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The purpose of this study was to develop a test which would reveal a person's primary level of existence according to Clare W. Graves' model of adult psychosocial behavior. The sub-purposes of this study were (1) to translate Graves' theoretical levels of existence into discrete components of attitude and behavior which could then be assessed with a written test instrument, (2) to create such a written instrument, and (3) to test the instrument for reliability and validity.

The study contains a detailed chronology of Clare Graves' development of the theory of Psychological Levels of Existence and compares his theory with other theories. Psychologist Graves believes in hierarchically-ordered, prepotent, upwardly-spiraling psychosocial systems of man which he terms levels of existence. He has identified seven levels of existence which are labeled Reactive, Tribalistic, Ego-centric, Absolutistic, Achievist, Sociocentric, and Individualistic. The latter six of these were selected for inclusion in the test developed in this study. The test
consisted of forty multiple-choice questions in a Most Like Me/Least Like Me format. It was administered to a total of 4,029.

Using the split-half technique and correlating the two halves of each individual's test, reliability indices of .91 (n = 105) and .88 (n = 2,220) were obtained. Using the split-half technique and correlating the various levels of existence separately for two groups (n = 105 and n = 2,220), reliability indices which ranged from .51 to .85 were obtained.

Content validity was established by asking the directors of the National Values Center to examine and to make recommendations for the instrument. The National Values Center is an independent corporation in Denton, Texas established for the purpose of furthering research in values through the use of Graves' theory of Psychological Levels of Existence.

Concurrent validity was established by comparing the predicted scores for thirty respondents with their actual scores on the test instrument. A correlation of .8858 resulted.

In establishing construct validity, three hypotheses were set forth.

Hypothesis One predicted that the results of the Levels of Existence test for persons under thirty years of age would differ significantly from the results for persons thirty years of age and over. The differences found were not
significant at the .05 level (n 179), and this hypothesis was not accepted.

**Hypothesis Two** predicted that the Levels of Existence test would discriminate between different occupational groups of people. Specifically, comparisons were made between counselors, managers, and clerical employees on their scores in Absolutism, Achievism, and Sociocentrism. On the basis of the results of two statistical tests, t-Tests for Two Independent Samples (n 179) and hierarchical grouping (n 99), hypothesis two was accepted.

**Hypothesis Three** predicted that a person's primary level of existence and secondary level of existence would be within three levels of each other. This was expected to be true for 90 percent of the persons tested. It was found to be true for 98.9 percent of those tested (n 216). Hypothesis three was therefore accepted.

The general conclusion of this study is that the Levels of Existence test meets the standards of reliability and validity accepted within psychometrics sufficiently to recommend that it be revised with respect to certain details as specified in the study, and that further research be undertaken.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

While man's attempt to understand himself and his peers may indeed be as old as man himself, an increased focus on this attempt has existed in the last several decades. In the decades since Freud (10), man has accelerated his search into intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships and has created such new professionals as the psychiatrist, psychologist, counselor, management consultant, communications advisor, and ombudsman. American business spends large sums of money on seminars teaching supervisors how to understand and motivate their employees; the public schools continue to ask what makes some children learn while others fail; and the President himself hires a media expert whose job it is to accurately convey the President's image to the public (4).

On a national scale, new dependence on other countries for oil dictates that we must learn to communicate successfully with cultures far different from ours. Internationally, though conflict is evident in various parts of the globe, there are scientists who tell us that the world has outgrown war and must immediately find viable options such as diplomatic negotiation (1). Thus, the need for man to
understand both himself and other men still exists and, in fact, may never have been more pronounced.

One of America's contemporary theorists who has researched and developed ideas regarding the nature of human development and its management is Clare W. Graves, former professor of psychology at Union College in Schenectady, New York. From nearly thirty years of research, Graves synthesized an emergent-cyclical model of adult psychosocial behavior which he says represents the hierarchically-ordered, prepotent, upwardly-spiraling psychosocial systems of man. He thus believes in various "levels of psychological existence."

...the psychology of the mature human being is an unfolding or emergent process marked by the progressive subordination of older behavioral systems to newer, higher order behavior systems. The mature man tends normally to change his psychology as the conditions of his existence change. Each successive stage or level is a state of equilibrium through which people pass on the way to other states of equilibrium. When a person is in one of the states of equilibrium, he has a psychology which is particular to that state. His acts, feelings, motivations, ethics and values, thoughts and preferences for management are all appropriate to that state... (13, p. 133).

Graves refers to these states of equilibrium as levels of existence or value systems. From his research, Graves identified seven levels of existence and felt that development of an eighth system was imminent. The seven clearly defined levels have been labeled Reactive, Tribalistic, Egocentric, Absolutistic, Achievist, Sociocentric, and Individualistic.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a test which would reveal a person's primary level of existence according to Graves' model of psychosocial behavior.

The sub-purposes of this study were

1. To translate Graves' theoretical levels of existence into discrete components of attitude and behavior which could then be assessed via a written test instrument,
2. To create such a written test instrument, and
3. To test the instrument for reliability and validity.

Background

The literature on human values has proliferated greatly in recent decades and has now reached proportions that defy comprehensive mention. A few of the well-known names in the field are Milton Rokeach (34, 35), Abraham Maslow (25, 26, 27), Sidney Simon (39, 40, 41), and O. J. Harvey (16, 17, 18, 19). These men and many others, some of whom are compared with Graves in Chapter III, have picked as their subject man's attempt to understand himself by identifying his value systems.

Graves feels that his work can be considered a revised, enlarged, and new conception of the Maslowian hierarchy of needs (14, p. 10). In his research, Graves found
substantiation for Maslow's emergent hierarchical conception, but also found grounds to challenge his specific categories and particularly the one of self-actualization. Graves thus felt compelled to develop a model which more accurately explained the results of his own research.

Graves subscribed to these basic premises:

1. That man's nature is not a set thing, that it is ever emergent and that it is an open system, not a closed system;

2. That man's nature evolves by quantum-like jumps from one steady state system to another;

3. That man's values change from system to system as his total psychology emerges in new form with each quantum-like jump to a new steady state of being (13, pp. 132-133).

Like Maslow, Graves holds a hierarchical systems point of view, but unlike Maslow, Graves' view is infinite rather than finite in character. Graves concluded that it is inaccurate to conceive of the ultimate in human existence and that there is no terminal actualization of the individual (14, p. 8). Man is always engaged in the solution of existential problems. When he solves current problems, energy is released in his system, and this free energy then is available to meet new existential problems. When these new problems arise, higher order or different configurations of dynamic neurological systems become active (13, p. 133).
As each existential state emerges, man believes that the problems of human existence are the problems with which he is faced at the level at which he has arrived. He develops, therefore, a general way of life, a thema for existence, including a thematic value system appropriate to his current existential state (13, p. 134). Many of the difficulties of human relationships stem from the fact that what a man values at one level will lead him to misunderstand what another man values who is at or striving for any other level. When a person is centralized in one state of existence, he has a total psychology which is particular to that state. His feelings, motivations, ethics and values, biochemistry, mental health, degree of neurological activation, learning systems, belief systems, conception of what mental illness is and how it should be treated, preferences for and conceptions of management, education, economic and political theory and practice are all appropriate to that state (12, p. 72).

Graves believes that man, as a species, must fully realize each level of existence if he is to rise to the next higher level, because only by pursuing his values to their limits can he recognize the higher-order existential problem that these particular values do not apply to and thus be ready for the next change upward (12, p. 80). However, in some cases, a particular person may not be genetically or constitutionally equipped to change in the
normal upward direction when the conditions of his existence change. Instead, he may stabilize and live out his life at any one or a combination of levels in the hierarchy. Again, he may show the behavior of a level in a predominantly positive or negative manner, or he may, under certain circumstances, regress to a behavior system lower in the hierarchy. Thus, an adult lives in a potentially open system of needs, values and aspirations, but he often settles into what appears to be a closed system (12, p. 72).

In his research, Graves noticed that at the seventh level adults showed a degree of change in excess of the sum of all six previous changes. He therefore believes that "adult psychological life is a developing, emergent process which can be likened to a symphony built on six basic themes which repeat, in higher order form, every set of six" (14, p. 2). The first six Graves has called "Subsistence Levels" because they are concerned with the establishment of individual survival and dignity. Once having become reasonably physically and psychologically secure in his existence, the individual becomes suddenly free to experience the wonder and interdependence of all life and thus enters the first of the "Being Levels," level seven. Writing in 1974, Graves said, "The societally effective leading edge of man in the technologically advanced nations is currently finishing the initial statement of the sixth theme of existence and is beginning again with the first theme in an entirely new and
more sophisticated variation" (12, p. 73). Most Western
people are now at levels four, five, and six but are pre-
paring to move into higher levels, according to Graves.
Graves has made some attempt to describe level eight but
says he has less data on this level and therefore a complete
description must wait until more people enter into this
level. Graves fully believes that new levels of existence
beyond level eight will emerge in future generations.

Graves' first published article explaining his theory
of levels of psychological existence appeared in the Harvard
Business Review in 1966 and applied the theory to a business
environment. Graves addressed the problem of deteriorating
work standards and claimed that the solution so often
proposed, i.e. changing people, either the managed or the
managing, would only result in further chaos. "The solution
is not necessarily Theory X or Theory Y," said Graves,
referring to the then popular theories of Douglas McGregor,
"nor is it a certain managerial grid style (Robert R. Blake
and Jane S. Mouton), or a new personnel department" (11,
p. 117). The only lasting solution, Graves claimed, lay in
acknowledging the reality and complexity of various levels
of human behavior and then in finding the appropriate style
of management for each individual worker. His point was
that all workers are not alike and thus all cannot be
managed successfully with the same method.
Since this article appeared, other followers have extended the application of Graves' theory to a business environment; notably Scott and Susan Myers, Charles Hughes, and Vincent Flowers have done so. In 1975 these four designed a Values for Working questionnaire which has been widely administered in workshops and seminars (21). Articles written by Myers and Myers, Hughes, and Flowers have appeared in The Harvard Business Review, Personnel, The Personnel Administrator, California Management Review, and other periodicals (8, 9, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30). Their work to date focuses on practical application as opposed to hypothesis-testing or theory-expansion. In other words, they have accepted the pragmatic validity of Graves' theory and have put their own efforts into communicating that theory to business executives and into applying the theory to business environments.

Graves further explained his theory in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology in 1970 (13) and in The Futurist in 1974 (12). In the latter article, he traced the thinking style, motivational system, specific motivation, means values, ends values, nature of existence, and problems of existence of each level. He also addressed the question of how human values change from one level to the other, and he drew specific applications of his theory to the business world of management, to the academic world of educators, and to the social world of welfare workers.
Don Beck became interested in Graves' levels of existence in the early 1970s and now heads a corporation in Denton, Texas called The National Values Center. Beck conducts workshops both nationally and internationally and has applied Graves' theory to public education, law enforcement, prison rehabilitation, and other social concerns as well as to the business world. He has published articles showing application of Levels of Existence analysis to airline flight attendants (2), law enforcement and criminal justice (3), and to business management (15).

As a professor at North Texas State University, Beck directed numerous theses of graduate students who furthered the research in the area by creating and administering questionnaires in the areas of Values for Religion (31), Values for Teaching (24), Values for Military Organizations (23), Values for Playing and Coaching (5), Values for Law Enforcement (32), and Values in Group Management (6). These questionnaires were administered to select groups of individuals (e.g. Values for Teaching was administered to groups of teachers), and in each case, the pragmatic validity of Graves' theories was assumed and accepted. Each of these theses was a descriptive study and did not focus on establishing the reliability or validity of the questionnaire used.

Three subsequent studies have, however, been concerned with some form of validity. George Scoggin's master's
thesis in 1976 correlated a Values for Working test with Shostrom's POI and found directionality but not predictability. Scoggins felt that his data indicated much support for Graves' theory of value systems (36).

Harvey Rishe's dissertation (1977) investigated the reliability and validity of a Values for Helpers test which he devised in conjunction with the National Values Center. Rishe found acceptable reliability but mixed results on validity. The individualistic scale demonstrated positive convergent validity with the POI and positive concurrent validity with the evaluative ratings of a panel of experts, but low predictive validity for developing relationship skills. The tribalistic and absolutistic scales demonstrated negative convergent validity with the POI (33).

More recently, Ann Evans investigated the construct validity of the Values for Working, Values for Teaching, and Values for Helpers instruments by using component R-analysis factor technique with orthogonal rotation. After a factor analysis of all items on each instrument, Ms. Evans concluded,

It is clear that the six value systems do not exist as hypothesized within the structure of the three instruments. However, this does not preclude their existence as higher order factors within the data or as related rather than independent constructs. Again, it must be emphasized that further evidence must be gathered before it will be known whether to question the validity of the instruments or the theory itself (7, p. 97).
The contributions discussed above represented the state of Clare Graves' Levels of Existence theory with respect to measuring instruments at the outset of this study. Numerous questionnaires had been developed, three of which had been tested in some way for validity. There was, as yet, no instrument which probed total personality (as opposed to a specialized area such as religion, working, teaching), and there was no instrument which had been satisfactorily validated and tested for reliability.

Significance of the Study

Certainly research follows many and varied patterns, but one which has been repeated in the behavioral sciences is the cycle from inductive work to theory to deductive translation of that theory into a measuring instrument. For example, from empirical research, Maslow formulated a theory of hierarchical needs and self-actualization (25). Based on this theory, Everett L. Shostrom developed the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), to measure self-actualization (37, 38). Robert Knapp in his Handbook for the POI stated, "The POI was developed to provide a standardized instrument for the measurement of values and behavior hypothesized to be of paramount importance in the development of the self-actualizing person" (22, p. 3). In the fifteen years since its inception, the POI has been used by literally thousands in teaching, counseling, medicine,
and business, and by their testimony, has resulted in greater insight, increased knowledge, and in some cases, more effective interpersonal relationships.

In Levels of Existence analysis, the research cycle had begun with inductive work and had progressed to theory development, but no deductive translation of theory into a measuring instrument had been accomplished at the time this study began. From nearly thirty years of empirical research, Clare W. Graves had formulated a theory regarding adult psychosocial behavior. Although Beck, Hughes, Flowers, Myers and Myers, and others applied the theory pragmatically in varied environments of daily living and although numerous simple instruments of measurement had been created and utilized, further advancement awaited the development of a standardized instrument thoroughly tested for reliability and validity. The intent of the present study was to create a measuring tool which would render operational the theories of Clare W. Graves in similar fashion as the POI had rendered operational the theories of Abraham Maslow.

It was hoped that, once developed, a standardized instrument for use in Levels of Existence analysis would facilitate greater understanding of pupils by teachers, of employees by supervisors, of spouses by each other, and of individuals by themselves. Hughes and Flowers said, "In today's expanding and diversified society, many differing values have surfaced, and we have all been made aware of
the value conflicts—between generations, socio-economic
groups, men and women, students and faculty, and various
life styles" (21, p. 8).

Relating to other people might be relatively simple if
there were only one value system to be considered, but since
there are several present in almost any given group of people,
the task is complex. For example, there may not be "a" best
method of teaching; there may be six different "best" methods
for six different types of learners. There may not be a
single style of management that is most successful; there
may only be different styles for different employees.

When they questioned several hundred employees regarding
their values for working, Hughes and Flowers found that the
majority of hourly employees tended to be primarily Tribal-
istic and Absolutistic. On the other hand, the managers and
personnel people in the company were primarily Achievist and
Individualistic (21, p. 16). It seems safe to assume that a
manager would manage or a teacher would teach out of the
system most familiar to him or her and that he would further-
more make unrecognized assumptions that his subordinates were
like him and would respond to the same strategies to which
he would respond. But will an employee whose primary level
of existence is Tribalistic produce maximally for a boss
whose primary level of existence is Achievist? Will a
student whose primary level of existence is Egocentric
perform satisfactorily for a teacher whose primary level of
existence is Absolutistic? Probably both the manager and the teacher stand a better chance of reaching their goals if they understand the differences that exist between them and their subordinates. The creation of a test on Levels of Psychological Existence was aimed at permitting such increased understanding and, hopefully, promoting a corresponding increase in interpersonal effectiveness.

A recognition that we live and work according to dissimilar personal views of the world confronts us all. Clare Graves has developed a model to explain many of the dissimilarities. It was hoped that the test created in this study would make possible individual identification of differences and thus would facilitate the first step in possible communication despite dissimilarity.

Definition of Terms

1. A level of existence is the central tendency among the forms through which an individual construes the world of knowledge and chooses preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence at a given time in his life. It is one of the various states of equilibrium in Clare Graves' emergent-cyclical model of the psychosocial systems of man. The terms levels of existence, levels of psychological existence, value systems, modes of adjustment, and coping systems are interchangeable and all refer to the various states of equilibrium.
2. Graves' first seven levels of existence are defined for purposes of this study in the terminology used by Beck at the National Values Center. (See Appendix.)

Limitations

The study was limited by the accuracy of a pencil and paper personality test. That accuracy is proportional both to the test taker's awareness and understanding of his own personality and to his truthful disclosure of that personality.

The study was limited by the fact that attitudes, beliefs, and thought patterns are not accessible for direct measurement and therefore can only be measured indirectly through self-report.

Delimitations

The test instrument developed in this study was expected to be valid only for speakers of Standard American English.

The test instrument developed was expected to be valid for persons with the equivalent of a high school education. No attempt was made to tailor the instrument for grade levels below the twelfth.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that there are certain detectable consistencies in human beings.
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CHAPTER II

CLARE W. GRAVES' LEVELS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXISTENCE:
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEMS CONCEPT
OF PERSONALITY

In 1952, Clare W. Graves was a professor of psychology at Union College in Schenectady, New York. He had previously served as a criminal psychologist at Cuyahoga City Court in Cleveland, Ohio, and as a professor at Case Institute of Technology and Western Reserve University. He had been teaching psychology for some years, and according to his self report, he was suddenly very tired of spending his time in the classroom refereeing in the conflict over which theory was correct on any given issue. For him there was no argument about which theory was correct; each was correct in some way, and thus the task became to study in what way each was correct and to discern the relationships between each one and others. Somehow, thought Graves in 1952, there must be a theory with the capacity to take confusing and contradictory information in the field of behavioral science and make sense of it all (7, p. 1).

Graves chose as his area of investigation the different conceptions of psychological health and maturity. When he asked people to describe the psychologically healthy mature
human being, he found great variance and disparity in their answers. Thus, by examining these multiple and varying conceptions, he felt that he would have a means, a vehicle, into the region of controversy and confusion with which he was concerned (7, p. 2).

He began by posing a number of research questions to himself. For example, he asked whether the concepts which exist suggest that psychological health should be viewed as a state, a condition, or as a psychological process (7, p. 2). He used students in two college classes and those in an adult evening class as his first subjects. Their ages ranged from twenty-one to sixty, and all were relatively unsophisticated in psychological theory. During the first five weeks of class, these students discussed in class their concepts of a healthy personality. There was no input from Graves as the professor, nor were there any reading assignments. At the conclusion of five weeks, all students were asked to write down their personal conception of a psychologically healthy mature human being. The responses were collected and recorded by Graves (7, pp. 2-3).

During the next five weeks, students were subjected to a process of peer influence. They were divided into small groups and told to discuss with each other their conceptions of a healthy personality. Graves had access to rooms with one-way mirrors and was thus able to observe behavior during the times these small groups were in session. At the end
of five weeks, students wrote either a defense of their original conception or an explanation of their new or modified conception (7, pp. 2-3).

During the last five weeks of the semester, Graves subjected the students to the influence of authorities in the field through lectures and reading assignments. He then gave the students their final assignment—to write once again either a defense of their original conception or an exposition of their present conception if that conception had changed. He conducted personal interviews with some students and gained more data that way.

Graves then turned all of the data over to an outside group of judges and asked them to classify the data in any way that they could. The judges had no familiarity with the methods Graves had used or with his research goal. After reading all the conceptions, they were able to classify approximately 60 percent of them into two categories with two subtypes each:

A. "Deny self" category (sacrifice)
   1. Deny self for reward later
   2. Deny self to get acceptance now

B. "Express self" category
   1. Express self as self desires in calculating fashion and at expense of others
   2. Express self as self desires but not at the expense of others (7, p. 6)
Graves continued to gather the same type of primary data year after year until he had collected 1,065 conceptions. Each year he used different judges who did not know how the previous year's judges had classified the data. Each group of judges classified all data accumulated to date. To Graves' amazement, each year of the investigation, the panel of judges came up with the same two categories and subtypes (7, p. 6).

As these categories emerged, Graves began to look next at the effect of peer authority and higher authority. He considered the five weeks spent in small discussion groups to be, in effect, time spent under the influence of peer authority and the five weeks spent studying the professionals' ideas to be time spent under the influence of higher authority. He thus looked for what changes in conceptions occurred following exposure to each of these experiences (7, p. 6).

He found that the two "deny self" subtypes were the same in that both responded to the influence of authority, but were different in that one responded to peer authority and the other to higher authority. The "deny self now for reward later" group was very vulnerable to influence from higher authorities, but not from peers. Criticism from peers only resulted in a strong defense of their original position. On the other hand, the "deny self now for acceptance now" group responded to peer authority and not to higher authority. Both subtypes of the "deny self"
category were alike in two respects: (1) they saw a healthy personality as adjustive to external sources and as denial of self; (2) whenever they made a central change in conception, it was always a change to an "express self" category (7, pp. 7-8).

The two subtypes of the "express self" category were also alike in two respects: (1) they saw a healthy personality as expressive of self; (2) whenever they made a central change in conception, it was a change to a "deny self" category. The "express self" types differed in that the "express self as self desires, but not at the expense of others" group responded to only self-procured information or to self thought, while the "express self in calculating fashion and at expense of others" group responded to information or thought whether it came from peers, higher authorities, or both. During one-way mirror observations, Graves discovered that the "express self but not at the expense of others" people did not try to take advantage of those in the group during discussions whereas the "express self in calculating fashion and at the expense of others" people certainly did and seemed to relish their ability to manipulate members of the group (7, pp. 8-9).

One other noticeable datum from these early experiments was that people in the "express self but not at the expense of others" subtype seemed to have much more freedom of thought, could see more options of behavior and more choices
than any of the other three subtypes (7, p. 9). At this
point of struggling to make sense out of his data, Graves
began to assert tentatively that perhaps a hierarchy of sorts
existed and that degrees of freedom increased as one moved
up the ladder within the hierarchy.

Graves kept track of which of his subjects approximated
Maslow's description of the self-actualized person (10), but
he noted that these persons uniformly fell into the "express
self but not at the expense of others" subtype. Then in
1959, Graves says he got the "shock of his life" (7, p. 10),
because subjects who had previously been "express self but
not at the expense of others" began to deny that this was
still their conception of a healthy human being. Graves was
told, "I used to believe that this was a healthy human being,
but I no longer believe this is exactly it" (7, p. 10). For
Graves, these experiences in 1959 turned out to be a major
milestone in the development of his theory. These unique
descriptions of healthy human behavior meant that Graves had
a new category, and this created a tremendous problem for
him. At this point, Maslow was celebrating the self-
actualized person as the epitome of human development (10),
and Carl Rogers' fully functioning person was viewed in
much the same way (11). Yet Graves' new data said that
the self-actualized or fully functioning level of existence
was one which some people were beginning to cast aside and
no longer considered representative of a healthy human
being. This opened up for Graves the idea that psychological health is a process and not a state of behavior and that man will continue to develop infinitely into the future.

Graves was ready to assert three main points of theory.

1. Psychological health is a process.
2. It is a hierarchical process.
3. It is an open-ended hierarchical process of the following character:

   Deny self now for later reward
to
Express self for self gain but calculatedly
to
Deny self now to get acceptance now
to
Express self but not at expense of others
to
Deny self to existential realities (7, p. 11).

The 1960s brought into college students who had previously been deprived of the opportunity to enter into higher education, and with their admission, Graves discovered a new conception that he had not previously identified. Graves remembers that one of these students started off his composition with, "Doc, this world is a Goddamned jungle and any healthy man knows it's survival of the fittest" (7, p. 10). Conceptions similar to this began to appear often enough for Graves' judges during these years to create a new subtype. It fit into the "express self" category and was labeled "express self impulsively at any cost." Graves noted that whenever people in this subtype made a central
change it was a change into "deny self now for later reward." Thus, it seemed obvious that he had found another rung on the hierarchical ladder and that it belonged immediately below "deny self now for later reward."

Could there be other rungs even lower on the ladder? Graves examined his hierarchy of conceptions, looked at the sources of his primary data and concluded that there probably were lower levels of existence than he was seeing evidence of in his college classes or even in his adult night school classes. He proceeded to search thoroughly the anthropological literature, and out of that he constructed two systems which now form the beginning of his hierarchy (7, p. 29).

In searching for these lower level systems, Graves said, "One of the problems you run into is that there seems to be a paucity of information coming out of the American psychological-psychiatric scene. Unless you get in contact with what is going on in other parts of the world . . . you don't come by these data" (7, p. 29). But studies from Japan, Uruguay, France, Germany, England, and Canada all seemed to provide additional evidence of the existence of two very primitive personality systems. The first was concerned only with the fulfillment of basic physiological needs of food and sleep and absence of pain. The second was a "deny self" system and the subtype was "deny self forever to the ways of the elders."
Graves now had distinguished eight different systems, and he began tentatively to label them. The following terms evolved:

Level 1  Autistic, Automatic, Reactive  
Level 2  Animistic, Tribalistic  
Level 3  Egocentric  
Level 4  Awakening & Fright, Saintly, Conformist, Absolutistic  
Level 5  Aggressive & Power-Seeking, Materialistic, Manipulative, Achievist  
Level 6  Personalistic, Sociocentric  
Level 7  Individualistic (Aggressive/Pacifistic), Cognitive, Existential  
Level 8  Experientialistic  

The next major idea which occurred to Graves was that conceptions might represent miniaturization of personality systems in operation. Perhaps he was not dealing with conceptions of psychological health but with personality systems in miniature. From this speculative position, Graves began to explore the people rather than the conceptions they submitted. Fortunately, many students who submitted conceptions in an early class of Graves also took advanced classes from him, and he was able to administer batteries of tests, to gather much psychometric data and to contrive behavioral situations and problem solving environments for observation (7, p. 6).
One major finding that grew out of such testing was that intelligence was not a factor which distinguished between or among the various levels Graves had found in his research. Another major finding was that in problem solving the "express self but not at expense of others" group (level seven) did everything assigned to them much better than did any of the other groups. (It should be pointed out that there were insufficient people in the eighth level to include them in the tests conducted in this portion of Graves’ research.) Graves formed groups representing all of the subtypes, except level eight, and gave them problem solving assignments with the instructions, "Here are some problems. You organize the problems. There are many answers to the problems and every answer is not the same" (7, p. 14). What he learned was that the level seven group found more solutions than did all of the other groups put together. Furthermore, the quality of their solutions was better than that of all of the other groups and the time required to arrive at solutions was less. There was considerable difference between this group and all the others, leading Graves to conceptualize that a sudden and significant change takes place in human behavior when the individual begins to believe that psychological health should be both expressive of self and taking care of the other human being at the same time.
Graves related that at this point in time he took all of the data he had been accumulating for ten years and tried to rationalize it within each of the existing theories of personality with which he was acquainted. No where would it fit. Always he had amounts of data left over which were unaccounted for by any theory of personality known to him. Finally, he decided to sum up all his own data and delineate his own systems conception of personality. He concluded that he would have to

a. Conceptualize adult behavior so as to allow for no variation in certain psychological dimensions, such as intelligence and temperament

b. Conceptualize adult behavior so as to allow for quantitative variation in some dimensions—authoritarianism, dogmatism

c. Conceptualize adult behavior in an alternating wave like fashion, allowing for repetition of theme and the different ways people in different systems organized the data

d. Conceptualize adult behavior so that every other system is similar to but at the same time different from its alternative

e. Conceptualize adult behavior so that each system has its system specificness, so that each system has a quality all its own

f. Conceptualize adult behavior so that certain systems are more externally oriented and that other systems are internally oriented

g. Conceptualize adult behavior so as to show increased degrees of behavioral freedom in each successive system, particularly in the "express self but not at the expense of others" system (7, p. 14).
Graves notes that after he came out with his findings, he looked around and found he was not alone. In the early 1960s a number of other theorists had suddenly published very similar ideas. Among them were Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder, and Jack Calhoun. Calhoun, who worked with rats rather than people, had the most extensive systems conception of personality, causing Graves to say, "We have arrived at a point in time when an idea can come up in any field—rat psychologists or human psychologists or physicists or what—it all seems to be pointing in the same direction" (7, p. 16).

One of the many studies Graves conducted in the early 1960s was a study correlating socio-economic level with conception of personality. He found that the lower the socio-economic status of the individual, the more his conception of healthy personality tended to be low in the hierarchy Graves had set up. Graves concluded that a person's conception of a healthy human being is partly a function of his having experienced himself the solution of certain problems that man encounters as a normal part of staying alive. The lower the conception of healthy personality in the hierarchy, the closer to being vital are the problems the human being is confronted with. The more vital is the problem, the more necessary that the person focus his energy toward its solution and the less choice he has to do anything else. This, of course, was what Maslow had also found (10). Problems exist to be solved, but only after solution of the
most basic problems is the individual ready to face the next
problem and the next and the next. As a person progresses,
he has fewer and fewer vital problems to deal with and more
and more existential problems. Graves decided to label the
most vital problems N and the sequentially less vital prob-
lems O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, etc. (7, pp. 16-18).

The way a person solves these problems must have
something to do with the brain, Graves felt. He hypothe-
sized that the brain of man must be structured one way or
another—probably functionally, not physically—into a
series of hierarchically ordered dynamic neurological
systems. Somewhere within the brain there must be specific
cells which are activated to solve N problems and other
cells which when activated solve O problems, etc. In
searching the literature, Graves found much evidence to
support his hypothesizing and continued to believe in
differentiated brain cell functioning and that different
stimuli turn on different systems. Arbitrarily, Graves
defined N problems as "those problems involved in the
operation of imperative periodic physiological needs of the
organism" (7, p. 18). O problems he defined as "those
problems involved in the physiology of the organism which
do not have the characteristics of periodicity in them"
(7, p. 18). By this latter definition he meant the problems
of shelter. The literature on experimental research
substantiated, Graves felt, that the brain could be stimu-
lated in one place to meet N problems and in another place
to meet O problems.

By this time, Graves had synthesized his hypotheses
and had begun calling each of his levels of existence by
letters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, stood for the neurological
coping system being activated in response to certain iden-
tifiable problems of environment represented by the second
letters, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T. Thus, Graves had arrived at
the point where he believed each level of existence devel-
oped from "the interaction of hierarchically ordered,
parallel and prepotent sets of existential problems and
sets of neuropsychological coping equipment" (6, p. 2).

The next question to be addressed was that of how a
person moved from one level of existence to another, and
this proved a difficult area for Graves to conceptualize.
Eventually, he began with the first requirement that there
must be potential within the brain for advancement. Since
he knew there existed hydrocephalics whose cortex was
arrested, he was convinced that all individuals do not have
the same brain structure and hence not the same potential
(7, p. 19).

The second factor that Graves felt must be present for
change to occur was the solution of the problems with which
the individual was faced at his present level. But this was
not enough. Lest the individual feel satisfied to remain at the present level where the problems were already solved, it was necessary that some dissonance occur. However, Graves found that the first thing an individual did in response to dissonance was to go back and try out old solutions. Moving forward to a new type of solution only occurred if the individual acquired something else—insight. So, insight became one of the ingredients necessary for change to occur. Still, Graves struggled to explain just what happened in the brain during transitions. He tried out a number of different ideas, but none of them could adequately explain the phenomenon of regression which he knew to be a reality (7, pp. 18-22).

Finally, Graves decided that there must be some sort of reversible chemical process in the brain and that the brain was therefore a producer of chemicals. He conceptualized that dissonance somehow induced the brain to begin to synthesize that kind of organic substance which caused the next higher level to take over dominance. The chemical was produced slowly at first, reached a certain critical point, and then a quantum jump was made to the new level (7, pp. 18-22).

Graves came to believe that this process results in subordination of the older levels, not eradication of them. When the B-O level takes over, the A-N is still there and subordinated in it. The N problems are plural problems, and
the O problems are plural problems; so most of the problems at the N level are solved, but a few remain, and thus there is a mixture of levels at work in each person all the time. Graves found, in reviewing his research, that for all the persons he had classified, at least 50 percent of each individual's thinking could be centralized at a particular level and the remaining percent was then divided between where the person was going and where he had come from (7, p. 22).

One more observation which convinced Graves that chemical processes were involved in the neurological systems was his observation that people at the G-T level evidenced no fear. They were not afraid of finding food (the fear of A-N people); they were not afraid that they were going to be without shelter (B-O); they were not afraid of predatory man (C-P); they were not afraid of God (D-Q); they were not afraid of lack of status or lack of success (E-R); and they were not afraid of social rejection (F-S). Here, as Graves examined him, was a man without fear. Yet, who would deny that the fear element has a chemical factor in it? It all seemed added substantiation for Graves' ideas (7, pp. 22-24).

Graves was attempting to explain the brain in terms of behavior. He reversed the ordinary process of deduction, just as Maxwell did when he tried to explain electromagnetism in reverse fashion and brought about the greatest advance of modern physics, according to Graves (7, p. 24). Graves was in a position where he could observe the behavior, and from
that he tried to infer a structure and to reason that the
brain must be constructed in certain ways. However, Graves
believed and still believes that it does not matter whether
you approach the conceptualization of personality from a
structural viewpoint, a chemical one, or a behavioral one,
because each of them is insufficient in itself and all are
needed together to provide a full explanation. It is not
one or the other; it is a system with all aspects integrated.

This is what Clare Graves believed his theory had
finally offered—a systems conception that integrated the
confusing and contradictory information which existed in the
field of behavioral science when he began his research in
1952. The theory of Levels of Psychological Existence seemed
large enough and complex enough to encompass paradoxical man.

And so the theory began to be applied. Beck, Hughes,
Flowers, and Myers and Myers all found much receptivity for
Graves' ideas as they carried them into the business world
and other arenas in the 1970s (1, 2, 8, 12, 13). For the
most part, these followers referred to Graves' levels of
existence as value systems during these years and called the
systems Reactive, Tribalistic, Egocentric, Conformist,
Manipulative, Sociocentric, and Existential. The term
"coping systems" was suggested by the National Values Center
in 1978 and met with Graves' approval as did the revised
names of Reactive, Tribalistic, Egocentric, Absolutistic,
Achievist, Sociocentric, and Individualistic.
Graves' followers continued to apply theory, and Graves continued to theorize. By 1978, he was calling his work "An Emergent-Cyclical Model of Adult Psychosocial Behavior," and he listed sixteen key concepts that his research showed a model of mature psychosocial behavior should represent. They were

1. That adult psychological development consists of hierarchically ordered, prepotent, upwardly spiraling psychosocial systems.

2. That these systems alternate their focus in a cyclic, oscillating, dominant-subordinate fashion. [See Figure 1, p. 40.]

3. An undifferentiated focus in the first system with differentiation to begin in the second and alternate thereafter between focus upon the inner subjective world and how to come to know and come to peace with it, in even numbered systems and focus upon the external world and how to control and expand power over it in each odd numbered system after the third.

4. That cerebral dominance, in the even numbered systems, is by the right hemisphere of the brain and in odd numbered systems, beginning with the third, by the left hemisphere of the brain.

5. That the alternating systems show little mean variation from system to system for some psychological dimensions such as intelligence and temperament.

6. That certain psychological dimensions such as ideological dogmatism and objectivity emerge with a particular system in the hierarchy of systems then decrease or increase systemically in subsequent systems.

7. That certain psychological dimensions such as guilt, as a felt emotion, emerge with a particular system in the hierarchy then, in subsequent systems, vary quantitatively in an increasing or decreasing cyclic wave-like fashion.
8. That every other psychosocial system, after the first, is like but, at the same time, not like its alternating partner. Systems 2, 4, and 6 are all obeisance systems, but each obeys in different ways. Systems 3, 5 and 7 are all change systems but how to and what to change in each system is different.

9. That each system has a general theme for existence which typifies it.

10. That each central theme for existence is particularizable into almost an infinite number of ways for peripheral expression. For example, the fourth level absolutistic "sacrifice now to get later" theme is formed in the world particularized into many absolutistic, monotheistic, religious theologies and many non-religious absolutistic ideologies.

11. That increasing degrees of behavioral freedom, increasing degrees of choice emerge with each successive level but the degree of increase is greater in odd numbered than in even numbered systems.

12. That every seventh system shows a degree of change in excess of the sum of all six previous changes.

13. That adult psychological life is a developing, emergent process which can be likened to a symphony built on six basic themes which repeat, in higher order form, every set of six. The first six tell the story of adult psychological development in a world of naturalistic abundance. The second order systems tell the story of how psychological development will take place in a world of naturalistic scarcity.

14. That each system develops from the interaction of hierarchically ordered, parallel and prepotent sets of existential problems and sets of neuropsychological coping equipment. [See Figure 1, p. 40.]

15. That adult psychological development is a flowing process in which the solution of current existential problems creates the next set of existential problems to be solved and in their creation activates the next set of neuropsychological coping equipment consisting of the information
processing means for detection and solution of the created set of existential problems.

16. That the process moves in a complex wave-like, progressive, nodal, regressive fashion. Each wave develops slowly to the point of inflection, then rapidly ascends to its nodal form, then begins a slow descent to the point of deflection where a precipitous fall ensues as the next wave starts slowly to ascend (6, pp. 1-2).

At least one of the concepts listed above appears to be a late development in Graves' hypothesizing. Attributing the oscillation between odd numbered states and even numbered stages to the alternation in the brain between the left and right hemispheres is a theoretical addition of recent vintage. Figure 1 (page 40) appeared in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology in 1970. It shows the emergence of the existential states with respect to their alternation between the adjustment-of-environment-to-organism component and the adjustment-of-organism-to-environment component, but does not connect such alternation with left/right cerebral dominance. However, this connection is explicitly stated in a drawing which appeared in an unpublished manuscript of Graves in 1978 (6).

Another evolvement of Graves' theory is merely a change in labeling. In early years Graves referred to the existential problems facing man by using the initials N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U and to the neurological coping systems by using the initials A, B, C, D, E, F, G. In later years, he reversed the alphabetical letters, using A, B, C, D, E, F,
Fig. 1--Emergence of the Existential States from the interaction of Components as Existential Problems N-U are solved and as Neurological Systems or Configurations A-H are involved. Source: *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 10 (Fall, 1970), 135.
to represent existential problems and N, O, P, Q, R, S to represent neurocoping systems and he began to refer to level seven as A'-N' instead of G-T in order to indicate that level seven was the beginning of the second order of basic themes which he now felt were organized into sets of six.

Characteristics of the Levels of Existence

While certain aspects of Graves' theory have evolved and been modified by new information or insight (primarily aspects of how and why), other aspects, such as Graves' description of the characteristics of people centralized at each of the existence levels, have remained constant. His description of each system has varied little over the years. With every article published he expanded the information on each level, and he gave more and more specific applications of theory to the problems of contemporary society. But the hard-core characteristics of the various levels were the primary data with which he began, and little has altered them.

Although brief definitions were provided in Chapter I, a full discussion of each level follows and it includes the behavioral characteristics, the thinking, and the values of each level. A summary in chart form is provided in Tables I and II (pages 42, 43) showing the learning system, thinking style, motivational systems, specific motivation, means
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Nature of Existence</th>
<th>Problems of Existence</th>
<th>Learning System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>Maintaining physiological stability</td>
<td>Habituation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Achievement of relative safety</td>
<td>Classical conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Living with self-awareness</td>
<td>Operant conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Saintly</td>
<td>Achieving ever-lasting peace of mind</td>
<td>Avoidant learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Materialistic</td>
<td>Conquering the physical universe</td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Living with the human element</td>
<td>Observational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Restoring viability to a disordered world</td>
<td>Any and all systems named above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Motivational System</td>
<td>Specific Motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Periodic physiological needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Autistic</td>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Aperiodic physiological needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Psychological survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Order, meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(dogmas, rules)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Adequacy, competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Relativistic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Love, affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>Existence</td>
<td>Self-worth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
values, end values, nature of existence, and problems of existence for each level.

**Reactive**

The Reactive system represents man at his first and most basic level of subsistence. It is a purely physiological existence where the human being seeks only the immediate satisfaction of his basic physiological needs. He is not capable of assigning cause or effect to anything. His awareness excludes self and is limited to the presence of physiologically-determined tension when it appears and to relief from such tension when it disappears. This level of existence is seldom seen in the modern world except in pathological cases, new-born infants, the profoundly retarded, severe stroke victims, or the senile elderly. It may be seen more frequently as a temporary level of existence which has taken over dominance during a period of drug use or emotional shock or physical shock. An individual is virtually without values at this level of existence, since he has no awareness of himself as a separate and distinct being. Any values that exist are purely reactive in character. Whatever reduces pain or tension is good (4, pp. 73-74; 5, pp. 135-136).

It is not necessary for man to rise above this level in order to procreate and to continue the survival of the species. Graves claimed that the human being at this level
can live what is for him a productive lifetime—productive in the sense that his built-in response mechanisms are able to reduce the tensions of his imperative physiological needs (4, p. 74). No man will ever be without some Reactive values, because he is always a physiological organism. But for most people in Western civilization, the Reactive values have been subordinated within higher level value systems (4, p. 74; 5, p. 136).

Tribalistic

What causes first level man to advance to the second level of subsistence? Graves believes that

As soon as man, in his food-gathering wanderings, acquires a set of Pavlovian conditioned reflexes, which provide for the satisfaction of his imperative needs, and thus enters his "Garden of Eden," he slides almost imperceptibly out of this first stage into the second existential state, an established form of human existence, the tribalistic way of life" (4, p. 74).

At this second level of subsistence, man seeks to continue a way of life that he does not understand, but which he strongly defends. He believes his tribalistic way is inherent in the nature of things, and as a result, he holds tenaciously to it and strives desperately to propitiate the world for its continuance. His existence is based on myth and tradition and is a mystical phenomenon full of spirits, magic, and superstition. Human beings at this level are aware of cause and effect only in the sense that they know
some things hurt ("The earthquake hurt me," "The stick hurt me") and some things help, and they try to perpetuate the latter. Everything is viewed from the personal perspective of how it will directly affect the tribe. The prime value at this level is safety, and the prime means is tradition. Since the tribal way of life is inherent in nature, the role of man is to perpetuate it and to learn from his elders the things that are necessary to insure safety and survival. For the first time, man becomes social, in the sense of being dominated by the traditions of his tribe. The theme for existence is "one shall live according to the ways of one's elders" (4, p. 74; 5, p. 137).

Such a tribal way of existence can be perpetuated for a very long time, especially since the dogma of the level is "continue the status quo, perpetuate our tribe." However, when the established tribal way of life assures the continuance of the tribe with minimal energy expenditure, it creates the first of the general conditions necessary for movement to a new and different steady state of being. It produces excess energy in the system which puts the system in a state of readiness for change. But unless another factor, dissonance, comes into the field, the change will not occur. This dissonance usually arises in youth, or can come to certain capable minds when outsiders disturb the tribe's traditional way of life and introduce new thoughts and values (4, p. 74; 5, pp. 137-138).
When readiness does occur in second level man, the insight that will cause his advancement to the third subsistence level is recognition that he is an individual being separate and distinct from his tribal compatriots. As he struggles with this new perception, he becomes aware that separateness means that the tribe is no longer his complete security for everything. He realizes that he is aligned against predatory animals, a threatening physical universe, and other men who fight back for their established way of existence or against him because of the new way of existence he is striving to develop. He no longer perceives himself as an inseparable part of the whole, as one-with-all; he perceives himself as alone in a battle to ensure his own survival (4, p. 74; 5, p. 138).

Egocentric

At the Egocentric level, raw, rugged self-assertive individualism comes to the fore. Graves says that this level might be termed "Machiavellian," for within it is all that the author of The Prince considered the essence of being human (4, p. 74). History seems to substantiate, claims Graves, that the few who were able to gain their freedom from survival problems surged almost uncontrollably forward into a new way of being and also dragged after them the tribal members unable to free themselves of the burden of stagnating tribalistic existence (4, p. 74). The few
became the authoritarians, while the many became the followers. The many accepted the "might-is-right" of the few because such acceptance assured their survival. A "might-is-right" philosophy is evident not only in past history but in some areas of today's world as well. It is a point of view based on the prerogatives of the "haves" and the duties of the "have nots." When an entire society adopts this view, then a system develops in which each individual acts out in detail, in the interest of his own survival, how life is to be lived, but only a small number ever achieve any amount of power, and the remainder are left to submit (4, p. 74).

Assured of their survival, the "haves" base life on the "right" way to behave as their might dictates. Both the ruler and the submissive develop standards which they feel will insure them against threat, but these are very raw standards. The submissive person chooses to get away with what he can within the lifestyle which is possible for him. The authoritarian chooses to do as he pleases. He claims the rights of assertive individualism, and these rights become in time the absolute rights of kings, the unassailable prerogatives of management, the inalienable rights of those who have achieved positions of power. It is a world of aggressive expression of man's lusts--openly and unabashedly by the "haves" and more covertly and deviously by the "have nots" (4, p. 74; 5, pp. 138-139).
The central theme of this level of existence, then, is that "might makes right." The person at the third level looks around at the world and observes that many people try but few succeed, and he comes to believe that the heroic deed (the demonstration of might) is the means to his survival. He therefore values heroism above all else. To the hero or victor belong the spoils and the right to exercise greed, avarice, envy, and pride, for he has shown through his deeds that he is worthy. The power ethic prevails. In the power ethic, the more daring the act of man, the more it is revered. Right is demonstrated in violent action. It is not necessary for the hero to replace the establishment he destroys; it is only necessary for him to attack it and be victorious in order to be the hero. The third level man values daring deeds, impulsive action, volatile emotion, the greatest of risk. Conquest is the central goal of life (4, p. 74; 5, pp. 138-139).

Why would he change? Graves believes that the impetus for change from this level of existence springs from the inescapable fact of death. No matter how revered the hero, he must eventually die, and his death is visible to "have nots" alike, so that eventually some ask "why?" "Why do I have to die?" "Why was I born?" Why does someone else have all the success in life while I have none?" The search for answers to these questions leads man to the fourth level of existence where he develops a strong
conviction that there must be a reason for it all, a reason why the "haves" shall possess so much in life yet be faced with death, a reason why the "have nots" shall be forced to endure a miserable existence. The reason seems to be that there is a directive design guiding everything, a design of man's destiny. At this point, man is moving to the fourth level of existence, the absolutistic level (4, p. 83).

Absolutistic

One of Graves' early adjectives for the fourth subsistence level was "Saintly" because he saw that here man developed a way of life based on the dictum "Thou shalt suffer the pangs of existence in this life to prove thyself worthy of later life" (4, p. 74). Graves felt that this "saintly" approach to existence came from seeing that living in this world did not result in ultimate pleasure, an insight that led to creating a rationale that rewards must therefore come later in some other world. Man perceives that certain rules are prescribed for each class of men and that these rules describe the proper way each class is to behave. The measure of a man's worthiness becomes the extent to which he has obeyed the established rules. There is punishment now and forever after for those who do not follow the rules, those who do not repent. Guilt and atonement emerge for the first time at this level. Feelings of
guilt are more intense at the fourth level than at any of the other levels of existence (7, p. 14).

Sacrifice is the primary value of the fourth subsistence level. The theme is "one shall sacrifice earthly desires now in order to come to everlasting peace later" (4, p. 83). Involved are denial, deference, piety, modesty, and harsh self-discipline. What one wants or desires is not important; what is important is that each person discipline himself to the prescription of his world. This becomes so ingrained in the thinking of level four man that he no longer truly has the later reward in mind when he denies himself and sacrifices; the process of denial and sacrifice have become valued in themselves since they are the familiar, the "right" way to live. Surely this can be illustrated in contemporary society with such prescriptions as "Good parents sacrifice for their children."

Level four man accepts that inequality is a fact of life. He accepts his position and role in life and feels that such calm and peaceful acceptance is a virtue. The task of living is to strive for perfection in one's role, regardless of how high or low the station of life (4, p. 83).

In its sacrificial theme, the fourth level of existence is similar to the second level. In the second level, man sacrifices to the spirits, the unknown gods, the mystical forces of the world; he propitiates them to remove threats and harm from his immediate existence. In the fourth level,
man sacrifices to what he considers to be a known God or a known and prescribed way of life; he does so not to advance his immediate existence, but in order to receive ultimate rewards later on (4, p. 83).

Level four is similar to level two also in its homage to authority. Level two man accepts unquestionably the authority of his elders and of the tribe. Level four man accepts unquestionably the authority of his church, political party, or other respected source. Life at the fourth level is a serious business, and only institutionalized pleasure is permitted. Rules are black and white, and the authorized authority defines virtue and sin in unqualified, non-relativistic terms.

Earlier in this chapter it was explained that each central theme for existence is particularizable into an infinite number of ways for peripheral expression. Graves says that this particular phenomenon often makes the fourth level system one of the most confusing to understand and to identify. What seem to be opposites are, in fact, different manifestations of the same value system. For instance, the Moslems and Hindus, often enemies, share the same level of existence. The holy wars of the crusades, Graves says, stemmed from the same value system as the non-violence of Gandhi and Martin Luther King (4, p. 83). The systems are basically similar because they emphasize sacrifice now to achieve a better situation later. Doctrinaire Catholicism
and atheistic communism are only polar opposite schema varying from the same central sacrificial theme (4, p. 83).

At this fourth level, man evidences for the first time the capacity for true two-way interpersonal interacting. He suddenly has feelings for other people. However, those feelings are shown as affection for people like him and shunning of people unlike him. He can display tenderness for others who follow the same rules he follows (belong to the same church, lodge, political party, etc.), but he cannot forgive those who ignore The Right Way. Above all else, fourth level man believes there is one right way of life and that all other ways are wrong (4, p. 73).

As in all the levels, the process of advancement to the next system begins after the fourth level problems have been adequately solved. After man has achieved security through the following of absolutistic rules, he then has time to question the price. When this happens, Graves says, the saintly way of life is doomed to decay, since some men are bound to ask why they cannot have some pleasure in this life (4, p. 74). The struggle to attain the fifth level of existence begins as man perceives his next set of problems—that he cannot have much enjoyment in life until he is no longer at the mercy of the unknown world, the servant of the universe rather than its master. As he perceives this, he begins to respond to the challenge, to desire to be a conqueror and to learn the secrets of the universe so that
he may be in control. As the fifth level man begins to 
emerge, fourth level man views him as the ultimate sign of 
man's depravity. The new independence of the Achievist man 
is exhilarating to people caught up in the vision, but 
impious to those still holding the earlier Absolutistic 
values (4, p. 83).

Achievist

The fifth level man has been labeled Aggressive and 
Power Seeking, Materialistic, Manipulative, and Achievist, 
the revisions in name a result of attempting most accurately 
to capture his essence. Perceiving that his fourth level 
life was limited by his lack of control over his environ-
ment, the Achievist man seeks greater mastery through 
objectivistic, positivistic, operationalistic, scientific 
methods. His goal is greater material gain for a more 
satisfactory human existence in the here and now.

A major phenomenon that emerges for the first time at 
level five is the capacity for multiplistic thinking. The 
Achievist comprehends that there are numerous different 
ways, but he still believes firmly in one BEST way. All 
of his energy is directed toward the discovery and pursuit 
of that best way in life (4, p. 83).

At the fifth level, man moves to objective viewing of 
himself and his world. He adopts the scientific method of 
inquiry because he believes it will lead to faster control
over the universe. He values rationalistic approaches to problems. Above all else, solutions must be pragmatic, utilitarian, and profit-producing. Life is a game, and he is in it to win. The process of attaining becomes the all important thing to him, eventually more important than the enjoyment of his acquisitions. He feels no compunction in taking all he can get, but he does it carefully, calculatedly so as not to bring down the wrath of others upon himself. The Achievist values equality of opportunity, because it gives him a chance to compete. Winning is the stimulation of life—winning more than what he has won. Independence, strength, and "standing on one's own two feet" are important. He espouses a mechanistic, measuring, quantitative approach to problems, and his values lead to wealth, knowledge, and techniques which improve the human condition (4, p. 83).

However, herein lies the inadequacy of level five and the impetus for further advancement to level six, for after the Achievist has achieved, he acknowledges once again the gnawing of subjectivity inside himself. He has achieved at the price of alienation, and he experiences an increasing need to belong, to affiliate himself once again. He finds himself master of the objective physical world but a prime neophyte in the subjectivistic, humanistic world. To his surprise, he is not liked by his fellow men. His callous use of knowledge for himself has led to envy, perhaps even respect, but not to affection. He has acquired personal
status and material existence at the expense of being rejected, often even by his own children in recent American history. The solution of his fifth level problems—assuring an abundant earthly existence—leaves man with excess energy with which to perceive his next set of problems—how to live at peace with his inner man and with his fellowmen. Gradually, driftingly, the Achievist discovers he no longer wants to "go it alone" with his achievements, and so a new theme comes into his existence: "Sacrifice some now so that others can have too" (4, p. 83).

**Sociocentric**

At this new sixth subsistence level, man becomes centrally interested in peace with his inner self and in the relation of his self to the inner self of others. He becomes concerned with belonging, with being accepted, with re-establishing harmony with other selves so that individuals everywhere can be at peace with the world. One can detect again the issue of authority, the same orientation to outside opinion that existed at levels two and four. The source of the authority has changed, however. At level two, man respected the authority of the tribal elders; level four man respected divine and institutionalized authority; level six man respects peer authority. For Sociocentric man, the opinions of his contemporaries are all important and all controlling (4, p. 83). Obviously,
the sixth level is another state in which the organism adapts himself to fit the environment—the environment he has recently worked so hard to conquer at level five.

The sixth level is like the second and fourth in the sense that it is a sacrificial or obeisance system also. Level two man sacrificed to the spirits and mystical powers and to the ways of the elders. Level four man sacrificed to rigid rules and regulations in order to gain eventual reward. Level six man sacrifices to his fellow man in order to gain from them their present approval and affection (4, p. 83).

The sixth level is affectively warmer than any of the other levels. Intimacy and involvement are prized, as is the sense of community. There is extended to others the right to express themselves. On the surface, sixth level values may appear shallow and fickle, since the Sociocentric shifts positions as the "valued-other" changes his preferences. But the central core of this level, Graves says, is a very solid process (4, p. 84). Sociocentric man is seeking to be with and within the feelings of his "valued-other." He favors sensitivity rather than objectivity, persuasion rather than force, consensus rather than majority rule, and softness rather than cold rationality. Because he wants from others support and approval, he often chooses roles where he can give support and approval, assuming that others also want this. Thus, Sociocentricals often choose
"helping" professions such as social work, teaching, the ministry, nursing. Cooperation is preferred to competition in this value system, and social approval to individual fame. In essence, this man values "getting along with" more than "getting ahead." This shocks the materialists of level five who view it as regrettable weakness and as a surrender of self for social approval. According to Graves' theory, however, man has subordinated his self-interest for the time being only; self-interest will return again in a new and higher form—the Individualistic form of existence (4, p. 84).

The seventh level of existence (and the first being level) begins to develop out of the resolution of man's animalistic or subsistence problems. He has learned and developed values which assure physiological satisfaction, provide for the continuance of a way of life, assure survival, assure future salvation, bring earthly satisfaction here and now, and enable affection and acceptance by others. Now something dramatic happens, claims Graves, for suddenly the human being is free to focus on himself and the world and to see himself and his situation as it really is (4, p. 84).

**Individualistic**

After being hobbled by the more narrow animal-like needs, by the imperative need for sustenance, the fear of
spirits and other predatory men, by the fear of trespass upon the ordained order, by the fear of his greediness, and the fear of social disapproval, suddenly, human cognition is free. And when man looks at himself and the world around him with clear cognition, he finds a picture that is far from pleasant. Illuminated in devastating detail are man's failure to be what he might be and his misuse of his world. Triggered by this revelation, the Individualist leaps out in search of a way of life and a system of values which will enable him to be more than a parasite leeching upon the world and all its beings. He seeks a foundation for self-respect which will have a firm base in existential reality (4, p. 84).

Proper behavior at the seventh level of existence is the recognizant way. The ethic is "recognize, truly notice what life is and you shall know how to behave" (5, p. 152). The proper way to behave is the way that comes from working within existent reality. If it is realistic that one should suffer, then suffer he should. If it is realistic to be happy, then it is good to be happy. If the situation calls for authoritarianism, then it is proper to be authoritarian, and if the situation calls for democracy, one should be democratic. Here man sees the "big picture" of life and thinks cohesively and systemically. His ethic prescribes that what was right yesterday may not be right tomorrow,
but it also prescribes that some behavior which was wrong yesterday will always be wrong (4, p. 84).

Of all the levels of existence, the seventh is the most difficult to comprehend, for there man lives in a world of paradoxes. He knows that his personal life is absolutely unimportant, but because it is part of life there is nothing more important in the world. Graves has observed that the Individualist enjoys a good meal or good company when it is there, but does not miss it when it is not (4, p. 82). He requires little, compared to his level five ancestor, and gets more pleasure from simple things than his level six predecessor. He knows how to get what is necessary to his existence and does not want to waste time getting what is superfluous. He knows, more than any other level, what power is, how to create and use it, but he also knows how limited is its usefulness. Magic and superstition hold no sway over him. He is not mystically minded, though he lives in the most mysterious of mystic universes. In his thinking, he obviously has the capacity to handle paradox and polar opposites.

Behavior at this level is so different from that of past levels that those past levels find it incomprehensible. For example, the seventh level man will explode at what he does not like, but he will not be worked up or angry about it. He will get satisfaction out of doing well but will get no satisfaction from praise for having done so. Praise
is anathema to him. He is egoless, but terribly concerned with the rightness of his own existence. He is detached from and unaffected by social realities, but has a very clear sense of their existence. In living his life he constantly takes into account his personal qualities, his social situations, his body, and his power, but they are of no great concern to him. He fights for himself, but is not defensive. He seeks to do better, but is not ambitious. He enjoys the best of life, of sex, of friends, and comfort that is provided, but he is not dependent on them (4, p. 81).

Here man values acceptance, the genuine acceptance of human nature as it is, and he shuns artificiality and preference for what it should be. He values all human appetites but is not a compulsive slave to any of them. He values spontaneity and simplicity and ethics that "make sense"—but not conventionality. Universality is valued over provinciality, and broadness of view is preferred to pettiness. He values the long run of time, even beyond his life. He sees the world and all its things, all its beings, all its people, as truly interdependent. He sees them entwined in a subjective-objective complex; so he values pluralism. He values that which will enable all animals, all plants and things to be and all mankind to become. His ethics are based on the best possible evidence as to what will benefit all. Concern with the majority, the needy or the desiring is not enough. He
values that which will bring good to him and to all the universe. That which alone commands his unswerving loyalty, and in whose cause he is ruthless, is the continuance of life on this earth (5, pp. 153-154).

This seventh level comes into being when man has conquered the basic human fears. With this a marked change in his conception of existence occurs. His attention turns to his failure to focus upon the truly salient aspects of life. He sees now that he has the problem of the continuance of life. What is important is not his own life now, not life after life, but the restoration of his world so that life can continue to be (4, p. 84). The most serious problem of existence to date is how the human species can survive. Thus, the seventh level is like the first in its survival goal, but the seventh level introduces an entirely new and higher plane of existence.

At this level, the new thema for existence is, "express self so that all others, all beings, can continue to exist." Now, at the level of being, man's values arise not from selfish interest but from the recognition of the magnificence of existence and a desire to see that it shall continue to be (4, p. 84).

Oddly enough, this value system is seen as decadent by many. It is seen as decadent because it values new ways, new structurings for life, not just the ways of one's elders. It values others as well as self, the enjoyment
of this life over and above obeisance to authority, equal
distribution of material gains, and it values all and self,
not just the selected few. But as different as this value
system may seem to those who can feel it or to those who
read its description, it is not, as so many have thought,
the ultimate for man. According to Graves, beyond it lies
another value world that few men have yet to know (5,
p. 154).

For those men who have come to a relative satisfaction
of their need to esteem life, a new existential state,
Experientialistic, is just beginning to develop. It emerges
when cognitive man truly realizes that there is much he will
never know about existence. A problem solving existence is
not enough. This eighth level, the highest Graves has found
among his subjects, is difficult to describe because so few
have yet attained it. Graves suggests that the general
character of the yet-to-come eighth level is captured by a
poem by D. H. Lawrence:

There are vast realms of consciousness still undreamed of
vast ranges of experience, like the humming of unseen harps,
we know nothing of, within us.

Oh when man has escaped from the barbed-wire entanglement
of his own ideas and his own mechanical devices
there is a marvelous rich world of contact and sheer fluid
beauty
and fearless face-to-face awareness of now-naked life . . .
when at last we escape the barbed-wire enclosure
of Know Thyself, knowing we can never know,
we can but touch, and wonder, and ponder, and make our effort
and dangle in a last fastidious fine delight . . .

(9, pp. 666-667)
American Society—Which Level?

When Graves began gathering his early conceptions of the healthy human being in 1952, he noted that level five, Achievist, was the mode or most frequently portrayed system. Thirty-four percent of his subjects were at the fourth level, and only six to ten percent were at the seventh level (7, p. 41); American society was completing the transition from Absolutistic to Achievist man. The end value of the fifth level man is materialism; the means value is rational, objectivistic positivism, that is, scientism. This pragmatic, scientific utilitarianism was the dominant mode of existence in the United States in the 1950s, Graves observed. And perhaps it was still the dominant theme in the 1960s, but certainly the sixth level emerged then and became highly visible.

The efflorescence of Sociocratic values could easily be seen in the popularity of such things as Esalen, yoga, the encounter group, the humanistic psychology movement, and participatory decision-making in management. In 1974, Graves, writing in The Futurist, felt that the so-called "generation gap" of the 1960s was in reality a values gap between the fourth, fifth, and sixth levels of existence. Many parents whose dominant system was Achievist, found their children espousing sixth level values. To individuals operating at the fifth level, it was inconceivable that their children might reject competition for cooperation and
seek inner self-knowledge rather than power, position, and things. "These young people not only challenged Might (and therefore Right)," said Graves, "but offered no new Might and Right to replace that which they mocked" (4, p. 76). Consequently, they were rightly (to the fifth level mentality) called anarchists, and it was widely said that such permissiveness was wrecking the values which made America great. Of course, in hindsight, America was not, in fact, "wrecked," and in the 1970s one could see a great many of the Achievist parents who protested against anarchy getting in touch with themselves at growth groups and advocating theories of participative management.

Graves says that one of the advantages which accrues when the mass of people in a culture moves beyond the fifth level and into the sixth is that homicide as a crime becomes extinct. His data shows that homicide as a behavior of man disappears as the transition into the Sociocratic level is made (7, p. 30). However, this is not to say that sixth level man is without problems; on the contrary, the suicide rate is highest at the sixth level. If there are severe frustrations and problems in the Sociocratic's life, he will take his aggression out on himself, since he no longer believes in taking it out on someone else (7, p. 30). He continues to be beset with the problems peculiar to the sixth level until such time as he solves these problems and moves into the Individualistic level, the first "being" level.
When people reading Graves' theory protest that his descriptions of seventh level man seem strange, he reminds them that a description of sixth level humanity, typified by the Esalen Institute, System Y Management and much with which they are now familiar, would have seemed equally perverse and bizarre to those who were at the fourth and fifth levels in the 1950s (4, p. 81). They would have sworn such values would never have been widely accepted. Those who survive long enough to live in a society ordered by the seventh level way of thinking will find it perfectly natural. Thus it will continue to be, according to the theory of Clare W. Graves. One value system will follow another, as mankind continues up the hierarchical ladder through ever new levels of psychological existence.
1. Beck, Don Edward, Director of the National Values Center.
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"Every classification is an injustice"
J. Loevinger (14, p. 133)

The truth of the epigram that any naming and classifying of human beings falls inevitably short of the reality that is life is here acknowledged. Semanticist Alfred Korzybski coined the phrases "the map is not the territory" and "the map does not represent all of the territory" in order to point out that the very process of language diminishes the wholeness of reality, since language cannot capture everything and thus becomes selective (13, p. 22). In similar fashion, all classifications of man are only man made and as such are believed here to be primarily pragmatic as opposed to The Truth.

We are, however, surrounded by classification systems of every sort, too diverse to be collapsed into one account, yet too much alike to refer to altogether different aspects of human nature. The fact that many different people begin at different points, use different kinds of data, and arrive at convergent conceptions may confirm the existence of some underlying reality. In terms of building a scientific discipline, however, the result is chaotic, with numerous theorists cultivating separate schools of thought, each with
its small cadre of followers, often out of touch with the theory or findings of others working on essentially the same problems and often with vocabularies so different as to make connections hard to establish. Nonetheless, one aim of reviewing the literature must be to attempt to establish connections. The focal point of this study is the theory of Clare Graves; the review of the literature therefore tries to connect other major conceptions with Graves' conception. Those theories most closely aligned with Graves' theory are reviewed, and aspects of similarity and difference are noted.

Focusing the Field: The Developmentalists

Graves' theory of adult psychosocial behavior is a developmental theory, and a review of the related literature begins with the recognition that there are two unreconciled approaches to development—the organismic view to which Graves subscribes and the mechanistic view. One of the differences between the views is the degree to which a human being is believed to have inherent capacities. The mechanists believe that the human mind is like a blank page, infinitely malleable and open, molded by outside forces. An organismic view such as Graves' says that the human mind has an essence of its own, however unknown such essence may be to scientists at the moment. The latter view holds that the organism actively selects its environment and interprets what is
selected. The former view holds that the mind is empty and receptive, essentially passive; rather like a camera, it is imprinted with what is offered to its eye, and all that is offered is imprinted. But in the organismic view, environment is not an objective entity, the same for all organisms. Environment is what an organism is sensitive to and can use for itself, and that is determined by the basic laws of its internal balance. The organism is equipped to engage in exchanges with the environment. Thus, while in the organismic view the organism defines the environment, in the mechanistic view the environment defines the mind-machine. Since Graves' concept of development is organismic in nature, the review of the literature is limited to that arena and mechanistic theories are not addressed.

Further Focusing: The Developmental Structuralists

The preceding chapter detailed how Graves arrived at a systems conception of personality. The word system is simply another term for structure, both of which apply where there are many elements or parts that are not simply an aggregate, an assemblage, but are related to each other so as to form a well-defined order. Graves is not only a developmentalist but a structuralist as well. Structuralism aims to establish a system of categories and of relations among categories parallel with the organizations existing in reality. Graves' own view of human maturation might well be
an echo of Augusto Blasi's statement, "I believe that the only way to understand development consists in conceptualizing it as a sequence of structural changes, often stimulated by the interaction of an organism with its environment" (1, p. 51).

This "sequence of structural changes" to which Blasi refers may be called stages, or as Graves prefers, levels. Jane Loevinger says that describing human development in terms of stages "implies, firstly, that there is not a smooth transition from very low to very high levels; instead, there are discontinuities. But what appear to be discontinuous variables can, on analysis, be shown to contain underlying continuities, whereas what appear to be continuous variables may harbor discontinuities; so the difference is not absolute" (15, pp. 54-55).

The labeling of stages or sequences presents a problem for all researchers, for no way of labeling, whether by the assignment of numbers or the assignment of names, is wholly satisfactory. Using numbers invariably leads to a terminological impasse when further stages are identified which belong in between sequenced numbers. Graves' theory grew from the original four stages that his college students presented to eight stages; however, any added stage fit conveniently either lower or higher in the hierarchy than his original four stages and caused no labeling problem. Such was not true for Loevinger, whose conception grew
during research from a four-point to a ten-point scale, the new sequences falling at various places in between the original ones; therefore, names were better for her purposes than were numbers. However, using names has its own hazards. Often the name assigned is the name of some broad human function or characteristic, implying that such function or characteristic arises all at once in one stage and perishes in the passage to the next. Such is not the case, since there are usually underlying continuities that run throughout the developmental structure.

As a structuralist, Graves' conceptions are abstractions in the sense that they are not predictive of specific, concrete behaviors as much as they are predictive of behavior in general. No structuralist theory can be reduced to observable performances of specific people, as one might incorrectly infer from reading theory texts. Rather than expecting identification of pure theoretical types, one must expect to discern in individuals only certain parallels and mixtures of types. This should be remembered when examining the theories of developmental structuralists.

Developmental Structuralism: An Overview of Related Theories

This section consists of an overview of the developmental theories of Sullivan, Ferenczi, Piaget, Erikson, Fromm, Riesman, Maccoby, Maslow, Rogers, Sullivan, Grant and Grant, Loevinger, Isaacs, Harvey, Hunt and Schroder,
Bull, and Perry. In most cases, accompanying charts illustrate how each theory corresponds to Graves' theory in terms of human developmental stages identified.

**Harry Stack Sullivan**

With what he called the "one-genus postulate," Harry Stack Sullivan (32) laid the basis for developmental characterology or developmental structuralism. Breaking with Freud because he found the psychoanalytic usage of ego, super-ego, and id unacceptable, and the instinct-derivative view of the personality preposterous, Sullivan concentrated on the study of interpersonal relations rather than intrapersonal introspection.

Sullivan was impressed with how much more human beings are like each other than they are different from each other. He held individual differences to be different stages of essentially a single development sequence, and this was his "one-genus postulate": "Everyone is much more simply human than otherwise, and . . . anomalous interpersonal situations, insofar as they do not arise from differences in language or custom, are a function of differences in relative maturity of the persons concerned" (32, pp. 32-33).

Anxiety is a key element in Sullivan's theory, and the avoidance of anxiety is the major motive of a human being. The self-system arises as a means for avoiding and managing anxiety. There are two major categories of needs: (1) the
need for interpersonal security, and (2) physiological needs. The infant's earliest self-concept is split into three elements: the "good me" is whatever leads to interpersonal security; the "bad me" is whatever leads to anxiety; and the "not me" is associated with sudden overwhelming anxiety which cannot be integrated by the infant as a learning experience. Sullivan continued to describe characteristic responses to anxiety typical of chronologically older children. He discussed the egocentricity of the juvenile era and the possible transcendence of this into a truly social state. He described developmental sequence and developmental arrest in a way that was then new and original (32). However, Sullivan always spoke in age-specific terms, titling his stages accordingly, and in this sense he is less comparable to Graves than are other theorists who, like Graves, believe that psychosocial development may or may not parallel chronological development.

Sandor Ferenczi

Ferenczi (4) may be best remembered for his classic psychoanalytic paper, "Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality," first published in 1913. He is here reviewed only briefly, since his exposition of stages is limited to very early development. However, the date of his contribution to developmental thought demands that he be recognized as a pioneer theorist. His psychoanalytic
background is apparent in the way that he describes development: "The replacement (to which we are compelled by experience) of the childhood megalomania by the recognition of the power of natural forces composes the essential content of the development of the ego" (4, p. 185).

The period in the womb is the period of unconditional omnipotence when the infant's needs are continually gratified. Immediately after birth there follows the period of magical-hallucinatory omnipotence. As he learns that crying and other expressions of needs will bring satisfactions, the child enters the period of omnipotence by the help of magic gestures. When the child first learns to distinguish his own person from the rest of the environment, he "seeks to find again in every object his own organs and their activities" (4, p. 193), and this becomes the animistic period. After the acquisition of speech, the child observes that verbalizing his wishes results in even more immediate fulfillment and often comes to believe that it was his thought or word which brought gratification to his wishes (4, p. 195). This period is the basis for superstition, magic, and some religious cults. At this point, Ferenczi's account of development stops. As far as it goes, it parallels Graves' theory as shown in Table III.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Ferenczi</th>
<th>Piaget</th>
<th>Erikson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Magical Hallucinatory Omnipotence</td>
<td>Anomy (imitation of parents and elders)</td>
<td>Trust vs. Mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omnipotence by magic gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magic Words &amp; Thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>(egocentric transactions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy vs. Shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heteronomy</td>
<td>Initiative vs. Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry vs. Inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Identity vs. Role Diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generation vs. Stagnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experientialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ego Integrity vs. Despair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Piaget

Known as the foremost authority on early childhood development, Piaget has written widely in his field, but only one of his many works, *The Moral Judgment of the Child*, published in 1932, is directly concerned with the phenomenon of psychosocial behavior and its development. Piaget chose to develop his work around children's conceptions and particularly their conceptions of the game of marbles. Graves began by asking college-age students to elucidate their conception of the healthy adult personality. Piaget began by asking children what is good and what is bad, what is fair and why, and above all, where the rules of marbles acquired their sanction. He concluded his inquiry by defining three stages of moral development: anomy, heteronomy, and autonomy. (See Table III.) However, it might be more accurate to say that anomy, as Piaget sees it, is a period of pre-morality, and that morality can be viewed on a continuum with heteronomy at one end and autonomy at the other end.

During the anomic stage, according to Piaget (20), the infant is governed only by his own wishes and has no conception of rules. The nature of his play is largely dictated by the type of item in his possession at the moment. He plays with toys primarily according to repetitive motor schemas. These motor schemes actually are a fore-shadowing of the rituals and rules which the child will
develop later. Graves' Reactive level is most comparable to Piaget's stage of anomy.

As the child grows older, Piaget (20) observed that he begins to imitate the people he sees around him, usually his parents and older siblings. At first the child does not comprehend that the point of the game of marbles is to win; he simply interprets the movement and interpersonal exchanges in terms of his own interests. His view is very egocentric, says Piaget. Physical laws are not distinguished from moral laws. Things are as they should be and as powerful persons like father decree that they shall be. The child's conclusion is that what is bad is whatever is punished by the older, powerful adults around him. In fact, punishment seems immanent in things and only later is associated with the individuals extracting it; then it is often viewed as arbitrary revenge. Piaget's descriptions of the child's development at this point sound very similar to Graves' descriptions of the Tribalistic and Egocentric levels. However, Piaget merely provides narrative description of these moral characteristics and does not label them as any stage at all.

The next official stage that he presents is heteronomy which corresponds to the fourth level in Graves' schema, the Absolutistic stage. Piaget (20) says that heteronomous morality is the result of the child's unilateral respect for first his parents and then for the other authorities in
his life. Because he respects them, he comes to regard the rules they have established as sacred and given for all time. A change of rules is difficult if not impossible for him to comprehend. Piaget uses the term "moral realism" to describe the thinking of this stage. By this he means that the child thinks of morality as existing outside of and independent of his own mind. The three features of moral realism are that the good is defined entirely by obedience, that the letter rather than the spirit of the law must be observed, and that actions are evaluated not in terms of motives but "objectively" in terms of exact conformity to rules. Most of these beliefs are also characteristic of Graves' level four man, though Graves feels that the capacity to think objectively does not appear until the fifth level.

The older the child becomes, the more he cooperates with other children. If left to the course of natural, normal development, the child will enter the stage of autonomous morality. Piaget (20) observed that twelve and thirteen-year-olds understand that they can change rules by mutual consent, that the rules can vary with the time and place because they originate with the players and not with outside adults. Once this recognition takes place, the child accepts the rules of the game because of mutual agreement. This leads to interiorization of the rules, and the child begins to adhere faithfully to them,
realizing now that they are neither sacred nor unchangeable. This paradoxical result is one of the benefits of unhampered development, Piaget believes.

A child at the stage of autonomous morality also believes in subjective responsibility; he looks not at the magnitude of the misdeed, but at the intent of the transgressor. Retributive justice gives way to distributive justice. Reciprocity is the essence of autonomous morality, and the unilateral respect for the parent is replaced by mutual respect one for the other. Cooperation is based on reciprocity (20).

Some of the oldest marble-players, Piaget (20) observed, went beyond cooperation to a concept of equity. Rather than treating everyone strictly the same, the children made allowances for special circumstances. This was the final stage in the codification of rules as Piaget observed them operating among children in the game of marbles. However, Piaget did not label this as a separate stage, but merely discusses it as the epitome of autonomous morality. At this level, punishment for misdeeds might be dispensed with entirely, depending upon how the marble-players viewed the situation and the particular truant.

Piaget does not think that intellectual capacity corresponds with moral development. Graves parallels him here, since Graves found that differences in intelligence did not explain differences in his levels of existence.
Piaget may be vulnerable to the criticism that he has an "ax to grind" in that he wants to prove the moral superiority of children to adults. He obviously believes that autonomy is a higher type of morality than is heteronomy. He also believes that children, when left alone, progress naturally from heteronomy to autonomy. What can impede their advancement, claims Piaget, is the discouragement of parents and teachers who, by demanding obedience and conformity and by punishing spontaneous cooperation, cause children to become fixated at the stage of heteronomy. This is tragic, in Piaget's view, since autonomy is the appropriate form of morality in adults in a democracy (20, pp. 366-367).

Erik Erikson

Erikson's Childhood and Society (3), published in 1950, is well known, and his name may be the one most associated with the concept of stages of development. His theory is based on observations made in his psychoanalytic practice, anthropological studies, and research he conducted with normal children. He defines the stages of psychosocial development in terms of a series of tasks, each of which comes to a crisis which the individual must resolve before proceeding to the next level. Erikson's model is complex and often oversimplified by those who quote him, much to his dismay and complaint. (See Table III.)
The first task of a human being, as Erikson saw it, was achieving a measure of basic trust, as opposed to mistrust, in three areas: the continuity of the world of objects, the difference between self and others, and control of one's own impulses (3). These three areas comprise the existential problems of Graves' Reactive, Tribalistic, and Egocentric levels.

The next developmental task in Erikson's scheme (3) concerns autonomy versus shame and doubt and might confuse unsophisticated readers, because Erikson's use of the term "autonomy" is different from Graves', Piaget's, and others' usage of it. Erikson uses the term to denote one of the earliest stages, while Graves, Piaget, and several others use it to denote one of the highest stages of development. By "autonomy," Erikson is referring to self-conscious assertion of independence, one of the characteristics of Graves' Egocentric level.

During Erikson's next two periods, the individual must choose between initiative versus guilt and industry versus inferiority (3). These are areas of concern to Graves' fourth and fifth levels. Graves says that guilt emerges for the first time at level four and is very strong here; initiative and industry are characteristic of level five. When initiative and industry finally have the upperhand over guilt and inferiority (in Erikson's schema), the
individual has made the transition from Absolutistic to Achievist (in Graves' schema).

Identity versus role differentiation and intimacy versus isolation are the next two stages in Erikson's conception (3), and both of them correspond to the Sociocentric level in Graves' scheme. When Erikson discusses intimacy versus isolation, he talks in terms of deepening interpersonal relations and developing an ethical sense; all of what he describes matches quite closely Graves' Sociocentric level.

The problems of generativity versus stagnation are precisely those of Graves' Individualistic man. Erikson's final task, choosing between ego integrity and despair, is probably also closer to Graves' Individualistic category than to his Experientialistic level. Erikson sees his developmental tasks in less abstract terms than do most theorists discussed in this section. His exposition of the crises of each task level ties the crises to age-specific problems such as courtship, marriage, child rearing, and aging, and in this sense the possibility of development at any point during adult life seems foreign to him.

Graves himself felt there were many similarities between his hierarchy and Erikson's hierarchy. "One thing that stands out in my mind," Graves says, "is that he [Erikson] had to go to eight systems from Freud's original five systems. And I have eight systems. But in my mind
Erikson committed the age old error . . . he has integrity as the ultimate, and I think that this too will disappear" (8, p. 37).

Erich Fromm

Erich Fromm (5) has long been concerned with social character, i.e. the predominant character structure in different societies. He therefore focuses more on the social and economic determinants of development than do other writers.

In Escape from Freedom (5), Fromm presents the alternative ways in which man reacts to the burden of freedom, a burden too great for many to bear. Each person begins life in a symbiotic relationship, in dependence upon another person. As an individual emerges from imposed restraints, he then is faced with the awesome choice of what to do with his freedom. Most people either slip into a mode of automatic conformity or go on to become truly autonomous; a few develop a lifestyle of destructive rebellion. These modes of adjustment are compared with Graves' levels of existence in Table IV. Fromm spends a great deal of time discussing the conformist who succumbs to the dictates of authority figures and in turn exercises authority over those who will submit to him. He presents Hitler and Nazi Germany as examples of this type of conformity, and he despairs of the end result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Fromm</th>
<th>Riesman</th>
<th>Maccoby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Symbiosis</td>
<td>Anomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tradition-Directed Conformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>(Destructive Rebellion)</td>
<td>Jungle Fighter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Company Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inner-Directed Conformity</td>
<td>Gamesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Other-Directed Conformity</td>
<td>(Creative Gamesman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experientialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the major conceptual differences between Fromm and Graves is that Fromm sees the difference between authoritarian conformity and autonomy as a kind of moral or existential choice made in childhood under social influence. Although there is a definite hierarchy in Fromm's scheme, i.e. autonomy is higher than conformity and conformity is higher than destructive rebellion, one stage is not seen as a necessary prerequisite to another stage. Graves, on the other hand, believes that human beings must proceed up his levels one step at a time, not bypassing any of the steps, for then the particular problems of that stage would not be met and resolved, thus paving the way for the next higher set of problems. Graves agrees with Fromm that an increase in spontaneity is only possible after an individual has passed through an intermediate stage of rigid controls.

Fromm (5) also assumes that everyone is capable of attaining the highest stage, whereas Graves believes that some human beings do not have the physiological brain structure necessary to progress to the highest level of being.

David Riesman

David Riesman (22) has been associated professionally with Erich Fromm and shares his concern for a social viewpoint on human development. In *The Lonely Crowd* (1950), Riesman describes the predominant character types found in
several kinds of society, tying differences to population growth. His types are shown in Table IV. The categories of Anomy and Autonomy match fairly well with Graves' levels of Reactive and Individualistic. However, the chief emphasis in Riesman's exposition is on the middle stages, the three stages of conformity which he calls tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed.

In primitive societies, characterized by high birth and early death rates, the predominant conformity type is tradition-directed. Here the social order is relatively unchanging, the culture controls behavior minutely, and "little energy is directed toward finding new solutions of the age-old problems" (22, p. 11). This mode of conformity exists in areas with high growth potential, Riesman claims, and is of diminishing relevance to an industrialized society like the United States.

As longevity increases and the death rate falls in progressing societies, a rapid growth in population results, during which time inner-directed characters predominate. This, Riesman feels, was representative of the America of yesteryear (22, p. v). During such a period of transitional population growth, conformity is insured by the tendency of social members to acquire early in life an internalized set of goals (22, p. 9). These internalized goals act like an implanted gyroscope that, once set by the parents and other authorities, keeps the inner-directed person on course and
enables him to maintain "a delicate balance between the demands upon him of his life goal and the buffetings of his external environment" (22, p. 16).

Riesman's third type of conformity, other-directed, is predominant in societies of "incipient population decline," where both the birth and death rates have been lowered. In such a society, conformity is insured by the tendency of social members to be sensitized to the expectations and preferences of others. Riesman uses contemporary metropolitan America as his illustration of a society in which other-direction is the dominant mode of insuring conformity (22, pp. 9-21). What is common to all other-directeds, Riesman says, is that their contemporaries are their source of direction (22, p. 22). The control equipment of the other-directed individual, instead of being like a gyroscope, is like a radar; it must be able to receive signals from far and near. What is internalized is not a code of behavior but the elaborate equipment needed to attend to messages from one's peers and from the mass media. The approval of others is all-important, and yet, in the middle of the social crowd, contemporary man is lonely, Riesman believes (22, p. v).

Riesman asserts that inner-directed persons are more interested in material things and other-directed persons more concerned with feelings (22, pp. 80-83). These characteristics correspond to Graves' level five (material
interests) and level six (interpersonal affective relationships). However, Riesman's overall schema is difficult to match with Graves' precisely because Riesman does not describe the Absolutistic level which Graves believes is also a stage of other-directedness. Both men, though, obviously share the conception of alternation between inner and outer dominance in a person. A loose interpretation of Riesman's theories permits comparison to Graves' in Table V.

### TABLE V

**GRAVES' LEVELS OF EXISTENCE COMPARED WITH THEORIES OF RIESMAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Riesman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Anomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Tradition-directed Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Inner-directed (Non)-Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Other-directed Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Inner-directed Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Other-directed Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Michael Maccoby**

Maccoby is placed here, out of chronological order, because of his relationship with both Fromm and Riesman. A student of Riesman's at the University of Chicago, Maccoby subsequently worked with Erich Fromm in Mexico for several
years and coauthored a book with him. Maccoby's orientation therefore is also a sociological one.

When he returned to the United States, Maccoby (16) became intrigued with the advances of technology. He acquired a very generous grant to study the leaders of top technological corporations, and out of his research came the book *The New Corporate Leaders: The Gamesman* (1976). In his extensive interviewing, Maccoby found four clearly differentiated types of managers. He labeled these executive types the Craftsman, the Jungle Fighter, the Company Man, and the Gamesman, claiming that the Gamesman was today taking over leadership of the most advanced technological corporations in America. The goal of the Gamesman is to be a winner. He thrives on competition and is innovative and risk taking. Since his sole concern is winning, the Gamesman evaluates co-workers almost exclusively in terms of what they can do for him, or for the team, or for the company. Unlike "softer" or more loyal company men, he is ready to replace a player as soon as he feels that person weakens the team. The Gamesman is bored without the game, has an adolescent desire to score and has no capacity for intimacy (16). In all of these descriptions, Maccoby's Gamesman sounds like Graves' Achievist. Maccoby's Company Man fits Graves' Absolutistic level, and the Jungle Fighter is equivalent to the Egocentric level in Graves' schema.
Maccoby's Craftsman is one of the ways in which Graves' Individualistic level might be expressed, although it is not the only way. (See Table IV.)

In Chapter Six of his book (16), Maccoby presents a case study of a person whom he calls a "creative gamesman," and indicates that he considers this person a notch above the "pure" Gamesman. His descriptions in this chapter are the descriptions of Graves' Sociocentric level, but since Maccoby did not find sufficient numbers of persons like the "creative gamesman" to establish another category, one concludes that the mode adjustment of top business executives in America is Graves' level five and there may be preliminary movement toward level six. It is interesting, though understandable, that Maccoby did not find managers who would fit Graves' Tribalistic level. It is also important to note that he found very few Jungle Fighter managers left in top positions and felt that this type was predominant in the early 1900s in America, but gave way to the Company Man type which in turn has given way to the Gamesman type.

Abraham Maslow

Of all of the theories popular at the time Graves was collecting his data in the 1950s, Maslow's hierarchy of needs came closest to matching the systems conception which Graves found his research dictating to him. When he began publishing his own ideas in the early 1960s and discussing
them in lectures, he often described his work as a "revised, enlarged, and new conception of the Maslowian hierarchy of needs" (8, p. 10).

Motivation and Personality (17) was published in 1954, and in it Maslow detailed his theory of needs. The motives of all men, he said, can be described in terms of a hierarchy of needs, and he used a pyramid to illustrate the ascending order of these needs. At the bottom of the pyramid are the instinctive needs in the following order: (1) physiological needs, (2) the need for safety, (3) the need for love, belonging, and identification, and (4) the need for respect and self-esteem. These are all deficiency needs, and their ordering is significant. Lower needs are prepotent when they are unsatisfied; higher needs are prepotent when the lower ones are satisfied. At the top of the pyramid is a need of a different type, the crowning need: it is the need for growth and self-actualization.

The similarities between Graves and Maslow are quite apparent. (See Table VI.) Though Graves sought to describe adult psychosocial behavior and Maslow's subject was human motivation, their research led them to very similar conclusions. Both concluded that a hierarchy was involved in development and that the lower rungs in the hierarchy had to be climbed before the higher ones could be reached; the problems of each level became prepotent until resolved. A most interesting parallel is the division both men found
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Maslow</th>
<th>Rogers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Subsistency Levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Physiological Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Need for Belonging and Love (also at Sociocentric Level)</td>
<td>(1) Constructs rigid and fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Feelings unowned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Some awareness of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Need for Respect and Self-Esteem</td>
<td>(4) Awareness but not acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Feelings expressed but painfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Acceptance of immediate feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Congruence between experience and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td></td>
<td>awareness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>B (Being) Needs</td>
<td>Independent choices of conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experientialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between a category that Maslow called instinctive needs and Graves called subsistence levels and a higher category much different in nature which Maslow called B or Being needs and Graves called Being Levels. Maslow distinguished between deficiency motivation, seeking only relief, and growth motivation, seeking exercise and fulfillment (17).

Graves also found a parallel division and said that during the first six levels of existence, man was concerned with the establishment of individual survival and dignity. "Once having become reasonably secure, both physically and psychologically, then the individual becomes suddenly free to experience the wonder and interdependence of all life and thus enters the first of the 'Being Levels'" (6, p. 73).

Much of Maslow's early years were spent in studying and describing the self-actualizing man. The characteristics of self-actualization are openness to development, more efficient perception of reality, availability of inner life, vivid perception of the outer world, capacity for both abstractness and concreteness, tolerance for ambiguity, capacity for guilt and sense of responsibility, capacity for spontaneity as opposed to intensive striving, existential as opposed to hostile humor, gaiety--particularly in sexual and other love relations, transcendence of contradictions and polarities, acceptance of reality, greater integration, autonomy, and sense of identity, increased objectivity, detachment, and transcendence of self, and democratic
character structure (18, pp. 41-57). It is apparent that the characteristics above also fit Graves' Individualistic level.

In later years, Maslow became interested in what he called peak experiences, experiences sought for themselves rather than for any other end they may serve. These, Maslow came to feel, are the moments of Being rather than Becoming. He pointed out that psychologists almost unanimously accept the premise that all behavior is motivated, yet man is most truly human precisely when he is not consciously motivated but is enjoying an experience for its own sake, as during peak experiences (18). Cognition at such times has a different character from ordinary, deficiency-motivated cognition, and Maslow labeled it B-cognition, the cognition of Being or of peak moments. In B-cognition, perception is richer; it is passive and receptive, and the individual may feel as though time and space were suspended. Often a person in B-cognition is aware of a temporary dropping away of anxieties and inhibitions. No longer does he view everything logically and analytically, classifying objects into categories according to their function. Instead, he experiences feelings of appreciation and views both people and objects as unique rather than as members of a class (18, pp. 251-269).

These words of Maslow may be similar to Graves' tentative, preliminary description of the Experientialistic level.
of being. In the late 1950s and the early 1960s, when Graves was struggling to fit his research data into then-existing theories, his major quarrel with Maslow was that Maslow saw development as terminal, saw the self-actualizing man as the ultimate, while Graves' data indicated that human development was open-ended and infinitely on-going. Though Maslow never established a higher level than self-actualization and instead seemed merely to expand the characteristics of the self-actualizing category with his later inquiry into peak experiences, Graves' contention is that Maslow's view changed. In personal, unpublished notes, Graves says, "You should know that Maslow came around to my point. If you look at some of his later writings you will see that he accepted both (1) the cyclic idea that there were more than one kind of expressive system and more than one kind of belonging system, and (2) that the system is open-ended" (8, p. 17).

Had Maslow and Graves worked more closely together, would they have perceived the data identically? Would they have eventually reached consensus and produced only one theory? These are questions impossible to answer, of course. The fact remains that at the time Graves was attempting to reconcile his information with existing theories, Maslow's lacked the aspects of open-endedness and the cycling of alternating systems, and thus Graves felt
compelled to disclose his data in an altogether new theoretical construct.

**Carl Rogers**

A contemporary of Maslow's, equally as popular and respected in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, was Carl Rogers, founder of client-centered therapy. Rogers is discussed only briefly here, since his developmental view is confined to a therapeutic setting and to the process of psychological growth.

Though Rogers describes a continuum of seven stages, comparison with Graves suggests that only three of Graves' levels of existence are covered. The result is that Rogers' scale is a truncated one which ignores the lower and the higher levels Graves found (see Table VI). The suggestion seems fully warranted, considering that Rogers' subjects were persons who sought psychotherapy. Thus, they might not be representative of those at lower levels of existence whose self-awareness has not reached proportions that would send them for therapeutic help nor of those at higher levels of existence whose capacities for integration of self, others, and environment would render unnecessary therapeutic help.

At the first of Rogers' seven stages, personal constructs are rigid and fixed. At the second stage feelings are not recognized, but neither are problems; there is no
desire for change. Personal constructs are thought of as facts and are not recognized as constructs. At the third stage, there is some self-expression, but feelings are usually shameful and bad, accompanied by guilt. At the fourth stage, current feelings are experienced but often not accepted by the individual. At the fifth stage, present feelings are expressed freely, but the immediacy of feelings is surprising and frightening rather than pleasant. The individual here begins to be concerned about contradictions and incongruities between his experience and his self-concept (24). All of Rogers' stages thus far seem to fit somewhere in Graves' schema between the Absolutistic and Achievist levels. Rogers' sixth stage (24) sounds like Graves' sixth level, for Rogers says that the individual has a desire to be the "real me," experiences acceptance of his immediate feelings, and evidences congruence for the first time. Rogers' seventh stage is similar to the sixth in that the individual accepts feelings of immediacy and appreciates their detail; in addition, the choice of courses of conduct becomes real and effective. At this final stage, personal constructs are tentatively formulated and loosely held (24).

The author's comparison of Rogers' stages with Graves' is shown in Table VI. It is clear that Rogers' stages are not sharply differentiated, and the conception seems to be more that of a polar variable (differing only in amount as
one goes from low to high) than of qualitatively different stages. In Graves' schema, each new level seems directly opposite to the previous level in many ways, creating the alternation from sacrificial systems to expressive systems. Such oscillation is not in Rogers' exposition.

Graves found Rogers' ideas lacking in the same way that he found Maslow's lacking: they described an ultimate in human development. For Rogers, the epitome was the fully-functioning, congruent, transparent person. For Maslow, the epitome was the self-actualizing person.

**Sullivan, Grant, and Grant**

Clyde Sullivan, Marguerite Q. Grant, and J. Douglas Grant (31) call their theory of development, "levels of integration." They have been interested in the study of delinquency and have drawn their model from working with delinquent navy men in San Diego and with delinquent boys and girls under the sponsorship of the California Youth Authority.

Sullivan, Grant, and Grant describe seven successive integrations. Each stage is defined by a crucial interpersonal problem which must be solved before further progress toward maturity can occur. All persons do not necessarily work their way through each stage, but may become fixed at a particular integration level (31, p. 375).
At Level 1, the discrimination of differences between self and nonself occurs. The individual here feels himself connected with his environment in a mystical participation. He senses mystic bonds with other persons or even with objects which he can influence by magic means. "Throughout this integration one finds a heavy flavoring of magical thinking," say Sullivan, Grant, and Grant (31, p. 375). An adult at this level cannot submit to control, postponement, or recognized dependency. Sullivan, Grant, and Grant say, "Adults who typically operate from this frame of reference are most likely to be found in mental hospitals and in such fringe groupings in the community as skid rows and hobo camps" (31, p. 375).

At Level 2 is found the differentiation of the environment into persons and objects with some appreciation of the characteristics of each (31, p. 377). However, the distinction and the appreciation are slight; both people and objects are still viewed primarily as aides or barriers to the individual's own satisfactions. He demands immediate gratification and when he does not receive it, he becomes intensely anxious and blames those outside himself for difficulties and deprivations which arise. "In his need to master objects, situations, and people," Sullivan, Grant, and Grant say, "he will frequently fall into a pattern of crude manipulation, tending to use people as tools without awareness of their feelings and without regard for
consequences to them or himself" (31, p. 378). Laws, rules, and punishments are interpreted simply as denials of gratification. Delinquency and nomadism are common when this level persists into adult life, Sullivan, Grant, and Grant have found. This level approximates Graves' Egocentric level.

Level 3 (Sullivan, Grant, and Grant) includes the perception of rules which govern the relationships between people and objects, with a beginning awareness of potential for complex manipulation (31, p. 378). The individual here transfers his feeling about the magic of people to the magic of rules; rules are now the magical talismans of control. However, the individual is still unable to perceive the patterning of relationships which will later enable him to make generalizations about rules. Instead, rules seem arbitrary, black-and-white. At this level, an adult seeks concrete and unchanging formulae which will enable him to handle all the problems that arise. He looks for final and absolute social rules which will define exactly what is expected of him and what he must avoid. Sullivan, Grant, and Grant describe two types of adults at this level--the conformists and the confidence-man personality types (the "cons"). The conformists attempt to achieve an integration by becoming completely conforming. They believe that if they conform to the demands of others, they will in turn have their own demands satisfied. The "cons" believe that
each party in a relationship will try to manipulate the rules so as to produce whatever effect is personally most desirable. They trust no one, and though they seem to have many useful acquaintances, they have no long-term relationships (31, pp. 379-380).

Sullivan, Grant, and Grant's characteristics for Level 3 seem like the negative manifestations of Graves' levels four and five, Absolutistic and Achievist. And perhaps this is explained by the fact that Sullivan, Grant, and Grant were using delinquents as their subjects; they studied maladapted people, whereas Graves was specifically soliciting descriptions of the healthy adult personality. At any rate, the "con" aspects of their Level 3 might correspond to the manipulative characteristics of Graves' Achievist, and certainly Graves' Absolutistic person is governed by rules and conformity, as is their Level 3 person. But no allowance is made for the well-adjusted, responsible, contributing Achievist, or for the well-adjusted, good-natured, trusting Absolutistic. Again, this may be perfectly understandable considering the different data sources.

At Level 4 occurs the perception of the influence and psychological force of others (31, p. 381). The person at this level, rather than identifying himself with the norm, characterizes himself as different from it (31, pp. 381-383). No correspondence with Graves' levels could be found for this category, except that one could hypothesize that
the Achievist level person who has just shifted from the fourth level could possibly feel a strong need to individuate himself, to break with the conformity he formerly espoused; this is certainly plausible, since in Graves' theory each level is opposite from its preceding level.

At Level 5 is found the perception of stable action patterns in self and others (31, p. 383). For the first time, there is a noticeable appreciation for others as unique personalities and an understanding of what they do and feel. Here the individual has learned something about the "consensually validated" meaning of language. "With consensually validated symbols and roles," Sullivan, Grant, and Grant say, "an individual is now equipped to carry on an 'inner forum' of thought, comparing his impressions as a subjective observer with others' observations of events and activities" (31, p. 384). At Level 5, an individual can enjoy people, can be stimulated by them, and can respond to them as individuals. Not many delinquents are found at this level (31, p. 384). Level 5 corresponds to Graves' Socio-centric level.

At Level 6 is found the perception of differences between one's self and the social roles which one may play momentarily (31, p. 384). The distinguishing characteristic of this phase is that the person is able to make a differentiation between self and role. This person can recognize
and allow role inconsistencies, yet perceive self-continuity and self-stability; ambiguity does not bother him (31, p. 384).

At Level 7 occurs perception of integrating processes in self and others. Now the person begins to get some perspective on previous modes of experiencing. He no longer seeks absolute realities, but sees a variety of ways of perceiving and integrating, some of which lead to more adequate expectations and hypotheses than others (31, p. 385). The adjustive capacity inherent in the integration of both Level 6 and Level 7 almost precludes criminal or delinquent activity, according to Sullivan, Grant, and Grant (31, p. 384). Both levels correspond to Graves' Individualistic level.

Comparisons between Graves and Sullivan, Grant, and Grant are illustrated in Table VII. The fact that one researcher could study healthy personality and another study maladapted personalities and both could develop sequences of growth that are quite compatible seems to confirm the existence of an underlying reality.

Jane Loevinger

Because Jane Loevinger's scheme evolved out of Sullivan, Grant and Grant's, she is placed here in the review of the related literature, even though publishings of her theory did not begin until the late 1960s. Loevinger refers to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Isaacs</th>
<th>Loevinger</th>
<th>Sullivan, Grant and Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Zeta</td>
<td>Pre-Social or Autistic</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separateness of Self and Nonself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Epsilon</td>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive (some Self-Protective)</td>
<td>Non-Self Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>Rules (Conformist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rules (&quot;Cons&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Self-Protective</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Conscientious-Conformist</td>
<td>Continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientious-Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Self-Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experientialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"stages of ego development" when discussing her ideas and says, "Ego development is at once a developmental sequence and a dimension of individual differences in any age cohort" (15, p. 13). The titles of her stages are shown in comparison to Graves' system in Table VII. They seem on the surface to be very similar to Graves'. Further inspection of the characteristics she ascribes to each stage, however, reveals differences as well as similarities.

At the Pre-Social stage, the person cannot be said to have an ego, says Loevinger (15, p. 15). There is no differentiation of self from surroundings, and one who remains at this stage past infancy is referred to as autistic. This first stage corresponds, of course, to Graves' Reactive level.

At the Symbiotic stage, the person (usually a baby) retains a symbiotic relation with his mother or whoever plays that part in his life. During this stage, the task is differentiation of self from non-self, and language plays a big part in the accomplishment of this. Loevinger, like Graves and others, believes that remnants of the Pre-Social and Symbiotic stages remain with a person throughout his life, but she says that the remnants of these first two stages "do not appear to be accessible by means of language in later life, as remnants of all later stages are" (15, p. 16). Graves also indicated that the Reactive and
Tribalistic levels are difficult if not impossible to assess verbally (8, p. 30).

At Loevinger's Impulsive stage, the person (usually a child) is suddenly aware of strong emotions within himself. These strong impulses help him to affirm his separate identity, but cause him difficulties in other ways since he is preoccupied with bodily feelings, particularly sexual and aggressive ones. Orientation at this stage is almost exclusively to the present rather than to past or future. Other people are seen and valued in terms of what they can give him. He tends to class people as good or bad, not as a truly moral judgment but as a value judgment with reference to how they have treated him. Loevinger says that the vocabulary of older children to describe their emotions is limited to terms like "mad, upset, sick, high, turned on, hot" (15, p. 16). Society often deems people fixated at this stage as uncontrollable or incorrigible. In all these descriptions, Loevinger's Impulsive stage approximates Graves' Egocentric level. One way in which it does not is that Loevinger says superstitious ideas are probably common at this stage, while Graves places superstition at his Tribalistic level.

The Self-Protective stage is the first step towards self-control of impulses (15, p. 17). The child has learned to anticipate immediate, short-term rewards and punishments and tries to protect himself from "getting caught." While
he uses rules for his own satisfaction and advantage, that is a step forward from the external constraint necessary to contain the impulsiveness of the previous stage. The Self-Protective person has the notion of blame, but he externalizes it to other people or to circumstances. Self-criticism is not characteristic. An adult who remains at this level may become opportunist, deceptive, and preoccupied with control and advantage in his relations with other people. For such a person, life is a zero-sum game; what one person gains, someone else has to lose. There is a more or less opportunistic hedonism. Work is perceived as onerous. The good life is the easy life with lots of money and nice things (15, p. 17). The descriptions of Loevinger's Self-Protective stage more nearly fit Graves' Achievist level than any other level, though the fit is not perfect and the hierarchical arrangement of each thus becomes dissimilar.

Loevinger's next stage is the Conformist stage, and she says, "A momentous step is taken when the child starts to identify his own welfare with that of the group" (15, p. 17). In addition to being conformist and to approving of conformity, the person at this stage tends to perceive himself and others as conforming to socially approved norms. While he observes group differences, he is insensitive to individual differences. The groups are defined in terms of obvious external characteristics, beginning with sex, age, race, nationality, and the like. Within groups so defined,
he sees everyone as being pretty much alike, or at least he thinks they ought to be. People are what they ought to be, which is whatever is socially approved. The Conformist's views of people and of situations involving people are conceptually simple, admitting few contingencies or exceptions. While the Conformist likes and trusts other people within his own group, he may define that group narrowly and reject any or all outgroups. The Conformist values niceness, helpfulness, and cooperation with others, as compared to the more competitive orientation of the Self-Protective person. However, he sees behavior in terms of its externals rather than in terms of feelings, in contrast to persons at higher levels. He is given to cliches, particularly moralistic ones. He does not distinguish obligatory rules from norms of conduct and thus condemns unusual dress or hair styles as immoral or as signs of immorality (15, pp. 17-19). All of these descriptions, it is apparent, apply to Graves' Absolutistic level as well as to Loevinger's Conformist stage. In fact, for some years, Graves' fourth level was labeled Conformist instead of Absolutistic.

The Self-Aware level in Loevinger's scheme is a transition from Conformist to Conscientious. She feels it is the easiest level to study since it is probably the modal level for adults in our society right now (15, p. 19). It is transitional only in a theoretical sense, for it appears to be a stable position in mature life. At the Self-Aware
level, there is an increase in self-awareness and the appreciation of multiple possibilities in situations. (Graves places this latter capacity at his Achievist level.) Where the Conformist lives in a conceptually simple world with the same thing right always and for everyone, the person in the Self-Aware level sees alternatives. Exceptions and contingencies are allowed for, and this paves the way for the true conceptual complexity of the next stage. At the Self-Aware level, feelings are more acknowledged, and the inner life is beginning to be valued (15, pp. 19-20).

At the Conscientious stage, the major elements of an adult conscience are present, according to Loevinger (15, pp. 20-22). They include long-term, self-evaluated goals and ideals, differentiated self-criticism, and a sense of responsibility. The internalization of rules is completed at the Conscientious stage. A person at this stage is less likely than the Conformist to feel guilty for having broken a rule, but more likely to feel guilt if what he does hurts another person, even though it may conform to the rules. At this stage, a person is his brother's keeper; he feels responsible for other people, at times to the extent of feeling obliged to shape another's life or to prevent him from making errors. A rich and differentiated inner life characterizes the Conscientious person (15, pp. 20-22). He corresponds quite well to Graves' Sociocentric person.
Loevinger's Individualistic level is a transition from Conscientious to Autonomous stages and is marked by a heightened sense of individuality and a concern for emotional dependence (15, p. 22). "The problem of dependence and independence is a recurrent one throughout development," Loevinger says (15, p. 22), and this, of course, is one of Graves' contentions. There is an awareness of inner conflict at the Individualistic level, but it is not recognized that conflict is part of the human condition until the Autonomous stage.

A distinctive mark of the Autonomous stage is the capacity to acknowledge and to cope with inner conflict, that is, conflicting needs, conflicting duties, and the conflict between needs and duties. Where the Conscientious person tends to construe the world in terms of polar opposites, the Autonomous person partly transcends those polarities, seeing reality as complex and multifaceted. He is able to unite and integrate ideas that appear as incompatible alternatives to those at lower stages; there is a high toleration for ambiguity. The Autonomous stage is so named partly because the person at that point recognizes other people's need for autonomy. A crucial instance can be the willingness of parents to let their children make their own mistakes. The Autonomous person, however, typically recognizes the limitations to autonomy, that emotional interdependence is inevitable. He will often
cherish personal ties as among his most precious values. The Autonomous person takes a broad view of his life as a whole. He holds to broad, abstract social ideals, such as justice (15, pp. 23-26).

Loevinger calls the highest stage Integrated, implying some transcending of the conflicts of the Autonomous stage, and she says that it is the hardest stage to describe partly because "it is rare, one is hard put to find instances to study" (15, p. 26). The Integrated stage has many of the characteristics of the Autonomous stage but with an additional new element of consolidation of a sense of identity. "In some sense," says Loevinger, "there is no highest stage but only an opening to new possibilities" (15, p. 26). In this, of course, she echoes Graves' insistence on an open-ended system of development. Her ideas, however, were not in published form at the time Graves was gathering and then explicating his own data. Graves and Loevinger are compared in chart form in Table VII.

K. S. Isaacs

Isaacs (12), whose theories appeared in his doctoral dissertation written at the University of Chicago in 1956, is briefly reviewed here and compared with Graves in Table VII. Isaacs' central term is relatability, the development of the capacity for interpersonal relations, and his instrument of measurement was the TAT (Thematic
Apperception Test). He identified six levels of development and gave them labels from the Greek alphabet.

Zeta he called the lowest level, and here a person is affectively like the neonate. Almost no adults operate at this level except during severe stress or times of illness. At the next level, Epsilon, there is an awareness of self as distinct from others but not yet the capacity for interpersonal relationships. At the Delta level, interaction is evident, but it takes the form of one person acting on another rather than true, two-way exchanges. The Delta person is characterized as actively seeking whatever he wants. At the Gamma level there are true two-way interpersonal relations, though they may be limited to those within one's circle of familiarity. Formality and rules are important at this level. "The Gamma level," said Isaacs writing in the mid 1950s, "is probably the most numerous and the predominant level in society" (12, p. 21). This level seems to correspond best to Graves' Absolutistic level. At Isaac's Beta level, objectivity develops for the first time, and one gains perspective in viewing self and environment. This person grasps more of the complexity in interpersonal interaction than does his immediate predecessor, and he is never hindered by guilt feelings (12). These descriptions sound like Graves' Achievist level. At Isaac's next level, the Alpha level, interpersonal maturity is apparent. "The struggle toward individuality is over," says Isaacs, "since
one's own and others' individuality is recognized. . . .
There is no longer the Beta struggle for freedom, the Gamma
struggle from guilt, the Delta struggle for control and need
to master others . . . " (12, pp. 226-228). This language
seems like an echo of Graves' description of level seven
(8, pp. 22-24), but the Alpha level described by Isaacs
actually encompasses both Graves' sixth and seventh levels.

Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder

Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder published Conceptual Systems
and Personality Organization (11) in 1961, just about the
same time that Graves was releasing his theory. O. J.
Harvey, professor of social psychology at the University of
Colorado, has published numerous works on his own and some
jointly with other collaborators. David Hunt is a former
student of Graves. These men together with Schroder examined
belief systems both in terms of content and structure. With
respect to structure, they looked at such attributes as
openness-closedness, consistency-inconsistency, and
complexity-simplicity. For the most part, their subjects
were college students. From their research, they described
four systems on a continuum of concreteness to abstraction
and closedness to openness.

System I is characterized by high concreteness of
beliefs, high absolutism toward rules and roles, a strong
tendency to view the world in an overly simplistic,
either-or, black-white way, a strong belief in super-naturalism and inherent truth, a strongly positive attitude toward tradition, authority, and persons of power as guidelines to thought and action, an inability to change set, role play, put oneself in another's boots, and to think and act creatively under conditions of high involvement and stress. System I people are influenced by the authority of someone of power and high status, irrespective of the latter's expertise and informational basis for his espousal (9, p. 2). It is apparent that this System I person resembles Graves' Absolutist.

System II representatives are also dogmatic and inflexible. However, they tend to have strong negative attitudes toward institutions, traditions, and the social referents toward which System I persons are strongly positive. System II individuals are the lowest of the four groups in self-esteem and the highest in alienation and cynicism, wanting and needing keenly to trust and rely upon authority and other persons, but fearing to do so because of potential loss of personal control and exploitation. While the Systems II person denounces power figures and their use of power when he is of low status and without power, he appears to use authority and power quite rigidly and abusively once he gets them. Espousal of the cause of the weak and disenfranchised by the System II representative
when he is low in power does not seem to stop him from using power unfairly once he acquires it (9, pp. 2-3).

This system of Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder seems to the author to embrace characteristics of both level three (Egocentric) and level five (Achievist) in Graves' schema. This conclusion contradicts Graves himself who said that Systems I, II, III, and IV were "roughly equivalent to (not totally) D-Q (Absolutistic), E-R (Achievist), F-S (Socio-centric), and G-T (Individualistic)" (8, p. 42). However, many aspects listed above, such as the negative attitude toward institutions and social referents, are more typical of Graves' third level than his fifth level. Graves reports that "Dave Hunt broke away from Harvey and Schroder because he said the data doesn't support just four systems. So he introduced a Sub I system—essentially the C-P (Egocentric) system" (8, p. 42). Perhaps the contradictions have been resolved by Hunt, but at any rate, as published in 1961, Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder's System II seems comparable to Graves' Egocentric level and to his Achievist level.

A System III belief system is reflected in a strong outward emphasis upon friendship, interpersonal harmony, and mutual aid. This takes the more subtle form of efforts at manipulation through establishing dependency of oneself on others and of others on oneself. The apparent need of the System III person to control others through dependency tends to be guised under the desire and need to help others.
Thus, members of the helping professions such as clinical psychology, social work, counseling overly represent the System III orientation (9, pp. 3-4). System III corresponds to Graves' Sociocentric category.

System IV, the most abstract and open-minded of the four belief systems, manifests itself in information seeking, pragmatism, a problem-solving orientation, and a higher ability to change set, withstand stress, and behave creatively. Representatives of this system are neither pro-rule, like System I persons, nor anti-rule, like System II individuals. They are for rules, structure, and organization when these are utilitarian and instrumental to problem solving and attaining an objective; but they want none of these for its own sake (9, p. 4). System IV is comparable to Graves' Individualistic level. All systems are compared with Graves in Table VIII.

Much of the work of Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder has focused on child rearing practices, and thus they have carefully studied and systematically detailed in their book the social conditions and developmental histories that seem to produce these different belief systems or ideologies. System I evolves from overly restrictive training, System II from parental inconsistency, System III from overprotection, System IV from openness and encouragement to explore the environment (11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Harvey, Hunt and Schroder</th>
<th>Bull</th>
<th>Perry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anomy</td>
<td>Position 1: Basic Duality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position 2: Multiplicity Pre-Legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position 3: Multiplicity Subordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>System II</td>
<td>Heteronomy</td>
<td>Position 4: Multiplicity Correlate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>System I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Position 5: Relativism Correlate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>System II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Position 6: Commitment Foreseen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>System III</td>
<td>Socionomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>System IV</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Position 7: Initial Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experientialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position 8: Commitment Implication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position 9: Developing and Ongoing Commitment(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study of several thousand liberal arts students (in the late 1950s), Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder found that approximately thirty-five percent represented System I, fifteen percent represented System II, twenty percent System III, and seven percent System IV. Among practicing teachers, the percent of System I went up to fifty-five and the percent of System IV went down to four. Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder also surveyed principals and superintendents in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico and found that seventy-five percent of principals and ninety percent of superintendents were in System I; not a single principal or superintendent was representative of System II (9, p. 5).

The instrument of measurement used by Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder is the *Conceptual Systems Test*, which produces a profile score on six variables: divine fate control, need for structure and order, need to help people, need for people, interpersonal aggression, and anomie. In their scoring instructions, Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder make allowance for individuals who do not fit any of these categories primarily and thus cannot be classified into one of their four systems. They do not, therefore, claim a perfect, all-inclusive instrument and perhaps not a perfect, all-inclusive theory either.
Norman J. Bull

Bull's subjects were 360 school boys and girls ages seven through seventeen; thus he was never seeking the same model of adult psychosocial behavior that Graves sought. Nonetheless, Bull's conclusions and his scale of moral development approximate Graves' conclusions sufficiently that it seems appropriate to include him in a review of the related literature.

Moral development was Bull's interest, and he divided it into four stages: Anomy, Heteronomy, Socionomy, and Autonomy. (See Table VIII.) Bull says that these stages were first delineated in the early work of W. McDougall in 1908 (2, p. 27). The process of development, according to Bull, has three characteristics.

1. Progressive interiorisation of heteronomous precepts.
2. Increasing development of inner attitudes that are powerfully emotionally-toned, fear merging into guilt and guilt into conscience.
3. The growing exercise of putting into practice the rules of conduct learnt from heteronomy (2, p. 27).

Bull's four stages are closely linked with each other and frequently overlap. Nonetheless, Bull says they must follow each other in sequence. "None can be by-passed if there is to be moral progress" (2, p. 35). Each stage also remains as a level of judgement in maturity, to a lesser or greater degree, and is applied as appropriate within differing situations.
Anomy is a pre-moral stage. Without rules to govern behavior, the individual is at the mercy of instinct and impulse (2, p. 26). The only influences are pain and pleasure as they are sensually experienced (2, p. 29). The obvious correlation is with Graves' Reactive level.

In the stage of heteronomy the individual is dominated by rules imposed by others. The rules are external to him, and their purpose is the increasing control of impulse. Sanctions are rewards and punishments. "True heteronomy is never an end in itself," says Bull. "It is, rather, a means to an end--the fuller moral development of the child" (2, p. 31). "Without such heteronomy the child could not develop an inner morality of his own" (2, p. 26). However, since heteronomy is always imposed morality, it cannot be truly moral. The individual must advance beyond this stage.

Socionomy is external-internal morality. The external morality of heteronomy is increasingly internalized to become part of the child himself (2, p. 32). The controls become social praise and social blame, the voice of opinion. The individual experiences a growing awareness of others and of his responsibility toward them. Peer opinion replaces parents and other authorities. Motives include dread of social isolation, sympathy, and altruism founded on reciprocal affection.

Autonomy is true internal morality and is the highest stage in Bull's scheme. Here the individual has his own
inner ideals of conduct. He is no longer dependent for his moral controls upon the praise or blame of others. His sanctions are his own inner self-praise and self-blame (2, p. 34). At this stage, the individual has reconciled the hard struggle "to remain true to the ingrained moral precepts derived from heteronomy, and yet to be loyal to newly acquired values stemming from relationships with others" (2, p. 34).

To a large extent, Bull's work in the 1960s grew out of Piaget's work in the 1930s. However, Bull differs significantly with Piaget's view of heteronomy as a hindrance to the development of autonomy. Bull not only sees heteronomy as a necessary predecessor of autonomy, but he believes that "the hard core of the individual's values will be those absorbed through his identifications and, above all, through heteronomy" (2, p. 34). Where Piaget was very critical of parents and teachers who promoted and thus prolonged heteronomy in children, Bull is very defensive of parents, teachers, and preachers who enforce a stage of heteronomy and thus aid in the natural progress of children up the hierarchical ladder to autonomy.

William G. Perry, Jr.

Perry's developmental scheme(19) has great appeal to college students who seem to recognize in it their own experiences, but it is a highly cognitive approach and
seems limited to one dimension—the range of thinking from dualistic and absolutistic at one end to relativistic and contingent at the other end. The theory and its development are summarized here, partly because the way in which Perry and his colleagues arrived at their hierarchical structure parallels the way in which Graves arrived at his Levels of Psychological Existence.

Perry, a professor at Harvard, set out to illustrate the variety in students' response to the impact of intellectual and moral relativism (19, p. 7). He had often noted that students had various ways in which they reacted upon entering Harvard and experiencing their first pluralistic environment. His initial aim was merely to describe these reactions; it had not yet occurred to him to consider developmental stages. He administered the CLEV (Checklist of Educational Views) to 313 freshmen in 1954, invited fifty-five to participate in a four-year annual interview program, received the acceptance of thirty-one, and began his research. Over the next four years, he and colleagues taped ninety-eight in-depth interviews, finishing with seventeen who completed four annual interviews. The interviews were unstructured, beginning with a question like, "Would you like to say what has stood out for you during the year?" At first the data gathered seemed to contain such a variety of form and content that any possibility of orderly comparison seemed improbable (19, pp. 7-8). (Graves
reports much the same feeling when he first began sorting and synthesizing his data.) However, Perry and colleagues gradually came to sense a line of general development common to all the students. This led to a new conceptualization—a developmental schema rather than descriptions of differences. They tentatively recorded their observations and resolved to expand their research. From the freshmen classes of 1962 and 1963, they acquired a total of 109 participants; during the years these individuals were in college, they conducted 464 interviews, ending with sixty-seven complete four-year reports. Six independent judges were asked to classify the data gathered, and out of all the results, Perry and colleagues finally delineated a nine-point scheme of intellectual and ethical development (19, pp. 8-9).

In Position 1, the student sees the world in polar terms of we-right-good vs. other-wrong-bad. Right answers for everything exist in the absolute, known to authority whose role is to mediate (teach) them. Knowledge and goodness are perceived as quantitative accretions of discrete rightnesses to be collected by hard work and obedience (19, p. 9). By this description, it is apparent that Perry's first level is Graves' fourth, but this is not surprising considering Harvard students were the source of original data. One would not expect Reactive, Tribalistic,
nor Egocentric individuals to be entering the academic halls of Harvard.

In Position 2, the student perceives diversity of opinion and uncertainty, and accounts for them as unwarranted confusion in poorly qualified authorities or as mere exercises set by Authority "so we can learn to find The Answer for ourselves" (19, p. 9).

In Position 3, the student accepts diversity and uncertainty as legitimate but still temporary where authority "hasn't found The Answer yet" (19, p. 9). Positions 2 and 3 may approximate Graves' level five where Graves says an individual evidences the capacity for multiplistic thinking but still retains the conviction that there is one best way.

In Position 4, the student perceives legitimate uncertainty and diversity of opinion to be extensive and raises it to the status of an unstructured epistemological realm of its own in which "anyone has a right to his own opinion" (19, p. 9). This sounds most comparable to Graves' level six where an individual displays tolerance for the opinion of others.

By the time he reaches Position 5, the student perceives all knowledge and values (including authority's) as contextual and relativistic and subordinates dualistic right-wrong functions to the status of a special case, in context (19, pp. 9-10).
In Position 6, the student apprehends the necessity of orienting himself in a relativistic world through some form of personal commitment (as distinct from unquestioned or unconsidered commitment to a simple belief in certainty) (19, p. 10).

In Positions 7, 8, and 9, the student makes an initial commitment in some area, experiences the implications of commitment, and finally affirms his own identity among multiple responsibilities, realizing commitment as an ongoing, unfolding activity through which he expresses his life style (19, p. 10). Perry's positions are matched with Graves' levels in Table VIII. The final position, Position 9, has many of the features Graves ascribed to his Individualistic level; the Individualist feels very committed, first and foremost, to the continuance and valuing of life.

Summary and Conclusions

A review of literature related to structural theories of human development has been presented in this chapter. Of the theories in published form at the time Graves was synthesizing and interpreting his data, Ferenczi's applied too narrowly to only the very early stages of development, Piaget's contained fewer categories than Graves had found and did not touch on the two highest levels, Erikson's was not open-ended in philosophical claim, Fromm's and Riesman's both contained too few differentiated categories, Maslow's
was not open-ended nor did it encompass the alternation of belonging and expressive systems, Rogers' was limited in scope to a client-centered therapeutic setting and did not contain early stages of development, Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder's was again truncated at both top and bottom and showed no cyclic features of alternation, Isaacs' was unpublished, and Sullivan, Grant, and Grant's had just been published. One of the aims of this review was to demonstrate why Graves, in the late 1950s, could find no existing theory which would satisfactorily handle all of the data he had gathered in his research and why he, therefore, formulated his own theory of Psychological Levels of Existence.

Another aim of this review was to acknowledge theories more recently disclosed which have similarities to Graves'—Bull's, Perry's, Maccoby's, and Loevinger's—and to compare the hierarchical stages of each with Graves' levels.

The authors whose schemes have been reviewed are not all talking about the same variables all the time, but in all the expositions there are some common elements, common threads which seem to confirm the presence of an underlying reality, particularly since the authors represented above began with differences in expectation, worked in different generations, came themselves from different academic backgrounds, and drew their data from subjects who differed in age, sex, and role in society.
Graves stands in respectable company in the related literature. A reliable and valid instrument of measurement constructed in reference to his theory of Psychological Levels of Existence will hopefully stand in respectable company with the measuring instruments now used in conjunction with many of the theories outlined above.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


8. ____________, unpublished personal notes, 85 pages.


CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND PROCEDURES USED TO DEVELOP

THE TEST INSTRUMENT

The first sub-purpose of this study was to translate Graves' theoretical levels of existence into discrete components of behavior and attitude which could then be assessed with a written test instrument.

To develop a test which could reveal a person's levels of existence within the Graves' classification system, it seemed necessary first to ascertain that the system of analysis was understood correctly, i.e. as Graves intends it to be understood. In full recognition of the truth of Loewinger's statement, "There are not absolutely certain signs of any level, only probabilistic ones" (11, p. 183), work was begun to delineate the "signs" of the various levels of existence. An extensive list of attitudinal and behavioral characteristics was compiled. A list for each of the six levels to be included on the test instrument—Tribalistic, Egocentric, Absolutistic, Achievist, Socio-centric, and Individualistic—was made. Level one, Reactive, was not included in the test, since it is considered by Graves to be a subverbal level and therefore not available for verbal measurement. Graves fears that the Tribalistic
level may also be difficult to assess verbally, but he thinks effort should be directed toward that end. No attempt was made to include the Experientialistic system in the test instrument, since it is viewed by Graves as an emerging level not yet visible enough to describe accurately.

Some of the work of compiling characteristics for each level had already been done by Graves himself and his descriptions were, of course, used. However, many additional characteristics were compiled in an attempt to translate the generalized features of each system into specifics indicating typical ways that each level would be manifest in contemporary American culture. An attempt was made to "put one's self in the shoes of . . ." each particular level of existence. "If I were a strongly Tribalistic person, I would think like this . . ." was the approach. Thus, a large number of statements were generated that are simply prefaced by, "A Tribalistic person might say or think . . ." The goal was to produce statements in the vernacular closest to that particular system, with the intent that when taking the test an individual would recognize not only the content of the particular systems which were his, but would be aided in recognition by the presence of familiar wording that "sounded right" to him.

The list of characteristics for system four--Absolutistic--is illustrated here.
Absolutistic Characteristics

**One-Word Descriptors**

- rule-following
- stable
- traditional
- moralistic
- consistent
- prescriptive

- orderly
- disciplined
- rigid
- guilt-ridden
- punitive
- dependable
- loyal
- organized
- structured
- conforming
- willing to sacrifice
- atoning
- systematic

**Beliefs**

- sacrificing now for the right will bring rewards later
- one right belief and all others wrong
- affection for likes; punishment for unlikes
- inconsistency is weakness
- there is a directive design
- duty alone must prevail

**An Absolutistic Person Might Say or Think**

- Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.
- Most things are either right or wrong and those who say otherwise are coping out on their moral responsibilities.
- I usually feel guilty when I don't do what's right.
- I like my world to be stable and well-organized.
- I expect loyalty and dedication to be recognized.
- It's one's duty to sacrifice for a cause in which he/she believes.
- There is a superior force guiding man and his destiny.
- A rightful place exists for everybody in society.
- The important thing in life is to find your rightful place and accept it.
- The well-disciplined life is a happy life.
- Good things stand the test of time.
- I always try to do my duty.
- Good people should be rewarded; bad people should be punished.
- Most things in life can fit within logical and consistent systems.
- The basic rules and standards of human conduct will never change.
- People should earn what they get.
- A good profession is stable, secure, and dependable.
- Even though I don't like some rules, I still must accept them.
We should build on the traditions we have inherited from our forefathers. 
I make decisions based on what is right and logical. 
We should strive to preserve our customs and traditions. 
We should avoid people with bad morals. 
Children who are taught discipline will be productive. 
I choose to associate with respectable, moral people. 
We have an obligation to show people what's right and what's wrong. 
I generally try to keep my emotions under control. 
We should defend those basic Truths that have guided man from the beginning. 
Work now, play later. 
Why do people have to break the rules? 
It looks so nice to have the house in order. 
How can that person stand such a messy desk? 
If you love another person, you put her/him first. 
I know I'm doing my best, and that's all that matters. 
Wherever I am, God has a purpose for me, a job for me to do there. 
It doesn't matter if the job is large or small; it's still important to do it right. 
God is not the author of confusion. 
Let everything be done in order and with decency. 
If we'd all live by the Ten Commandments, we'd have no problems in the world. 
Someday I'm going to hear, "Well done." 
People should go to church more often. 
Women belong at home. 
Children should be seen and not heard. 
There's no discipline in the world anymore. 
When I've done something wrong, I know it; my conscience tells me. 
Criminals are getting away with murder in our courts today. 
What's happened to law and order and old-fashioned decency? 
Children used to know their place. 
There's no order in the classroom today. 
They'll be punished someday; God will punish them in the long run. 
I feel like it's my duty to take care of my family. 
You can't always have what you want. 
The world wasn't made for partying. 
I'm glad I learned the habit of saving early. 
There's no excuse for such sloppy work. 
I'd better save my money instead. 
If a recession comes, I don't want to be caught short. 
Things are either right or they are wrong. 
Honesty is the best policy. 
It's wrong to go against the laws of nature. 
It's wrong—that's all there is to it. 
I usually try not to think of my own desires.
If it's good for the company, it's good for me.
Either you did or you didn't.
I like my orderly world.
I don't understand people who aren't patriotic.
We ought to be grateful for the old Red, White, and Blue.
If my country needed me, I'd be ready.
Hard work is the backbone of America.
Being a playboy is dispicable.
Pornographers ought to be severely fined.
Rapists should be caught and hanged.
It's nice to see a tidy yard.
Those who don't work don't eat.
Young people nowadays think they should have everything they want right now; they never heard of waiting.
I don't mind postponing my own pleasure.
A good mother puts her children first.
Sacrificing is part of being a parent.
It's better to be prepared.
"Fly now, pay later" is not for me.
Save for a rainy day.
It doesn't seem right to get money if you didn't work hard for it.
I believe in accumulating a savings account.
I do what I know is right.
I'll be rewarded eventually, if not on earth, in heaven.
Right will triumph in the long run.
My goal in life is to follow God's rules and His plan for my life.
If TV and movies keep lowering their standards (swear words, bedroom scenes, etc.) I don't know what's going to come of it!
I care about my family and friends.
Wars are a time when every citizen is called upon to sacrifice and do his share for the country.
Consistency is important to me.
There are more important things than partying.
I expect my hard work to be rewarded someday.
If everyone did the right thing, we'd all get along and life would be pleasant.
I feel guilty when I exceed the speed limit.
I feel it's important to be on time for appointments.
I feel ready to face the day after I make up a list of things to do.
I wish other people cared as much about being accurate as I do.
Policemen have a job to do keeping law and order; we should respect them.
It's impossible for all religions to be right; it's simply illogical that one belief can be right and its opposite also be right.
The law's the law, and right or wrong it must be obeyed. I pride myself on always being fair with everyone.
It gripes me when someone takes more than his share.
I don't think one should live just for the moment; it's irresponsible.
It may be necessary to give up some things now in order to plan for the future.
Everything has a certain spot where it belongs in my house (or garage, or office). I can tell immediately if anyone's touched anything.
I feel better after I get my day organized and know what's ahead.
I enjoy planning and organizing.
I expect my co-workers to follow the rules, and I get upset when they don't.
I am a person who is stable and responsible with firm convictions, beliefs, and traditions.
I prefer to work for an organization that is well organized, consistent, and rewards loyalty and dedication.
I like a job that has a lot of stability with orderly work and which rewards loyalty.
I can best be managed when I have a management system that is fair, consistent, and sticks by the rules.
I learn best when the instructor is well organized with clear objectives and job-related knowledge.
Laws, rules, and regulations are absolutely essential in order to maintain stability and discipline.
The best way for me to cope with life is to hold to my beliefs and keep doing what's right—then I will eventually be rewarded.
In terms of communication, I respond best to organized and authoritative messages that tell me what I need to know.
To me, money is important because it provides me a decent standard of living and security for a rainy day.
Those who break the law ought to be appropriately punished. One should bear the consequences of his own actions.
"A place for everything and everything in its place"—it's a comfortable way to live.

Typical Behaviors

punishing wrongdoers and lawbreakers
making a list of things to do
following the speed limit
accumulating a savings account
keeping an appointment book
being on time for appointments
keeping a budget and sticking within its guidelines
getting up at the same time every morning
helping others in the same church, fraternity, lodge, etc.
sacrificing for the right (The Truth, The Way, The System
    The Cause, The Company)
going to church
following all rules and regulations
going by the book

Compilations for systems two, three, five, six and seven were
completed in like fashion and are available from the author
upon request. Content validity for the compiled lists was
established by procuring the evaluation and concurrence of
Don Beck and Chris Cowan at the National Values Center. All
descriptions which did not meet with their agreement were
removed, and these cumulative lists became the resource bank
out of which the test instrument was then constructed.

Don Beck, Ph. D., and Chris Cowan, M. A., founded the
National Values Center, an independent corporate entity,
for the purpose of utilizing Clare Graves' theory of Psychological Levels of Existence in the study of values. Graves
is personally acquainted with the work of the National
Values Center, having visited the center himself in 1978
and having conferred with Beck in New York on numerous
occasions. Graves is thus aware of the workshop activities
of Beck and Cowan and has given his approval to their inter-
pretation of his theory. Beck and Cowan have traveled
all over the United States as well as into Alaska and Spain
presenting the theoretical concepts of Psychological Levels
of Existence. Beck and Cowan therefore seemed the most
qualified people in this geographic area to examine the test being constructed in this study.

The second sub-purpose of this study was to create a written test instrument. In developing the test, the following were done.

(a) The test was designed to reveal a person's levels of existence with reference to his overall lifestyle and not to any compartmentalized area of his life such as his occupation, family life, religious beliefs, etc. While professionals at the National Values Center certainly believe that it is possible for a person to be a mixture of different systems and even to use one system in a certain area of life and another system in another area of life (e.g. a person could be primarily Tribalistic in a marriage relationship and primarily Absolutistic or Sociocentric in a parenting role), still this particular test was aimed at revealing the test taker's overall dominant value system, secondary value system, and so on. Therefore, most of the questions on the test instrument do not pertain to compartmentalized areas of life.

(b) The test instrument was designed to include both negative and the positive aspects of the various value systems. Since Graves and his followers believe that there exists both high level and low level (positive and negative) functioning within each system, the test instrument attempts to include examples of each.
(c) Equal representation among the levels of existence being tested was provided.

(d) American Standard English at the adult level was used throughout the test.

(e) The test was designed to be completed in forty-five minutes or less.

Chronology of Development

The following questions had to be answered. What should the content of the test be and which statements should represent each level of existence? What should the format of the test be, i.e. should it be multiple choice, a Likert-like scale, or open-ended sentences? How should the questions be scored? Decisions in these three areas could not be made at the beginning once and for all, but had to be made as the test was being developed and after much exploration and some early field testing.

The content selection process began with examination of the compiled lists of characteristics for the levels of existence and with choosing the one statement most representative of each level. "What is the one statement which all Sociocentric persons, but no one but Sociocentric persons, will recognize immediately and agree with wholeheartedly?" was the question asked at this point. Representative statements were intended to be not only
typical of the level they represented but atypical of all other levels. The sentences chosen were as follows.

Tribalistic--Leaders look out for their people; I trust my leader.

Egocentric--You gotta be tough or they'll eat you alive.

Absolutistic--Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.

Achievist--Life's a game, and I'm in it to win.

Sociocentric--It makes me feel good when I can reach out and help another person.

Individualistic--I like making my own decisions about life, even when I differ from other people.

Then an additional sentence for each level was added and the list looked like this.

Tribalistic--Leaders look out for their people; I trust my leader. I would sacrifice myself for the good of the group if necessary.

Egocentric--You gotta be tough or they'll eat you alive. If you don't look out for yourself, someone will rip you off.

Absolutistic--Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards. There are certain basic Truths that have existed from the beginning and will always be the same.

Achievist--Life's a game, and I'm in it to win. I like to negotiate and get the best deal possible.
Sociocentric—It makes me feel good when I can reach out and help another person. I want to invest my life in people, not things.

Individualistic—I like making my own decisions about life, even when I differ from other people. I respond more to competency than to authority or position.

At this point, these "most representative" statements were checked at the National Values Center with Don Beck and Chris Cowan, both of whom indicated their approval. The lists were expanded, one sentence at a time (by checking Graves' writings in between each addition) to ten statements per level. However, some statements were considered so representative of a particular level that they were used twice in the ten selections. Lists were again checked with Beck and Cowan, and a multiple-choice format was begun.

After examination of numerous other test instruments, it was decided that a Most Like Me/Least Like Me type of format would be tried. Four statements would be listed, each representative of a different value system, and the respondent would be asked which of the four was "most like" and which was "least like" himself. It was felt that a choice of three or four would be easier and simpler for the respondent to evaluate and choose among than would be a choice of all six of the levels being tested. After a format with sets of three and a format with sets of four were designed, the statements were grouped by fours by an
arbitrary decision. This arrangement would permit some power-matching also; that is, since all levels would not be represented in all questions, the respondent would be forced to indicate his second or third choice system when his first choice was not present. At one point, a test was composed using a couplet format, matching each level against every other level. However, in trial administrations, the results of the test were almost identical to the results from grouping by fours. Thus, the sets-of-four format was retained.

Using four choices in each question necessitated some calculation so that equal representation would be assured for all six levels of existence and so that all possible combinations of matching one level against all other five levels would be facilitated. It was possible to attain all possible combinations within fifteen questions. This required sixty sentences, ten sentences from each of the six levels of existence. The power-matching was as follows:

(1) 2 3 4 5, (2), 2 3 4 6, (3) 2 3 4 7, (4) 2 4 5 6, (5) 2 4 5 7, (6) 2 5 6 7, (7) 3 4 5 6, (8) 3 4 5 7 (9) 3 5 6 7, (10) 4 5 6 7, (11) 7 2 3 5, (12) 7 2 3 6, (13) 6 2 3 5, (14) 4 6 7 3, and (15) 4 7 2 6.

At this point, an attempt at internal consistency was made during the construction of the test itself. Going back to the list of the one "most representative" sentence per value system, the first test of fifteen questions was
compiled using exclusively the "most representative" sentences. Each sentence was typed ten times. The questions were composed by using the matching of levels shown above so that coverage of "all possible combinations" was assured. The fifteen questions were arranged in random order, and within each question the four choices were randomly ordered. The author used herself as the "guinea pig" in these early tests and responded to the fifteen questions, adding up points on the arbitrary basis of four plus points for every "Most Like" choice and four minus points for every "Least Like" choice. A profile was established consisting of a numerical score for each of the six levels.

A second test consisting of fifteen questions was composed by using the two "most representative" sentences for each level and drawing at random when composing the all possible combinations of matches. Again, order within each question was random, and order of the fifteen questions was random. The author's profile score on this test was compared with the profile score on the first test, the thinking being that if the same dimensions were being measured, then the profile would remain the same as sentence variety was introduced. No matter how many ways Individualistic statements might be phrased, they should still be representative of Individualism and always be selected by people who were primarily Individualistic. Individualists should recognize
all Individualistic statements and only Individualists should recognize them. This was the goal. On the second test, the author's profile score was similar to the profile score on the first test, so work continued.

Thus, the fifteen-sentence test was composed gradually by adding one sentence at a time, by drawing at random to obtain the matching of levels, the ordering of questions and the ordering of choices within each question, and by checking the profile score after each addition. If the profile score changed, the most recently added sentences were re-examined. Following completion of the first fifteen sentences, another set of fifteen was composed, and all of these were checked with Don Beck and Chris Cowan at the National Values Center at this point.

Concurrently with development of the multiple-choice format, other sentences were being arranged in a Like Me/Not-Like Me, Likert-like, seven-point scale. In this format, one hundred fifty sentences were generated, twenty-five for each level. This early instrument is attached in the Appendix and shows the score sheet which was designed for quick and easy feedback to respondents taking the test. This instrument was the first of the experimental instruments to be field-tested.

As proposed, the early field testing involved examining the relationship between the score on individual items and the score on the total test. The inventory shown in the
Appendix was administered to an \( n \) of 209, and the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used to obtain a Pearson Product Moment correlation between the score on each individual test question and the score on all the test questions in the level of existence which that test question represented. Based on the results of this examination, the one hundred fifty questions were narrowed to sixty, providing the ten highest correlating items for each level. Test questions selected and the correlation for each are shown below.

**Tribalistic:** 7 (.5047), 13 (.5830), 19 (.5470), 31 (.5311), 61 (.6130), 67 (.6514), 73 (.5747), 103 (.5375), 121 (.5518), 145 (.5624).

**Egocentric:** 8 (.4656), 38 (.5032), 44 (.5102), 56 (.5027), 62 (.5925), 86 (.4324), 98 (.5206), 134 (.4675), 140 (.4538), 146 (.4502).

**Absolutistic:** 3 (.5349), 9 (.5268), 21 (.5311), 51 (.5307), 63 (.5940), 99 (.5427), 105 (.5536), 111 (.5446), 123 (.5712), 147 (.6383).

**Achievist:** 10 (.5291), 46 (.4988), 76 (.5801), 88 (.5638), 94 (.5489), 112 (.5675), 118 (.5126), 136 (.5159), 142 (.5496), 148 (.4936).

**Sociocentric:** 17 (.6125), 23 (.6427), 35 (.6367), 72 (.6142), 77 (.6771), 95 (.5802), 107 (.6252), 125 (.5304), 137 (.6384), 149 (.6137).
Individualistic: 24 (.4603), 54 (.5153), 60 (.5369), 66 (.4956), 72 (.4875), 96 (.4281), 114 (.4661), 126 (.4614), 146 (.4806), 150 (.4423).

All correlations were significant at the .001 level. Use of this reduced sixty-question Like Me/Not Like Me, Likert-like scale test was held in abeyance pending the results of field testing the multiple-choice format. It was thought at this point that some combination of the two formats might be desirable since the descriptive sentences rated on a Likert-like scale were obviously measuring intensity of similarity and difference but not ranked choice among the levels, and the multiple-choice questions would measure choice between and among levels but not intensity of that choice.

The next step was field testing the multiple-choice questions, and this was done via the preliminary instrument in the Appendix. This instrument was administered by Don Beck to a workshop group of social workers in San Antonio. As proposed, the test results were examined in the light of challenging the internal consistency of the instrument. Each level of existence—two through seven—was examined separately as was each question within each level. The total test score rankings of an individual were observed. The levels which ranked first and second in the total score should not appear as any of the Least Like Me choices for that respondent, it was decided. Conversely, the levels which ranked fifth and sixth in the total score should
probably not appear as any of the Most Like Me choices for that respondent. The middle-ranked value systems for each respondent were ignored, since there was no score which would be polar opposite to the score represented by their ranked position. Thus, the systems ranked first, second, fifth, and sixth by each respondent were analyzed. A matrix like the one shown in Table IX was created for each level of existence to illustrate which questions were suspect. It can be noted that persons 4, 9, and 11 are omitted from the chart; this is because Tribalism was not a level at either extreme for these individuals (fourth-ranked for #4, third-ranked for #9, and fourth-ranked for #11) and thus could not be examined for answers opposite of what would be expected from the total score.

It was originally proposed that any question for which 80 percent or more of the answers were opposite to the respondent's total response to the value system represented by that particular question would be omitted from the final instrument. In examining test scores of 144 individuals from Beck's workshop, not one question fell into the 80 percent category. The closest to 80 percent occurred in level three, Egocentric, where question 10 received 56 percent opposite answers. At the Tribalistic level, partially illustrated in Table IX, question 8 received 44 percent opposite answers. At level five, Achievist, question 29 received 49 percent opposite answers, and at level six,
TABLE IX
TRIBALISTIC LEVEL--ITEM ANALYSIS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Rank of T. in Total Score</th>
<th>Tribalistic Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*x indicates instances where the response on a specific Tribalistic question was opposite to the respondent's total score on Tribalism.
Sociocentric, question 13 received 41 percent opposite answers. Even though none of the questions approached the 80 percent criterion originally established, it was decided to change the four statements shown below.

**Question 8—Tribalistic statement**—(old) It's important to be loyal to your "family"—especially when times are difficult. (new) The only way to survive in this world is to band together with others.

**Question 10—Egocentric statement**—(old) It's MY body and I can do with it what I damn well please. (new) I don't like anyone telling me what to do.

**Question 24—Sociocentric statement**—(old) A genuine interest in and regard for people can solve many of our problems. (new) If we truly put people first, our other problems will vanish. (It was believed that the content of the question was representative of the Sociocentric level, but perhaps the wording was not; it was therefore decided to try the same content with different words.)

**Question 29—Achievist statement**—(old) Given half a chance, I'll make it big. (new) I've got big plans for myself and expect to be successful. (It was believed that the old wording might be recognized more by Egocentrics with their anti-establishment philosophy than by Achievists, but that the content message of wanting to become successful was still essentially an Achievist belief.)
Minor changes in wording were made in several other statements. An example is shown below.

**Question 24—Individualistic statement**—(old) I believe that man is man—neither inherently good or bad. (new) I believe that a human is human—neither inherently good or bad.

The multiple-choice experimental instrument had thus been field-tested for internal consistency and was judged to be adequate as revised. However, the most interesting results from this group of social workers lay in the overall profile scores attained with this instrument. The mean score for each level of existence is shown in the figure below.

Fig. 2—Mean scores of 144 social workers on multiple-choice experimental instrument.
These scores were extremely close to what might have been predicted for a group of social workers. Recalling Graves' theory, Sociocentric persons are dominated by a focus upon the inner subjective world and how to come to know and come to peace with it (7, p. 2), as are Absolutistic and Tribalistic persons. This is confirmed by the peaks in the even-numbered levels two, four, and six, as shown in figure 2. These persons are in an "adjustment of organism to environment" stage, an obeisance level (7, p. 2). Sociocentric persons are often found in the helping professions, said Graves, and certainly social work would be considered a helping profession. Furthermore, the mean scores shown in figure 2 indicate a cyclic progression which seems very close to what Graves must have expected when he said that "adult psychological development consists of hierarchically-ordered, prepotent upwardly spiraling psychosocial systems ...that alternate their focus in a cyclic, oscillating, dominant-subordinate fashion" (7, p. 2).

For all the reasons stated above, it was decided to make the revisions indicated by the internal-consistency checks, add ten more questions which would have six choices each, and then proceed with the multiple-choice format rather than the descriptive sentences rated on a Likert-like seven-point scale. The profile scores from early use of the descriptive sentences instrument had not seemed nearly so definitive as from the multiple-choice instrument. It was
believed at this time that forcing a choice between and among the various levels of existence resulted in less of an "aspiration effect" (an individual marking every statement Like Me because he wishes to see himself in that light) than did the descriptive sentences rated on a Likert-like seven-point scale. The multiple-choice question format seemed to be revealing not only what an individual selected as like himself, but what he rejected as well.

In adding questions 31 through 40, an attempt was made to incorporate the previous experience gained by the National Values Center and by graduate students who had designed and administered earlier questionnaires (1, 2, 4, 12). Items they had used and found particularly successful were revised, with their permission, and formed into the last ten multiple-choice questions.

For purposes of this study, the decision was made to proceed with the test instrument as shown in the Appendix, but to conduct further analyses of internal consistency (since the last ten questions had been accepted on the basis of surface validity only) and to remain open to revisions that the tests of reliability and validity would indicate.

For simplicity in addition and multiplication, the scoring was arbitrarily set at five plus points for every Most Like Me choice and five minus points for every Least Like Me choice. The net score of plus and minus together would be the raw score for that level of existence. The
score was weighted (by plus and minus five) in order to achieve greater spread among the various levels in the overall score profile.

The final thing remaining to be done before proceeding to reliability and validity tests was to establish a time allowance for the instrument. This was done at a workshop conducted by the National Values Center. All respondents were timed from beginning to end, and the mean time (for twenty-four participants) was found to be twenty-eight (28.12) minutes. Thirty minutes was established as the official time required to take the test.
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CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TESTING:
INTERPRETATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter IV explicated how sub-purposes one and two were carried out in this study, i.e. how Clare Graves' theoretical levels of existence were translated into discrete components of attitude and behavior and how a written test instrument was then designed. The third sub-purpose of this study was to test the instrument for both reliability and validity. Results of these tests are reported here in Chapter V along with interpretation of the results and with recommendations.

Reliability

In establishing the reliability of the instrument developed, the split-half technique was employed. The test was split into two halves. Each half was scored separately, and a correlation coefficient between the two scores was computed. Then the Spearman-Brown formula was applied in order to compensate for the fact that the reliability was estimated from a test one-half the length of the final form. The test was not halved according to the odd-even approach, since it was imperative for equivalency that each half contain equal representation of all six levels of existence.
The odd-even approach would not have insured this. The test was halved, instead, according to groupings of the six levels of existence, so that equal representation of each level was included in each half of the test. This was accomplished by using questions 1 through 15 and questions 31 through 35 to represent one half of the test and questions 16 through 30 and 36 through 40 to represent the other half of the test.

Two separate computations of reliability were done, one by individual and one by level of existence. Each examination used two groups, the first with an \( n \) of 105 and the second with an \( n \) of 2,220. In the first group were geophysical supervisors (\( n=20 \)), managers from the Internal Revenue Service (\( n=39 \)), oil field managers (\( n=18 \)), and supervisors of visiting nurses (\( n=28 \)). All had attended workshops conducted by the National Values Center and had taken the test instrument as part of their workshop experience. In the second group were employees of Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas who took the test as part of a company-wide attitude survey.

**Split-Halves Reliability by Individual**

The first computation of reliability established a correlation coefficient between the two halves of each individual's test. Each individual's profile scores were ranked for the first half and for the second half as shown in this sample from the data of group one. (See Table X.)
A Spearman Rank Order correlation coefficient was then calculated for each individual. For the 105 correlation coefficients, the range was 1.0000 to -.3714. The inter-quartile range was .9286 to .7386. The median was .8286. When the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula is applied to the median, the expected reliability of the full test is .91.

For the 2,220 correlation coefficients, the range was 1.0000 to -.9710. The mode was .9280. The median was .7910. When the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula is applied to the median, the expected reliability of the full test is .88.

**Split-Halves Reliability by Level of Existence**

The second computation of reliability established a correlation coefficient between the two halves of the test for each level of existence. Two groups were used. The first group consisted of the 105 workshop participants
described above. The second group consisted of 2,220 employees of Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas. A Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was calculated for each of the six levels tested. In each case, the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was applied in order to obtain the expected reliability of the full test. The results are shown below in Table XI.

**TABLE XI**

SPLIT-HALVES RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS
BY LEVEL OF EXISTENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients*</th>
<th>Expected Reliability of Full Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Groups (n=105)</td>
<td>Blue Cross (n=2,220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>.3462</td>
<td>.3914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.4906</td>
<td>.5338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.6643</td>
<td>.5450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>.6038</td>
<td>.6156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>.7403</td>
<td>.5730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>.5072</td>
<td>.5038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

Guilford, in setting forth standards for judging the strengths of correlation coefficients, says that a correlation falling between .40 and .70 is considered a moderate
correlation with a substantial relationship, between .70 and .90 a high correlation with a marked relationship, and between .90 and 1.00 a very high correlation with a very dependable relationship (4, p. 145).

However, Roscoe warns that "one cannot attach meaning to a correlation coefficient without taking into consideration the size of the sample, the sampling distribution of the coefficient, the nature of the group being studied and the nature of the variables being studied" (7, p. 264).

In descriptive statistics, the nature of the group and the variables being studied plus the use to which the coefficient is to be put will determine whether a particular coefficient is large or small. For example, a correlation of .70 between scholastic aptitude as measured in the first grade and grade point average in college would be phenomenal. However, a coefficient of .70 between two supposedly equivalent forms of an achievement test would be so low as to suggest major revision is in order (7, p. 101).

The reliability indexes obtained by taking the median of the correlation coefficients (.91 and .88) seem to be satisfactory and in line with expectations. However, the reliability indexes obtained by examining each level of existence separately are not as satisfactory. Examination of the data revealed that low coefficients were primarily a function of low numbers, particularly for the Tribalistic and Egocentric levels which were not often selected as Most Like Me choices by participants in this study. Item analysis of the test questions revealed that question 38, which appeared in the second half of the test, was
confounding question which drew unexpected answers, particularly for the Tribalistic statement (see Table XII). Respondents who otherwise scored low in Tribalism often answered the Tribalistic statement in question 38 by checking Most Like Me; this would have an impact on the split-halves reliability coefficient for Tribalism.

Though the first computation of reliability in this study seems sufficient to justify continued use of the instrument, it is recommended that further reliability tests be administered in the future in the form of test-retest. This method would insure having larger raw scores for each level of existence.

Validity

The instrument developed in this study was subjected to several types of validity testing, including tests for content validity, internal consistency, concurrent validity, and construct validity.

**Content Validity**

A type of content validity, referred to as validity by definition, was established by seeking the concurrence of Don Beck and Chris Cowan at the National Values Center both as the instrument was being developed and after it had been completed. Based on their experience and research with Levels of Existence analysis and the theoretical knowledge gained through personal acquaintance with Clare
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Tribalistic</th>
<th>Epocentric</th>
<th>Absolutistic</th>
<th>Achievist</th>
<th>Sociocentric</th>
<th>Individualistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graves, Beck and Cowan examined each item on the test carefully. Any question which they deemed non-representative or inaccurate was omitted from the instrument or revised according to their recommendations. The instrument as shown in the Appendix met with the final approval of the National Values Center.

**Internal Consistency**

As specified at the end of Chapter IV, it was decided to continue with internal consistency checks beyond the early field testing. One reason for this decision was that questions 31 through 40 were added after the early field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Tribalistic</th>
<th>Egocentric</th>
<th>Absolutistic</th>
<th>Achievist</th>
<th>Sociocentric</th>
<th>Individualistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
testing and thus had not been examined for internal consistency. Also, some questions were replaced or revised as a result of early field testing, and the new statements needed to be examined.

Each level of existence—two through seven—was examined separately as was each question within each level. The total test score rankings of an individual were observed. The levels which ranked first and second in the total score should not appear as any of the Least Like Me choices for that respondent, it was predicted. Conversely, the levels which ranked fifth and sixth in the total score should not appear as any of the Most Like Me choices for that respondent. The middle-ranked levels for each respondent were ignored, since there was no score which would be polar opposite to the score represented by their ranked position. Thus, the systems ranked first, second, fifth, and sixth by each respondent were analyzed.

It was necessary to examine 271 tests in order to obtain an $n$ of 100 for each level of existence, i.e. 100 times that each level was ranked either first, second, fifth, or sixth by an individual. Respondents were graduate students in counseling classes at North Texas State University and people in attendance at eight different workshops conducted by Don Beck of the National Values Center. The workshop participants included oil field managers, geophysicists, IRS managers, nursing supervisors, college
educators, and members of a professional training group. Most were middle-aged and successful in their various fields.

From all the answers, matrixes like the one shown in Table IX were created for each level to illustrate which questions were suspect. The totals of anomalous answers for each question are shown by level of existence in Table XII.

All statements in the test were carefully examined according to the results of these internal consistency checks. The statements which received no unexpected or anomalous answers needed to be recognized as being good embodiments of their intended level of existence. The statements which received large numbers of unexpected or anomalous responses needed to be individually analyzed. Those statements which received more than twenty anomalous responses are discussed below.

**Question 38.**—In terms of communication, I respond best to (a) human interest themes that reflect the importance of people and mankind (Sociocentric); (b) personal, face-to-face messages from someone I trust and know I can rely on (Tribalistic); (c) complex messages and media that display a total picture for me to interpret (Individualistic); (d) straight talk from a person in power who doesn't beat around the bush (Egocentric); (e) being shown
what's in it for me so I can use the information to my advantage (Achievist); and (f) organized and authoritative messages that tell me what I need to know (Absolutistic).

This question received the highest total of anomalous answers. Forty people who otherwise scored very low in Tribalism chose the Tribalistic statement in question 38 as their Most Like Me choice. Fourteen people who scored low in Egocentrism also chose the Egocentric statement as Most Like Me in question 38. Anomalous answers were discovered in the other levels of existence also, but sometimes the unexpected answer was a Most Like Me choice when the overall score of that level was low and sometimes it was a Least Like Me choice when the overall score of that level was high. In every level but Sociocentric, this question elicited numerous responses contrary to expectations. The subject of question 38 is communication style. Since there is no reason to believe that people would operate at a different level in terms of communication style than they operate in other areas of their lives, the conclusion is that the wording in question 38 must not accurately portray the various levels. With reference to the Tribalistic statement, the author was told by several respondents, "Everyone wants to get information from a trusted source." Such reactions mean that the Tribalistic statement as now phrased does not discriminate between Tribalistic persons whose lifestyle is to establish a symbiotic relationship
with a trusted leader and all other persons whose communication style is to respond to a credible, trusted source of information. The aim of the test is, of course, to make such discrimination. It is therefore recommended that question 38 be revised. Two possible alternatives are suggested below.

In terms of communication, I respond best to (a) something that is clear and simple and comes directly from our leader (Tribalistic); (b) straight talk, no beating around the bush, and the power to back up what is said (Egocentric); (c) organized messages which are logical and have the facts straight (Absolutistic); (d) messages which affect me personally, from which I stand to either win or lose (Achievist); (e) human interest themes that reflect the importance of people and mankind (Sociocentric); and (f) messages placed in a frame of reference that shows the total picture including all points of view (Individualistic).

If you want to communicate with me (a) be a good leader, and I will listen to anything you say (Tribalistic); (b) give it to me straight and don't beat around the bush; and you'd better have the muscle to back up what you say (Egocentric); (c) please be organized and logical and have your facts straight (Absolutistic); (d) show me why I should be interested in what you have to say (Achievist); (e) show me that you care: be genuine and real; take off your mask (Sociocentric); and (f) try to give me the big picture; put
your message in a frame of reference and tell me all points of view (Individualistic).

In both alternatives suggested above, an attempt was made to distinguish each level of existence more sharply by focusing on a characteristic peculiar to that level and to no other levels. Specifically, the Tribalistic sentences emphasize dependence on a leader, the Egocentric sentences emphasize "toughness" and adherence to the power ethic, the Absolutistic sentences emphasize organization and logic, the Achievist sentences emphasize self-centered gain, the Sociocentric sentences emphasize concern for humanity and warm relationships, and the Individualistic sentences emphasize a systems approach and relativistic thinking. It is hoped that such emphases would result in fewer anomalous answers for question 38 in the future.

**Question 3.**—(a) Most things are either right or wrong (Absolutistic); (b) The world is a very complex process without any easy answers (Individualistic); (c) Love and tolerance are important to me (Sociocentric); and (d) I intend to get somewhere in life (Achievist).

The absolutistic sentence in this question received thirty-four anomalous answers, all Least Like Me responses from individuals whose total score was high in Absolutism. It is suggested that many respondents in this study may have had a difficult time selecting a Least Like Me choice in
question 3, since there are no Tribalistic or Egocentric statements in the question. The majority of participants in this study ranked Tribalism and Egocentrism as their two lowest levels of existence and therefore usually chose either a Tribalistic or Egocentric statement as Least Like Me whenever one was available. With Tribalistic and Egocentric statements eliminated, respondents were forced to select a Least Like Me choice from the remaining four levels of existence. Further examination of the data indicated that 77 percent of all respondents in this study checked the Absolutistic sentence in question 3 as Least Like Me. However, such a response pattern results in anomalous answers for only the Absolutistic level of existence; these anomalous answers are difficult to understand. Dualistic, black-white, right-wrong thinking is very definitely a characteristic of the Absolutistic person, according to Graves' theory. There seems to be no rational way to explain why the sentence, "Most things are either right or wrong" elicited so much disavowal from persons who otherwise espoused Absolutism. The author's recommendation is that more data be gathered before any revisions are made in question 3. It is suggested that the primary source of additional data be personal interviews with individuals whose response patterns provide anomalous answers to this question.
Question 1.—(a) Leaders look out for their people and I trust my leader (Tribalistic); (b) It feels good to reach out and help other people cope with life (Sociocentric); (c) Don't just tell me "it's the rule;" I've got to have a reason (Individualistic); and (d) When I play a game—I play to win; otherwise, why bother? (Achievist)

The Achievist statement in question 1 received twenty-five anomalous answers, all Least Like Me responses from people who otherwise scored high in Achievism. The interpretation given this by the author is that the sentence is stated too strongly. According to Graves' theory, it is true that high achievers play to win and find that the game loses its flavor if there is no win/lose structure. However, they may not like to acknowledge this when it is stated so baldly as in the above question. It is recommended that the intensity of the sentence be toned down as follows and that further studies be conducted to examine the results of such toning down: When I play a game, I play to win.

Question 6.—(a) Whatever turns you on—do it (Ego-centric); (b) If everyone did what was right we'd all get along a lot better (Absolutistic); (c) There's always one best way and if we want to progress we'll find it (Achievist); and (d) I wish the world weren't so scary, but when I'm with my own people I feel safer (Tribalistic).
The Egocentric statement in question 6 received twenty-five anomalous answers, all Most Like Me responses from persons who otherwise ranked low in Egocentrism. It is the author's interpretation that the wording of this sentence may not be sufficiently specific to attract only Egocentrics and no one else. It is therefore recommended that the sentence be altered slightly in order to focus more specifically on the Egocentric characteristic of being limited to a "now" orientation and to momentary feelings. According to Graves' theory, an Individualist also appreciates the present moment and also indulges his own feelings. However, the Egocentric couples a "now" orientation with an irresponsible attitude toward the future, whereas the Individualist couples a "now" orientation with a long-range view on everything and a deep sense of responsibility toward future generations. The Egocentric is concerned with his feelings and incapable of concern for the feelings of others, whereas the Individualist is concerned with his feelings but also aware of and concerned with the feelings of others. The suggested rephrasing is as follows: Whatever turns you on, do it! ... let someone else worry about the consequences.

Question 25.—(a) Even though I don't like some rules I still must accept them and live by them (Absolutistic); (b) Everybody has his or her price and can be bought (Egocentric); (c) Winning is the only thing that really
matters to me (Achievist); and (d) I pretty much "hear my own drummer" in dealing with life (Individualist).

The Achievist sentence in question 25 received twenty-one anomalous answers and seems very similar to the Achievist statement in question 1 which was previously discussed. All of these anomalous answers were Least Like Me responses from people who scored either first or second in Achievism in their total score. The author's interpretation of this is that the Achievist sentence in question 25 is stated too strongly, causing even high achievers to say to themselves, "Well, winning isn't the only thing that matters to me." Since winning is definitely a trait which distinguishes the fifth level of existence, according to Graves, it is recommended that the concept of this sentence be retained in the test instrument but that the wording of the statement be toned down in intensity as follows: Winning is important to me.

Conclusions.—This method of checking the internal consistency of the test instrument yielded valuable results, both in early field testing and in this portion of the study. Its limitations, however, should be acknowledged. In examining answers, it became apparent that interaction is involved in the format of this test and that whenever one statement in a group of four or six appears to be
suspect, it could be that any or all of the other statements are also suspect.

The internal consistency checks reported here are also limited by the bias of the respondents who participated in this study. Very few persons ranked first or second in either Tribalism or Egocentrism. A great many persons ranked fifth and sixth in Tribalism and Egocentrism. As a result, the "opposite to expected" answers for these two levels were almost always instances of marking a Tribalistic or Egocentric statement Most Like Me when Tribalism and Egocentrism ranked low in the overall score. There is very little data in this study on Tribalistic or Egocentric statements marked Least Like Me by people whose overall score was high in Tribalism or Egocentrism. If groups are found in the future who score high in Tribalism or Egocentrism, it is recommended that their test answers be examined for the internal consistency of each question by the method used in this study.

Conversely, very few persons in this study ranked fifth and sixth in either Sociocentrism or Individualism. A great many people ranked first and second in Sociocentrism and Individualism. As a result, the "opposite to expected" answers for these two levels were almost always instances of marking a Sociocentric or Individualistic statement Least Like Me when Sociocentrism or Individualism ranked high in the overall score. There is very little data in this study
on Sociocentric or Individualistic statements marked Most Like Me by people whose overall score was low in Sociocentrism or Individualism. If groups are found in the future who score low in Sociocentrism or Individualism, it is recommended that their test answers be examined for the internal consistency of each question by the method used in this study.

The Absolutistic and Achievist levels were well balanced in this portion of the study. There were respondents who ranked both high and low in their overall scores at these levels. In question 11, the Absolutistic statement received Least Like Me answers from people whose primary level in their overall score was Absolutistic and Most Like Me answers from people whose fifth level in their overall score was Absolutistic. A number of other statements were similar in that they received anomalous answers from both respondents who ranked low in Absolutism and Achievism in their overall score and from respondents who ranked high in Absolutism and Achievism. It is concluded that these two levels were adequately represented in this study.

Recommendations for further research in the area of internal consistency of the test instrument are included in Chapter VI.
**Concurrent Validity**

In further attempting to validate the Levels of Existence test, a form of criterion-related validity or discriminant validity was employed. Don Beck and Chris Cowan from the National Values Center were asked to specify persons with whom they had had considerable contact through personal interviews, the administration of other tests, and empirical observations. The persons they specified were contacted and questioned regarding their willingness to participate by taking the test instrument developed in this study. The author was also deemed by the National Values Center to be sufficiently versed in Clare Graves' theory to qualify as one of the judges, so she also contacted personal acquaintances regarding their willingness to be a part of this study. Effort was made to screen out anyone familiar with the theory of Levels of Existence. The polling process continued until a total of thirty participants was obtained.

Prior to administration of the test, each participant was evaluated by the judge most closely acquainted with him—Beck, Cowan, or Hurlbut. The judge predicted the participant's overall test score by ranking the person within the Levels of Existence classifications, identifying the person's dominant level, secondary level, and so on, assigning a rank to each level Two through Seven. The test was then administered to all participants. Test scores were compared with the judges' evaluation using the Spearman Rank
correlation coefficient. The results are shown in Tables XIII, XIV, and XV. The median of the correlation coefficients for Beck was .8928, for Cowan .8286, and for Hurlbut .8858. The median of all thirty Spearman Rank correlation coefficients was .8858.

In interpreting the results of this form of concurrent validity testing, the multiple variables involved must be recognized. If the correlation between the judge's evaluation and the participant's actual score is low, it could be an indication that the test is not testing what it purports to test. However, it could also mean that the judge is not an accurate observer of the participant and misinterprets what he perceives. Further, it could mean that the participant does not disclose himself accurately to the observing world. Considering all of the possibilities for low correlations in this form of validity testing, the results obtained in this study seem significantly positive.

**Construct Validity—Hypotheses-Testing**

In *Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, John T. Roscoe says,

Construct validity is not a simple idea. It includes both logical and empirical approaches to validity, as do all other approaches, but it seeks a unique combination of the two. The approach is as follows, in a general sense, but the exact techniques will vary greatly:

1. The investigator sets forth a proposition that a test measures on a certain dimension, or designs a test to measure that dimension.
### TABLE XIII

**COMPARISON OF PREDICTED SCORES WITH ACTUAL SCORES ON THE LEVELS OF EXISTENCE TEST: PREDICTIONS BY BECK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Predicted Rank of Levels</th>
<th>Actual Rank</th>
<th>Spearman Cor. Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8857*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Predicted Rank of Levels</td>
<td>Actual Rank</td>
<td>Spearman Cor. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8857*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .10

median = .8928*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Predicted Rank of Levels</th>
<th>Actual Rank</th>
<th>Spearman Cor. Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Predicted Rank of Levels</td>
<td>Actual Rank</td>
<td>Spearman Cor. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.6571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  median = .8286**

**p < .10
TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF PREDICTED SCORES WITH ACTUAL SCORES ON THE LEVELS OF EXISTENCE TEST: PREDICTIONS BY HURLBUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Predicted Rank of Levels</th>
<th>Actual Rank</th>
<th>Spearman Cor. Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8858*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Predicted Rank of Levels</td>
<td>Actual Rank</td>
<td>Spearman Cor. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9429*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .10  median = .8858*
2. He then inserts that proposition into current theory about that dimension.
3. He hypothesizes empirical relationships based on the theory.
4. Then a study of the relationships is carried out using the test to measure the dimension.
   If the findings are consistent, some support is lent to the measurement and the theoretical framework within which it is presented (7, pp. 137-138).

The test developed in this study purports to measure certain value constructs. Three hypotheses were set forth as expectations if the test measured what it was designed to measure. The results of testing these hypotheses are outlined below.

**Hypothesis 1.**—The results of the Levels of Existence test for persons under thirty years of age will differ significantly from the results for persons thirty years of age and over. Specifically, persons under thirty will score higher in the Individualistic and Sociocentric levels and persons thirty and over will score higher in the Absolutistic and Tribalistic levels.

This hypothesis was tested by stating four separate hypotheses in null form and applying a t-Test for Two Independent Samples for each of the levels of existence Two, Four, Six, and Seven. Test scores came from adults in ten different workshops conducted by Don Beck and Chris Cowan of the National Values Center and from graduate students in five different counseling classes at North Texas State University. A one-tailed test was used with the level of
significance specified at .05. The results are shown in Table XVI. None of the differences was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis 1 in this study is not accepted.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF SCORES AT FOUR LEVELS OF EXISTENCE BETWEEN PERSONS UNDER 30 YEARS OF AGE AND PERSONS 30 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 30 (n=56)</td>
<td>30 and Over (n=123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.8036</td>
<td>10.4065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.9107</td>
<td>36.0975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.0357</td>
<td>49.1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.5714</td>
<td>57.6423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .10 \)

Prior to the completion of the data collection and before the results of the above tests were known, it had been concluded that hypothesis 1 would have to be deemed an inappropriate test of validity regardless of the statistical results. The hypothesis was originally formulated directly from one of the aspects of Clare Graves' theory—that of hierarchical progression within societies as well as within individuals. Graves himself has discussed the sociological
implications of his ideas and has declared that the modal level of existence for Americans in the 1950s was Achievist but that in the 1960s he observed a shifting into the Socio-centric level (1, pp. 76-78; 3, p. 10). The hypothesis thus grew out of the theory. However, as data were being collected, it became apparent that the populations used in this study do not represent a random sample of American society at large and that precisely such would be needed in order for this hypothesis to be tested properly. Some of the sources of bias in the participants in the study were (1) the graduate students in counseling classes were expected to score high in Sociocentrism because of the profession they had chosen, not because of their age, (2) the adults attending Beck and Cowan's workshops were usually professionals, often managers and persons at the top of their occupational fields; they were hence often in their forties and fifties in age and could not be considered representative of the "average" American in terms of either economic success, educational background, or professional prestige. It was therefore felt that nothing could be concluded about the effect of age upon test scores, since the effect of profession, status within that profession, economic level, and educational background was undetermined. Hypothesis 1 is now considered an inappropriate test of validity within the parameters of this study.
Hypothesis 2.—The Levels of Existence test will discriminate between and among different occupational groups of people. Specifically, comparisons will be made between persons engaged in or preparing for the counseling profession, persons confined to prison and designated as criminal, persons engaged in or preparing for bookkeeping, accounting and clerical positions, and persons engaged in or preparing for selling or management professions. The following sub-hypotheses were set forth:

Hypothesis 2 (a).—Persons engaged in or preparing for the counseling profession will score higher on the Socio-centric scale than will persons in the other three groups.

Hypothesis 2 (b).—Persons confined to prison and designated as criminal will score higher on the Egocentric scale than will persons in the other three groups.

Hypothesis 2 (c).—Persons employed in or preparing for bookkeeping, accounting, and clerical positions will score higher on the Absolutistic scale than will persons in the other three groups.

Hypothesis 2 (d).—Persons engaged in or preparing for selling or management professions will score higher on the Achievist scale than will persons in the other three groups.

It was not possible to obtain permission to test a criminal population, as was originally hoped. However, representatives of the other three groups were secured. For hypothesis 2 (a), graduate students majoring in
counseling and attending counseling classes at North Texas State University were predicted to score higher on the Sociocentric scale than persons in the comparison groups. For hypothesis 2 (c), persons in clerical positions at Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas were predicted to score higher on the Absolutistic scale than persons in the comparison groups. For hypothesis 2 (d), managers at Blue Cross-Blue Shield were predicted to score higher on the Achievist scale than persons in the comparison groups. Hypotheses 2 (a), 2 (c), and 2 (d) were tested by employing two separate statistical techniques—t-Tests and hierarchical grouping.

Results of t-Tests for Two Independent Samples are shown in Table XVII. The sixty-five managers used in this portion of the study were randomly selected from 350 managers who took the Levels of Existence test at Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas. The sixty-five clerical persons were randomly selected from 2,967 clerical persons who took the Levels of Existence test at Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Texas. A table of random numbers was used in the selection process (7, pp. 410-411). A one-tailed test for level of significance was used.

Table XVII shows that at each level of existence tested the two comparison groups were significantly different from each other. On the basis of these tests, hypotheses 2 (a), 2 (c), and 2 (d) are accepted. The t-Test for Two
TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF SCORES AT THREE LEVELS OF EXISTENCE
ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Group A--Clerical (n=65)</td>
<td>44.3939</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B--Managers (n=65)</td>
<td>33.0488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (n=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Group A--Managers (n=65)</td>
<td>54.0909</td>
<td>5.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B--Clerical (n=65)</td>
<td>30.9756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselors (n=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Group A--Counselors (n=49)</td>
<td>72.6531</td>
<td>7.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B--Managers (n=65)</td>
<td>38.7121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical (n=65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p \leq 0.01 \)
** \( p \leq 0.001 \)

Independent Samples confirms that the Levels of Existence test will discriminate between certain different occupational groups of people.

The statistical technique of hierarchical grouping was developed by Joe Ward in the early 1960s (9). The purpose of the program is to identify people with similar profiles on a group of different variables. By using a differences-squared statistical method, the hierarchical grouping program identifies the two most similar profiles in the total number (maximum \( n \) of 100), then the three most
similar profiles, and so on. In other words, it sorts into groups "each of which has members that are maximally similar with respect to specified characteristics" (9, p. 236). When the profiles are identical, the error rate is zero; as the clustering process continues and the profiles become similar rather than identical, the degree of variance from identicalness is reflected in an error rate. Ward calls the error rate, "the quantitative estimate of the loss associated with each stage in the grouping" (9, p. 236).

In this study, the technique of hierarchical grouping was used in order to cluster persons with similar profiles on the Levels of Existence test. To accommodate the maximum of 100, thirty-three participants in each of three categories (counselors, managers, and clerical persons) were randomly selected. The scores of the ninety-nine participants on six variables (the six levels of existence) were standardized and submitted to hierarchical grouping. Results are shown in Table XVIII.

The purpose of employing this statistical procedure was to investigate whether group membership, as defined by similarity of profiles in hierarchical grouping, could be connected with occupation. When ninety-nine profile scores were clustered into four groups, groups A, C, and D showed a definite relationship to occupation. Group A was dominated by counselors, Group C by clerical persons, and Group D by managers. Group B, the smallest of the clusters,
### TABLE XVIII

**COMPARISON OF OCCUPATION WITH HIERARCHICAL GROUPING ACCORDING TO SIMILARITY OF PROFILE SCORES ON THE LEVELS OF EXISTENCE TEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 Groups</th>
<th>4 Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error rate = 53.0114

Error rate = 35.2908
showed little or no relationship to occupation. When the clustering process was extended further into three groups, groups A, B, and C each showed a relationship to occupation. Group A was dominated by counselors, Group B by managers, and Group C by clerical persons. The results of this hierarchical grouping test are interpreted as confirmation of hypothesis 2, i.e. the Levels of Existence test does discriminate between and among different occupational groups of people.

Hypothesis 3.--A person's primary level of existence and secondary level of existence as revealed on the Levels of Existence test will be within three levels of each other, since the theory of Levels of Existence involves hierarchical progression and the subordination of older behavioral systems to newer, higher order behavioral systems.

Hypothesis 3 (a).--When the primary level is Individualistic, the secondary level will be Sociocentric, Achievist, or Absolutistic.

Hypothesis 3 (b).--When the primary level is Sociocentric, the secondary level will be Individualistic, Achievist, or Absolutistic.

Hypothesis 3 (c).--When the primary level is Achievist, the secondary level will be Sociocentric, Individualistic, Absolutistic, or Egocentric.
Hypothesis 3 (d).—When the primary level is Egocentric, the secondary level will be Achievist, Absolutistic, or Tribalistic.

Hypothesis 3 (e).—When the primary level is Tribalistic, the secondary level will be Egocentric or Absolutistic.

The results of testing hypothesis 3 are shown in Table XIX. An n of 216 was used in this examination. Participants were managers, educators, and technical personnel in attendance at six different workshops conducted by Don Beck and Chris Cowan of the National Values Center and graduate students in counseling classes at North Texas State University.

It was originally proposed that the sub-hypothesis for a particular level would be rejected if the Not-Expected responses totaled 10 percent or higher of the total responses for that level of existence. Using this criterion, all of the sub-hypotheses listed above are accepted and found to be true within this study. The limitation that almost no participants were found whose primary level of existence was either Egocentric or Tribalistic is hereby acknowledged. Nonetheless, the data seems sufficiently strong that it can be interpreted as lending validity to the instrument and also to the theory of Levels of Existence.

For measurement to serve as the leading edge of a scientific discipline, it must be informed by theory, and there must be clear lines for results to feed back as
TABLE XIX

COMPARISON OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS OF EXISTENCE
AS REVEALED ON THE LEVELS OF EXISTENCE TEST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Level</th>
<th>Expected Secondary Levels</th>
<th>Not Expected Secondary Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociocentric 62</td>
<td>Egocentric 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Achievist 36</td>
<td>Tribalistic ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Individualistic 45</td>
<td>Egocentric ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievist 6</td>
<td>Tribalistic ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Individualistic 24</td>
<td>Tribalistic ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociocentric 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egocentric 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Achievist ..</td>
<td>Sociocentric ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic ..</td>
<td>Individualistic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribalistic ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Egocentric ..</td>
<td>Achievist ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic ..</td>
<td>Sociocentric ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individualistic ..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 216
corrections to theory. Several phenomena were noted during the testing of hypothesis 3 which have bearing on Clare Graves' theory of Levels of Existence.

Graves set out to find an explanation of human development sophisticated enough to embrace the reality of paradoxical man. While compiling statistics to test hypothesis 3, great diversity in profile scores was observed, perhaps attesting to Graves' success in being able to expound a theory complex enough to portray large degrees of dissimilarity within an integrated concept. Some of the diverse scores are illustrated below in Table XX with brief explanations beside each.

**TABLE XX**

**ILLUSTRATION OF DIVERSE PROFILE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-45 -55 -35 +55 +35 +45</td>
<td>An even spread of scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-100 -15 -35 0 +40 +110</td>
<td>High scores at the extremes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>+5 -85 +10 -40 +110 0</td>
<td>642, 753 combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-100 0 -45 +75 -5 +75</td>
<td>753, 642 combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-60 -45 -10 +30 +40 +55</td>
<td>Descending order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-20 -50 +15 +60 +50 +65</td>
<td>756, 423 (a common pattern)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the patterns observed is that the secondary level is not usually the level immediately below the primary level. This feeds back to the theoretical concept of right-left brain domination and the grouping together of levels Three, Five, Seven and Two, Four, Six. This was noticed when the primary level was Four, Five, or Six. When the primary level was Four, the secondary level was almost never Three, nor was it Five; it was usually Six and sometimes Seven. When the primary level was Five, the secondary level was almost never Four, and it was rarely Six; it was usually Seven instead. When the primary level was Six, the secondary level was rarely Five, but here the pattern broke in that it was often Seven, the next higher level. And when the primary level was Seven, no patterns were the same, and the secondary level was the level immediately below the primary level—the opposite pattern established in the other levels. In interpreting this, one might wonder whether the choice of a secondary level for persons whose primary level is Seven is limited by not having higher levels available in the test instrument and, indeed, in the theory itself. This question is addressed further in Chapter VI.

2. , lecture notes at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, April, 1978.

3. , unpublished personal notes, 85 pages.


CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to develop a test which would reveal a person's primary level of existence according to Graves' model of adult psychosocial behavior.

The sub-purposes of this study were

1. To translate Graves' theoretical levels of existence into discrete components of attitude and behavior which could then be assessed via a written test instrument;
2. To create such a written test instrument;
3. To test the instrument for reliability and validity.

To accomplish the purposes of the study, the following methods and procedures were followed.

1. In order to translate Graves' theoretical levels of existence into discrete components of attitude and behavior, extensive lists of attitudinal and behavioral characteristics were compiled for each of the six levels included on the test instrument--Tribalistic, Egocentric, Absolutistic, Achievist, Sociocentric, and Individualistic. These lists were checked for content validity with the National Values Center.
2. In creating the test instrument, the following areas were addressed.

(a) The content of the test was derived from the compiled lists of characteristics for the levels of existence. Rather than using a process of random selection, an evaluative process was employed and the "most representative" statement for each level was selected, then the second "most representative" statement, and so on. The statements selected were verified and approved by the National Values Center.

(b) Two initial instruments were created, one with a format of multiple-choice questions and one based on a seven-point, Likert-like scale. Both used the evaluative concept of Most Like Me/Least Like Me. Both instruments were field tested, and greater validity was found for the multiple-choice instrument than for the instrument based on a Likert-like scale. Thus, a format of multiple-choice questions was decided upon.

(c) After experimentation, it was decided to use four sentences in each question for the first thirty questions in order to obtain some power-matching of one level against all other levels. Statements for each question were drawn at random, and the order of the sentences within each question was randomized.
(d) The initial instrument was field tested for internal consistency, and numerous revisions were made as a result of this testing.

(e) For simplicity in addition and multiplication, the scoring was arbitrarily set at five plus points for every Most Like Me choice and five minus points for every Least Like Me choice.

(f) A time allowance was established by taking the mean completion time of twenty-four respondents at a workshop conducted by the National Values Center.

3. The instrument was subjected to tests of reliability and validity with the following results.

(a) Reliability indices of .91 \( (n=105) \) and .88 \( (n=2,220) \) were obtained by using the split-half technique and correlating the two halves of each individual's test. These measures of reliability were considered significantly positive.

(b) Reliability indices as shown in Table XXI were obtained for each level of existence by using the split-half technique. These measures of reliability were not considered adequate. Further examination led to the conclusion that low correlations were a function of low numbers, and it was recommended that future reliability studies be done using a test-retest format where the raw scores would be larger.
TABLE XXI

RELIABILITY INDICES USING THE SPLIT-HALF TECHNIQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Existence</th>
<th>n=105</th>
<th>n=2,220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>.5143</td>
<td>.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.6583</td>
<td>.6969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.7983</td>
<td>.7055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>.7530</td>
<td>.7621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>.8508</td>
<td>.7285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>.6730</td>
<td>.6730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Content validity was established by asking the National Values Center to examine and approve the test instrument.

(d) Internal consistency checks using an n of 271 (in order to obtain an n of 100 for each level of existence) revealed that five questions contained statements which received twenty or more anomalous answers. These statements were individually analyzed, and recommendations for revision are included in Chapter V.

(e) A form of concurrent validity was employed and resulted in a high correlation between the predicted scores for thirty respondents and their actual scores on the test instrument (.8858). The results
of this form of discriminant validity testing were considered significantly positive.

(f) Under the heading of construct validity, three hypotheses were set forth as expectations if the test measured what it was designed to measure. Hypothesis 1 predicted that the results of the Levels of Existence test for persons under thirty year of age would differ significantly from the results for persons thirty years of age and over. Specifically, persons under thirty were predicted to score higher in the Individualistic and Sociocentric levels and persons thirty and over were predicted to score higher in the Absolutistic and Tribalistic levels. This hypothesis was tested by stating four separate hypotheses in null form and applying a t-Test for Two Independent Samples for each of the levels. Results are shown in Table XVI. None of the differences was significant at the .05 level. Hypothesis 1 was not accepted.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the Levels of Existence test would discriminate between and among different occupational groups of people. Specifically, comparisons were made between counselors, managers, and clerical employees on their scores in Absolutism, Achievement, and Sociocentrism.
Two statistical techniques were used. The results of the t-Tests for Two Independent Samples are shown in Table XVII. At each of the three levels, the groups were significantly different from each other. The second statistical technique, hierarchical grouping, identifies persons with similar profiles on a number of variables. The scores of ninety-nine participants (thirty-three in each occupation) were sorted by degree of similarity into three groups. The membership of each group was examined to see if any connection with occupation was apparent, and in each case it was. Group A was dominated by counselors, Group B by managers, and Group C by clerical persons. On the basis of the results of the two statistical tests described above, hypothesis 2 was accepted. 

Hypothesis 3 predicted that a person's primary level of existence and secondary level of existence as revealed on the Levels of Existence test would be within three levels of each other. This was found to be true for 98.8 percent of the individuals tested (n=216). Hypothesis 3 was therefore accepted.

This study sought to advance the research in Clare Graves' theory of Levels of Psychological Existence. It was hoped that, by creating a written instrument which represented
Graves' theoretical construct, and by testing the instrument for reliability and validity, a useful tool would result which would facilitate increased intrapersonal and interpersonal knowledge and communication. The generalized conclusion of this study is that the Levels of Existence test meets the standards of reliability and validity accepted within psychometrics sufficiently to recommend that it be revised and further researched. (Note: Revisions based on this study are presently under way at the National Values Center.) In other words, the work done thus far is the beginning, but a beginning encouraging enough to warrant proceeding in the field. Recommendations for future research are discussed below.

As previously mentioned above and in Chapter V, it is recommended that further tests of reliability be conducted using a test-retest format. Test-retest would permit larger raw scores for each level of existence than did the split-halves technique employed in this study.

It is also recommended that questions 1, 6, 25, and 38 be revised according to suggestions outlined in Chapter V. These revisions should then be examined after future administrations of the test to see if they are internally consistent. It is recommended that more data be gathered on question 3 by conducting personal interviews with individuals who answered the Absolutistic statement in question 3 anomalously.
After inquiring into the thought processes of these respondents, revision of the Absolutistic sentence should again be considered.

As further data are gathered, it is recommended that norms be established for various populations and that all of the regular procedures for standardization be followed.

It is suggested that future research include the investigation of question 31 and its correlation to the test in its entirety. Question 31 asks the respondent to evaluate himself and begins, "I am a person who is . . ." In the process of hand-scoring many tests for this study, the author noted that often what the respondent said about himself in question 31 correctly prophesized his primary level of existence after the entire test was scored. This seemed particularly true when a person's primary level was Achievist. However, the author's observations were casual and not scientific; an objective investigation should be done in the future. If there were one hundred percent correlation between question 31 and the results of the entire test, perhaps the entire test would not be necessary; as much information could be gained by asking one question.

It is recommended that the last ten questions in the test be examined for their correlation with the first thirty questions. The last ten questions are more topical than the rest of the test. Graves says that certain management methods and teaching styles are appropriate for different
levels. If a person's primary level of existence on the test was Absolutistic, for instance, what did he indicate were his preferences for learning (question 35), and for being managed (question 33)? Do the responses correspond with Graves' theory?

Graves has made many statements which can now be tested in future studies. For instance, he said at one point that he had "not yet found a person in whom at least 50 percent of his thinking could not be centralized in a particular system and then it shades off to where he is going and where he has come from (4, p. 22). A future investigator might well ask what percent of a person's personality, as measured on the Levels of Existence test, falls at the primary level and what percent at other levels.

Graves has said that although homicide disappears when an individual advances beyond the fifth level of existence, suicide is the most likely at the sixth level (4, p. 30). Both of these issues could be tackled as points to validate, probably through the case study method and by using historical research.

Many descriptive studies could be done, comparing the mean scores of various professional or educational groups. Mean scores for all of the groups tested in this study are shown in Table XXII. It can be noted that members of the Mensa organization scored extremely high in Individualism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Most Like Me</th>
<th>Least Like Me</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTSU Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Counseling Majors</td>
<td>9 9 26 23 73 60</td>
<td>57 71 26 30 5 9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross-Blue Shield</td>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>9 11 43 49 34 50</td>
<td>66 64 29 19 13 15</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross-Blue Shield</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>16 13 49 38 45 36</td>
<td>48 70 17 29 10 21</td>
<td>2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross-Blue Shield</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>10 14 39 49 34 50</td>
<td>64 60 22 20 14 15</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross-Blue Shield</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>10 13 39 45 32 59</td>
<td>65 56 24 22 19 13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOCO (Oil Co.)</td>
<td>Managers, Tech. Prof.</td>
<td>9 12 30 34 59 65</td>
<td>63 58 33 28 6 9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Visiting Nurses Assn.</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>12 11 29 34 53 61</td>
<td>59 61 32 30 10 8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU Harris College of Nurses Mensa</td>
<td>Educators (club requiring high intelligence)</td>
<td>9 16 17 33 39 80</td>
<td>71 48 37 27 11 4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources</td>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>13 13 32 32 52 58</td>
<td>55 56 25 35 12 13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>10 12 51 39 39 51</td>
<td>59 69 21 25 15 13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>(Professional Training Group)</td>
<td>6 13 17 43 35 87</td>
<td>70 55 43 19 6 5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 13 46 40 43 40</td>
<td>52 68 19 27 11 20</td>
<td>4,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The single criterion for membership in Mensa is high intelligence. Yet, Graves contends that intelligence does not correspond to level of development in his schema. This could be a point for future research to investigate.

More description could be provided regarding the best methods of teaching and management for each of the various levels. Graves says Skinnerian principles should be used for individuals at level three and other techniques for individuals at levels four, five, and six (4, p. 36). These claims could be further researched and tested.

Various political analyses could be attempted using this theory. For example, Graves felt that an analysis of Vietnamese history and culture made it clear that Vietnam was ready for a benevolent autocracy, not democracy, and that attempting democracy was a strategical error. "If you study the history and culture of Vietnam and this system," he said, "you know that the road from tribalism to democracy is autocracy. You don't try to put democracy in there; you try to develop autocracy" (4, p. 44). What political system is best suited for the United States today? If a republican form of government was best in 1776, is it still in 1979? Have the American people as a society remained at the same level of development? Or do levels of existence enter into politics? Can the theory be applied to the Israeli-Arab conflict? To Rhodesia? To the third world countries with whom the United
States must negotiate for oil? The application of Graves' theory to world politics could be an appropriate critical analysis.

Can the results of Maccoby's study (9) be reconciled with the results of this study? This is a question for a future investigator to pursue. Test results in this study indicate that many managers and supervisors are operating primarily at the seventh level (Individualistic). Yet Maccoby found in his study of technological companies that the modal type of top executive was the Gamesman (comparable to Graves' level five). Have managers changed that much since Maccoby gathered his data in the early 1970s? Is the comparison of Maccoby's Gamesman with Graves' Achievist accurate? Is the test instrument developed in this study producing results based on aspiration rather than reality? These are all valid questions to address.

However, the main area in which future research is needed is really none of the above, important as these may be. Top priority in Levels of Existence research right now should be given to an effort to distinguish closed from open systems. Graves has always said, "An adult lives in a potentially open system of needs, values and aspirations, but he often settles into what appears to be a closed system" (2, p. 72). Graves further believes that in order to be effective, different relationship skills should be used in dealing with open individuals than in dealing with closed individuals. Research
is just now approaching a point where it may be feasible to learn to distinguish between those who operate at one level but are open to further development and those who operate at one level and will remain at that level. Tackling this problem will require research of a greater magnitude than anything done thus far, for it will undoubtedly involve longitudinal studies. But the gains available, once open/closed personalities can be identified, will be greater than anything research in this field has thus far facilitated. According to Graves, effective application of his theory in terms of matching teachers with students and supervisors with employees rests on being able to distinguish between open systems of development and closed systems. "If the subject is closed, then the teacher, the supervisor, the trainer, the coach or whatever, should be at the same level as the subject," says Graves, "but if the subject is open then the teacher, supervisor, trainer, coach, should be one level in advance of that person" (4, p. 41). Graves feels the evidence is very clear from his own particular research that "the closed [individual] works well with a person who thinks the same way" and that "the open [individual] works well with the person who is one step ahead of him" (4, p. 41).

This is theory, of course, the ideas themselves being subject to challenge. However, the theory could not be tested without a measuring tool, and that measuring tool had to be accurate, else discrepancy lie in the instrument
and not in the theory. Hence, the first task seemed, at
the outset of this study, to create a written test of meas-
urement for Clare Graves' theory of Levels of Existence.
To the extent that this purpose has been realized, it is now
possible to establish primary levels of existence for groups,
e.g. for teachers and students taking the test, but this is
still a long way from having sufficient data to most effec-
tively match teachers and students; for this, according to
Graves, we need to know not only the present primary level
of existence of a student, but more importantly, whether he
is open and in the middle of upward development or whether
he is closed and will remain at his present level.

How will we learn this? It seems the most difficult
of research tasks. Though longitudinal studies would reveal
change, the knowledge gained would be retrospective and too
late for practical application in terms of matching teachers
with the particular students in the study or supervisors
with the particular employees in the study. Perry, for
example, studied change in college students over a four year
period that they attended Harvard University (12). By the
end of the four years, he knew which students had changed
and which had not. However, by then such information would
be of no use in finding the right professor for these stu-
dents while they were attending Harvard, had that been
Perry's purpose.
Thus, the challenge for future researchers in Levels of Existence theory is not only to develop a way to differentiate between open and closed systems, but to develop a way to identify such difference early, when desired, at the beginning of a relationship. Is there any connection between the pattern of a person's score profile and his being either open or closed? This is one question to ask. In this study, the profiles varied greatly, examples of which are previously given. Could it be that persons whose scores look like 642, 753 or 753, 642 (where the sacrificial levels cluster and the expressive levels cluster) are different from persons whose scores look like 567432 or 765432 (where the higher levels cluster and the lower levels cluster)? This question seems worthy of investigation. Perhaps the former persons are closed and the latter are open. Is there a difference between persons whose scores are evenly spread across the levels and persons whose scores are extremely high in one or two levels and low in all other levels? There are many questions yet to be addressed.

With respect to the theory itself, there is a great and growing need to fully describe the eighth system—Experientialistic. It was in 1959 that Graves says he got the "shock of his life" (4, p. 10) because he first began to encounter persons who had grown beyond his seventh level. Through the 1960s and into the 1970s, Graves still felt that he had not encountered enough of these people to be able to
comprehensively describe the level. However, it seems time to do so now. In the early 1950s, Graves found 34 percent of his students operating at the fourth level, but felt that the modal level was the fifth level (4, p. 41). In the 1960s, he talked about the sixth level being very visible in American society (2, pp. 76-78). On the tests given in this study, the seventh level was the modal primary level for nine of the eleven groups. All of this indicates upward movement and leads one to conclude that there must be an eighth system becoming more and more visible. Since such a high percent of participants in this study indicated their primary level of existence is the seventh level, some of them should, theoretically, be halfway into the eighth system now. This might have shown up had choices for an eighth system been included on the test instrument. Theory seems lagging behind reality at the moment and needs updating.

Another central issue to be dealt with on the theoretical level is the integration of Graves' concepts of left-right brain dominance with newer scientific research on the subject. Graves believes "that cerebral dominance, in the even numbered systems, is by the right hemisphere of the brain and in odd numbered systems, beginning with the third, by the left hemisphere of the brain" (3, p. 1). Because of this alternation between right and left hemispheres, there is an accompanying alternation "between focus upon the inner
subjective world and how to come to know and come to peace with it, in even numbered systems and focus upon the external world and how to control and expand power over it in each odd numbered system after the third" (3, p. 1). When the right hemisphere of the brain is dominant, the organism is in a phase of adjusting itself to the environment. When the left hemisphere of the brain is dominant, the organism is in the phase of adjusting the environment to itself (3, pp. 1-2). These concepts of Graves need to be reconciled with the split-brain theory discussed by Robert Ornstein in *The Psychology of Consciousness* (11), Leslie Hart in *How the Brain Works* (5), Carl Sagan in *The Dragons of Eden* (15), Julian Jaynes in *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (6), and Steven Rose in *The Conscious Brain* (14). Research upon which these books are based indicates a division in the brain between the left side which thinks logically, factually, verbally, and mathematically and the right side which demonstrates itself creatively, artistically, musically, and emotionally. Can these ideas be synthesized with Graves' ideas? Such a synthesis should be attempted. It seems clear that the surface has been scratched but that there are "miles to go" (1, p. 317) in developing to the fullest the potential applications of Clare Graves' theory of Psychological Levels of Existence.
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**SUMMARY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL LEVELS OF EXISTENCE***

**Level One—Reactive**—Functions at the physiological level. Reacts to stimuli such as hunger, pain, cold, warmth, and sleep in order to obtain the immediate satisfaction of basic human needs. Pure Reactives are virtually value-less—concerned only with survival. Seen in new-born infants, profoundly retarded, severe stroke victims, and the senile elderly. Can be either a temporary state (like a person on drugs or in a state of emotional or physical shock) or a permanent state of existence.

**Level Two—Tribalistic**—Seeks safety and security in a threatening world by fixating on power, chieftains, clans, rituals, or superstition. Strong reliance on chieftain(s) (parents, teachers, coaches, supervisors, etc.) or the norms established by a clan (family, work-unit, team, or tribe). Depends on the mystical forces inherent in life and tends to be both superstitious and ritualistic. Needs to find some way to explain the unexplainable. Expressed in highly-visible group affiliation and preference for "paternalistic" atmospheres.

**Level Three—Egocentric**—Unabashed, self-centered assertiveness. Aggressiveness takes many forms as he rebels against authority figures, norms, rules, and standards. Somewhat flamboyant in behavior in order to gain attention.
Often brash, rough, brazen, abrasive, and even uncouth. May appear "paranoid"—feels that the world is a hostile and alien place. May internalize the impulses into an angry, embittered, and bristling personality. Manifests itself positively in creativity, willingness to break with tradition, and dogged determination.

Level Four—Absolutistic—Finds structure, security, and predictability in systems of various types rooted in directive design. Strongly committed to what he considers to be the "right way." Promotes clearly-defined social roles. Prefers order, structure, patterns, and sequential time-frames. Somewhat rigid in responding to diversity and ambiguity. Likes a "cut and dried" kind of world and is prone to impose his system, concepts of right and wrong, rules and procedures on others. Places a premium on sacrifice, discipline, and adhering to the established norms of society.

Level Five—Achievist—Achievement-oriented, self-serving, and aggressive, but within the constraints of society. Enjoys wheeling and dealing, engaging in various forms of competition, and demonstrating his ability to motivate, attain goals, and get ahead in life. Manipulation may be either concealed and private or it may be open, above-board, and displayed. Designed to produce evidence of success, accomplishment, and winning. This mode of adjustment will be found in abundance in politics, management, and in sales and marketing professions.
Level Six—Sociocentric—Personalistic concern for self-discovery, acceptance, human dignity, and the uniqueness of each person, as well as the inherent worth of people as a whole. By finding basic value in people and humanity in general, a Sociocentric individual will spend his time and/or energy working in behalf of social causes. Sociocentrics are opposed to the manipulative use of people as well as the mindless punitiveness of rigid conformity systems. Reflected in the "helping" professions and new theories and methods of personal introspection.

Level Seven—Individualistic—A personal activist who seeks to live within society's constraints while enjoying his maximum individual freedom. Tends to be inner-directed and self-motivating. Readily accepts ambiguity in people and situations. This value system is quite tolerant, but, at the same time, expects high levels of performance of itself and others. Responds to reasons, not to rules, and is managed through competence, not status or position. May be expressed by dropping out of society in order to pursue individualistic interests and alternative life-styles.

*Based on the Theoretical Concepts of Clare W. Graves and adapted by the National Values Center (from promotional flyer).
To Whom it May Concern:

The National Value Center, aka The National Center for Values Research, hereby grants permission to Marilyn Anne Hurlbut to use and to reproduce in her dissertation the following test instruments:

- Value Systems Inventory, Copyright 1978
- Value Systems Inventory, Copyright 1978 (Multiple-Choice)
- Coping Systems Inventory, Copyright 1979

Don Edward Beck
National Values Center
VALUE SYSTEMS INVENTORY

This Value Systems Inventory has been developed by the National Center for Values Research. The use of this instrument requires the written authorization by the National Center. Copyright 1978/National Center for Values Research.

INSTRUCTIONS

This instrument consists of 150 statements that reflect different perceptions of life as well as diverse expressions of what people think, feel, and do. All of these statements are "normal" and simply describe the differences in people and perceptions in our society.

You are to determine the extent to which each of the individual statements is "like you" or "not like you" using the following seven-point scale.

"The ideas, feelings, and behaviors contained in this statement are. . . ."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Like Me At All</td>
<td>Rarely Like Me</td>
<td>Not Like Me Most of the Time</td>
<td>Sometimes Like Me- Sometimes Not Like Me</td>
<td>Like Me Much of the Time</td>
<td>Like Me Most of the Time</td>
<td>Perfectly Descriptive of Me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will indicate your response to each of the statements by placing one of the above numbers in the space directly in front (on the left) of each statement. Be sure you indicate your reaction to each of the statements.

AN ADDITIONAL WORD. . .

It's extremely important that you respond in terms of how you actually think or feel. Avoid the tendency to:

1. Respond in a fashion that you think is "expected of you" by people you know.

2. Reflect how you would "like to be" instead of how you genuinely see yourself.
VALUE SYSTEMS INVENTORY

1. I have a lot of superstitions in my life.
2. I love being the maverick I am.
3. Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.
4. I like to negotiate and get the best deal possible.
5. I see myself as a "humanist."
6. It doesn't matter that people often see me as "different."
7. The past is awe-inspiring.
8. Sometimes it is fun to rock the boat.
9. I often feel guilty when I don't do what's right.
10. I've learned to "play the game" and expect to be successful.
11. Materialism stands in the way of human relationships.
12. I respond differently in different situations.
13. I often feel helpless in a world that's often threatening.
14. It's a tough world where the strongest will survive.
15. I like my world to be stable and well-organized.
16. I'm willing to work hard if it will pay off for me.
17. I seek inner peace and harmony with others.
18. We must immediately begin to restore man's balance with nature.
19. I feel the safest when I'm with my group or leader.
20. I keep getting a raw deal from life.
21. I expect loyalty and dedication to be recognized.
22. We can conquer our problems and control our destiny.
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23. Each life should contribute to human well-being.
24. I function best in a very open and flexible environment.
25. Much of life is mysterious and cannot be understood.
26. A lot of people seem to have it in for me.
27. It's one's duty to sacrifice for a cause in which he/she believes.
28. Compromise and trade-offs are inherent within human nature.
29. A person can change his basic nature and improve himself.
30. To me, a meaningful job is more important than the paycheck.
31. I sometimes feel the spirits are controlling my life.
32. I don't like anybody trying to tell me what to do.
33. There is a superior force guiding man and his destiny.
34. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
35. Feelings and emotions and their expressions are important to me.
36. It's better to simply be yourself—regardless.
37. People are the strongest when they band together.
38. I don't blame anyone for grabbing everything he/she can.
39. A rightful place exists for everybody in society.
40. I like to find the best decision by weighing advantages and disadvantages.
41. We should get to know ourselves as total persons.
42. I sense that I can see and understand the "big picture."
43. We should look up to our leaders and trust in their guidance.
44. You really can't trust anybody but yourself.
45. Children who are taught discipline will be productive.
46. I pride myself in taking advantage of my opportunities.
47. Things don't count—people do.
48. Practicality and functionality are my primary guidelines in decisions.
49. I would sacrifice myself for my group if necessary.
50. You ought to do what you want to do—now!
51. The well-disciplined life is a happy life.
52. I can manipulate people and situations rather easily.
53. People aren't bad per se—but may do "bad" things.
54. I respond more to competency than authority or position.
55. Family bonds are the tightest of all.
56. You only live once—you might as well enjoy it.
57. Good things stand the test of time.
58. You've got to take chances if you want to get ahead.
59. I tend to avoid aggressive and assertive people.
60. I respond much more to reasons than to rules themselves.
61. My life is filled with sacred objects and rituals.
62. I usually do what I damn well please.
63. I always try to do my duty.
64. Nice guys often do finish last.
65. We shouldn't stereotype people or treat them as objects.
66. I need more variety and diversity than most people I know.

67. The day-to-day problems of life often overwhelm me.

68. I don't like anybody "riding my back."

69. Good people should be rewarded; bad people should be punished.

70. The more I produce the more I expect to get in return.

71. I'm more sensitive to the needs of people than most.

72. I am more a non-conformist than an anti-conformist.

73. I need to be with someone who is strong and will protect me.

74. If you don't look after yourself nobody else will.

75. Most things in life can fit within logical and consistent systems.

76. The world is full of opportunities for those who are ambitious.

77. We should be patient with people and understand why they do things.

78. I believe that man is man—neither inherently good or bad.

79. My roots where I am are very strong.

80. After everything is said and done might does make right.

81. The basic rules and standards of human conduct will never change.

82. I'm willing to bend rules or principles whenever necessary.

83. Everyone should have an equal opportunity to develop to the fullest.

84. People should feel free to be who they are.

85. Other people in my group will stand by me all the way.
86. I get a real thrill out of risky fun.
87. I choose to associate only with good people.
88. I don't mind a little "wheeling and dealing."
89. I don't understand why some people are so mean and callous.
90. Life is full of uncertainties, but that's OK by me.
91. Others usually make decisions for me.
92. In most things I'll take on anybody--anytime.
93. People should earn what they get.
94. I enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
95. A genuine interest in and regard for people can solve many of our problems.
96. Personal freedom and autonomy are bottom-line with me.
97. I like to be with people who really stick together.
98. Everybody has his or her price and can be bought.
99. A good profession is stable, secure, and dependable.
100. As I'm successful in meeting my goals, my friends or organization will benefit as well.
101. There's no reason why people shouldn't get along with one another.
102. I rarely feel guilty about not responding to social pressures.
103. If we are lucky, the good spirits will be with us.
104. Lots of people think of me as "flashy."
105. Even though I don't like some rules I still must accept them.
106. Learning the world's secrets helps us enrich our lifestyle.
107. It makes me feel good to share myself with others.
108. Although independent, I'm seldom seen as abrasive.
109. Realistically, I don't think I can make it alone.
110. Sentimentality is a lot of crap.
111. We should build on the traditions we have inherited from our forefathers.
112. Winning is the main thing.
113. Personal growth and development are important to all people.
114. I pretty much "hear my own drummer" in dealing with life.
115. Evil spirits possess me at times.
116. You can count on me to say what I think--regardless!
117. I make decisions based on what is right and logical.
118. I have strong needs to achieve.
119. We could get the job done better if we work together in harmony.
120. My life goals tend to be rather abstract and tentative.
121. I usually need for someone to show me what to do.
122. A person is stupid if he just takes what the world dishes out.
123. We should strive to preserve our customs and traditions.
124. I've profited from learning that "who you know" is more important than "what you do."
125. I wish everybody had all they wanted in life.
126. What I value is more self-determined than society-dictated.
127. Some of the things I own seem to have a magic power about them.

128. My impulsive nature gets me in a lot of trouble.

129. We should avoid people with bad morals.

130. In life there are winners and there are losers.

131. People should be free to do what feels good to them.

132. I tend to assess individuals and events without using absolutes.

133. I know that my "good luck charms" have helped me.

134. I call the shots and let the chips fall where they may.

135. We have an obligation to show people how they should live.

136. I like to take the initiative and make things happen.

137. Life is a beautiful experience when we trust and help each other.

138. I do what I want to do--instead of what others or society expects of me.

139. My life has been full of heroes that I have honored and respected.

140. People will try to rip you off if given a chance.

141. I generally try to keep my emotions under control.

142. Given half a chance I'll make it big.

143. I can understand others only when I understand myself.

144. I'm committed more to principle than rules or doctrine.

145. Sometimes living scares me.

146. Frankly, I feel superior to most people.

147. We should defend those basic Truths that have guided man from the beginning.
__148. I relish the challenge of testing myself against others.

__149. I prefer work or activities that are important to human welfare.

__150. I enjoy viewing life from a broad perspective—observing the continuous flow of people and events.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE SYSTEM</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Below are sets of four statements describing attitudes or personal characteristics of people. In each set choose the one statement that you most prefer, that is most like you or that applies most to you. Circle the letter in front of the statement that is most like you: (A)

Examine the remaining statements and choose the one statement that you least prefer, that is least like you or applies least to you. Cross out the letter in front of the statement that is least like you: X

1. A--Leaders look out for their people and I trust my leader.
   B--It feels good to reach out and help other persons cope with life.
   C--Don't just tell me "it's the rule:" I've got to have a reason.
   D--When I play a game--I play to win; otherwise, why bother?

2. A--I would willingly sacrifice myself for the good of my group if necessary.
   B--It's people who really count--not things!
   C--Life's a game and I'm in it to win.
   D--The basic Truths that have existed from the beginning will always be the same.

3. A--Most things are either right or wrong.
   B--The world is a very complex process without any easy answers.
   C--Love and tolerance are important to me.
   D--I intend to get somewhere in life.

4. A--When the spirits get angry, horrible things can happen.
   B--I don't think one should live just for the moment; it's irresponsible.
   C--I think of myself as a "humanist" first and foremost.
   D--I admire competency in anything.

5. A—Diversity is stimulating.
   B—The basic Truths that have existed from the beginning will always be the same.
   C—It's a dog-eat-dog kind of world.
   D—It feels good to reach out and help other persons cope with life.

6. A—Whatever turns you on, baby!
   B—If everyone did what was right we'd all get along a lot better.
   C—There's always one best way and if we are skillful we can find it.
   D—I wish the world weren't so scary, but when I'm with my own group I feel safer.

7. A—I love to meet the challenge of competition and prove myself.
   B—The work I do must be relevant and meaningful; money is not that important.
   C—I would willingly sacrifice myself for the good of my group if necessary.
   D—You gotta be tough or they'll eat you alive!

8. A—It's important to be loyal to your "family"—especially when times are difficult.
   B—The law's the law and whether right or wrong it must be obeyed.
   C—I make my own decisions in life and even if they differ from what most people think I'll accept the consequences.
   D—It's stupid to save a lot of money because you can't take it with you.

9. A—I choose to judge myself and don't need to solicit the opinion of others.
   B—I like to negotiate and get the best deal possible.
   C—You gotta be tough or they'll eat you alive.
   D—I want to invest my life in people and not possessions or power.

10. A—Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.
    B—It's MY body and I can do with it what I damn well please.
    C—I enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
    D—I'm usually the one who can see the "big picture" and understand the long-term consequences of decisions.

11. A—I wish the world weren't so scary, but when I'm with my own group I feel safer.
    B—I wish people would get off my back.
    C—I feel guilty when I don't follow the rules.
    D—if you really understand a person, you can't dislike him.
12. A—If you don't look out for yourself, no one else will. B—Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards. C--I take advantage of every opportunity that comes my way. D--Everyone's beautiful in his/her own way.


14. A--I make my own decisions in life and even if they differ from what most people think I'll accept the consequences. B--I can't imagine life alone without my group and our leader. C--If you don't look out for yourself, someone will rip you off. D--If I trust a person, I'm not afraid to tell him who I am.

15. A--Work now, play later. B--It's stimulating to be with people who think differently than I do. C--I like a little competition; it makes life more lively. D--Leaders look out for their people; I trust my leader.

16. A--The past is awe-inspiring. B--I seek inner peace and harmony with others. C--I function best in a very open and flexible environment. D--I've learned to "play the game" and expect to be successful.

17. A--I often feel helpless in a world that's often threatening. B--Each life should contribute to human well-being. C--We can conquer our problems and control our own destiny—both as individuals and as a society. D--Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.

18. A--I often feel guilty when I don't do what's right. B--I respond more to competency than authority or position. C--Feelings and emotions and their expressions are important to me. D--I pride myself in taking advantage of my opportunities.
19. A—I feel the safest when I'm with my group or leader.
B—I expect loyalty and dedication to be recognized.
C—we should be patient with people and understand why they do things.
D—I respond much more to reasons than to rules themselves.

20. A—I need more variety and diversity than most people I know.
B—I always try to do my duty.
C—Sometimes it's fun to rock the boat just for the sake of it.
D—Everyone should have an equal opportunity to develop to the fullest.

21. A—I don't blame anyone for grabbing everything he/she can.
B—Children who are taught discipline will be productive.
C—The world is full of opportunities for those who are ambitious.
D—My life is filled with sacred objects and rituals.

22. A—I don't mind a little "wheeling and dealing."
B—Personal freedom and autonomy are bottom-line with me.
C—The day-to-day problems of life often overwhelm me.
D—You only live once—you might as well enjoy it.

23. A—I sometimes feel the spirits are controlling my life.
B—The well-disciplined life is a happy life.
C—I am more a non-conformist than an anti-conformist.
D—I usually do what I damn well please.

24. A—I believe that man is man—neither inherently good or bad.
B—I enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
C—I get a real thrill out of risky fun.
D—a genuine interest in and regard for people can solve many of our problems.

25. A—Even though I don't like some rules I still must accept them.
B—Everybody has his or her price and can be bought.
C—Winning is the main thing.
D—I pretty much "hear my own drummer" in dealing with life.

26. A—I usually need for someone to show me what to do.
B—I call the shots and let the chips fall where they may.
C—we should build on the traditions we have inherited from our forefathers.
D—I wish everybody had all they wanted in life.
27. A—Lots of people see me as "flashy" because of what I do.
   B—We should strive to preserve our customs and traditions.
   C—I have strong needs to achieve.
   D—Life is a beautiful experience when we trust and help each other.

28. A—I prefer work or activities that are important to human welfare.
   B—My life has been full of heroes that I have honored and respected.
   C—People will try to rip you off if given a chance.
   D—I like to take the initiative and make things happen.

29. A—I enjoy viewing life from a broad perspective—observing the continuous flow of people and events.
   B—Sometimes living scares me.
   C—People will try to rip you off if given a chance.
   D—Given half a chance I'll make it big.

30. A—I usually need for someone to show me what to do.
   B—I make decisions based on what is right and logical.
   C—Learning the world's secrets helps us enrich our lifestyles.
   D—What I value is more self-determined than society-dictated.
INSTRUCTIONS

Below are sets of statements describing attitudes or personal characteristics of people. In each set choose the one statement that you most prefer, that is most like you or that applies most to you. Black in the one most appropriate Most Like Me box. Then examine the remaining statements and choose the one statement that you least prefer, that is least like you, or that applies least to you. Black in the one most appropriate Least Like Me box.

1. ☐ — 1 — ☐ Leaders look out for their people and I trust my leader.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ It feels good to reach out and help other people cope with life.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ Don’t just tell me “It’s the rule”; I’ve got to have a reason.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ When I play a game — I play to win; otherwise, why bother?

2. ☐ — 1 — ☐ I would willingly sacrifice myself for the good of my group.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ It’s people who really count — not materialistic gain.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ Life’s a game and I’m in it to win.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ The basic Truths that have existed from the beginning will always be the same.

3. ☐ — 1 — ☐ Most things are either right or wrong.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ The world is a very complex process without any easy answers.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ Love and tolerance are important to me.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ I intend to get somewhere in life.

4. ☐ — 1 — ☐ When the “spirits” get angry, horrible things can happen.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ I don’t think one should live just for the moment; it’s irresponsible.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ I think of myself as a “humanist” first and foremost.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ I admire functionality and competency in anything.

5. ☐ — 1 — ☐ Diversity is stimulating.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ The basic Truths that have existed from the beginning will always be the same.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ It’s a dog-eat-dog kind of world no matter what anybody says.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ It feels good to reach out and help other people cope with life.

6. ☐ — 1 — ☐ Whatever turns you on — do it!
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ If everyone did what was right we’d all get along a lot better.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ There’s always one best way and if we want to progress we’ll find it.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ I wish the world weren’t so scary, but when I’m with my own people I feel safer.

7. ☐ — 1 — ☐ I love to meet the challenge of competition and prove myself.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ The work I do must be relevant to me; money is not that important.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ I would willingly sacrifice myself for the good of my group.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ You’ve got to be tough or the world will eat you alive!

8. ☐ — 1 — ☐ The only way to survive in this world is to band together with others.
   ☐ — 2 — ☐ The law’s the law and, whether right or wrong, it must be followed.
   ☐ — 3 — ☐ I make my own decisions in life and even if they differ from what most people think I’ll accept the consequences.
   ☐ — 4 — ☐ It’s stupid to save a lot of money because you can’t take it with you.
9. I choose to judge myself and don't need to ask the opinions of others.
   I like to negotiate and get the best deal possible.
   You've got to be tough or the world will eat you alive.
   I want to invest my life in people — not possessions or power.

10. Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.
    I don't like anyone telling me what to do.
    I enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
    I'm usually the one who can see the "big picture" and understand the long-term consequences of decisions.

11. I wish the world weren't so scary, but when I'm with my own people I feel safer.
    I wish people would get off my back.
    I feel guilty when I don't follow the rules.
    If you really understand a person, you can't dislike him/her.

12. If you don't look out for yourself, no one else will.
    Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.
    I take advantage of every opportunity that comes my way.
    Everyone's beautiful in his/her own way.

13. Each individual must contribute to the betterment of humankind.
    My good luck charms help protect me.
    Love 'em and leave 'em — that's my motto!
    The world's there for the taking — if we are ambitious enough!

14. I make my own decisions in life and even if they differ from what most people think I'll accept the consequences.
    I can't imagine life alone without my own people or the person I look up to.
    If you don't look out for yourself, nobody else will.
    If I trust a person, I'm not afraid to tell him/her who I am.

15. "Work now — play later" is the safest motto for life.
    It's stimulating to be with people who think differently than I do.
    I like a little competition; it makes life more lively.
    Leaders look out for their people and I trust my own leader.

16. The past is awe-inspiring.
    I seek inner peace and harmony with others.
    I function best in an open and flexible environment.
    I've learned to "play the game" and expect to be successful.

17. I often feel helpless in a world that's often threatening.
    Each life should contribute to human well-being.
    We can conquer our problems and control our own destiny.
    Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.

18. I often feel guilty when I don't do what's right.
    I respond more to competency than authority or position.
    Feelings and emotions and their expressions are important to me.
    I pride myself in taking advantage of my opportunities.
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19. 1 — 1 — I feel the safest when I'm with my own people.
    1 — 2 — I expect loyalty and dedication to be recognized.
    1 — 3 — We should be patient with people and understand why they do things.
    1 — 4 — I respond much more to reasons than to rules themselves.

20. 1 — 1 — I need more variety and diversity than most people I know.
    1 — 2 — I always try to do my duty.
    1 — 3 — Sometimes it's fun to rock the boat just for the sake of it.
    1 — 4 — Everyone should have an equal opportunity to develop to the fullest.

21. 1 — 1 — I don't blame anyone for grabbing everything he/she can.
    1 — 2 — Children who are taught discipline will be good citizens.
    1 — 3 — The world is full of opportunities for those who are ambitious.
    1 — 4 — My life is filled with sacred objects that I rely on.

22. 1 — 1 — I don't mind a little "wheeling and dealing."
    1 — 2 — Personal freedom and autonomy are bottom line with me.
    1 — 3 — The day-to-day problems of life often overwhelm me.
    1 — 4 — You only live once so you should eat, drink, and be merry.

23. 1 — 1 — I sometimes feel the spirits are controlling my life.
    1 — 2 — The well-disciplined life is a happy and stable life.
    1 — 3 — I am more a non-conformist than an anti-conformist.
    1 — 4 — I usually do what I damn well please.

24. 1 — 1 — I believe that a human is human — neither inherently good or bad.
    1 — 2 — I enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
    1 — 3 — I get a real thrill out of risky fun.
    1 — 4 — If we truly put people first our other problems will vanish.

25. 1 — 1 — Even though I don't like some rules I still must accept them and live by them.
    1 — 2 — Everybody has his or her price and can be bought.
    1 — 3 — Winning is the only thing that really matters to me.
    1 — 4 — I pretty much "hear my own drummer" in dealing with life.

26. 1 — 1 — I usually need for someone to show me what to do — and when.
    1 — 2 — I call the shots and let the chips fall where they may.
    1 — 3 — We should build on the traditions we have inherited from our ancestors.
    1 — 4 — I wish everybody had all they wanted in life.

27. 1 — 1 — Lots of people see me as "flashy" because of what I do.
    1 — 2 — We should strive to preserve our customs and traditions.
    1 — 3 — I have strong needs to achieve.
    1 — 4 — Life is a beautiful experience when we trust and help each other.

28. 1 — 1 — I prefer work or activities that are important to human welfare.
    1 — 2 — My life has been full of heroes that I have honored and respected.
    1 — 3 — People will try to rip you off if given a chance.
    1 — 4 — I like to take the initiative and make things happen.
29. I enjoy viewing life from a broad perspective — observing the continuous flow of people and events.
Sometimes living scares me.
People will try to rip you off if given a chance.
I’ve got big plans for myself and expect to be successful.

30. I usually need for someone to show me what to do and when to do it.
I make decisions based on what is right and logical.
Learning the world’s secrets helps us enrich our lifestyles.
What I value is more self-determined than society-dictated.

31. I am a person who is...
- a real free spirit — self-reliant, flexible, and non-judgmental.
- stable and responsible with firm convictions, beliefs, and traditions.
- security-conscious, sometimes superstitious, loyal to group/family/clan.
- spunky, bold, often abrasive, aggressive and rather self-centered.
- ambitious and prestige-seeking, with strong aspirations and initiative.
- open and authentic, sensitive to feelings and people-oriented.

32. I like a job that has...
- a lot of security with a close group of co-workers like me.
- a lot of action with a chance to make lots of cash — quick!
- a lot of stability with orderly work and which rewards loyalty.
- a lot of opportunity for advancement, with pay based on merit and my performance.
- a lot of responsiveness to human needs and feelings.
- a lot of freedom to do interesting things on my own terms.

33. I can best be managed when I have...
- the power to influence my own destiny and challenges that test me.
- a boss who calls the shots but doesn’t hassle me or get on my back.
- a management system that is fair, consistent, and sticks by the rules.
- a supervisor who shows a personal interest in me and stays in charge.
- an atmosphere that responds to the needs and feelings of everyone.
- access to the information I need and the freedom to do a job my own way.

34. I prefer to work for an organization that...
- is well organized, consistent, and rewards loyalty and dedication.
- understands and accepts individual uniqueness without being judgmental.
- offers action and adventure, pays me well, and leaves me alone.
- considers the needs, feelings, and well-being of both employees and customers.
- creates a protective and secure “family” atmosphere for us employees.
- provides avenues and incentives to climb the job ladder and get ahead.

35. I learn best when...
- I see the personal pay-offs and get involved in competitive activities.
- the instructor is well-organized with clear objectives and job-related knowledge.
- the instructor shows me step-by-step what I’m supposed to learn.
- we are encouraged to explore our feelings and understand the learning process.
- resources are made available to me so I can learn in my own way.
36. Laws, rules, and regulations are . . .
- 1 — necessary, but we only make progress when we can bend them a bit.
- 2 — absolutely essential in order to maintain stability and discipline.
- 3 — generally designed to protect selfish interests and punish the rest of us.
- 4 — functional guidelines that should encourage personal responsibility.
- 5 — protective of those in trouble and tell the rest of us what’s expected of us.
- 6 — helpful if they benefit all people and are enforced in a humane manner.

37. The best way for me to cope with life is to . . .
- 1 — attach myself to a person or group which will take care of me.
- 2 — be tough enough to take care of myself so I can get what I want.
- 3 — hold to my beliefs and keep doing what’s right — then everything will be OK.
- 4 — learn to negotiate with the world in order to enjoy life to its fullest.
- 5 — seek peace with my inner being and the inner selves of others.
- 6 — transcend the usual human needs and concerns and accept reality as it is.

38. In terms of communication, I respond best to . . .
- 1 — human interest themes that reflect the importance of people and mankind.
- 2 — personal, face-to-face messages from someone I trust and know I can rely on.
- 3 — complex messages and media that display a total picture for me to interpret.
- 4 — straight talk from a person in power who doesn’t beat around the bush.
- 5 — being shown what’s in it for me so I can use the information to my advantage.
- 6 — organized and authoritative messages that tell me what I need to know.

39. To me, money is important because it . . .
- 1 — pays for the basic necessities that I need to keep going.
- 2 — lets me buy the things I want so I can feel like somebody.
- 3 — provides me a decent standard of living and security for a rainy day.
- 4 — allows me freedom to be myself and to do what I find interesting.
- 5 — is a means whereby we can provide for the needs of people.
- 6 — demonstrates that I’ve been successful and deserve to enjoy life’s good things.

40. I make decisions based on . . .
- 1 — the impact of my decision on the well-being of other people.
- 2 — what is right and consistent with our standards and ways of living.
- 3 — what’s in it for me — now; if you don’t, somebody else might rip you off.
- 4 — what will pay off for me in terms of material gain and/or personal recognition.
- 5 — what the signs indicate is best for me to do.
- 6 — the effect on our total life system — and on man’s basic freedom to be.

*Referred to as the Levels of Existence Test throughout this study.
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