaluative judgements as the clients themselves. Given such a premise the reality of the trouble becomes subject to consensual definition and in effect "votes" are taken as to the client's trouble. The client's vote simply becomes one vote among votes and carries no special weight in the decision-making process.

It is as if the actor is relegated to the same status as any outside observer and as such may be "outvoted" on any decision concerning the reality of the personality under examination. This change in the client's status would perhaps be seen as a demotion to "observer" in that in the location of trouble in the member they lose the special insight into themselves.

Through such a view the client is only wrong about him/herself in so far as s/he may disagree with those around him/her in the voting process. If s/he should agree with the vote, then s/he will be recognized as correct.

If s/he should disagree then the client's vote will be discounted and s/he will be defined in that situation at least as incompetent. The interesting feature of this ascription is that it is contingent upon the client's vote and not upon his/her trouble. That is, the defined personality trouble will not consistently render the client incompetent to supply data or make judgement but rather only during the situation of a "voting clash."

What is interesting is that again it is not the client's personality or personality trouble that determines the incompetent ascription but a social agreement with those in the immediate setting. Such an inconsistency is interesting in that the work of the maintenance of the personality as troubled will hide or mask such an irony. During the course of one brief encounter the same client will be allowed to supply evaluative judgements concerning him/herself and then will be dismissed as unable to do so. Should the client-offered data be determined to be compatible with the general model, then his/her data will be accepted.

In an examination of the client as incompetent to report on his or her own personality, it is interesting to note that there are at least two types of reports that may occur. The first is the report that finds the client supplying data about him or herself that may be used in the construction of the personality model. In this type of situation such questions as, "how do you feel?" or the reporting of specific information concerning an event may be allowed. This type of reporting may be considered the reporting of basic data to be used in the determination of the personality model. The client is allowed to report data as is any other member. The second type of information is the evaluation of the personality model as to its correspondence to the real personality.

Again as we will see, we will find the client's contribution to this process is linked to the agreement of others as to the accuracy of the information.

Let us look to specific examples of the process in action. In 1/38 we find the client described as "using an excuse" to describe her nonparticipation in the gym class. As previously described (see personality repair: trouble) the use of the term excuse describes the client as offering "incorrect" information. The observer claims to know better than the client the accuracy of the client's condition at the time of the gym class.

It is at this point irrelevant whether the client knowingly or unknowingly is offering the excuse. The observer feels certain that he knows the true nature of the information offered by the client. If the client agrees with the observer as to the "excuseness" of the data, then the description is verified. If the client should disagree, then this disagreement is discounted through a variety of vehicles. First, we find the client described as unable to realize the nature of her own problem and therefore unable to make evaluative judgements as to her own dynamics. In a sense the disagreement is taken as proof of the client's trouble. As previously noted, it appears that in the case of client trouble there is the sense that the client is unable to see him/herself as others do. It is the external determination of the meaning of the client's action that is seen as taking precedence over the client's own interpretation.

In 1/122 we find an interesting example of one of the ways in which the client is not allowed to report on her own personality. Here the description of the client as "lazy" is used. In the discussion that

follows the possibility of "lazy" as a category is eliminated. The orientation is that no one is "lazy" but rather "unmotivated." In the elimination of the category of "lazy," not only the staff but the client lose this description as a possibility. Thus the client is not allowed to claim disinterest as a motive for action.

In the establishment of the client as incompetent to report on herself in this situation, it is established that the client is generally not competent to do so. After describing that the client does in fact perform a variety of actions that bring on negative effects to herself, it is reported that she is unable to see this pattern as "self-destructive." It is clear that there are varieties of ways in which this behavior could be thematized by the client. The fact that she does not conclude that the pattern is first a pattern at all and second, a self-destructive one is taken as a sign of the client's incompetence.

In this case this particular formulation of incompetence serves both the function of describing incompetence and specifically the sort of incompetence that finds the member unable to "recognize" in him/herself certain patterns. The sense is that the client is unable to be theoretic about herself in the ways that others are about her.

While there are varieties of types and kinds of incompetence, it is important that a type established about a specific client is one which potentially discounts conflicting (client-generated) theoretic formulations. Again the key here is the potential for the discounting of the client's point of view. It is not necessary to discount the client in every offering but rather only when his/her view is generally contradictory and inferior to that of the treatment staff.

In the course of the "discounting" of the client it should be

noted that one of the major issues that occurs, particularly in the context of reparability, is the sense of the client's "control" over her own behavior. Here in the discount negotiation there is little or no relevance of the notion of control in the sense of whether the client does control her nonparticipation. Rather it is the sense that she is not theoretic about her own behavior. It is of no concern at this point over whether she cannot or will not participate but simply the "fact" of her nonparticipation that is important. While issues of control may be of interest in the determination of the level of client trouble and hence incompetence, it is simply here that the determination that the client is generally theoretically incompetent that is sufficient for the discounting of the client's theoreticity. It is simply the suggestion that the client's displays and subsequent theoretic descriptions are potentially defective that creates the possibility of discounting.

It is as if the reality of the client's personality is "voted" upon and that the largest number of votes wins. The client is both "outvoted" in the sense that she loses out in the determination of her personality and personality trouble but in fact her vote is not even counted unless it is cast for the winning proposition (on the specific context the client is absent).

It is through the mechanism of discounting the client that the arbitrary and consensually determined nature of the personality gains such clarity. Thus in experience the sense is maintained that the personality is discovered though it appears analytically clear upon close inspection that the process can be seen as the product of consensual agreement in which the owner of the personality has only minimal say.

This is particularly true in the case of the "troubled" personality in that the fact of the personality trouble is taken itself to define the inability of the client to see him or herself in some significant way.

This is, as we have said, taken to be the sense of a pattern in actions or behavior. The client is, or may be flawed in her ability to see such a pattern in actions or in the ability to see the same pattern as those around her.

It should be noted, however, that such "discounting" is not limited to the formal context of personality repair as it is done in such repair stations as the program. Throughout everyday life we find owners of personalities being discounted in terms of their own personalities. There appears to be the sense that at times almost all members experience moments in which they lose their perspective and hence their ability to be theoretic about themselves. This does not render them incompetent in the same sense as the troubled. Rather it is a form of temporary discount that is typically only applicable to one context and is not generalized to other settings and times. Such devices as "discounting" appear to be indispensable to the maintenance of the personality model as "consistent" and "constant."

Discounting is vital to the personality repair activity in that it is utilized in each phase of the repair activity. In the initial stages of the activity in which the determination of the client's trouble is made (see personality repair: finding trouble) it is important that the "diagnosis" be considered authoritative if not complete. It is important in the repair activity that there be maintained the sense that the repair is a "real" thing in that there is both something real wrong

with the client and that this thing is being repaired. The activity is not, and cannot be, seen as the formulation of personality models and paradigm and the maintenance of these models through an elaborate manipulation of the perceptions of all involved.

As we have said throughout this analysis, the fact that personality work is other than it appears to be is not an indictment of that work as somehow wrong. Rather we have stressed that this personality work is in fact highly functional for the maintenance of social order.

It appears to be critical that members of society possess the sense that they are informed by an accurate view of the external reality. Anything less and the actions based on these perceptions would be seen as arbitrary and the possibility of social action would be lost in a quagmire of solipsism. Therefore the coherence or rather the sense of coherence of personality models is essential and this coherence is maintained, in among other ways, through such devices as the "discounting" of data and/or theoretic formulations that threaten those models.

In the non-repair context this discounting may be directed at some personality formulation that disagrees with the formulation made by the member about him/herself. As mentioned earlier in non-repair, the member typically (though not always) retains the authoritative position vis-à-vis his/her own personality. In the context of repair, however, to allow the member to retain such authority would render that entire activity absurd and administratively impossible.

It is critical, then, in the course of repair work that the client be rendered potentially "incompetent" to be theoretic about his/her own personality. Such incompetence is partially an artifact of the ascription of the actor as troubled. In addition, however, must be the

specific determination that the client is unable, in some cases, to be properly theoretic about his/her personality. By "properly" we, of course, mean theoretic in a way that reaches the same conclusions as the staff of the repair station.

As we will see (see personality repair: change) this discounting of the client's view of her personality is important in the determination of the client's cure. At such point that s/he comes to agree with the staff as to the nature of his/her personality, s/he will be considered as improving in the repair task. The disagreement is taken, then, as a sign of the personality trouble and as the trouble itself. Upon the elimination of such "disagreement" the repair task in the client is begun. Through the ability of the staff to discount the client as well the possibility of the repair activity is maintained and the sense of the repair as real is perpetuated.

Ability to Link Treatment to the Facet of Personality in Need of Repair

In the course of the maintenance of personality repair as a "real" activity, it is essential that there be maintained the sense that the repair members are able to apply to the troubled feature of the personality a set of techniques that will alter that trouble in some desired way. As we have said, there is in personality repair the implicit sense that the activity is able to identify certain troubles in the personality (see personality repair: trouble). As we will see the sense that once having located that trouble the staff are able to "repair" that trouble. This activity is maintained as concrete and real in the same way that the personality is sensed as real. In fact as we have said the ability

the ability to repair a personality itself is taken as an important verification of the "fact" of that personality.

We should be clear that while the sense of the link of the trouble to personality is certain, the specific nature of that link may be opaque (unself-conscious) even to the practitioners of the repair. That is, there is a certainty that personality structures may be affected through the application of certain techniques, although the specific nature of the dynamics of that change may not be clear to members at the time of their use.

It is perhaps a measure of the differences of the lay, paraprofessional, and professional "treaters" that the level of sophistication of their respective descriptions as to the dynamics of the repair process increase as one continues to the professional end of the continuum. It is the mark of the professional that his descriptions as to the nature of the personality dynamics be more detailed and hence the increased detail of the description of the repair. This "detail" is often confused by members for accuracy.

The nature of the techniques to be used in the repair of the personality is an artifact of the theoretic description of the personality itself and specifically of the diagnosis of the personality trouble at hand. It is self-evident when the client is described as lacking in self-confidence that s/he will be treated so as to change that trouble. In the case of this example the types and kinds of treatments that would be possible are myriad. The issue is not that many treatments are possible but that the sense is maintained that the thing personality is seen, studied, described, and finally that the techniques of treatment directly change some of the features of this personality.

Again, the possibility of treatment as an activity depends on the maintained sense of these actions. In the context of repair the certainty that change is possible and in fact can be "seen" by observers is central to the activity. Repair serves in addition as a reaffirmation of the "thingness" of the personality (see personality as thing).

The activity of personality is typically considered complex and at times opaque but it is continually considered a real activity. It is not idle and it is not contrived. It represents for members an activity that is really occurring in the patient and that it may be taken to describe a facet of the true nature of the personality. As we have continually stated in the course of day-to-day personality work, the idea of personality is one that is never called into question. It is not that the repair certifies the personality for the practitioners but rather that the possibility of the existence of the personality is never called into question. In order for repair work to validate the concept of personality there would first have to be the doubt that such personalities did in fact exist. For members no such doubt appears to exist.

Treatment may be seen as the application of a set of techniques for the solution of the client's problem. While this definition may appear deceptively simple, it glosses a process of amazing complexity. Such a process presupposes the ability to link some outside set of practices with the internal problem. It finds the repair staff able to alter both the "list" of the client's characteristics and the "theory" that conceptually ties those characteristics together into a coherent whole.

As in many other such activities (e.g. science) there is the sense that such techniques for the alteration of the personality are effective though often the reason for the change is not understood.

To heighten the complexity of an already complex activity is this process that seems to define the translation of the treatment from an abstract description of "psychodynamics" into a description of everyday interaction. That is, the staff must thematize the client in order to determine the nature of the client's personality and then determine within that personality the nature of the client's problem or trouble.

All of these descriptions seem to take a different form. For some descriptions the use of experiential description may be considered adequate. For instance, there may be a description that finds the client to be "feeling sad." This description is a form of theorising which summarily describes an experience that may not be (and probably is not) experienced in those terms.

As we have said, action is now described theoretically and as a result the theory serves to describe some features of the experience in what must necessarily be artificial terms. For instance, the term "sad" has a variety of linguistically related terms with similar meanings, i.e. "unhappy," "depressed," "down," "feeling bad," "feeling negative," and so on. Each of these terms describes a lebenswelt but do so in ever so slightly different ways and with significantly different implications.

Some of the theoretic descriptions define what might be considered "mood" and as such are seen as transitory and probably not trouble in need of repair. There clearly appears to be some sense of a qualitative and quantitative distinction between the normal swing of "mood" and the presence of personality trouble. If, for instance, one is sad too often or to an extreme, there enters the possibility of personality trouble. In the context of such trouble the possibility of the application of treatment is implicit (though its application is not automatically conferred).

What we suggest is that the nature of the treatment for the client "suffering" from such a personality trouble is implicit in the description of the trouble. Adherence to a theoretic stance typically will define the nature of the treatment for the problem. For example, if the description of the trouble is "depression," then the treatment for that depression follows from the repair staff's definition of the nature of depression.

If the orientation is a medical model, then the sense is that the client's biochemistry is malfunctioning and that a manipulation of that mechanism will eliminate the trouble. If the view is one of psychopathology (particularly in the psychoanalytic tradition) then the treatment seeks to locate the past experience that produced the trouble and alter the client's interpretation of that event in such a way that his/her conclusions about the event change and the trouble is eliminated.

The diagnosis of the client's trouble, then, is not merely the description of the client but in addition, of the locus of the client's trouble with some suggestion as to the dynamics or vehicle for the trouble. The significance here is that the treatment for the client's trouble is linked not to the client's behavior but to the theorizing about that display. The choice of treatment for the client is based not in the client as actor but rather in the client as theoretic object. It is the nature of the theorizing about the client that determines the techniques that will be used to solve the client's problems.

At each point in the process, however, we find the client described in terms that, as theoretic terms, are and must be distinct from the experiences of the process under examination. It appears that treatment of personality trouble is an essentially theoretic activity

and as such it bears little resemblance to the action at hand. Members in the world appear not to operate in terms of such concepts of "poor ego strength," "low self-esteem," "negative self-esteem," etc.

In the phenomenon of diagnosis the lebenswelt of the client is described in terms that would be foreign to the daily life of the client. It appears that an essential skill of the repair staff is the ability of "translation" between the theoretic descriptions of the conceptual model they are using and the experiential world of the clients with which they interact. The transition between the behavioral displays of the client and the conversion of that "data" into a conceptual description is, as we have described, the main activity of personality work. In the context of applied personality work the grounding of this activity takes place in the context of the application of a program of techniques that are seen to link the definition of the client (diagnosis) and the ability of the staff to "fix" that trouble in the client. As we have noted the staff seem to experience little difficulty in the accomplishment of this process.

As previously described the accomplishment of personality work is taken to be scientific in the sense that it is, in some ways, a correspondence activity in the relationship to some notion of an objective and self-evident truth. In the application of treatment we find the scientific character of the activity reaching its most clear aspects. The treatment plan is experienced as a set of techniques that allow the staff to (in the style of trial and error) affect the course of the client's personality. Inherent in the notion of this process is the sense that the personality can be seen in the context of the descriptive metaphor.

Personality is a theoretician's notion. It is the attempt to order action through the "production as discovery" of the list theory that serves as the framework on which the member gains theoretic sense.

In the member's perpetual shifting gears of the weltanschauung between actor and theoretician the personality appears and reappears as a "frozen metaphor." During each "fixing" the metaphor assumes a slightly shifting posture. Though there appears to be a form of amnesia as to the exact nature of each subsequent description. That is, members seem to forget the previous description in complete detail.

One notes that during theoretic phases and the description of personality (its only existence) there are often used shorthand symbolic descriptions which seem to stand in a relationship to some sense of gestalt of the entire personality. Though one may find these same descriptions repeated, when elaborated the larger more detailed descriptions seem to fluctuate widely. That is, the detail of the personality of an individual seems to change though in gross terms there is retained some consistency. Thus though the use of the "key descriptors" the illusion of the consistency of personality is maintained.

These key descriptors seem central to the process of personality description. They are metaphorically gross. Their very inexactitude seems highly functional to the personality process. It is precisely their sense of being "good enough" that allows for the sufficiently vague/sufficiently exact and for-all-practical-purposes nature of interaction.

In this sense while personality work seems scientific, philosophical or scientific rigor is death to social interaction as action. To seek exactitude in member's meanings misses the essential point in

the lebenswelt. To be exact is to pith the frog, to pin the butterfly to the wall. Not only is theory the antithesis of action, but theoretic rigor is its destruction. Interaction is essentially vague, essentially incomplete. This is a fundamental of social order.

In the formulation of the treatment of the client the role of the key descriptor is critical. For the client to be described as "depressed" or "hostile" to authority is a description that at one level makes little interactive sense. As discussed in earlier material a question that may be put to the theoretician is, how often the client needs to be unhappy to be a "depressive"? In the maintenance of the illusion of science in personality work, the tests for the client include both those experienced as qualitative and quantitative measures. "How often is the client depressed?" "How depressed is the client?" "Is the depression appropriate to the circumstances?" These and myriad other questions are asked in the effort to determine the true nature of the client's subjective world. Elaborate tests and indices are formulated that purport to isolate the type and kind of the client's trouble. This is not to denigrate the activity as it could not be otherwise. As we have said ad nauseam the common sense notions of personality are essential to the maintenance of social order and that as such they probably cannot essentially be changed.

Having agreed upon some "key descriptors" concerning the client the staff then approach the task of creating a set of techniques that will change the descriptors. The actual ways in which the treatment is to produce the desired effect is essentially vague in that little is understood as to the nature of the processes involved.

Again the key descriptors serve an unusual function. They appear to have the status of some sort of list/title and that the role of the affirmation of that list is located through the presentation of "examples" of that descriptor. This exemplifying task seems to be one that is the most arbitrary (i.e. practically constrained) of all the phases of the personality work. The location of the examples seems to consist of the inclusion of information thematically related to the key descriptor and the exclusion of other information that is considered to be irrelevant. This determination of relevance seems (as we have said) to be an essential feature of this (and many other activities) in the sense-making process. In the formulation of the form of treatment we find the treatment linked to the form of personality trouble in the same way that, as we will see, the location of the patient's cure is linked to the redefinition of the personality as now essentially different than before the application of the treatment (see "Cure"). In a similar fashion we find in the repair process the sense of what is key to the personality is a fundamental "variable" in the list/theory that comes to be the client's personality.

As previously described, essential to the form of treatment is the definition of the client's problem. In the case of the example under study the client's "identity" changes from situation to situation. Initially the client is seen as the lazy individual unwilling to participate in the activities of the program and therefore unmotivated for the treatment being offered by the agency. This diagnosis changes when it is allowed that the client cannot "control" these actions as well as she might and that she cannot be held accountable for her actions in that they are not what they appear to be. She is not, then, taken to be

exhibiting the signs of a lack of commitment to the program but rather signs of her pathology. Based on this assessment differing strategies for the client's treatment were discussed that seemed to deal with the problem in a way more closely linked with the described problem.

The treatment construction is a complex process in which the staff attempt to "build" the client's perceptual world and then try to find a way to convert that world into the world of the supposed normative individual. Such an activity on the face of it sounds virtually impossible though it is accomplished with great regularity.

An issue for the treater is the fact that the treatment is experienced as only linked to the facet of the client's personality that is in need of repair. The definition of the client's trouble is seen to be contextually bound (though such terminology is rarely used).

Part of the client's problem is experienced to be in either the client's inaccurate definition of a situation or context, or the client's inappropriate action based on that definition. The treatment then consists of helping the client to "do" reality in ways that coincide with the existing consensus. Lip service is often paid to the client's right to a different "opinion" but the notion that reality might be thought of as a collective "opinion" is apparently discounted out of hand as if it were not an issue.

The theme of this work has been that personality work and, by extension, personality repair work serves as an example of the methods by which members co-produce a sense of external reality. It is not that the reality to which each is thought to subscribe is felt to be some sort of "decision" or "point of view" but rather that the reality appears as external and concrete. The only area of opinion concerns the details

of that reality. Even then the decision as to the nature of that reality may be considered on a basis of the participant's "vote." It appears that to members there is a baseline reality that supercedes all other interpretations and that the recognition by the client of that reality is taken to be a symbol of the client's mental health.

For purposes of discussion let us create an example (one more clear than found in this transcript) of such a situation and examine the ways in which the treatment of the client could be seen to follow these principles. "Johnny" (the imaginary client) reports that he "sees" the teacher in his class mistreating him and possibly other students. He says that the teacher forces him to do things that he doesn't want to do and that he for one will not "knuckle under" to the teacher. He might be defined by the organization as "resistant" to the teacher and perhaps to the school as a whole.

Johnny is then referred to some sort of service agency whose function it is to repair such children as Johnny. After several sessions with Johnny a case conference is held to discuss the nature of Johnny's trouble and one possible determination to be made is that Johnny has a "problem with authority." Specifically Johnny is felt to respond negatively to all authority figures. It is felt that when Johnny defines the situation to be one in which he is in a "power struggle" with the authority figure, his attempt will be to win that struggle and as such will incur the wrath and punishment of that organization and individual.

Having thus defined "Johnny" as having a problem with authority, the inevitable treatment is to create a more positive attitude toward this authority. Perhaps the most crude example of such a treatment would be to "break" Johnny, that is, to force him to submit to the organization

through severe and continuous sanctions. Typically this is the first route tried (within the organization) and when this does not work, then Johnny is referred to repair as some version of "incorrigible." (There would be those who claim that if Johnny sees the school as the "bad guy," then the attempt to "overpower" will simply reinforce that opinion--but that's another story.)

When Johnny shows up for repair and is defined as having a problem with authority, his treatment will consist of some version of establishing a "positive relationship" with that authority. One version of the diagnosis of Johnny's problem may be that he "sees" power relationships when other children see none. That is, it is felt that the client's base line definition of the nature of a specific interaction may be at odds with those around him. Typically it is not felt that Johnny is "wrong" in his definition of the power features of the situation but rather in his constantly "seeing" or orienting to them.

The repair staff might perfectly well agree that power is, in fact, a feature of all interaction but that its active inclusion into some types of interaction is considered inappropriate. It is not that Johnny is wrong in what he sees in the classroom, but rather that the classroom is the inappropriate place to see it.

The treatment agenda will then be an attempt to dissuade Johnny from his persistent inclusion of the power feature. This scene may be played out in a variety of ways. Staff may seek the reason or cause for Johnny's perception and attempt to change that perception through talk. They, as well, may seek to create an environment in which power remains an issue but that Johnny will come to see it to be in his own best interests to cooperate with the holders of the power. The former will attempt

to delete the power feature of the contextual definition from Johnny's lexicon and the latter will retain the feature in an attempt to create in Johnny a perception of the power and power figures as benign forces.

It is interesting to note that even though such a description of the process may be resonant to a repair staff member, the proximity of such a perspective to the one outlined in the research seems to remain unnoticed. It bespeaks the power of the common sense notion of a concrete external reality that one could come so close to a view of the production of reality and never entertain it as a working possibility.

The assertion of the constructed nature of the social order is an idea to be entertained in the halls of academia (and not very often there) or in some other "philosophical" discussion but does not warrant consideration in the "real world."

What appears to be "treated" is the client's unshared contextual definition and implications of such an activity in the world appear to be lost on the practitioners of the personality repair. This in no way denigrates the treaters as this perceptual "blindspot" seems essential to the very maintenance of social order itself. If all contexts could be called into question and all (within a practical range) definitions could be considered co-equal, the relativistic nature of social order would become glaringly evident and hence very unstable.

It appears that much of the treatment of the clients in question consists of a reordering of their hierarchy of contextual definitions to come into agreement with some organization requirements. There appears to be an attempt to come to some essential agreement as to a formulation of a baseline definition of "what is going on here." Other "optional" definitions may be acceptable but are taken to be in some way subordinate to the prime or baseline definition.

It appears that in the construction of a "context" there are primary and secondary contextual theorizing requisite for action. As described earlier, social order may be thought of as an indexical interaction between action and theorizing about that action. Action takes place in the context of a theoretical description (response to perceived action on the part of others, interpretation of a motive for other's action, or a determination of "appropriateness" of action as they relate to social rules for that action, etc.). The theoretical description likewise is experienced as grounded in social action as it self-evidently appears.

We find, then, that action depends on a contextual determination of meaning and that contextual determination of meaning is supposedly grounded in action. Central to this process and mechanism is some sense that there can be agreement on the nature of the context. Such a belief is only possible given the ability to rank order such determinations in terms of their correspondence to reality. That is, there must be the sense of the most real and other lesser real theories.

The "reality scale" is itself grounded in contextual determination of the situation and the constraints and needs of that determination. The most "real" assessment of the nature of a specific context could be seen to be that most in keeping with the goal or purpose of the setting.

If, in our example, the purpose of a classroom is to teach, then it may be dysfunctional to that goal to orient to the power features of such an interaction as the prime operant dynamic. To do so interferes with the accomplishment of the goal of "education." As a secondary contextual definition "power" is an acceptable ascription and may serve to instruct the participants, but it cannot serve as the model or theme

to which the members orient in the course of their action.

To orient to power in the classroom as the essential or prime contextual definition literally destroys classroom as classroom. For all practical purposes the classroom will become something else. Social order is possible only with shared definitions and it is the task of personality repair to bring the client to those shared definitions. Treatment is the set of practices that attempts to do just that.

In the case of Johnny the treatment goal must, at some level, be to reorder his contextual determinations in such a way that he will be able to share the "reality" of the classroom with the other participants. Such a definition constitutes the possibility of "functionality."

The treatment of the client essentially consists of the continual redefinition for the client of the context until the client comes to "accept" that redefinition. Again this redefinition might be more clearly seen as a reordering of a variety of possible definitions. If, for Johnny, power is a conceptual category or model in his repertoire, then it becomes the task of the treatment to get him to stop using that category as a first or baseline definition.

It appears to be very difficult, if not impossible, to delete a category once it has been established. It is possible, however, to reduce the frequency of the use of this category. If the treater can persuade Johnny to "go to" a different category first, then he will have moved a giant step toward Johnny's "cure."

If the notion of personality has any usefulness at all it is as a set of ordered conceptual categories and the implications for the actor/theoretician of the application of those categories.

For instance, it appears that in the social world members pass through one might call conceptual category "fads." These fads consist at the experiential level of "noticings." One constantly hears in talk members reporting phenomena such as "I've begun to notice the amount of sexism in the world." This might be heard as the application by the actor/theoretician of a new conceptual framework which identifies a type of power feature operating between men and women which finds women typically in the disadvantaged position.

Gender as category in interaction in a way that didn't previously exist becomes increasingly "self-evident" as one utilizes the category. This noticing is typically referred to as "consciousness raising" though perhaps a more representative term might be consciousness creating.

Gender interaction is certainly not "news" to any member of society. When, however, one politicizes this interaction with the addition of power considerations and the implications of such an orientation for action, you have a "new" category. The addition of a category such as "sexism" to a conceptual repertoire dramatically changes both member's world and the member. It is perhaps too complex a phenomenon to totally predict the impact of such a new category.

We can say with some confidence that if the actor/theoretician begins to utilize such a new category as a prime or baseline category, then the world will in fact "change" for that individual. When linked with "value" categories, dramatic changes can result. Given such a category, other "sub" or "spinoff" categories become possible such as "secual oppression," "sexual liberation," "sexual manipulation," etc.

Through the integration of the category of power and gender interaction, the possible metaphors that follow are almost endless.

These metaphors no longer (for members) are metaphors but become social reality and a new feature of life. Action may be judged through the application of these metaphors and, lo and behold, one finds examples of these new features in the world.

Please note that this is again not an indictment of this perspective but rather the creation of an example. Such a perspective as "sexism" is just as "legitimate" as any other of the unimaginable numbers of categories in use in society. Social order could not be otherwise. What is interesting is that through the use of such categories the face of society changes and probably irreversable so. As previously stated, it appears virtually impossible to delete categories once they have been established, though the level of their use may fluctuate.

For a variety of reasons it appears that over time members seem to shift the priority of their application of conceptual categories in ways that seem to have little to do with obvious contextual constraints. As mentioned earlier it is as if there are "fads" in the use of these categories. If, for instance, a member "decides" (this gloss appears to have to do with the ability of the new category to "explain" features of the world), that he is not "assertive" enough, then he will spend some time finding in his interaction examples of assertiveness or the lack of it. That is, the member will add to his theoretical categories "assertiveness" and use it as a prime or baseline feature of interaction. Before he uses other descriptive categories he will evaluate the context in terms of assertiveness.

Through this reordering of the conceptual categories there follows some reordering of the world. The actor comes to "see himself in a different light" and as such may change his action in the world. It is

also possible that for whatever reason the member will, after some period of time, stop utilizing the category as a prime definer and the phenomenon will cease to be an "issue."

The basis for the decision to apply over the long term a particular conceptual category seems to be a complex one, requiring extensive research. A feature appears to be the theoretic "power" of the category. That is, the ease by which the user may tie together events into a "theme." Partially this may result from the user's familiarity with the new category. Over time and with practice members seem to become more "proficient" with some categories or models. The terms "category" and "model" are used interchangeably in that a "category" may be self-sufficient or part of a larger perspective and as such tied to that perspective. (Note: Conceptual "leaps" seem to be less a function of the member than the metaphorical complexity of the category--power, for instance, is a category that may be grounded in virtually any context and hence may be considered to be highly and easily generalizable and a prime candidate for a baseline category.)

The more comprehensively the member will be able to apply a specific model or category, the more likely that category will assume a place of prominence in the member's repertoire. Other considerations such as the prevailing categories in the member's peer group may also affect the ranking and content of the conceptual repertoire. Also, a particularly "vivid" or "insightful" application of a category or a highly novel application may catch the member's attention and become incorporated temporarily or permanently in the repertoire.

One suspects a wide variety of reasons for the selection of the member's "favorite" conceptual categories. Again, however, the

point is made that through the application of these conceptual categories the member makes sense of the context and locates the rationale for action.

The treatment of the client is not the treatment of the client but rather the reordering and perhaps "editing" of the client's conceptual categories. Through such a reorganization, the subjective reality of the client changes and (it is felt) the behavior of the client will also change.

What typically goes unnoticed, however, is that this activity is as much a function of the treater's categories as the client's. Further, this is not only an activity that restructures behavior but one that gives massive entree into the fundamental methods by which all social interaction takes place. The way we "do" personality work is the way that we "do" all social interaction. It is also the way that we build reality rather than "find" it.

It appears that the technique of treatment takes the form of a type of "debate" between the client's primary category concerning a specific setting and the treater's category as to the same setting. It may be that the debate concerns the nature of the respective categories (a version of "I'm right and you are wrong") or it may be the determination of the primary and secondary categories for this setting.

The primary category as we have mentioned is the baseline or "most real" definition of the nature of a specific setting. While one may define a setting an infinite variety of ways there appears to be the sense in interaction that one of the definitions is the "most real." This definition seems to be based on a consensual definition while the criteria and conditions that form the basis for this definition seem somewhat more opaque.

Members essentially vote on the nature of a specific setting. The majority opinion (in most situations) seems to hold sway though it is possible for a minority opinion to force a reversal of the majority view (see definition of personality: theme).

The client's personality trouble is seen as essentially a mis-definition of the situation or a mis-ordering of the primary and/or secondary categories/definitions. Occasionally one will hear in treatment talk the notion that the client does not thematize and therefore does not generalize from one situation to another. One suspects that such an inability would be considered one of the most serious forms of personality trouble.

It should be clearly noted that most practitioners of personality do not use theoretic terms in the description of the client's personality trouble that speak to the "definition of the situation." However, one expects that were such a descriptive framework offered, most members would "recognize" the treatment activities as resonant with the action of treatment. While the terms themselves are not those used in this analysis the theme appears common to all. (For those readers who noted the use of the term "theme" above it must be remembered that it is the principal assertion of the analysis that the dynamics herein described apply in all activities including this analysis. It cannot be otherwise!)

In the discussion of the treatment of the client, then, it appears that the activity takes the form of persuading the client to redefine the setting in terms that are considered to be more in line with the norm (as it itself is situationally defined). The persuasive nature of the treatment takes a variety of forms including massive amounts of talk, and constant attempts on the part of the treaters to "see behind" the

client's behavior in an effort to determine the genuineness of changes (if any).

Upon analysis it becomes increasingly clear that "treatment" of the client takes the form of a redefinition of member's conceptual categories. It appears that it is the theoretic component of the member's action that is the focus of the activity although it is the member's action that serves as the realization of the treatment.

#### Recognition of Change in the Actor

The ability of the practitioners of personality repair to be able to locate change in the clients with which they are involved exemplified some of the most basic features of social interaction and the entire sense-making process.

In the location of change in the member's personality we find the ability to "see" the personality as some type of frozen metaphor or caricature that is in some way different from the determination of the same personality at some point earlier in time. It has the sense of the alteration of the list/theory in that this list now has different "key descriptors" than at some other time or that the interrelation of these key descriptors (theory) is in some way altered.

In the determination of this change we incorporate the same techniques as the original description of the personality, although we now arrive at a different "conclusion" as to the nature of the personality. Here, as at other points, the important feature of the process is the determination of what is considered the "relevant" features of the client's behavior, that is, those features which seem to stand in some indexical relationship with the key descriptors that define the personality. All other behavioral displays are taken to be other than

personality displays or in some other ways not linked to the key descriptors.

What exactly is this determination of "relevance"? There is clearly the sense in members that they are able to discern that some behaviors are "important" in this process. The focus for examination is how this sense of insight may be considered an artifact of the structural nature of the interaction.

As behavior is experienced as related in some way to the underlying personality, the question that comes to mind is that of how the member is able to make the "connection" to this underlying personality? If the personality only has existence in the context of the behavior that is its "evidence," then how may one see through this behavior to that personality? Perhaps the actor is seen to respond to the same situation differently.

Here the key seems to be the ability to define the situation as the "same" or "different." Again the sense that the objective reality is readily available to anyone who cared to "look" world comes into play. Is it possible to have two situations that are the same at different points in time? Clearly the "philosophical" answer to this question must be no, though at the same time the experiential answer is yes "for all practical purposes."

There is the sense that the event may be repeated through the client's definition of the event produced by his/her own set of key descriptors of "what is going on here." That is, the client will refer to a class of events of which this event is seen as an example.

In short, the member will refer to a list. S/he will see that what is going on here could at least be partially described as an event

of the type "X". If this is an event of the type "X" then the member should act according to a set of responses that are applied to such events. If, however, this is an event of the type "Y", then the response for this event should be of a different sort.

The sense is that the client acts differently because he defines the situation differently and not because s/he is different. The preceding is a theoretic description of a member's account if s/he were constrained to produce one (clearly this is one among many). It would appear that in the course of interaction such accounts are rarely required and typically only for artificial reasons (e.g. reporting procedures, etc.).

The experience of the "change" in the member and for the member is one that appears to find in the client some different set of behaviors that are taken by observers to be indexically linked to some change in the underlying personality pattern. It is as if the client's action may now be organized according to a different set of themes and that there is the conclusion that therefore different motives may be ascribed to these behaviors. What appears to be the case is that these key descriptors or themes seem to be judged to be thematically inadequate to the task of describing the client's behavior. That is, for members the behavior no longer "makes sense."

As discussed in the Treatment section of the analysis the client's problem may be seen to be the mis-use of descriptive categories to determine the nature of the context of any situation. This problem can take the form of a mis-determination of the so-called "baseline definition" of the situation.

The client is seen to describe the situation in some way disagreeing with the consensus as to the nature of "what is going on here." It

is experienced by treaters as the client's inability to understand what is going on and that the client therefore does not act "properly" in a given situation.

If the sign of the client's trouble is his/her mis-definition of the context, then the best indicator of change in that same client is the recognition of a change in this definition. During the extended talk that describes much of the treatment the client is constantly tested for his/her definitions. "Change" in the client is seen when either the client begins to report differing definitions or (more commonly) a different order of definitions.

By "order" we mean that the client is experienced as changing his/her baseline definition of the situation. By "baseline" we may mean that definition of the situation or context that the client uses as his/her basis for action. The client may still include many of the same categories in his/her definition but the category upon which s/he acts changes.

In the example previously used, if the student's trouble is that he defines the situation in the classroom to be one in which "power" is the most significant category, then s/he will orient and act in some way appropriate to that power feature. We should of course note that the client's definition of an appropriate action vis-à-vis power may not be legitimate according to larger cultural definitions (e.g. violence). From the client's "point of view" however, his action may be most appropriate.

This description of types and degrees of personality trouble includes virtually infinite variation and combination. At each point along the line in the formation of the client's action, "turns" may be

taken that are considered in one way or another to be unacceptable. It appears that it is the baseline definition that determines each of these "turns" and that most personality theories and treatment models speak in one way or another to these issues. It would seem most productive from the client's point of view that to recognize this essential commonality and address it more directly rather than through the obfuscation of a detailed story. The various personality theories and models seem useful as ways to conceptualize the processes that we have described. Once they are accepted by the client as persuasive descriptions of their dynamics, then they possess the inevitable "solution" to the client's problem.

By accepting the treater's definition of the client and of the treater's model of personality, the client is experienced as well down the road to the solution of the personality trouble. Built into the description of the client's trouble are the criteria for the recognition of the solution of that trouble.

This is not to say that these treatments are "wrong" but rather that often they are unself-conscious. In the determination of the client's problem the essential activity is the uncovering of the client's conceptual categories ("perceptions") and his/her rules for the use of those categories.

Having determined the client's categories one has located the first step to the client's personality. The dynamics of personality might be considered the application of a determination of context and then the selection of an appropriate action for that context. Personality might be considered the "style" of choices for action.

For instance in the example cited, if the client defines the situation in the classroom as a power struggle with the teacher, then the personality might be thought of as the tendency in that situation to respond to power in a specific way, e.g. "confrontation." The response represents a type of "emotional habit" based on a specific definition of the context. The goal of the treatment is then to alter the definition of the context and/or the emotional habit that defines the response in such a situation.

While the definition and the response are clearly an interactive process it seems clear that it is the definition of the situation that most often goes unnoticed as an arbitrary choice. Again, as we repeatedly point out, the member's sense of determination of the context is the essential act in the production of the social order. While this determination may be affected by a variety of previous actions and determinations, it is at the point of the pre-act determination that the course of interaction is at its most crucial nexus. It is at this point that reality is held together by its most tenuous threads.

It is clear that in the determination of "change" in the client we find the best example of the myriad definitions of personality, personality problems and personality repair. In terms of content or the nature of the client's personality, its structure and that nature of the personality trouble, there appears to be very little agreement in a member's theoretic sense. One doubts the possibility of agreement by any two theoreticians though there does appear to be a structural thread that runs through all of the descriptions.

This thread takes the form of (1) experiencing an event, (2) defining or categorizing that event in terms that are appropriate for

re-action to the event, and (3) the accomplishment of this reaction by the actor in some more or less similar to the version that he or she "had in mind." The notion of "trouble" appears to be experienced as some sort of malfunction along this chain of events.

There appear to be throughout this process imbedded or implicit assumptions that direct thinking by and about individuals who concern themselves with personality and its repair. For instance, as we have said, an implicit assumption concerning the definition of an event is the notion that there is a hierarchy of descriptions that defines the situation and that the criterion for this hierarchy is that some descriptions are more "accurate" than others.

Again as previously mentioned we find the notion of descriptive categories to be a useful one in the analysis of the "cure" or change in the client. The recognition of change in the client appears to be linked to the alteration of the client's conceptual categories.

In the course of human interaction perhaps the essential or critical feature is the member's making sense of the present action. That is, it is the set of categories that the client brings to the situation that "cuts up" the action into slices of meaning that shape the member's action and subsequent interaction.

The member brings with him/her a set of categories or orientations to the situation with which s/he makes sense of the interaction. These categories consist largely of metaphorical descriptions that link some features of the interaction and due to their implicit assumptions and structure shape following action. Theoretic descriptions, i.e. descriptions that define the structure of interrelationships, or other features of an event, seem to be "controlling" the shape of interaction rather than serving that interaction.

Let us assume that "Mary" is being described by two of her friends as either "shy" or "reserved." One friend finds Mary to be a person who holds herself distant from others in action and appears to prefer this style of interaction. The sense here is that Mary chooses "reserved" as a matter of taste, as a personal preference. The other friend, however, finds that Mary does indeed hold herself at a distance from interaction but does so because she is afraid of the interaction. This latter description seems to "undercut" the former in that it speaks to some sort of motivation for Mary's behavior.

The distinctions between the two descriptions are subtle but important. Mary as "reserved" is described in terms which find her to be a person of definite opinions and a person in control of herself in that she chooses this style rationally as the result of some consideration of alternatives. The description of Mary as "reserved" is an essentially "healthy" description.

If, on the other hand, Mary is described as a "shy person" then we find in the notion of "shy" a variety of implications for Mary. For instance, Mary may be seen to be in some way not "in control" of herself. That is, to be "shy" suggests that the individual wishes it to be otherwise. "Shyness" is not seen as a rational decision but rather as a way of "coping" with a fear of some feature of the interaction. Shyness is taken to be an adjustment to the fear, an adaptation to a reaction the member cannot control. Shy, then, may be taken as an essentially unhealthy description of Mary.

As we have described earlier the definition of the client's trouble carries within it the seeds of the client's treatment goals, not in the sense that the dynamics described are really in the client

but rather that the dynamics are in the description and that in some ways it is the description that gets "treated" and not the client. It could not be otherwise.

If the theoretic process is defining the client's trouble and then defining the client's change, then we must look to the dynamics imbedded in the theoretical process for the dynamics of the treatment. It is the theoretical process used by treater on client and by the client on him/herself that is the treatment. The activity is only available to those involved through this process (by definition) and may be said to only exist in the activity. It is the words, the images, the metaphors that have the "power," not the members.

There is clearly an interactive and interdependent relationship between the theoretician and the descriptive devices of that theoretician. Typically it appears to members that the theoretician chooses his/her descriptive devices because of their correspondence to the subject at hand. The choice of the term "shy" as opposed to "reserved" may be made with the understanding of the implications both implicit and explicit, involved in the use of such a term. One notes, however, that often it is the implicit assumptions that seem to shape the theoretical formulation of an individual personality. Further it appears that the "flow" results more from the descriptive device than from any powerful sense on the part of the describer of some "essence" of the subject of the description.

It appears that some descriptions seem to possess more depth of implication and consequently more "power" to direct the flow of interaction. To continue with the current example we find that "shy" seems to possess more of this depth than the notion of "reserved." Reserved

seems in this instance to be a description only of behavior and as such seems not to speak to such issues as motivation for this behavioral choice. It is a term describing style and essentially not a "psychological" term in that it does not easily allow entree into the personality.

The structure of the notion is that as a style the member chooses it as one would choose clothing, music, art, or perfume, i.e. as a matter of taste. As such the choice of reserved as a style is seen as a rational choice based on it as a style. It is in a sense not a feature of personality repair in that it provides little or no implicit entree into the dynamics of the member's personality.

A notion like "style" seems to "close the door" on personality analysis. It is possible to force this door open and push into motivation for this "choice," but this would have to be accomplished in spite of the notion not as an implicit or essential feature of the notion. That is, the use of the term "reserved" here does not appear to produce a built-in pressure or predisposition to flow into the underlying dynamics of the member's personality.

One might note that through the use of such "style terms" as reserved one finds in the therapeutic process the client coming to "accept" behavior (either his own or someone else's). Acceptance is typically taken to a nonanalytic and non-value orientation to the actor's behavior. The use of such nonpsychological terms as "reserved" seems to mediate for an easier "acceptance" of the member's behavior than the use of terms that seem to invite the kind of analysis that leads to a "deep" examination of motives.

It may be that an essential feature of the therapeutic process is the restructuring of the client's lexicon in such a way that he/she

make more (or less) use of such style terms as "reserved." Perhaps one of the most effective ways of altering a client's orientation toward the world is to alter his set of descriptive categories through the modification of the vocabulary, the lexicon of terms that the member uses to "construct" that orientation.

If the client is seen as having the "wrong attitude" or "inappropriate reactions" or some other set of "bad" reactions to the world, then it may be that the notions that he is using are creating for him the world and that his/her problem might be best seen as some sort of artifact of the client's use of descriptive categories that create for him/her what is seen in the world as personality trouble.

Clearly, if one orients to the notion of personality trouble as not trouble in a personality but rather an artifact of the descriptive frameworks utilized by the member in the formulation of the world, then the change in the member might likewise be determined in the client's reorganization of the external reality through a reworking of the lexicon of conceptual categories. Further, it is the lexicon of the treater that often in itself it creates the therapeutic process and as such may be seen as an essential feature of that therapeutic process.

Again, in referring to our example we find that if the notion of "reserved" is taken to be one that seems to deter the analysis of personality dynamics (particularly motivation), then concepts such as "shy" seem to invite such analysis. Imbedded in the notion of "shyness" is the sense that the individual does not interact due to some fear that blocks this interaction. It carries the sense of some conflict within the individual in that s/he wants to interact but is at the same time blocked from the interaction by some internal personality dynamic.

This sense of conflict seems to invite the theoretician to move to the deeper level of personality dynamic to determine what "causes" this conflict. The user of such a term is by nature of the implicit assumptions of the conceptual categories utilized drawn to "finding" personality trouble even though the nature of that trouble may remain opaque.

Questions arise concerning whether the client is "afraid of interaction" and if so what the nature and cause of this fear may be and the nature of the most appropriate treatment. Such a term as "shy" seems incredibly rich in therapeutic possibilities, while the notion of "reserved" is certainly more barren in this area.

As we have shown in the determination of the client's personality trouble, the nature of the trouble may rely as extensively on the use of language as debate as in the correspondence to the reality of the client. One feature of this "debate" may be the use of the terms most conceptually rich in therapeutic possibility. It is, after all, the task of the enterprise to locate personality dynamics and most particularly "trouble." In such a context the use of "rich" terms would certainly enhance the types and kinds of personality troubles that one might be able to "find" in the client.

The more troubles one finds in a specific personality the more likely the possibility of success in treatment. It is through the terms themselves that the treaters are able to locate the client's trouble and it is again through these same terms that they are able to locate that change in the client. This change is linked at least as much to the descriptive categories utilized as to any behavior displayed to the treater by the client. The work of therapy takes place in language and not in behavior.

In the recognition of change in the member we may find taking place a redefinition of the client in terms that do not invite analysis and therefore do not invite the possibility of trouble. As we have stressed throughout this analysis it is the definition of the client and not the client that is the focus of the personality work and personality repair work. It is the interactive formulation of the client, his personality and the personality trouble that creates the reality of personality and its repair.

Again the analytic notion of personality is of an entity that does not exist. It gains its existence only in the theoretic formulation for and by the member and has no interactive existence as action. Its existence is a mutually perpetuated illusion maintained through its vehicle, namely language.

To return to the recognition of change in the actor, the therapeutic process in the member seems to include the member orienting theoretically toward himself in much the same way as the external theoretician in terms of the use of the conceptual categories that either block or invite therapeutic implications.

Through the process of proffering the client an altered lexicon and consequently an altered perceptual framework, we find the client comes to orient to him/herself differently not because the personality has changed but rather the description of the personality has changed. For instance, if the client accepts the imagery of a "style" and its implication of a way of life that warrants neither analysis nor evaluation re: a value standard, then the behavior consisting of constant questioning of his/her own actions and a crippling of interactive effectiveness seems less likely. Here nothing about the individual personality has

changed but instead the orientation to the individual's action (i.e. the theoretic stance) has redefined the nature of those actions.

The recognition of change in the member, then, may be seen as the redefinition of the troubled personality in terms that maintain the sense that the personality has in fact changed. As in all of personality work the analyst finds that the process of cure or change is arbitrary (i.e. practically constrained). Further, it is an artifact of the techniques used to organize interaction concerning the phenomenon. The recognition of change in the client is, as with the rest of personality work, the accomplishment of its method.

## NOTES

16. Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 44-52.
17. Garfinkel, pp. 70-73.
18. Zimmerman and Pollner, pp. 175-77.

## CONFERENCE #1

Date: January 1, 1976

Client: "C"

Staff: "B", "J", "R"

- 1 R: OK, then let's just review through the academic stuff...
- 2 J: Which one are you using first?
- 3 B: Final
- 4 R: Final
- 5 J: Case conference final?
- 6 R: Yeah
- 7 J: OK
- 8 R: Um, attendance?
- 9 J: Attendance according to this she has been present 39 times,
- 10 absent 13 and late 14...
- 11 R: Ahum.....go ahead
- 12 J: You want me to go straight down the list?
- 13 R: Sure
- 14 J: Well, all I have down here for reading she has an incomplete and  
math...
- 15 R: Well, incomplete meaning what?
- 16 J: Meaning that she wasn't attending enough to get a grade for that
- 17 course...
- 18 R: OK, you might want to make a note of that...
- 19 J: She got a 50 for math because she failed to do as well as she could...
- 20 R: Umhum...
- 21 J: Right, and the attendance was a factor also here.
- 22 R: OK

- 23 J: Writing she has a 60. I have no other notes regarding that.
- 24 Again apparently she hasn't done all the work.
- 25 R: Umhum
- 26 J: Social studies is incomplete. Again that would be as the result
- 27 of poor attendance.
- 28 R: The reading and math scores you might put there too, under reading
- 29 and math. When you finish compiling the test scores you could
- 30 stick those test scores in, all right? In under reading and math.
- 31 J: OK
- 32 R: So there'll be something to compare to the first conference.
- 33 J: All right, the language arts she has no grade or score because it
- just started.
- 34 R: Right
- 35 J: All right, physical education she had got an incomplete, OK? and
- 36 the comment here was that because she generally did not participate
- 37 in any gym activities. She would go and just sit by the sidelines
- 38 or you know as I recall it she would use excuse saying that she was
- 39 not feeling well or that she could not...or she never goes to gym,
- 40 you know, and she would stay behind.
- 41 R: Do you know why she was doing that?
- 42 J: Um...
- 43 R: Embarrassment or was she just not very athletic?
- 44 B: She's not a very athletic girl. She's got epilepsy which is very
- 45 dormant ah but that wasn't...we got a note from the doctor which
- 46 said she shouldn't be excused from any physical activities such as
- 47 gym because of her epilepsy. And then she has asthma which she
- 48 complains of, but the doctor also said that that also shouldn't be

49       used as an excuse so just general laziness and not no enthusiasm  
50       for physical sports...

51 J: Just in terms of a personal comment anyway she seems to me that she  
52       deems gym as a little too beneath her and to participate...

53 R: What do you mean?

54 J: ..you know all the little girls get involved but not her 'cause  
55       she sees herself as a little too mature for that...

56 R: For athletics?

57 J: She kind of projects that image if you were to ask me...

58 R: You see that as well?

59 B: Yeah.

60 R: Um, she's above doing physical work or what?

61 J: Not really physical work...

62 R: I mean is that what you're saying or is it because she can't play  
63       basketball?

64 J: I'm pretty sure that's a factor, but I think even more so she sees  
65       everybody else getting involved in sport or activity in gym as, well,  
66       little kids, that this is not her shot.

67 R: Is she...expressed that or is that your impression?

68 J: No, that's totally my impression.

69 B: Well, generally ah what she says was that she just doesn't like gym.  
70       For instance, the girls at times would have the basketball court  
71       and she doesn't play that ah not even handball or paddleball would  
72       she play. Once in a while when the girls had a dance routine going,  
73       when the teacher, JM, would teach dance lessons, once I saw her get  
74       involved and then she stopped that.

75 R: Yeah, I'm not trying to make a big deal out of this, I'm just saying

76 that first I didn't think that, this may be a mistake on my part,  
77 I didn't think that physical education was optional. I didn't think  
78 it was an activity that you could go to and watch, like when I used  
79 to be the last one picked on teams but I still had to do it you know  
80 when I went to school you had to do it, you couldn't sit and watch.

81 B: Well, it's not actually um optional, but it's run on the premise that  
82 you really can't make a kid get involved in gym. All right for instance..

83 R: Boy is that wrong... [laughter]

84 B: Yeah, I agree but that's how it's run you know...

85 R: OK, I guess that was a misunderstanding...but I'm saying if it  
86 seemed like a significant event then we should note it or deal  
87 with it, but if it's just simply that she's not inclined in that  
88 direction, fine.

89 J: She also seemed to me to act ultra-feminine so in the end if it's  
90 a rough and tough thing then she can't see herself getting involved  
91 in it, because she's very feminine...

92 B: Even through junior high school she had a record of not participating  
93 and failing gym...at thirteen.

94 R: OK, she doesn't see it as self-destructive to fail at gym all the  
95 time?

96 B: Oh no not at all.

97 J: Or any other course for that matter either...no I wouldn't go that  
98 far because she seemed to have gotten pretty excited over the fact  
99 that she passed...an exam (garbled).....ok I don't have any  
100 thing down for...

101 R: Ancillary skills being things like again note taking and attention  
102 in class, asking questions in class. The kinds of things that a kid

103 has got to know to achieve. Be able to do, achieve, you know.

104 If the kid sits and never asks a question in class then they're  
105 not going to make it in class.

106 J: OK for the time that she is in class for the most part as I've  
107 observed she doesn't really get involved and the only time I have  
108 observed her getting seriously involved with any lesson or class  
109 is when you actually go up to her and put your arm around her  
110 and say, "OK you can do it," that kind of thing. She really needs  
111 a lot of personal attention in order to get involved. Other than  
112 that she I mean class is going on you're trying to present a  
113 subject to a whole class she just spaces out...

114 R: Reentry orientation meaning in this case, what would you as a  
115 teacher want to tell...both of you having known her...what would  
116 her teacher...the teacher that she...if she, if she is referred  
117 out...she is being referred out? What would you want her teacher  
118 to know about her academically? What have you learned about her  
119 academically that you think the teacher should know?

120 B: Well, I guess I agree with what J said and plus I think she's um  
121 she's exhibited...she's very lazy...like J says....

122 R: Ain't no such thing as lazy. Lazy is when you're doing something  
123 you don't want to do. It may sound like a stupid remark, but people  
124 are lazy about what they don't want to do. You get one kid who's  
125 ...you put him down in front of a book and you watch him not work  
126 and say he's lazy, you give him a basketball and let him run for  
127 the next six hours, he's not lazy any more. So is it she's not  
128 motivated to academic work? Is she not motivated to anything?  
129 See I don't accept the notion that people are lazy. I can see

130 as unmotivated, um depressed, um detached, afraid to participate.  
131 I don't see lazy as an activity. I tend to see people as willing  
132 ...you know it may be few and far between to find what really moves  
133 them when they find something that moves them they really do it.  
134 So lazy is a general kind of 'I don't like to move my body' number.  
135 I think that we have to be careful about it...  
136 I tend to agree with you, but again like I said before if I come  
137 and constantly give her assurance that she can do it and kind of  
138 joke with her, you know and she comes around. She likes, you  
139 know, she likes to be complimented. She likes to be teased, to  
140 be kidded with...  
141 R: But then she'll work.  
142 J: Then she'll work...  
143 R: So it's not a question that she may be...(garbled)  
144 J: I mean that's been my experience. I don't know, I really don't  
145 know...  
146 R: Yeah, but it might be something that another teacher might want  
147 to know. Instead of having to do trial and error to find out  
148 that if you do work independently with her, she can work. It  
150 would be nice to that..that..for a teacher to know that. That's  
151 what I mean by reorientation.  
152 J: But for the most part she's very detached, you know, from what's  
153 going on...  
154 R: Detached meaning what?  
155 J: Meaning that....very little of what goes on in the classroom or  
156 whatever interests her.  
157 R: Does it not interest her or is she not participating out of fear

158 of failure or whatever? Again...

159 J: Yeah, I see that the point that you're getting at.. I find it  
160 very difficult to make a comment on that. I don't know if it's  
161 because she's either turned off by the subject matter itself or  
162 it's not being presented in a more exciting way or there are some  
163 other personal dynamics going on with her. I mean that she removes  
164 herself and only, you know, only comes in again, you know only  
165 gets involved when she has the...

166 R: She plays on her terms.

167 J: Yeah or when she has the attention that she wants.

168 R: Have you found anything that about what..about how she feels  
169 about class or class work or academics. I mean is she afraid or  
170 is she...you know what..

171 B: I don't generally get the feeling that she's afraid, um because  
172 at different times her up for a challenge um..for instance she  
173 came here um with the idea, what the motivation was she got left  
174 back one year and her motivation was to make up that year. I  
175 think that someone back at the school told her that if she raised  
176 her reading level..

177 J: Yeah..

178 B: ...and her math level a year here that she'd be promoted to  
179 her regular grade. So this was her initial motivation and um  
180 at different times you could see spurts of her getting involved  
181 and being able to do and accomplish. This is why I used that  
182 phrase lazy!..maybe unmotivated you know at the time would be a  
183 better phrase for it.

184 R: Have you been able to get a handle on what it is..when she gets

- 185 moved is it..do you have any idea what it is that moves her?
- 186 B: Well, um I don't know if it has anything to do with school. You  
187 see with C there's a lot of things that are happening outside of  
188 school..ah she's having a lot of personal problems and it seems  
189 to peak at different times and at those times either she's out  
190 of school or she's very uninvolved when she's here..
- 191 R: OK,ok,ok, then again something that would be useful for a teacher  
192 to know would be that outside things tend to affect her perform-  
193 ance in class and whatever her emotional problems are tend to  
194 produce the impression that she's not interested or turned off  
or whatever
- 195 J: The comment I would add is that I was kind of surprised by her  
196 reaction when she had taken the test and she had gotten a mark  
197 which even though it was curved..which was passing on a curve..  
198 she was excited about it and a lot more excited than I had an-  
199 ticipated cause she had been present for some time and she had  
200 taken what I considered an indifferent attitude towards the class  
201 in general and when she had gotten a mark that was a passing mark,  
202 even though she had failed the mark for the report card..
- 203 R: Umhum..
- 204 J: ...she had passed the test and she was really animated, really  
205 excited about it. So I think that's a key into something there,  
206 I can't put my finger on it exactly, but somehow success does  
207 mean a lot to her in a certain context and a..
- 208 R: She's not as indifferent as she appears.
- 209 J: Right, so there's something there..(garbled)..I'm sure there's a  
210 heck of a lot going on personally, you know, outside of school  
211 that's affecting her performance...

212 R: But again you would want to note that for her teacher to see and  
213 read and be able to recognize..

214 J: I think that she...

215 R: ..cause if she plays at aloof and indifferent and 'this is beneath  
216 me' and 'I don't want to be involved' and 'I'm too good for this'  
217 that, that, if that's the wrong image if she is responding for  
218 some other reason and that happens to be her game..there's no  
219 sense having the teacher spend three months trying to find that  
220 out. When we can tell them up front or even if it's a question  
even if you're not sure even as a possibility.

221 J: Yeah, I don't think..I don't consider her apathetic I think she  
222 can be turned on she sure...

223 R: OK recommended...

224 J: (garbled)

225 R: ..then on page 2 under 'recommended placement' is there any  
226 specific advice in terms of academic areas that you would have?  
227 I mean again in the sense of reading lab should something like  
228 that be continued..would we be recommending that she be contin-  
229 ued in some kind of reading lab type situation?..did she re-  
230 spond to that? Would it be more useful for her to get a more  
231 intensive experience like that..a mathlab, if they've got one  
232 or whatever?.....Again she shouldn't go back there the same  
233 way she came in here. There should be more information than  
234 when she walked in the door here. And some better idea as to a...

235 J: I don't know if this ties in with that question but I think she  
236 does get turned on to certain challenges, but they have to be  
237 within the scope of what she's capable of handling. You know

- 238       some kids..some people try to take on something more difficult  
          than they can handle.
- 239 R: Umhum..
- 240 J: ..which makes them go on. She accepts a challenge but it has to  
241       be within what she is capable of dealing with, if it's just be-  
242       yong that you know forget it she just won't deal with that at all.
- 243 R: Again the reading lab situation would she respond to that here?  
244       Did that seem to be effective?
- 245 J: I don't know..
- 246 R: Well you might want to check with JK to see what his interpre-  
247       tation its impact..its..if it really seemed to move her then  
248       you might want to see if we if we could get her replaced back  
249       in the school in a reading lab to continue in...again its things  
250       like that we want to know. If it seemed to be totally wrong then  
251       doesn't seem to be any sense in putting her in one when she goes  
          back.
- 252 J: OK cause I don't have anything down for..
- 253 R: OK but there'll be..just make a note to check..Now in terms of  
254       the behavioral stuff, the family, commitment and behavior. I've  
255       found that it's most useful instead of just um ..instead of just  
256       clipping down through the paragraphs if we just sort of summarize  
257       who she is and what her problems are..what we know about her and  
258       then most of that information will fall into the answers here.  
259       It tends to flow better if we just tend to talk about her for a  
260       couple of minutes and then try to answer these questions instead  
261       of just clipping through and answering these questions.
- 262 B: Well, on that I had written a summary and I had answered...

263 R: OK..

264 B: ..which ever would be more helpful for you..

265 R: Why don't you start with the summary..that's in the back?

266 J: Are you now referring to the family or..

267 R: Let's do all of it as a package..

268 B: You want me to read all of this?

269 R: Sure.

270 B: OK. "At first coming to S., C had a negative attitude and wouldn't

271 get involved. She would consistently attend classes but wouldn't

272 produce academically. C didn't want to be in the program and her

273 attitude and performance showed it as do her grades for the first

274 quarter. C's attendance and punctuality continued to be poor

274A (absent-13, late-14). After several confrontations, counselling

275 sessions and commitments made by her, C was resistant and defiant

276 towards authority and structure. C was unable to adhere to the

277 S structure and rules for the most part in a constructive manner.

278 On Friday 1/16/76 C's class went on a trip, which she didn't

279 attend (this is an incident)..

280 R: Yeah

281 B: OK, C's class went on a trip which she did not attend. She was told

282 by L and myself that she couldn't go home after she insisted she

283 was going to leave. L stated to C not to leave and if she left, not

284 to return unless she returned with her mother. She was also told

285 that if she left, she would face dismissal from the program. She

286 chose to leave. The day before, 1/15/76, C's mother had come in be-

287 cause of problems she and Chad had been having to find out that C

288 had not been attending school that Wednesday, 1/14/76, after being

289 sent to school. Mrs. S. currently has a court case (PINS petition)  
290 pending against C. Mrs. S. has no control over C at this point.  
291 She is suspecting of having relations with a much older man, by  
292 her mother. She is staying out late and not attending school  
regularly."

293 R: OK, now um I'm a little confused cause you said she was..expressed  
294 or seemed committed to the program in the beginning paragraph or  
295 the second paragraph, she expressed commitment to the...

296 J: I think he said just the opposite..

297 B: No one said that...she consistently attended classes the first two  
298 weeks, ok but coming here she had a negative attitude about the  
299 program and expressed that she didn't want to be here..

300 R: OK, I misheard you..OK so what are her problems basically as you  
301 see them? You say a couple of problems with authority and struc-  
302 ture and whatever.

303 B: Yeah

304 R: What are the problems with authority and structure? I mean...

305 B: Well, basically she knows no limits, ah her mother has no control  
306 over her, hasn't for a few years since the father left the home.  
307 And C is more or less on her own right now. She doesn't listen  
308 to her mother or her older brothers at all.

309 R: Well I mean for instance, why would she be..whenever the confron-  
310 tation on Friday? Yeah Friday um and she was ordered not to leave  
311 and she left. Ok, now the rationale for her dismissal is what?

312 B: That

313 R: That she disobeyed an order?

314 B: That and her attendance, her attitude, her performance..

315 R: The fact that she appears not to be committed to the program.

316 B: At all.

317 R: OK, um..

318 J: You know one thing I find, I don't find her defiant so much, just  
319 that almost indifferent, you know in terms of authority, almost an  
320 indifferent attitude towards it. Ah within a classroom structure  
321 she will participate when she's told, you know when she's told to..  
322 You leave her alone for a minute and she's, you know she's spaced  
323 out again. But if you tell her, 'ok open up your notebook and  
324 start writing! she does it. But again you know if you go to the  
325 other side of the room and give someone else assistance..

326 R: She's gone.

327 J: ..she's gone again. You've got to come back to her again to  
328 remind her..

329 R: So attention span might be a problem..I mean is it something  
330 like that? Is the fact that she...

331 J: I don't know..

332 R: ..can't or won't focus her attention?

333 B: She won't.

334 J: Yeah, she won't focus her attention and but it's not done in a  
335 defiant way, you know what I'm saying?

336 R: It just drifts

337 J: It seems to..you know..it seems to..

338 R: I mean is it like a little kid, like a three-year-old? Where a  
339 three-year-old asks you to tell him a story and you start...you  
340 get three sentences into the story and the kid wanders away. I  
341 mean is it that kind of thing? A very short attention span in

342 that way? Is it the fact that she's just saying, is she saying  
343 'fuck you' all the time and just putting up the wall? You know I'm  
344 trying to get at what is this turning on and off that she does?

345 J: The only combination..I really can't put my finger on it..because  
346 it seems to be a combination of both because I wonder how much  
347 she's really in control of it and how much of it is really con-  
348 trolling her because, you know, if I tell her 'OK, open up her  
349 notebook and write' she does..OK. And I don't know if she's act-  
350 ing just, you know, conditionally because of authority, but...or  
351 ah she does actually make an attempt. But I mean in other words  
352 as long as I'm there, you know, giving her assurance that she  
353 can do it--that's OK. Now if I give attention to someone else..

354 R: If on the other hand you just said, 'C pick up your pencil and  
355 start to work'..with no assurance, not, not that 'you can do it  
356 C', just do it. How does she respond to that?

357 J: Again, she responds.

358 R: She'll do it.

359 J: She'll do it. And then I'm paying attention to someone else  
360 in the class...

361 R: But it's not just a question of you have to say 'C, you can do  
362 it'. It's not a question of getting her confidence up. She'll  
363 respond just being told..

364 J: I think she..she responds either way, OK? I mean it's more pro-  
365 longed if you give her assurance and if you say, 'you can do it',  
366 you know kind of make her feel this is not really a painful situ-  
367 ation. I really can't say she does it in terms of defiance, but  
368 almost as if you know she has no control over it. But then again

369 she's, you know, she seems to have kind of pretty much, you know,  
370 pretty much control over most of what she does. You know that's why  
371 I really can't place my finger on exactly what it is because I..  
372 I'm pretty sure she's conscious to a certain degree what she's  
373 doing, but then..you know when you say something to someone one  
374 minute and the next minute again you really wonder if they are  
375 really that much in control...can they turn off and turn on that  
easily?

376 R: You were shaking your head, do you disagree?

377 B: Yeah, because I've seen C come in and like ah have perfect days,  
378 you know, go to all her classes; do all the work that she was given  
379 and you know, just have beautiful days. And then, you know, largely  
380 I've seen her come in and choose to do certain things, choose to  
381 perform in class and it's really funny because she'll say, 'Well,  
382 I'm going to this class but I'm not going to do the work' and sure  
383 enough she would go to that class and not do the work, not do any-  
384 thing and it was even a thing of..C loves attention from..from  
385 authority figures. She had a very close relationship with V and  
386 she'd go down and talk to V for a hour, a half hour, 45 minutes...

387 R: Was she the one she gave the dog to?

388 B: Possibly, I'm not sure. And she loves attention you know from  
389 authority. She won't openly admit it, you know, and she does negative  
390 things to get attention, um she loves attention from authority  
391 figures. But I've seen her come in and really be motivated to do  
392 good work, you know, really perform it, deal with all the rules  
393 and structure and everything and then there's days when she  
394 chooses not to. And which I think she consciously chooses not to.

395 R: So you are both agreeing that it's at least partly conscious..

396 J: Yeah, I would not say totally unconscious. I mean there are times  
397 I feel that she really is, you know, she really is controlling  
398 the situation..she turns on and turns off as she pleases. But then  
399 there are times, I'm wondering, you know is she really capable of  
400 turning on and turning off just like that.

401 R: Is this..what you're talking, is this about her prime problem?  
402 the fact that she can't or won't focus on the situation at hand.  
403 That she can't or won't focus on the task that she's about...

404 J: For the most part I would say that...

405 R: ..is that a major problem for her?

406 J: For the most part I would say...

407 R: ..cause that's sure as hell not gonna get her through school, if  
408 she won't do school work...

409 B: Well it's not...I wouldn't say it's major...I'd say that...largely  
410 again I'll focus on that are happening with her outside of the  
411 school. Ah, I think that she's very confused most of the time and  
412 she'll give you a confused picture. You know she'll sit here one  
412A day, 'OK, J or B, I'll be here tomorrow on time,' she'll have 15  
413 commitments and she'll go through, she'll follow through with  
413A those commitments. The next day she'll come in she'll be a half  
414 hour late and she'll go to class and she'll just sit there and  
415 you know look out the window all day. Um, and I definitely think  
416 a lot of it has to do with outside, you know, she doesn't come  
417 here and let anyone support her or let anyone really counsel her,  
418 you know, she's really closed off and when she presents things in  
419 counselling sessions they're very abstract and not very direct.

420 They're not really source things that are bothering her. You  
421 know, so I tend to think that she tends to keep a lot of things in.  
422 Her mother, her relationship with her mother is horrendous. She  
423 hollers at her mother, she has no respect at all. They were here  
424 one day and she got into an argument and started hollering at her  
425 mother. And so the mother says the only way she can control her  
426 or to show some type of discipline is to beat C while she's sleep-  
ing. You know to go in while she's sleeping and start beating her.

427 R: That would provide me with a great stimulus to yell at my mother,  
428 if she beat me while I was sleeping.

429 B: Yeah, but...

430 R: Did you do a visit in the home?

431 B: No.

432 J: Let me, like I said before, for the most part...

433 R: Let's finish..do some more of the home stuff. There's no father?

434 B: The father left about three years ago.

435 R: Siblings?

436 B: Yeah, two older brothers. One..both high school dropouts..both..  
437 living at home..one-23 and one-19. Both doing mental jobs and give  
438 the mother very little support. The mother has asthma, a heart  
439 condition, she's very sickly. She was just in and out of the hospi-  
440 tal at the end of last year, for two to three weeks. At which time,  
441 surprisingly, C showed a whole lot of concern for her mother. In  
442 so far as calling from here to her mother at home, spending a lot  
443 of time in the hospital. Ah, but after her mother got well she got  
444 back on the road again, so to speak. And now the mother has the  
445 PINS petition because she feels that C is running around with a man

446       who's between 34 and 38. She's staying out very late at night.  
447       She leaves here early sometimes and doesn't go home.....She  
448       smokes marijuana constantly, her mother knows that.

449 R: OK, behaviorally..um in terms of what you've been saying, what  
450       would tell them in school..the school team to do about C?....  
451       Again this is one of the purposes of the final conference, to  
452       prepare the team for this kid that's coming.

453 B: Well, behaviorally or as far as acting out C presents no problem.  
454       The only real problem is...

455 R: Well, she's certainly no problem to the organization, but the point  
456       is that she is obviously a problem to herself.

457 B: Right.

458 R: I mean what is it that in terms of, of...if they're going to pick  
459       her up as a counselling client, what specific recommendations of  
460       say in terms of behavior would you make?

461 J: The thing that comes to mind to me is that the only thing that  
462       can be done is that there has to be a follow through on whatever  
463       demands are placed on her. OK, if she...

464 R: Yeah, but the point is that she can't have somebody standing over  
465       her for the next four years in school. The point is you got to get  
466       at what it is that gets her to turn off and obviously you're right  
467       it's..the home sounds lovely.

468 J: Yeah, but I get the impression that too..that she has..that there  
469       has been very little follow up in terms of demands made on her.  
470       I think she has effectively, in the past, been able to out-  
471       maneuver any demands made on her, for reasons that I'm not sure.  
472       I'll give you a classic example is gym..

473 R: Yeah.

474 J: When she's sick, when she's not feeling well, whatever it is she  
475 manages to evade..

476 R: She uses her mother's trick..

477 J: Right..

478 B: She's very manipulative..very..

479 J: And I'm saying if that could be cut short...

480 R: Again, that would be..again if the school team member doesn't know  
481 that she's manipulative and she will use these things, they're  
482 going to get run around in circles for three months, till they  
483 catch on. Again that would be good that you'd specifically want  
484 to mention.

485 B: Well, C is the type of kid who..that her maturity is so much an  
486 act. She is a very mature girl, ah dresses herself, she has..  
487 appears very nicely dressed, her hair..she's..her hair's combed.  
488 She's a very mature girl for 14. And you know she doesn't respond  
489 to demands. She immediately turns off to, ah rigid people and  
490 people who place demands on her, you know..

491 R: See that's...the two of you are saying very different things here  
492 and I'm trying to decide..

493 B: Oh, no.

494 J: Yeah, but I don't think that we're contradicting each other. You  
495 know what I'm saying?

496 R: B is saying she turns off to demands and you're saying that she  
497 responds to demands by working.

498 J: No, no she..she..I'm not saying responds to demands..I'm saying  
499 that she has successfully abated..I mean, you know..outmaneuvered..

500 R: But you've also said that if you make a demand on her in the  
501 classroom she'll do it.

502 J: That has been my experience, OK? Demands of her, in terms of  
503 character of hers or a..

504 R: She may be willing to do what you say..as an individual as opposed  
505 to what somebody else said..that's what I'm trying to get at,  
506 partially. In the other classes how does she respond?

507 J: OK, again from what I can see, for the most part she doesn't..

508 R: Does she respond to demands to other teachers?

509 J: From what I can see according to this, no.

510 R: OK, we want to find that out...maybe it's got something to do with  
511 J. Maybe it's..how does she respond to L? How does she respond to  
512 JM? How does she respond to JK? Can they use..can they make demands  
513 of her, does she respond, does she not respond whatever?

514 J: My impression is that it depends more in terms of the situation in  
514A which the demand is placed. OK if it's structured in such a way  
515 that the demand is almost impossible to avoid, I think she com-  
516 plies..all right? Ah and then again the demand is not something  
517 that is threatening to herself, but is a demand that is required of..

518 R: She doesn't react out of fear, she just figures 'it's just easier  
519 to do what I'm told' the first time...

520 J: Right, I don't think that..she doesn't do it because she's afraid  
521 of me or anything like that...

522 R: She's got a problem..really..I'm serious..she..let's face it, she's  
523 gonna go back into the school and either drop out in a month or  
524 sit there for three years and get progressively more stupid .um  
525 again..I'm not sure about that...

526 R: I'm not saying one...or some combination of that. She's not going  
527 to achieve there. Because she doesn't want to achieve, because  
528 she's afraid to achieve, she's too depressed to achieve, she's  
529 whatever, but I'm trying to get us to focus on some specific  
530 course of action..you know maybe there's nothing, maybe it's too  
531 late..some specific course of action for whatever the school team  
532 is going to be. To deal with her to try as much as possible to  
533 alleviate whatever problem there might be.

534 B: Well, as I was saying I found that C doesn't respond..she responds  
535 negatively to demands and people telling her what to do..In a very  
536 forceful, authoritative, parental type way. What I tried to do  
with C...

537 J: She doesn't even respond to that..

538 B: No, no she just ignores you, turns off, or you know makes smart  
539 remarks something like that. So what I tried to do was talk on a  
540 very mature level and place responsibilities for her actions on  
541 herself, you know, like with lots of kids you can place responsi-  
542 bility with the parent. They say, well if you and I can't deal  
543 with it, perhaps you, I and the parent can. But in C's case you  
544 can really can't depend on the parent for any type of support.  
So I put all the responsibilities on herself, you know.

545 R: That's very important..exactly that. That a technique you found  
546 that works is exactly that placing...making her responsible for  
547 her own actions..accountability whatever.

548 B: Yeah, and she stresses her own independence..ah what I tried to do  
549 was focus in on her being independent in a very positive way, you  
550 know, "yeah, your mother doesn't take care of you, you're very

551 mature and you're very independent. Why don't you do that in a  
552 constructive manner? Instead of hurting yourself like you're doing  
553 now..you're being very independent in a very destructive manner  
554 to yourself." And use this to play against her, to play with her,  
555 you know, her maturity, her independence. You know in individual  
counselling it can really be done.

556 R: OK that would be a recommendation I would think for behavioral.  
557 I think you've maybe already got it, but um that would be something  
558 that the team would start off on that foot, by making her account-  
559 able to them for whatever. OK let's get back to..is there anything  
560 else about her? it's getting more depressing as it goes on.

561 J: Let me just repeat that she does respond when you relate to her  
562 as a person.

563 R: A peer kind of thing..

564 J: That and saying "you look very nice today" or something like that.  
565 You know...

566 R: She can be flattered.

567 J: Yeah, she likes being flattered, You know...

568 R: Who doesn't...

569 J: Yeah, but not in a patronizing way though. I think that you have to  
570 make it, you know, you do it not because you're trying..

571 R: In a peer kind of way..not "you're a pretty little girl"...

572 B: Right.

573 R: OK in terms of the family dynamics and support?

574 B: Yeah, again 'no father at home and mother unable to control C.'

575 R: I think you ought to mention the PINS thing.

576 B: Oh, that's in "Recommended Followup."

577 R: OK

578 B: OK um 'currently pending PINS petition pending.' Um the mother  
579 went to court about three weeks or a month ago and um C had a  
580 legal aid lawyer and the mother had no representative and the  
581 mother can't speak English very well and understands very little  
582 and legal and C hooked up and really ran a number on the mother.  
583 OK the mother currently went back to community legal services and  
584 got a representative to ah to go to court with her ah so I don't  
585 know exactly where the case is not, it's still pending.

586 Um..OK good.."commitment"

587 B: OK I put down 'low'. Her attendance and punctuality was very bad  
588 back at 13. Ah she had made a commitment to the school team before  
589 coming here that she would deal with it. That she would come to  
590 school regularly. That she would come to school on time. She did  
591 that for a while. She got here. Again, when she first got here she  
592 again made the commitment, ah she didn't keep it. She's been  
593 absent one third of the time and late approximately one third of  
594 the time. Ah her attitude toward school class work has been con-  
sistently poor.

595 R: Umhum. 'Behavioral'?

596 B: Generally good until demands or requirements were placed on her.  
597 Very resistant and defiant toward authority, in those situations.

598 R: How do you recommend to the teams to deal with that?

599 B: OK, because of a lack of parental support any attempt to reach C  
600 should be through her. Stress maturity, independence and indi-  
601 vidual counselling.

602 R: Is there anything else not covered about C that would be useful  
603 for them to know? For instance, um you know she's going back.

604 Which school is she going to?

605 B: 13.

606 R: 13. You know she's going back there. Does she know why she's being  
607 terminated from here?

608 B: Um well she hasn't actually...no I wouldn't say she has... to sit  
609 down and to actually say to C you're going back to 13 for these  
610 reasons hasn't been done.

611 R: I think if you're talking about accountability, making her respon-  
612 sible for her own actions, I think the way you finish with her is  
613 probably going to be very important in terms of her actions there.  
614 If she thinks that she's been fucked over her by the big bad  
615 authority figures she's going to respond probably in a very nega-  
616 tive way when she gets back there. If you can make this thera-  
617 peutic for her, if you can get her to see this as important for  
618 her development, you know, that she screwed up here and she  
619 broke..she knowingly got herself in this position and if she  
620 wants to she can do it again in 13. She can get thrown out of 13  
621 if she wants. Following what your own advice is, I think it would  
622 be very important that closing statement from you. Or both of you  
623 or however you're going to work it, to prepare her for them.

624 J: Well one thing I want to add is that it is highly important to  
625 you to relate to her degree of maturity. But I think that that  
626 would have to be done very carefully because I think that she..  
627 make sure that...have to avoid her taking it as a...her seeming  
628 much older than she is, it's very easy to approach her on a very  
629 mature level but it will be interpreted by her as "well I'm a  
630 peer and I can do whatever I please" so therefore she relinquishes

631 her responsibility of being mature. I think you have to tie in...

632 R: It's accountable, again. If we're going to treat you this way you  
633 are going to have to act it. If you want to be treated as a semi-  
634 adult, then the responsibilities go with it and here they are.  
635 And again in terms of going to school, if you wanted to be treated  
636 there as mature, here's what you are going to be expected to do...  
637 attend class, work...

638 J: I think that I want to stress that she does act mature but that  
639 there are times that her maturity lacks responsibility.

640 R: I think I would also strongly stress that work with the family be  
641 done.

642 B: Oh yeah.

643 R: Probably professional work.

644 B: Yeah, I think LU was going to make a referral to XYZ agency.

645 R: Right, right...cause it sounds like a reasonably unpleasant  
646 situation. OK anything else? All right, thank you very much.

647 END OF CONFERENCE

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS: CONFERENCE #2 - June 6, 1976

In this analysis we will attempt to integrate all the previously delineated Personality Practices and Personality Repair Practices in the analysis of one transcript. In any given instance of personality work some repair practices are more available than others and some, in fact, may not appear. In this analysis we will attempt to depict the "flow" of a specific instance of personality work.

First, a word concerning the nature of the situation described by the transcript. Three program staff are present at the conference and one (H) reads comments concerning the client supplied by other non-present staff. The formal purpose of the conference is to summarize the client's performance in the program for the preceding year and make some determinations concerning his fate for the coming year. An interesting feature of this conference is exactly the fact that some of the descriptions of the client's personality are fixed in that they are prewritten reports by non-participating members of the program staff. These reports tend to serve as final decisions by others as to the nature of the client's personality or at least the "relevant" parts of it. As we will see they will serve as competing themes in the negation of the client's personality.

In 2/7 we find the first specific reference that might be construed as appropriate to the client's personality. In the comment that the client's attendance at the program is "good" there is a signal that is common to any organizational setting. Participation in the program activities is typically taken as indexically related to the client's personality.

"Through" such a behavior, staff often feel that they can see something in the client personality. Often such terms as motivation and commitment are linked with this attendance. At this point we have been presented with a cue as to the possible tone or direction of this negotiation. There has been proffered at least the possibility that a feature of the client personality is available for examination.

This act sets the possibility for the first of a variety of "moves" in the negotiation. For instance, as we have discussed, attendance is often, in this setting, "linked" to the personality feature of commitment or motivation. Thus several immediate dichotomies become available for interpretation. For example, if the behavior of attendance is linked to the notion of commitment, then three possible subsequent routes of negotiation are client as committed, not-committed and non-committed. This last may require some explanation.

By non-committed is the sense that the act of attendance has nothing whatever to do with the personality notion of commitment. In this case the reason for the client's attendance may be the requirement by the parent that the client attend and the parent supports this requirement by bringing the client to the program personally. Should the negotiation move in the direction of non-commitment, we find the possibility of a new avenue of negotiation (e.g. the client-parent relationship). We note the hand over hand nature of the action. In this way the nature of the personality negotiation is structurally bound.

The natural flow of the negotiation (client as committed) is interrupted at this point due to the fact that prerecorded material concerning the client is read. In what might, in other circumstances, have

been an opening for discussion of the aforementioned "commitment" of the client we now find the personality work directed to the conclusions of those staff not present. The staff member reads the comments of the teacher of each subject matter.

In 2/9 we find the absent staff member reporting that the client is "motivated." As previously mentioned in the discussion of personality repair we find that the notion of motivation is essential to the process of repair. Through the notion of motivation we find the sense that the client shares in the perception that he is "troubled." That is, the client has come to orient to himself in ways similar to those of the staff. With this sense of a shared definition we find the "desirable client." While there may be substantive disagreement between staff and client as to the nature of the personality trouble, there is agreement that there is trouble. The effect of this agreement is to reinforce the "thingness" of the client personality even through the sense that there may be disagreement as to the specifics of that personality. As previously stated the ability to find trouble in a personality tends to reinforce the very notion of personality as a concrete entity.

Likewise in 2/9 we find another common feature in personality work. It is reported that the client "likes it at (the program)." This is, in itself, an interesting notion. There is implicit in such a comment a sense of "good enough for all practical purposes" (see Garfinkel<sup>19</sup>). To "like it" at the program is an observation so essentially vague that taken literally it has virtually no meaning. It appears to describe a summary description that the client uses to evaluate the program. Inherent in such a summary is the evaluation of quite literally thousands of features

of the program and the creation of an overall evaluation. This summarization is quite common in daily interaction and essential to the maintenance of social order. Through the ability to create an "overall impression" a kind of interactional shorthand is created for general and necessarily nonspecific discussions. For instance, in the example cited here one could spend an extremely lengthy period attempting to define what it might mean for the client to "like" the program. Such an analysis would require a breakdown of the program into many subcomponents using a variety of criteria. For instance, in the area of the client liking the staff one might generate many "contexts" for that liking. One might wonder which features of the staff member the client likes and the "reasons" for that liking. Such a discussion might suggest further discussions of the client's personality based on those "reasons" (e.g. "why does the client like the staff member's supposed "concern"?). If the staff member who made this comment were present such an analysis might be undertaken and new features of the client's personality might be "discovered" (see personality as discovered). Due to the absence of the staff member this feature of the client personality will remain for the present time hidden. In describing the negotiation of personality as arbitrary it is exactly to examples such as these that we may point. Due to the fact that the comment that the client likes the program is taken as good enough for all practical purposes and essentially vague a feature of the client personality quite literally does not come into being.

All such examples of "good enough for all practical purposes" serve in personality work (and in interaction in general) to allow the flow of a specific exchange to continue on to some other point and thereby

inevitably shape the conclusion of that exchange. In personality it is as much what is not said that shapes the client personality as that which becomes a major "issue." A personality is created as much through exclusion as inclusion (see discussions on "relevance").

The first thread forming the theme of the client's personality is the notion that he is "motivated." Implicit in the notion of the client's motivation are, as we have said, a variety of indexical features that may or may not be considered in the negotiation. Again at this point due to the absence of the "speaker" we find none of these features examined.

Next the absent speaker reports that the client has poor "ancillary skills." This is a technical term in this program meaning such things as study habits, note-taking ability, and a general sense of the ability of the student to orient to the academic activities in an organized way. Whether the evaluation of the client as "poor" in this area is taken as a personality ascription seems to depend on the implications of the notion of it as a skill. To be unskilled is not typically seen as an indication of any particular personality feature although there are clearly contexts in which poor skills may be seen as impacting on personality. Such formulations as "incompetent" relate to the notion of a skill and do have implications for the personality of the individual. Simply put, to have a poor skill is not inherently a personality-relevant ascription.

In this context the relationship of the description of the client as "motivated" and as poorly skilled in academic areas does seem to come together in ways which suggest personality work may be done. A highly motivated, but poorly performing client is a clear though simple picture. It favorably disposes the "viewer" to the individual in question and suggests possible

areas for further personality work. Again the issue of a potential for personality elaboration becomes clear with the concomitant notions of the arbitrary nature of these of such personality decisions.

In 2/10 we find an interesting example of the sense that personality is discovered scientific, and that personality is in fact there. The client is described: "he seems younger than many of the other kids in that he talks loudly and he acts out in a loud tone of voice." In this observation we find a variety of features that are classic in personality work. The staff member has the sense that she is able to see into the client, as finding something in him that accounts for the "loud" behavior. Of all the possible characterizations that could be made that describe loud behavior, the staff member has chosen the notion of "younger." In this example we find the reflexive relationship which maintains two interactive and interdependent phenomena. The staff member explains the behavior through the ascription of "younger" and at the same time validates the notion of younger through the behavior. This is the classic illusion that maintains reality. This relationship that the staff member creates is then reified as if it were real and the reader is left with a tightly closed circle and "objective" fact. Such a description is the stuff of science (see personality as scientific). No doubt the staff member truly experiences her observation as "insight" and in so doing validates it for herself. One suspects that the experience of insight is the achievement of closure in the explanatory model. Through such closure the model gains coherence and the experience of that coherence is most likely the one actors feel to be "insight." Insight is the sense of the ability to explain.

The illusion of orderliness maintained throughout the action of personality work is marvelous. Even in the sequence of the reporting of an observation concerning the client behavior we find factors that bias for the stated connection. In the staff presentation of the conclusion concerning the client before the evidence for that conclusion, we find some tipping of the scales in favor of that conclusion. One can insert such an observation into conversation and "hear" this bias:

1. "This client seems younger than the other kinds"
2. "Why do you say that?"
3. "Because he talks loudly and acts out in a loud voice"
4. "Oh. . ."

If one were to reverse utterance #1 and #3 we would find an entirely new sense to the interaction and possibly a different conclusion. In the reversed sequence the conclusion would seem much less definitive. The focus of this analysis is not at the level of linguistic analysis of the process we describe. It is, however, useful to note the role of such devices on such interactions and the ways they further tend to reinforce the frequent use here of the notion that such processes are highly arbitrary. Through the use of the simple linguistic device described, a feature of the client personality assumes greater "reality."

In this one brief description of the client as "younger" we find operant many of the personality practices and repair practices. "Younger" finds thematicity in the client's behavior. In so finding it helps to reinforce the thingness of the client's personality. There is created the sense that the "younger" trait is discovered in the client. There is a scientific feel to the way the characteristic is presented. Finally,

though the characteristic is stated and described, there is left the possibility for more elaboration of the client personality (e.g. "why does he act that way?" etc.).

Likewise in this one utterance we may find the potential repair practices. In defining the client as younger than his peers, there is clearly the sense that this may call into question the competence of an immature individual. Again the notion of the client being younger could (though it may not be) taken as a personality trouble (again it could be described as immature). If it were found that "younger" were a personality trouble, then one can imagine a variety of treatments for immaturity (and otherwise loud behavior). Finally, as the trouble in the client was evidenced through the client's loud behavior, then when (and if) the client were to become more quiet it might be possible to recognize through this new behavior some change in the underlying personality.

Where do personalities come from? From a simple utterance like "he seems younger than many of the other kids in that he talks loudly and acts out in a loud tone of voice."

In 2/12 we find the statement that even though the client acts younger than others, "however, he is respected by his peers." In the formulation of a personality, such an utterance serves to reinforce the reality of the personality in that others are claimed to recognize this feature of the personality and make it a consideration in their interaction with the client. Such a comment seems to reinforce the notion of the scientific nature of the personality work, in that the conclusion concerning the client personality is taken to be objective, i.e. available for anyone who would care to look. The fact that others see the personality

trait tends, of course, to validate not only that interpretation of the client personality, but the very notion of client personality. In the structure of the discourse the external and real nature of personality is continually reinstated and reinforced.

In 2/13 we find the client personality further evolving as a second absent staff member begins his report. The client, it is said, "likes to be challenged." Implicit in this comment is the notion that the observer can see into the client and determine the mechanism that is operating in the client during a circumstance that the staff member describes as "challenging." The staff member assumes a common definition of the situation in that he and the client orient to a specific context as "challenging." Such assumptions are lynch pins of social interaction. Members seem to operate in the firm conviction that the theme they ascribe to a specific context is available to all and is the operant condition for all. It is, of course, not that they are naive but rather than such an assumption makes if not social interaction possible, then at least a lot easier. The staff member asserts that not only is the definition of the situation shared by him and the other members present, but that the client in some way enjoys such a context.

Continuing along the same line, the staff member in line 2/14 asserts that the client "readily grasps new concepts or ideas." In addition to serving as a feature of personality work, such a comment is germane to the whole notion of shared perspective or knowledge. Understanding appears to be, like personality, essentially incomplete. During moments of the aforementioned insight, understanding seems to achieve new depths or heights (or some other spatial dimension). There is the sense

that in such a moment, even though the individuals feel that they had previously understood some phenomenon, they now understand it "better." Relative to the new understanding, the old understanding was in fact lack of understanding. Through the process of retrospective reorganization we are able to recognize that previous understanding was poor understanding and that current understanding is true understanding. In such a way we constantly validate the current at the expense of the old and stay au courant with reality. One often wonders why the issue of the past "misunderstanding" seems to be ignored during interaction. If the actor was previously acting on misunderstanding, then conclusions reached based on that misunderstanding must have been incorrect conclusions and that would indicate inappropriate action. Since the actor was at the time acting according to what was at the time "understanding" (and often confident, almost arrogant understanding), does that not call into question the member's validation devices? If he thought he understood then and now understands that he didn't understand, doesn't that throw suspicion on his current, equally confident understanding? It is truly ironic that members constantly miss the ironic nature of their own action. Were such ironies to be fully appreciated, one would expect an essentially different form of social interaction, and probably a much more cumbersome one.

Returning to the specifics of personality work, we find the staff member reporting on the client as one to "readily grasp new concepts." Such terms are a gloss for an understanding good enough for all practical purposes. Here "practical" suggests for purposes of daily interaction.

In 2/14 we find an excellent example of some of the features of personality as a common sense notion. It is reported that the client

"works effectively on his own but should have his work checked often."  
What is described appears to be an interesting contradiction. What is presented is an interesting notion of the term "effectively." The various interpretations of the term produce a variety of meanings for the utterance. The fact that this observation is not defined in any way suggests that its meaning may be essentially vague. When using the term "vague" we mean to suggest that if one were to question those involved in the discussion, there would be a variety of types of interpretations of the remark. Each member no doubt has a sense of the meaning, but one might find that there is very little sharing of that meaning.

In 2/15 we find another notion common in personality work and particularly in personality repair. One hears constantly the notion that consistency is connected with mental health. The suggestion is here that it is important for that staff to be "consistent" with the client during their interaction. Such consistency, of course, requires a variety of consistencies (or shared realities) that we assert are very difficult to accomplish.

In the context of awareness let us look to the staff assessment of the client. In 2/17 we find the client to have "good spelling awareness" and in 2/20 the comment that the "spelling needs work." While, of course, these descriptions are not directly contradictory (and perhaps they are not), they serve as an interesting example of the notion of member's orientation.

There is an old homily defining optimism and pessimism. In effect, it says that an optimist is one who sees a jar as half full and a pessimist as one who sees the same jar as half empty. Though both experience the same jar, the conclusions concerning that experience

are very different. The "optimist" seems to be orienting to something present and the pessimist to something absent. Such is often the case in personality work, especially repair work. To what is the speaker orienting when he sees the absence of something in the client? To take a common example, what does the presence or absence of confidence look like to the viewer? When we look into a personality, what exactly is the nature of this image? We suspect that there is in fact no coherent image at all. No gestalt. No ego. No cluster of drives and needs. Rather, the image of a personality is more properly a non-image. That is, there is the "sense" that the personality exists and is present without the slightest sense of the detailed totality of the personality. (Plato's shadows on the wall of the cave?) We have repeatedly stated throughout this analysis that in terms of interaction there is no such thing as personality. That is, in fact there is no total image of the actor. There is not even some detailed and fully present model that represents the actor. There is only the sense of the personality. There exists only the faith that it is there and that we are able to find it in the actor's behavior.

In this conference we find a client who works well independently (2/14) and who doesn't work well independently (2/19). One would suspect that this apparent contradiction might make trouble for the personality work. Not so. There is no more trouble here reconciling these two points of view than there would be if this were to occur in any other context. In fact, the same reconciliation techniques would be used. One need not be a mental health worker to possess the requisite skills in the reconciliation of this problem. Many come immediately to mind: "difference of opinion," "it depends on the client's mood,"

"he works better for some teachers than others," "one teacher was concerned about the quantity and the other about the quality of the work produced," etc.

The ability to theorize about the different does not resolve the differences, though often it appears to. In our efforts to maintain the sense of order and consistency, we provide for the possibility of that order. We do not necessarily provide the order itself. The possibility of reconciliation between differing interpretations allows for the sense of concrete reality that is essential to social order. A "difference of opinion" reconciles the immediate threat to order even if it is not a rigorous solution. In monitoring such events in the world, one is constantly amazed at the sloppiness of the entire process. Apparently due to the shared faith in the reality of personality, the felt need for conceptual rigor when dealing with the notion seems superfluous.

In 2/20 we find the client described as "defensive when reprimanded by peers and authority." Here again we find that personality work is often vague if approached from the point of view of specific interpretation of the specific statements involved. Again it is important to note that this vagueness appears to be an artifact of analysis and not experienced by those involved in the personality work. It seems clear that the staff member intends that this described behavior should be seen as a feature of personality trouble. What is somewhat more difficult is the determination of what this problem is meant to represent in the client's personality.

A common feature of personality work is that when a characteristic is described, such as the notion that the client is "defensive,"

there is very little agreement as to what that might mean. For instance, was the individual "defensive" all the time or some of the time, or on one occasion did it seem to be a qualitative difference? Similarly, "defensive" seems to suggest that the staff member is able to observe some behavior on the part of the client that provides for this "diagnosis."

What might the client do to display "defensiveness"? Is an argument defensive? It appears that an issue operant in personality work is the sense of levels of the work. As a category, "defensive" might be considered a somewhat more general formulation than "irritable" and somewhat more specialized than "argumentative."

In visualizing the interaction of personality there appears to be a variety of levels of activity going on at the same time, often in a very loose fashion. In much of personality work there appears to be "legitimate" interchange at a variety of levels almost as filler. It is as if in much of the interaction, the nature of an observation seems substantially less significant than the fact of an observation.

By 2/28 there is beginning to develop a picture of the client, albeit a somewhat contradictory picture. He is, for instance, depicted as a loud boy (2/11) who can be defensive with peers and authority (2/21). He is motivated (2/9) and has no overwhelming desire to learn (2/26). He works effectively on his own (2/14) and does not work well independently (2/19). He is younger than his peers (2/10) but is respected by them (2/12) as evidenced by his good relationship with them (2/23). One of the interesting features of this summary is that it doesn't seem to create a picture of the client at all. For varieties of reasons it

appears that the client is depicted with a few, fairly simplistic descriptions that seem to suffice (again for all practical purposes). In day-to-day interaction at least, these descriptions seem to lack coherence in the sense that they do not create a gestalt.

It appears that personality may, experientially, take the form of a multitiered description of the individual's behavior. At the "lower" levels of this description there appears to be a core description of a very few characteristics. At this level the personality is drawn in very broad strokes. It appears that the very lack of specificity of this core personality is highly functional in day-to-day interaction. The core personality is typically a description of characteristics that are not contextually grounded. For instance, in 2/25 we find an example of a core descriptor. The client is described as "personable." Such a description is notable in its essentially vague character. "Personable" produces the sense of a description without creating the detail of a description. It seems to create a generally favorable sense of the client without any specificity concerning the nature of the personality. It is exactly this vagueness which allows for the possibility of consensus concerning the client personality. In that "personable" is an ungrounded description that does not seem to demand the presentation of evidence supporting its validity, there appears less likelihood that as a personality description it will be called into question.

A specific descriptor appears to be one demanding evidence. For example, in 2/9 the client is described as "motivated." A description of this type appears to be more contextually bound in that it would seem to require evidence of its existence. Were there to be a challenge to this

description, the presenter would be obliged to find a list of behavior examples of the lack of motivation and present them in a way deemed convincing to the audience (see personality work as scientific). In this way, "motivation" (or the lack of it) seems to require grounding for its legitimate appearance in personality work and most certainly in repair work.

The personality then seems to consist of a core of Primary Descriptors and the specific or Secondary descriptors. The primary descriptors define the core personality of the individual and tend to form a broadly defined and essentially vague picture of the individual that allows for the possibility of non-problematic consensus concerning the individual. The "easy" consensus made possible by the primary descriptors seems to have the additional implicit effect of supporting the general sense of the concrete and external reality of the personality as a thing (see personality as thing). It would seem that if members could never establish consensus concerning a specific personality, the whole notion of personality might come into question. It is exactly the functionality of the notion of personality that maintains its possibility in the member's world.

If the primary descriptors define the broad strokes of the personality, it is the secondary descriptors that fill in its detail. Although the secondary descriptors are more subject to conflicting interpretations and the type of co-produced negotiation that this analysis seeks to describe, through this process they reinforce the reality of the specific personality. In the effort by the member to "prove" the validity of his/her description of personality, we again find the sense of

personality reiterated. In the scientific sense of this "proof" (see personality as scientific), one establishes both the nature of the specific personality at hand and the general notion of personality.

Through the differing demands of the primary and secondary descriptors, both personality work gets done and the reality of personality is maintained. Primary in its self-evident and essentially vague nature and Secondary in its "proved" and essentially specific nature, the descriptors combine to form a "tight" sense of personality. It is a phenomenon both postulated and proved. In other words it is the product of the reflexive method. The result is a kind of closure that dispels doubt. In fact, it seems to preclude doubt.

The reflexive process seems to be a form of self-deception in which the human mind tricks itself so thoroughly that the genesis of the trick is not only unknown but the possibility of a trick is unsuspected.

A key feature of this process that impinges on the activity of personality work is the notion of relevance. In the construction of a personality, it appears essential that only some of the behavioral displays offered by the actor are taken as relevant in the personality (see personality as theme). Some behavior is seen as "relevant" to the client personality and some as "not relevant." The determination of relevance seems to be critical to the formulation of the personality, in that through this determination the certification of "evidence" is accomplished (see personality as scientific). If a behavior is felt to be linked to some underlying pattern (personality), then this behavior may be taken as an indicator of the nature of the personality. This feature of the personality negotiation would seem to demand extensive future analysis.

In addition to the obvious deliberate determinations of an act being either relevant or not relevant to the process at hand, there appears to be a third category operant in the activity. This is the notion of non-relevance. Whereas relevance and not-relevance are the products of a deliberate overt decision-making process, non-relevance appears to be a determination of a process that is unavailable to the members involved.

The most obvious example of non-relevance is this analysis. The notion that personality is a construct and the product of a set of methods designed to produce it is not experientially available to members as actors. The success of the methods that produce personality is so complete that they themselves are obfuscated in their accomplishment. The fact of personality as a concrete, real and generally available phenomenon is so total that even the possibility of its construction (in the sense of that term used here) is not a consideration. It is not that members debate the efficacy of the notion of the constructedness of personality and "decide" that personality is real, but rather that the very question of the reality of personality is not an issue. Through the mechanisms that create and maintain social reality, members literally create that reality and seem never to realize the act of creation. This is the experience of non-relevance. The construction of personality in day-to-day interaction is non-relevant to those very members who accomplish its construction. It goes unnoticed.

In the evolution of the client personality one finds a variety of themes developing that will come to define the client. For instance, in 2/26 we find the client characterized as possessing "no overwhelming

desire to learn, but he does try and does complete his assignments." Such a description is a common type in personality work. Through the behavior the individual is seen to display some underlying pattern that is taken to describe some essential feature of the personality. An interesting feature of this description is that the client is seen to be displaying what might be taken as an indicator of "willingness to learn" (completion of assignments). At the same time that such behavior is noted, the observer (staff) reports that this behavior does in fact seem to appear in spite of the client's real lack of "desire to learn." The staff member seems to have no difficulty in seeing past what might be considered a contraindication to the real attitude concerning learning. In the maintained sense that the personality is real, observers seem able to see into the client and find the theme (see personality as theme) regardless of the evidence. While there is maintained the sense that personality work is scientific in that it is grounded in evidence, it appears that many personality conclusions seem to operate in an extra-evidentiary fashion. The reality of personality is so unproblematic that what might be considered a breach of the methods for its discovery (see personality as discovered) goes unnoticed. Such is the power of the reflexive process.

Often in personality work one finds descriptors that seem to straddle the boundary between the behavior of the actor and the underlying pattern that is thought to cause the behavior. In 2/28 we find an example of such a descriptor. Here the client is described as being "somewhat of a follower." What is described here? A follower is one that does not direct activity. Is "follower" a description of some feature of the

personality, or would the answer to some question such as "Why is he a follower?" provide such information? There appears to be a somewhat vague boundary between the full sense of behavior and the underlying pattern for that behavior. The ascription of the client as follower might be seen as either: (1) behavior and therefore an invitation for a determination of a grounding of the behavior in some theme or underlying pattern (documentary interpretation); or (2) follower may be seen as the grounding itself (e.g. "the reason you don't notice him is that he tends to be a follower"). It appears that some characterizations possess the ability to occupy both sides of the negotiation process. Further analysis would surely locate the interactional features that would signal the appropriate (for that context) use of such ambiguous indicators.

In the same utterance, previously described, we find another common feature of personality work. The client is described as being "influenced" by other students (2/28). Of interest here is again the sense that "influenced" appears to have, for the purposes of this interaction, some special meaning. Initially there appears to be very little to notice here. However, upon closer examination one notes that the fact that the client is influenced by those around him seems to become more complex. What is the meaning of this statement? For the members present one suspects the sense that this version of "influenced" is somehow different than the obvious statement that the client is influenced by those around him. (In a social setting, who is not?) It would appear that the sense of degree of influence is what is being described. The client apparently is influenced by his peers but not too much and not to a point that it is seriously destructive to him. The mention of the issue of influence seems to establish it

as a "problem" warranting some consideration (see personality repair; problem). This would seem to suggest that some minimum level of problem has been established but that it was not a serious problem. In the use of the notion of influence, there appears to be both qualitative and quantitative determinations that are left unexplicated. Although all of this information is undefined, there appears to be no difficulty for the members present to make sense of the observation. The implication clearly follows that either there is a methodic way for the members to interpret this vague statement in a consistent way or there exist a variety of interpretations and only the sense of consensus. Further analysis in this area is clearly indicated.

In 2/31 we find a critical moment in the negotiation of the client personality. That moment is the summary of information presented concerning the client personality. As mentioned earlier in this discussion, at the point at which information gets summarized there is created the first integration of the various members' accounts concerning the client. The member engaged in the summary provides a clear example of the notions of relevance and not-relevance. In selecting some of the information concerning the client and putting it together into a rough model of the client, a baseline against which to measure the client is established. Even in those cases when the initial formulation is modified in subsequent negotiations, it is the initial summary to which the members must orient. In agreeing or disagreeing with the present formulation, all members must orient to that formulation. Even in situations in which major modifications occur, one is still able to detect the core of the original summary and this gives this summary tremendous conceptual power.

The summary is essential to the process of personality construction in a variety of ways. It is in the summary that the choice is made as to the most significant behaviors and their relationship to some underlying pattern or personality. The collection of descriptions is synthesized into some shorter and more "abstract" description. This synthesis tends to give the member the sense of a decision-making process although the nature of that process may remain unexplicated. For example, in the summary provided in 2/31 one would be hard put to find this summary in the "data" of the transcript. The client is said to be a "plugger." This description seems to be linked to comments that the client tries to complete his academic work although he is not a good student. The preceding sentence describes a summary of actions on the part of the actor, and the thread of a summary run through those actions to tie them together. It is the ability of the human brain to perform his act that seems at base to allow for the possibility of making sense. A close analysis of this summary will display that the summary is imbedded in the use of the imagery and metaphor used to describe the client. The description "plugger" seems to pull the feature of the talk which finds the client to be willing or motivated to perform in the classroom but with limited abilities in the successful completion of that task. In this feature the summary is faithful to the data. As we will come to see, however, the power of the summary lies in the fact that the summary-as-metaphor comes to be applied to the client in ways that are difficult to link to the data. Having formed the summary of the client as a plugger, the total set of implications of the plugger will come to be applied to the client. It is at the transition from the summary as correspondence to summary as coherence model that the nature of personality construction

leaves the client and moves totally to the interactional sphere. At this point the members orient to the summary as a shorthand for the client and in so doing validate many features of the metaphor that might upon reflection not be considered as applicable to the client/data at hand. This process will be closely examined as this analysis unfolds.

As the summary continues, the client is described as not "totally participating therapeutically." As a summary this comment is interesting in that it is very difficult to ground in the data. At no point do any of the participants report that the client is not participating in the activity. The client is described as acting "out in a loud voice" (2/11) and "defensive" (2/20). Neither of these descriptions seem to suggest that the client is not participating in the activities. This summary represents an interesting feature in that while the description might be challenged as inaccurate (in terms of the correspondence to the client), it is not and as such is certified, in effect, as corresponding to the client personality. An unchallenged description tends to acquire a type of de facto power in personality negotiation in that the very lack of challenge tends to in some way certify the validity of the description.

In the description of the client which finds him to be not totally participating in the therapeutic process, one has difficulty imagining the nature of total participation. Again the nature of the description seems to present no trouble for the present members.

In the summary of the client the picture presented has three general features that might be considered to be part of the client's core personality. The client is found to be a "plugger," not participating, and with poor academic performance. In terms of the core personality it

is perhaps the notion of the plugger that best fits the description of the primary personality. This notion seems to speak most specifically to some inner feature of the client while the others seem to be more oriented to what might be called secondary features of the personality.

With this description of the client there are the beginnings of a sketch of the client personality. This sketch serves as a beginning or bench mark around which the total personality is built. In its noticing of some of the data as relevant for the personality account, it is making the implicit determination that other features of the personality data are not relevant to the personality task. Unless the account is challenged, the data not included in some form at this point may be lost to the negotiation process. Through the power of exclusion as much as the power of inclusion, the summary serves a pivotal role in the process.

The certification of a summary as an accurate accounting of the personality may be accomplished through either a tacit or specific approval. In 2/34 we find an example of the explicit approval of the description. Other staff members present certify the account as accurate and then move to elaborate on this account. In 2/37-2/52 we find an excellent example of the formation of the client personality. Having certified the client to be what he was described to be in 2/32, the staff move on to elaborate and intensify the personality description. In 2/35 we find the description of the client in anecdotal form. He is described as a child who is struck by other children. The staff member claims that the client gets "angry" when struck and that even though he is angry he doesn't "do anything about it."

This description is interesting in a variety of ways. First, the staff member is clearly making a set of assumptions about the client that are not immediately supported. Although the rules of the activity often tend to require that the present descriptions in a "scientific" way (see personality as scientific), we find here one of the more clear examples of a case in which no such requirement is made. The staff member claims to be able to see into the client and determine the nature of his response to the "slap." This incident clearly displays the ways in which the personality is built from so-called significant events in the client's behavior. This event is experienced by the staff member as important to the basic nature of the client personality. Of all the behaviors displayed by the client this is taken to be one of the most important. The nature of the sense of insight that surrounds the selection of the behavior warrants extensive analysis. One suspects that the phenomenon may be linked to the observer finding in the example "proof" of some seminal theme concerning the personality involved. Due to the reflexive techniques of the process, the event would most likely be experienced as the validation of a correspondence model rather than as the establishment of coherence. But that is another analysis.

A second feature of the description of the client offered by this example is that it represents an interesting variation on the negotiation process. In the anecdote described, we find the speaker offering an open-ended anecdote describing some significant feature of the client personality. It is offered, however, without a summary. That is, it is a specific description without a descriptor. Interactionally this allows the other members present to make the decisive summary on this description.

In terms of interactional power this format dramatically weakens the position of the speaker in establishing his/her version of the client. This is not to suggest that personality negotiations need be overt power struggles, but rather that in terms of the interaction some positions are more inherently powerful than others. We have already examined the importance of the summary in the formation of the personality; and in this example the power of summary is handed over to another speaker, though the initial speaker retains the power of the selection-of-the-anecdote-as-significant. Here the more effective move might have been the offering of the summary description of the client and then providing the example as proof of the validity of the initial observation. In such a move the only way to block the speaker's interpretation is to offer a counterinterpretation that is felt to be more persuasive (see personality as scientific). For instance, in the example offered, an effective counter to the description offered might be that the client is not pathetic, but rather that he comes from a home which expressly forbids violence as a conflict resolution technique. Such a response could be seen to undercut the notion of the client as pathetic, with a superceding notion of family values (that is, the client makes a reasoned choice based in a firm set of beliefs). We mention this feature of the personality process in order to describe the many ways that the supposedly objective and real personality may be effected by the interactional process. It is a product of those processes.

Starting in 2/38 we find the nature of the personality work moving into greater detail concerning the client personality. In the anecdote previously described, we find the client unsummarized without a theme to pull together the offered evidence. The question appears to be: Of what

is the anecdote evidence? What does it speak to in the client personality? The first summary offered finds the client to be "a pathetic character." This description is a somewhat unusual one in personality work in that it tends to describe a position rather than a personality dynamic. It is most certainly difficult to translate into experiential terms. While this description is accepted (24/11), it "doesn't seem to go anywhere" in the personality negotiation. It appears that some descriptions of personality are conceptually richer for the process than others. For those that lack the extrapolation ability to continue to build on them, the experience seems to be one that "they don't go anywhere." The next conceptually richer description in the sequence seems to pick up the thread of the negotiation and continue it.

Having established that the client is "pathetic" and an unextreme "victim," the negotiation seems to be foundering in its attempts to move and form a clear picture of the client. Here we see how while the rules of personality construction allow for its possibility, they also constrain the nature of the interaction in such a way that it has difficulty meeting their requirements. One finds in personality negotiations that a common occurrence is the developing theme which seems to become a tangent that ultimately dead ends and the process is forced to restart with some other feature of the personality and follow it for a more fruitful "line of thought." Such dead ends originate in varieties of ways and for varieties of reasons including the degree of conceptual or metaphorical richness of the description or the enthusiasm of the members involved to perform the work (and personality negotiation is work).

In 2/48 we find an interesting exchange concerning the assertion that the client is weak. If some utterances are present to fill in gaps in conversation, then there are also some that seem to defy translation. Such is this example. The exchange concerns whether the client, who is agreed to be weak, is then seen to be a threat due to his weakness. How the leap is made from the weakness of the client to his supposed threat is opaque at this point. Given the nature of the exchange, the members present seem to be able to find meaning in the exchange that eludes the present analysis.

In 2/50 we find the next attempt to generate a personality description that provides for the possibility of continued flow of the personality negotiation. The question is asked if the client is "mature." The question may refer back to 2/10 in which the client was described as younger than his peers. It is the notion of maturity that seems to allow for the more detailed continuation of the process. It is determined that the client is not mature (again without reference to any "evidence" of that immaturity). But it is the notion of immaturity that seems to trigger some more extended descriptive work. With the notion of immaturity comes the determination of the validity of the description in terms of the consensus of opinion in the agency. In 2/54 there is presented the assertion of general agreement of all present that the client is seen to be immature. The emphasis here is on "seen" in that it is the "seen" that allows for the continued discussion. There is agreement that the client is seen to be immature and the question appears to be why he is seen this way. In this exchange we are able to see the ways in which a member's orientation to a specific feature of the description allows for the negotiation to be

continued. It seems that in order for the process to continue there is required some negotiable item, in this case the basis for the view of the client as immature. Theorizing as a process seems to require a catalyst and perhaps the best catalyst is the question "Why?"

In response to this question the members produce in 2/55 several theories that attempt to describe the nature of the phenomenon. In the attempt to describe the immaturity, another (for this interaction) rich concept is introduced. This is the notion of "trust." In 2/56 the client is described as "trusting the group process." One can almost sense from the transcript and most definitely from the original tape the excitement building as the members again find a rich vein to follow in the negotiation. A list is formed of who the client trusts, starting with his peers and then including the staff member speaker.

In the description of the client's relationship with the staff member there is imbedded the notion of general relations with staff and one can almost see the speaker's brain take the bait and move into this next "logical" area. In the Schutzian sense of the interactional field, the speaker "reminds himself" of related information that is considered relevant to the topic. Such "conceptual leaps" may be an artifact of the physiological operation of the brain or of the implicit connections in language structures (or most probably both). Once, however, the leap is made to a conceptually broader category, the possibilities for more extended negotiation are opened up. The point is that the leap occurs in the mind of the theoretician and as we have described the sequence of the formation of the client personality is as critical as the substance of that negotiation. It is the forces that effect the describer of the

personality that are pre-eminant, not the forces that impinge upon the subject of that description.

As the members make the critical leap to the more abstract category of relations with staff, the descriptions concerning the client begin to cascade. The client is described in 2/58 as one who "respects authority." Such terms are colloquial in that they typically have special meanings in differing settings. Particularly in personality repair stations, such descriptions as "respect for authority" often describe the client's willingness to participate in organizational activities in prescribed ways. Failure to do so is often interpreted as not a resistance to the nature of the activities but to the status of the staff involved. It is felt that the client is orienting to the staff members' level of power relative to his own. In this way the client is seen as resisting the power of the staff member as status rather than the staff member as individual or the nature of the activity itself. It appears that an orientation to the power of an individual is thought in these settings to be superior to an orientation to the individual him/herself (it is seen as more sophisticated and more professional).

In 2/59 we find the speaker reminding himself in midsentence of the client's negative reactions to authority through the description of the client as very "sneaky." "Sneaky" is clearly a description related to power in that it describes action performed by the individual while (it is thought) s/he is orienting to power. Again we find the conceptual linkage that binds comments that might at first glance appear to be random but are rather, in some ways, inevitable.

Again in 2/60 we find the continuing link to the description of the client and his relationship to power figures in his life. The client's parents are described as "very supportive." Again the bridge to this comment follows the theme of power. It is clear that the parents approve of the repair station, but what is not so clear is the reason. They report through the speaker a "drastic" change in the client's "attitude" (2/61). Again the notion of "attitude" must be approached colloquially. In the repair setting this term seems to suggest a special kind of orientation on the part of the client toward something. It suggests that the client has a certain definition of a situation (typically negative) and that definition causes him to act in a certain way. This attitude is evidenced through the client behavior and when the behavior is determined to have changed (note "determined"), then the implication is that the definition has likewise changed. The nature of this change is often assumed rather than explicated. For instance, when the client begins to act more positively toward the setting and staff, it is assumed that the change in definition has shifted from a negative one to a positive one. The notion of the client who has altered his/her behavior to maximize reward and minimize punishment, i.e. the "manipulative" client is often ignored. Again we see the good-enough-for-all-practical-purposes nature of the interaction.

In 2/63 we find an excellent example of a type of personality assertion common to negotiation. The comment is made that the staff member feels that the client sees the program as a place to change. The key word here is "feeling" (2/63). During the act of theorizing about the client personality there appear to be several types of validation of a

personality theory. One, as we have seen, is the attempt to ground the observation in specific examples of the client's behavior. Another technique (of which this example is an instance) is what might be called the personal credibility technique. Here the speaker simply asserts that feature of the client's personality and provides as validation the notion, "I feel." Here the negotiation takes a qualitative turn. In the technique which grounds the observation in an example, there exists the possibility of alternative interpretations of the behavior or the anecdote supplied. In the credibility technique there is no grounding supplied except the speaker's "feeling." There is no challenge that may be made that does not "attack" the credibility of the speaker. Should the speaker wish to "defend" his/her position, the onus falls to the challenger to generate an alternative theory with a "stronger" grounding than "I feel." We, in this analysis, speak continually of the complexity of the personality process. By that we mean that operant in the activity are many levels of dynamic, implicit and explicit sets of rules for the "doing" of personality work. And now we find an active (and possibly conscious) negotiation between the theoreticians themselves. More exasperating still is the realization that much of this dynamic is not available to the members while they are engaged in the activity. To them it appears that they are discovering an external and objectively available phenomenon known to all as personality. If the course of this analysis at times appears complex, it does so with reason.

In 2/66 we find an excellent example of the recognition of change in the client. It is reported that when the client first came to the program he was very "withdrawn." Now, it is reported, the client is not so

withdrawn, but is "very compliant with authority." An obvious question might be: "What does the difference between 'withdrawn' and 'compliant with authority' look like?" How is the observer able to discern the reduction of "withdrawn" and the increase of "compliant with authority"? As previously mentioned, the recognition of change in the actor may often be seen as the redefinition of behavior in some other way. The ability to perform this redefinition appears to be an "effortless" activity on the part of members.

In the ascription of personality one often marvels at the simplicity of which the members are able to create the personality. For instance, in 2/71 we find the client defined as "not bright." In terms of the personality scheme we have described, the notion of bright would most likely be considered a primary feature of personality. It is a characteristic that would seem to pervade all of the individual's endeavors and as such it would seem that it would warrant careful evaluation in terms of the "scientific" nature of personality work for its members. Here, however, we find the simple assertion that the client is not bright and that this description is simply accepted "on its face." The rule-guided nature of the personality construction is evident here in that the members may choose to invoke the rule for "evidence" or not, as they wish. One assumes a variety of constraints on the activity that might lead to the invoking of rule and that such constraints may range from the interest level of the members to their fatigue, to simple time constraints on the activity. Even according to the method outlined by the members themselves, there are better and worse versions of the activity.

In 2/72 we find an excellent example of the reinforced "thingness" of the personality as externally and objectively real. The staff member is asked to rate the personality in terms of the variable called commitment. For this individual the notion of personality and commitment is real enough so that such a task possesses no difficulty. He is able to rate the client as a "high" commitment person with only a moment's hesitation. Such certainty clearly evidences the reality of the personality with which this staff works. Further the reality of the personality variable is reinforced through the consensus on the part of the staff in terms of their agreement as to the rating of the client's commitment.

In the next somewhat confusing section the transcript finds the staff in a direct contradiction of an earlier evaluation of the client. In 2/71 the client is described as not bright. In 2/80 we find a description of the client which finds him to be able to grasp a concept quickly. The contradiction is apparently noticed by the staff member that described the client as not bright and the discrepancy is "repaired" through the use of a common device. The client is redefined as one who "presents himself as being dumb rather than being" dumb. In this way the staff member repairs the contradiction through a comment which is experienced as undercutting the original comment. Such a repair is elegant in that it retains the "rightness" of both of the comments. Through the use of such "qualifications" the evolving picture of the client personality is maintained and the coherence of the description is reinforced. An interesting feature of the activity is that members conspire to maintain the image of the personality by reinforcing the "repair" of the description (2/83).

In 2/84 we find an important step in the development of the personality for repair. Here directly for the first time the members are required to locate trouble in the personality (see personality repair: trouble). Clearly in the repair station that is the program the staff must be able to locate a specific trouble in the client. This is considered one of the special skills of practitioners of personality repair, i.e. diagnosis. The inability to locate such trouble creates a problem both for the program (why is the client here?) and for the staff members (inability to find the problem indicates a poor level of skill). Therefore, there is strong pressure to locate some trouble in the client. This pressure acts to force the interpretation of some behaviors in terms of trouble as opposed to some sort of untroubled or O.K. status.

Starting in 2/87 we find such a description of the client in terms of the need to find trouble. The client is described as "very passive." He is described as someone who follows the rules most of the time and occasionally breaks them. Again, one would be hard put to use such a description to differentiate members in the world. Such a description could safely be applied to virtually anyone. Clearly this is experienced from the point of view of the staff involved as a serious and real problem in, one supposes, the same way that personality itself is experienced as real.

In 2/92 we start to see the increasing presence of contradiction in the picture of the client. The area of interest is the client's academic performance and the focus is on the reason for his poor performance. It has been previously established that the client is "not dumb" even though he presents himself as dumb. As noted earlier, this two-level observation serves to solve the problem of contradiction in the

description of the client. Of course, the experience is that the staff member has made an insight into the client and is able to see the client present as dumb. It is a common experience in personality work for the observer to have the sense that s/he can see into the subject and see under or through some behavior to some other more real level. Through the maintenance of the coherence of the personality model, the sense of insight is gained and the reality of personality is once again reinforced.

Throughout this analysis we have noted that in personality work the notion of personality achieves its sense of reality through the constant application of a set of practices that orient to the notion of personality as if it were real. Part of the success of the illusion of personality is in the very frequency of times it, as a real thing, is reinforced. Its practices constantly reify it and perhaps for no other reason than this frequency, the reality is maintained.

The problem at hand in 2/92 is the explanation of the client's poor academic performance in the program. In the previously mentioned "contradiction repair," the client's intelligence was established and therefore in the answer to this problem is is not used as a possibility.

In the therapeutic field one finds a common conceptual distinction concerning clients and their behavior. This is what one might call the "can't/won't" distinction. There is the sense that in action there are behaviors over which the client has control and others over which s/he does not. To use the example at hand the notion of intelligence would be considered an area of which the actor had no control. For the client with low intelligence, the reason for poor performance would be a "can't" explanation. On the other hand, the client who chooses not to perform in

the classroom would be considered the "won't" client. Experientially it appears that "can't" takes precedence over "won't" in that it removes the possibility of choice.

In this conference the client has been determined not to fall in the "can't" category in that he has been determined to be bright (or at least not dumb). Given the elimination of the "can't" category as an explanation for action, the only alternative is the "won't" category. In repair programs the most common "won't" is motivation (or the lack of it). Motivation is taken to be a matter of choice in that the client is able to exercise control over it. There are myriad theories as to the origin for the lack of motivation which are used in the treatment of the problem. The point, however, is that the conclusion that the client is not motivated is not an idle one but rather constrained by the nature of the conceptual categories concerning the personality. In a very strong sense this "discovery" could not have been otherwise.

Having "established" the presence of the motivation problem in the client, the staff then attempt to determine the degree of the problem through the location of settings that display the client's motivation. A list of possible settings and topics is offered as a gauge of the motivation problem.

In 2/101 we find an exceptionally clear example of the sense of the reality of the personality. As the list of possible topics for motivation is read, we note the marvelous comment that the client "doesn't project that girls turn him on." The very imagery used suggests that members have the sense that they can truly see into the client and that actors

have the ability to "project" a particular feature of their personality. Again the reification of personality.

If in 2/101 the client is "seen" to be unmotivated, then we find the client caught in the act of motivation. The observer is able to see through the client's behavior and in the behavior the motivation the client has for sports. It is found that when the client engages in sports he is "a totally different kid." This raises an important question in the negotiation of the client personality in that again a primary personality characteristic must be negotiated. Previously the client was found to be "very passive" (2/101). Now we find the client exhibiting what is seen by the staff as aggressiveness. As in the smart/dumb dichotomy, there must be a resolution of this potential inconsistency. In this case the resolution is the common one that in some situations the client is passive and in others he is aggressive and that he may be both without the inconsistency of being both at the same time. Through such resolutions the client's personality becomes modulated and theoretically conceptually more powerful. Theoretic power is the ability of the theory to explain a variety of seemingly disparate data. Powerful theories are taken to be accurate in that they correspond to the real world. They are seen as reflections of the true dynamics of a situation.

At this point the client personality may be seen as having two primary features. First, the client is smarter than he appears and that one of the reasons he appears to lack intelligence is that in some situations he chooses not to participate "because" he is unmotivated. The second feature of the client personality is that in some situations he is passive and in others he is aggressive. This picture of the client is

the product of a variety of forces that structure and constrain the construction (as opposed to discovery) of the personality.

In 2/114 we continue in the discovery that the client can at some time be aggressive. This aggressiveness is symbolized in the fact of the client arguing with the other clients during sporting events. In the spirit of modulating the sense that the client is aggressive but not too aggressive, the client is described as becoming passive again when confronted by another aggressive boy. Further, the notion that the client is only aggressive sometimes in that two anecdotes are described that find the client exhibiting the two different characteristics.

True to the "scientific" orderly nature of the personality work, there is provided to the client an explanation of the reason for his passivity. This reason is taken to be his lack of "confidence" (2/124). The experience of this type of diagnosis is that it is a deeper determination of the dynamics of the client personality. This lack of confidence is felt to cause the passivity in the client. Having defined the client's problem to be one of confidence, the staff outline a plan to "treat" the confidence problem with a program that places the client in a situation in which it is felt that the client will develop the necessary confidence.

Incorporated into the notion of the treatment plan there are a variety of interesting notions concerning the nature of the common sense experience of personality. For instance in 2/130 there is a description of the "maturational period." This includes the sense that the personality develops over time as the child grows into the adult. Through the application of such a description, it is felt that the client may pass through the "passivity" as somehow related to the "maturational process."

The notion of a stage of development is like the notion of a mood in that it is seen as something transitory and therefore not linked to the primary personality, but rather as something that is temporary. What is interesting here is that the notion of the client as passive, which was at first described as a primary feature of the personality, now assumes the status of a possibly secondary and transient characteristic.

Again, it is interesting to note the importance of finding the most fruitful way of orienting to the client personality. While the notion of passivity seemed to possess the conceptual power of explanation of the client behavior, it seemed to lack the ability to generate a specific treatment plan. The question was how would you make someone less passive? This type of question seems to lead inevitably in the direction of the "scientific" question of why the client is passive. There appears in personality work a strong experiential certainty that there may be located in the client the cause for a specific behavior. This is a very powerful faith that there exists an indexical link to some pre-existing condition or situation that will explain the personality structure. The notion of passivity tends to describe an interactional style and not the so-called reason for the style. It appears that members believe that actors choose styles of action based on experiences that they have had at some point earlier in life. Treatment typically takes the form of changing the experiences of the client with the goal of changing their styles of response to that experience. The differing traditions in psychotherapy are extensions on this common-sense theme, e.g. use drugs to change experience, changing the environment (milieu therapy) and talking with the client in the attempt to change the client's interpretation of his/her

experiences. With the client at hand, the attempt will be made to change his experiences by changing the nature of his position on the world. For instance, the suggestion is made to give the client power in the setting as a sort of junior staff member. The sense is that by forcing the client to change his behavior there will be some change in the style of action in the world.

This, then, is the production of a personality. This analysis is, of course, essentially incomplete and could in very real ways continue almost endlessly. The analysis of the accomplishment of personality through a set of practices is in its seminal stages. For each feature that the analysis highlights, there are many that require illumination. The details of this process are incomplete and will probably always be so. Personality as a set of practices is a microcosm of all of social interaction. Its practices are the practices of reality construction and maintenance. As product it possesses all the external and objective reality of all the myriad features of social order. And that is exactly the point. Personality possesses a kind of reality that is accomplished. It possesses the reality of illusion. It "exists" but not as it appears to. It is the product of a method, although a method of necessity opaque. Personality is an illusion taken "literally." We choose to believe the illusion and in so doing the illusion becomes real. Real, that is, for all practical purposes.

Social order is the same stuff, produced in the same ways and made real in the same ways. As members it is important, no imperative, that we not "notice" the illusion; for it is the illusion that makes it all possible. How is social order possible? It isn't, but somehow it

happens anyway. Its happening in the context of a personality has been the focus of this analysis. To invoke the ancient cliché, "further research is indicated."

NOTES

19. Garfinkel, pp. 74-77.

## CONFERENCE # 2

Date: June 6, 1976  
Client: "W.P."  
Staff: "H", "L", "R"

6 R: Attendance  
7 L: Attendance is good.  
8 H: "W. has problems in reading. He needs improvement in all areas of  
9 reading. However, he's motivated, and likes it as S. His ancillary  
10 skills are poor, he seems younger than many of the other kids, in  
11 that he talks loudly and he acts out in a loud tone of voice. How-  
12 ever, he is respected by his peers. I recommend that W. stay at S.  
13 for another year." That was high intensity. Mathematics. "Likes to  
14 be challenged, readily grasps new concepts or ideas. Works effec-  
15 tively on his own, but should have his work checked often. One must  
16 be consistent when dealing with W. on any level." Writing shop.  
17 "Excellent worker, is up to date with his work, has developed good  
18 spelling awareness. He would benefit from staying here next year."  
19 Social Studies. "Poor reading comprehension and vocabulary skills,  
20 does not work well independently, spelling needs work, can be defens-  
21 ive when reprimanded by peers and authorities. Generally completes  
22 assignments, classroom behavior is fair, quite talkative and can be  
23 distracting. Generally good relationship with peers and authority but  
24 does not always concentrate on work, recommend additional year with  
25 S." Language Arts. "Is very cooperative and personable student who  
26 does his work most of the time, as he should, he has no overwhelming  
27 desire to learn, but he does try, and he does complete his assign-  
28 ments. Seems to be somewhat of a follower with other students, and

29 is influenced by them, but it has not been detrimental to his work  
30 performance. W. needs help in spelling and word recognition greatly.  
31 With constant practice, I am positive that he will improve."

32 R: The gist is that he is not a good student, he is, um, a plugger, um,  
33 he does not seem to be totally participating therapeutically, um,  
34 and, he's still academically deficient in a variety of areas.

H: L?

L: Yeah.

35 L: W. is the kind of kid that um, all kids slap on his head. All the  
36 other kids, the more aggressive kids, they slap him on the head, he  
37 gets angry, but he won't do anything about it, um

38 H: He's a pathetic character?

39 L: Yeah.

40 R: A victim?

41 L: Huh?

42 R: A victim?

43 L: Yeah, but not to an extreme.

44 R: Yeah

45 L: Yeah but not to an extreme.

46 H: He seems weak?

47 L: Yeah, but

48 H: But no threat?

49 L: No threat, not at all.

50 H: Is he mature?

51 L: No, I wouldn't say he's very mature

52 H: He's immature?

53 L: I would say he's very immature

54 H: And he's seen that way

- 55 L: And he's seen that way by his peers.  
He's a short little kid, uh, he's not that quite articulate either.
- 56 He really trusts the group process.
- 57 H: And he trusts you
- 58 L: And he trusts me a lot. And he respects authority, I mean, you tell  
59 him to....and he's also a sneak, he'll do things like very sneaky  
60 like. Um, his parents are very, very supportive. Um, they want him  
61 here, they say, they say there's been a drastic change in his home,  
62 his attitude has changed a lot, um
- 63 H: I sometimes get the feeling from W that he sees S. uh, in the same  
64 way his parents do, as a place where he can really change.
- 65 L: Yeah
- 66 H: And when he first came here, he was very withdrawn. Now he's not so  
67 withdrawn but he's very compliant with authority, and the skills, as  
68 they've, as they've indicated shown really haven't shown any  
69 measurable improvement...
- 70 R: Is he a bright kid or not?
- 71 H: Uh, no he's not bright.
- 72 R: Is he committed to the program?
- 73 L: Yeah, he's committed
- 74 R: Highly committed, medium, low?
- 75 H: I'd say high
- 76 L: High. I think uh, I think part of the academic thing, I think that  
77 academically is you know, a lot of academic, a lot of group, a lot  
78 of follow up with family more.
- 79 H: Follow up on the academic?
- 80 L: Yeah. Because if you give him something like a concept, he's able

81 to really grasp it, you know, and you would only have to tell him  
82 once. He, uh

83 H: He uh, presents himself as being dumb rather than being...

L: Yeah

84 R: Um, therapeutically? Does he, are there specific problems you've  
85 detected?

86 L: No, no drastic problems, nothing really, not anything from home.

87 H: Just very passive and uh

88 L: Just very passive, uh safe player type of kid, goes along with the  
89 rules but sneaky here and there, but plays it very safe. Everybody's  
90 making noise, he'll make noise, when I walk in, you know, he'll run  
91 to his chair, whereas somebody else won't run to their chair.

92 R: Why is he not doing well academically? Is it because he's dull, or  
93 is it because he just hasn't gotten down to it, or what?

94 L: He's not motivated in that area.

95 H: I'm not sure

96 L: I don't think he's motivated in that area

97 H: Then what are his interests? I mean is there anything that turns  
98 him on?

99 L: Well

100 H: Girls?

101 L: Uh, girls don't, no he doesn't project that girls turn him on, like,  
102 he's not into that...

103 R: Sports? Cars?

104 L: Sports, stuff like that, music.

105 H: You've really seen him excited?

106 L: Yeah, really excited.

- 107 H: In that forum is his relationship with the kids any different than  
108 it is up here, when he's playing ball?
- 109 L: When he's playing ball, he's very aggressive, very, he's a totally  
110 different kid...
- 111 H: He's competent.
- 112 L: Very competent, yeah.
- 113 H: So
- 114 L: And he would, and he would argue like.....if he thinks he's right.  
115 In that situation, what it meant, therapeutic situation, he would  
116 start to argue, but when a dominating kid gets to his head, he would  
117 like let's say P. would say something...he would close back up. But  
118 on a, on a, on the field, the ball playing field if he felt like the  
119 the guy hacked he'll go all the way out to you know, to say, no you  
120 didn't, no I didn't go all the way out... rather in a group setting,  
121 he'll just close his mouth, he wouldn't say nothing.
- 122 R: When he feels confident about something, he'll be aggressive.
- 123 L: Aggressive, yeah. Just needs more, a little more confidence in himself.
- 124 R: How are we going to do that? How are we going to establish confidence?
- 125 L: Um, I think that him being here next year as one of the...
- 126 R: Old guys?
- 127 L: Old, old guys, would really turn him around...
- 128 R: For instance
- 129 L: I would use him for...
- 130 H: How about, how about you get the normal maturational period, which  
131 may be good for him in a more controlled setting...
- 132 L: I would use him for running information to the new kids...
- 133 R: Yeah, that's what I'm saying

- 134 L: You know, I would put him in a situation, yeah put him in a situation  
135 where he would have to come out of his
- 136 H: What's he doing, is he going to be here this summer?
- 137 L: Uh, yeah
- 138 R: Could you use him in that, some kind of capacity like that this summer?
- 139 L: Yeah in the school setting. Sure would. That would bring him out too..
- 140 R: OK, anything else?
- 141 END OF CONFERENCE

## GLOSSARY OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF PERSONALITY WORK

- Accomplishment:** The notion that events in the world are the result of the application of a set of rules (a grammar), i.e. that the events are methodic.
- Action/Actor:** The production of events, or phenomenon in the world. These events are unself-conscious and methodic.
- Arbitrary:** The notion that many features of personality work are practically constrained. Such constraints include such things as time, interest level of members, fatigue, organizational constraints, etc.
- Ascription:** In this context the "construction" of a specific personality and the application of that personality to the subject matter.
- Caricature:** The notion of the personality is an ever evolving framework continuously altering and adjusting to meet contextual needs.
- Coherence Model:** A formal descriptive account in which the focus is the maintenance of internal consistency. Personality quickly moves from correspondence to coherence model.
- Co-maintained:** The notion that events in the social world are maintained interactionally between members, through the same set of practices that "produced: them.
- Common Sense:** The sense that is common. A massively complex set of rules and practices that form a perspective from which members "make sense" of the world.
- Co-produced:** The notion that events in the social world are interactively created between members, through the application of a methodic set of practices.

**Correspondence Model:** A formal descriptive account in which the features of the account are thought to reflect the dynamics of the subject of the account. Personality is thought to be a correspondence model.

**Discount:** Device utilized during the formation of a personality which eliminates information in the form of client behavior, that is, could be seen to be contrary to the emergent description. There are varieties of "discounts."

**Essentially Vague:** The notion that activities in the social world are of necessity opaque to members. The methodic character of personality is a case in point.

**Facticity:** The notion that facts are methodic, are action. Facts are accomplished, that is, they may be best thought of as verbs.

**Faith:** A belief, both unquestioned and unquestionable, in the existence of some event or phenomenon. Members have "faith" in the existence of personality.

**Folk Positivism:** The colloquial faith of members that external reality is available and shared. That things are what they seem to be.

**For-All-Practical-Purposes:** The most general and fundamental constraint on the nature of personality work. It indicates that the production of a personality is "tailored" to contextual demands.

**Gloss:** The description of a phenomenon such that its accomplishment is obfuscated. The term "personality" is a gloss.

**Grammar:** A set of practices and the rules for their application that describe the method of a specific phenomenon. This research attempts a beginning grammar of personality.


**Illusions:** The notion that many social features, such as personality, are not what they appear to be. The illusion of personality includes all of the personality practices and repair practices. Like the illusions of magic the methods are not available.

**Image:** A description of an event or phenomenon in which some visual picture is used as a referent or identification for the topic.

**Indexicality:** An interactive process that members use to find meaning. Through the application of the indexical method events acquire meaning through location in their "context." Reciprocally the context is defined through the collection of local events.

**Indexical loop:** The interactive feedback that perpetuates

indexicality.      Context                      Events



**Grounding:** The establishment of the meaning of an event in terms of its context. Part of the indexical process.

**Lebenswelt:** The set of perspectives, orientations, senses, and faiths that constitute the "life World" of the member.

**List/Theory:** The two apparent features of member's notions of personality. The "list" is a set of characteristics that describe the individual (both primary and secondary descriptors). The "theory" is a descriptive account that integrates through explanation the characteristics of the list.

**Making Sense:** The endless, ongoing activity that finds members "locating" themes in events. The experience for members is one of discovery. Analytically, both the themes and the sense of their location in events are taken to be an accomplishment.

**Member:** Actors and Theoreticians co-producing and co-maintaining social order. Members may, at any time, assume either the actor's or theoretician's stance.

**Metaphor:** A thematic description of events or phenomenon in which the dynamics or features of the phenomenon are likened to another phenomenon. Metaphors are important to "making sense."

**Methodic:** The notion that events in the social world are the result of the application of a set of practices. Thus, events are seen as accomplishments.

**Negotiation:** The notion that personality is co-produced and co-maintained. Further that the substance of a specific personality is the product of interactive debate and not "discovery."

**Opaque:** The notion that much of social interaction, specifically the productive features, are unself-conscious and unavailable to the very members who produce them.

**Personality Work:** The combined activities that produce the common sense notion of personality. These activities are methodic, repetitive, and unself-conscious.

**Personality Practices:** A set of features that establish, perpetuate and maintain the common sense notion of personality. They constitute part of personality work.

1- **Thematicity:** The ability of the observer/theoretician to "find" a theme in the actor's or event's behavior. This "skill" is one of the most essential for the maintenance of social order.

2- **Thingness:** The ability of the observer/theoretician to establish and maintain the real, objective, facticity of personality. The fact of personality appears "self-evident" to the members.

- 3- Discovered: The ability of the observer/theoretician to maintain the sense that personality is discovered "in" the individual.
- 4- Scientific: The sense on the part of those engaged in personality work (both formal and informal) that the activity has the orderly and organized character of science. This includes the sense that "evidence" may be found of and for personality.
- 5- Essentially Incomplete: The sense that personality is both consistent and changing and that a personality may never be fully "known." Hence, personality work is never ending.

Personality Repair Practices: A set of features that establish, perpetuate, and maintain the common sense notion of the repair of personality. Such practices appear in both formal and informal personality work.

- 1- Troubled Actor Incompetent: The sense that the "troubled" personality is unable to report "accurately" about itself. The effect of this practice is to "disallow" data offered by the client about him/herself.
- 2- Troubled Location: The ability of the observer/theoretician to link a form of repair (treatment) to the specific personality trouble. The trouble is felt to define the necessary form of treatment.
- 3- Link to Treatment: The ability of the observer/theoretician to link a form of repair (treatment) to the specific personality trouble. The trouble is felt to define the necessary form of treatment.

4- Change Recognition: The ability of the observer/theoretician to "recognize" change in the individual's personality; typically, although not necessarily, after the application of the "treatment." One type of change recognition is experienced as "getting better."

Phenomenon: An event or activity with its ancillary productive features (set of practices).

Primary Descriptors: Features of a specific personality that are taken as fundamental to the individual. Primary descriptors possess major conceptual power in the description of the individual.

Problematic: The attempt to make self conscious and therefore available some phenomenon. The focus of this research is to make Personality problematic.

Reality: The sense of an external, objective existence that is available to all. Members seem to believe that they all have access to, and all share the same "reality."

Reflexivity: The ability to produce, externalize and reify phenomenon in such a way that the phenomenon become real, external, objective and "true." The reflexive process is unself-conscious. It is how "social order" is maintained.

Reification: The process that externalizes the product of a methodic activity, e.g. personality as if the product were real. An essential feature of reflexivity.

Relevance: The sense displayed by members that some data falls outside the domain of the specific personality negotiation at hand. The determination of relevance is essential to the activity of "making sense." Relevance may be used as a "discount."

**Repair Station:** An organization whose goal is to establish "functionality" in members deemed to be performing inadequately in the world. There are many types.

**Reparability/Non-Reparability:** The notion that members orient to some personalities repair potential differently due to the nature of the description of that personality.

**Retrospective Reorganization:** The phenomenon in which members reinterpret the meaning of events subsequent to the occurrence of the event. The impetus for such reorganization is the sense that new information has been learned that alters previous descriptions.

**Rule Governed:** The notion that members are held interactionally to a rigid set of rules that are applied with absolute consistency.

**Rule Guided:** The notion that members use rules in the construction of social order. They use these rules flexibly and in an infinite combination. Personality is taken in this analysis to be a rule guided activity.

**Science:** The "orderly" and "rigorous" system for the examination and discovery of features of reality. While members typically do not consider themselves "scientific" in the doing of personality work, they seem to feel the sense of orderliness and rigor that characterize science as a method.

**Secondary Descriptors:** Features of a specific personality that are taken as subsidiary to the individual personality. These features are seen as possessing less conceptual or explanatory power.

**Sense of ... :** The belief displayed by members of the existence of a particular phenomenon. This belief seems to be an artifact of the method for accomplishment of the phenomenon. This belief although

analytically vague and incomplete is nevertheless experienced by members as clear and concrete.

**Social Order:** The sense on the part of members that the social world consists of clear patterns and regular operant forces. The "order" is thought to be objective, external and "real."

**Story:** A descriptive account, a theory which purports to "explain" some phenomenon. Personality is a story.

**Summary:** That feature of the personality negotiation in which a member "pulls together" the available information in the creation of a baseline description of the subject personality. Summaries are "powerful" activities in the formation of personality.

**Theory/Theoritician:** The explanation or description of events or phenomenon by members. Theorizing is talk about action.

**Weltanschauung:** The "world View" of members. The subjective perspective felt to be shared that "explains" the world.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Garfinkel, Harold. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967.
- Garfinkel, Harold and Sacks, H. "On the Formal Structure of Practical Actions," in J. McKinney and E. Tiryakion (eds.), Theoretical Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Husserl, Edmund. The Idea of Phenomenology. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Schutz, Alfred. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1967.
- Zimmerman, D. H. and Pollner, M. "The Everyday World as a Phenomenon," in J. Douglas (ed.), Understanding Everyday Life. New York: Aldine Press, 1970.

## SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Work which has impacted on this analysis in non-specific ways)

- Bensman, Joseph and Lilienfeld, Robert. Craft and Consciousness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Blum, A. F. and P. McHugh. "The Social Ascription of Motives," in American Sociological Review. Vol. 36, 1971.
- Churchill, Lindsay. "Ethnomethodology and Measurement" in Social Forces. Vol. 50, 1971.
- Kelly, George A. A Theory of Personality. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1963.
- Laing, R. D. The Politics of Experience. New York: Ballantine Books, 1967.
- McHugh, Peter. Defining the Situation. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1968.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Sense and Non-Sense. Northwestern University Press, 1964.
- O'Neill, John. On Critical Theory. New York: The Seabury Press, 1976.
- Roche, Maurice. Phenomenology, Language and the Social Sciences. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Ryle, Gilbert. The Concept of Mind. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1949.
- Sudnow, David. Studies in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press, 1972.
- Turner, Roy. Ethnomethodology. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. Language, Thought and Reality. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1970.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. Philosophical Investigations. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
- Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and Language. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1962.