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The relationship between degrees of self-actualization as measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory and the amount of parochial school experience in male Roman Catholic college students was investigated. Previous work suggested that there was a negative relationship between these two variables. Subjects were categorized into four groups based on the amount of parochial school education and the nature of the subject's choice of higher educational institution. It was predicted that subjects in the group with the least amount of formal religious training as measured by amount of parochial school experience would be the group with the highest mean scale scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory. It was expected that the groups would be ordered from highest to lowest from least to most formal religious training. An analysis by the Friedman 2 way analysis of variance test found that the self-actualization measure did significantly differentiate between the four groups (p < .001) but there was an exact reversal of the predicted order. Those students with the most formal religious training
had the highest mean scores on the POI scales. There were significant differences between the two extreme groups on five of the twelve scales. Those differences were on the scales of Spontaniety and Acceptance of Aggression (p < .01) and Inner-Directed, Feeling Reactivity, and the Nature of Man scales (p < .05). All these differences favored the group with the most formal religious training.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Maslow hypothesized that an institutional and conventional religious affiliation is not compatible with self-actualization. Gibb's 1968 findings and the brief report in the POI manual (Shostrom, 1966) suggest that there is empirical support for such a hypothesis when one compares POI scores of college students on formal religious training, current church attendance and adherence to religious values. Although Webster and Stewart (1969) found Baptist ministers in New Zealand scored significantly higher on several POI scales than did other young adults such a discrepancy might be due to cultural differences between the United States and New Zealand.

In order to examine the discrepancy between the empirical studies and to test Maslow's hypothesis under better controlled conditions a comparison was made in this study between samples of Roman Catholic males who had experienced different degrees of religious training. The degree to which a subject had experienced formal religious training was defined by parochial high school experiences versus a public high school experience and further by the subject's choice to attend either a seminary, a Catholic university or a secular university. The assumption
was made that subjects who had attended parochial high schools and who chose either a seminary or a Catholic university over a secular university were more committed to a traditional religious viewpoint than those who chose a secular school. A further assumption was that a parochial high school experience exposed the subject to a greater amount of formal training in conventional religion than did a public high school education. Four groups of subjects were defined based on these levels of formal religious training. The four groups were defined as:

**Group Four**—Roman Catholic male students who attended public high school and who are now enrolled in a secular university.

**Group Three**—Roman Catholic male students who attended parochial high school and who are now enrolled in a secular university.

**Group Two**—Roman Catholic male students who attended parochial high school and who are now enrolled in a Catholic university.

**Group One**—Roman Catholic male students who attended parochial high school or a minor seminary and who are now enrolled in a Roman Catholic seminary.

According to Maslow's theorizing and Gibb's findings on the variables of religious affiliation, one would expect those students with the most exposure to parochial or minor seminary school training (i.e., those who attended parochial schools or minor seminaries and who have chosen to continue such training
at the college or seminary level) to rank lower on the POI scales than those who have had the least parochial school and Catholic university or seminary experience. In effect, the former group of students have received formalized training in the more institutional and traditional aspects of religion which Maslow hypothesizes are not compatible with self-actualization. Gibb's findings suggest that the POI supports these theoretical expectations. To the extent that current church attendance is reflective of the individual's acceptance of the more traditional and orthodox view of religion one might also expect that those students who report regular church attendance would rank lower on the POI scales than those who are not actively participating in their formal religious affiliation.

The following formal hypotheses were formulated:

1. For each of the 12 scales of the POI there would be significant differences among the mean scores of the four groups distinguished on the basis of the amount of parochial or minor seminary secondary school education. The four groups would be ordered from highest to lowest in the following sequence:

   a. Roman Catholic male students who attended a public high school and who are now enrolled in a secular university will rank highest. (Group Four)

   b. Roman Catholic male students who attended a parochial high school and who are now enrolled in a secular university will rank second. (Group Three)

   c. Roman Catholic male students who attended a parochial high school and who are now enrolled in a Catholic
university will rank third. (Group Two)

d. Roman Catholic male students who attended a parochial high school or a minor seminary and who are now enrolled in a Catholic seminary will rank last. (Group One).

2. It was further predicted that the mean scores of Group Four would be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group One on the scales of Time Competence, Spontaneity, Acceptance of Aggression, and Existentiality.

3. For each of the 12 subscales of the POI there would be significant differences among the mean scores of the two groups distinguished on the basis of current church attendance. The two groups would be ranked high and low in the following order.

   a. The group which is self-identified as infrequent (less than once a week) in church attendance would rank highest. (Group X)

   b. The group which is self-identified as frequent (once a week or more) in church attendance would rank lowest. (Group Y)

4. It was further predicted that the mean scores of Group X would be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group Y on the scales of Time Competence, Inner-Directed, Spontaneity, Acceptance of Aggression and Existentiality.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The self-actualizing person has been defined as the individual who is fully functioning intellectually, emotionally and interpersonally. Such an individual is one who lives a life in which he productively actualizes his capabilities (Maslow, 1954, 1970). Psychologists have studied pathology rather than healthy functioning and have tended to infer health from an absence of pathology or life problems. The notion that self-actualization differs from mere absence of pathology had been advanced by Maslow as well as others (e.g., Rogers, 1951, 1961; Shostrom, 1964). It has been suggested as an ideal end product of psychotherapy.

Maslow's original work was primarily an impressionistic study of a small sample of contemporary and historical persons whom he judged to be self-actualized. Such sampling, while helpful with the task of generating hypotheses, is of little value in empirically defining the self-actualized person since the investigator tends to select those who fit his theory. Landsman (1967), in an attempt to be more empirical about self-actualization, asked nearly 700 subjects ranging in age from 9 to 90 to list three positive personal experiences which they
had experienced. He found human relationship experiences to be the most frequently reported for all age groups with earned-success experiences second for all but the youngest group. He suggests that such positive experiences are the major medium for the development of the self-actualized person. While Landsman's extensive sampling of intact groups represents an improvement upon Maslow's sampling, he does not, unfortunately, provide any data to suggest that such positive human experiences correlate with any behavioral indices of self-actualized functioning.

Maslow (1954, 1970) suggests a number of characteristics of the self-actualized person such as more efficient perception of reality, greater acceptance of the self and others and notes that the self-actualized person is one who has worked out his philosophical and religious views in ways which allow him to be true to himself. He sees the self-actualized person as one who is strongly ethical with well-defined moral standards but he notes that such standards are often different from the conventional religious notions of good and evil. He suggests that to define religion in terms of social behavior is to include the self-actualizer but the self-actualizer is excluded if institutional orthodoxy and the supernatural element of religion are stressed. In other words, the more conventionally religion is defined the less likely it is to be a part of the self-actualizer's life. Thus, according to such reasoning religious orthodoxy or adherence to institutionalized religion should be
negatively correlated with measures of self-actualization.

In 1964, the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was developed by Shostrom as a paper and pencil inventory to test the self-actualization theory of Maslow and Rogers. The test consists of 150 items each of which asks the subject to choose between two comparative value judgments; the items seek to discriminate the values and behaviors which are of importance in the current functioning of the self-actualized individual. Generally, the higher the scores for each of the 12 independent scales the more the individual is seen as self-actualized. Shostrom has included upper limit cut-off points of these scales beyond which the individual is seen as trying to appear more self-actualized and psychologically healthy than he really is. The self-actualizing individual is characterized by Shostrom as: being free from responding to social pressures; living in the present, with the past and future in meaningful continuity; having an autonomous orientation in which he is sensitive to others but not dependent on them; and is synergistic in the sense that he appreciates individuality in himself and others.

Operationally measured values and attitudes on the two major scales and ten subscales of the POI are: Time Competence or the degree to which one is oriented towards the present; Inner-Directed or the extent to which one is basically oriented towards the self; Self-Actualizing Value or the extent to which one sees self-actualization as a primary value; Existentiality or the ability to react situationally without rigid adherence to
principle; Feeling Reactivity or the extent to which one is responsive to his own needs and feelings; Spontaneity or the freedom to be one's self; Self-Regard or the value of the self in terms of strengths; Self-Acceptance or the value of the self in spite of weaknesses and shortcomings; Nature of Man or the extent to which one sees man in constructive terms; Synergy or the ability to integrate and transcend the dichotomies in life; Acceptance of Aggression or the extent to which one's natural aggressiveness is accepted; and finally, Capacity for Intimate Contact or the ability to develop intimate relationships with others free from the constraints of expectations and obligations. Each scale is independent and there is no single representative score.

The items in the scale were developed from clinical experience regarding value judgments of both clinically troubled and clinically healthy people as well as from the writings of various humanistic and existential personality theorists. A particular strength of the scale is that each item is worded so that both poles of the dichotomy are made explicit rather than the True-False approach in which it is assumed that the subject knows the opposite of the question.

Only three studies have reported data bearing specifically on the reliability of the POI. Shostrom (1964) reports a test-retest reliability of .91 and .93 for the two major ratio scales of the POI, a finding which has not been replicated. These reliability coefficients are reported without stating the time
interval between the two administrations nor is the sampled population described. These two omissions severely limit the meaning of Shostrom's reliability coefficients. Other researchers (Klavetter & Mogar, 1967; Ilardi & May, 1968) report test-retest reliability coefficients after one week and one year, respectively, of .52 to .82 and for first year nursing students, .32 and .74 for the various scales. A lapse of a week only between test and retest suggests that Klavetter and Mogar may have been testing subject memory rather than the reliability of the POI scale while the one year interval used by Ilardi and May presents some equally difficult problems. They report a subject attrition rate of nearly 30 per cent and are looking for test score stability on a measure which is supposedly sensitive to the kinds of personal growth and change which is likely to occur during a first year nursing experience. In general, however, these studies are suggestive of reliability levels that are acceptable especially in a measure which, by definition, one expects to be sensitive to change as a result of personal growth over time.

The initial validity study by Shostrom (1964) showed POI scores on the two major scales and eight of the ten sub-scales significantly (p < .01) differentiated a group of clinically nominated self-actualized persons from a similarly nominated group of non-self-actualizers. The Feeling Reactivity and Nature of Man scales were the least powerful discriminators, achieving significance at the .05 and the .10 levels respec-
tively. Shostrom did not report any statistical analysis of the differences between the clinically nominated populations and the "normals" used nor did he report the source or definition of this normal population.

Knapp (1971) reviewed over 50 published studies and some 65 unpublished papers, theses, and dissertations on the measurement and implications of self-actualization using the POI. Although all suffer from the inadequacy of non-random sampling and several are limited to college student populations the five published studies reviewed bearing directly on the validity of the POI suggest that the POI does indeed discriminate between levels of growth towards self-actualization. Ilardi and May (1968) found that eight POI scale score changes were in the direction of significant growth ($p < .05$) towards self-actualization among a group of student nurses over a three year period. Knapp (1965) examined the relationship of the POI scores of college students to their scores on the Eysenck Personality Inventory. The neurotic-stability dimension was negatively correlated with all POI scales with the correlation of the highest magnitude being $-.57$ against the POI scale of Time Competence. Such a negative correlation is supportive of the notion that the POI is able to discriminate healthy functioning. Similarly, Fox, Knapp and Michael (1968) found a sample of 100 hospitalized patients to score significantly lower on all POI scales than the self-actualized and normal adult samples reported by Shostrom in his initial validation study. As previously discussed, this
normal population of Shostrom's was essentially undefined. McClain (1970) correlated POI scales with ratings of self-actualization for a sample of normal adults. Counseling staff educators and supervisors rated 30 summer institute counselors according to Maslow's criteria for self-actualization; ratings and POI scores were significantly (p < .01 to p < .05) correlated for all scales except Self-Regard, Nature of Man, and Synergy. The highest correlation of .69 was with the Inner-Directed scale which is based on 127 of the 150 items. Graff, Bradshaw, Danish, Austin, and Alterkruse (1970) assessed the value of the POI in predicting dormitory counselor effectiveness as evaluated by the assisted students. Inner-Directed, Self-Actualizing Value and Acceptance of Aggression were the primary predictor variables associated with effectiveness of the dormitory assistants. In both of these studies there appears to be some likelihood that the final ratings were made by persons who knew the criteria being used in the study. Additionally, when such raters are also the teachers there is the possibility that the subjects were in some way shaped and reinforced for the kinds of self-actualized attitudes which might reflect in higher POI scale scores. There is evidence, however, to suggest that the POI is able to discriminate between clinically nominated self-actualizing persons, those nominated as normal or defined by an absence of treatment for pathology, and a hospitalized population. There is also evidence that the POI scores are related to behavioral and rating criteria and thus have some predictive power.
Only three studies are reported which bear directly on religious preference or religious populations and POI scores. Knapp (1971) reports a study by Webster and Stewart in 1969 in which the POI was administered to a sample of 77 ministers in the Baptist Union of New Zealand. The ministers, when compared to other young adults in New Zealand, scored significantly higher on Time Competence, Self-Acceptance, Spontaneity, and Capacity for Intimate Contact, and significantly lower on Synergy. Kennedy and Heckler (1971), in a study on the Roman Catholic priesthood, found the POI significantly differentiated some 200 priests who had been independently classified as developed, developing, underdeveloped, and maldeveloped on the basis of a two hour clinical interview by trained clinical psychologists. The classification of development of the priests in four categories was further validated by clinical psychologists who rated the priests on the basis of clinical interview reports. Significant differences among the groups were found on the Time Competence, Inner-Directed, Existentiality, Spontaneity and Synergy dimensions favoring the developed and developing groups. This is the only study reviewed in which the subjects were randomly sampled from a nation-wide population of interest.

Gibb (1968) presents the only study dealing with religion as a demographic variable in POI scores. He compared the backgrounds of 250 Midwestern college students in terms of formal religious affiliation, type of religious training and the degree
to which formal religion is currently practiced. These vari-
ables were compared in terms of self-actualization as measured
by POI scores. Gibb did an inadequate job of reporting his
procedure. He did not state the source of his subjects nor the
method used in collection of questionnaire data. Consequently,
such important sampling information as to whether the subjects
were volunteers and the percentage of those who did not complete
the questionnaire is not known. Additionally he did not report
an analysis of sex differences although both males and females
were used as subjects. Statistical analysis was limited to
sorting the sample on demographic characteristics, obtaining
means for each sort and applying $t$ tests for level of signif-
icance. The number of subjects for each sort was not reported
and thus there was no data on sample size for Protestants and
Catholics.

No significant differences were found between Catholics
and Protestants as to level of self-actualization on the 12
scales. Those students who had formal religious training, de-
dined as Sunday School for Protestants and parochial school for
Catholics, scored lower on 9 and 11 of the 16 POI scales re-
spectively. Gibb used 2 ratios and the four scales which were
the basis of these ratios instead of only the 12 POI scales com-
monly used. For Roman Catholics, those students who had little
or no parochial school experience scored significantly higher
on Spontaneity ($p < .01$), Acceptance of Aggression ($p < .05$)
and Existentiality ($p < .05$) than did those students with
parochial school educations. The other eight scales, while not significant at accepted levels, indicate trends concordant with the above-mentioned statistical findings. The final comparison, the degree to which formal religion is currently practiced as measured in terms of church attendance, produced the greatest mean differences. Those students attending church seldom or never were significantly (p < .001) higher on 8 of the 16 POI scales. These scales were: Existentiality, Feeling Reactivity, Spontaneity, Self-Acceptance, Acceptance of Aggression, Capacity for Intimate Contact and the Other/Inner directed ratio scale.

Shostrom (1966) briefly reports data on POI scores and Study of Values scales for 64 females entering nurses training. Significant negative correlations were found for Inner-Directed, Existentiality, and Self-Acceptance with the Religious Scale. These data and the work of both Gibb and Kennedy and Heckler suggest that the POI is useful in testing Maslow's theoretical considerations concerning traditional religious commitment and self-actualization. Kennedy and Heckler's study further suggests that the POI has some predictive validity in a population of Roman Catholic priests.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects consisted of 140 Roman Catholic males who were enrolled in undergraduate college or seminary work. The subjects used were selected on the basis of religion, age, sex, type of high school attended, and type of higher educational institution attended from a total subject pool of 332 students. Subjects were tested in intact psychology classes for the convenience of the investigator. Classes were obtained from Niles College, Loyola University and the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.

Of the total subject pool of 332 students tested, 119 students met the criteria as subjects for the study. That is, they were male Roman Catholics aged 18 or 19 who had attended parochial or public high school. An additional 20 students were added to increase the sample size in Groups One and Two. These additional subjects differed from the criteria in that they were ages 20 and 21. They met all other original criteria.

Group One was composed of 42 subjects whose mean age was 18.4 years. Subjects in Group One were male Roman Catholics who attended a parochial high school or minor seminary and then
enrolled in a Roman Catholic seminary. The 49 subjects in Group Two also had a mean age of 18.4 years. They were male Roman Catholics who attended parochial high school and who then attended a Catholic university.

Group Three was partially composed of 14 Roman Catholic males who had attended parochial high school and who were currently enrolled at a secular university. These subjects were either 18 or 19 years old. An additional 15 subjects, ages 20 and 21, were added to Group Three who met all other criteria except age to increase the sample size in this group to 29. A comparison of the mean POI scale scores for older and younger subjects in Group Three yielded no significant differences between the older and younger subjects. (Table 1.)

Group Four was partially composed of 14 male Roman Catholic secular college students who had attended public high school and were either age 18 or age 19. An additional 6 subjects aged either 20 or 21 were added to Group Four. These 6 subjects met all the criteria for the group except age and were added to increase the sample size in Group Four to 20. A comparison of the mean POI scale scores for older and younger subjects in Group Four showed no significant differences between the two age groups. (Table 2.) Mean ages and standard deviations for the four groups were: Group One, 18.4 years with a standard deviation of 0.50; Group Two, 18.4 years with a standard deviation of 0.53; Group Three, 19.8 years with a standard deviation of 1.12; Group Four, 19.2 years with a standard deviation of 1.09.
TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF POI SCALE
SCORES FOR OLDER AND YOUNGER SUBJECTS IN GROUP FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>18-19 Yr. Olds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>20-21 Yr. Olds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>t&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>15.93 ± 11.96</td>
<td>14.50 ± 6.44</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Directed</td>
<td>76.92 ± 49.56</td>
<td>76.33 ± 22.26</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>18.14 ± 16.48</td>
<td>16.50 ± 5.43</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>19.50 ± 15.45</td>
<td>19.50 ± 7.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>14.07 ± 14.79</td>
<td>13.83 ± 8.88</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>10.64 ± 11.96</td>
<td>10.33 ± 6.73</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>11.57 ± 10.26</td>
<td>10.66 ± 4.16</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>13.85 ± 11.99</td>
<td>15.33 ± 8.45</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>10.92 ± 15.78</td>
<td>9.83 ± 8.53</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>6.35 ± 5.22</td>
<td>5.66 ± 4.40</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>14.71 ± 11.26</td>
<td>14.66 ± 7.57</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>16.42 ± 17.30</td>
<td>16.83 ± 9.10</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> N (18-19) = 14
<sup>b</sup> N (20-21) = 6
<sup>c</sup> df = 18
* p < .05 = 1.734
** p < .01 = 2.552
## TABLE 2

**COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF POI SCALE SCORES FOR OLDER AND YOUNGER SUBJECTS IN GROUP THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>18-19 Yr. Olds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>20-21 Yr. Olds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td>43.08</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>\text{n} (18-19) = 14

<sup>b</sup>\text{n} (20-21) = 15

<sup>c</sup>df = 26

* \text{p} < .05 = 1.706

** \text{p} < .01 = 2.479
Materials

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and a Biographical Data Questionnaire were distributed to intact classes of students during regular class time. In addition to the POI booklet, answer sheet, and the Biographical Data Sheet, the student received a mimeographed instruction sheet and an index card. He was instructed to place his name and address on the index card if he wished personal feedback or an abstract of the study.

The mimeographed instruction sheet was read to all subjects by the investigator. Subjects were told that the study was a comparison of educational experiences and scores on the POI among students at several Chicago area universities. The POI was described as a series of items concerning people's attitudes and opinions about themselves and others. Subjects were asked to give their own opinion and to avoid skipping items if possible. Subjects were told that all answer sheets and data sheets were coded so that their answers would be anonymous and that none of the data in the study would be identified by name. They were also told that no one besides the investigator and the individual testee would have access to personal scores. A copy of both the mimeographed instructions and the POI booklet instructions are included in Appendix A.

The POI is a self-administered 150 item forced-choice paper and pencil inventory in which the subject chooses between two-choice comparative value judgments. The items are scored
twice, first for the two major scales of Inner-Directed (127 items) and Time Competence (23 items) and then for the 10 subscales each of which measures some conceptual aspect of self-actualization. The ten subscales are: Self-Actualizing Value, Existentiality, Feeling Reactivity, Spontaneity, Self-Regard, Self-Acceptance, Nature of Man, Synergy, Acceptance of Aggression and Capacity for Intimate Contact. Appendix B contains the keyed alternatives by scale.

An independent score is reported for each scale and there is no overall measure of self-actualization although the two major scales of Inner-Directed and Time Competent are considered to be the basic measures of self-actualization. For all the scales, subjects who achieve T scores between 50 and 60 are considered to be in the score range which characterizes a self-actualizing person. Within this range the higher the scale score the more self-actualized the person is considered to be. Scores above a T score of 60 suggest that the subject is attempting to present a false picture of himself as self-actualized. Such scores are considered too healthy since they are above the T scores which characterized the normative sample of self-actualizing people.

Information collected on the Biographical Data Sheet by self-report included: age, sex, and college year; the religion in which the subject was raised, and his current religious affiliation; length of attendance and the type of grade school and high school attended; whether the subject had attended
religious services once a week or more; the education levels of both parents and the subject's place of residence while in high school. Copies of the POI and the Biographical Data Sheet are included in Appendix C.

Procedure

All classes were tested by the investigator. Each subject had an individual copy of instructions. The instructions were read aloud before the subjects began to work on the POI. Subjects were instructed to answer the POI first and then complete the Biographical Data Sheet. Completion of this material required approximately 40 minutes. The remainder of the class time was devoted to a brief discussion of Maslow's concept of self-actualization and the POI. All subjects received a brief explanation of the study in which they were participating.

The POI answer sheet and the Biographical Data Sheet were coded so that the subject could remain anonymous if he wished. Each subject was given the opportunity to request a personal profile of his POI scores and asked to list his name and address on an index card if he wished to receive this feedback. Of the total subject pool of 332 approximately 200 subjects requested such individual profiles. The Profile Sheet for the POI was completed and mailed to those students who made the request. Information on the Profile Sheet included a brief description of all the scales, the subject's scores and a graph of the subject's scores by T scores. The Profile Sheet also included an overall explanation of what the POI attempts to measure.
A copy of the Profile Sheet is included in Appendix C.

POI answer sheets were machine scored. Statistical analysis was done at the Research Support Center at Hines Veterans Administration Hospital. Upon completion of this study all subjects who requested a copy of the abstract will receive one by mail.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

An examination of the mean POI scale scores of each of the four groups indicates a trend in which scores in Group One are consistently higher than those in Group Four. The highest mean scores, however, tended not to fall in the self-actualized range or at best in the bottom part of this range. (Table 3.) The Friedman Two Way Analysis of Variance, a non-parametric test for use with ordinal measures in related samples, was used to analyze these sets of means. (Seigel, 1956). The four means for each scale score were assigned ranks from one to four or highest to lowest. If the mean scores were independent of the four conditions then the distribution of ranks would be a matter of chance and four ranks would appear in the four columns with equal frequency. An examination of the ranks suggested that the ranks did not appear in all columns with equal frequency (Table 4) and that the groups appear to be generally ordered from Group One to Group Two to Group Three to Group Four. Ranks were totaled across the four groups (rows) and the Friedman Chi Square statistic was computed to determine whether the rank totals differed significantly. The obtained Chi Square was 22.50 which is significant at the .001 level.
TABLE 3
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF POI SCALE SCORES FOR ALL FOUR GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>S.A. Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Directed</td>
<td>84.14</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>80.56</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>79.32</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Raw score values which fall in the T score range of 50-60, considered to be the self-actualizing range.
TABLE 4
TABLE OF RANKS FOR FRIEDMAN TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FOR ALL POI MEAN SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Directed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant ordering of the four groups as measured by the POI. The ordering however is a complete reversal of the hypothesized order. Group Four with the least parochial schooling was expected to rank first or most self-actualized on the measure while the seminarians, Group One, were expected to rank last, i.e., have the poorest POI scores. There is a significant order effect but it is in the reverse of the predicted direction.
Significance tests for the differences between means were computed for each of the 12 scale score means for Group One and Group Four, the two extreme groups. Examination of Table 5 indicates five of the differences achieved significance. Spontaneity and Acceptance of Aggression were significant at the .01 level while Inner-Directed, Feeling Reactivity, and the Nature of Man scales were significant at the .05 level. In all cases Group One means were higher than Group Four means but the other differences did not approach significance. Again, there is a reversal of the predicted direction for the scales Spontaneity and Acceptance of Aggression, two of the scales for which specific predictions were made. The other two scales about which specific predictions were made, Time Competence and Existentiality, showed no significant differences between the two groups.

The data which was collected on church attendance were analyzed by Chi Square to see if there were significant differences between the subjects on the frequency of church attendance. A Chi Square of 46.72, 3 df, was significant at the .001 level on differences in church attendance. An analysis of POI scale score means was not performed since the church attendance data was essentially ordered by the Groups. Subjects in Groups Four and Three attended church less frequently while subjects in Groups Two and One attended church once a week or more. (Table 6).
TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF POI SCALE
SCORES FOR SUBJECTS IN GROUP ONE AND GROUP FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>Group One(^a)</th>
<th>Group Four(^b)</th>
<th>t(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Directed</td>
<td>84.15</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>76.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>10.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Age</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>19.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) \(N\) (Group One) = 42

\(^b\) \(N\) (Group Four) = 20

\(^c\) \(df\) = 19

\(*\ p < .05 = 1.729\)

\(**\ p < .01 = 2.539\)
### TABLE 6
CHI SQUARE MATRIX OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE MEASURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Less&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>More&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Less = attends church less than once per week.

<sup>b</sup>More = attends church once per week or more.

***\(p < .001 = 16.27\)

Chi Square analyses were performed on the demographic variables of educational level of the subjects' fathers and mothers and the subject's place of residence, either city or suburban, while in high school. (Table 7.) Data on the educational level of the fathers and on the educational level of the mothers was dichotomized into those who attended college and those who did not. A Chi Square value of 4.78 with 3 df was obtained for the educational level of the fathers which was nonsignificant. A nonsignificant Chi Square value of 7.17 was obtained for the educational level of the mothers. Not only were the groups not significantly different on these two variables
but there was also no difference between the groups as to place of residence. A nonsignificant Chi Square value of 2.96 was obtained for the city versus suburban residence measure.

### TABLE 7

**CHI SQUARE MATRIX OF DEMOGRAPHIC SUBJECT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level of Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level of Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05 = 7.815$

** $p < .01 = 11.34$

These comparisons were done to see if significant differences existed among subject backgrounds in the four groups for the 140 subjects from the three schools. It was felt that socio-economic differences might be inferred from these data but no such differences occurred.
Comparison of the 119 subjects aged 18 or 19 with the 21 subjects aged 20 or 21 showed significant differences at the .05 level favoring the younger group on the POI scale scores. The three scales on which significant differences occurred were Feeling Reactivity, Nature of Man, and Acceptance of Aggression. (Table 8.) Since all the older subjects were in Groups Four and Three and these were the groups which ranked lowest on the POI these data are further support for a significant order effect which was the reverse of the predicted direction.
TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF POI SCALE SCORES FOR ALL SUBJECTS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>18-19 Yr. Olds (^a)</th>
<th>20-21 Yr. Olds (^b)</th>
<th>(t^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>15.68 3.01</td>
<td>15.38 3.75</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Directed</td>
<td>81.45 9.02</td>
<td>77.38 11.55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>19.63 3.07</td>
<td>18.47 3.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>19.80 4.14</td>
<td>20.19 3.74</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>15.40 3.15</td>
<td>13.71 3.42</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>12.04 2.74</td>
<td>11.00 3.05</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>11.70 2.50</td>
<td>11.04 3.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>14.84 3.55</td>
<td>14.90 3.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>11.35 2.11</td>
<td>10.28 2.55</td>
<td>1.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>6.71 1.48</td>
<td>6.47 1.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>16.06 3.03</td>
<td>14.23 3.14</td>
<td>2.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>17.17 3.57</td>
<td>16.47 3.23</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{b_N} (18-19) = 119\)

\(^{b_N} (20-21) = 21\)

\(^{c_{df}} = 20\)

\(^* p < .05 = 1.725\)

\(^{**} p < .01 = 2.528\)
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The finding that within a group of male Roman Catholic college students those students who are most closely associated with a traditional religious system are the most self-actualized on the POI measure is a direct contradiction of Maslow's theory and Gibb's previous research. What is striking is the complete reversal of the predicted order over the four groups. The groups of students who had the most traditional religious education, as defined by parochial schooling, had the highest mean scale scores on the POI. Further, the seminarians who have made a choice to become a part of the church hierarchy and thus have perhaps the strongest commitment to such traditional religious values were the most self-actualized group.

The idea that self-actualizers were typically people who had a strongly developed sense of ethics and moral standards but who were not religious in the sense of conventional morality and a belief in the supernatural was first presented by Maslow in 1954. His presentation of this viewpoint was essentially unchanged in the 1970 revision of his work on self-actualization. However, nearly 20 years beyond 1954, it may be that the nature of the values of an institutionalized religion have changed.
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It may be that within the Roman Catholic church more emphasis is being placed on social action and interpersonal behavior than on a moral code of good and evil. According to Maslow, self-actualizers are religious if religion is defined in terms of social behavior. What this particular result may indicate is that even for the orthodox religious, religion is often defined, at least by the young, as man's concern for one another in addition to man's relationship with God and with the rules of the church. Perhaps the behavior which is religious for today's young people in the Roman Catholic church is behavior which 20 years ago would have been seen as unconventional and have no place within the traditional church milieu. It may well be that self-actualization, as a theoretical concept, is highly culture bound and as institutions and mores change there is a need to redefine what constitutes psychological health and growth.

Gibb's 1966 finding that POI scores were higher for the group with little or no formal religious training remains at variance with this study. He used both Protestants and Catholics as his subjects and did not report the respective sample sizes. It may be that in the combined group of Catholics and Protestants his results were due to a greater proportion of Protestants in the group. Although Gibb reports no significant differences between scale scores for the two groups, when considered together there could well be differences between them within the categories of more or less formal religious training. When religious training is defined as Sunday School for Protestants
and parochial school for Catholics it would seem that Catholics would have had considerably more religious training just by virtue of the total time involved. Likewise, it seems questionable to assume that Catholics who did not attend parochial school had as little formal religious training as did Protestants who did not attend Sunday School. Relatively few Protestant denominations require regular attendance at services and the learning of a catechism as does the Roman Catholic church. The study by Gibb and this study share a possible weakness in that no group was included which was characterized by subjects who were not exposed to some traditional religious experience.

While Gibb's comparison of only Roman Catholics indicates that the group with little or no parochial school experience had significantly higher mean scores on the scales of Spontaneity (p < .01), Acceptance of Aggression and Existentiality (p < .05) he does not report either the sample size of the two groups, the total sample size for Roman Catholics or the composition of this group by sex. This later omission is particularly serious since sex differences could be a plausible alternate explanation for his results. He used a total of 250 first semester juniors of which 97 were male and 153 female. Foulds and Warehime (1971) report (p < .05) significant sex differences on 10 of the 12 POI scales with females scoring higher than males. Existentiality and Self-Regard were the only two scales without significant sex differences. Since Gibb did not analyze his data by sex the possibility remains that his results
are related to sex differences rather than differences in religious training.

Maslow's work on self-actualization was drawn from his impressions of adults whom he considered to be self-actualized. With college students who are in the end phase of adolescence in our culture it may be that religious idealism is still an important part of the late adolescent developmental period which Erikson (1963) terms identity vs. role diffusion. Both Erikson and Kolberg (1963), who has done work on moral development, see adherence to an ideology and conventional societal morality as a part of the developmental stage of adolescence. It may be that for college students such religious commitment is more indicative of psychological health at this particular stage than it would be for an adult. Perhaps adherence to traditional and idealistic religious values is one aspect of a developmental process towards self-actualization when it occurs during adolescence. The work of both Erikson and Kohlberg suggest that such idealism and adherence to rituals, creeds and programs is later replaced by a more personal system of values or what Erikson terms ego integrity. Ego integrity or Maslow's self-actualization all seem to involve some set of values which are integrated within the person rather than adopted wholesale from some particular ideology, religious or otherwise. What the import of this particular result may be is that self-actualization is tied to successful working through of developmental stages and what is appropriate in any one stage may be counter-
productive in subsequent stages. Perhaps these same subjects in ten years would appear in the hypothesized order as they move into Kohlberg's stage III of moral development. In this stage there is movement from morality defined in terms of existing social order, or the Conventional stage, to a personal system of values which the person uses to define ethical behavior and societal values.

The subjects in this study did not differ by groups in educational level of either parent or by city or suburban residence. Consequently, it seems unlikely that there were socio-economic differences among the groups. Unfortunately, no measures were taken to give an indication of any differences in intellectual ability between the groups. LeMay and Damm (1968) in a study of Grade Point Average and the POI found support for the hypothesis that intellectual ability may be an important moderator variable in the relationship between self-actualization and college achievement. Maslow admits that his impressionistic sample tended to be people of high intelligence but points out that this seems to be no guarantee of self-actualizing growth. A comparison of the admission standards for the three schools involved in this study was not possible since each of the three schools uses different criteria. Niles College, as a seminary, places much emphasis on personal recommendations as to candidacy for the priesthood and will take most students so recommended from two minor seminaries. These two minor seminaries supply nearly 90 per cent of the Niles student
body. Loyola uses a composite SAT and ACT score along with class rank while the University of Illinois Chicago Circle uses class rank plus various cut off points for ACT scores. For both of these schools students in the upper half of their high school class are eligible for admission. Students in the lower half of their high school class must show evidence of ability in ACT and SAT scores. Since Loyola uses no fixed cut off points it was not possible to make a comparison between the admission standards of the two schools. Although intellectual ability can not be ruled out as a confounding variable there is little evidence to suggest that the three schools vary significantly in the intellectual abilities required for admission. Further, the school from which the most self-actualizing group was drawn was the seminary which has the least rigorous academic admission requirements.

Foulds and Warehime (1971) investigated the relationship between the Repression-Sensitization (R-S) scale and the POI. All 12 POI scales were found to be negatively and significantly related to R-S scores for each sex and all but two of the comparisons were significant beyond the .001 level. High scorers on the POI were people who were identified as repressors on the R-S scale. Repressors are theoretically people who use avoidance defenses to handle stress although Foulds and Warehime conclude that repressors may be better adjusted than sensitizers. Such a conceptualization would require rethinking the dimension of R-S as it was originally formulated by Byrne (1964) since his
original hypothesis was that repressors were less open to a variety of experiences and more bound to rigid rules of society than sensitizers. If such a hypothesis, as originally formulated, is valid then it may be that repressors simply appear more healthy on the POI as a result of being able to avoid stress and deny and repress problems. That this is the case with seminarians may be a possibility since by virtue of a choice for celibacy there is certainly some avoidance in some students of the problems involved in heterosexual intimacy and preparing for marriage.

The group of Loyola students however, would seem to weaken this argument since in all likelihood they are similar to other college freshmen in dating habits and marital plans. If Foulds and Warehime (1971) are correct in thinking that perhaps Repressors are at the healthy end of the R-S continuum then this is additional evidence for the validity of the POI.

A comparison of the means between the seminarians and the University of Illinois Circle Public High School attenders (Group One against Group Four) indicates that the seminarians had higher mean scores for all 12 scales. Five of the differences were significant: Spontaneity and Acceptance of Aggression were significant at the .01 level; and Inner-Directed, Feeling Reactivity, and the Nature of Man were significant at the .05 level. All of these differences favored the seminarian group. Of these scales all but the Nature of Man scale score means were in the T score category of 50 which is the bottom of Shostrom's 50 to 60 T score range for persons in the self-
actualizing range. It seems an additional check on the validity of the POI that college student subjects in general do not score high in the range of self-actualizing scores.

Reliabilities of the scales on which significant differences were found range from .66 for the Nature of Man scale to .84 for the Inner-Directed scale. The only other reliability coefficient above .69 on these scales is .81 for the Spontaneity scale (Shostrom, 1966). Given this range it would seem that the mean scale score differences which were significant were not a function of these scales having better reliability than those on which no significant differences were found. In fact, there was a significant difference on the Acceptance of Aggression scale which has the lowest reliability of the twelve scales.

Shostrom (1966) considers the Inner-Directed scale to be one of the most important of the POI scales. He defines Inner-Directedness in much the same way that Reisman, Glazer and Denny (1950) first used the concept. The inner-directed person is characterized by autonomy and self-support rather than dependency on others; by individuality rather than being socially conforming; and by the source of his actions being essentially inner-directed. It is not difficult to see how the significant differences between the seminarians and the secular college students might fit in with this concept. The seminarian has often made a clearer vocational choice and a more unusual choice. It may well be that the choice of a relatively unusual vocation is evidence of the seminarians greater autonomy and that semin-
arians as a group are less conforming than are other Roman Catholic college-age males to peer group standards.

Feeling Reactivity and Spontaneity (Shostrom, 1966) are considered to be complementary scales. A high score on Feeling Reactivity measures sensitivity to one's own needs and feelings and a high score on Spontaneity indicates the ability to express feelings in spontaneous action. Interestingly, the seminarians in this sample are more at home with their own feelings and more comfortable in the expression of such feelings, by self-report, than are the secular college students. A possible explanation for this may lie in the impact which the sensitivity and encounter group movement has had on the church. It may be that these seminarians have had opportunities for participation in personal growth groups and have been encouraged to participate in such groups while the secular college students have not been so encouraged. Hindsight suggests that a question regarding such experiences would have been useful data to collect on the Biographical Data Sheet. Aside from such groups it may be that the traditional retreat and self-study involved in preparation for the priesthood serves to put the seminarian more in touch with his own feelings and the changing nature of the Roman Catholic church is such that the seminarian is encouraged and permitted to express his feelings behaviorally.

Such reasoning also applies to the Acceptance of Aggression scale. A high score on this scale indicates an ability to accept anger and aggression within one's self as natural.
Another possible reason for the seminarians' higher mean score on this scale might be the fact that seminarians are residential students while the students from the secular university are typically commuters who live at home. One of the tasks of late adolescence involves separation from parents and growing independence on the part of the young adult and it is not unusual that the achievement of this involves some anger on the part of both parents and children. Perhaps the secular university students who live at home are caught in the dilemma of experiencing such anger but not being able to accept it due to their more dependent life style. Their solution to such a bind might be to deny anger and thus avoid the conflict. Seminarians who are no longer living at home, however, are more likely to be free from such a dilemma and therefore more able to accept such feelings.

The final scale which achieved significance was the Nature of Man scale. This scale measures the extent to which one sees man as essentially good and can be accepting of the dichotomies in the nature of man. With the emphasis of the priesthood shifting towards more involvement with people and the increasing democratization of the Catholic church this result is not particularly surprising nor is the notion that a man who hopes to become a priest does so because he wishes to work with people.

When the older subjects were compared with the younger subjects over all groups there were significant differences
favoring the younger subjects on three scales. These scales were Feeling Reactivity, Nature of Man, and Acceptance of Aggression and all were significant at the .05 level. Since the bulk of the younger subjects were in the Groups which ranked first and second this result is not particularly surprising. It does argue, however, for the validity of these findings since the POI is a measure on which older subjects should score higher than younger ones if the theoretical concept of self-actualization is followed.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The intent of this study was to further investigate work done by Gibb and some theoretical conceptualizations by Maslow about the role of formal religious education and affiliation in self-actualization. Subjects were 140 18 to 21 year old male Roman Catholic college students who attended a seminary, a Catholic university, or a secular university. Testing was administered by the writer in intact undergraduate psychology classes and subjects were requested to complete a Biographical Data Sheet and the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), a paper and pencil measure of self-actualization. All subjects were given an opportunity to request and receive both personal profile sheets of their own scores and an abstract of the study.

Subjects were categorized into four groups on the basis of the amount of parochial high school education of the subject and the nature (secular, Catholic or seminary) of the subject's choice of a school for higher education. The groups in the order from most to least formal religious education were seminarians who attended minor seminary or parochial high school, Catholic university students who attended parochial high school,
secular university students who attended parochial high school, and secular university students who attended public high school.

The hypothesis from Maslow's theoretical position, that self-actualizers are not people who are religious in the conventional sense of a belief in the supernatural and religious definitions of good and evil, was that those students with the least formal religious training would be the highest scorers of the four groups on a paper and pencil measure of self-actualization, the POI. It was expected that the group scale score means on the POI would be ordered from highest to lowest as the groups were categorized from least to most formal religious training. Subjects were also compared on the variable of church attendance with the expectation that those who maintained a formal religious affiliation and attended church once a week or more would be in the lowest score group on the POI.

Chi Square analysis of subjects by educational level of both parents and by place of residence, city or suburb, indicated no significant differences between the four groups on these variables. An analysis by the Friedman Two Way Analysis of Variance test showed that the POI did significantly (p < .001) differentiate the four groups of subjects but there was an exact reversal of the predicted order. Those students with the most formal religious training had the highest mean scale scores on the POI scales. An analysis of the differences between the two extreme groups found significant differences in favor of the seminarians on the scales of Spontaneity and Acceptance of
of Aggression (p < .01) and on the scales of Inner-Directed, Feeling Reactivity, and the Nature of Man at the .05 level.

The data on church attendance was significantly related to the group in which the subject was categorized (p < .001) in that high church attendance was characteristic of the subjects who attended the seminary and the Catholic university. These two groups ranked first and second on mean POI scale scores.

The results of this study are at variance with previous findings that students with little or no religious training ranked higher on mean POI scale scores. However, the previous findings were not limited to males since both men and women were included in the sample. Since there is evidence that females score significantly higher on the POI scales than do males it may be that the earlier work reflects a comparison of sex differences rather than a comparison of religious training differences.

In terms of the implications for Maslow's theory it may be that Maslow's concept of traditional religious affiliation has currently a more limited value and that in 1973 a formal religious affiliation indicates a greater commitment to social and interpersonal attitudes that is different from such an affiliation 20 years ago. Additionally, self-actualization may be a process which involves successful working through of developmental stages. It was suggested that perhaps college students were at the developmental stage which Erikson terms identity versus role diffusion in which the psychologically
healthy or normal adolescent maintains a considerable commitment to an outside ideology. The absence of such a commitment in college students may indicate more destructive conflict and role diffusion which serves to make him less healthy than his more idealistic counterpart. Maslow's theoretical concept may still be sound for older subjects.
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APPENDIX A
TO: Students who are participating in this study

FROM: Mrs. Gail Wolfe, Principal Investigator

The study in which you are being asked to participate is one in which students in introductory courses at various universities in the Chicago area are being compared on educational experiences and scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) is a series of items concerning people's attitudes and opinions about themselves and others and this study is an attempt to see how these attitudes might differ among several groups of students. Please be sure to give your own opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

You will notice that an index card is attached to your answer blank as well as a biographical data sheet. Please list your name, summer address, telephone number and sex on the index card. Complete the card first, the POI second and the biographical data sheet last. DO NOT place your name on anything but the index card. The answer sheets and data sheets are coded so that your answers will be anonymous. None of the data in this study will be identified by name. A profile sheet of your answers indicating attitudes about yourself and others will be made up and returned to you if you write the request "FEEDBACK" on the index card. You are the only person besides myself who will see your profile sheet if you do request feedback.

After you have completed the inventory and the biographical data sheet there will be a short class discussion about the POI and the kinds of attitudes being studied. If you wish, arrangements can be made to inform you of the results of this study. If you would like a summary of the results of the research please note the word "ABSTRACT" on the index card. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
INSTRUCTIONS

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a." (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b." (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.
APPENDIX B
KEYED ALTERNATIVES GROUPED BY SCALE

Time Incompetence Items (Tg)

Rem

Number

45. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
46. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
47. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
48. All of the time I always regret their wrong-doings.
49. I worry about the future.
50. I prefer to save good things for future use.
51. Only living for the moment is important.
52. Wishing and imagining are always good.
53. I spend more time preparing to live.
54. Living for the future suits my life in primary meaning.
55. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
56. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
57. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.
58. I feel the need to keep doing something significant all of the time.
59. I suffer from memory.
60. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
61. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.
62. I respect my past.
63. For me, the future often seems hopeless.
64. My past is a hindrance to my future.
65. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
66. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.
67. My hope for the future depends on having friends.

Time Competence Items (Tc)

68. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
69. I do not feel it necessary to predict what will happen in the future.
70. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
71. People need not always regret their wrong-doings.
72. I do not worry about the future.
73. I prefer having good things now.
74. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
75. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
76. I spend more time actually living.
77. Only when living for the future time into living for the present does my life have meaning.
78. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."
79. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.
80. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
81. I do not feel the need to be using something significant all of the time.
82. I do not suffer from memory.
83. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
84. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
85. I do not respect my past.
86. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
87. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
88. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.
89. The past, present and future are in meaningful continuity.
90. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.

Other-Support Items (Os)

1. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
2. When a friend does not do a favor, I feel that I must return it.
3. I feel I must always tell the truth.
4. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.
5. I feel that I must achieve perfection in everything that I undertake.
6. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.
7. I am afraid to be myself.
8. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
9. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
10. I live in images which are in agreement with others.
11. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
12. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
13. Anger is something I try to avoid.
14. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
15. I put others' interests before my own.
16. I sometimes feel elaborated by compliments.
17. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.
18. I don't get off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
19. I have a right to expect other persons to appreciate what I give.
20. My moral values are dictated by society.
21. I do what others expect of me.
22. I don't accept my weaknesses.
23. In order to be emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
24. I am hardly ever wrong.
25. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
26. I am afraid of making mistakes.
27. I do not treat my decisions I make spontaneously.
28. My feelings of self-worth depend on how much I succeed-
pitch.
29. I fear failure.
30. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings, and decisions of others.
31. It is not possible to live life at terms of what I want to do.
32. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.
33. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
34. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
35. I avoid "thinking things out" in my relations with others.
36. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
37. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.
38. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
39. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.
40. I do not believe these innate capacities to cope with life.
41. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own inter-
est.
42. I am tortured by fears of being inadequate.
43. I believe that men are essentially evil and cannot be trusted.
44. I live by the rules and standards of society.
45. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
46. Because I am bound by my obligations.
47. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.
48. I am everyone I know.
49. Criticism increases my self-esteem.
50. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
51. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
52. My basic responsibility is to be aware of other's needs.
Other-Support Items (5) (continued)

54. To feel right, I need always to please others.
55. I will overstep a friendship just to say or do what is right.
56. I feel bound to keep my promises, I make.
57. I must avoid everyone at all costs.
58. It is important that others accept my point of view.
59. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
60. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
61. Other people's criticism is an opportunity for growth.
62. Appearances are all-important.
63. Hardly ever gossips.
64. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
65. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
66. I do not feel free to take myself and bear the consequences.
67. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
68. I hesitate to allow my weaknesses among strangers.
69. I will continue to guard my rights on a high level, socially approved goal.
70. I cannot accept me exactly as I am.
71. I am normally unemotional.
72. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.
73. Happiness is an end in human relationships.
74. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
75. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.
76. Self-interest is unimportant.
77. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
78. For me, work and play are oppressive.
79. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
80. I like only meeting men and bouncing women.
81. I actively attempt to avoid misunderstandings whenever I can.
82. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
83. I always feel that a person should be only at the right time and place.
84. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposite.
85. People should always control their anger.
86. The truly spiritual man is never actual.
87. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
88. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
89. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
90. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
91. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
92. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
93. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
94. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
95. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
96. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
97. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
98. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
99. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
100. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
101. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
102. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
103. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
104. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
105. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
106. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
107. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
108. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
109. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
110. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
111. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
112. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
113. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
114. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
115. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
116. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
117. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
118. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
119. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
120. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel building up within me.
121. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets concerned.
36. I am not orthodoxy religious.
37. I am not free of guilt.
38. I believe we are not free to choose our interests.
39. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
40. I feel dedicated to my work.
41. I am expressive of my feelings regardless of whether it is returned.
42. It is better to be yourself.
43. I am loved because I am lovable.
44. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.
45. I can let other people control me.
46. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
47. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
48. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
49. A person can never change his essential nature.
50. I am not afraid to be tender.
51. I am assertive and affirming.
52. Women should be trusting and yielding.
53. I see myself as others see me.
54. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
55. Men should be assertive and affirming.
56. I am able to risk being myself.
57. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
58. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
59. I am self-sufficient.
60. Sometimes I am a little.
61. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
62. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
63. I can accept my mistakes.
64. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
65. Having myself is helpful to others.
66. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
67. People do not have an innate instinct for evil.
68. People are both good and evil.
69. I can like people without having to approve of them.
70. Men are basically good.
71. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.
72. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
73. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.

Self-Actualizing Value (SAV)

6. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
10. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.
20. My moral values are self-determined.
27. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
36. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
38. I live in terms of my values, likes, dislikes and values.
42. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
46. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
49. For me, work and play are the same.
50. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.
52. The truly spiritual man is sometimes (usually).
53. I am able to express myself even when I sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
54. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.
55. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.

hyper. Support Items (I. (continued))
20. I can "catch my foot out" in my relations with others.
26. I believe people of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
37. I feel that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
38. I live in terms of my values, likes, dislikes, and values.
39. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
40. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
41. I need not justify my actions to the pursuit of my own interests.
42. I am not fettered by fears of being inadequate.
43. I believe that men is essentially good and can be trusted.
44. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.
45. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.
46. Reason is not needed to justify my feelings.
47. There are times when I believe in the least way I can express my feelings.
49. I do not like everyone I know.
50. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.
51. I should believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people not right.
52. I feel free to be angry at those I love.
53. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
54. Expressing myself is most important.
55. I can feel right without always having to please others.
56. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
57. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.
58. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.
59. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.
60. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.
62. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
63. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
64. Appearances are not terribly important.
65. I regard a little at times.
66. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
67. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
68. I feel free to be my self and bear the consequences.
69. As life goes on, I am similar to know more and more about myself.
70. I am not like the people among strangers.
71. I will continue to grow best by being myself.
72. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
73. Men are naturally cooperative.
74. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
75. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
76. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.
77. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
78. Self-interest is natural.
79. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.
80. For me, work and play are the same.
81. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.
82. I like men and women who show individuality as well as femininity.
83. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.
84. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.
85. I can be silly when I feel like it.
86. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.
87. People should express honestly felt anger.
88. The truly spiritual man is sometimes (usually).
89. I am able to express my feelings even when I sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
90. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.
91. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
Self-Authenticating Value (SAV) (continued)

141. People are both good and evil.
142. I can like people without having to approve of them.
143. People are basically good.

Externality (Ex)
1. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.
2. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.
3. I do not always tell the truth.
4. I do not feel that I must arrive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
5. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
6. I find myself often in a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
7. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
8. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
9. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
10. I find myself large to do what others expect of me.
11. It is possible to live in terms of what I want to do.
12. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
13. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.
14. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.
15. Expressing myself is most important.
16. I will risk a friendship in order to say what I believe is right.
17. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.
18. Appearances are not terribly important.
19. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
20. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
21. For me, work and play are the same.
22. I can be silly when I feel like it.
23. Kindness and submission need not be associated.
24. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensuous.
25. I am not orthodoxy religious.
26. I have no problem in facing sex and love.
27. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."
28. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
29. Sometimes I cheat a little.
30. "Existing time" is not a problem for me.
31. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.
32. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.

Feeling Reactivity (Fr) (continued)
33. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.
34. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.
35. People should express honestly felt anger.
36. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
37. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.
38. I have had mysterious or realistic experiences.
39. I can express affection regardless of whether it is reversed.
40. I am not afraid to be tender.
41. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.

Spontaneity (Sp)
1. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.
2. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
3. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
4. I do not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
5. I feel free to be angry at times I love.
6. Expressing myself is most important.
7. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
8. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
9. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
10. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.
11. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.
12. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.
13. I can be silly when I feel like it.
14. I can express affection regardless of whether it is reversed.
15. I am able to risk being myself.
16. Being myself is helpful to others.
17. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.

Self-Regard (Sr)
7. I am not afraid to be myself.
8. I am not embarrassed by compliments.
9. It is possible to live in terms of what I want to do.
10. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
11. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
12. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
13. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
14. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
15. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.
16. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
17. Self-interest is natural.
18. I am assertive and affirming.
19. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
20. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
21. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.

Self-Acceptance (Sa)
3. I do not always tell the truth.
4. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
5. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.
6. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.
Self-Acceptance (4) (continued)
22. I accept my weaknesses.
24. Sometimes I am even when I am not feeling well.
26. I am not afraid of making mistakes.
39. I don't fear failure.
37. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
41. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
43. I am not bothered by fear of being loudmouthed.
46. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
65. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
66. I gossip a little at times.
67. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
70. I accept inconsistency within myself.
71. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
87. People need not always repeat their wrong-doings.
107. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.
115. I am not self-sufficient.
121. I can accept my mistakes.
126. I can overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
Nature of Men (6)
36. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
46. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
61. I believe that man in essentially good and can be trusted.
76. Self-interest is natural.
87. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.
92. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sexual.
115. I have no problem in falling in love.
116. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
118. A person can never change his essential nature.
135. Women should be trusting and yielding.
137. Men should be assertive and affirmative.
205. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
241. People do not have an instinct for evil.
244. People are both good and evil.
417. People are basically good.
Synergy (5)
36. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
80. For me, work and play are the same.
86. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposite.
97. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sexual.
135. Love is not a problem in loving sex and love.
177. Being myself is helpful to others.
184. People are both good and evil.
185. For me, present and future is in meaningful context.
196. I can like people without having to approve of them.
Acceptance of Aggression (4) (continued)
56. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
61. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.
63. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
65. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
69. Man is naturally sociable.
75. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.
89. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
94. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.
97. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposite.
101. People should express honestly what they feel.
135. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
192. As we are, people sometimes annoy me.
115. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.
128. I am assertive and affirming.
122. Men should be assertive and affirming.
135. I am able to push being myself.
125. Sometimes I feel a little.
311. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
138. I find some people who are stupid and unpleasant.
146. I can like people without having to approve of them.

Capacity for Intimate Contact (6)
1. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.
2. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel I must return it.
5. I do feel obliged when a stranger does me a favor.
19. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
21. I feel free to do what others expect of me.
25. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.
33. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
36. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.
41. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.
45. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.
49. I do not like everyone I know.
51. I feel free to be angry at those I love.
53. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
54. Expressing myself is most important.
55. I can feel right without always having to please others.
70. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.
71. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.
131. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.
137. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
101. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
131. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.
115. Two people cannot gel along best if each person feels free to express himself.
102. It is better to be yourself.
105. I am loved because I am lovable.
111. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.
106. I can let other people control me.
117. I am not afraid to be kinder.
127. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
APPENDIX C
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
    b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
    b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
    b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
    b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
    b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.

17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
    b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.

18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
    b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
    b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.

20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
    b. My moral values are self-determined.

21. a. I do what others expect of me.
    b. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.

22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
    b. I don't accept my weaknesses.

23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
    b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.

24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
    b. I am hardly ever cross.
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25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
   b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
   b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
   b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

   b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.
   b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
   b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
   b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
   b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
   b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
   b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
   b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
   b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
   b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
   b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
   b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
   b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
   b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.
   b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
   b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.
   b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
   b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
   b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.
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47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

49. a. I like everyone I know.
b. I do not like everyone I know.

50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.

51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.

52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.

53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.

54. a. Improving others is most important.
b. Expressing myself is most important.

55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
b. I can feel right without always having to please others.

56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.

57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.

58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.

59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.

60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.

61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.

62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.

63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.

64. a. Appearances are all-important.
b. Appearances are not terribly important.

65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
b. I gossip a little at times.

66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.

67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
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69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
   b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
   b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
   b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
   b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

74. a. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
   b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
   b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
   b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
   b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

78. a. Self-interest is natural.
   b. Self-interest is unnatural.

79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
   b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.

81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
   b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
   b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
   b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.

84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
   b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.

85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
   b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.

86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
   b. I can be silly when I feel like it.

87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
   b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.

88. a. I worry about the future.
   b. I do not worry about the future.

89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
   b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
   b. I prefer to use good things now.

91. a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
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116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
   b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.
   b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.
   b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
   b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.
   b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
   b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
   b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

123. a. I suffer from memories.
   b. I do not suffer from memories.

124. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
   b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

125. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
   b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

126. a. I am self-sufficient.
   b. I am not self-sufficient.

127. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
   b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

128. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
   b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

129. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
   b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

130. a. I see myself as others see me.
   b. I do not see myself as others see me.

131. a. I am able to risk being myself.
   b. I am not able to risk being myself.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
   b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
   b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
   b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
   b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
   b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
   b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
   b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.
139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
   b. People do not have an instinct for evil.
140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
   b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.
141. a. People are both good and evil.
   b. People are not both good and evil.
142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
   b. My past is a handicap to my future.
143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
   b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.
144. a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.
   b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.
145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
   b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.
146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
   b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.
147. a. People are basically good.
   b. People are not basically good.
148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
   b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.
149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
   b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.
150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
   b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
## PROFILE SHEET FOR THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

### NAME

### DATE TESTED

### AGE

### SEX

### OCCUPATION

#### TIME COMPETENT LIVES IN THE PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INNOCENT DIRECTED Independent, self-supportive</th>
<th>INNOCENT DIRECTED Incompetent, self-supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME COMPETENT</td>
<td>TIME INCOMPETENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TIME OTHER LIVES IN THE PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER DIRECTED Dependent, seeks support of others' views</th>
<th>OTHER DIRECTED Incompetent, seeks support of others' views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other lives in the present</td>
<td>Other lives in the past or future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEELING

#### FEELING INDEPENDENT PERSONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEELING INTIMATE PERSONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEELING SYNERGISTIC PERSONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEELING INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SELF-PERCEPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SELF-CONCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SELF-ACCEPANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACCEPTANCE OF AGGRESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATURE OF MAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPACITY FOR INTIMATE CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADULT NORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME OTHER LIVES IN THE FUTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME INCOMPETENT LIVES IN THE FUTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME INCOMPETENT LIVES IN THE PAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 1:8</th>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>Self-Actualizing Average: Tc = 8:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM BY ANY MEANS STRICTLY PROHIBITED
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF WHAT THE POI MEASURB

Your profile on the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) shows the degree to which your attitudes and values compare with those of self-actualizing people. A self-actualizing person is one who is more fully functioning and who lives a more enriched life than does the average person. Such a person is developing and utilizing his unique talents to the fullest extent. It is generally agreed that a self-actualizing person might be seen as the desired result of the process of counseling or psychotherapy.

The interpretation of your scores falls into two general categories, the ratio scores and the profile scores. If your ratio scores are close to the scores that self-actualizing persons make, you may consider your values and attitudes, as measured by the POI, to be similar to these people. Your profile scores will further help you to compare yourself with self-actualizing people.

RATIO SCORES

Interpretation of the T1 - Tc Ratio

In order to understand the Time Incompetent - Time Competent (T1 - Tc) ratio, it is of help to consider time in its three basic components -- Past, Present, and Future.

The T1 (Time Incompetent) person is one who lives primarily in the Past, with guilt, regrets, and resentments, and/or in the future, with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions, and fears.

In contrast to the T1 person, the Tc (Time Competent) person lives primarily in the Present with full awareness, contact, and full feeling reactivity. Because it is known that the self-actualizing person is not perfect, he is understood to be partly T1 and partly Tc. His T1 - Tc ratio is, on the average, 1 to 8. His ratio shows that he therefore lives primarily in the Present and only secondarily in the Past or Future.

If your score is significantly lower than 1 to 8, for example 1 to 3, this suggests that you are more time incompetent than the self-actualizing person. If your score is above 1 to 8, for example 1 to 10, this suggests that you are excessively time competent and this may perhaps reflect a need to appear more self-actualized than you really are.

Interpretation of the O - I Ratio

In order to understand your score on the Support (Other - Inner) ratio, one should first understand that the self-actualizing person is both "other-directed" in that he is dependent upon and supported by other persons' views, and he is also "inner-directed" in that he is independent and self-supportive. The degree to which he is each of these can be expressed in a ratio. The O - I ratio of a self-actualizing person is, on the average, 1 to 3, which means that he depends primarily on his own feelings and secondarily on the feelings of others in his life decisions.

If your score is significantly higher than 1 to 3, that is 1 to 4 or above, it may be that this indicates an exaggerated independence and reflects a need to appear "too self-actualized" in responding to the POI. On the other hand, if your score is lower than 1 to 3, for example 1 to 1, it would suggest that you are in the dilemma of finding it difficult to trust either your own or others' feelings in making important decisions.

PROFILE SCORES

On the Profile Sheet, short descriptions of each of the sub-scales are shown which describe high and low scores. In general, scores above the average on these scales, that is, above the mid-line shown by a standard score of 50, but below a standard score of 60 are considered to be most characteristic of self-actualizing adults. The closer your scores are to this range, the more similar are your responses to the POI responses given by self-actualizing people. The further below the score 50 your scores are, the more they represent areas in which your responses are not like those of self-actualizing people. If most of your scores on the profile are considerably above 60, you may be presenting a picture of yourself which is "too" healthy or which overemphasizes your freedom and self-actualization. Your counselor can discuss the psychological rationale of each scale in greater detail with you.

The ratings from this inventory should not be viewed as fixed or conclusive. Instead they should be viewed as merely suggestive and to be considered in the light of all other information. The Personal Orientation Inventory is intended to stimulate thought and discussion of your particular attitudes and values. Your profile will provide a starting point for further consideration of how you can achieve greater personal development.
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