

DISCUSSION

In 1974, *Psychology Today* ran an interview, one of the last conducted with Roberto Assagioli, entitled, "The Golden Mean of Roberto Assagioli." The title is apt. The theorist seems to add up all that other theorists have postulated, then divide them by a sum notion he defines to reach a syntheses within a synthesis that promulgates synthesis. The theory is difficult fare, as admirable as any integration of Western and Eastern thought, as contradictory as any psychology that attempts to satisfy all personality theory perspectives, and as impractical as any therapy that requires more time than psychoanalysis. What can be gleaned from Assagioli, along with the effort to build a much needed metapsychology, is his insistence on the existence of a spiritual Self, a superconscious, and a hunger for transcendence. His delineation of numerous exercises allowing concentration on world reknown examples of the best of human endeavor provides, at the very least, a series of ideals that hi-tech humans seem to desire and that criticism of behaviorism would dicatate (Capra, 1982). However esoteric and seemingly nonscientific, psychosynthesis does offer what most Western psychologies do not—acknowledgment of and a program for spiritual, as well as personal, development.

REFERENCES

- Assagioli, R. *Psychosynthesis*. New York: Viking, 1965.
Assagioli, R. *The act of will*. New York: Penguin, 1973.
Capra, F. *The turning point*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982.
Green, E., & Green, A. *Beyond biofeedback*. New York: Delta, 1977.
Keen, S. The golden mean of Roberto Assagioli. *Psychology Today*, December 1974, 97-107.
Maslow, A.H. *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Viking, 1971.
Pelletier, K.R. *Mind as healer, mind as slayer*. New York: Delta, 1977.
Pelletier, K.R. *Toward a science of consciousness*. New York: Delta, 1978.
Samples, B. *The metamorphic mind*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.
Smith, D. Trends in counseling and psychotherapy. *American Psychologist*, 1982, 37, 802-809.
Wilber, K. *The spectrum of consciousness*. Wheaton: Theosophical Publishing House, 1977.
Wilber, K. *No boundary*. Boulder, Co.: Shambhala, 1981.
Wilson, C. *New pathways in psychology*. Mentor: New York, 1972.

CAROLINE S. MARSH
NICHOLAS COLANGELO

The Application of Dabrowski's Concept of Multilevelness to Allport's Concept of Unity

INTRODUCTION

Gordon W. Allport's (1937, 1961) theory of personality has had considerable influence on contemporary psychology. The extent of his influence was indicated by a questionnaire circulated in 1951 by the Division of Clinical and Abnormal Psychology of the American Psychological Association (cited in Hall & Lindzey, 1978). The questionnaire was distributed among practicing clinical psychologists. The respondents were asked what personality theorist was of most direct value to them in their day-to-day clinical work. The overwhelming majority said Freud was the most influential, but the second most frequently mentioned theorist was Allport.

Despite his considerable influence on the attitudes of therapists in the 1940s and 1950s, Allport is today one of the more neglected of American theorists. An examination of some of the current major textbooks confirms the diminished influence of his work. Allport's work is still discussed in textbooks on personality theories (e.g., Hall & Lindzey, 1978; Maddi, 1980; Monte, 1977; Sahakian, 1977), but even here he is occasionally omitted. Two major current texts that do not treat him at all are

Caroline S. Marsh is a counselor in private practice, Iowa City, Iowa, and Nicholas Colangelo is an associate professor, Division of Counselor Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City. Portions of this article were presented at the Third International Conference on the Theory of Positive Disintegration, Miami, November 1980.

Theories and Methods of Personality (Cartwright, 1979) and *Introduction to Personality and Psychotherapy: A Theory Construction Approach* (Rychlak, 1981). The list of textbooks on counseling and psychotherapy is an even more graphic illustration of Allport's diminished influence. Although recognized as a theorist, he is virtually omitted in the training of clinicians. Allport is not mentioned in the following leading texts in counseling and psychotherapy: *Theories of Counseling* (Burks & Steffle, 1979); *Theory and Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Corey, 1977); *Current Psychotherapies* (Corsini, 1979); *Psychotherapies: A Comparative Casebook* (Morse & Watson, 1977); *Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Patterson, 1980); *Systems of Psychotherapy: A Trans-theoretical Analysis* (Prochaska, 1979); and *Psychotherapy and Counseling: Techniques in Intervention* (Sahakian, 1976). The exclusion of Allport from these texts affirms the contention that his theory does not command the influence that it once did, and that his usefulness to the clinician is in question.

Why has Allport's initial influence in the field of psychology diminished? In order to answer this question, we must examine the nature of his thinking and some hypotheses about why his ideas have not been translated into clinical practice.

THE NATURE OF ALLPORT'S THINKING

The profusion of Allport's ideas and the range of his thinking was extraordinary. His writing expressed a strong commitment to people and an unshakable belief in the unique qualities of the individual. His style was rich with feeling—for people, for words, for concepts. A prolific and stimulating thinker, he produced a steady flow of ideas. He was seldom defensive, but listened to criticism and occasionally revised his work as a result (Hall & Lindzey, 1978). Not overly concerned with proving himself right, he searched constantly for a deeper and more accurate understanding of the nature of people.

Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, when the field of psychology was dominated by Freudians and behaviorists, Allport staunchly disagreed with the leading theories of his time, and spoke out as a defender of the individual. His views finally were not only tolerated, but adopted by those he had consistently battled. As mentioned earlier, he gained immense popularity, especially among the Freudians (Hall & Lindzey, 1978). As a result, he found himself in the peculiar position of having to ask toward the end of his life, "What does the critic do when his field comes to agree with him?" (Pettigrew, 1970, p. xxi).

One of the major problems in Allport's writing was his lack of theoretical cohesion (Hall & Lindzey, 1978; Maddi, 1980). His ideas were not well-interrelated, nor did they form a coherent pattern, both attributes

of good theory. This was in part due to the fact that Allport never intended to formulate a unified theory (Corsini, 1979; Hall & Lindzey, 1978), but rather responded to current theories or social problems (e.g., *The Psychology of Rumor*, 1947; *The Individual and His Religion*, 1950; *The Nature of Prejudice*, 1954).

Allport's lack of theoretical cohesion was most evident in his concept of unity, which was a central concept to his thinking on personality. Essentially, Allport referred to unity as an "integration" or a "bringing into a whole." A personality involved in a purposeful striving for a goal most clearly illustrates Allport's (1961) meaning of unity. Such purposeful striving results in an integration or unity of personality. Although Allport implied that this purposeful striving for unity was a sign of maturity (i.e., high level of development), it is our contention that such is not always the case. Integration and purposeful striving for a goal can also exist in a personality that is immature (i.e., at the lower end of a developmental schema). Thus, unity is not a useful criterion in determining maturity or immaturity in personality. Rather, the distinction between maturity and immaturity is in part dependent on the nature of one's goals (including values, attitudes, and beliefs). This distinction is also dependent on the complexity and dynamics of the personality integration.

Allport (1937, 1961) referred to four individuals as examples of unity in personality: Dr. D. (a character of Allport's invention), Eliza Doolittle (the heroine of Shaw's [1914] *Pygmalion*), Leo Tolstoy, and Dr. Albert Schweitzer. Allport's use of these four examples implied distinct hierarchical levels of development (i.e., a continuum from immaturity to maturity) within their unity of personality. He did not, however, explicitly distinguish hierarchical levels of development, nor did he explicitly differentiate the nature of goals and integration as they correspond with different levels of development.

It is our thesis that the unity of these four personalities does reflect various levels of development. Furthermore, we contend that by explicitly describing the levels of development in unified personalities, the confusion in Allport's thinking is diminished. Allport's concept of unity understood within the framework of hierarchical levels of development would have increased clinical application for counselors and psychotherapists.

In order to clarify that Allport's understanding of unity assumed the existence of distinct development levels, a new concept was needed that described such distinct levels of cognitive and emotional development. We found such a concept in Dabrowski's presentation of multilevelness, a central feature in his general theory of positive disintegration. We will discuss Dabrowski's concept of multilevelness and how this concept differentiates and organizes levels of development.

Multilevelness

Kazimierz Dabrowski's (Dabrowski, 1964, 1967, 1972; Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977) theory of positive disintegration (TPD) is a theory of human development with three basic elements. All three elements are necessary to understand TPD, but for the purposes of this article the third element, multilevelness, is the most relevant. The three elements are:

1. A conceptualization of personality development as a process of individual evolution;
2. A recognition of the significance of the roles of both cognitions and emotions in human development, with primary emphasis on the function of emotions;
3. Most importantly, the concept of multilevelness, which posits a non-age-related, hierarchical order of levels of development. Each level is organized and distinguished by unique cognitive and emotional structures. A level is defined as an underlying structure or abstraction that is not meant to predict concrete behaviors, but rather to specify how a person attends, interprets, organizes and responds to experience (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977; Piechowski, 1975). Dabrowski (1964; Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977) proposed a hierarchical order of development moving from levels I to V. A description of these levels is presented in Figure 1.

Dabrowski (1964; Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977), in his concept of multilevelness, conceived individual development to be a function of the extent and depth of psychological transformations. These transformations entail remaking the cognitive and emotional structure of the individual. The transformations are observed to progress in one direction, indicating movement from external to internal locus of control, from impulse to reflection, from sociability to empathy, from social norm to norm of the ideal, from relative values to universal values, and from individual love to all-embracing love (Dabrowski, Kawczak, & Piechowski, 1970; Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977).

The moving forces or propellents of a person's transformations (development) are called dynamisms. They act in two ways. They move the individual forward (i.e., up the hierarchy) at the same time that they inhibit the lower, more automatic behavior of a previous level (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977; Piechowski, 1975). Although Dabrowski identified many dynamisms (see Appendix for definitions), it is most important to understand that the nature and function of dynamisms include empathy, responsibility, and guilt. Ogburn (1976) illustrated the relationship between dynamisms and the level of development by ex-

Level I. Primary Integration

Absence of emotional dynamisms, absence of reflection, absence of self-observation and self-evaluation; absence of inner conflict; orientation toward external standards; self-interest as primary motivation; little cooperation with others, no empathy or consideration for others. Primary characteristic is cohesiveness. Due to lack of conflict, self-reflection, individual tends to be integrated, unified. This static unity is reflected in name of the level, Primary Integration.

Level II. Unilevel Disintegration

Fluctuations between opposite feelings and extremes of mood; changeable and contradictory courses of action; dependence on social opinion ("what will others say") coupled with feelings of inferiority, sometimes alternating with feelings of superiority. Plenty of feeling but going in all directions, often confused, which results in a lack of the unity or integration evidenced in level I. Such cohesion dissolves in doubt, hesitation, polarized thinking, thus occasioning the name Unilevel Disintegration.

Level III. Spontaneous Multilevel Disintegration

Experiences of conflict between "what is" (the lower) and "what ought to be" (the higher); feelings of inferiority toward oneself—frustration with what is lacking in one's character structure, frustration with not being all that one can become; dissatisfaction with oneself—frustration and anger with the lower in oneself and with lack of development in oneself; feelings of guilt—discomfort and anguish over moral failure with determination to make up for it; strong appreciation and defense of unique qualities of others; existential anxieties. Strong inner conflicts, awareness of ideal and how one has not attained it result in periods of intense feelings of disintegration of personality. Although basic unity provided by goal of the ideal may be evident, periods of disintegration are characteristic of level III.

Level IV. Organized Multilevel Disintegration

Conscious choices in the development of one's inner standards and steadfast adherence to one's ideal of development; inner restructuring—by transcending age-related changes and built-in personality traits; responsibility—taking on tasks for the sake of others and for the sake of one's development; strong sense of universal values and autonomy. Inner conflicts lessen as the individual's goals of the ideal strengthens, providing greater unity than evidenced in level III. Development of level IV is particularly noted for its directed, organized quality. Individuals who have been suggested as having attained level IV include Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King, Albert Schweitzer.

Level V. Secondary Integration

This is the highest level of development. It is characterized by universal compassion, self-sacrifice, and total dedication to the service of others. All conflict has been transcended at this level and replaced by a complete inner harmony. Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977) offer Dag Hammarskjöld as an example of a personality who has achieved secondary integration.

*Table 1 is based on Piechowski, M. M. A theoretical and empirical approach to development. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1975, 92, 231-297. With permission of author.

FIGURE 1
Description of Dynamisms and Their Corresponding Levels*

aming guilt. Ogburn pointed out that any dynamism (e.g., guilt) can be experienced by an individual; however, it is the developmental level that determines the nature of that experience. The developmental level provides the framework in which all dynamisms are experienced. Thus, at any level a variety of dynamisms may be experienced, but they are all connected by the organization of the level. Therefore, all dynamisms of one level (intra-level) have more in common with each other than the same dynamism at different levels (inter-level). For example, level II guilt has more in common with level II responsibility than level II guilt has with level III responsibility or level III guilt. For a more complete discussion of the distinctions between intra-level and inter-level dynamisms, see Marsh (1980) and Ogburn (1976).

THE APPLICATION OF MULTILEVELNESS TO FOUR UNIFIED PERSONALITIES

As previously mentioned, Allport (1961) described four individuals, Dr. D., Eliza Doolittle, Leo Tolstoy, and Albert Schweitzer, to illustrate various aspects of the concept of unity. He emphasized the unity of their personalities without reference to the nature of their differences. Yet, Allport (1961) recognized differences in development as evidenced by his provision of criteria for maturity (e.g., warm relating to others, emotional security, self-objectification, and a unifying philosophy of life). Nonetheless, he never integrated these criteria for maturity with his discussions of unity. Our analysis of Allport's writings indicates that he clearly did not consider Dr. D. and Schweitzer to have reached similar levels of maturity, but he never discussed the nature of their differences.

It is our contention that the concept of multilevelness, when applied to these four personalities, makes explicit their significant differences. The remainder of this section is an analysis of the four personalities using both the concepts of unity and multilevelness.

Descriptions of Four Personalities

Dr. D. was a character invented by Allport (1937, 1961) to illustrate the concept of unity. Allport described him as a punctilious professor, extremely neat, keeping his possessions not only well-ordered, but carefully locked up. He was also in charge of the department library, where his trait of orderliness deteriorated into total chaos—books were lost, dust accumulated, the door was often left unlocked. Allport explained this apparent inconsistency in Dr. D's behavior by noting that he was predominantly motivated by self-interests, an egoist with no concern for others. Dr. D kept his own belongings well-ordered and protected, but he did not put the same effort into the belongings of others. His unity was to a great extent centered around his self-interests (Marsh, 1980).

Eliza Doolittle exemplifies unity in her love for Professor Higgins. Allport (1961) described this unity as congruence and consistency. Eliza does whatever Higgins demands (she acts as his servant, or as a lady in high society). Allport (1961, p. 35) suggested that this apparently un-integrated behavior is actually congruent because her motivation is her love for Higgins (expressed by her desire to please him). Actually, she also had periods of anger and rebellion, indicating ambivalence and uncertainty within the congruence that Allport notes. Shaw (1967) wrote that Eliza was greatly interested in Higgins, but did not like him at all (p. 120). Allport did not note this inconsistency in Shaw's characterization of Eliza, possibly because Allport was referring to Eliza of *My Fair Lady*, the romanticized musical adaptation of *Pygmalion*. *My Fair Lady* was showing in New York City and Boston in the years prior to the publication of *Pattern and Growth in Personality* (1961). Allport's view of Eliza is not inconsistent with the Eliza of *My Fair Lady*.

Although Allport (1961) used Tolstoy and Schweitzer as examples of unity, he did not provide detailed descriptions of their personalities. Allport focused on Tolstoy's passion for the "simplification of life" (Marsh, 1980), while the focus on Schweitzer was the unifying factor of his philosophy of a "reverence for life."

Tolstoy's ideal of the simplification of life was a unifying philosophy of his life, but it also led him into constant bickering with himself and his family over the variance between the ideal and their daily lives. His life was fraught with conflict concerning his moral principles and ideals (Troyat, 1967).

Schweitzer came to his philosophy of life as a result of a lifelong search to understand the relation between reason and emotion (Brabazon, 1975). His striving to understand this dichotomy led him to a unity of purpose that was expressed in his ideal of reverence for life. That ideal was manifested in his life, in his sense of compassion and responsibility to all living creatures, and in his lifelong attempt to ease the pain of illness in fellow human beings (Brabazon, 1975). Schweitzer (unlike Tolstoy) shows a remarkable congruence between his philosophy and his daily living.

A Multilevel Perspective of the Four Personalities

The application of multilevelness to the four personalities provides three areas of differentiation. First, multilevelness suggests that each of these four personalities is functioning at a different level of development. Second, multilevelness accounts for major differences between integrated personalities. Third, multilevelness distinguishes disintegration as well as integration within personalities. Figure 2 illustrates the three major differentiations provided by multilevelness as applied to the four personalities.

FIGURE 2

Correlation of Allport's Descriptors of Unity in Dr. D, Eliza Doolittle, Leo Tolstoy, and Albert Schweitzer with Dabrowski's Dynamisms in the Concept of Multilevelness

Allport's Example	Allport's Descriptors	Dabrowski's Dynamisms ^a	Level of Development (TPD) ^b
Dr. D	punctilious, extremely neat locks up possessions careless with others' possessions egocentric, interest only in self unified by self-interest	rigid, automatic no desire to be helpful or cooperative lack of consideration for others egocentric absence of self-reflection or inner conflict; blame is placed on others not self— <i>external conflict</i> ^c (pp. 20-21) integrated, cohesive	I: Primary Integration
Eliza Doolittle	obedience to Higgins in love with Higgins her love is appropriate outward inconsistency, inner consistency (Allport, 1961), p. 383)	imitation of Higgins— <i>suggestibility</i> (p. 124) dependency and need for approval from Higgins and Col. Pickering— <i>second factor</i> (p. 26) mixed feelings of love and hate for Higgins— <i>ambivalence</i> (p. 24) refusal to marry Higgins despite his wealth; marries Freddy, but keeps friendship with Higgins— <i>ambitendency</i> (p. 41)	II: Unilevel Disintegration
Leo Tolstoy	passionate "simplification of life" as unifying philosophy (Allport, 1961, p. 378)	conversion to Christianity and development of own religion in protest against established Church and social norms of the time— <i>positive maladjustment</i> (p. 49) awareness of his values, faith in the simple life— <i>hierarchization</i> (p. 49)	III: Spontaneous Multilevel Disintegration

FIGURE 2 (continued)

Allport's Example	Allport's Descriptors	Dabrowski's Dynamisms ^a	Level of Development (TPD) ^b
Albert Schweitzer	guided by ideal of "reverence for life" highly unified personality due to this ideal (Allport, 1961, p. 378)	discontent with his own life: "All the inconsistencies of his entire life spread before his eyes and his mind reeled in horror. He preached universal love—and made his wife miserable; poverty—and lived in luxury; forgetfulness of self—and recorded his every twinge; fusion with God—and wasted his life in domestic bickerings; contempt for fame—and curried his celebrity. . ." (Troyat, 1965/1967, p. 699)— <i>inner conflict between what is and what ought to be</i> (p. 42)— <i>inner conflict</i> (p. 48) <i>War and Peace, Anna Karenina, Resurrection, etc.—creative instinct</i> (p. 46)	IV: Organized Multilevel Disintegration

^a Italics indicate dynamisms or characteristics of level of development. See Appendix for definition of dynamisms.

^b Theory of Positive Disintegration.

^c Page references are to Dabrowski & Piechowski (1977).

The first differentiation that multilevelness provides (see Figure 2) is that each of Allport's four examples of unity functions at a different level of development. Dr. D's dominant self-interest is indicative of the descriptors of primary integration or level I (see Figure 1 for descriptors of levels). Eliza Doolittle's ambivalence, ambidendencies, and suggestibility are characteristic of a personality functioning at level II. Leo Tolstoy's deep awareness of self and profound conflicts of values are indicative of level III development. Albert Schweitzer's overriding concern for the quality of human life and his dedication to the service of others reflect personality development at level IV. The descriptions of the levels show that the organization of personality at each level is qualitatively different. Each of these four personalities has been shown to function at a different level, indicating major differences among them. These differences are more significant than whatever commonalities are evidenced among the four personalities. To think of them as primarily examples of unity suggests similarity among the personalities; however, a more in-depth understanding of these four people is in the recognition of their different levels of functioning.

Second, multilevelness accounts for major differences between integrated personalities. Dr. D. and Schweitzer can be conceptualized as manifesting unity of personality. Allport understood Dr. D to be unified by his egoism and Schweitzer by his philosophy of life. According to the concept of multilevelness, Dr. D and Schweitzer are also seen as unified, but the integration of the former (level I—primary integration) has no relation to the integration of the latter (level IV—organized multilevel disintegration). Dr. D evidences unity in that his motivation for his behavior is self-serving. Given the limited information Allport provided, Dr. D can be characterized as possessive and lacking in self-reflection and empathy. Schweitzer also evidences unity, but in this case it is a unity based on a synthesis of a variety of ideals organized within his philosophy of reverence for life. Schweitzer's unity is characterized by his self-reflection, service to others, empathy, and a commitment to act in accordance with his ideals. All of these ideals are exemplified by his missionary work in Africa. It should be noted that while level IV is entitled Organized Multilevel Disintegration, the emphasis is on the organized and directed nature of development, rather than on the disintegrative aspect of this level (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977). While Schweitzer had periods of doubt and conflict in his life, he did not allow these to interfere with his extended commitment to serve humanity.

The application of multilevelness to Dr. D. and Schweitzer also provides a differentiation as to their level of maturity. Clearly, Dr. D's unity reflects a lower level of development, while Schweitzer's unity reflects maturity at a much higher level. A consistency exists between the descriptors of level IV (see Figure 1) and Allport's (1961) six criteria for

maturity. This consistency is not evident with the descriptors of Dr. D. Despite the integrated qualities of Dr. D and Schweitzer, multilevelness enables one to make a qualitative distinction between the two personalities.

Third, multilevelness indicates that Eliza Doolittle and Tolstoy are more representative of disintegration than of unity. Within the concept of multilevelness is the distinction between integration and disintegration of personality structure. Integration is the incorporation of various functions into a coordinated structure, and disintegration is the loosening of the structure of personality (Dabrowski et al., 1970). It is this "loosening" that makes development possible. When a structure has disintegrated due to conflicts, it is possible for a new integration. Disintegration can be of two types: unilevel or multilevel. Unilevel disintegration is a loosening of personality structure whereby the new integration does not lead to a higher level of development. In essence, disintegration is circular (horizontal) and the personality continues to function at the same level. Multilevel disintegration is a loosening of personality structure whereby the new integration can lead to a higher level of development. In essence, disintegration is hierarchical (vertical) and transformative, and the personality begins to function at a higher level (Dabrowski et al., 1970).

According to the concept of multilevelness, Eliza Doolittle can be understood by her susceptibility to the power of suggestion, dependency and need for approval, inability to make decisions, and conflicting feelings. As shown in Figure 2, Eliza Doolittle most strongly evidences level II development (unilevel disintegration), which is characterized by imbalances, polarizations, and a loosely structured personality that comes apart under the impact of stress and emotional tension (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977; Marsh, 1980).

Allport (1961) also understood Tolstoy as a unified personality, as exemplified by Tolstoy's guiding ideals of the "simplification of life." According to the concept of multilevelness, however, Tolstoy's dominant characteristic is disintegration, characterized by inner conflict and discontent with his life in relation to his ideals, existential anxieties, and suicidal tendencies. In addition to these conflicts, Tolstoy also evidenced an emerging hierarchy of values, a deepening empathy, awareness of moral responsibility, and self-evaluation. Both Eliza Doolittle and Tolstoy can be more completely understood by their conflicts and the resultant disintegration than by their unity.

The disintegration (level II—unilevel disintegration) evidenced by Eliza Doolittle has little in common with the disintegration (level III—spontaneous multilevel disintegration) evidenced by Tolstoy. Despite the intensities of conflicts and feelings characteristic of unilevel disintegration, they seldom propel the individual to higher levels (i.e., the conflicts are

not transformative, Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977). These conflicts are of a repetitive or cyclical nature; they lack resolution. Another differentiation is that level II conflicts are externally mediated (i.e., between person and environment). Level III conflicts are internally oriented, with emphasis on conflicts of values. These conflicts are transformative in that they have the potential for propelling the personality towards higher levels of development. Thus, the concept of multilevelness allows for a clear differentiation between the personality organization of Eliza Doolittle and Tolstoy.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The application of the concept of multilevelness to unity results in two important outcomes:

1. It provides a paradigm in which Allport's ideas are clarified.
2. It differentiates significant characteristics within personality that are potentially useful for counseling.

As mentioned in the introduction, while Allport had considerable influence on the attitudes of therapists in the 1940s and 1950s, this influence is considerably diminished today. This has been attributed to confusion in his work stemming from a lack of theoretical unity. The thesis of this article has been to show that a more subtle, yet important, confusion in his work centers on the implicit assumptions of hierarchical order in his concepts. Allport's concept of unity particularly evidences this confusion. These implicit assumptions are made explicit when the concept of multilevelness is applied to them. Confusion surrounding Allport's various use of the concept of unity diminishes as one understands that the unity of personality can be differentiated by levels of development.

Another reason for Allport's diminished influence can be traced to the lack of clinical applicability of his ideas. While his concept of unity offered a global understanding of personality, it was not specific enough to distinguish significant differences in personalities. This is strikingly clear in the four personalities discussed. Using only the concept of unity, there is no basis for making the obvious distinctions in personality among Dr. D, Eliza Doolittle, Tolstoy, and Schweitzer.

The levels of development provide information that is relevant to counselors. Each level describes the dominant features of personality functioning, including nature of conflicts, motivation for behavior, and direction for change. Multilevelness offers the counselor a framework for understanding the client. From this perspective, a therapist can understand disintegrative processes as a potential dynamic for psychological growth rather than essentially a neurotic symptom that must be

corrected. An example of how this perspective can be applied with clients is presented in a case by Ogburn-Colangelo (1979).

While Allport recognized that personality is unified, and organized and motivated by a single dominant pattern, he did not clearly recognize that this dominant pattern differs extensively among individuals. Also, he did not explicitly recognize that this dominant pattern takes predictable forms (levels). The concept of multilevelness does recognize and specifies the different forms of unity (i.e., personality organization). These forms of unity are relevant to the kinds of goals and processes that would be most therapeutic in a counseling relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank Dr. Michael M. Piechowski, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, for his suggestion to investigate the relationship between the ideas of Allport and Dabrowski. We also gratefully acknowledge his critical comments on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt, 1937.
- Allport, G.W. *The individual and his religion*. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Allport, G.W. *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Allport, G.W. *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961.
- Allport, G.W., & Postman, L. *The psychology of rumor*. New York: Holt, 1947.
- Brabazon, J. *Albert Schweitzer: A biography*. New York: Putnam's, 1975.
- Burks, H.M., Jr., & Steffle, B. *Theories of counseling* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- Cartwright, D.W. *Theories and models of personality*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1979.
- Corey, G. *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy*. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1977.
- Corsini, R.J. (Ed.). *Current psychotherapies* (2nd ed.). Itasca, Ill.: Peacock Publishers, 1977.
- Dabrowski, K. *Positive disintegration* (J. Aronson, Ed.). Boston: Little, Brown, 1964.
- Dabrowski, K. *Personality-shaping through positive disintegration*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.
- Dabrowski, K. *Psychoneurosis is not an illness: Neuroses and psychoneuroses from the perspective of positive disintegration*. London: Gryf, 1972.
- Dabrowski, K., & Piechowski, M.M. *Theory of levels of emotional development* (Vol. 1). Oceanside, N.Y.: Dabor Science Publications, 1977.
- Dabrowski, K., Kawczak, A. & Piechowski, M.M. *Mental growth through positive disintegration*. London: Gryf, 1970.
- Hall, C.S., & Lindzey, G. *Theories of personality* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley, 1978.

- Maddi, S. *Personality theories: A comparative analysis* (4th ed.). Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1980.
- Marsh, C.S. *Kazimierz Dabrowski's concept of multilevelness as applied to the concepts of unity and maturity in the personality theory of Gordon W. Allport*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Iowa, 1980.
- Monte, C.F. *Beneath the mask: An introduction to theories of personality*. New York: Praeger, 1977.
- Morse, S.J., & Watson, R.I. *Psychotherapies: A comparative casebook*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1977.
- Ogburn, M.K. *Differentiating guilt according to the theory of positive disintegration*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976.
- Ogburn-Colangelo, M.K. *Giftedness as multilevel potential: A clinical example*. In N. Colangelo & R.T. Zaffrann (Eds.), *New voices in counseling the gifted*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1979.
- Patterson, C.H. *Theories of counseling and psychotherapy* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1980.
- Pettigrew, T.F. Introduction. In R.I. Evans, *Gordon Allport: The man and his ideas*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1970.
- Piechowski, M.M. A theoretical and empirical approach to development. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1975, 92, 231-297.
- Prochaska, J.O. *Systems of psychotherapy: A transtheoretical analysis*. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1979.
- Rychlak, J.F. *Introduction to personality and psychotherapy: A theory-construction approach* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.
- Sahakian, W.S. (Ed.). *Psychotherapy and counseling: Techniques in intervention* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Co., 1976.
- Sahakian, W.S. (Ed.). *Psychology of personality: Readings in theory*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1977.
- Shaw, G.B. *Pygmalion: A romance in five acts*. London: London Constable, 1914.
- Shaw, G.B. *Pygmalion and other plays*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1967.
- Troyat, H. Tolstoy (N. Amphous, trans.). Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967. (Originally published, 1965)

APPENDIX

DEFINITIONS OF DYNAMISM

Short Definitions of the Dynamisms (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977, pp. 44-45).

Level I

Absence of developmental dynamisms. Instead, there is either external conflict of conformity, group exploitation or group adhesion, external standards of status and success, or striving for control over others.

Level II

Ambivalences—fluctuations between opposite feelings, extremes of mood.

Ambitendencies—changeable and conflicting courses of action.

Second factor—susceptibility to social opinion, feelings of inferiority toward others.

Level III

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

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

Dissatisfaction with oneself—frustration and anger with what is.

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

Disquietude with oneself—agitation and anxiety with what is.

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

Shame—embarrassment over one's deficiencies.

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

Level IV

Subject-object in oneself—observation, critical evaluation, and reflection on oneself and others.

Third factor—choice and decision in setting and following internal standards.

Inner psychic transformation—inner restructuring; transcending age-related change and one's psychological type.

Self-awareness—knowledge of one's uniqueness, developmental needs, and existential responsibility.

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

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

Autopsychotherapy—self-designed psychotherapy methods and preventive measures.

Level IV-V

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

Authenticism—pervasive—hierarchy of values in action.

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

Personality ideal—the highest guiding principle.

Additional Definitions of Dynamisms (Dabrowski, 1972; Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977)

DDC—Disposing and Directing Center—that which guides behavior and its expression. At low levels, it is made up of drives and instincts, at higher levels it is an independent dynamism working toward secondary integration.

Temperamental syntony—responsiveness to the environment. At lower levels, it can be identified with an in-group feeling of togetherness.

Empathy—high level of syntony, involving insight into experiences and feelings of others, combined with an attitude of helpfulness.

Identification—more differentiated than syntony, and directed toward a person, not a group. At level II, identification is with one's image of another, without checking the reality of that perception with the other. At level III, it is more selective, directed toward deeper relationships. At this level, it is closely related to empathy.

ELIZABETH BUTCHER

Evolution or Revolt? Role of the Change Agent in Psychology

The past decade has witnessed some dramatic changes in both the philosophy and practice of psychology in the United States. The growing stature of differential treatment strategies, demonstrated viability of group and systems approaches to resolving human problems in living, and increasing visibility of psychologists in the courts, in industry, and at all levels of government represent just a few of the emerging trends in our profession. Together, they portray psychologists as seeking a more proactive stance as agents of positive change in our society (Atkinson, Froman, Romo, & Mayton, 1977).

Progress in any arena, however, seems to occur more predictably in phases rather than smooth sequences, and our field evidences no exception to this tenet. Recent efforts of psychologists and other mental health specialists to engage in and influence social policy have been confounded by controversy within the profession itself. One area of controversy addresses differing perspectives on whether psychology should, in fact, assume change agency as a professional activity, and to what degree. Another serious question concerns psychology's relationship to society at large, the interplay between existing theory and the social, economic, and political context in which we operate.

These issues have not been resolved to date; in fact, some contend that they have not even been seriously addressed. The result is that, while both the American Psychological Association (APA) and the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) recognize change agent

Elizabeth Butcher is a therapist at the Seacoast Regional Mental Health Center, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and is part-time faculty in Counselor Education at the University of New Hampshire, Durham.