Case studies of self-actualizing people according to the ideas of A. Maslow and the criteria of K. Dabrowski are presented. To find people meeting the criteria of Level 4 of the Dabrowski theory, a pool of 21 subjects was established by nomination. All subjects were given the Definition-Response Instrument to assess levels of emotional development. One man and three women were selected for study based on their levels of functioning. A life history was obtained from each subject. Interviews were the richest source of material. Three of the four subjects were found to be self-actualizing. They displayed a commonality possessed by self-actualizers, kindness and simplicity in responding to problems basic to humanity. It was possible to assess the degree of self-actualization with the interviews techniques developed. The interview guide, life history questions, and definitions of the dynamisms of self-actualization are included in appendices. (SLD)
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INTRODUCTION

When Maslow presented his concept of the self-actualization, he did not present any case studies. Only two studies of self-actualization have been completed, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry (Piechowski, 1978) and Eleanor Roosevelt (Piechowski and Tyska, 1978), both studies of historical persons. The challenge of finding living individuals who are well on their way in the self-actualization process is yet to be met. The purpose of this study was to find these kinds of people and to examine them through an in-depth case study.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Two sources converge to provide the theoretical basis for this study. The first is Maslow's description of the characteristics of self-actualizing people (Maslow, 1950, 1954, 1956, 1967, 1969a, 1969b, 1970, and 1971). These people were to Maslow the norm of a fully developed human potential, and the logical standard against which one ought to measure values, character, social institutions, education, etc. Maslow set out to study "extraordinary people" to prove "original goodness" as opposed to "original sin": "to know self-actualization is to know human nature as it truly is and to know that it is basically good" (Lowry, 1973, p. 31 and 36).

The second source is Dabrowski's theory of emotional development which posits five levels (Dabrowski, 1970; Dabrowski and Piechowski, 1977a and 1977b). The trend across levels is for development to proceed from a narrow self-serving ego structure to a transformed and expanded altruistic one.
In his study of the self-actualization profile of Antoine de Saint-Exupery, Piechowski (1978) showed that one of the levels, Level IV, in Dabrowski's theory corresponds exactly to Maslow's construct of self-actualization.

Dabrowski's theory is based on the following assumptions: personality is structured; emotional life plays a central role in development -- it guides and directs the process of inner growth and transformation; individual development is viewed as a function of the extent and depth of psychological transformation undergone by the individual; development is an evolitional process, a transformation from a lower to a higher level, from simple to more complex, from automatic and unconscious to voluntary and conscious; development occurs through the breakdown of a lower level structure to be replaced by a higher level structure.

The five levels of development can be succinctly described. The first level tends to be unified due to a lack of inner conflict and self-reflection resulting in a certain self-assurance, an integration, but without much of inner psychic life. The second level is characterized by polarities, looseness, a lack of direction and inner organization, and a sense of self absorption or self-centeredness. The third level is characterized by inner conflict, a growing sense of "what is" as opposed to "what ought to be." This level often involves very strong negative judgments of oneself. Intrapsychic processes begin to influence and direct behavior. The fourth is characterized by autonomy and internal hierarchy of values. "What ought to be, will be" is the principle that characterizes this level. The fifth level is characterized by a dynamic integration governed by the "personality ideal." The ideal which governs can be, for example, service to others out of
universal compassion or service to truth.

The structures of each level are comprised of what Dabrowski called dynamisms. Dynamisms are intra-psychic dispositional traits which shape development; they are both the movers of development and the inhibitors of lower level functions; they define the various levels. The dynamisms are listed in Appendix A with their definitions.

There are both unilevel and multilevel dynamisms. When unilevel dynamisms (Level II) emerge, they are not transformative, only disintegrative in respect to the structure of primary integration. They drive a wedge into this structure by introducing indecisiveness and changeability, resulting in a fluidness in the inner psychic milieu. Ambivalent feelings are plentiful and the opinion of others exercises great influence over a person's mind. Multilevel dynamisms do not appear to be derived from the transformation of the former; they emerge as new and distinct dispositions whose origin does not lie with unilevel elements (Piechowski, 1975). They are transformative and, with their emergence, a hierarchically structured inner psychic milieu is formed. Level III dynamisms are special forms of inner conflict, self-evaluation and self-judgment. The type of inner conflict is between the higher and lower principles, between the "status quo" and the possibilities of "what ought to be." This type of conflict is distinguished from unilevel inner-conflict which comprises issues with dimensions on the same level. An example of a dynamism of this level is hierarchization, a critical perception and evaluation, a recognition of higher and lower levels of experiences and phenomena. Another example, frustration and anger with the status quo describes the dynamism of dissatisfaction with oneself. Positive
maladjustment, another dynamism, is the independence from social opinion as it expresses a strong protest against the violation of intrinsic ethical principles. Level IV dynamisms provide deliberate direction and are consciously transforming. For example, one dynamism, third factor, represents choice and decision in setting and following internal standards. These internal standards are the guides which enable us to accept the positive over the negative elements in both the internal and external milieu. Self-control, self-designed methods to maintain equilibrium, and development of methods directed at enhancing personal growth are examples of other dynamisms. Personality ideal is principal dynamism in Level V which is the sole unifying factor at that level, the crown of development.

In summary, the developmental dynamisms are advanced emotional and cognitive factors which guide the transformation process to a higher level of functioning. Dynamisms are one of the moving forces of inner development. The line of attack in this study was first to find self-actualizing people by finding first people who meet the criteria of Level IV in Dabrowski's theory.

METHOD

SUBJECTS

The aim of this study was to identify those subjects who would manifest multilevel development. Because of the rarity and theoretical importance of such subjects, they are what Homstrum (1972, p. 183) called "strategic cases," that is, cases that have the potential to reveal the most about special situations, contexts, or types of personality development. The
aim of choosing such cases was not to seek a sample representative of a larger population, or even a more limited population, but to choose subjects who would be the richest sources of data in regard to the aim of the study (Sarris, 1978, p. 270). Individuals who would be the best candidates of advanced multilevel development were sought out. The search was guided by our knowledge of the characteristics of multilevel development as described by Dabrowski.

A pool of 21 subjects was established by nomination. This approach ensured a greater proportion of high level subjects than in two earlier studies (Lysy, 1979; Robert, 1984). These two studies chose specific groups or populations, each thought to be committed to and involved in personal growth. The application of the theory came after the data on these populations were collected. This study sought out specific kinds of candidates - persons who by what was known of them were likely to be engaged in multilevel growth. The age of the twenty-one subjects ranged from late twenties to late fifties; ten were men and eleven were women; they came from the professions of business, law, industry, social service (social work, psychology, etc.), teaching, nursing and home-making. Sixteen had a master's degree or Ph.D or were working on a Ph.D.

ASSESSMENT TOOL

All subjects were administered the Definition-Response Instrument (DRI) used for assessing levels of emotional development. The DRI is a six item, free-response questionnaire developed by Gage, Morse, and Piechowski (1981) for the purpose of determining the level of emotional development. The six statements describe themes that underlie the six most important of the thirty developmental dynamisms: Susceptibility to the Influence of Others, Personal Conflict, Inferiority, Dissatisfaction, Self-
Observation, and Personality Ideal. Appendix B lists the six statements. Subjects were asked to respond in writing or through an interview (recorded and transcribed) to the six statements.

The study completed by Gage, et al. (1981) demonstrated the acceptability of the DRI as an instrument to be used to discriminate levels of development as defined by TPD. As an initial screening device, an autobiography, biography, or life-history on each subject would be cumbersome. Their study demonstrated that the DRI can be substituted for life-histories in order to determine level of development. The method has been used by Lysy (1979) and Beach (1980) with acceptable inter-rater reliability.

Dabrowski's theory offers rigorous criteria for assessing level of emotional development. Hence the DRI (Gage, Morse, & Piechowski, 1981) has greater power toward assessing self-actualization than the commonly used Personal Orientation Inventory. The latter fails to tap the strong features of self-actualization, such as the democratic character structure, problem-centering, discrimination between means and ends, or superior and more efficient perception of reality.

Four subjects, one man and three women, were chosen for study. Their ages ranged from 38 to 58.

LIFE HISTORY

An extensive life history was sought from each of the four subjects in order to understand the developmental path toward multilevel development. One of the life histories was provided by Walker (1981). Each was taped
and transcribed. The guidelines used for the life history were developed by Piechowski (1982): they emphasize the emotional dimension of experience and suggest areas to be explored and a procedure to follow as well as provide suggestions for writing up a life history. Each subject was asked to present their life history through the description of significant relationships, experiences, and events that have influenced their development. An unstructured type interview was used for this purpose.

INTERVIEW GUIDE

The purpose of this investigation was to study multilevel development, that is, how the subjects came to achieve their present level of functioning, how they maintain this level, and how they intend to continue their growth. Multilevel growth is represented in Dabrowski's theory by Levels III, IV, and V. Each of these levels has a characteristic set of dynamisms. In order to obtain a detailed picture of a subject's developmental level, an interview schedule was developed to elicit material manifesting these dynamisms. To this end, clusters of questions were developed to elicit expressions of specific dynamisms. For instance, for the dynamism of "hierarchization," the subjects were asked:

Do you feel there are both higher and lower principles guiding you?

For the dynamism of "self-control," the subjects were asked:

What place does discipline play in your life? Does self-control relate in any way to your own personal development? Does self-control come easily or does it create difficulties?

The interview schedule of question clusters is listed in Appendix C.
The question clusters were grouped to correspond closely with dynamism definitions. However, they do not predetermine the response. In most cases, expressions of specific dynamisms were found in response to question clusters other than the one aimed at eliciting that dynamism. The nature of this phenomenon is a bit of a puzzle.

The length of the interviews with the four subjects took from approximately two hours to four and one-half hours. A focused type interview was used for the Interview Guide. Each of these interviews was audio-taped and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

The interview, rather than the life history, proved to be the richest source of relevant material. However, knowing that the Dynamism Interview would follow the life history, some questions were not asked during the life history. Perhaps, if they were asked, the difference in productivity would not have been so marked.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The life histories were presented in a chronological fashion to provide an outline of the developmental path and of the significant events in each life. The life history material was analyzed for indicators of self-actualization, giftedness, developmental potential, growth trends, and life themes. The life history material served to inform about the family of origin, its emotional climate, and influences of schooling and significant others. Further, it provided a number of distinguishing characteristics common to these four subjects, e.g. the experience of being different, affective undernourishment, and disruption in the course of their lives.
Analysis of the Dynamism Interview material proceeded along two lines. First, content analysis was the method focusing on the theme as the unit of analysis (André, 1982, p. 10; Bogdan & Bilken, 1982, p. 173; Mills, 1959, p. 16, cited in Bogdan and Bilken, 1982; and Holsti, 1968, p. 647). Asking the question "what are the data saying?" leads to the identification of themes.

Holsti (1968, p. 647) defines a theme as a specific kind of a recording unit of analysis based on size of unit. He states its influences but also the difficulty in using it:

For many purposes the theme, a single assertion about some subject, is the most useful unit of content analysis. It is almost indispensable in the study of propaganda, values, attitude, and the like. A major drawback to coding themes is that it is usually time-consuming. Another difficulty is that it is not an easily identified "natural" unit like the word, paragraph, or item: thus the coder must make an intermediate judgment to identify the boundaries of the theme.

Because this study explores the guiding ideals and motivations of self-actualizing people, it necessarily deals with values and attitudes. Intermediate judgments were made in identifying the boundaries of the themes. Corroborating with a second analyst served as a check to ensure that the identified themes decided upon appropriately represented the data.

The theme expressions were matched with 30 descriptors of Dabrowski's levels (six for Level II, seven for Level II-III, 11 for Level III, 10 for Level IV, and four for Level IV-V) to obtain a profile for each subject. Each theme expression was reviewed by both authors for all four subjects and arrived at a common determination about the presence or
absence of evidence justifying the recognition of dynasim in excerpts.

RESULTS

The level scores determined by the DRI of the 21 subjects are presented in Table 1 below. Nine subjects scored 2.6 or better -- i.e. they are engaged in multilevel development. The levels for the four main subjects were 2.8, 3.9, 3.9, and 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL SCORE</th>
<th># OF SUBJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 - 2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 - 3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 - 3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 - 4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 - ABOVE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The construct of Dabrowski's Level IV corresponds to Maslow's construct of self-actualization. The integration of these two theoretical frameworks showing the close correspondence between the two was provided by a previous study (Piechowski, 1978).

This study was analyzed according to the themes that emerged while, at the same time, making note of the dynamisms that were present. In the process of analyzing the data, it became obvious that Maslow's self-actualizing traits were also manifested. The following sections summarize the results according to themes, dynamisms, and self-actualizing characteristics.
SUMMARY BY THEME

Nine themes were identified in the total material: benefit to mankind, philosophy of life, personal growth, self-acceptance, decisions for self, relationships, solitude, responsibility, and physical well-being and energy.

Some themes were common to all four subjects; some are shared by two or three; and, with some, there is a fair amount of variety between the subjects. Examples are provided for each theme; if dynamisms are manifested in the excerpts, they are noted.

The theme benefit to mankind comprised expressions which focus on problems outside of oneself, stem from the person's conception of a mission in life, of having a task to fulfill for the sake of others. This theme is the same as problem-centering, one of the characteristics of self-actualizing people described by Maslow (1970).

Regarding this theme, three of the subjects see the necessity of overcoming evil in the world in some fashion, but the same perception has not emerged with subject #4. Subjects #1 and #2 are presently engaged in what they perceive to be their mission, and subject #3 is preparing to do so. Subjects #2 and #3 believed their service should be provided directly. Subject #2 believes working directly with people on a one-to-one basis is her way of contributing to mankind. Subject #1 serves others in a more indirect fashion. He believes the fruits of his research are clearly meant to improve the condition of mankind.
Subject #1 wants to understand human motivation so that people can recalibrate their thinking and redirect their behavior. He measures his every endeavor against this goal and his decisions are based on the attainment of this goal. To him, this is the highest principle.

The higher principle is to figure out what makes humans act in destructive and self-deceiving ways, how to prevent that from happening, and how to achieve an understanding that will allow man to evolve in harmony with himself and the universe. That is about the highest level of principle that you can think of. I would like to think that anything I do relates to that goal.

In Maslow's words, this goal is outside himself, which means that he has taken it up because of its importance and urgency, not because it might make him famous (i.e., and thus serve his ego). This is the self-actualizing characteristic of problem-centering (Maslow, 1970). It is a goal, yet is more than that: the subjective and objective are a union of his perception and his will. He has taken on this task out of his concern for the welfare of the American people ("Responsibility," "Empathy").

The theme philosophy of life consists of expressions of guiding principles which aid in understanding how to deal with life. Philosophy of life consists of expressions of values one lives, perspectives on mankind, spiritual and religious frames of reference, and principles of universal interrelationships.

As the essence of their philosophy of life, some form of inner guidance provides direction for each of the four subjects. For subject one, it is a Zen paradox -- an informal, personalized way of achieving "the committed but detached attitude as taught by yoga, Zen, and Christianity": 
That you should always act as if the whole universe depended on what you do; but, at the same time, know that whatever you do is ridiculous and does not matter.

This paradoxical principle of taking one's responsibility with utmost seriousness but laughing at oneself is also an ideal that this subject tries to realize in his life ("Responsibility"). This ideal may be taken as a clear expression of what Dabrowski called "Personality Ideal." His attitude conveys forcefully the self-actualizing characteristic of lack of ego involvement.

For subject #3, her guiding principle is her inner voice. She listened to her inner voice as a guide, as her consciousness ("All that I could perceive and feel. You're so alone in it. Nobody else sees and understands.") was overwhelming to her. Following her inner voice helped her to gradually develop self-confidence.

The theme personal growth comprises statements about working on self, emotional development, internal change and struggle, and methods of bringing change in oneself. Subjects #2, #3, and #4 use the language of personal growth whereas it is virtually absent with subject #1. He thinks that is self-indulgent to spend time on self-oriented issues.

Of the four subjects, subject #3 is the most descriptive in depicting "personal growth." She sees as her highest calling a responsibility to the growth of her own self so that it could contribute to the growth of others.

I guess I see the responsibility to self is to me the highest religious calling, to live out life. We were created for God's pleasure, and I see his pleasure in our living out all the possibilities created in us and for us. So that becomes
an act of worship. Becoming most wholly and truly -- what
the blueprint or design was for our lives and to fall
short of the creation.

There is a kind of self-absorption that doesn't go any place.
You really meet a lot of people that are at that point. In
my own situation, there is a sense that I am enacting a
larger program in my own self growth. As I fulfill this
blueprint for my life, I feel that the end result down the
line is that I will more effectively make the contribution
to the purpose of the world -- to other people's growth or
whatever the contribution is to be made, to other people's
feelings. So there is a kind of detachment which I see.
The absorption is not with the self. I feel like I'm
"flowing with the flow" in growth. Certainly, I am con-
flicted, I do agonize, and I must make decisions. But
underneath that, at a still deeper level, I am just trying
to get to the middle of the river.

This subject sees in many people a directionless self-absorption which is
unproductive for personal growth. She feels that life is unfolding in
a yet unspecified but definite direction. She is preparing for her
life's task; she is enacting something which goes beyond herself
("Hierarchization," "Identification," precursor of "Inner Psychic Trans-
formation," and precursor of "Responsibility"). The subject maintains a
detachment, an objectivity toward herself in this inner process. Trying
to get to the "middle of the river" is her effort to reach the center
of her being, her true self.

A significant part of personal growth is self-acceptance but this was
made into a separate, although closely related, theme. It comprises
expressions about trusting the unfolding process of personal growth or the
opening up of oneself and full recognition of every part of oneself. For
many people, not all one is aware of is accepted. This does not appear
to be the situation, at least in intent, with these four subjects. At
the same time, being aware and accepting all parts of oneself does not
mean approval.
Subjects #1 and #2 achieved a level of self-acceptance in which most internal conflicts are resolved and the resulting integration has a strong degree of harmony. They have faced the dark side of their personalities; they do not deny any part of themselves. Subject #3 is in the midst of her struggle for full self-acceptance yet she has crossed the psychological barrier to realizing the value of self-acceptance. Subject #4 is beginning to confront that same barrier.

Subject #1 provides an illustrative example of the theme of self-acceptance. Although the excerpt is not taken from the Dynamism Interview, it is included because of its poignancy and centrality to his experience. It appears that, from his adolescent years on, he has always been in touch with his inner self. In responding to another source of questions, he describes an orientation that he espoused since that time.

Remarkably little of inner conflict ever since as a teenager I decided that it was a waste of time to struggle with myself. I found that the way to avoid conflict was to admit to myself whatever I thought or felt, even if shameful or embarrassing, and then to reason it out within myself which desire or thought should have priority and why. This way no part of me felt left out or short-changed and decisions were reached by consensus rather than conflict. (Of course, this is only what I know at the conscious level. In reality, I might be a tangled mass of repressed contradictions. If that were true, which I doubt, I suppose it would make no difference anyway in terms of inner conflicts.)

This basis for self-acceptance provided a manner of handling inner conflict ever since. He made a choice to be attentive to and to accept all parts of himself. This involves critical self-evaluation ("Subject-Object In Oneself") and making decisions in keeping with his own inner standard. Approaching one's self and life in this fashion, he is able to live according to his values which are: living with a detached commitment.
fostering harmony, using energy efficiently, and avoiding clashes with opposing forces. The modus operandi of self-acceptance manifests a confidence in his own development ("Autonomy"); and, because it deals with all parts of himself, it constitutes a program of systematic development ("Education-of-Oneself").

All four subjects have made important decisions (decisions for self) which have changed and deepened the direction of their lives. The decisions of subjects #1 and #3 have reflected an underlying basic choice or fundamental option, a very basic orientation to life. Subject #1's decision was described above, to fully accept every part of himself. Subject #3's decision to divorce was a decision for self, for life (presented as an example below). Although the decisions of subject #2 do not manifest such a basic orientation, her entire life does - to live at a very fundamental level of experience, to care for others. Life for subject #4 does not manifest such an orientation at this point. For subjects #2 and #3, decisions to divorce caused major disruptions in their lives.

An example of this theme is provided by subject #3. Her decision to divorce was the critical decision of her life. But, more significantly in her case, it also represents a much deeper choice for her true self. She weaves together various images and themes that capture the drama of that portion of her life: decision for life as decision for self, something being at stake beyond a concern for her own life, a sense of inner freedom, the courage not to be a victim anymore, and the level of
intensity it all generated.

The lonely but good feeling of that decision -- that I'm going to follow through with this divorce and talk about the reasons for that or this decision for self and what has to be done and what is right.

The oppression she suffered made her realize that something very deep inside her was threatened -- her very "self." Divorce, then, was a decision for her true "self" ("Third Factor"). She says that the principle she was acting on was greater than her own life. She compared "not willing to be victim anymore" with being on a "windswept pinnacle" ("Positive Maladjustment"). The "windswept pinnacle" is the recurrent image of her true self and acts as an empirical model after which she shapes her personality ("Personality deal"). It is worth noting that she is capable of living at a level of intensity that is quite exceptional. It is common, however, among highly talented and creative people.

The theme of relationships emerged in the response of all four subjects and comprised expressions describing their relationships with mates, family, co-workers, students, and clients. Each subject manifests different patterns of relationships. For subject #2, relationships are the core of her existence. She is open to forming a relationship with anyone who crosses her path because she cherishes other people. For her, a relationship is always a possibility. Subject #3 is currently experiencing an internal struggle to discover how to meet her interpersonal needs. She is at the present time very cautious having imposed stiff criteria that have to be met by any possible adult friend. Subject #4 grows through relationships and depends upon them for her own personal growth, even though they can be conflict-
And subject #1 finds a great deal of security in his family. Other relationships have not had that same importance for him.

Subject #1 provides an example of this theme as well as the theme of responsibility.

His central relationships are with his family.

What people are close to me, certainly my family is indispensable. In the past twenty years, I've been always spending half of the day or at least part, away from work, with them. In that sense, it is built into the fabric of my life.

He finds that this relationship to his family is an effective way of coping with "aloneness" and finds that it facilitates his capacity to work.

I think that my marriage and my family are an effective way of coping with this sense of ontological anxiety, kind of being alone, cut off from the universe. In twenty years, I don't think I ever felt the sense of being cut off from the universe. When I am physically alone, I don't feel lonely at all anymore. When I'm physically alone, it is the best of times. I can sort out ideas, I can plan, I can work. I welcome being alone, but I wouldn't take credit for that. I have no way of knowing whether work and thought would be really an effective way of coping with solitude if I didn't have my family. I tend to think that, if we didn't get along at home and if we would break up and didn't care for each other, work and thought wouldn't really help me to put up with being alone. I learned to cope with solitude through thinking and working because I have my back covered in a sense now. If I didn't have that backing, maybe work wouldn't help that much.

Solitude is a very essential requirement for subject #1 to be productive at his work, and his family contributes significantly, though seemingly indirectly, to his productiveness. His deep and exclusive relationship with his family is characteristic of self-actualizing people. Maslow (1970) describes the relationships of self-
actualizing people as very deep and exclusive with a few people.

The theme of solitude comprises expressions about the need of solitude, meditation, and inner work. Each subject experiences a need for solitude. Subject #1 finds it essential and accepted dimension of his existence. Both he and subject #4 rely on solitude as a necessary condition to enhance free flowing associations as in day-dreaming. Subjects #2, #3 and #4 seek solitude as a means of renewal, reflection, and inner work. Subjects #3 and #4 contemplate in similar ways but emphasize different uses. Subject #3's contemplation involves an inner integration or reaching for an inner balance and a deeper harmony. Subject #4's contemplation emphasizes planning, sorting things out, and problem solving.

Subject #3 has found gardening a valuable time for solitude.

Yes. I really get inside myself, sometimes absent minded on the external because I'm following the inner route, the thoughts or caring. There is a flow and I'm less aware of what is happening to me. We talked about getting solitude just through swimming at night. Sometimes, I just need — and it isn't a conventional form of solitude to go out — gardening. It has to be in a rhythm where I don't have to do a lot of hours of work. But if I can go out for an hour early in the evening, to pull weeds, do things like that. I just love it. It seems to be a form of self-therapy. The kids usually don't interrupt me because they don't like to pull weeds. There is some kind of communion with myself that takes place in nature. That's a tremendously important thing to me. It's hard to put it in categories or words. I love putting in seeds. I love the miracle of it all. I still feel so much wonder about plants. I love putting in the little budding plants. It isn't as much fun to have to wash and dig up the vegetables. But they are so good. I love just mucking around in the dirt with my hands. Somehow, it makes me peaceful and calm. Perhaps it makes me settled and gives me a sense of harmony and rhythm of things. Perhaps a way of pacing myself in what at some level I am perceiving as the rhythm of nature, or the earth, or growth.
Subject #3 finds in gardening self-renewal, a communion with herself, resulting in peacefulness and calmness ("Autopsychotherapy"). Although she does not engage in gardening as in a systematized or structured program at a specified time every day, it is fairly regular. It is a method that enables her to step on the inner path of contemplation ("Education-of-Ourselves").

The theme of responsibility comprises expressions concerning fairness, sense of ethics or justice, being accountable for one's actions, reliability, taking up tasks on behalf of others, and importantly, having concern for the growth and personal development of others.

A sense of responsibility permeates the lives of all four subjects. However, the dynamism of responsibility is not equally manifest. Both subjects #1 and #2 are engaged in tasks for the sake of others; theirs is the larger responsibility. Subject #3 took responsibility for her personal growth and for her children; she is planning a larger scope for her life in the future which flows from her sense of mission and responsibility to realize her potential in serving others. Like subject #3, subject #4 took responsibility for raising her children but has yet to develop a sense of responsibility in the larger sense.

The theme of physical well-being and energy level comprises expressions of awareness and sensitivity to one's physical condition, and statements in regard to physical exercise and personal level of energy. A concern for energy is not manifest by all four subjects. Subjects #3 and #4 are concerned for their physical well-being as a means to enhancing personal energy. For subject #1, energy is an all pervasive
concept. Even though subject #2 never talked about energy, she is a person of high energy and whose energy is directed into the intuitive channel.

Subject #1 safeguards his personal energy by remaining focuses on what is important.

What requires discipline and self-control is to keep your eyes on the ball, to make choices that reduce the likelihood of wasting energy away from what matters and from what counts: and what counts essentially, on the one hand, are my family and my marriage and children, and, on the other, my work.

He thus exercises a vigilance and alertness, or a focused centering ("Self-Control"). This conveys a sense of inner unity characteristic of self-actualizing people, a concordance between what one believes and how one acts.

DYNAMISMS

Each excerpt or theme expression was analyzed for the presence of dynamisms, i.e. matched with the 38 descriptors of Dabrowski’s levels. Tables 2 and 3 provide a summary of these results. Table 2 provides a matrix for each subject and the dynamisms which emerged in their responses. The left column lists the dynamisms by level and the top row lists the four subjects, including original dynamisms as well as precursors (i.e. foreshadowings). The dots represent the number of instances where a dynamism was manifested. Table 3 provides the same information, except this table provides numerical figures for the totals. For both tables, George is Subject #1, Andrea is Subject #2, Susan is Subject #3, and Kate is Subject #4.

Subject #1's profile fulfills the criteria for complete Level IV, and sub-
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<th>Personality Ideal</th>
<th>Originals</th>
<th>Precursors</th>
<th>Personality Ideal</th>
<th>Originals</th>
<th>Precursors</th>
<th>Personality Ideal</th>
<th>Originals</th>
<th>Precursors</th>
<th>Personality Ideal</th>
<th>Originals</th>
<th>Precursors</th>
<th>Personality Ideal</th>
<th>Originals</th>
<th>Precursors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>Autopsychotherapy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-Of-One’self</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Psychic Transformation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchization</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Factor</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Object In Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Instinct</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Hierarchization</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Object In Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Maladjustment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority Toward Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Conflict</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perfection</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II-III</td>
<td>Disquietude with Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonishment with Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Maladjustment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority Toward Oneself</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>Second Factor</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalences</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Conflict</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Instinct</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- DYNAMISMS
- ORIGINALS
- PRECURSORS

\[
\text{TABLE 2} \\
\text{DYNAMISMS AND PRECURSORS} \\
\text{BY SUBJECT}
\]
TABLE 3

DYNAMISM AND PRECURSOR SUMMARY

LEVEL BY SUBJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GEORGE</th>
<th>ANDREA</th>
<th>SUSAN</th>
<th>KATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV &amp; IV+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11, 1-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECURSOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6, 5+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECURSOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II - III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1- = 1 DYNAMISM AT III 1/2

5+ = 5 DYNAMISMS AT III 1/2
ject #2's profile primarily fulfills the criteria for Level IV but with trailing of some Level III. Their material has most of the actual dynamism expressions in Level IV. The four occurrences manifesting unilevel growth in subject #2's material are peripheral to her overall orientation and level of functioning.

Subject #1 appears to be more fully self-actualizing because he is functioning in a more harmonious manner than subject #2 appears to be. Perhaps this impression arises only because he is more capable of articulating a well developed philosophy of life. However, all the interview material collected here points to the fact that he indeed function in the integrated and highly efficient manner of bona fide self-actualizer. Furthermore, a personality ideal is explicitly present in his material, whereas in subject #2's material, one is present only by implication. In addition, a sense of harmony and balanced integration seems to permeate Subject #1's responses more completely than in subject #2's case.

Subject #3 is close to Level IV but, in one dimension of her life, is still firmly rooted in Level II, having conflicts over interpersonal needs and relationships. Table 2 shows her developmental profile. This pattern contradicts the expectation based on Dabrowski's theory: that is, that the cluster of dynamisms be centered in one region of the scale with fewer dynamisms above and below that region. In her profile, the spread is more extended. Four of the Level III dynamisms are "hierarchization," and two of those are Level III 1/2 which have elements of Level IV but the elements are not strong enough to be rated as such. Perhaps, as she begins to deal with the relationship issues and conflicts remaining,
Level III dynamisms will become more represented. In contrast to subject #1 and #2 whose developmental profiles are predominantly made up of Level IV dynamisms, subject #3 has fewer Level IV dynamisms than they and a fair number of precursors which are dynamisms only in incipient form. The actuality of Level IV is as yet far from fully realized.

Subject #4, on the other hand, is predominantly rooted in unilevel growth. There is, however, sufficient evidence to reasonably place her at Level II-III on the way to Level III functioning.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION

This study was carried out on the assumption that Maslow's self-actualization and Dabrowski's Level IV are different constructs of the same underlying phenomenon. Hence, the interview based on the descriptors of Level IV also produced characteristics of self-actualization. However, the process of determining the completeness and justification for each characteristic was not as rigorous as was the process for determining the presence of dynamisms. The traits of self-actualization appeared in the material only after the study was completed. These characteristics appeared for the most part in subject #1's, #2's, and #3's material but rarely in #4's.

For example, a self-actualizing trait is possessing a more efficient perception of reality and having more comfortable relations with it. Subject #1's incentive for his research lies in his understanding of the dire consequences of the present trends in energy consumption. The originality
of his approach lies in his efforts to find psychosocial rather than economic strategies to avert the inevitable energy crisis. Subject #2's hallmark is accurate intuitive insight. Subject #3 already as a child saw through the appearances of reality as a "house of cards" and the capacity to get to the heart of things has stayed with her.

Another trait is possessing a quality of detachment and need for privacy. All four subjects cherish solitude. The first three are not dependent on others "in the ordinary sense," as Maslow says, because they recognize clearly the basic autonomy of each self, but this is not true of subject #4. Regarding detachment, the Zen paradox, which is subject #1's guiding principle, is the clearest expression of this quality.

A third trait of self-actualizing people is having mystic or peak experiences. These subjects have presented instances of this. Subject #1 described having "epiphanies" as an adolescent and occasional peak experiences as an adult as a result of listening to music, hiking, or participating in a religious ritual. Subject #2 described a religious experience when she was in Israel. And subject #3 speaks of going beyond herself in the encounter with a burglar and of the "windswept pinnacle." In addition, subject #3 described physical healing in her life history.

A fourth trait is continued freshness of appreciation. However, the material doesn't necessarily lend itself directly to providing evidence for this trait, but the whole tone of their being in different degrees gives strong indication for the presence of this trait. It goes with their naturalness and awareness of the moment. Subject #1 seizes every new
insight or new way of looking at things; hiking and watching a sunset are opportunities for ecstatic experiences. Subject #2 savors every new personal encounter. Looking at the stars and watching the birds are profoundly moving to her. Subject #3 enjoys coming to new perspectives on growth and continually focuses on the positive. As well, nurturing tomato plants and working with the soil in her garden are for her a source of wonder and renewal. Subject #4 becomes excited over the prospect of continued personal growth and enjoys connecting with challenging people and challenging herself.

This study suggests that there is a commonality possessed by all self-actualizers. The kindliness and simplicity of Saint-Exupéry and Eleanor Roosevelt (Piechowski and Tyska, 1982) was also characteristic of the four subjects of this study. Subjects #1, #2, and #4 as well as Saint-Exupéry and Eleanor Roosevelt, either have or are responding to problems basic to the human race. Each possesses a Personality Ideal. The four subjects of this study all displayed an intensity and spontaneity that draws one to them, and one leaves them with a sense of excitement and optimism. They go beneath the surface of things. At the same time, they were not all free of struggles and turmoil, as their life histories showed. Because of their abilities and giftedness, measured partly by dynamisms, they were able to overcome the awesome negative influence of their environments. The same appears to hold true for Eleanor Roosevelt.

Piechowski and Tyska (1982) provide a description of Saint-Exupéry and Eleanor Roosevelt concerning the truths by which they lived and inspired others. The same description holds true for at least subjects #1, #2 and #3.
Thus they both lived basic human truths. Ideals that to many seem abstract or naive were to them a living thing. The significance of self-actualizing people lies in the fact that by living these truths they inspire others by their example. They are the carriers of universal values, they are individuals in whom everything human is concentrated and undistorted; they are evidence of the vitality of human spirit, they reaffirm the value of service to others and to an ideal, but not any ideal, only that which sets man free, which makes human beings into brothers and sisters, which allows people to trust one another, which expands their horizons, which awakens them to the life of spirit and enables them to go beyond and outside themselves (pp. 150-151).

Piechowski and Tyska (1982) state that "what the two exemplars of self-actualization share is life inspired by the highest human ideals" and that "the power to inspire is a transcendent quality" (p. 151). With this view, the distinction between the transcender and nontranscender diminishes and becomes less important. This study has provided three more models, presently living, who equally possess a deep source of motivation.

LIFE HISTORIES

The life histories of these subjects showed a number of emotionally difficult and disruptive experiences as well as of intense life-affirming ones: leaving country of origin because of war, separation and divorce, a sense of being different or marginal, profound life-changing religious experiences. The life histories revealed evidence of childhood giftedness in terms of high intelligence, avidity for knowledge, questioning attitude and the ability to pierce the appearances of the world around them.

CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that self-actualizing people can be found by means of
the instrument for assessing levels of emotional development. The degree of self-actualization can be assessed with the intensive interview developed for this purpose. The interview openly defines for the subject the characteristics sought. Yet the subjects do not produce "the expected" response. If a subject is not functioning at a high level, their responses to the questions cannot reflect high level functioning. One of the four subjects, subject 14, was not yet self-actualizing. She was asked all the same questions; yet, she did not produce any material resembling the distinctly larger vision of life and the human community that was typical of the other three. The Interview Guide was successful. It did elicit information manifesting the presence of developmental dynamisms.
APPENDIX A
DEFINITIONS OF DYNAMISMS

Short Definition of the Dynamism:*

Level II:

Ambivalences: fluctuations between opposite feelings, extreme of mood.

Ambivalencies: changeable and conflicting courses of action.

Second Factor: susceptibility to social opinion, feelings of inferiority toward others.

Level III:

Hierarchization: critical perception and evaluation; level III -- individual values, level IV -- universal values.

Positive maladjustment: independence from social opinion; weak form -- antagonist of Second Factor, strong form -- protest against violation of intrinsic ethical principles.

Dissatisfaction with oneself: frustration and anger with what is.

Inferiority toward oneself: frustration with what is lacking; weak form -- feelings of failure and inadequacy, strong form -- frustration with not being all that one can become.

Disquietude with oneself: agitation and anxiety with what is.

Astonishment with oneself: surprise and shock in regard to what is.

Shame: embarrassment over one's deficiencies.

Guilt: weak form -- discomfort or anguish over moral failure, strong form -- discomfort or anguish over moral failure coupled with reparation.

Level IV:

Subject-object in oneself: observations, critical evaluation, and reflection on oneself and others.
Third factor: choice and decision in setting and following internal standards.

Inner psychic transformation: inner restructuring: transcending age-related changes and one's psychological type.

Self-awareness: knowledge of one's uniqueness, developmental interfering processes.

Self-control: regulating development and keeping in check interfering processes.

Education-of-oneself and Self-perfection: programs and methods of systematic development.

Autopsychotherapy: self-designed psychotherapy methods and preventive measures.

Level IV-V:

Responsibility: taking on tasks for the sake of others and one's own development.

Authentism: pervasive -- hierarchy of values in action.

Autonomy: confidence in one's development, freedom from lower levels in oneself.

Personality ideal: the highest guiding principle.

Additional Definitions of Dynamism:**

Disposing and Directing Center: stands for that factor or group of factors which directly guides behavior and its expression at any particular level.

Tempermental Syntony: superficial, easy, and immediately expressed feeling of commonality with others. Strong at lower levels.

External Conflict: in conflict with people, fault is never within oneself; at level III, conflict is over moral principle or human ideals rather than conflict of interest.

Inner Conflict: in essence, it is conflict between "what is" and "what ought to be"; it appears most strongly in level III.
Identification: differs from syntony in that it is directed toward an individual, not a group, more differentiated than syntony; at level II, identification with one's image of another while not checking out its reality; at level III, it is more selective, more personal, and more directed toward deeper relationships.

Empathy: growing understanding of others based on genuine acceptance as unique persons, combined with an attitude of helpfulness.

Creative Instinct: at level II, creative pursuits are impulsive, spontaneous, and isolated from personality development; at higher levels, increasing concern with process of personality development, religious strivings, and self-perfection.

*Piechowski and Gage, in Dabrowski and Piechowski, 1977a, pp. 44-45.

APPENDIX B
DEFINITION-RESPONSE INSTRUMENT*

Susceptibility to the Influence of Others:
Think of times of when you are or have been strongly affected by what others think of you or when you have compared yourself in some way to others.

Personal Conflict:
Think of those questions which cause strong doubts within you, that frustrate you, and perhaps result in anxiety or depression. The problems should be limited to struggles which are internal (for example, philosophical, sexual, emotional), not struggles which are primarily external (for example, a purely economic problem).

Inferiority:
Recall times when you have felt inadequate, unworthy, not good enough. Possibly you felt frustrated with what may have been lacking in yourself (abilities, skills, talents, personal qualities, etc.).

Dissatisfaction:
Consider those situations which have caused you to feel frustration or anger toward yourself. They may have been over something you did and later regretted, as well as over something you feel you should have done, but did not do. Likewise, you could have become angered with yourself for having felt a certain way, or believing something you no longer feel is true.

Self-Observation:
Think if there have been any times when you have tried to stand back and look at yourself objectively. Upon what specific things did you reflect, if you did so?

*Taken from Gage, Morse, and Piechowski (1981).
Think of your "ideal self" and those qualities which you think are best for an ideal life. What attributes have you most dreamed of having?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE

MULTILEVEL-DYNAMISMS

The questions stated under each dynamism can relate to other dynamisms and to more than one level of functioning.

INFERIORITY TOWARD ONESELF (STRONG FORM):

Do you ever become frustrated, angry, or upset because you are unable, blocked (internally or externally) from becoming all that you can become? What do you do about having such feelings?

GUILT:

Do you or have you ever felt a need to make reparation (e.g. make amends, repair, make-up for) due to failure on your or others' part? Have you or do you in fact make reparation in any way?

DISSATISFACTION WITH ONESELF:

What place does anger, aggression, frustration play in your life? What people, institutions, events, or interactions stir these feelings up? What have you done and how do you handle these feelings -- in other words, what is your resulting behavior?

CONFLICT:

Do you experience conflict of any kind? If so, is the conflict within yourself with the external world? What are the issues involved? Why is the conflict important to you or to others? What is your resulting behavior?

HIERARCHIZATION:

THIRD FACTOR:

Do you feel there are both higher and lower principles guiding you? How do you respond to each and what is the resulting behavior?
IDENTIFICATION/EMPATHY:

What place do other people have in your life? Just how different or similar do you feel in relation to them? What people are closest to you? How do these relationships enable you to relate to others? Do you see yourself as a "helping" person? Do you ever sense "where people are coming from?" What part do the poor, oppressed, helpless, and exploited play in your life? If they do have an important place, from where has the importance developed? Where, if so, does this attitude come from and how did it develop?

SELF-AWARENESS (UNIQUENESS):

Have you ever had any intense experiences that you would consider out of the ordinary for you or for others? What do you feel makes you uniquely the person you are? Do you see yourself as standing apart from other people, culture, and the environment? If so, then, what place do other people, culture, and the environment have in your life? How do you relate to them? What qualities do you feel you possess that are distinctively and uniquely your own?

Weren't you ever pushed to the wall to make a decision? Have you ever had an exact or clear sense of who you are, where you are going, and how you will get there? Describe the "sense" you have? Has there ever been a precipitating event or period of time when you realized that the bottom had fallen out or that you really are different from others in the sense of being unique? Do you feel your perceptions are different from everyone else's? Do you ever feel on the edge of a creative breakthrough? Do you ever feel you are dealing with issues and problems that no one has a clear resolution to and that perhaps you are on a frontier of unexplored territory?

SUBJECT-OBJECT IN ONESELF:

THIRD FACTOR:
INNER PSYCHIC TRANSFORMATION:

(Third Factor decides upon what Subject-Object in Oneself has uncovered while Inner Psychic Transformation is the process by which the decision is put to work.)

Have you ever evaluated your life and tried to understand your motivation? (S-O) Is there a central theme in your life or core "problem" -- how did you formulate it? How does it change and grow? (S-O)

Have any major decisions been made as a result of this life theme if you have one? (TF) Have you ever been "driven to the wall" to
make a decision? Describe. (Ty)

What influenced it? (S-O) Do you ever look at yourself from the outside? (S-O) And evaluate your behavior? (S-O) Have you ever been through a severe or serious questioning in your life? (S-O)

Has your personality gone through any internal changes either in a short or over a long period of time? (IPT) Have you noticed a growing expansive inner awareness in yourself? (IPT) Have you noticed yourself "going against" established ways of viewing the life cycle or personality because of what is occurring internally?

EDUCATION-OF-ONESELF:

Do you engage in any systematic system to enable you to effectively continue personal development (e.g. yoga, meditation?) Describe the frequency, kind, and experience during and as a result of such involvement.

SELF-CONTROL:

What place does discipline play in your life? Does self-control relate in any way to your own personal development? Does self-control come easily or does it create difficulties?

AUTOPSYCHOTHERAPY:

What role does solitude (or loneliness) play in your life, if it does at all? Are there any means available to you inside yourself to deal with inner conflicts, disruptions, and anxieties? Do you have the capacity to concentrate or remain focused for any period of time? If so, describe the experiences and processes involved as well as your resulting behavior? Do you have the capacity to contemplate?

AUTONOMY:

What does "freedom" mean to you and how much "freedom" do you feel you possess? Relate your awareness to environmental, interpersonal, and intrapersonal forces. How much control do you feel you have over your own "destiny" or "fate"?

RESPONSIBILITY:

Do you feel you have a sense of ethics and how does it operate? What does the concept "responsibility" mean to you and what place
does it have in your life? Do you feel responsibility to yourself in any way?

PERSONALITY IDEAL:

When you think of "people" to measure yourself by, who do you think of? Have you ever felt drawn or pulled toward something? Have there ever been any experiences where you have felt un-self-conscious? What principles guide you? Where do these principles come from? Do you feel "called" or do you feel you have a "mission" in life? Are you able to respond to and or relate to anything "universal" and how does that become concretely acted out in your life?
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