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A systemic, interpersonal understanding of self-actualization is presented. General Systems Theory is seen as an epistemological framework which helps fashion this understanding. The "self" is defined as part of a dynamic, holistic structure of interdependent relationships called the biosphere. The capacity of the self to actualize itself must take this environmental interdependence into account. Metamotivation is discussed as the individual's desire to fulfill his superordinate systems. The term "systems actualization" is introduced to help explain metamotivation. The systems view of self-actualization is then juxtaposed with descriptions of intercultural programs whose overall purpose is also labeled systems actualization. The activities of these programs are seen as one way that systems actualizing goals are applied in the community.

Seven Factors of personal and community change were chosen from these community programs. Two of these Factors were selected as most representative of positive systems actualizing qualities. One Factor was selected as least representative of systems actualization. Participants' factor scores on these three Factors were used to sort participants into high \((SA_{hi})\), medium \((SA_{med})\) and low \((SA_{lo})\) systems actualizing groups.

Three major questions were analyzed: (a) Do community lab participants increase in their systems actualizing qualities? A Multivariate Repeated Measures T-test (Hotelling's \(T^2\)) was used to analyze pre-program and post-program factor scores on the 7 community Factors. (b) Do those participants who are high systems actualizers
display more capacity for self-actualization than those participants who are low systems actualizers? Two MANOVAs were conducted; one comparing the \( SA_{hi} \) and \( SA_{lo} \) groups, and one comparing all three groups. The MANOVAs compared the groups on the 12 scales of an inventory for the measurement of self-actualization: the POI. (c) Do high systems actualizers have different patterns of self-ideal self and self-significant other congruence than do lower systems actualizers; and does the variable of sex have any effect on these differences? A series of 4 separate \( 3 \times 2 \times 7 \) analyses of variance were conducted in each of 4 congruence categories - self-ideal self, self-exceptional person, self-father, and self-mother. The questionnaire used to rate self and others was the Community Questionnaire from which the original Factors were derived. The \( 3 \times 2 \times 7 \) model was used because "3" is the number of groups, "2" is the number of sexes, and "7" is the number of community Factors.

Results showed that participants have neither increased nor decreased in their systems actualizing qualities. The two-group MANOVA showed the \( SA_{hi} \) group significantly higher than the \( SA_{lo} \) group on 7 of the 12 POI scales. The \( SA_{hi} \) group's POI profile was uniformly higher than the \( SA_{lo} \) group's profile. The three-group MANOVA showed the \( SA_{hi} \) group significantly higher than the lower two groups on 2 of the POI scales.

It was found that the \( SA_{hi} \) group displayed more self-ideal self congruence than did the \( SA_{lo} \) group in the areas of interpersonal sensitivity, working to resolve community inequities, and using aggressive, confronting styles to facilitate change. All program participants see themselves as more likely than their parents to work
at resolving community inequities. This is particularly true of the SA group. Females generally see themselves as much different from their mothers in the area of using aggressive, confronting styles to facilitate change. However, extreme lack of self-mother congruence in this area is related to lowered systems actualization. Lower systems actualizing males display more conflict about increasing their inter-cultural understanding than females do.

These and other results are discussed in the light of the systemic, interpersonal understanding of self-actualization. It is concluded that this understanding was supported by the results.
INTRODUCTION

Today, while watching the news on television, I heard that a federal research agency has found conclusively that the fluorocarbons we use in aerosol spray cans have damaged the ozone layer protecting the earth from harmful solar radiation. Possible consequences of this damage include increased incidence of skin cancer and dramatic changes in the earth's weather patterns. The agency recommends immediate control or abolition of fluorocarbon use.

I was immediately struck with how seemingly isolated personal acts can have the most profound consequences for others. The wholly innocent act of spraying one's underarms in the privacy of the bathroom turns out to be related to skin cancer and climatic changes. As Marshall McLuhan (1967) has pointed out, the electronic revolution has tremendously enhanced the amount of information we receive about events in the world, and consequently forces upon us the realization of man's fundamental interconnectedness with his environment. According to McLuhan, "The wheel is an extension of the foot. The book is an extension of the eye...clothing an extension of the skin, (and) electric circuitry an extension of the central nervous system."

As I continued to think about the implications of that news report the notion of responsibility occurred to me. How we personally define or incorporate this concept into our daily living has great import for the kind of world we are making. Our actions do not go unnoticed by the environment. My understanding of the term "responsible" gradually became based on our interrelatedness with everything around us. We are responsible simply because our actions have effects on the systems and organisms around
us, and because their actions affect us. The Webster's Dictionary (1970)
only implies this relationship view by defining responsibility as "moral,
legal, or mental accountability." It is assumed we are accountable to
something. Wolman (1973) defines "legal responsibility" as "The account-
ability for actions and their consequences in those who are assumed to be
able to conform to laws, customs, and standards of the society." Responsi-
bility in this sense entails a recognition that one is a functioning part
of some system. I assume that "accountability" as used by Wolman includes
the awareness that one's actions do influence other parts of the system,
in this case the system being the "society."

A relationship view of responsibility can be further clarified by
dividing the word in two; as a response-ability. Webster's defines
"response" in part as "something constituting a reply or a reaction."
It defines "ability" as "a state of being able" and a "power to perform."
Thus, responsibility means "the state of being able to perform." Wolman
defines "response" as "the organism's executing processes." He defines
"ability" as a power to perform now in the present. Response-ability is
seen as "the power of the organism's executing processes to perform in
the present."

It does seem evident that responsibility entails a response ability.
I will assume the proposition self-evident, perhaps erroneously, that all
living organism's are possessed of this response-ability, and that a good
argument can be made that such ability could be used as a defining mark
for the distinction between living and dead organisms. I want to make the
point that all living organisms are responsible in the sense that they
are interacting parts of systems and that they possess a response-ability
which affects all parts of that system. The distinction between this
understanding and the more limited sense of responsibility we normally
have is the act of being accountable; to oneself, to others, or both. This act of accountability implies a self-conscious function, or else we would not be aware of who is accountable to whom for what. We would not be able to draw distinctions about who is holding whom accountable for his actions unless we were able to distinguish a self from non-selves. This distinction is a paramount factor in the development of self-consciousness, greatly facilitated by language (Fenichel, 1945). Viewed in the terms discussed previously, we can then talk about a "responsible person" as one who says, "Yes, I recognize (or am aware of) my response ability. In fact, I am aware that I am responding right now. I accept that my actions have effects on other aspects of the environment of which I am a part, and that the environment engenders effects in me. Therefore, I feel myself to be both cause and effect in my surroundings, intimately and inextricably interconnected."

There is an air of self informed accountability here. In a sense, it can be said that the person above is accepting responsibility for his actions. But the sense in which I want to convey this responsibility is further clarified by noting how the person affirms his responsibleness. He does not say, for example, "I cause effects"; nor does he say, "I have response abilities". The subtle but important distinction is that he says, "I accept that my actions have effects" and "I am aware of my response ability." This distinction is important because it allows me to hold to the more general account of responsibility mentioned earlier: that we are all responsible simply because our actions have effects on the systems and organisms around us, and their actions affect us. We do not then have to have one assert that he is responsible for his actions, or that he is possessed of a response-ability. Such ability is considered given, and the person's (or organism's) responsibility for his actions is also
considered as obvious in the sense that his actions affect the environment. This passive view of responsibility has important implications for our understanding of man. The element of choice, or free will, does not enter into the question of responsibility. We cannot choose to be responsible, for we are this by the very nature of our being alive among other living beings. Choice becomes apparent when we are faced with the decision of accepting the responsible nature of our existence or choosing not to be aware of it. That is, we can choose to become aware of our actions and their effects on others or we can choose to remain ignorant of this process.

Returning once more to the words of McLuhan, "instant communication insures that all factors of the environment and of experience coexist in a state of active interplay." As the pace and amounts of information communicated within the "global village" accelerate the impact of our responses to each other becomes clearer. It is becoming more crucial that we become aware of our relatedness. McLuhan's statement tells me that today it is more important than ever that we develop conceptions of man which help us to understand him in relation, and that we develop solutions to our problems which take this fundamental relatedness into account.
The rest of this dissertation continues to develop the theme of man's relation to and interdependence with his social and material environments. The question of responsibility appears again as part of a systemic and interpersonal conception of self-actualization. This perspective of self-actualization will in turn be linked with the aims, activities, and processes of a community/laboratory-learning program which operated according to systemic interdependent principles, ranging on a continuum from personal to community change processes (Glad, et al, 1977; Glad, et al, 1977). By combining measures of self-actualization with measures of participation in the community program, we will be able to test the systemic self-actualization conception. We may also be able to discuss the influence of community programs on the actualization potential of participants.

The General Systems Paradigm

I would like to start by describing the kind of theoretical perspective which underlies both the community program and the systems view of self-actualization. It comes from a class of scientific theory known as General Systems Theory (GST).

GST was first conceived by a biologist, Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968), when he became discouraged with the shortcomings of purely atomistic approaches in explaining biological phenomena. Atomistic approaches were suitable mainly to the study of the composition of dead matter or to the study of very simple, isolated phenomena strictly controlled in
laboratories. These techniques seemed wholly inadequate in beginning to comprehend the rich, dynamic flow of changing life patterns which, von Bertalanffy felt, is the real province of biological science. Faced with this dilemma, he began to study the patterns of relationships among biological phenomena and found that these relationships were structured in particular ways. Attention shifted from the study of isolated events to the study of structured living wholes. The science of GST was born as von Bertalanffy and others began to develop consistent ways of identifying and categorizing relationship patterns they observed.

Since then attempts are being made to develop mathematical techniques which are particularly suited to the problems of defining patterned relationships in ongoing living phenomena (Rappaport, 1972). Bertalanffy himself (1972) feels that two major tasks of systems theorists are to develop appropriate mathematical techniques and to develop a new epistemology. As already intimated, he feels that the concepts and procedures of classical science are unable to deal adequately with the complexity of relationships manifested by living organisms.

I feel that GST represents a paradigm shift on the order that Thomas Kuhn (1972) wrote about, a paradigm being an ordered form of thought by which we view the world. From this "world view" certain procedures are evident which consistently follow the order of the particular theory which is adopted. For example, the pythagorean astronomical view demanded that the revolution of the stars be accounted for in strict circles. Elaborate mathematics were applied so that the observed facts would fit the theory. The world view adopted by Copernicus was able to account for the stars' revolutions in a much less complicated way, and as it turned out more accurately; but this view radically challenged cherished beliefs which were integral parts of the prevailing paradigms. The point to be made
here is that the strategies one adopts for understanding phenomena or for acquiring new knowledge follow consistently from the particular theory or world view that has been adopted. Kuhn also applies this paradigm notion of scientific understanding to his view of historical change. He rejects the "on the shoulders of great men" approach which argues that one important finding in a science is the direct cause of other important findings later on, the entire process proceeding in a linear, ladder-like fashion. He adopts a more systems oriented perspective of change which he calls "paradigm switches." These switches constitute changes in the way scientists order the facts of their fields into meaningful wholes. It is the pattern of relationships between man and knowledge that is the important focal point for understanding the process of scientific change. We most need to know how man orders knowledge and how he discovers new orders among the relationship patterns in the universe.

I have identified five characteristics of the systems approach which recommend it as a tool for understanding and acquiring knowledge about living organisms and their activities.

Reification

One advantage of systems theory is that it is not prone to the reification of entities which do not exist. The analytic reductionistic approaches prized by classical science tend to focus on the identification of strict entities: "What is the active component in yeast that causes dough to rise?" "What behaviors need to be extinguished or reinforced to change this person's anxious shyness at parties?" "What is the chemical in the DNA molecule which controls the precise coding of genes?" Because the analytic approach is primarily concerned with the identification of single entities, it tends toward reification when applied to the study of non-entity processes such as "consciousness", "substance", 
"value", and even "groups". This approach rightly discards the study of such concepts on this basis, for there is no sense in trying to find a tangible entity to represent them. Systems theory does not, of course, deny the existence of tangible entities, nor does it discount the power of reductionist analysis. However, systems theory shifts the emphasis to the relationships (or the dynamic structure of relationships) among these qualities. It is not necessary, therefore, to posit tangible units to give meaning to intangible entities. Vitalism failed because it posited a "life force" which somehow existed in organisms and motivated them to life. One could use a systems approach to describe a concept like "life force" in terms of the observed or calculated dynamic relationship patterns that the organism exhibits both within its physiological make-up and with its environment. Using systems theory, then, does not tend toward reification of such concepts as "life force" or those concepts mentioned above. It is concerned with describing the structure of relationship patterns. (The concept "relationship" itself is not a tangible quality in the sense of being a single entity that can be placed under a microscope, for example, and observed. In order to understand what relationship means it is necessary to posit the active interplay and interdependent qualities exhibited by single entities.)

**Comprehension of General Concepts**

Closely related to the reification question is the meaningfulness of general concepts. System theory seems able to account for general concepts in an easy and satisfactory way for the same reason that it avoids reifying: by accounting for the structure of relationships. Concepts such as "consciousness" and "substance" are very general. General concepts like these are often hard to understand from an analytic-reductionist perspective. This approach tries to break up
more inclusive components into their segmental parts. It is therefore ideally suited to the study of those parts, but less suited to the study of the larger component system. Bertalanffy (1972) makes this point when he says that we gain knowledge of higher (in this case more general) systems from the structured relations of their constituent components. He says further that open systems - systems which are alive and freely exchanging information with their environments - are by nature more general, both physiologically and mathematically, than their components. Therefore, systems theory is ideally suited to the study of general concepts. Indeed, it includes such concepts as important areas for study.

Hierarchy of Systems

One reason that the study of general concepts is important is explained through the idea of hierarchical systems. One way of explaining it is to say that systems progress to higher and higher levels of generality. The patterns of organized relationships which define the higher levels incorporate entities of the lower levels. Lower level entities are expressed as components structured in the higher system levels.

A popular way of explaining this hierarchical patterning is to use the human body as an example. The body is built up from cells which form into tissues. These tissues then form into organs which organize into organ systems like the digestive and circulatory systems. The organ systems function in an ordered way to constitute a human organism. This simplified example illustrates how elements organize in patterned ways to produce systems which become more and more inclusive, or generalized, in the sense that they incorporate the "lower" systems into their overall function. Lower systems continue to operate by particular kinds of relationship patterns, and in turn are incorporated in the next highest
system, which in turn is formed by the particular relationship patterns of these constituent elements. The lowest systems always represented by more individual elements than are the highest systems. There are many more cells than there are tissues, many more tissues than organs, which go on to constitute just one human organism.

Communication Patterns in Systems

The structuring of relationship patterns in systems is largely reflected in the types and the extent of communication which takes place among the system's component elements. Miller (1965) points out that communication among systems parts is essential to the ordered relationship patterns characteristic of all systems. If systems parts are unable to share appropriate kinds of information, they are unable to fulfill the system's unique structuring requirements. The system therefore has to work harder to maintain its structural integrity and may cease functioning altogether. The latter case constitutes the death of the system.

Ervin Laszlo (1972), in an excellent introduction to systems theory, says that communication occurs in systems at all levels, from the simple to the complex. He contends that nature conspires to build organized systems rather than "blobs", and that interacting communication with the environment helps develop systemic arrangements. He illustrates three different levels of ordered systemic arrangements and discusses the communication patterns characteristic of each level. At his first level, the atomic, intercommunication takes place through "fields of force potentials" among atomic and subatomic particles. Within the second level, that of single organisms, communication takes place via diverse physio-chemical processes. At the third level, human groups, communication takes the form of interpersonal sharing among individuals, including the use of communication technology. Communicating in these ways: (a) atoms
co-relate to form different material structures, (b) the elements within organisms share information with one another and the environment to maintain the organism's integrity, and (c) individuals relate to one another in ways which help structure different types of groups.

The advantage of this systems theory quality is that we can study whole systems by discovering how they share information within themselves and with one another. Relatively simple systems, such as an amoeba, have rigid requirements concerning the type of information they need to share with the environment in order to survive. More complicated systems like human groups manifest greater flexibility in the types of information that is shared among members. It is possible to facilitate member relationships in groups by establishing new patterns of communication or by removing blockages in patterns that already exist.

Isomorphy of Systems

Systemic isomorphy represents a particular kind of intersystem connectedness. It means that the structure of the relationships characterizing one system level is often found to be characteristic of other systems. The different communication levels that Laszlo illustrates are one kind of systemic isomorphy. All three system levels are isomorphic in the sense that sharing information among their components contributes to their unique structural qualities. Another more precise way in which they may be isomorphic is if we discover that the communication patterns themselves are structured in similar ways across the three levels.

One of the most exciting applications of systemic isomorphy, if only in terms of the boldness of its approach, was by the anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1972). He powerfully states the isomorphic viewpoint in the following passage:

I picked up a vague mystical feeling that
we must look for the same sort of processes in all fields of natural phenomena - that we might expect to find the same sort of laws at work in the structure of a crystal as in the structure of society, or that the segmentation of an earthworm might really be comparable to the process by which basalt pillars are formed. (p. 74)

Bateson applied this isomorph principle while studying an Iatmul tribe in New Guinea. It occurred to him in an intuitive moment that the social structure of the Iatmuls might be analyzed in terms of the comparative structure of radially constructed animals (such as jellyfish and sea anemones) and symmetrically built animals such as earthworms or lobsters. By using concepts and diagrams derived from the study of body form in these animals, Bateson found that he was able to apply these principles to an understanding of Iatmul societial structure. He found that Iatmul society resembled a radial structure more than the symmetrical transverse segmentation that is characteristic of modern American society. The importance of these steps is not only that isomorphic structural relationships are shown operating in as diverse systems as lobsters and social systems, but that a scientist can take systemic principles from one area of study and apply them to his own (for example, zoology to anthropology). This kind of thinking leads to another value of systems theory.

**Interdisciplinary Potential**

Bertalanffy (1972) says that systems theory is ideally suited to interdisciplinary cooperation in the scientific pursuit of knowledge, whereas analytic-reductionist methods are not. The reasons are implied in the different perspectives of the two approaches. Systems theory tends to study whole units by searching for integrative relationship patterns. Analytic methods tend to search for isolable elements which can be
separated and analyzed apart from their "living" participation in integrated wholes. Thus, as we break down an organism into organic, chemical, and finally atomic components, the study of atomic particles is often thought to be unrelated to the study of human beings, groups, or societies. Yet, as we view all of these entities, abstract or otherwise, as wholes defined by the structured relational patterns of their parts, we find that there can be marked similarities among such relationship patterns at markedly diverse system levels. The very nature of systems theory not only allows interdisciplinary efforts, but demands that they occur, just as nature herself consists of the entire range of multirelational occurrences. A prime interest of systems theorists such as Bertalanffy, Laszlo, and Miller remains the discovery of system principles which operate across system levels.

In summary, systems theory is shown to be applicable to both the community programs and self-actualization through the qualities which have been discussed.

Reification and Comprehension of General Concepts:
Both the "community" and "self-actualization" concepts are highly general, and systems theory does not force us to posit static processes or isolable substances. They are concepts which refer to complex dynamic events and to life as it is happening. Using a systems perspective, we do not have to rely solely on reducing these concepts to their constituent components in order to describe them. Hopefully, we can be more descriptive about patterns of relationship.

Hierarchy of Systems: This quality allows us to "break down" the community and self-actualization concepts without sacrificing our understanding of the relationships among the constituent elements. We can
continue to understand these concepts holistically. As will be shown later, this quality allows the introduction of different stages of social development as a way of understanding both the actualization process and the concept of community.

**Communication Patterns in Systems:** This quality allows us to study patterns of communication at various levels of community functioning. As noted, communication patterns are bound up in how these levels are structured. For example, autocratic groups are often structured in such a way that information flows in only one direction - from top to bottom. In democratic groups, information from all elements of the structure is usually encouraged. Communication is multidirectional.

Some patterns of communication are judged to be more actualizing than are other patterns. We will see later how the community programs emphasize changing the patterns of relationships among individuals and groups in order to increase the quality of life for all community members. Working to develop more open styles of communicating among individuals and groups is a necessary aspect in changing these relationship patterns.

**Isomorphy of Systems:** This quality of systems theory allows us to look for comparisons between processes of personal growth and the development of a healthier, more equitable community. One isomorphic aspect of the two processes is that both can be viewed in terms of systemic hierarchies.

**Interdisciplinary Potential:** Descriptions of what constitute a healthy community system can be seen to apply to descriptions of what constitutes a healthy growing person. Although not explored herein, this systems theory quality also allows comparisons of growth processes across other areas, such as botany, embryology, and so on.
across other areas, such as botany, embryology, and so on.

**Self and World**

I begin the discussion of self-actualization by turning to a branch of psychology in which the concept of "self" is an important part of the theoretical framework: Existential Psychology. Many Existential Psychologists feel that in order to adequately understand man we have to understand the concept of a "self."

Rollo May, in his book *Existence*, includes many passages which develop a concept of self which I argue can be understood systemically. He says, for example, that we cannot have an adequate understanding of man if we view him as a static entity. It is man's nature to be in a process called *being*, which May points out is a verb and not a noun. Unfortunately, we tend to view many conceptual categories, such as the word "man," as if they were fixed as the word written on paper. (In fact, even such an everyday perceptual event as reading is by no means a static process.) Being, however, is an active process occurring as individual organisms, including men, interact in diverse ways with their environments. All "beings" are in constant interplay with their environments. It probably does not overstate the existential position to say that any attempt to understand man which does not account for his dynamic becoming in relation with his world must be based on artificial, and therefore less valid, premises. Furthermore, man's ability for self-consciousness allows him to abstract or transcend his situation in the sense that at any moment he can see himself as being both subject and object; that is, he can experience himself as "becoming" in the ongoing relational patterns that he is engaged in. This ability to abstract and
to be aware of oneself as distinct and yet in relation with others allows man to be continually "designing" or "forming" his world. In this case, world is understood as the pattern of relationships man is involved in.

Existential conceptions of man include as basic his fundamental relatedness with the environment. This relatedness helps us to conceive of the process of being, which describes the dynamic, on-going, and ever-changing aspect of man's relatedness. The quality of self-consciousness allows man to experience his relationships in the process of becoming with them. If this last statement sounds awkward, it is because it attempts to account for man's experience of his becoming while not divorcing the experience from the becoming process itself. That is, it does not say that a man has an experience of becoming, but that the experience and the becoming are one. Since this becoming process is a dynamic relational event, I included the final words "with them." Man can experience himself as part of a dynamic, changing, structured process.

It helps to elaborate this relational understanding of self by pointing out a distinction made by May. He says there is a difference between saying, "The play was well written" and "I liked the play." The latter statement affirms a personal response or an experience in relation to the play. The former statement makes an intellectual evaluation of the play without directly accrediting one's personal response to it. May points out that the more "objective" response has more sanction in Western culture. It implies that the criteria for well-written plays are somehow independent external entities, bearing no relationship to the reviewer. These views of "objectivity" are rein-
forced when such criteria become codified. Then, by steady reference to them, these criteria do take on the appearance of autonomous guidelines. There is some truth to this autonomy because we usually played no part in the development of such criteria. Our experiences of environmental events of almost every kind are structured by learned cultural criteria. However, the play's critic, for example, does use them. Even though his response to the play is structured by these criteria, he is still responding to the play in those terms. The cultural norms are not reacting to the play, he is. The rub comes when he talks about the play in terms of the criteria as if his participation in the process had no significance. Therefore, "I liked the play" gets at the kind of "responsibility" discussed in the beginning of this dissertation. It is a response which affirms one's relatedness to environmental events.

When the existentialists extend their concept of being to a concept called being-in-the-world, we see clearly how important they consider man's intercommunication with the world as being essential to a description of man. May (1958) says to us:

Let us now inquire how the existential analysts undertake to rediscover man as a being interrelated with his world and to rediscover world as meaningful to man. They hold that the person and his world are a unitary, structural whole; the hyphenation of the phrase being-in-the-world expresses precisely that. The two poles, self and world, are always dialectically related. Self implies world and world self: there is neither without the other, and each is understandable only in terms of the other. It makes no sense, for example, to speak of man in his world (though we often do) as primarily a spatial relation. The phrase match in a box does imply a spatial relation, but to speak of a man in his home or in his office or in a hotel at the seashore implies something radically different. (p. 59)
The "something radically different" is that the only viable way of understanding man (that is, a living man) is in constant active interaction with his environment. No mere description of the environment, or its influence on man, and no description of man or his influence on the environment, can adequately describe either aspect. The terms being and being-in-the-world are holistic systemic concepts that treat structured relationships intrinsically. Therefore, the definition of the existential concept world becomes a systemic statement (May, 1958).

World is the structure of meaningful relationships in which a person exists and in the design of which he participates. Thus world includes the past events which condition my existence and all the vast variety of deterministic influences which operate upon me. But it is these "as I relate to them," am aware of them, carry them with me, molding, inevitably forming, building them in every minute of relating. For to be aware of one's world means at the same time to be designing it. (p. 59)

I feel that the notion of designing one's world can perhaps be better understood by the notion of participating in the design of one's world. Referring again to the beginning discussion on responsibility, the "response-ability" of any living organism is essential to his being alive. The mutual effects of organism and environment on each other are inescapable. The quality of "designing one's world" comes through this intimate, unitary participation in life. As noted earlier, the element of choice enters in terms of degrees of awareness of one's mutual relatedness in the world. Those of us who are relatively more aware of our active interconnectedness in the world probably have a greater sense of participating in the design of the world. May goes on to say that "the basis on which we see the real world in its true perspective (is) the basis on which we relate."
Many theorists have taken this fundamental relatedness as vital to their theories of human development. George Mead (1934), Harry Stack Sullivan (1953), and Timothy Leary (1957) all developed elaborate theories in which man's relationship with others, particularly significant others, is crucial to the understanding of the self. For Martin Buber (1958) the essence of life is relation. It is through relation that all individual things exist. He makes a distinction between two fundamentally different types of relationship: I-Thou and I-It. I-Thou describes a relationship between a person and his environment which is based on an affirmation of their mutual existence through the relationship between them. I-It describes a relationship in which the environment is perceived as existing for some purpose other than mutual relatedness, usually for a purpose which is self-serving. Alan Watts (1966) has written about the "Taboo Against Knowing Who You Are." Our real identity lies in our relatedness with the environment. A principal ethos of Western culture, however, is that man stands apart from nature. This ethos establishes a dichotomy with man at one pole and his environment at the other. Through his intellect, man is able to fathom nature's laws and use them to serve himself. The main thrust is to dominate. This attitude is so dominant in our culture that it reinforces a taboo against realizing ourselves as participants in the overall design of nature. Such an approach adopts Buber's I-It attitude.

One of the clearest expositions of personality which transcends the self-environment dichotomy is presented by Andras Angyal (1941). He states his case unequivocally:

...the life process does not take place only within the body surface, but involves a much broader realm of events. Such a broad definition of biological happenings is unconventional but
necessary in order that justice be done to the problems of the total personality. (P.99)

Angyal (1941) coined the term "biosphere" to describe one of his fundamental concepts about his holistic, integrated theory of personality. He says:

...I propose to call the realm in which the biological total process takes place the "biosphere," that is, the realm or sphere of life. The biosphere includes both the individual and the environment, not as interacting parts, not as constituents which have independent existences, but as aspects of a single reality which can be separated only by abstraction.

...we regard the life process as a unitary happening, as an organized single process whereof the organism and the environment are only abstracted features. Instead of studying the "organism" and the "environment" and their interaction, we propose to study life as a unitary whole and endeavor to describe the organization and dynamics of the biosphere. The subject matter of our considerations are not organismic processes and environmental influences, but biosphere occurrences in their integral reality. (P.100)

It would be hard to find a more clear description of personality from a systemic point of view. Self and environment are not separate; they are parts of the unitary life process. The concept of biosphere elucidates the fact of man's being-in-the-world. We understand self and environment only from the perspective of their holistic relation.

Angyal further applies this concept to the understanding of personality by proposing two "tendencies" or "attitudes": autonomy and homonomy. Autonomy is that tendency of the individual to control and master his environment. Homonomy is the individual's tendency to feel a part of life patterns larger than himself, to set aside individual goals for the larger goals of family, group, or community. Angyal extends the meaning of homonomy to include identification with
ever-larger life patterns such as the universe. This type of identification is analogous to mystical or "peak experiences" in which the individual feels himself in union and perfect harmony with the whole of nature. These larger life patterns of which all individuals are part Angyal calls the "superindividual" life units. Healthy personality functioning includes a synthesis of autonomous-homonomous tendencies in the dynamic unitary life processes of the biosphere. He implies that as we grow we become aware of our integration into larger superindividual life units, thus enlarging the biospheric space in which we are conscious participants.

The Self-Actualization Conceptions of Goldstein and Maslow

Turning from this discussion of "self" to the concept "self-actualization," I refer to some of Kurt Goldstein's writings (Goldstein being the man who first used the term self-actualization). It is clear that Goldstein's (1940) holistic approach to understanding personality is systemic in nature. He says, for example,

Naturally one cannot fail to observe that a true insight into the condition of the individual is to be gained only if the individual is considered as part of the whole of nature, particularly of the human society to which it belongs. Many manifestations of disease can be understood only in the light of their social origin and can be eliminated only by considering this origin. Such a view leads to the study of the interrelationships between the individual and society....

Thus, just as the previous theorists do, Goldstein understands the "nature of man" as being intrinsically bound up with organism-environmental relationships. And both theories propose that only by including this relationship can we understand man's potential for
actualization. The organism's capacity for relating to its environment in the terms of its potentialities is how we can understand the organism's potential for actualization. Furthermore, actualization is intrinsically bound up with the existence of the organism. That is, he must relate to his environment in order to continue existing. In this sense, when Goldstein talks about the "nature" of an organism, he is referring to its unique capacities (sense receptors, for example, and abstract thinking) for interacting with the environment.

One way of discussing the systemic aspects of actualization is to review some of Goldstein's statements about those tendencies which are less actualizing. Goldstein stresses fragmentation, isolation, and withdrawal when he speaks of such tendencies. In fact, his general characterization of sickness includes an overemphasis by the organism of isolated parts of its functioning. Goldstein, along with the existential psychologists, sees anxiety as intrinsic to man's need for actualization. It is part of the necessary condition of every man's life to face up to the fulfillment of his potentials in relation to his environment. The anxiety that is often felt as a part of this process is bound up with a threat to the individual's very existence, for the nature of life is such that we are not always sure that our capacities are equal to the adjustments or tasks demanded of us by the environment. Goldstein considers the handling of anxiety in the direction of actualization as maintaining a holistic perspective of one's relationship to the environment. As he says it, "This form of overcoming anxiety (what he calls courage - an 'affirmative answer to the shocks of existence') requires the ability to view a single experience within a larger context, i.e. to
assume the 'attitude toward the possible,' to maintain freedom of decision regarding different possibilities." In contrast, the withdrawal of one's capacities from interaction with the environment inhibits our potential for actualization.

The concept "freedom" is understood as the willingness to continue awareness of one's on-going relatedness in the environment, even when that environment is perceived as threatening because one's potentialities are threatened. A lessening of freedom, on the other hand, is understood as isolating or withdrawing parts of oneself from contact with the environment. Anxiety is likely to produce what Goldstein calls "substitute phenomena." These are overemphases of parts of the organism in order to obstruct the awareness of one's relationship to threatening aspects of the environment. One obvious example of such phenomena are the conversion reactions of hysterical neurosis. However, this line of thought can also be applied to such abstract occurrences as religious beliefs or racial prejudice. In this latter sense, Goldstein's thinking is similar to the existential view discussed as the distinction between "I liked the play" versus "The play was well-written." When we justify our beliefs by continually referring to external, dogmatic sources, we are likely to block awareness of certain aspects of our relatedness to the environment. Our beliefs then take on the quality of substitute phenomena. They become a substitute reference point for determining our attitudes about certain behaviors rather than our relying on awareness of our responses to these behaviors, such as, "I liked the play." This is contrasted with the self-actualizing person whose values and beliefs are an alive, continuing affirmation of his existence - intrinsically
including all aspects of his relationships in the world. (Of course, few of us ever reach the point of such a self-actualizing person.) The debilitating role of substitute phenomena can be summed up in this sentence:

Substitute phenomena reveal their abnormal character, their origin in the abnormal isolation produced by anxiety, by their abnormal stress on 'partial' aspects of human action or nature, and by their compulsiveness, their lack of freedom and relationship to reality, to life.

Goldstein makes the same point in a slightly different way when he takes issue with the homeostatic definition of health. This view states that the primary goal of the organism is to maintain a fixed, balanced level of functioning. Goldstein says that preoccupation with the maintenance of sameness is characteristic of sick or impaired, not healthy, people. He cites as example the brain-damaged person's need to maintain strict uniformity in his environment because of his inability to adjust to many changes. Healthy functioning is characterized by active tendencies for new activities and "progress." A preoccupation with self-preservation in fact promotes "decay of life."

Healthy actualizing behavior is "the organism's tendency to come to terms with the requirements of the outer world in the best possible condition of the whole." Whereas Goldstein seems to be using "whole" in reference to the organism, I think it is helpful to use "whole" as referring to the pattern of organism-environmental relationships of which the organism is a part at any point in time. As we shall shortly see, this viewpoint becomes an important aspect of the understanding of self-actualization developed in this dissertation.

Goldstein himself seems to touch on this view when he says that people
cannot actualize themselves "without respect to their surroundings in some degree, especially to other persons." And he says that those people who lack the ability (or willingness) for restriction of their own needs and desires, have less capacity for actualizing themselves. "It is because they seem so self-centered that they are unable to build up by themselves a real community or social world."

Abraham Maslow is a psychologist with whom the term self-actualization is often associated. Maslow himself has been given the distinction of being one of the founding fathers of a movement known as Humanistic Psychology or the "Third Force" (Goble, 1970). His work has sometimes been understood as a reaction against the instinct determinism of Freud and the environmental determinism of Behaviorism. Maslow proposed a view of Man as free to construct his own future, as not being bound forever in conflict between instinctual drives and environmental restrictions. In essence, the humanistic view denies that man is always determined by forces beyond his control, either internal or external, and therefore affirms that the individual man himself is able to determine the direction of his own life.

It is not surprising when viewed in the latter context of opposition to competing "world views" of man that some people understand the Third Force as extolling the glory of the "self." It is easy to adopt a position in which the self is understood as a law unto itself bearing no necessary meaningful relationships to anything other than itself. In fact, it is possible to view relationships of any kind, especially those not "freely chosen" by an individual, as hindering his own unique actualization. The danger inherent in this approach is that it represents the same kind of
overemphasis on parts in relation to wholes that the Systems Theorists and Goldstein criticize in the Analytico-reductionist approaches. It sometimes adopts a self-determinism over against the instinctual and environmental determinism. As such, it represents as artificial a depiction of reality as any method which attempts to single out one set of parts as the sole determiners of the holistic pattern of relationships of which they are part. This dissertation does not represent such a self-deterministic approach. It adopts the view of self which was described earlier as embodying a system of self-other relationships. Therefore, any conception of self-actualization based on this premise will have to include the self's systemic relationships with others as an essential aspect of the self's actualization. As we shall see, this view is not incompatible with Maslow's developing conceptions of self-actualization.

I seriously doubt that Maslow adopted a view of self-actualization in the sense I have described. His writing often reflects a struggle to integrate the concepts of autonomy on the one hand and what might be described as "social feeling" on the other. The following pages highlight the problem with Maslow's own quotes, and then illustrate how he attempted to solve it.

At times, Maslow does seem to stress the individual's freedom to the exclusion of his relationship with the environment. For example, Maslow (1962) often expressed concern about our society's growing tendency to value the individual in terms of his "usefulness" to the society; the valuing of individual persons in terms of criteria external to them. At such times, he seems to be striking the same chord of alarm that Erich Fromm (1941) expresses. Fromm is concerned
that modern society is teaching us to value ourselves in terms of external criteria of achievement. We are daily bombarded with messages which preach innumerable necessities that will help us be more respected by others. The tragic misconception is that we learn to perceive self-respect solely in terms of what others think of us. When Maslow (1962) writes in this way, he seems to be on the verge of a strict "self-determinism."

The danger that I see is the resurgence of the old identification of psychological health with adjustment...adjustment to society, adjustment to other people. That is, the authentic or healthy person may be defined not in his own right, not in his autonomy, not by his own intra-psychic and nonenvironmental laws, not as different from the environment, independent of it or opposed to it, but rather in environment-centered terms, e.g., of ability to master the environment, to be capable, adequate, effective, competent in relation to it...successful in its terms. An extrapsychic centering point cannot be used for the theoretical task of defining the healthy psyche. (p.179)

In such passages as these, Maslow seems to dichotomize individual and environment. He almost seems to imply that they bear no necessary relationship with each other. He makes this point stronger when he argues for the incorporation of primary process thinking into conceptions of "healthy human nature" (Maslow, 1962). We should know that such processes are:

...intra-psychic and have autochthonous laws and rules, that they are not primarily adapted to external reality or shaped by it or equipped to cope with it. More superficial layers of the personality differentiate out to take care of this job...environment-oriented words...are...inadequate to describe the whole psyche, part of which has nothing to do with the environment. (p.183)

By referring to environment-oriented coping mechanisms as "superficial," Maslow is subtly saying that the "autochthonous" processes of
the psyche are more real and more valuable components of the personality. He is caught in an either-or dilemma in which he is forced to explain unique individual growth in terms of an environmental perspective which is strictly deterministic in the Skinnerian sense. He must say, then, that the self is either environment oriented or self-determined. He resolves the issue by allocating some personality components to deal with the environment while the most important components are perceived as unrelated to the environment.

It is easy to see how passages such as this could be used by others to justify a self-deterministic philosophy. For example, Marin (1976) in a criticism of some new personal growth movements cites the case of an EST graduate saying that her friend was attacked, raped and murdered because she wanted it. In this extreme view, everything that happens to us is solely determined by us, whether we realize it or not. In the same article, Marin noted that one of the heroes of these new movements is Abraham Maslow.

However, Maslow himself was keenly aware of the self-other dilemma he was facing in attempting to adequately explain self-actualization. While he struggled to free the individual from instinctual and environmental constraints, he also strove not to separate man from the context of his environment. This process is vividly illustrated in a passage where Maslow is objecting to Harry Stack Sullivan's attempt to "define a Self simply in terms of what other people think of him." The healthy person "certainly is characterized by his transcendence of other people's opinions." What is noteworthy is Maslow's (1962) explanation of his use of the word "transcendence":

The word is used for lack of a better. "Independence of" implies too simple a dichotomizing
of self and of environment, and therefore is incorrect. "Transcendence" unfortunately implies for some a "higher" which spurns and repudiates the "lower," i.e., again a false dichotomizing. In other contexts I have used as a contrast with "dichotomous way of thinking," which implies simply that the higher is built upon, rests upon but includes the lower. For instance the central nervous system or the hierarchy of basic needs is hierarchically integrated. I use the word "transcendence" here in the hierarchical-integrative sense rather than in the dichotomous sense. (p.180)

This passage (and many others) make it clear that Maslow rejects any understanding of "self" in terms of a separating, or dichotomizing, of self from environment. This position agrees with the existentialist conceptions such as being-in-the-world, and with Goldstein's holistic approach to personality.

In his final book, published posthumously, Maslow (1971) says, "...I now consider that my book Religions, Values, and Peak Experiences was too imbalanced toward the individualistic and too hard on groups, organizations, and communities." He distinguishes between two types of actualizers: those who are strong "Selves," living "in accordance with their own true nature," and those who are "more than this." An important intention of this dissertation is to say that this something more is a self-identity which is also an absorption with and identification with the changing world in which one lives and helps comprise. Thus, one's "own true nature" becomes understood as an integration of autonomous-homonomous tendencies. Maslow (1971) called the other type of actualizers "transcenders." He used eleven pages to give various descriptions of the term "transcendence." One description highly relevant here is:

Transcendence of ego, self, selfishness, ego-
centering, etc., when we respond to the demand character of external tasks, causes, duties, responsibilities to others and to the world of reality. When one is doing one's duty...a transcendence of the lower needs of the self...This is a sensitivity to extra-psychic requiredness...(the) ability to yield, to be receptive to, or respond to, to live with extrapsychic reality as if one belonged with it, or were in harmony with it. (p.271)

Note how different this passage is from the one on page 27. Whereas before primary process thinking was extolled as being removed from reality, now external reality is seen as something to which we can positively respond. In fact, the environment has "demand character." Instead of being bad, it is good that we respond to it and manifest responsibility to others. Most important, it no longer seems necessary to stress the differences between self-needs and environmental demands. The two are reconciled when one experiences his belonging as part of the world. Instead of implying that primary processes bear no meaningful relationship to external reality, Maslow (1962) later says that primary process thinking is a valuable, creative means for solving real problems in the real world. For the self-actualizing person, what is good for the world in which he lives is also good for him. Goble (1970) explains Maslow's position by saying, "The healthy person finds happiness in helping others. Thus, for him unselfish is selfish. 'They get selfish pleasures from the pleasures of others, which is a way of saying unselfish' (Maslow). The healthy person is selfish in a healthy way, a way which is beneficial to him and to society too" (my italics).

Not only are individual and environment reconciled, there is an intrinsic, positive, shared, and on-going relationship between them. The affirmation of this relationship in one's life constitutes a very important quality for one's personal self-actualization.
The discussion to this point has shown that Maslow's ideas about self-actualization can be understood in the light of systems theory. This conclusion is supported by Maslow's insistence that we use holistic concepts to understand man, his refusal to separate man from environment by proposing that they are antagonistic, his insistence that self-actualizing people are meaningfully related in their environment, and his use of the hierarchical model to resolve the false self-environment dichotomy. This model is very similar to the concept of hierarchical systems.

An important way of discussing Maslow's understanding of self-actualization in terms of the self-environment dichotomy is his distinction between two types of motivation. One type is displayed more by those who are more actualizing, and the other is displayed by those who are less actualizing.

Less self-actualizing people are motivated by Deficiency Needs (D-needs). This means that behavior is motivated by satisfaction of felt deficiencies in the body or in the psychological makeup of the person. In terms of the self-environment dichotomy, this type of motivation serves to accentuate the split between self and environment. This split occurs because the individual perceives the elements of his environment as important mainly in terms of their usefulness in supplying satisfaction or discomfort to him. D-need motivation results in overemphasis of the self in its environmental context because all environmental events are judged in terms of their usefulness or uselessness to the self. Events in the environment are valued in terms of whether they satisfy the individual's felt biological and psychological deficiencies or as a release of tensions
in the organism. Thus, Maslow coined the term D-values to correspond
to the concept D-needs. It is based on a valuing of things external
to the self mainly in terms of their value to the self.

A principal feature of the self-actualizing motivational
structure is that it overcomes, or transcends, the self-environment
split which is a feature of D-need motivation. In terms discussed
previously, the needs of the individual coalesce with the needs of his
environmental context. When this happens, the individual feels in
harmony with his environment, not separated from it. Maslow ways
that people operating at the self-actualization level are motivated
by Being-needs (B-needs). The corresponding valuing process is
labeled Being-values (B-values). The self-environment transcendence
which is characteristic of this level is implied by Maslow's (1971)
description of the term "Being." He does not apply it to one or the
other side of the false dichotomy but applies it to both.

(The term Being) has been used to refer to
the whole cosmos, to everything that exists, to
all of reality. In peak experiences...attention
can narrow down to a single object or person
which is then reacted to "as if" it were the whole
of Being, i.e., the whole of reality. This im-
plies that it is all holistically interrelated.
The only complete and whole thing there is is the
whole Cosmos. Anything short of that is partial,
incomplete, shorn away from intrinsic ties and
relations for the sake of momentary, practical
convenience. It refers also to Cosmic Conscious-
ness. Also implies hierarchical integration
rather than dichotomizing.

(Being) refers to the "inner core," the
biological nature of the individual - his basic
needs, capacities, preferences; his irreducible
nature; the "real self" (Horney); his inherent,
essential, intrinsic nature. Identity. Since
"inner core" is both species-wide (every baby has
the need to be loved) and individual (only Mozart
was perfectly Mozartian), the phrase can mean
either "being fully human" and/or "being per-
fectly idiosyncratic." (p.130)
The individual is able to express his unique nature and maintain his relationship in his environmental context because both are holistically interrelated. Thus it is possible in states of B-cognition to perceive the "whole of Being" in one elemental part; and it is possible to perceive the active unity of many elemental parts in the whole.

The self is experienced simultaneously as a unique entity and also as a part of a larger whole into which it is integrated at a level higher than the self. This is simply a further description of the systemic hierarchical structure of life. The systems "above" the self of which it is part are called superordinate or superindividual systems in the sense that Angyal describes. I call this type of experience "simultaneous awareness." Maslow says that it is a characteristic part of peak experiences.

I contend that B-values are superordinate systems values. When a person is motivated by B-values, he is oriented to his superordinate system rather than the simple satisfaction of his own needs (although this consideration is not to be discarded in B-values). This understanding is reinforced by Maslow's labeling of B-values as meta-motivation. The use of the prefix "meta" provides a more comprehensive holistic meaning to the term "motivation." It implies something higher than the self to which the self belongs. It implies the self being motivated by the fulfillment of this superordinate whole. My meaning is illustrated by this quote from The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (Maslow, 1971):

...the metamotivations which hold in the self-actualizing life. More specifically, these can be summed up as the B-values. These metaneeds for
perfection, for justice, for beauty, for truth, and the like also show themselves in the industrial /or the community - H.L.\slash situation, where there might very well be complaints about inefficiency (even when this does not affect the pocket of the complainer). In effect, then, he is making a statement about the imperfections of the world in which he lives (again not a selfish complaint but an impersonal and altruistic philosopher's complaint, one might also call it). Or he might complain about not being given the full truth, all the facts, or about blocks in the free flow of communications. (p.241)

All of these complaints have to do with the operation of the system of which the individual is part. Maslow makes it clear that the individual is concerned about his environmental context, and is not motivated by reasons of personal gain. We might say that such a self-actualizing individual gains satisfaction from the fulfilled functioning of metalevels of which he is part.

The cornerstone B-values of truth, beauty, and justice (which Maslow says are all different expressions of man's relatedness to the whole of existence) are ideals of man's superordinate system functioning. Metamotivation includes concern about the welfare of other people who coexist with the individual in his superordinate systems, along with concern about his own welfare. I use the term "systems actualization" to refer to this metamotivation of self-actualizing people to actualize the superordinate systems in which they participate. In the following passage, Maslow (1971) strongly affirms the relationship between self-actualization and systems-actualization. In fact, he says, in the spirit of non-dichotomous transcendence, that both are the same thing.

The empirical fact is that self-actualizing people are our best experimenters, our most compassionate, our great improvers and reformers
of society, our most effective fighters against injustice, inequality, slavery, cruelty, exploitation (and also our best fighters for excellence, effectiveness, competence). And it also becomes clearer and clearer that the best "helpers" are the most fully human persons. What I may call the Bodhisattvic path is an integration of self-improvement and social zeal, i.e., the best way to become a better "helper" is to become a better person. But one necessary aspect of becoming a better person is via helping other people. So one must and can do both simultaneously. (The question "Which comes first" is an atomistic question.) (p. 346)

I do not want to imply from the latter quote that self-actualization automatically includes infusion with zeal for social reform. B-values are expressed in many ways through innumerable types of activities and vocations. In fact, it needs to be stressed that Maslow saw the B-values of self-actualizing people as transcendent in another way besides that of transcending the self-environment dichotomy. They also transcend the perception of what "is" and what "ought to be" such that "is" and "ought" become integrated in a unitary valuing process. For self-actualizing people, what "is" is also what "ought to be." This type of valuing process is closely aligned with a style of relating which Shostrom (1966) calls Time competence and Jung (1964) has called perception. Time competence reflects our orientation to "living in the present" unhindered by undue worrying about past failures or obsessive planning about the future. Time competent people are able to apply more of their "being" and resources to activities in the present. Those who exhibit the quality of perception are able to perceive events in the present as they are, unfilted through projections of inner D-needs or intellectual criteria of "what ought to be." Perception is also understood in terms of its
opposite quality - judgment. People who exhibit this quality tend to perceive external events in terms of pre-established criteria. They are therefore less capable of perceiving events in a new and fresh way. They tend to judge what they perceive, while those who manifest perception simply perceive what is. As a result, the latter people are able to perceive external events more accurately.

What a unitary valuing process means for metamotivation is that self-actualizing people are able to apply more of their personal resources to injustice in their superordinate systems. They are also more likely to make better choices for effective change because they perceive their environment more freshly and more accurately. Their actions are less encumbered by "what should be" as they respond more completely to what "is."

This unitary valuing process is reflected in self-actualizing personalities in the sense that they experience less internal conflict. Such a person is less likely to feel anxious or guilty because the sort of person he perceives himself "to be" is different from the sort of person he thinks he "should be." In Rogers' (1951) sense, mature healthy people experience less conflict between their "selves" (who they are) and their "ideal selves" (who they feel they should be). This conflict-free orientation reflects greater congruence between "self" and "ideal self." Shostrom (1976) says that such congruence is part of a profound inner-directed sense of personal worth. The self-actualizing person experiences himself as a "whole" being, integrating his weaknesses into the totality of his personality. Such congruence allows him to rely on what Rogers calls the "organismic valuing process" to make decisions in life and to grow.
As noted, however, the growth decisions of self-actualizing people are more likely to integrate self-improvement with the improvement of the superordinate systems in which they participate. This is the manifestation of B-values as opposed to D-values. Self-actualizing people integrate the qualities of being who they truly are with being motivated by the improvement or fulfillment of conditions beyond their own skins. Because their experience of environmental relatedness is less structured in terms of the satisfaction of felt personal deficiencies or internal conflicts (D-needs), they are better able to perceive faulty and enriching relationship patterns in their superordinate systems. They are better able to experience the joy of union when these relationship patterns are enriching, and to experience the sting of pain, compassion, and even outrage, when relationship patterns are inadequate for the needs of all system parts. The enrichment of superordinate relationship patterns - called systems-actualization - constitutes the metamotivation of self-actualizing people.

In the next few pages I will present an elaboration of how Maslow’s concept of self-actualization can be presented in systems-hierarchical terms. I will do this by juxtaposing his description of self-actualization with the theory and techniques of community laboratory learning programs directed by Don Glad (Glad, et al, 1977; Glad, et al, 1977). The reasons for presenting self-actualization in this way will become more evident later. Suffice it to say now that these community programs were motivated by systemic and holistic conceptions of personal, interpersonal, and community functioning. They therefore offer a framework within which to view a systemic holistic conception
of self-actualization in action. The previous discussion of Maslow's ideas will be incorporated in the light of this juxtaposition. At this point, however, it is necessary to describe somewhat the philosophy and the activities of these community programs.

Intercultural Community Programs

These programs were conducted over a period of five years in Baton Rouge and other Louisiana communities. They began as the result of interracial tension in Baton Rouge. Therefore, as the programs progressed, one of their dominant themes became the establishment of interracial equity in various Louisiana communities and schools.

From the beginning, these programs adopted a systemic perspective of intercultural change. This perspective was seen in: (a) The emphasis on patterns of relationship among different elements of the Baton Rouge community. It was suggested that the racial problems existent in Louisiana communities could be tackled by highlighting the way people of different races related to each other - both interpersonally and at group and community levels. The intention backing this approach was that by highlighting interpersonal relationship patterns, changes could be made in those patterns which might bring about a more open and satisfying community system for members of all races. (b) The adoption of a systems hierarchical perspective of personal, group, and community change. The hierarchy was usually approached as follows:

Community
Inter-group
Group
In most cases, the programs placed the emphasis on change at the superordinate levels of "interpersonal" through "community." It was stressed that personal change might occur during these encounters, but it was encouraged that such change be in the direction of enhancing interpersonal, group, and/or community processes in which the individual was participating.

Utilizing this twofold systems purpose, the overall intention for participants in these programs was as follows: (a) By involving themselves experientially and analytically in personal relationships with others, participants were encouraged to learn about their own contributions to faulty or enriching interracial relationships. They might learn how their behavior was affecting others and how their own prejudices were affecting their perception of others. The usual format for these interpersonal and intercultural encounters was a weekend laboratory held at a site some distance away from the community in which participants lived. Some of the techniques used in these labs will be mentioned shortly. (b) Participants were also encouraged to learn some of the processes that underly faulty and enriching interpersonal, group, and community relationships. Individuals were expected to apply these learnings in their back-home groups, and to serve as consultants to other community groups on the issues of highlighting and changing interpersonal relationships. Those participants who conducted themselves in this way came to be called FACS (Facilitators of Action in the Community). Some of them became involved with other community programs which were direct spin-offs of the original programs. (c) Participants might become involved in
actually confronting real problems in the community. Some lab programs were set up to surface problems in the community and to devise strategies for dealing with them. These strategies sometimes included the facilitation of relationships or the opening of channels of communication. At other times, the discovery and sharing of new community resources or sources of power in the community might be discussed. Sometimes intervention strategies were devised for problems which existed in the community. In terms of the systems hierarchy, such programs focused on the level of community as the point where efforts at change would be directed.

As mentioned, the usual format in these community programs was to have labs over a three-day weekend designed to focus on some aspect of interpersonal, group, or community change processes. Many of the techniques used in the labs are designed to focus on relationship patterns among the participants. They often include ways that a participant may learn more about his or her part in these relationships. An outstanding example is the lab notion of "feedback." It denotes a process whereby individuals exchange information concerning each other's behavior in groups, information largely based on their personal reactions to each other. During the process of learning about and practicing feedback, it is stressed that effective communication is two-way communication. It entails giving honest, spontaneous information about one's environment, and the acceptance of information from others about oneself. This allows one to influence the process of groups and to be influenced by that process as well. Guidelines are sometimes illustrated for the effective giving and receiving of feedback.
Examples of the former are that (a) we avoid using words which 
judge the other person, such as "You only care about yourself" or 
"You don't know what you're talking about." (b) Instead, we express 
\[ 1 \] our feelings about \( 2 \) the person's behavior. In the latter 
case it is important to be specific. Examples of this guideline are 
"I get irritated when you change the topic everytime I say something" 
or "I felt very warm toward you when you were speaking about your 
experiences in school. I too have shared these experiences."
(c) Give the feedback on time when the behavior and our responses 
to it are occurring. If the feedback is given too far after the 
relevant behavior it is apt to have less impact for the one receiv-
ing it.

Guidelines for accepting feedback are just as important. They 
stress that we take an attitude of learning about ourselves in the 
feedback process; that we adopt an attitude of listening to what 
the other person is saying. Listening entails not only hearing the 
words but putting oneself in the other person's shoes - really 
trying to understand what he is thinking and feeling; that we main-
tain personal responsibility for acting on the feedback given. We 
are often likely to feel defensive while applying the first two 
guidelines. Learning to develop objectivity with respect to per-
sonal feedback is not always easy. It is important to remember 
that feedback consists of the personal responses of others to one's 
behavior. It is not a mandate for change. The ultimate decider of 
who will change his behavior is the individual himself. This is a 
guideline also applied to the giving of feedback. It is important 
we remember to allow freedom of change or no-change to each
individual as regards his own behavior.

Such guidelines are intended to foster a quality I call "interpersonal sensitivity." It entails awareness and sharing of one's own feelings, and openness to the feelings of others, while simultaneously accepting responsibility for one's own feelings and actions.

On the side of giving feedback, the guidelines stress that each individual accept responsibility for his own feelings. Other people do not make us feel a certain way. Our feelings are related to the behavior of others but not caused by them. When we view our reactions to others in this way, we may be less likely to judge or blame. On the side of receiving feedback, the guidelines stress that individuals decide for themselves whether or not they will change certain behaviors which are the object of feedback. Accepting feedback and changing behavior are not identical. One can deeply understand another's point of view while continuing to hold a different point of view which one thinks is right for oneself. The individual is encouraged to have the same attitude with respect to others. While giving feedback he should know that others retain the right to change or not change their behavior.

The feedback emphasis in labs is intended to teach participants that they are parts of interpersonally interdependent systems larger than themselves. It is intended to point the way to more effective interpersonal behavior and hence to the betterment of the social system in which we all participate. The communication process is seen as a unitary event in which one is participating with others simultaneously as subjects and objects, hence the emphasis on learning to both give and receive effective feedback.
I used the term "systems awareness" to refer to the individual's increasing awareness of the superordinate systems in which he participates. The process of enhancing interpersonal sensitivity is also intended to enhance systems awareness. Another way of attempting to apply systems awareness in the lab programs was to encourage participants to give feedback on the group processes in which they were engaged. Participants often gave their impressions of how their groups were conducting business, and their degree of satisfaction with it. This procedure was generally called "process review." It was often supplemented with brief lectures and instruments designed to highlight various aspects of group functioning; such as leadership styles, decision-making processes, and interpersonal styles which frequently appear in groups. It thus became possible for people to (a) learn about their predominant roles in groups, (b) experiment with different roles and thus increase their flexibility and effectiveness in groups - people sometimes discover leadership resources of which they were previously unaware, (c) learn about various aspects of group process while treating the group as a holistic unit of behavior. Note that this approach allows one to learn how to identify group processes while also learning about one's own style of participating in groups. The ultimate intention was to have participants recognize and express untapped resources within themselves and learn to manage groups more effectively.

Moving up the community hierarchy to the inter-group level, other types of lab techniques stressed relationship patterns among groups. Simulated decision-making games have been devised which require different degrees of cooperation or competition among groups.
The application of feedback procedures to these exercises gives opportunities to review relationship patterns across groups. Since intercultural equity was the focus of many labs, they often dealt with resolution of conflicts between the races. Simulated racial conflicts were sometimes used to examine this issue. However, actual racial conflicts sometimes occurred in the labs, as when a large group of black people temporarily walked out of one lab. Such occurrences were chaotic and painful for some, but nonetheless gave participants the chance to deal with actual conflicts in a laboratory setting.

The reader will note that the laboratory rationale for sharing information, and generating new kinds of information, is similar to the systems notion of Communication Patterns discussed previously. Particular kinds of structured relationships are determined in part by the kinds of communication that are taking place among the relating components of the system. The feedback and process review procedures are intended to open up channels of communication that might otherwise be blocked by systems processes at all levels - from personal to community. When we concentrate on personal feedback and the facilitation of interpersonal processes, we are automatically working to develop more effective groups. When we concentrate at the level of developing more open systems-effective group processes we are automatically working to facilitate interpersonal relationships. The direction of these changes is based on the assumption that open channels of communication from all system parts provide a more fully integrated system more responsive to the needs of all its components.

If the relating components of any system are adequately sharing
appropriate information with each other and with the environment, the system is probably operating at an optimal level. Such a system is more likely to be responsive to the needs of all its components.

I summarize the intention of these community programs as promoting "systems actualization." I feel the term adequately describes the interpersonal systemic perspective of the programs and the emphasis on constructive facilitation of systems processes along the community hierarchy. There have been three major programs which placed different emphasis on the facilitation of systems processes in various Louisiana communities. The first two programs were called the Human Resources Group of Baton Rouge (HRGBR) and the Louisiana Community Laboratory Learning Institute (LCLLI). In fact, these programs actually became part of each other because the community-lab inspiration of the Baton Rouge group was later extended to other Louisiana communities via LCLLI. These programs placed most emphasis on the types of lab activities already discussed: concentration on feedback, process review, and the development of skills to facilitate group processes in the community.

A third program evolved from these beginnings. Partly because of concern that these programs were becoming too lab oriented, this latest program focused specifically on solving problems in the community. It extended the level of intervention in the community hierarchy to the community level itself. The main thrust was that significant sources of a community's problems can be located in its ecology - the various cultural and social mores which help define and establish the patterns of relationship among members of a community. The relationship patterns reflect the structure of that
community. Some of these structured patterns are equitable and some are not. Some are clearly visible to community members and some are not. This program was named the Social Ecology Equity Change Quest (SEECQ) to reflect the emphasis on the ecology as a level of intervention for community change.

The general procedure used in SEECQ was as follows. Groups of people were organized into separate Task Forces. It was suggested that a community problem-solving approach be adopted in each Task Force. This approach started with a period of exploration in which Task Force members might bring up problems they wanted resolved in the community. There followed a period of discovery in which the group might synthesize their ideas into one problem area which expressed the concerns of all group members. From this point the group might become identified around this problem area. The next step would be to devise strategies for dealing with problems within the problem area. This phase often included a weekend lab at which people would discuss various strategies for dealing with these problems. The labs were also often used to gather information about resources available for solving the problems and to find ways of developing new resources. After the labs, the Task Forces were encouraged to apply the strategies in the community and to continue to develop alternate strategies and resources as needed. This period of follow-up was deemed crucial to the success of the Task Forces. Follow-up meetings occurred after every lab, often for months afterward, as members reviewed their commitments and assessed their progress.

It is worth noting that many of the FACS from the LCLLI program
applied their skills to the facilitation of SEECQ. In general the programs reflect a sweep along the community hierarchy from personal interpersonal, group, and intergroup intervention levels to SEECQ's stress on the community's ecology. In all programs there was explicit emphasis on the individual's response to the superordinate systems in which he participated. This emphasis justifies the term "systems actualization" as describing the labs' overall purpose. It is also consistent with the discussion of metamotivation and B-values discussed earlier.

This link between the purposes of the community programs and self-actualization is further elaborated by juxtaposing the community hierarchy and Maslow's need hierarchy. It helps to show how the concept of "personal need" fits in with a self-environment systemic view as compared with the notion of "drives," which best fits an atomistic perspective. The drive concept implies some physiological force impelling an organism to act. It is therefore reductionistic in nature. It describes an aspect of the organism's functioning which is separate from the organism, acts according to its own laws, and determines actions by the organism.

"Needs," on the other hand, in this case explained by Goldstein (1940), are "tendencies corresponding to the capacities and the nature of the organism, and to the environment in which the organism is living at the time." The organism has certain capacities that have the potential for fulfillment in relation with the environment. Therefore, the organism has the "need" to actualize this potential. Needs are understood as being part of the capacities of the organism, not some biomechanism which mercilessly impels the organism
to perform certain acts. The experience of these needs as expressions of inborn capacities helps us to "experience ourselves as active personalities...not passively impelled by drives that are felt to conflict with (be separate from?) the personality (Goldstein, 1940)."

It seems reasonable to conclude from this premise that needs felt as capacities allow one the experience of active interconnection with the environment, allowing one to feel and express the mutual interdependent relations. In this way, the above phrase would be changed to read,"...needs felt as capacities for relationship with the environment..." We thus have a way of explaining drives in terms of the individual's felt potential to relate in mutual, meaningful, and fulfilling ways with his environment.

Maslow's need-hierarchy looks like this:

- Self-Actualization
- Esteem
- Belonging and Love
- Safety
- Physiological

When the need-hierarchy, representing individual need-capacities, and the community-hierarchy are combined they are intended to represent different expressions of the same levels of self-environmental growth. One system represents the internal need-capacities of the individual, and the other system represents the external social arrangements that a fully functioning person must "come to terms with." We can use the two systemic hierarchies isomorphically to show that self-actualization is not a process which occurs just "inside" the individual, irrespective of his environmental relatedness, but which manifests a unitary systemic relation between the internal need-capacities of the individual and the developing
community of which he is part. Maslow (1971) says that, "...basic human needs must be fulfilled only by and through other human beings, i.e., society...humanness and specieshood in the infant is only a potentiality and must be actualized by the society."

Juxtaposition of Maslow's Need Hierarchy and the Community Hierarchy

The gradual growth of the individual in terms of the two juxtaposed hierarchies is discussed as follows. It should be stressed that this developmental isomorphy is intended primarily as a heuristic and that the developmental periods are conceived as overlapping to a great extent.

Physiological - Personal: Infancy is the time of life when the physiological needs are most ascendant. The basic bodily needs for food, sleep, and stimulation are dominant. The infant's felt relatedness with his world is relatively minimal and is dependent on the excitement and cessation of physiological processes. As he grows and develops motor skills the baby learns to satisfy his own physiological needs more and more, for example holding his own bottle of milk. Thus, as the individual develops skills associated with the satisfaction of his needs, we say he is developing capacities while also learning to fulfill them through interaction with his environment. This is what is meant by the hyphenated term need-capacities. This fulfillment of need-capacities is repeated at more complex levels of organism-environmental interaction as the individual continues to mature. As we shall see, the higher levels include wider ranges of integrated social involvement.
Safety - Interpersonal/Group: Safety needs become paramount at a
time in life when the child is beginning to experience himself as a
self-conscious being, distinctly separate from others, yet much
weaker than most of the other beings he encounters. Gradually the
child, through his ever widening explorations and returns to the safety
of the parents, learns to feel secure without the constant presence
of his parents. At this point the child's social adjustment is pri-
marily diadic, consisting of a relationship between himself and his
parents.

This level is linked to the previous level because the need for
security includes fears of personal destruction if one is abandoned for
any length of time by the principal guardian figures. It includes
the following level because interpersonal relationships gradually
achieve a stability and regularity which enable us to label them as
groups. Interpersonal relationships gradually merge into a sense
of group belongingness inside the home and outside of it.

Belonging and Love - Group/Intergroup: At this level the need-
capacities for acceptance, warmth, affection, and approval are mani-
fest. This level consists of two phases: one extending from the
previous level to what Freud called the latency stage, the second
 corresponding to puberty and adolescence.

During the first phase the individual gradually becomes aware
that he is a part of the family, that he has a place there. He
relies heavily on this core group for the satisfaction of this level's
manifest need-capacities. He is also learning to give warmth, affec-
tion, and approval to other family members. At the same time, his
interpersonal relationships outside the home are becoming more frequent and more stable. He is learning to rely on extra-family peer groups for additional satisfaction of belonging needs. Much of his identity becomes centered around his participation in the family and extra-family groups. He gradually learns the behaviors of cooperation and sharing in play groups, as well as the assertion of his desires in relation to others in these groups. He is learning to play various roles in groups inside the home and out. Outside the home these are often same-sex groups.

In the second phase there is usually full awakening of sexual interest. The individual still relies on groups for the satisfaction of belonging needs, but he is now feeling more pressures to interact with groups to which he does not belong. The groups from the preceding phase no longer satisfy all belonging needs. This preliminary enlargement to an intergroup level could be described as primarily inter-sexual. Intersexual encounters begin to generate new patterns of social relationships, and individuals may gradually become members of groups based on these new patterns which are different from groups of the previous phase.

This is a time of transition and uncertainty for most people. Individuals usually experience powerful needs for approval and acceptance from their peers and from the opposite sex. The problems of self-identity, sexual expression, and the establishment of new group loyalties are pressing. The questions of mutual expression of love beyond the immediate family and the establishment of one's own family loom on the horizon. The full development and expression of need-capacities (which means giving as well as receiving)
like love, warmth and affection are crucial from both a personal and species point of view. They help insure that the coming young will have their lower hierarchical needs fulfilled with the parents.

Besides intersexual involvement, the individual also becomes involved with groups during this phase that are closely linked in cooperation and competition with other groups. Examples are the high school debate team and the slum gang. The individual is learning to be a functioning member of different types of groups. He learns the satisfaction of belonging through group membership, and learns to represent his group to other similar groups comprised of different individuals.

**Esteem - Intergroup/Community:** I see this level of the systemic hierarchies as an extension of the previous level. The difference between the two levels is that at the community level inter-group relationships are more directly related to community services. The influence of one's vocation, for example, extends to people and groups in various segments of community life. At the preceding level, the individual's intergroup relationships are mainly concentrated in his school and neighborhood. The Intergroup/Community level includes that time of life when one has begun serving a vocation. The influence of groups at this level are usually intended to be community-wide. Many individuals are now seen as working members of the total community. Esteem needs are ascendant as one becomes identified with certain groups, even at the preceding level. The individual competes with others as he struggles to find his place in the world separate from his immediate family. If all has gone well up to this point, he will have a solid foundation for establishing his
status as a valuable, contributing member of his community. The choice of vocation is a major route to seeking status, probably because cultures identify them with judgments about how well one is "making it" in the community.

Most of us continue our active affiliation with groups (vocational, political, or otherwise) as a way of continuing to gain status or to satisfy other need-capacities farther down the need hierarchy. Our interactions with other people remain segmented through our affiliation with certain groups. Very few people, therefore, transcend an intergroup level of functioning. This is so even though normal adult adjustments include vocations and other group affiliations which have direct impact on various aspects of community life. These various aspects remain more or less segmented from one another in the minds of community people. One of the reasons for this segmentation is the individual's continuing affiliation with groups in order to fulfill esteem. If this is the only motivation, chief interest remains focussed on personal rewards or satisfactions. The individual has less interest in the welfare of his superordinate community. Another reason is that the group segmentation often has cultural sanction. Some community groups are traditionally opposed to each other, such as Republicans vs. Democrats or Union vs. Management. This type of intergroup community functioning seems to be based on the assumption that members of opposing groups forcefully advocating their own positions results in a balance or compromise for the good of the community. This system has worked well over the years. To a large extent, however, the opposition means that many community groups interact as fostering the needs of their own
members as over against other groups, rather than directing their efforts with a view to the needs of all groups in the community, whether they state their goals as being community-wide or not.

Even though community action patterns are conceived as often being segmented, conflicting, and self-serving it is possible to view group interactions at the higher systemic level of community. In this light the intergroup conflicts, both formal and informal, are seen to represent an overall structured pattern of community relationships. The interaction channels - for example, patterns of communication, power, and influence among groups - tend to relative stability and maintain the structural integrity of community relationship patterns over time. This is necessary in order to maintain ordered community functioning. In the same fashion as the notion of "responsibility" discussed earlier, community members are in mutual relation whether or not they are aware of their relationships. Their style of relating has specific effects for the structure of the overall patterns of which they are part.

Self-Actualization - Community: At this level we are dealing with an integral part of the hierarchy, but a part which is nonetheless fundamentally different from the lower system levels. The discussion of what this difference implies constitutes a summary of what has previously been written in the Introduction about self-actualization.

The phenomenon of transcendence helps us understand this level of functioning. In fact the ability to transcend the "false" self-environment dichotomy may be the need-capacity most characteristic of self-actualization. As previously noted, Maslow speaks of a
"transcendence of ego-centering" and an affirmative harmonious response to the "demands" of one's environment. In Angyal's sense the individual perceives and experiences his part in the unitary processes of the biosphere. He experiences himself as a part of his environment, not apart from it. This awareness allows him to transcend purely selfish needs. He achieves metamotivation which is manifested by his concern for the needs of the superordinate systems of which he is part.

In terms of the community-need hierarchy, the individual no longer bases his community-oriented actions solely on satisfying the needs of his own group or for gaining respect for himself. His actions are based on satisfying the needs of the entire system or community. Sometimes this motivation takes the form of acting for a more equitable community. At other times it may take the form of working on ideas or projects which may eventually benefit the community as a whole - all members of the community.

One important quality that is characteristic of this level is that the individual is more likely to perceive the reactions and feelings of community group members as they are, not merely in terms of rewards or threats they represent to groups to which he belongs. Since he is less motivated by D-needs he desires less from others for himself. Therefore, he is more likely to perceive others as they are without the filters of his own fears and desires projecting onto them.

The above quality also implies that the individual values others' ideas and feelings as important, including their impressions of him. He sees such impressions as vital information regarding the impact of his relatedness to others. Yet, at the same time, he retains freedom of
choice regarding his values and behavior. They remain intrinsically motivated. He is aware of his responses to his environment and the environment's response to him. This "duality" is experienced as one process. The individual is aware of his unique integrity as an individual and his participation in a larger order simultaneously. He feels that his existence and his integrity are achieved through his relatedness with others and that he best contributes to the effective organization of the levels of which he is part when he accepts full responsibility for his values and behavior. He faces us with the paradox of a person who is intrinsically motivated and metamotivated at the same time. The values by which he orders and gives meaning to his life are more likely to manifest the systemic, holistic, and integrative qualities of the B-values. He is apt to be an individual who is sensitive and responsive both to his own needs and to the needs of his world. As Shostrom (1967) says, "[The self-actualizer] doesn't look upon other people as objects, but 'touches' them, at the same time retaining and enhancing his own selfhood."

**Empirical Evaluation of the Community and Self-Actualization Perspectives**

Generating empirical research about the processes and outcomes of the community-lab programs was considered a vital part of the overall business of feedback and process-review. Many different surveys and studies were undertaken, some more formally organized than others. The more formal studies included six different factor analyses using questionnaire items created by program staff
and participants. Most of the questionnaire items were used throughout all six analyses.

The original study, by Glad and Busch (1974), dealt with LCLLI. A subsequent study by Goldfeder (1975) partially dealt with a comparison between LCLLI and SEECQ. The third study (Ryan, 1976) included four factor analyses using SEECQ participants. One analysis consisted of responses to the questionnaire before labs and three analyses included responses at different intervals after the labs.

These analyses generated factors labelled "perceptions of personal change in the community." For the purpose of this study, they will also be construed as more or less representing the goals and activities of the laboratory programs. Some of these goals are summarized as "systems actualization" - the promotion of openness and equity in the ecological system of the Baton Rouge community.

The Factors obtained from Ryan's pre-lab analysis were selected to represent the goals and activities of the SEECQ program. The Factors from Ryan's study were chosen because they were obtained more recently than the Factors from the other studies. Ryan's pre-lab factor analysis was chosen because this factor structure was generated with an N of 170, whereas his post-lab analyses were generated with Ns of half that number. The larger N indicates a more stable factor structure, and allowed a larger sample from which to draw current measures for the purpose of post vs. present comparisons of program participants.

Of the ten factors generated in Ryan's pre-lab analysis, seven were selected for use in this study on the basis of their having been repeated at least once in the five other factor analyses.
mentioned. This ensures that the factors used herein have some further demonstrated stability. The seven factors are listed in Table 1.

All seven Factors are thought to represent important dimensions of the participants' perceptions of their participation in SEECQ. However, of these seven Factors, the author selected three he felt most represented the systems actualization purpose of the SEECQ program. This selection was made on the basis of the composition of the Factors themselves. The combined meaning of these three Factors represent three aspects of systems actualization. Factor C represents positive aspects of "interpersonal sensitivity" and "systems awareness." Factor B represents negative components of these concepts. Factor A represents particular ways that these actualizing tendencies are put into action. These strategies, of course, are consistent with an important overall intention of the SEECQ program - working with people from different parts of the community to enhance intercultural equity for all Baton Rouge citizens. The meaning of these three Factors is a specific description of the system-actualizing purpose of SEECQ. These Factors are intended to be empirical representations of the dimensions which can be used to differentiate participants in terms of those who are high systems actualizers and those who are low systems actualizers. (It should be understood, of course, that such groups be considered "high" and "low" only in relation to each other.)

We thus decided to use the SEECQ Factors as measures of participation in the SEECQ program. Having decided on which measures to use, we divided the overall design of this research into three phases.
Table 1
Seven Factors Derived from the SEECQ Pre-Lab Factor Analysis
(from Ryan, 1976)

*Factor A: Interpersonal Involvement and Community Problem Solving 
Skills Contributing to Involvement in Community Develop- 
ment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my use of laboratory learning methods in community problem solving</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my participation in political and community groups</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my use of cross-cultural support systems as an aid to community understanding</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my participation in programs of legitimate interest to both races so that their natural separation would be reduced</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my ability and willingness to play a variety of group roles</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my working towards equity for all cultural groups in a community</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my involvement in developing new political and community groups and organizations</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my ability to see where others are at</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor B: Use of Social-Ecological Barriers and Peer Support Aiding 
One's Cultural Identity and Blocking Intercultural Exchange

my tendency to accept the symbols of my "in-group" and reject the symbols of all "out-groups" .76

*Signs of the loadings on Factor A and Factor C are reversed from Ryan's (1976) analysis. The signs are reversed from (-) to (+) to indicate the positive systems actualizing nature of the items comprising these Factors.
Table 1 (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my use of false impressions based on racial stereotypes</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer pressures limiting my efforts to effect reduction of inequities among races</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my being resistant to change</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my participation in the formation of black service clubs and organizations to keep out the &quot;lily white&quot;</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my communication with other racial groups being cut off by fear, apathy, ignorance, and hopelessness</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor C: Self-Other Awareness Associated with Involvement in Community Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my ability to communicate with others</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my willingness to work with others to solve community problems</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my willingness to relate to people whose values and beliefs are extremely different from my own</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my placing value on gut level communication between persons as a means of solving community problems</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my sense of who I am and where I am going</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my willingness to let others know where I'm at</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my awareness of my feelings</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my sense of being part of a community</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my awareness of my own prejudices</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor D: System Frustration Facilitating Innovative Group Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my frustration with the system</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my satisfaction in being a member of a group</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my willingness to set aside the rules when they seem to block group or community goals</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor E: Fear of the Reaction of Others and Personal Risk Leading to Community Non-Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my awareness of how others see me</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear of the outcome of change in terms of my own risk and the risk of what is closest to me as a strong motivating force to personal inaction in the community</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my reliance on the community's leaders for solutions to community problems</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor F: Willingness to Examine and Confront Inequities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my willingness to use confrontation and conflict in bringing about social change</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my willingness to question established beliefs and practices</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my awareness of the tendency of the power structure to be only in the hands of whites</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor G: Increased Intercultural Resources and Understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the number of friends or acquaintances that I have in other cultural groups expanding</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my understanding of different cultural groups</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first phase involved looking at the SEECQ program itself. We wanted to determine if this community program had measurable effects on the participants during the two to three years since the first SEECQ Factor measurements were derived. We decided to use participants' factor scores on the seven SEECQ Factors as the measures to determine if any effects had occurred. The second phase of the research focussed directly on the systemic conception of self-actualization adopted in this dissertation. We decided to divide the SEECQ participants into high and low system actualizers, again using SEECQ Factor scores as the basis of measurement. These systems actualizers (systems actualization being a major goal of the SEECQ program) would be compared on a standard measure of self-actualization. If the high systems actualizers scored higher on this measure of self-actualization, we would have some basis for saying that working to fulfill one's superordinate systems is related to fulfillment of self. The third phase of the research also focussed on personality characteristics of the participants. Because both the community programs and the systemic self-actualization conception are interpersonal in nature, we wanted to look at the participants' patterns of relationship with others. Once again using the Factors as a basis for measurement, we decided to ask participants to rate their perceptions of some significant others in their lives. We also asked participants to rate themselves in terms of their "ideal self." We then compared participants' self ratings with their perceptions of others to determine how they perceived themselves in relation to their significant others. This phase generated measures for self-significant other and self-ideal self congruence.
Factor scores on the seven SEECQ factors were used as a basis of measurement throughout all three research phases, and all factors were considered important dimensions of participation in the community program. However, since systems actualization was singled out as a central concept in the self-actualization conception and the SEECQ program, it was decided to restrict hypotheses in all phases of the research to those factors chosen as the clearest indicators of systems actualization.

The following questions followed from the above research considerations:

(1) Have the SEECQ participants increased in their manifestation of the goals and activities of the SEECQ program?

(2) Does a major purpose of the SEECQ program, summarized by the term "system actualization," bear any relationship to a standard measure of self-actualization? More specifically, do high systems actualizers, as determined by SEECQ factors, score higher on these measures than do low systems actualizers?

The self-actualization measure referred to is Shostrom's (1966) Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). It is by far the most used "objective" measure of self-actualization. Many validity studies have been conducted, including McClain (1970), Crossck (1966), Drenn (1969), Stewart and Webster (1970), Shostrom (1964), Fox, Knapp, and Michael (1968), and Shostrom (1966). The items and scales of the POI seem more directed to qualities of the self rather than the self's relationship with superordinate systems. However, at least one study (Margulies, 1969) suggests that high POI scores are related to persons' attitudes about their working situations. Self-actualization
was associated with a greater degree of involvement with one's job and one's job complex; the environment in which one works. Furthermore, the norms which were valued in job complexes considered more actualizing were: (a) consideration of others' feelings, (b) improvement of work, (c) achieving group goals, (d) sharing in the training of co-workers, (e) assisting others. Norms in the least actualizing job complexes put greater emphasis on authority and were "protective, insulative measures rather than freeing, expanding ones." This dissertation attempts to test the relationship between the interpersonal systemic goals of SEERQ and POI measures.

(3) Finally, we wanted to explore possible differences between high and low systems actualizers in terms of their perceptions of their relationships with significant others. More specifically, we measured the degree of congruence participants perceived between themselves and the significant others.

The significant others can be divided into two separate categories: (a) father and mother, (b) internalized and externalized ideals. The internalized ideal is the "ideal self." The externalized ideal is represented by the participants' perceptions of an "exceptional person" known to them.

We asked, then: (a) Do high systems actualizers have different patterns of self-significant other congruence than do low systems actualizers? (b) Does the variable of sex have any effect on these differences? Besides there being possible differences in patterns of congruence related to high or low systems actualization, there may be some differences in these patterns more related to sex. If so, it would be interesting to discover what these patterns are.
Discernible patterns of sex differences could lead to speculations about the different ways that males and females perceive themselves in relation to significant others. We could expect, for example, that males perceive themselves as more like their fathers than do females, and that females perceive themselves to be more like their mothers than do males. Other patterns may emerge in the "ideal self" and "exceptional person" categories. We would then attempt to understand these patterns in the light of the sex variable's relationship to systems actualization. This aspect of the study is more exploratory in nature than the other aspects.

There are two general ways of incorporating possible sex differences into our understanding of systems actualization: (a) We may find that self-significant other congruence is more related to sex than high or low systems actualization. (b) We may find that sex influences the effects of high or low systems actualization on self-significant other congruence. For example, I expect the high systems actualizer group to show a higher degree of self-ideal self congruence. However, we may find that females in this group show a higher degree of congruence than do males.
**METHOD**

**Subjects**

Participants were drawn from people who participated in Social Ecology Equity Change Quest from 1974 to 1975. Of the 285 people who participated in SEECQ, approximately 125 were contacted. Eighty-one (81) of those who were contacted satisfactorily completed questionnaires and were included in the research.

**Materials**

Three questionnaires were used. The questionnaires were: (a) The Community Questionnaire I (CQI). This is the same questionnaire used by Ryan (1976) to obtain the seven pre-lab factors used in this study. (b) The Community Questionnaire II (CQII). This questionnaire is divided into three parts, each part containing the same items that make up CQI: (1) In the first part, participants rate their fathers and their mothers. (2) In the second part, they rate the items on their "ideal self." (3) In the third part, they rate an "exceptional person" with whom they are familiar. (c) The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). This questionnaire is a widely-used twelve-scale "measurement" of self-actualizing personality dimensions.

A ranking form was also used. It was distributed to sixteen (16) professionals in the area of personal and societal health and growth. These professionals consisted of psychologists, sociologists, ministers, and social workers. One part of the ranking form is a systems actualization description of the purposes of the SEECQ program. It is entitled "An Interpersonal Description of the Concept"
'Self-Actualization'." Attached to the description is a list of the seven SEECQ factors used in this study. The professionals were asked to rank the seven factors from the most to the least actualizing in terms of the systems actualization description. A measure of inter-rater reliability would then give some indication that the SEECQ factors, particularly Factors A, B, and C, can be understood by other professionals in the context of the author's description of systems actualization. The CQI - CQII questionnaires and the ranking form are reprinted (with modifications dictated by dissertation binding requirements) in Appendix A.

Procedure

Lists of SEECQ participants were obtained. Whenever possible, participants were contacted by telephone. The author introduced himself in the following way:

"My name is Hank Lagarde. I am a graduate student at LSU, working on my doctorate in Clinical Psychology. Over the past few years I have worked with Don Glad in a number of community programs. I am now conducting some research into one of these programs - the SEECQ program. I have been getting in touch with as many people as possible who participated in SEECQ. Do you have a few moments so I can tell you more about it?"

"I would ask you to answer three questionnaires, which will take you between one and one-and-a-half hours to complete. I have a room available at the Methodist-Presbyterian Student Center near the LSU campus. I ask that we set aside a two hour block of time that would be convenient for you on any day, Thursday through Sunday. Would you be willing to participate in this research project?"
At this point, most participants assented; and we set up an appointment. Occasionally, people said they would be unable to make appointments. We therefore arranged that the materials be mailed to them with a return, self-addressed stamped envelope.

The vast majority of people asked about the questionnaires and the research. They were answered in a way similar to the following:

"One of the questionnaires is the same one you completed when you participated in SEECQ about two years ago. Another questionnaire has the same items, but we ask that, instead of rating yourself, you rate people you know well. The other one is a personality questionnaire which gets at personality from the viewpoint of values that people have about different things. The research is intended to learn something about the kind of people who participate in programs like SEECQ. Hopefully we can contribute some knowledge about such programs which can help improve them in the future."

Less than half of the people who made appointments kept them. Attempts were made to recontact them, but this process became increasingly slow and difficult. It was therefore decided that everyone be offered the option of having the questionnaires mailed to them with a return, self-addressed stamped envelope. Of the seventy-nine packets that were subsequently mailed or delivered, fifty-one were completed and returned. The remaining thirty participants completed the questionnaires at the Methodist-Presbyterian Student Center. The cover letter which accompanied the mailings, and a consent form signed by all participants, are in Appendix 3.

As regards the preparation and distribution of the ranking form, the author rated the seven SEECQ factors in terms of those he perceived
as most representative of systems actualization and those he perceived as least representative. This was seen as a ranking of SEECQ's goals in the light of the systems actualization concept. Factor C and Factor A were seen as the most and second most actualizing factors respectively. Factor B was seen as the least actualizing one. The author then wrote the brief description of SEECQ's goals, entitled: "An Interpersonal Description of the Concept 'Self Actualization'." The description was based on his ranking of the Factors. It includes such concepts as "interpersonal sensitivity" and "systems awareness."

The author distributed the ranking form to the various professionals. All psychologists, sociologists, and ministers are associated with LSU. The social workers work at the VA Hospital in New Orleans.

Statistical Analysis

Three types of analysis were used, based on the major questions of the study. The analyses are presented in terms of these questions. Hypotheses are included.

(1) Have participants increased in their manifestation of the purposes of the SEECQ program?

(a) A Repeated Measures Multivariate T-test (Hotelling's $T^2$) was used. It measures overall change of the participants on the seven SEECQ Factors. This change will have occurred from a period prior to participation in a SEECQ lab (Pre-Test) to the present, approximately two to three years later (Post-Test). The actual measures used in the $T^2$ analysis were factor scores of each individual on each of the seven Factors. These factor scores were generated for both Pre-test and Post-test conditions. The factor scores were obtained by multiplying
each participant's questionnaire item raw scores by the scoring coefficient matrix generated in Ryan's (1976) pre-lab factor analysis. This procedure allowed a comparison of Pre-test and Post-test factor scores because both sets of factor scores were derived from the same factor structure, as represented by the scoring coefficient matrix.

A series of seven separate univariate t-tests were also conducted on each of the seven Factors. Hypotheses will be restricted to Factors A, B, and C, since they were chosen as the most important Factors in this study. However, differences on all seven Factors will be interpreted if they occur.

Of the 81 participants, 49 were used in this analysis. These are the participants for whom we have both pre-lab and post-lab (CQI) measures.

(b) Interrater reliability on the systems actualization ranking forms was computed by a coefficient of concordance (Guilford and Fruchter, 1973).

(c) Hypotheses:

Hypothesis I: Participants' factor scores on Factor A will increase.

Hypothesis II: Participants' factor scores on Factor C will increase.

Hypothesis III: Participants' factor scores on Factor B will decrease.

(2) Do high systems actualizers, as determined by SEE factors, score higher than low systems actualizers on a standard measure of self-actualization?
(a) A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used. It measures differences among groups selected on the basis of their factor scores on Factors A, B, and C. The differences among groups are measured in terms of the twelve self-actualization scales of the POI. The MANOVA determines if there is any significant overall differences among groups. In order to determine which, if any, POI scales are contributing to this difference, twelve separate univariate analyses of variance are conducted, one for each scale.

(b) The groups were selected in the following way. Factors A, B, and C, the factors the author feels most represent the program goal of systems actualization, were used to select participants for each of the three groups. The factor scores of all 81 subjects on each of these factors were ranked. Factor A and Factor C are considered the highest actualizing factors. Therefore, the factor scores on both of these factors were ranked from the highest score to the lowest score. Factor B is considered the lowest actualizing factor. Therefore, the factor scores on this factor were ranked from the lowest score to the highest score, the lowest scores being ranked above the higher scores.

After the factor scores were ranked in this way, the rankings were combined to form single rank scores for each individual. These rank scores were used for another ranking of all 81 subjects. For example, if individual x's factor scores rank 10th on Factor A, 3rd on Factor C, and 17th on Factor B, his single rank score would be the addition of these three rankings: 10+3+17=30. Those individuals with rank scores below 30 would be placed above him in the new ranking, and those participants who have rank scores above 30 would be placed below
him. This final ranking is used to select high, medium, and low actualizing groups. Generally speaking, the lower the rank score, the more the participant is said to manifest systems actualization.

The high systems actualizing group \( (SA_{hi}) \) was selected by choosing the 20 participants who have the lowest rank scores. The low systems actualizing group \( (SA_{lo}) \) was selected as the 20 participants who have the lowest rank scores. The medium actualizing group \( (SA_{med}) \) was selected as the 20 participants whose rank scores are in the middle of the ranking. There are ten individuals between the high and medium groups not included in the analysis. There are also eleven individuals between the medium and the low groups who are not included in the analysis.

(c) Two separate MANOVAs were conducted; one with the \( SA_{hi} \) and \( SA_{lo} \) groups, and another including all three groups. This was done to see how highest systems actualizers compare with lowest systems actualizers, and also to see how all subjects compared on these measures. The high-low comparison will be studied first, then supplemented with the comparisons of all three groups. A graph will be drawn comparing the main POI profiles of all three groups.

(d) Hypotheses:

Hypothesis IV: The \( SA_{hi} \) group will score higher on the POI variables than will the \( SA_{lo} \) group.

(3) Do high systems actualizers have different patterns of self-significant other congruence than do low systems actualizers? Does the variable of sex have any effect on these differences?

(a) A series of separate 3 x 2 x 7 analyses of variance were conducted in each of the four congruence categories self-father.
self-mother, self-ideal self, and self-exceptional person. Thus, this $3 \times 2 \times 7$ model was repeated in all four categories. This model was used because "3" is the number of groups (SA_h1, SA_med, SA_lo), "2" is the number of sexes (male and female), and "7" is the number of SEECQ factors.

This model tests for differences among the three groups and the two sexes on each of the seven SEECQ factors. Therefore, seven separate analyses are conducted to determine if any significant differences exist on any of these seven Factors. Each of these separate analyses, one for each factor in the $3 \times 2 \times 7$ model, generates main effect tests for group and sex. It also generates a test for the significance of the group x sex interaction. As noted, this pattern of analysis is repeated four times, once for each of the four congruence categories studied. The model is illustrated in Table 6 on page 87.

(b) The data variables used for the analysis in each of the congruence categories are difference-scores obtained by subtracting self-rating factor scores from significant other factor scores. For example, in the self-father category subject x's self-rating factor score on Factor A was subtracted from subject x's father-rating factor score on the same Factor A. The same procedure was followed for all seven Factors for each subject in the SA_h1, SA_med, and SA_lo groups. Difference scores were generated in the same way in the self-mother, self-ideal self, and self-exceptional person categories. These factor difference scores, then, were the data variable used in the four separate applications of the $3 \times 2 \times 7$ analysis of variance model. The less difference between scores, the more congruence between self-father, self-mother, self-ideal self, and self-exceptional
person ratings is manifested.

The factor scores for each participant's significant other ratings were obtained in a way similar to the one used in the Repeated Measures Multivariate T-test analysis. The CQII raw scores were converted to factor scores using Ryan's scoring coefficient matrix for his pre-lab factor structure. This conversion allowed the self-rating and significant other-ratings to be compared on each of the seven Factors.

One participant in the $SA_{med}$ group and one participant in the $SA_{lo}$ group did not complete the CQII questionnaire. Therefore, $N = 19$ in each of these groups for the self significant other analyses. The number of participants by sex in each of the three groups is as follows. In the $SA_{hi}$ group there are 10 males and 10 females. In the $SA_{med}$ group there are 7 males and 12 females. In the $SA_{lo}$ group there are 9 males and 10 females.

(c) Hypotheses:

Hypothesis V: The $SA_{hi}$ group will score significantly higher on self-ideal self congruence than will the $SA_{lo}$ group on Factor A.

Hypothesis VI: The $SA_{hi}$ group will score higher on self-ideal self congruence than will the $SA_{lo}$ group on Factor B.

Hypothesis VII: The $SA_{hi}$ group will score higher on self-ideal self congruence than will the $SA_{lo}$ group on Factor C.

Hypothesis VIII: The $SA_{hi}$ group will score significantly higher on self-exceptional person congruence than will the $SA_{lo}$ group on Factor A.
Hypothesis IX: The $SA_{hi}$ group will score higher on self-exceptional person congruence than will the $SA_{lo}$ group on Factor B.

Hypothesis X: The $SA_{hi}$ group will score higher on self-exceptional person congruence than will the $SA_{lo}$ group on Factor C.

Hypothesis XI: Males as a group will score significantly higher on self-father congruence than will females as a group.

Hypothesis XII: Females as a group will score higher on self-mother congruence than will males as a group.
RESULTS

The results are presented in terms of the three major analyses: (1) the Repeated Measures Multivariate T-test, (2) the Multivariate Analysis of Variance, and (3) the series of four univariate $3 \times 2 \times 7$ analyses of variance. Significance in every analysis was determined at the .05 level.

(1) The Repeated Measures Hotelling $T^2$ Multivariate T-test was not significant. The obtained $T^2$ value was .296371 with a Rank of 7 and 48 df. The Rank refers to the number of dependent variables, in this case the seven SECCQ Factors. Df are obtained by $N-1$. The value shown in the $T^2$ table for significance at the .05 level with these values is 17.80 (Kramer, 1972). The obtained statistic falls far short of this level of significance.

We must conclude that the first 3 hypotheses are not supported. SECCQ participants used in this analysis manifested no significant change in their factor scores on Factors A, B, and C from the Pre to the Post-Lab conditions.

The results of the seven separate univariate t-tests conducted for each of the seven factors is shown in Table 2. The means and the standard deviations of the differences are shown, along with the corresponding t-values. T-values of 2.014 or 2.014 with 48 df were needed for significance at the .05 level.

Table 2 shows that only the differences on Factor F were significant. The meaning of Factor F is Willingness to Examine and Confront Inequities (see Table 1). The direction of possible change is increase from the Pre to Post-Lab conditions. None of the other
Table 2

Results of Seven Repeated Measures Univariate t-tests for Each of the Seven SEECQ Factors. The **Mean Differences** Reflect the Differences Between Pre-Lab Factor Scores and Post-Lab Factor Scores on Each Factor. **S.D.** = the Standard Deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>*t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-3.96</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t-values must be 2.014 or -2.014 to be significant at the .05 level with 48 df. The t-value for Factor F (underlined) is the only one that is significant.
Factors are very close to significance. Since the $T^2$ was also not significant, this single univariate difference is considered inconclusive.

Two coefficients of concordance ($W$) were computed with the systems actualization ranking form. One $W$ was computed using all 7 Factors and another was computed using only Factors A, B, and C. A chi square distribution is used to determine the significance of obtained $W$'s which use more than seven raters. The obtained $W$ coefficient for the 7 Factor ranking was .88. This $W$ is equivalent to a chi square value of 84.48. Since the value needed for significance with 6 df at the .05 level is 12.592, this value is highly significant. The obtained $W$ for the 3 Factor analysis was equivalent to a Chi square of 666.24 ($W=20.82$), which of course is also highly significant. We can conclude that the interrater reliability on the ranking form is very high.

(2) The MANOVA for two groups - $SA_{h1}$ and $SA_{l0}$ - was significant at the .05 level. The Hotelling-Lawley Trace produced an $F$ of 2.37, which was equivalent to a $p$ of .03. The Pillar's Trace produced an $F$ of 2.37, and the Wilk's Criterion statistic was also significant. These results indicate that there are significant differences between the $SA_{h1}$ and $SA_{l0}$ groups among the twelve POI scales.

Of the 12 univariate analyses of variance conducted to determine where the significant differences were, 7 were significant at the .05 level. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for the two groups on these 7 scales. The Table shows that all of the $SA_{h1}$ means are higher than the $SA_{l0}$ means. The significant scales were Time competence (Tc) ($p=.04$), Inner-directed (I) ($p=.02$), Feeling reactivity (Fr) ($p=.02$), Self-regard (Sr) ($p=.04$), Self-acceptance (Sa) ($p=.02$), Nature of man, constructive (Nc) ($p=.05$), and Acceptance of aggression
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for the $SA_{hi}$ and $SA_{lo}$ Groups on the Seven Significant POI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$SA_{hi}$</th>
<th></th>
<th>$SA_{lo}$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>S. Ds</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>S. Ds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>54.85</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>58.70</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>58.80</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 gives descriptions of these and the other POI scales. The 12 scales are divided into six major categories, each category containing two scales. Scales on which there were significant differences in the two-group analysis are identified by asterisks.

The MANOVA with all three groups - $SA_{hi}$, $SA_{med}$, and $SA_{lo}$ - also was significant. The Hotelling-Lawley Trace produced an F of 1.66, which was equivalent to a p of .046. The Pillar's Trace produced an F of 1.62, equivalent to a p of .05. Wilk's Criterion was also significant at the .05 level, with a value of 36.73. A value 36.40 was needed for significance. The conclusion is that the multivariate analysis is picking up real differences among the three groups on the 12 scales.

Among the 12 univariate analyses of variance conducted to determine which scales were significantly different, two scales were shown to be significant at the .05 level. These scales were $Sa$ and $A$. The $I$ and $Fr$ scales were both very close to significance, having values of .0578 and .0562 respectively. Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations for the three groups on the $Sa$ and $A$ scales. On both scales, the mean follows a progression from $SA_{hi}$ at the highest and $SA_{lo}$ at the lowest.

A further comparison among groups was possible through a graph comparing the mean profiles of all three groups. The graph is shown in Fig. 1. Fig. 1 shows that the height of the POI profile is largely a function of group. The $SA_{hi}$ group profile is, with one exception ($Sy$), higher than the $SA_{med}$ profile. The $SA_{hi}$ profile is uniformly higher than the $SA_{lo}$ profile. The $SA_{med}$ profile slightly overlaps with the $SA_{lo}$ profile on three scales - $To$, $Ex$, and $C$. Generally, the
Table 4

Descriptions of POI Scales (from Shostrom, 1966).
(*) Indicates Scales that Were Significant in Two-Group MANOVA

**Tc** (Time Competence): measures degree to which one is "present" oriented

**Major Scales**

*I* (Inner-directed): measures whether reactivity orientation is basically toward self or others

**SAV** (Self-Actualizing Value): measures affirmation of primary values of self-actualizing persons

**Valuing**

**Ex** (Existentiality): measures ability to situationally or existentially react without rigid adherence to principles

**Feeling**

**Sp** (Spontaneity): measures freedom to react spontaneously or to be oneself

**Self-Perception**

**Sa** (Self-acceptance): measures affirmation or acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses or deficiencies.
Table 4 (cont)

*Nc (Nature of Man, Constructive): measures degree of the constructive view of the nature of man, masculinity, femininity

**Synergistic Awareness**

Sy (Synergy): measures ability to be synergistic, to transcend dichotomies

*A (Acceptance of Aggression): measures ability to accept one's natural aggressiveness as opposed to denial of aggression

**Interpersonal Sensitivity**

C (Capacity for Intimate Contact): measures ability to develop contactful intimate relationships with other human beings
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the $SA_{hi}$, $SA_{med}$, and $SA_{lo}$ Groups on the Two POI Scales Which Were Significant in the Three-Group MANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$SA_{hi}$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$SA_{med}$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$SA_{lo}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S_a$</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>58.80</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>53.95</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Mean POI Scores of the three systems actualizing groups on the twelve POI scales. Scores between 50 and 60 are in the self-actualizing range. See Table 4 for descriptions of the POI Scales.

- high systems actualizers
- medium systems actualizers
- low systems actualizers
pattern of higher systems actualizing groups having higher profiles is clearly illustrated. This pattern is illuminated by noting that Shostrom (1966) considers the score area from "50" to "60" as representing the "self-actualizing range" of POI scores. That is, scores from "50" to "60" are said to represent the range that self-actualizing people are most likely to have upon completing the POI. (In the actual scoring profile, scores do not stop at "60," as they do in Fig. 1.)

When we examine the three groups in this light, we find that 10 of the SA_{hi} group's scale scores fall in the actualizing range, 7 of the SA_{med} group's scores fall within it, and only 3 of the SA_{lo} group's scale scores fall within the actualizing range. This indicates that the higher systems actualizing groups are more likely to have POI profiles similar to the profiles expected of self-actualizing people.

These findings suggest that Hypothesis IV can be accepted. The SA_{hi} group did score higher than the SA_{lo} group on all POI scales, and 7 of these differences were significant. The 2 significant scale differences which emerged in the three-group MANOVA may indicate that these scales (Sa and A) are particularly potent as distinguishing qualities among the three systems actualizing groups.

(3) In this part of the analyses, the results from the four congruence categories - self-ideal self, self-exceptional person, self-father, and self-mother - will be presented one at a time. In each category, there are group main effect tests, sex main effect tests, and tests for group x sex interactions on each of the 7 SESQ Factors. The overall design for a single congruence category is illustrated in
Table 6.

(a) There are 4 significant group main effect differences in the self-ideal self congruence category. The differences occur on Factors A (p=.005), C (p=.01), D (p=.02), and F (p=.04). The meaning of these Factors, as listed in Table 1, are: (1) Factor A - Interpersonal Involvement and Community Problem Solving Skills Contributing to Involvement in Community Development. (2) Factor C - Self-Other Awareness Associated with Involvement in Community Problem Solving. (3) Factor D - System Frustration Facilitating Innovative Group Practices. (4) Factor F - Willingness to Examine and Confront Inequities.

Fig. 2 shows the means for the three systems actualizing groups on Factor A. In this and all subsequent figures, a score of "0" indicates perfect self-significant other congruence. The farther these scores are removed from "0" the less congruence is manifested. Scores above "0" mean that participants rated themselves higher than the ideal self or the significant other. Scores below "0" mean that the significant other or ideal self was rated higher than the self on the Factor in question.

In the case of Fig. 2, we see that the SA^hi and SA^med groups display the same degree of self-ideal self congruence on Factor A. The SA^lo group displays by far the least amount of congruence. Participants in all groups see themselves as being less than their ideal on this Factor. This is particularly true of the SA^lo group.

Fig. 3 shows the self-ideal self difference-scores of the systems actualizing groups on Fac C. The pattern is similar to the one in the previous figure. The SA^hi and SA^med groups display about the same degree of self-ideal self congruence. Their congruence is very
Table 6

A model of the 3 x 2 x 7 Analysis of Variance Used in All Four of the Self-Significant Other Congruence Categories: I = male and F = female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA_{hi}</th>
<th>SA_{med}</th>
<th>SA_{lo}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A
B
C

Factors D
E
F
G
Figure 2. Mean self-ideal self difference scores on Factor A for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-ideal self congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than ideal self-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that ideal self-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/IS = self-ratings higher than ideal self-ratings
IS/S = ideal self-ratings higher than self-ratings
Figure 3. Mean self-ideal self difference scores on Factor C for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-ideal self congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than ideal self-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that ideal self-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/IS = self-ratings higher than ideal self-ratings
IS/S = ideal self-ratings higher than self-ratings
high on this Factor. Participants in the $SA_{10}$ group again display low self-ideal self congruence. They see themselves as manifesting much less of Factor C's quality than they would like.

Fig. 4 shows the difference-scores for the three systems actualizing groups on Factor D. The $SA_{hi}$ group displays very high self-ideal self congruence on this Factor. The $SA_{10}$ group displays very low congruence. The $SA_{med}$ group falls in about the middle. However, participants in the latter group see themselves as manifesting more of the Factor D quality than they would like, while the participants in the $SA_{10}$ group continue to see themselves as manifesting less of the Factor's qualities than they would like.

Fig. 5 shows the self-ideal self difference-scores for the systems actualizing groups on Factor F. The pattern is similar to the one in the previous figure, Fig. 4. The $SA_{hi}$ and $SA_{med}$ groups display high self-ideal self congruence. The latter group continues to see themselves as being slightly more than their ideal. The $SA_{10}$ group again displays much less congruence, and they see themselves as manifesting less of the Factor F quality than is the sort of person they would like to be.

Fig. 6 shows the group x sex interaction on Factor G in the self-ideal self category. Males and females in the $SA_{hi}$ group show identical degrees of congruence on this Factor, and their congruence is very high. Males in the $SA_{med}$ and $SA_{10}$ groups display less self-ideal self congruence than do the females. However, males in the $SA_{med}$ group see themselves as manifesting more of Factor G's quality than is their ideal, and males in the $SA_{10}$ group see themselves as manifesting less of this quality than they would like. The pattern of female perceptions
Figure 4. Mean self-ideal self difference scores on Factor D for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-ideal self congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than ideal self-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that ideal self-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

\[ S/IS = \text{self-ratings higher than ideal self-ratings} \]
\[ IS/S = \text{ideal self-ratings higher than self-ratings} \]
Figure 5. Mean self-ideal self difference scores on Factor F for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-ideal self congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than ideal self-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that ideal self-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/IS = self-ratings higher than ideal self-ratings

IS/S = ideal self-ratings higher than self-ratings
Figure 6. Group x Sex interaction in the self-ideal self category on Factor G. "0" indicates perfect self-ideal self congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than ideal self-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that ideal self-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/IS = self-ratings higher than ideal self-ratings
IS/S = ideal self-ratings higher than self-ratings

--- = males
----- = females
from group to group seems relatively stable because of the low differences from "0." The male pattern fluctuates more widely.

Based on these findings, we can accept Hypothesis V and VII, but not accept Hypothesis VI. The \( S_{h1} \) group did show significantly more self-ideal self congruence than the \( S_{lo} \) group on Factor A and on Factor C. In addition, there were significant group main effect differences on Factor D and Factor F, and a significant group x sex interaction on Factor G. The predicted significant group main effect difference on Factor B did not materialize. Attempts will be made to integrate these and subsequent findings in the discussion.

(b) There was only one significant difference in the self-exceptional person category. The difference was a group main effect on Factor A (\( p = .02 \)). Fig. 7 shows the mean difference-scores on this Factor for the three systems actualizing groups.

The figure shows a progression away from self-exceptional person congruence based on groups. The \( S_{h1} \) group displays very high congruence, and the \( S_{lo} \) group displays very low congruence on Factor A. The \( S_{med} \) group falls almost in the middle. Both the \( S_{med} \) and the \( S_{lo} \) participants see themselves as manifesting less of the Factor A quality than the persons they perceive as exceptional.

Based on these findings, it is possible to accept Hypothesis VIII. Hypotheses IX and X cannot be accepted. The only significant difference in this category suggests that the \( S_{h1} \) group displays more self-exceptional person congruence than does the \( S_{lo} \) group.

(c) There were two significant group main effect differences in the self-father congruence category. The differences were on Factors A (\( p = .05 \)) and B (\( p = .0003 \)). The meaning of Factor A has been
Figure 7. Mean self-exceptional person difference scores on Factor A for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-exceptional person congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than ideal self-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that ideal self-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/EP = self-ratings higher than exceptional person-ratings
EP/S = exceptional person-ratings higher than self-ratings
recently stated. The meaning of Factor B is Use of Social-Ecological Barriers and Peer Support Aiding One's Cultural Identity and Blocking Intercultural Exchange.

Fig. 8 shows the self-father difference-scores for the systems actualizing groups on Factor A. Participants in all groups see themselves as being quite incongruent with their fathers on Factor A. This is shown by the amount of difference of all mean scores from "0." In addition, all groups see themselves as manifesting much more of this Factor's quality than their fathers. This finding is particularly true of the $SA_{hi}$ group participants, who see themselves as manifesting much less self-father congruence than participants in the other two groups.

Fig. 9 shows the self-father difference-scores for the systems actualizing groups on Factor B. The $SA_{med}$ group displays high congruence on this Factor, and the $SA_{hi}$ group displays very low self-father congruence. The $SA_{lo}$ group falls between the latter two groups. Participants in the $SA_{hi}$ group perceive their fathers as manifesting much more of Factor B's quality than they do. Participants in the $SA_{lo}$ group, on the other hand, see themselves as manifesting more of the Factor's quality than their fathers manifest.

There were no significant sex main effect or group x sex interactions in the self-father congruence category.

(d) There were two significant group main effect differences in the self-mother congruence category. These differences were on Factors A ($p=.05$) and B ($p=.0004$). The pattern of the means for the systems actualizing groups on these Factors is similar to the patterns in the self-father category.
Figure 8. Mean self-father difference scores on Factor A for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-father congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than father-ratings.

S/F = self-ratings higher than father-ratings
Figure 9. Mean self-father difference scores on Factor B for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-father congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than father-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that father-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/F = self-rating higher than father-rating
F/S = father-rating higher than self-rating
Fig. 10 shows the self-mother difference-scores on Factor A for the three systems actualizing groups. The pattern is similar to the one in Fig. 8, although the differences from "0" are not as large. Participants in all groups display little congruence with their mothers on this Factor, though the amount of incongruence is not as large as in the self-father category. All groups see themselves as manifesting more of the Factor A quality than their mothers. This is particularly true of participants in the SA hi group, who display much less self-mother congruence than participants in either of the other two groups.

Fig. 11 shows the self-mother difference-scores for the systems actualizing groups on Factor B. The pattern of mean scores is similar to the one in Fig. 9. The SA med and SA lo groups display fairly high self-mother congruence. Participants in the latter group see themselves as manifesting slightly more of the Factor's qualities than their mothers. The SA hi group displays very low self-mother congruence. These participants perceive their mothers as manifesting much more of Factor B's quality than they themselves manifest.

There were no significant sex main effect differences in the self-mother category. However, there were three significant group x sex interactions. These interactions were on Factors D (p=.03), F (p=.03), and G (p=.04).

Fig. 12 shows the group x sex interaction in Factor D. The figure shows wide differences between males and females in the SA med and SA lo groups. In the former group, males display extreme self-mother incongruence on Factor D. The females in this group display
Figure 10. Mean self-mother difference scores on Factor A for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-mother congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than mother-ratings.

$S/M = \text{self-ratings higher than mother-ratings}$
Figure 11. Mean self-mother difference scores on Factor B for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-mother congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than mother-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that mother-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/M = self-ratings higher than mother-ratings
M/S = mother-ratings higher than self-ratings
Figure 12. Group x Sex interaction on Factor D in the self-mother category for the three systems actualizing groups. All scores are self-ratings higher than mother-ratings.

S/M = self-ratings higher than mother-ratings

— = males
----- = females
much more congruence than do the males. This pattern is reversed in the $SA_{lo}$ group. Now the females display extreme self-mother incongruence, and the males are much more congruent with their mothers than are the females. The sexes in the $SA_{hi}$ group are closer together, but the females display more self-mother congruence than do the males.

The scores of both sexes in the $SA_{hi}$ group are somewhat more moderate than scores of males and females in the other two groups. However, most scores show extreme differences from self-mother congruence on Factor D.

Fig. 13 shows the group x sex interaction in the self-mother category on Factor F. The pattern is very similar to the previous pattern diagrammed in Fig. 12. There are again wide differences between males and females in both the $SA_{med}$ and $SA_{lo}$ groups. Males in the $SA_{med}$ group see themselves as manifesting much more of Factor F's quality than do the females in this group. However, females in the $SA_{lo}$ group perceive themselves as manifesting much more of the Factor's qualities than do the $SA_{lo}$ males. In the $SA_{hi}$ group, females display more self-mother congruence than males. The males in this group see themselves as manifesting more of Factor F's quality than do the $SA_{hi}$ females. Generally speaking, the $SA_{hi}$ males, $SA_{med}$ males, and $SA_{lo}$ females display the least self-mother congruence. The $SA_{hi}$ females display relatively moderate congruence. $SA_{med}$ females and $SA_{lo}$ males display the most self-mother congruence. It should be reiterated, however, that only the latter two sex-scores are even close to congruence. Four of the six sex-group scores are markedly different from "0."

Fig. 14 shows the group x sex interaction in the self-mother
Figure 13. Group x Sex interaction on Factor F in the self-mother category for the three systems actualizing groups. All scores are self-ratings higher than mother-ratings.

S/N = self-ratings higher than mother-ratings

--- = males
----- = females
Figure 14. Group x Sex interaction on Factor G in the self-mother category for the three systems actualizing groups. "0" indicates perfect self-mother congruence. Scores above "0" mean that self-ratings are higher than mother-ratings. Scores below "0" mean that mother-ratings are higher than self-ratings.

S/M = self-ratings higher than mother-ratings
M/S = mother-ratings higher than self-ratings

--- = males
----- = females
category on Factor G. Scores for sexes in all groups are almost equally different from each other. There are different patterns of scores for sexes-within-groups in all three groups. The $S_{\text{hi}}$ males, $S_{\text{med}}$ females, and $S_{\text{lo}}$ males display high self-mother congruence on this Factor. The $S_{\text{hi}}$ females, $S_{\text{med}}$ males, and $S_{\text{lo}}$ females display less congruence. Generally, males tend to be more congruent than females. There is also more overall congruence than was displayed in the previous two figures.

In conclusion, it is not possible to accept Hypothesis XI or Hypothesis XII. There is little indication from the previous analysis that males are more congruent with their fathers than females, or females more congruent with their mothers than males. There was some indication from the interactions in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 that $S_{\text{hi}}$ and $S_{\text{med}}$ females are more congruent with their mothers than the males in these groups are congruent with their mothers. However, in order to fully support the above hypothesis, it would have helped to have some significant sex main effect differences and/or more group x sex interactions in the self-parental categories. However, the findings which did emerge from these and other self-significant other analyses lead to interesting speculations about the systems and self-actualization concepts.
DISCUSSION

The SEECQ participants sampled in this study show no-change with respect to their orientation on those Factors which were chosen as most representative of systems actualization. Hypotheses I, II, and III were not supported. That these Factors can be chosen by others as actualizing Factors is indicated by the two highly significant coefficients of concordance on the Factor-rating form.

The most obvious explanation for no-change finding would seem to be the long time between the termination of the SEECQ program and the present. This has been a period of over two years. However, it is also relevant at this point to refer to Ryan's (1976) study in which he attempted to discover patterns of change in SEECQ participants in Pre-Lab to Post-Lab conditions. As previously stated, Ryan administered a questionnaire equivalent to CQI before labs and after labs. The latter administrations occurred immediately after the labs and again two weeks hence. Ryan summarized his results by noting participants' differing orientations to change. Many participants experienced a hesitancy to become involved in community change because of the fears and the risks involved in confronting inequitable conditions. This hesitancy was expressed before labs and continued somewhat diminished after labs. For some people, "the price for change is too high." Such people preferred not to make efforts for change but to maintain the established order, erecting and keeping barriers to intercultural exchange. For others, the fears of change were related to lack of skills or experience in
confronting community inequities. There was a sense among these participants that if proper skills could be developed they might engage in community change processes in spite of personal risks. For still other participants, "the learning laboratories were highly successful in facilitating growth toward increased effectiveness in the community." These participants experienced very positive expectations with respect to using problem solving skills for the promotion of intercultural equity. They also expected that these skills would lead to more active involvement in political and community groups.

In the analysis conducted after participants had returned home to their communities, Ryan reports a "continued growth towards intercultural development and change." There was a sense that many participants had increased expectations of being able to apply skills for constructive community change. There was also increased sensitivity to system inequities and a sense that there were more opportunities for intercultural sharing. At the same time, however, there was continued recognition of personal resistances to change which contributed to maintaining personal and intercultural isolation in the community. Ryan also says that should the "new skills and innovative practices acquired through the laboratories fail to effect meaningful change in the community, a more confrontive style may again be adopted."

Approximately two years later, we find there has been no change with respect to how some of the former SEECQ participants perceived themselves on systems actualizing Factors prior to their involvement in SEECQ. As noted, the element of time over which so many unpredictable things can happen is probably a major reason why this result
occurred. It may be that in order to continue the impetus for forward movement in community change programs many participants need to get periodic stimulation from the structured program which excited them in the first place. This possibility was reinforced in my mind when some participants asked if SEECQ were starting again, saying they wanted to participate. In some instances, there was need expressed for a program like SEECQ. At the same time, many participants with whom I talked are maintaining the same level of high community involvement they displayed prior to SEECQ. The \( T^2 \) results suggest that those who were active in community change before SEECQ are the ones who are still most active today, and those who were less active are still that way. There is a further sense I have from talking to the people who participated in this research that for many the old battles for increased community equity are still being fought. Of course, none of these suppositions are conclusive. Even though the one significant t-test (Factor F) is also inconclusive, it is tempting to use it as a rough gauge for the perspective of SEECQ participants today. It states that there may have been some increase over the past two years in Willingness to Examine and Confront Inequities. This orientation brings to mind Ryan's previous contention that some participants had a predilection to shift to confrontive styles if other intervention strategies did not satisfactorily influence community change.

The part of the research designed to test for the effects of the community program on participants showed that no appreciable effects had occurred in terms of participants' factor scores on the seven
SEECQ factors. However, the research phases which focused on the characteristics of participants did show some differences in terms of the SEECQ purpose of systems actualization. In particular, the fact that Hypothesis IV was supported leads to the supposition that there is some relationship between systems actualization and self-actualization. Those participants who see themselves highest in terms of the SEECQ goal of systems actualization are also the highest self-actualizers. The participants who have the lowest overall scores on the systems actualization measures are the least self-actualizing group. These findings stand as empirical evidence that personal growth and improvement of one's superordinate systems are indeed two non-dichotomous and mutually compatible processes. This interpretation is, of course, consistent with the previous discussion of self-actualization as transcending the self-environment dichotomy and as being characterized by metamotivation.

The two major POI scales, I and To, significantly differentiated between the high and low systems actualizing groups. The highest systems actualizing group scored significantly higher on I and To than did the lowest systems actualizing group. The significant I finding indicates that those participants who most perceive themselves as manifesting interpersonal sensitivity, systems awareness, and involvement in community groups for the promotion of community equity also feel that their "internal motivations are the guiding force (of their lives) rather than external influences." (Shostrom, 1966) This presents the paradox we said earlier is characteristic of self-actualization: that self-actualizing people are internally motivated and metamotivated at the same time. The high systems actualizers also score higher on this
major scale of self actualization.

The significant Tc finding suggests that high systems actualizers are able to apply more of their energy and resources to living-in-the-present than are the low systems actualizers. In Goldstein's (1940) terms, the Tc quality allows systems actualizers more resources to "come to terms with" their present environments. This ability may be an important aspect for the simultaneous, effective fulfillment of the self-actualizing individual's superordinate systems.

The other significant scales serve to reinforce the above description of the systems actualizing participants. However, these scales share many items with the Major I and Tc scales. Such Item overlap drastically reduces the efficiency of these scales, particularly since they also share a number of items with each other. It is difficult to determine whether any significant difference is a function of the scales's meaning or its correlation with the two major scales. These scales are discussed in the following paragraphs, but the reader is advised to keep the dependence of these scales on the major scales firmly in mind. The fact that the meaning of these scales seems to support the Tc and I findings is already built into the conceptualization and construction of the test.

The significant Fr scale means that the high systems actualizers are more sensitive to their own needs and feelings than the low systems actualizers. This finding is consistent with the notion of being more inner-directed. Also consistent is the finding that the high systems actualizers scored higher on both scales of the Self-Perception category. Participants in the SAhi group display more personal worth both in terms of their perceptions of themselves as strong worthy people (Sr),
and in terms of perceiving themselves as worthy in spite of their weaknesses \( (S_3) \). The significant difference on the \( N_0 \) scale means that the high systems actualizers are more likely to see man in general as being essentially good rather than evil. This orientation implies that they tend to be more optimistic about life in general, a quality that Maslow (1968) points out as a characteristic of self-actualizing people. Finally, the difference on \( A \) suggests that high systems actualizers have a greater tendency "to accept anger or aggression within one's self as natural" (Shostrom, 1966), rather than having to deny such feelings.

I will now attempt to describe how the significant self-actualizing scales discussed above apply to the effective implementation of the systems actualizing goals of SEECQ. It thus becomes possible to show how qualities normally associated with personal growth become important qualities for the most effective fulfillment of superordinate system growth. Given the non-dichotomous spirit of transcendence, it is also possible to say that the systems actualization qualities are important for personal growth.

The SEECQ program involved making change in Baton Rouge's social-ecological system and devising intervention strategies for completing such changes. As noted previously, the impetus of these changes was in the direction of more open-system functioning. The situations encountered by SEECQ participants in carrying out these goals demand strong, effective leadership. For example, one of the Task Forces contained participants who were involved in a high school that was experiencing chronic tension and a rash of suspensions (Glad, et al, 1977). The school was beginning to adopt a crisis atmosphere, and the
Task Force decided to develop intervention strategies to help the school solve its problems. Members from all of the school's major components were recruited into the Task Force. These recruits included students, administrators, teachers, and parents. The Task Force's special mission was to open up blocked channels of communication among the major components, and have them work together to resolve on-going problems in the system. One concrete result of this Task Force was a marked decrease in school suspensions. Another Task Force took as its mission the "Creating (of) Power in the Community." A principal goal shared by many participants was to find ways of integrating community resources which already existed, and identifying untapped resources for the purpose of resolving a wide variety of personal and interpersonal problems that Baton Rouge citizens were encountering every day.

It seems reasonable to assume that successful involvement in activities of this kind would be facilitated by the strong inner-directed, self-actualizing qualities of I and Tc. This is simply because most of the SEKIQ activities demanded strong and effective leadership to be successful. Those who would be more likely to be concerned about acceptance from others (other-directed), for example, would probably be less likely to adequately confront stress-laden community situations. The same logic would apply to the other POI scales. Sensitivity to one's own feelings, a self-perception dominated by feelings of intrinsic worth, the acceptance of aggressive feelings as part of one's nature, and a sense of optimistic hope in man's future are all qualities which would seem to enhance the likelihood of effective leadership in confronting and facilitating community change.
processes.

What I have been striving for in the pages of this dissertation is an adequate description of the self-actualizing person as being motivated to achieve fulfillment of the superordinate systems he participates in while being also possessed of the strong, inner-directed, autonomous qualities traditionally associated with the self-actualization concept. Stated in Angyal's terms (1940), self-actualization is an integration of autonomous and homonomous tendencies in the ongoing unitary life processes of the biosphere. The SEECQ program, and other community programs like it, may represent actual manifestations of such descriptions. Whereas this can only be a supposition at this point, it has been empirically demonstrated herein that those who perceive themselves as high systems actualizers also score higher on a popular measure of self-actualization. I then assume that the systems actualizing and self-actualizing qualities are part of the same holistic dimension, for this is the thrust of my own "world view" of self-actualization. I mean to say that self-actualization and systems actualization are the same thing, that one enhances the other. In applying this notion to the actual "demand character" of the SEECQ activities, I feel it is reasonable to assume that inner-directed self-actualization qualities enhance the likelihood for success of actually applying SEECQ's systems actualizing goals in the community.

The two scales which were significant in the three-group MANOVA (S and A) may represent qualities more likely than any others to insure success in the application of SEECQ's systems actualizing goals. Having qualities like self-acceptance and acceptance of aggression makes sense for people who are involved in conflict and change in their
communities. It seems easier to explain this concept in a negative sense. People who are more likely to play on their weaknesses, doubt themselves, and feel guilty about their aggressive, angry feelings should be less likely to "come to terms with" the demand qualities of a program like SEEGQ. The program's activities often demanded that individual participants take the initiative in facilitating conflictual group processes and in confronting various types of problems in the superordinate systems of their community. Preoccupation with personal weaknesses and denial of aggressive feelings in such situations would probably be counterproductive for the actualization of the system. These speculations lead to the supposition that community programs that emphasize resolution of conflict and inequity might place emphasis on teaching participants to integrate felt weaknesses and aggressive feelings into their overall personal functioning. If these qualities are important correlates of high systems actualizers, it may be worthwhile to focus on them to help others become more systems actualizing than they are.

In the third phase of the research, it was expected that high systems actualizers would display less internal conflict in terms of self-ideal self congruence. This expectation was borne out by the results. High systems actualizers displayed less internal conflict in the systems actualizing areas of "interpersonal sensitivity" and "systems awareness" (Factor C), and involvement in community problem solving for community equity (Factor A). They also evidenced less conflict on the Factors (D and F) which denote aggressive, confronting intervention strategies.

However, the differences between the high and low groups on the
systems actualizing Factors (A and C) must be tempered with the knowledge that the groups were selected on the basis of high and low scores on Factors A, B, and C. Therefore, the self-ideal self congruence on Factors A and C is a reflection of how much participants in the groups value the SEECQ program's systems actualizing goals. If both the $SA_{h1}$ and $SA_{lo}$ groups value these goals, as they seem to, it is not surprising that the group selected on the basis of high scores on these Factors would display the most congruence. We can then interpret the differing degrees of congruence as a valuing by all participants of the systems actualizing goals. Even those who see themselves as lowest in these areas still hold them to be ideals worth achieving for themselves. With this perspective in mind, it is still possible to posit less internal conflict in the $SA_{h1}$ group, and more in the $SA_{lo}$ group. Both groups "buy into" the SEECQ goals, and one group see themselves as manifesting those goals in their daily lives more than do the other group.

The combined findings on the systems actualizing Factors and the aggressive, confronting Factors indicates that high systems actualizing qualities are associated with lack of internal conflict regarding confrontation of frustrating inequities in the community. It will be recalled that the $SA_{med}$ group perceived themselves as manifesting slightly more of the aggressive, confronting qualities than they would like. This finding suggests conflict regarding expression of the confronting, aggressive qualities of Factors D and F rather than the lack of their expression, which is manifested among low systems actualizers. It brings to mind the self-actualizing quality, acceptance of aggression. Perhaps the $SA_{med}$ participants
have slightly more difficulty reconciling their aggressive feelings when confronting inequities than do the high systems actualizers. The fact that high systems actualizers display less internal conflict on all the significant Factors is consistent with the finding that they are more inner-directed (I) and more present-centered (Tc) than low systems actualizers.

It is interesting in the light of so many self-ideal self differences that there was only one significant difference in the self-exceptional person category. Evidently, lower systems actualizing people are more likely to experience internal conflict with respect to internalized expectations for themselves than they are to experience themselves as different from the people they admire. The one exception was with Factor A: Interpersonal Involvement and Community Problem Solving Skills Contributing to Involvement in Community Development. The pattern of decreasing congruence by groups, shown in Fig. 7, indicates that the lower systems actualizers admire community involvement in others more than they practice it. Participants in the SA\textsubscript{hl} group evidently tend to be more "doers" in the sense of active involvement with others in community problem solving activities. This interpretation is reinforced by the Factor A pattern in the self-ideal self category (Fig. 2).

Some interesting findings also emerged in the self-father and self-mother congruence categories. However, the expected differences of males identifying more with their fathers (Hypothesis XI) and females identifying more with their mothers (Hypothesis XII) were not supported. Evidently same-sex parental identification
plays little part in how these participants perceive themselves on the SEECQ Factors.

There were similar congruence patterns for both parents on Factor A and on Factor B. Turning first to Factor A (Figs. 8 and 10), it is evident that those who became involved in SEECQ were likely to perceive their parents as less involved in community problem solving activities for the purpose of enhancing intercultural equity. SEECQ participants see themselves as quite different from their parents in this respect. In particular, the high systems actualizers see themselves as being much more involved in intercultural problem solving than their parents.

Regarding the self-parental scores on Factor B - a "negative" actualizing Factor - the high systems actualizers continue to see themselves as much more "positive" than their parents. They see their parents as more likely seeking to maintain intercultural barriers. However, participants in the other two groups do not perceive their parents as very much different from them on the quality of maintaining intercultural barriers. The low systems actualizers even see their parents as manifesting less of this quality than they themselves do. Comparing Factors A and B, it seems that many SEECQ participants do not perceive their parents as striving to actively maintain intercultural barriers any more than they themselves do. However, these participants do see their parents as less likely to become actively involved in facilitating intercultural equity. The one difference is the SA_{hi} participants, who see them-
selves as being much different from their parents both with respect to maintaining intercultural barriers and participating in community groups to overcome these barriers. The intercultural inequities which are ingrained in Baton Rouge's ecology have existed for decades and generations. Therefore, those who choose to become involved in changing these patterns of inequity are likely to be engaged in new and unusual activities. It is not surprising, then, that these people perceive themselves as different in these respects from those who have come before them - including their parents. This is particularly true of the high systems actualizers. They have taken what appears to be a markedly independent stance from their parents with respect to these systems actualizing issues. Such independence may reflect some of the strong inner-directed qualities they display through their high self-actualization scores.

The interactions in the self-mother category will be discussed in two parts. The interactions on Factors D and F (Figs. 12 and 13) will be treated as a pair because their patterns are similar and because these Factors represent confronting, aggressive community change strategies. The Factor G interaction will then be discussed with the Factor G interaction from the self-ideal self category.

Figs. 12 and 13 continue the pattern of overall marked difference from self-parental congruence. All sex-scores are above "0". As noted, the Factors on which these interactions take place denote confronting, aggressive community change strategies. These qualities are unlike the more passive expectations for women which our culture normally has. Therefore, a certain amount of resistance
to or rejection of such cultural mores may be showing through the females' lack of self-mother congruence on these Factors. However, it seems that extreme deviation from congruence may be harmful instead of actualizing. The high systems actualizing females display a relatively moderate amount of self-mother incongruence, whereas the low systems actualizing females display an extreme amount of incongruence. Too much perceived difference from their mothers in the areas of confrontation and aggression is likely to be inhibiting of systems actualizing qualities in women.

The results are somewhat different for males. They seem to be able to experience larger differences from their mothers in the area of confronting inequities. In their case, high self-mother congruence seems related to having less systems actualizing qualities. Cultural mores free males for more aggressive behaviors, so it is not surprising that males in the two highest actualizing groups display more difference from their mothers than do the females. However, among the males there is a further suggestion that more moderate self-mother incongruence is more related to systems actualization than extreme incongruence.

As far as the meaning of Factor G is concerned - Increased Intercultural Resources and Understanding - it seems that males show more internal conflict between self and ideal than females do (Fig. 6). Females remain relatively congruent with themselves on this matter, while men who see themselves as less systems actualizing also see themselves as manifesting too much or too little intercultural understanding. For some reason, men may have a harder time adjusting to
the development of this capability than women do.

Although females in the $S_{ah}^1$ group show practically no internal conflict about increasing their intercultural resources and understanding, they do feel that they manifest more of this quality than their mothers do (Fig. 14). The latter finding is consistent with the previous interpretation of high systems actualizing females expressing independence from cultural expectations for women by expressing some independence from their mothers. Evidently, this moderate independence is also expressed by low systems actualizing females in the area of increasing intercultural understanding. The role of the $S_{ah}^0$ group is difficult to integrate into the meaning of this interaction. Therefore, this interaction's interpretation is considered as only tentative.

Summary

It seems that the SEECQ participants have neither increased nor decreased in their qualities of systems actualization during the two year period since SEECQ's termination. There is a very vague sense that they may have increased in their Willingness to Examine and Confront Inequities. This finding is consistent with Ryan's (1976) discovery that some participants tend to resort to confrontation when they feel that other intervention strategies are not working as they would like.

The systemic, interpersonal concept of self-actualization seems to have been supported. Those participants who most manifested systems actualizing qualities were more likely to manifest the strong
inner-directed personality traits traditionally associated with self-actualization. Participants were formed into high, medium, and low systems actualizing groups on the basis of their scores on Factors A, B, and C. These Factors denote qualities of "interpersonal sensitivity," "systems awareness," lack of rigid maintenance of intercultural boundaries, and open participation with other community members to resolve community inequities. Because these Factors, and the lab programs themselves, stressed open, constructive participation at the superordinate systems levels of group and community, they were thought to be representative of Angyal's (1970) homonomous tendencies. (For example, some of the items in Factor C state "my sense of being part of a community," "my willingness to work with others to solve community problems," and "my ability to communicate with others.") These Factors emphasize the self's participation in the actualization of its superordinate systems. The FOI was seen to be more representative of Angyal's autonomous tendencies, reflecting as it does the capacities of the self to actualize itself. The fact that participants who scored highest on the autonomous, self-actualizing qualities were members of the group which most manifested homonomous tendencies supports the contention that self-actualization represents the integration of autonomous-homonomous tendencies.

The supposition that high systems actualizers experience less internal conflict between the way they are and the way they would like to be also seems to have been supported. This is true for the positive systems actualizing qualities (Factors C and A) and the qualities of examining and confronting frustrating community inequity.
ies (Factors B and F). Since SESCA involved the examination and change of inequitable community conditions, it was sometimes necessary to confront inequities if the program's overall purpose of systems actualization were to be realized. High systems actualizers felt less conflict about confronting inequities and less conflict about using their capabilities for systems actualization. They also felt more accepting of their aggressive feelings and their weaknesses, which probably contributed to their relative lack of internal conflict in these areas.

With respect to the negative systems actualizing quality of rigid maintenance of intercultural boundaries (Factor B), low systems actualizers show about the same amount of self-ideal self congruence as high systems actualizers do. The SA10 participants evidently experience most of their internal conflict in the area of working to confront and change inequities rather than stiving to maintain them. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that active participation in community groups was the only area in which low systems actualizers felt themselves to be significantly inferior to those people they consider as exceptional.

SESCA participants are likely to see themselves as more active in intercultural community problem solving activities than their parents. This suggests that participants are displaying independence and moving in directions different from the ones their parents have taken. Such independence is expected in those whose purpose is changing inequitable community conditions which have existed for years. High systems actualizers have become more comfortable with
greater independence. They see themselves as being more different from their parents than the other groups see themselves, and as experiencing little conflict about the way they are.

There is a differing pattern of self-mother congruence between males and females on those two Factors (D and F) which denote confronting, aggressive community change strategies. When females' perceived differences from their mothers are too extreme, they seem to manifest less systems actualizing qualities. However, if males manifest too much self-mother congruence, their systems actualizing qualities may be affected. For both males and females, a relatively moderate lack of self-mother congruence in the area of confronting community change strategies seems optimal for systems actualization. Generally, systems actualizing females display more congruence than systems actualizing males.

Lower systems actualizing males manifest more conflict or uncertainty than females in the area of increasing intercultural understanding. However, high systems actualizing males display little conflict in this area. Females generally see themselves as manifesting slightly more intercultural understanding than their mothers, and they are satisfied with the way they are in this respect.

In conclusion, the systemic concept of self-actualization seems to have been supported. SEECQ participants chosen as the most actualizing displayed both high autonomous and high homonomous tendencies. High systems actualizers were also shown to be high self actualizers. They displayed more inner-direction, time-competence, intrinsic self-worth, and freedom from internal conflict
than those participants chosen as low systems actualizers. Most participants displayed marked independence from their parents in the area of participating in community groups to promote intercultural equity. High systems actualizers displayed the most independence and the least conflict in this area. Many SEBCQ females, by displaying low self-mother congruence on Factors D and F, showed signs of rejecting cultural mores that women not be confronting or aggressive. However, a relatively moderate lack of self-mother congruence in this area seems more optimal for systems actualization. Generally, males display more conflict than females in the area of increasing intercultural understanding.
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APPENDIX A

Community Questionnaires and Factor Ranking Form
COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE I

The following pages contain the set of items that you answered when you were participating in laboratory-learning and community problem-solving programs. We are asking that you answer these items again, as part of a continuing study of intercultural and community programs in Louisiana.

You may recall that each item describes a certain behavior, feeling, or belief that is connected with living and working in a community. We would like you to indicate how likely it is that you personally would behave, feel, or believe as the items describe. Focus your attention on how you would rate yourself on these items today.

We ask that you rate the items on the following scale:

[Image of a scale with points labeled 1 to 7]

This scale has been printed next to each item. Record your rating by circling the one point (out of a possible 31 points on the scale) that reflects how likely it is that you would behave, feel, or believe the way that the item describes.

For example, the first item states:

"my ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems."

If it is Most Likely that you would use your ability in this way, circle number 7 on the scale.

If it is Least Likely that you would use your ability in this
way, circle number 1 on the scale.

If the likelihood of using your "ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems" is between Average and Most Likely or Average and Least Likely, circle the point on the scale that you feel most accurately describes you.

You may now turn the page and begin answering the items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAST LIKELY</th>
<th>ABOUT AVERAGE</th>
<th>MOST LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- My ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems
- My feeling of powerlessness in bringing about social change
- My use of laboratory learning methods in community problem solving
- The number of friends or acquaintances that I have in other cultural groups expanding
- My feelings of mistrust and suspiciousness in the community
- My ability and willingness to play a variety of group roles
- My placing value on gut level communication between persons as a means of solving community problems
- My reliance on the community's leaders for solutions to community problems
- My willingness to relate to people whose values and beliefs are extremely different from my own
- My understanding of different cultural groups
- My participation in political and community groups
- My satisfaction in being a member of a group

[Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires]
fear of the outcome of change in terms of my own risk and the risk of what is closest to me as a strong motivating force to personal action in the community.

my awareness of my feelings

my participation in the formation of black service clubs and organizations to keep out the "lily white"

my ability to communicate with others

my willingness to let others know where I'm at

my participation in programs of legitimate interest to both races so that their natural separation would be reduced

my awareness of how others see me

my sense of who I am and where I'm going

my willingness to work with others to solve community problems

my ability to see where others are at

my sense of being part of a community

my willingness to set aside the rules when they seem to block group or community goals.
my awareness of my own prejudices
peer pressures limiting my efforts to effect reduction of inequities among the races
my use of cross-cultural support systems as an aid to community understanding
my perception of community learning laboratories to become ends in themselves
my understanding of what it takes for a group to maintain itself and to work productively
my tendency to accept the symbols of my "in-group" and reject the symbols of all "out-groups"
my willingness to question established beliefs and practices
my involvement in developing new political and community groups and organizations
my use of false impressions based on racial stereotypes
my being resistant to change
my frustration with the system
my communication with other racial groups being cut off by fear, apathy, ignorance and hopelessness

Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAST LIKELY</th>
<th>ABOUT AVERAGE</th>
<th>MOST LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires.

- my working towards equity for all cultural groups in a community
- my willingness to use confrontation and conflict in bringing about social change
- my awareness of the tendency of the power structure to be only in the hands of whites
- limited opportunities for meaningful social mingling among the races preventing my own cultural enrichment
The Community Questionnaire II contains the same items that describe certain behaviors, feelings, and beliefs that are connected with living and working in a community. This time we ask that you rate the items not solely for yourself, but also for other people you may know well.

The questionnaire is divided into three parts. Easy instructions are included before you begin answering the items in each part.
PART I

In Part I we ask that you rate each item in terms of how you see both your father (F) and your mother (M). Each item is rated two times - once for your father and once for your mother. Answer the items by making a circle around that point on the scale you feel best fits the way your father would behave, believe, or feel as the items describe. Also make a circle around that part of the scale which best describes how your mother would behave, believe, or feel. Write an "F" or an "M" above each circle to show that the rating is for your father (F) or your mother (M). Remember, each item in Part I is rated twice.

For example, an item might be rated this way:

LEAST LIKELY   ABOUT AVERAGE   M MOST LIKELY
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

This example shows that the rater perceived his father as About Average on a particular item, and his mother as between Average and Most Likely that she would behave, feel, or believe as the item describes. If you want to rate your father and mother the same way on a particular item, simply write the letters "F" and "M" above the same circle on the scale.

You may now turn the page and begin answering Part I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAST LIKELY</th>
<th>MOST LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires.

- having ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems
- feeling powerless in bringing about social change
- use laboratory learning methods in community problem solving
- the number of friends or acquaintances in other cultural groups expanding
- feeling mistrust and suspiciousness in the community
- having the ability and willingness to play a variety of group roles
- placing value on gut level communication between persons as a means of solving community problems
- relying on the community's leaders for solutions to community problems
- willing to relate to people whose values and beliefs are extremely different from his/her own
- having an understanding of different cultural groups
- participating in political and community groups
- satisfaction in being a member of a group
fearing the outcome of change in terms of personal risk and the risk of what is closest to him/her as a strong motivating force to personal inaction in the community.

being aware of his/her failure

participating in the formation of black service clubs and organizations to keep out the "lily white"

having ability to communicate with others

willing to let others know where he/she is at

participating in programs of legitimate interest to both races so that their natural separation would be reduced

being aware of how others see him/her

having a sense of who he/she is and where he/she is going

willing to work with others to solve community problems

having ability to see where others are at

having a sense of being part of a community

willing to set aside the rules when they seem to block group or community goals

being aware of own personal prejudices

Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaire.
peer pressures limiting his/her efforts to effect reduction of inequities among the races

use cross-cultural support systems as an aid to community understanding

perceiving community learning laboratories to become ends in themselves

having understanding of what it takes for a group to maintain itself and to work productively

having a tendency to accept the symbols of his/her "in-group" and reject the symbols of all "out-groups"

willing to question established beliefs and practices

involvement in developing new political and community groups and organizations

use false impressions based on racial stereotypes

being resistant to change

frustrated with the system

communication with other racial groups being cut off by fear, apathy, ignorance and hopelessness

working towards equity for all cultural groups in a community
willing to use confrontation and conflict in bringing about social change

aware of the tendency of the power structure to be only in the hands of whites

limited opportunities for meaningful social mingling among the races preventing his/her own cultural enrichment

Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires
Most of us have experienced a difference from time to time between the type of person we are and the type of person we would like to be. One way of talking about this is to say that we have a self (who we are) and an ideal self (who we would like to be). In Part II, we ask that you rate each item in terms of your "ideal self" - the sort of person you would be if you could be exactly or ideally the sort of person you want to be.

Rate each item in terms of how likely it is that you would behave, feel, or believe as the items describe if you could be exactly the sort of person you want to be - your "ideal self."
my ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems

my feeling of powerlessness in bringing about social change

my use of laboratory learning methods in community problem solving

the number of friends or acquaintances that I have in other cultural groups expanding

my feelings of mistrust and suspiciousness in the community

my ability and willingness to play a variety of group roles

my placing value on gut level communication between persons as a means of solving community problems

my reliance on the community's leaders for solutions to community problems

my willingness to relate to people whose values and beliefs are extremely different from my own

my understanding of different cultural groups

my participation in political and community groups

my satisfaction in being a member of a group
fear of the outcome of change in terms of my own risk of what is closest to me as a strong motivating force to personal inaction in the community

my awareness of my feelings

my participation in the formation of black service clubs and organizations to keep out the "lily white"

my ability to communicate with others

my willingness to let others know where I'm at

my participation in programs of legitimate interest to both races so that their natural separation would be reduced

my awareness of how others see me

my sense of who I am and where I'm going

my willingness to work with others to solve community problems

my ability to see where others are at

my sense of being part of a community

my willingness to set aside the rules when they seem to block group or community goals
my awareness of my own prejudices

peer pressures limiting my efforts to effect reduction of inequities among the races

my use of cross-cultural support systems as an aid to community understanding

my perception of community learning laboratories to become ends in themselves

my understanding of what it takes for a group to maintain itself and to work productively

my tendency to accept the symbols of my "in-group" and reject the symbols of all "out-groups"

my willingness to question established beliefs and practices

my involvement in developing new political and community groups and organizations

my use of false impressions based on racial stereotypes

my being resistant to change

my frustration with the system

my communication with other racial groups cut off by fear, apathy, ignorance, and hopelessness

[Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires]
my working towards equity for all cultural groups in a community

my willingness to use confrontation and conflict in bringing about social change

my awareness of the tendency of the power structure to be only in the hands of whites

limited opportunities for meaningful social mingling among the races preventing my own cultural enrichment
PART III

In Part III we ask that you rate each item in terms of someone you know who is an "exceptional person." This person should be someone you perceive as fully and completely living up to his potential as a human being. If you cannot think of anyone who exactly fits this description, use the person you feel comes closest to it. If you like, you may use a person you are familiar with from history or literature.

After you have decided on your "exceptional person," rate the following items in terms of how Likely it is you think that person would behave, feel, or believe as the items describe. Unless you would prefer not to do it, we ask that you write the name of your chosen person at the bottom of this page.

This Part concludes the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your participation in this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAST LIKELY</th>
<th>MOST LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- having ability to facilitate the analysis and working through of group problems
- feeling powerless in bringing about social change
- use laboratory learning methods in community problem solving
- the number of friends or acquaintances in other cultural groups expanding
- feeling mistrust and suspiciousness in the community
- having the ability and willingness to play a variety of group roles
- placing value on gut level communication between persons as a means of solving community problems
- relying on the community's leaders for solutions to community problems
- willing to relate to people whose values and beliefs are extremely different from his/her own
- having an understanding of different cultural groups
- participating in political and community groups
- satisfaction in being a member of a group
fearing the outcome of change in terms of personal risk and the risk of what is closest to him/her as a strong motivating force to personal inaction in the community

being aware of his/her feelings

participating in the formation of black service clubs and organizations to keep out the "lily white"

having ability to communicate with others

willing to let others know where he/she is at

participating in programs of legitimate interest to both races so that their natural separation would be reduced

being aware of how others see him/her

having a sense of who he/she is and where he/she is going

willing to work with others to solve community problems

having ability to see where others are at

having a sense of being part of a community

willing to set aside the rules when they seem to block group or community goals

being aware of own personal prejudices
Scales were included next to all items in the original questionnaires to allow for a distribution of responses.

Peer pressures limiting his/her efforts to effect reduction of inequities among the races use cross-cultural support systems as an aid to community understanding.
willing to use confrontation and conflict in bringing about social change

aware of the tendency of the power structure to be only in the hands of whites

limited opportunities for meaningful social mingling among the races preventing his/her own cultural enrichment
Following is a description of the concept "self-actualization," and a list of seven (7) Factors developed from a community program. The self-actualization description is based on a continuum of interpersonal styles which are seen as most characteristic of self-actualization through interpersonal styles which are seen as least characteristic. The seven Factors reflect this continuum, each Factor representing a different interpersonal style.

For the purposes of this study, we ask that you read the self-actualization description and the Factors. Then rank the Factors, lettered A through G, in terms of those you see as most characteristic of self-actualization and those you see as least characteristic. Base your rankings on how they conform with the self-actualization description. Rank the Factor you see as most characteristic at the top, the second most characteristic Factor second, and so on until you have ranked all seven Factors. Space for the rankings is provided on page 2. Be sure to base your rankings on the self-actualization description. Thank you for your help.
An Interpersonal Description of the Concept "Self-Actualization"

The interpersonal style most characteristic of self-actualization contains the qualities of "interpersonal sensitivity" and "systems awareness." Interpersonal sensitivity means that a person is aware of his own feelings, and is also open to the feelings of others. He is willing to share his perceptions of others, and wants to hear other's perceptions of him. However, he sees his own feelings as emanating from within; as being related to others but not caused by them. In summary, such a person displays awareness and sharing of his own feelings, and openness to the feelings of others, while simultaneously accepting responsibility for his own feelings and actions. Systems awareness is closely related to interpersonal sensitivity. It means that a person is aware of his intrinsic membership and participation in life "systems" much larger than himself - such as family and community. He is no longer principally motivated by the satisfaction of narrow personal needs. He is most motivated to fulfill the needs of the systems of which he is part. This sometimes includes the desire to work with others to achieve system or community-wide goals. In the process, such people are more likely to be open to those in the system who are different from them.

The next interpersonal style in the continuum reflects one way of expressing the self-actualizing tendencies noted above. It entails actual participation in various community groups for the purpose of enhancing community effectiveness. Closely related is the development of skills for resolving interpersonal difficulties and facilitating group processes in the community.

Slightly less characteristic of self-actualization is the interpersonal style which displays willingness to meet with and understand those in the system who are different from oneself.

Still less characteristic are people who are frustrated and who do not enjoy being part of groups. However, this frustration can contribute to a flexible orientation regarding established group practices which no longer meet the needs of the group. And the next lowest interpersonal style contains those people who challenge established groups or established practices by using confrontation for its own sake.

The two Factors which reflect the lower end of this self-actualization continuum display qualities opposite from interpersonal sensitivity and systems awareness. The next to last interpersonal style describes a person whose fears of change are related to his non-involvement in strengthening the systems he lives in. He abdicates responsibility by relying on others to solve his community's problems.

The last interpersonal style displays a more active resistance to change. This type of person shows a readiness to respond to social pressures for maintaining the status quo. He actively cuts off relationships with others, particularly those who are outside of his own social groupings. This style stifles interpersonal sensitivity and systems awareness.
* Rank Factors Here

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____

* In the actual Factor ranking form, the seven Factors with their items were listed after this page. Refer to Table 1, pages 59-61, for the list of S.E.E.C.Q. Factors.
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Cover Letter and Participant Agreement Form
Dear Friend:

These are the materials for the SEECQ research project that we talked about over the telephone. Allow me to say that your participation in this project is greatly appreciated.

We ask that you follow these guidelines in answering the questionnaires:

(a) Answer them in this order:
   (1) Community Questionnaire I
   (2) Personal Orientation Inventory
   (3) Community Questionnaire II

This ensures that you will answer the questionnaires in the same order as those people who come to the Methodist-Presbyterian Student Center.

(b) Be sure you read all of the instructions carefully, and write your name on each questionnaire.

(c) Do each questionnaire by yourself

(d) Answer each questionnaire at one sitting. Once you start one, please finish it.

It will take between one and two hours for you to complete all three questionnaires. We ask that you answer and mail back the questionnaires no later than one week (seven days) after you receive them in the mail. Please return all materials sent to you, including the Personal Orientation Inventory question booklet.

Included with the questionnaires is a brief note which we ask all participants in this research project to sign. The note is a requirement of the Committee on Experimentation with Human Subjects at L.S.U. It is intended to protect your rights, and the rights of the University. Please send the note back with the questionnaires.

Again, let me thank you for your cooperation. I assure you it is greatly appreciated. If you wish to contact me, the number at the Methodist-Presbyterian Center is . I will usually be there during the day on weekends.

Sincerely,

Hank Lagarde
I understand that my participation in this research project is voluntary, that I may withdraw at any time, and that information from all the questionnaires will be kept strictly confidential.

Signed,
VITA
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