Nemvus Productions, Open Access | www.vultology.com
September 17, 2021

Vultological Parallels to Psychology

Juan E. Sandoval, Laura A. Hardulak

Abstract: Preliminary data obtained from 60 vultologically classified individuals, using the CTVC3, is compared against data from the Energetics Survey 1 (ES1), to test the degree of dependence between psychology and vultology. A chi-square examination was performed on the two groups to check for dependency, with no dependency as the null hypothesis. The results showed a critical chi-square value equivalent to $p \leq 0.005$, leading to a rejection of the null hypothesis. The vultological classifications and psychological survey result data show a statistically significant dependency, evidencing that vultological type corresponds to psychological type designation via the ES1.

Keywords: *Facial expressions, Facial analysis, Body language, Vultology, Jungian, Carl Jung, Embodied cognition*

1. Introduction

Vultology is a method of classification that relies on facial expressions, body mannerisms and voice tone to categorize people based on their most habitual mode of expressivity. However, whether a vultological classification has significant correspondence to psychological classification has remained untested. In this study, the Cognitive Type Vultology Code 3.0 (CTVC3) was used to classify 60 volunteers (3 subjects were removed due to unclear and unusable data) as one of four energetic types. These four energetic types are:

- Proactive-Rigid (PR)
- Reactive-Rigid (RR)
- Proactive-Fluid (PF)
- Reactive-Fluid (RF)

After vultological classification had been determined, the Energetics Survey 1 (ES1), a psychometric instrument composed of 40 questions, was administered to the volunteers, to independently measure their psychological aspects according to four possible results:

- Introverted Judgment (Ji)
- Extroverted Judgment (Je)
- Extroverted Perception (Pe)
- Introverted Perception (Pi)

Both points of data were compared against the null hypothesis (H_0) and against the alternative hypothesis (H_1) which predicts a non-random correspondence between PR↔Je, RR↔Ji, PF↔Je, and RF↔Pi according to the Cognitive Typology model. Pearson's chi-square test was used to measure whether the null hypothesis is a good fit for the data.

2. Vultology Classification

The CTVC3 contains 30 energetic signals which were used in this study. These are:

- 5 signals for Rigidity (R) *(corr. J)*
- 5 signals for Fluidity (F) *(corr. P)*
- 5 signals for Proactive Rigidity (PR) *(corr. Je)*
- 5 signals for Reactive Rigidity (RR) *(corr. Ji)*
- 5 signals for Proactive Fluidity (PF) *(corr. Pe)*
- 5 signals for Reactive Fluidity (RF) *(corr. Pi)*

Classification was determined by the sum of the Rigid or Fluid signals and the four energetics, then a comparison against the four separate sums was calculated to determine the highest value:

- RR = RR + R
- PR = PR + R
- PF = PF + F
- RF = RF + F

The 60 participant's classifications were:

Figure 1

Subject	ES1	CTVC3	Dev	Model Match?
Volunteer 1	Je	PR	l-ll	Yes
Volunteer 2	Je	PR	lll-	Yes
Volunteer 3	Pe	PR	l--l	No
Volunteer 4	Pe	PR	l-ll	No
Volunteer 5	Je	RR	l--l	No
Volunteer 6	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 7	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 8	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 9	Ji	RR	l--l	Yes
Volunteer 10	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 11	Ji	RR	l-l-	Yes
Volunteer 12	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 13	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 14	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 15	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 16	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 17	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 18	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 19	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 20	Ji	RR	lll-	Yes
Volunteer 21	Ji	RR	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 22	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 23	Ji	RR	ll-l	Yes
Volunteer 24	Ji	RR	l---	Yes
Volunteer 25	Pe	RR	l--l	No
Volunteer 26	Pe	RR	ll--	No
Volunteer 27	Pe	RR	ll-l	No
Volunteer 28	Pi	RR	l---	No
Volunteer 29	Pi	RR	l--l	No
Volunteer 30	Pi	RR	l--l	No
Volunteer 31	Je	PF	l---	No
Volunteer 32	Je	PF	llll	No
Volunteer 33	Ji	PF	ll-l	No
Volunteer 34	Ji	PF	l-l-	No
Volunteer 35	Ji	PF	llll	No
Volunteer 36	Ji	PF	lll-	No
Volunteer 37	Ji	PF	ll--	No
Volunteer 38	Ji	PF	ll--	No
Volunteer 39	Ji	PF	ll--	No
Volunteer 40	Ji	PF	ll--	No
Volunteer 41	Pe	PF	l---	Yes
Volunteer 42	Pe	PF	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 43	Pe	PF	l--l	Yes
Volunteer 44	Pe	PF	l-l-	Yes
Volunteer 45	Pe	PF	lll-	Yes
Volunteer 46	Pe	PF	l--l	Yes
Volunteer 47	Pe	PF	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 48	Pe	PF	llll	Yes
Volunteer 49	Pe	PF	lll-	Yes
Volunteer 50	Pe	PF	lll-	Yes
Volunteer 51	Pe	PF	ll--	Yes
Volunteer 52	Pe	PF	l-ll	Yes
Volunteer 53	Pi	PF	ll-l	No
Volunteer 54	Pi	PF	ll-l	No
Volunteer 55	Je	RF	ll--	No
Volunteer 56	Ji	RF	lll-	No
Volunteer 57	Pi	RF	ll-l	Yes
Volunteer 58	Pi	RF	l---	Yes
Volunteer 59	Pi	RF	l---	Yes
Volunteer 60	Pi	RF	ll--	Yes

3. Analysis

Using the data from Fig.1 the following table is constructed, where the groups are rows RR, PF, RF, PR and the responses are columns Ji, Pe, Pi and Je.

Figure 2

Vultology	Ji	Pe	Pi	Je	TOTAL
RR	19	3	3	1	26
PF	8	12	2	2	24
RF	1	0	4	1	6
PR	0	2	0	2	4
TOTAL	28	17	9	6	60

If we hypothesize that the vultology and survey results (group and response) are independent, the expected probabilities that a person in the sample is in both groups (e.g. RR and Ji), would be as follows:

Figure 3

P(A and B)	P(A) * P(B)	Expected Percentage	Expected Freq.
P(RR and Ji)	(26/60)*(28/60)	20.22%	12.13
P(PF and Pe)	(24/60)*(16/60)	11.33%	6.8
P(RF and Pi)	(6/60)*(9/60)	1.5%	0.9
P(PR and Je)	(4/60)*(6/60)	0.67%	0.4

The expected RR↔Ji frequency would be 12.13, and we observe a frequency of 19. The expected PR↔Pe frequency is 6.8, and we observe a frequency of 12. The expected RF↔Pi

frequency is 0.9, and we observe a frequency of 4. The expected frequency of PR↔Je is 0.4, and we observe a frequency of 1. To calculate the X^2 statistic, we use the chi-square formula:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(19 - 12.13)^2}{12.13} + \frac{(12 - 6.8)^2}{6.8} + \frac{(4 - 0.9)^2}{0.9} + \frac{(2 - 0.4)^2}{0.4}$$

$$X^2 = 24.94$$

The resulting calculation yields a chi-square statistic of $X^2 = 24.94$. We then calculate the degrees of freedom (df) as (r-1)(c-1), to arrive at df=9. The critical chi-square (X_c^2) value for df=9 and p=0.05 is **16.919**. A comparison of our X^2 result of 24.94 to the critical value 16.919 shows a higher statistic than the critical value needed, compelling us to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) in favor of the alternative hypothesis (H_1). The resulting chi-square statistic of $X^2 = 24.94$ extends beyond the needed critical value, and to a higher value of $p \leq 0.005$ (23.589).

4. Conclusion

The vultology classifications from the CTVC3 and the ES1 psychological survey data show a statistically significant dependency, at a strength of $p \leq 0.005$. These two separate forms of measurement have a dependent relationship to one another, allowing for the possibility of predicting psychology from a vultological analysis, at a rate high above chance.