

THE POSITIVE-HEALTH DEVELOPMENTAL MODEL

Jan Vanderburgh

ABSTRACT

The Positive-health Developmental Model (PDM) is a comprehensive arrangement of personal characteristics, behaviors, and social practices in three dimensions: Approach, a person's way of relating to self, others, and the world; Developmental Level, a person's social and cognitive behaviors, as compared with societal norms; and Mastery, the extent to which a person has mastered and integrated the skills and content of each Developmental Level, described in terms of Actor-Observer-Critic function. Some possible advantages of such a model are discussed, along with settings in which the model has already been used. Directions for further research are suggested.

Current well-founded concerns in education, psychology, medicine, and other fields have led to the development of peer-review requirements for the encouragement of responsible professional behavior and the improvement of services.

Advances in Descriptive Psychology, Volume 3, pages 271-298

Editors: Keith E. Davis and Raymond M. Bergner

Copyright © 1983 JAI Press Inc.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

ISBN 0-89232-293-4

One problem encountered in this process is the identification of specific goals and objectives.

What kind of person is the educational system designed to produce? Ought there to be a difference between public and private education? What kinds of change are to be seen as positive in the practice of psychotherapy? Which current medical procedures so degrade the quality of a person's subsequent life as to make them undesirable or actively destructive? How can a social worker be sure that his or her interventions are in fact helpful to the client?

The answers to such questions often take into account either the needs of the society in which the recipient of the services lives, or the needs of the individual himself or herself, but not both. When one adds to this the time lag in the professional's delivery of the services, what is provided is often neither precise nor timely. For example, by the time universities had produced an appropriate number of scientists and engineers for the space program, the program itself was winding down.

In fact, many of the problems in delivering services are caused at least in part, or compounded, by our taking a reactive stance on various specific difficulties. If Johnny can't read, we'll set up to teach his son and grandson to read. In being perhaps too specific, we find ourselves sometimes working at cross purposes—drawing the boundaries among the professions so rigidly that cooperation is discouraged and the benefits of the knowledge of one profession are not shared with others. We lose sight of our common goals.

It seems, then, that it would be desirable to have a model of positive health, sufficiently general to provide for interdisciplinary communication and broad usefulness, and sufficiently specific to be usable independently of, or cooperatively with, other models. It would make sense to look to developmental models for help with the problems mentioned above. One such model is proposed here.

SUMMARY OF THE MODEL

The Positive-health Developmental Model (PDM) is a way of describing and assessing human behavior in terms of three factors: Approach, a person's way of relating to others and to the world; Developmental Level, a person's social and cognitive behaviors, as compared with societal norms; and Mastery, the extent to which a person has mastered and integrated the skills and content of his/her developmental level to provide enriched and extended opportunities for effective function in his/her world. These factors, or conceptual dimensions, are delineated below.

Approach

Approach is defined as an orientation which is characterized by a preferred context, mode of operation, and set of priorities. Differences in approach, in this

sense, involve differential preference for, an emphasis on, and an inclination toward different modes of operation and their corresponding goals, values, and natural contexts. A person with a given approach will characteristically select or create situations which call for the preferred mode of functioning and carry the promise of the preferred goals. Each approach has its own frame of reference, its own specific skills, and its own values. (One of Ossorio's [Note 1] status dynamic principles is, "If a person wants to do something, he has a reason to create or look for an opportunity to do it.")

Three approaches are distinguished: Relationship, Power, and Information. As defined above, each of these orientations involves a variety of personal characteristics, of which values and preferences, on the one hand, and skills and abilities, on the other, are major elements. In general, we may expect that the acquisition of skills, traits, attitudes, interests, knowledge, and interpersonal styles reflects the result of the operation of consistent preferences over time, and that it is this latter which accounts for much of the psychological coherence of the constellation of acquired personal characteristics.

The fact is, however, that the skills and interpersonal capabilities associated with any one of the three approaches will be too limited to enable the person to function at a normative level. From the latter point of view, we may say that normative functioning at most ages will, at one time or another, call for the skills and capabilities associated with each of the three approaches. For this reason, we need to distinguish the skill and capabilities which are characteristic of a given approach from the approach as such, including the simply preferential aspects. This is accomplished by referring to "Relationship skills," "Power skills," and "Information skills." A person who has normative capability for exercising Relationship skills does not necessarily have a Relationship approach.

We can say, therefore, that normative functioning requires Relationship, Power, and Information skills, even though a given person will have a primary approach that reflects values and preferences. The operation of the values and preferences can be expected to be evidenced by some selectivity in the acquisition and exercise of skills corresponding to the nonpreferred approach. For example, a person whose primary approach is Power will exercise Relationship and Information skills in ways that express the Power orientation as well. (Another status dynamic principle [Ossorio, Note 1] is, "If a person has two reasons to do a certain thing, he has a stronger reason to do it than if he had only one of those reasons.")

At the same time, the division between skill and value or attitudinal components should not be too sharply drawn empirically. The exercise of, for example, "Relationship skills" is not just a matter of engaging in certain skilled performances. To a large extent, it is a matter of appreciating certain values and operating within certain perspectives. Thus, we may speak of our Power-oriented person not merely as capable of exercising Relationship or Information skills, but also as capable of taking a Relationship or Information approach to particular

situations. Accordingly, rather than saying simply that a given person operates from one of the three approaches, we may say that a person has one primary approach, and that the others are secondary for him or her.

One can exercise skills independently of one's own attitudes and preferences, but one can also *adopt* a given attitude or perspective and act on that relatively independently of one's "real" or "primary" attitudes and preferences. To the extent that the three orientations distinguished in the PDM have psychological reality and the corresponding developmental significance, there is a point in saying that a person specifically needs Relationship, Power, and Information skills to function normatively, rather than saying merely that a person needs whatever skills he needs to function normatively. Similarly, there is a point in saying that a person needs to have all three approaches available in order to function normatively.

Considered as personal characteristics, in the sense that Ossorio (1978) uses the term, Relationship, Power, and Information refer to motivational priorities or behavioral preferences. They do not represent or correspond to stages. The relative valuation of Relationship, Power, and Information may be constitutional, that is, already present at birth, or may be a consequence of individual or family preference or training; this is an area for research. The Relationship, Power, and Information *skills* consist of those abilities which are called for by the behaviors and social practices, participation in which constitutes a realization of the Relationship, Power, or Information values. These skills are stratified in terms of the developmental levels.

The following three approaches are delineated in some detail here and in Table 1.

Relationship has an interactional context. A person with a Relationship approach will value personal contact with other people; will be interested in his/her own feelings and others'; is likely to be nurturing, cooperative, and skillful in building intimacy. In a continuum of possible relationships (acquaintanceship, cooperation, alliance, friendship, . . . , intimacy), he/she is likely to prefer those relationships in which intimacy (not necessarily sexual in nature) is possible. He or she will tend to structure his/her time around the wants, needs, or goals of others; his/her own goal is being with and taking care of, or being taken care of by, others.

Power is goal- and task-oriented. Where a Relationship-oriented person might say, "I don't care what I'm doing, so long as I have good company," a Power-oriented person would say, "I don't care how you do it, get it done!" Such a person is likely to be impatient with feelings, his/her own or others', hard-driving, autocratic, controlling, and solitary or reserved. His/her skills have to do with getting things done, with leading (but probably not following), with setting structures for others and building myths that others accept. Competition is

Table 1

<i>Approach</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Methods, Characteristics, and Values</i>
Relationship	magical, intuitive, <i>ad hoc</i> , one-valued, other-directed, "good ol' boy," Doc and Uhura in <i>Star Trek</i> , BJ on <i>MASH</i>	<i>intimacy</i> , charm, friendliness, enthusiasm, pleasing behaviors, seduction (both sexual and non-sexual), ingenuity, persuasion, adaptability, commitment to a relationship or person, loyalty to a relationship or a person, taking care of or being taken care of, dependency, feelings, enjoyment, over-generalization, distortions of sequence, missing steps in thinking, political skills (of relationship), regrets, depression
Power	control-oriented, authoritative, goal-centered, planned, expedient, two-valued (often in extremes), active, not reflective, Lone Ranger, Captain Kirk, Colonel Potter	<i>control/cooperation</i> , energy, creativity, organization, charisma, leadership and political skills, dedication, perseverance, commitment to own goals, responsibility, lack of concern with process, outcome evaluations, involvement with the task at hand, arbitrariness, hostility, competition (both appropriate and inappropriate), conviction (sometimes uninformed), incorrect or missing steps in thinking process, distortions of duration, remorse, cyclic disorders
Information	process-oriented, flexible, multi-valued, logical, precise, reflective, Spock	<i>trust</i> , analysis and synthesis, reality-testing, model-building, cognition, study, observation and examination, accuracy, curiosity, rationality, suitability for a chosen purpose, difficulties with closure, low-pressure, not inspiring, successive working hypotheses, concerned with learning and teaching, exchange of information, procrastination, anxiety, extra steps in thinking, isolative behaviors, faithfulness to principle or commitment

an integral part of the underlying thought structure, whether with self, others, or some real or imagined standard. Where intimacy is the highest priority for Relationship-oriented people, control (and its concomitant cooperation) is the name of the game for Power-oriented people. Pleasure comes from achievement, from testing one's limits and extending one's skills—from making something challenging or new come to fruition. And after a moment's pleasure at closure on one task, a Power-oriented person is likely to move on quickly from that achievement to the next, and the next, and the next, with brief but intense periods of satisfaction from each.

For such a person, crises are exciting and stimulating; the successful resolution of an emergency is enormously gratifying. Where Relationship- or Information-oriented people will put considerable effort into denying, avoiding, or smoothing over a crisis, Power-oriented people often create crises in order to have an opportunity to function effectively.

Information, as an approach, is process-and structure-oriented. People who approach the world from this system are almost endlessly curious; they wish to know how everything works, from relationships to computers, drainpipes to bagpipes. Their passion is for accuracy and the increase of knowledge; they play with words, ideas, objects, and arrangements, and find delight in knowledge for its own sake. These are the trivia experts, inventors, intellectual packrats. Their highest priority is trust, whether of information or of persons. In general, they are poor liars, because accuracy is a high value to them. Many Information-oriented people have difficulty bringing a project to closure, because there is always more to learn, and a project cannot be trusted if it is incomplete. At their healthiest, they maintain a sense of delighted wonder at the world and its variety; at their least healthy, they so drastically limit their field of observation that they become deprived of the full benefits of interaction with other people and with the world around them.

Some empirical articulations of the approaches, taken primarily from material generated at workshops by leaders and participants, are shown in Table 2.

In various combinations, the approaches are significantly related to the ways a person chooses to spend his/her time, and the kinds of communication and relationships in which a person chooses to engage. In order to be healthy, a person needs to have skills and some fluency in all these approaches. A single-approach person seems to others to lack some essential characteristics. Even a very young infant uses Relationship skills to elicit affection and nurturing, Power skills to compel appropriate responses from the environment (e.g., a baby's urgent distress cry), and Information skills to make sense out of his or her experience.

In a healthy and supportive environment, a child has opportunities to learn and practice skills from all three approaches. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a well-rounded adult who does not value intimacy, trust, and control/cooperation, even

Table 2
Empirical Articulations of the Three Approaches

<i>Distinction</i>	<i>Approach</i>		
	<i>Relationship</i>	<i>Power</i>	<i>Information</i>
action distortion	sequence	process	significance
affective disorders	hysteria, depression	cyclic, depression	anxiety
competition	for taking care of, being taken care of	for frame of reference, defining reality	for accuracy
confusion	thinking with feeling	doing with feeling	thinking with doing
decision process	intuition, feelings	conviction (sometimes uninformed), action	successive working hypotheses, reflection
interests	enjoy, feel close, feel good, take care of or be taken care of	achieve, compete, succeed, excel, strive	learn, teach, exchange, experiment
locational priority	closeness	time	space
management style	buddy, good ol' boy, "Let's win one for the Gipper," Col. Blake in <i>MASH</i> , Doc in <i>Star Trek</i>	solitary horseman, no peers, charismatic leader, outcome-oriented, Col. Potter in <i>MASH</i> , Capt. Kirk in <i>Star Trek</i>	rational, informed, low-key, uninspiring, process-oriented, Mr. Spock in <i>Star Trek</i>
reality statements	"Reality is what you/they say it is, I guess . . ."	"Reality is what I say it is!"	"Reality is what I can test to nine nines."
reasoning disorder	missing step	incorrect step	extra step
relationships	many warm long- and short-term, some superficial	few, often stormy, not very close, one or two very close	few long-term, very stable, terminate suddenly if trust is violated
strengths	linking, person orientation	outcome orientation, task involvement, determination	flexibility, process orientation
thinking disorder	over-generalizing	over-generalizing	over-detailing
time distortion	sequence	duration	closure
weaknesses	dependency, lack of investment in closure, lack of control, passivity	over-control of other people, hostility, isolation, arbitrariness, extremism, lack of investment in how things happen	procrastination, lack of investment in closure, isolation, over-control of self, over-concentration on detail
values	intimacy/feeling	control/achievement/doing	trust/understanding/thinking

though the mix may vary greatly among individuals who prefer different approaches.

Perhaps it is easiest to show the interdependence of the approaches through these three values. A Relationship-oriented person is most likely to trust and cooperate with a person to whom he/she feels close. ("Of course he's a good lawyer; I've known him all my life!") A Power-oriented person will learn to trust another person, or be close to him/her, by cooperating with or attempting to control him or her. ("He's the best doctor I've ever had; he doesn't take any nonsense from anyone—even me!") An Information-oriented person will not be intimate with, and will limit cooperation with, a person until he or she has come to trust that person. ("He's a good friend; I've never known him to go back on his word.")

Each approach assumes particular importance in connection with various tasks, and at various developmental levels. A child who is testing limits is likely to do so most effectively from a Power approach; a child who is developing social skills is likely to use Relationship orientation; a child who wishes to understand how the world works and how things fit together in it is likely to be coming from an Information stance.

When a particular developmental level is focused on a task which calls for the skills of one approach more than the others, the child is generally most effective using the skills of that approach. But again, at each stage, the primary way of relating to the world will affect the way in which a particular child accomplishes the developmental task. So, for instance, the end of the so-called Terrible Twos (the anal resolution) can come as a battle over who will tie the two-year-old's shoes, or where he will move his bowels and when; over whether the child must share and "be nice"; or over a disputed piece of information, like what Daddy said or who put the Teddy bear into the dryer. In each instance, the caretaking person (usually the mother) insists effectively that the child accommodate to reality as understood by consensus in that family or society, and the child discovers that he/she can think and/or disagree and still be taken care of.

A healthy, intact family can probably provide some experience of, or at least support for the development of, all three approaches. A child in whose family a particular approach is absent, forbidden, or grossly distorted may find additional resources external to the family, and still grow to adult life with a full repertoire of behaviors suitable to the culture and time in history in which he or she lives. One of the arguments for the extended family is the increase in experiential resources for the children involved. Radical deficits in skills or in valuing of one or more approaches appear to issue in behaviors that are culturally unacceptable to a degree sufficient to impair a person's function.

Many people appear to function well from two approaches, alternately or together, at a comparable level of skill, and significantly less skillfully from the third. A person who uses Relationship and Power skills, but lacks Information skills and priorities, may display considerable energy in the pursuit of his/her

goals, while testing reality poorly. A person who combines Relationship and Information skills may be very pleasant and hard-working, with large gaps in leadership skills and the ability to bring a task to a successful conclusion. Such a person may also not be effectively assertive, even when it is to his/her interest to do so. A person who combines Power and Information, but lacks Relationship skills and priorities, may be seen as effective, cold, and forbidding. He/she is likely to test external reality—the material world—quite well, and to lose sight of human values, being awkward, reserved, impatient, or careless in personal relationships.

Where a person is far more skilled in two approaches than in the third, even though he or she may be comparably skilled in both, the person's primary approach still makes a difference. The nonprimary approach is still colored by the primary. So, for example, the pairing of Power and Relationship approaches in a primary Relationship-approach person is observably different from the same pairing in a primary Power-approach person.

Looking at these combinations in vocational, that is, "preferred context," terms, one might find the Relationship-Power person functioning well as an evangelist, politician, entertainer, or salesperson; the Relationship-Information person as a minister, guidance counselor, social worker, or family-practice physician; and the Power-Information person as a successful engineer, surgeon, or entrepreneur.

Very few people function consistently in only one approach. A single-approach person would appear strange and limited in his or her behavior. Most people seem to use two of the three approaches more frequently and with greater skill than the third. It is possible to get along quite well this way. However, in terms of the PDM, a positively healthy person has comparable skills in all three approaches, and affirms the values of each to some extent. This permits the person to develop the kind of balance that comes from pleasure at one's own effectiveness, willingness to learn, and satisfying personal relationships.

In general, a person operating from a two-approach combination makes use of the skills of two approaches in the service of the values of the primary approach. Following are brief descriptions of the two-approach combinations

Relationship-Power (RP) persons use the skills of both approaches to support the Relationship values. They are very gregarious, and usually have a strong network of friends. They combine concern for all of the individuals involved in a situation with a drive for success and closure. They are very effective persuaders, politicians, entertainers, and advocates of a particular point of view. Lacking the Information values, they may leave out important steps in planning or thinking.

Relationship-Information (RI) persons use the skills of both approaches to support the Relationship values. They are very effective teachers and trainers, good team members, loyal and trustworthy, highly-principled, perceptive, sometimes quite sensitive, and not very competitive. They can be excellent mediators

and negotiators. They respond well to praise and support, and not to negative criticism. Lacking the Power values, they may experience difficulties with closure.

Power-Relationship (PR) persons use the skills of both approaches to support the Power values. They are often charismatic, sometimes almost overpowering. They may support a program or a point of view for the sake of winning, rather than for any intrinsic benefits; if they do, they will do it very well, and are likely to win. They do well in jobs that require both high energy and some understanding of others. They tend to use their understanding of people in ways that may seem careless or exploitive to other people. They are high achievers, and need to have opportunities for achievement; otherwise, they can become a focus of discontent. Lacking the Information values, they may be willing to be deceptive, and may not always be as thorough as they intend to be.

Power-Information (PI) persons use the skills of both approaches to support the values and goals of Power. These people are excellent politicians and leaders, but poor followers unless they see some chance of advancement. They are the prime upholders of hierarchical systems. Many are workaholics. They are superb strategists and fine senior military officers. They are often insensitive to human values and needs. They are very thorough, and rarely make careless mistakes. They are impatient with anything they regard as incompetence. They do not value anything which they do not understand.

Information-Relationship (IR) persons use the skills of both approaches in support of the values and goals of Information. They are generally noncompetitive, friendly but not gregarious, extremely flexible except on issues of trust, cooperative, hard-working, and loyal. They do well in staff, but not in line, positions. They are very effective working independently on a project of their own, but need external support or pressure to meet deadlines and get closure. They tend to develop Power skills late in life, if ever, and do not really understand the Power values.

Information-Power persons use the skills of both approaches in support of the values and goals of Information. They are moderately competitive and closure oriented, very precise, somewhat rigid, very private, not very playful. They make excellent CPAs, actuaries, editors, script persons, auditors, administrative assistants, trouble-shooters, and inspectors—jobs that require attention to detail and prompt performance. They tend to have very few friends and to avoid intimacy. Lacking the Relationship skills and values, they are often unwilling to tolerate much personal contact, with the possible exception of their families.

Various approaches and combinations of approaches are valued within cultures and subcultures, often in association with conventions about masculinity and femininity. (There is so large a body of literature on this issue that it is not necessary to discuss it here.) The differences in values that operate in a culture

generally exercise a molding effect on the persons living in that culture. Such molding effects are seen, however, as potentially limiting, since the presence of each of the approaches enhances the others and increases positive behavioral options.

Developmental Levels

The second dimension of the PDM describes the skills, social practices, and characteristics of healthy development in sequential form. Eleven developmental levels (0–10, where 0 indicates the absence of even a minimal set of resources and achievements, e.g., an absence of voluntary movement, and 10 indicates the presence of extraordinary resources and accomplishments) cover physical, social, and intellectual competencies which in general increase from birth to maturity. Specific criteria for identifying functioning at each level in each approach have been developed. Relevant distinctions are made both for those who are unusually able and those whose function is in some way impaired (see Table 3).

A person is said to have “completed” a given developmental level when he or she can do all those things which are required for meeting the standards defining that developmental level. In general, a person will not be considered to have completed a given developmental level until he or she has mastered the requisite skills in all three approaches at that level. To do so requires the incorporation of these skills into a self-regulating form of functioning (see discussion of Mastery below). In the developmental dimension, comparisons are made on the basis of need for external or community support and the degree of independent responsibility, as well as on the basis of appropriate activities and settings for the individual, and cultural norms. Values reflected in the developmental section are: competence, independence, willingness and ability to contribute to the common good, responsibility for own actions and decisions, problem-solving, moral and ethical development, creativity, and the formation of durable and satisfying nonexploitive relationships with other persons. In general, each of these values is affirmed to a greater degree at each higher level.

A rough summary of levels 0–10 is provided in Table 3. Specifics for a wide variety of cultures and subcultures can be subsumed under the several headings. In general, an adult who exemplified positive health would function at at least level 4, and probably 5, in all three systems. Both 0–3 and 8–10 are rare in the general adult population, with the most extreme occurring least frequently.

Considered as personal characteristics (Ossorio, 1976), the developmental levels correspond to ability or achievement descriptions. Ossorio (Note 2) identifies two general types of developmental models: Models of the first type are formally *ipsative*. They attempt to describe what a child is doing without reference to external criteria. In general, these tend to be related to intrapsychic theories. Models of the second type are formally *norm-based*. These take adult (or some other) function as normative, and describe the child’s behavior as

Table 3
Summary of Developmental Levels

-
10. Genuinely new ideas, behaviors, creations, inventions, or understandings which are fundamental contributions to the culture and have revolutionary implications for human living.
 9. Genuinely new ideas, behaviors, creations, inventions, or understandings which have significant implications for how people live their lives.
 8. New uses of old or existing materials, ideas, behaviors, or understandings; significant influence on society and on other people; if complete, altruistic.
 7. Well-integrated, responsible, constructive, autonomous behaviors; ethical but not necessarily altruistic; not innovative; high achievement in chosen field of endeavor; high satisfaction and positive self-image.
 6. Well-integrated, responsible, constructive, autonomous behaviors; stands out in ordinary population; moderate satisfaction and positive self-image; well regarded by others in subculture.
 5. Well adapted to culture, within general mid-range of chosen subculture, experiences satisfaction in life, generally constructive. Developmentally, this level is appropriate for healthy 17- or 18-year-olds.
 4. In process of adaptation to culture, or adapted with mild to moderate discomfort; has made or is changing limiting choices; experiences limited satisfaction, has developing or not entirely positive self-image; if adult, requires support additional to that normally available in adult society. This level is appropriate for healthy 13- to 16-year-olds.
 3. In process of adaptation to culture, or adapted with moderate to severe discomfort; requires considerable external support and some external controls; requires supervision; has developing or negative self-image; if adult, has made severely limiting choices, has barely adequate reality-testing. This level is appropriate for healthy 8- to 12-year-olds.
 2. As a child, functions well and comfortably within a limited and supportive environment. As adult, functions within society with great difficulty; often institutionalized; distorted perception of reality, high stress; requires consistent supervision and instruction, experiences major discomfort when support is withdrawn. This level is appropriate for healthy 4- to 7-year-olds.
 1. Requires constant support and supervision; reality-testing impaired by limited experience or understanding; requires primarily external controls. As adult, usually institutionalized; may be chronic psychotic or severely impaired in some way. As child, healthy for age 0-3.
 0. Nonfunctional or not yet functional. In children, this designation would be an indication of anomaly beyond a few hours after birth; in adults, acute psychotic, comatose, or massively impaired.
-

compared with the norm. In general, these tend to be related to behavioral theories.

The developmental dimension of the PDM represents a norm-based developmental-stage theory. That is, it is anchored on the adult, and the stages represent the ways in, and degrees to which the child is like the adult. The adult in question is the normative adult, not the statistically average or usual one.

Levels 0-5 hinge on the extent to which the child can participate in the social practices of his or her community effectively on his/her own. The child's achievements are compared with those of a fully functional adult. Levels 6 to 8 deal with the degree to which the skills, knowledge, and so forth, required for normative social participation are personally integrated and therefore authen-

tically exercised. It is this level of personal integration and authenticity that lays the basis for the creativity and innovation of levels 9 and 10. Here it is especially significant that the normative adult is used as the criterion, since levels 9 and 10 consist of being socially creative in the sense of going beyond the social practices already participated in, or at least creating significant new versions of some practices. Thus, in this model, to be ideally socialized is to be capable of constructive social innovation, not merely to be "adjusted" to a society as it exists. Because degree of socialization goes beyond mere adaptation to society, it allows for a greater or lesser fit to the individual as well.

Mastery

In order to provide ways to distinguish differences in function at a particular level of a particular approach, the Mastery dimension makes use of the Descriptive Psychology schema of Actor-Observer-Critic (AOC). Ossorio (1970/1981) speaks of AOC functions, a model in which observation is a special (in some respects more sophisticated) case of action, and criticism a special (in some respects more sophisticated) case of observation.

In general, a person functions in each of these three ways at all times. However, the sequence of action-observation-appraisal-action, and so on, with respect to a particular content, provides a functional negative feedback loop which in turn is paradigmatic for human self-regulation. Mastery of a given set of activities, social practices, or interpersonal ways of relating is attained not merely when these can be accomplished more or less at will, but rather when they are incorporated into the person's capability for self-regulation.

One might say, as a rough division, that the Actor acts in the world, assimilating it to his/her own projects; the Observer/Describer notes and experiences the episode; and the Critic provides evaluation in accordance with personal/social standards or viewpoints. The Actor says or does something; the Observer-Describer notes and remembers it, and may also elaborate it or comment about it nonjudgmentally; the Critic evaluates it, judges it, appreciates it, or suggests changes in it, assigns significance to it, and fits it into other aspects of the Actor's life and function.

In general, what falls under the category of the Actor is answers to the questions "Why?" and "What?" Reference to the Observer answers the questions "What?" and "How?" The Critic deals with the general questions "Where does it fit for me?" "What is its value and significance?" "Is it good or bad, how much, and in what way?" and "If bad, what can be done about it?" The Critic also answers the more specific questions "Why?" "What for?" "What does it mean?" and "What is it *really*?"

At the point at which a person has mastered the content of a particular approach and level, in the sense that he has a genuinely functional (AOC) mastery

of it, he or she has added a distinctive set of standards, appreciations, distinctions, and skilled behavioral options to his/her repertoire, and has correspondingly enlarged the world in which he/she lives.

It is possible to begin to deal with the skills of the next developmental level before one has achieved AOC mastery of the skills of the current level. Observation suggests that, where this is the case, the individual may experience difficulty or discomfort in dealing with the new material; that is because some significant percentage of the skilled behaviors for human beings are sequential in nature and depend upon prior learnings for their attainment.

Unlike the developmental levels, Actor, Observer, and Critic are not personal characteristic norms; rather, they correspond to achievement or ability descriptions. In Descriptive Psychology, AOC refers to three basic forms of functioning which enter into the process of human self-regulation, and are therefore essential for human rationality. Each of these is an achievement in itself; to function jointly is also an achievement. They are always the same achievements, irrespective of age level or content (Ossorio, Note 2).

The development of the capability for functioning as Actor, Observer, and Critic at all, and the question of differential preferences with respect to these, are areas for theory and research, but are not central to the PDM. Presumably the acquisition of these abilities is a special case of the acquisition of abilities generally.

In this model, the AOC dimension deals with the person's ability to function as Actor, Observer, and Critic with respect to the behaviors, participations, choices, and interactions corresponding to a given developmental level. With respect to the latter, normative functioning requires that the person be able to behave and participate in a humanly self-regulating way.

The AOC dimension provides an analytic breakdown of the elements of self-regulating behavior. Therefore it provides a representation of the degree to which, and the ways in which, the individual can participate in given behaviors, practices, and interactions in a fully normative way, or, conversely, the degree to which the behaviors, and so on, are fully mastered or assimilated into the person's repertoire. Mastery at a given developmental level is particularly important because it puts the person in a position to begin participation at higher levels.

In Ossorio's Developmental Schema (1977; 1970/1981), the basic unit of representation is given by the formula:

$$\text{Capacity} + \text{History} \rightarrow \text{Personal Characteristic}$$

That is, a person acquires a given personal characteristic by virtue of having a prior Capacity and an appropriate intervening History. This formula is then elaborated in that the prior Capacity is accounted for by the individual's Personal Characteristics at the prior time; correspondingly, the acquisition of the new Personal Characteristic is in principle the acquisition of some new Capacity, and so on.

The correspondence of Personal Characteristics and Capacities provides a way of understanding the transition from one developmental level to another without making an a priori commitment to a single substantive principle, for example, a self-actualizing motive, which *moves* a person through a series of developmental stages. Conversely, it does not leave the appearance that the whole matter is merely an historical accident (e.g., a matter of which behaviors were reinforced) or a biological epiphenomenon.

There are various ways in which a person's existing personal characteristics can make a difference in his or her capacity to change and acquire new characteristics. Among these ways are the following:

1. Prior learning may provide some components (skills, attitudes, knowledge, etc.) of later, more complex forms of behavior. In this case, successful enactment of the latter is facilitated, but successful enactment of the latter may also be the vehicle for acquiring new skills, attitudes, and knowledge. (Another status principle [Ossorio, Note 1] is, "A person acquires concepts and skills by practice and experience in one or more of the social practices which call for the use of that concept or skill.")

2. Prior learning may provide conceptual or procedural patterns which may be transferred to new activities or situations more or less intact, and thereby facilitate new learning. Actor-Observer-Critic functioning provides one of the most general and fundamental cases here. (We are reminded that AOC functioning is a personal resource which enables a person to acquire normative ways of behaving, relating, and understanding. But it is not merely that. In addition, AOC functioning is itself one of the primary normative requirements.) Similarly, procedures such as problem-solving strategies, interpersonal styles, and grammatical forms and representational schemas (such as process schemas, cause-effect schemas, and calculational schemas) may all have facilitating effects.

3. Prior learning may sensitize the person to questions, problems, complexities, dimensions, values, and so forth, which need to be taken into account in moving on to the situations, relationships, and practices at a new developmental stage. What is then carried over is an appropriate existential scope rather than specific resources.

4. Of course, negative effects are correspondingly possible. For example, a person may fail to acquire personal characteristics, such as those indicated above, which are usually acquired and are usually facilitative with respect to some target personal characteristic, for example, ability to speak the native language. Then we can say that the person's development has hindered him or her, or reduced his or her capacity, with regard to the target characteristic. A second possibility is that the person acquires particular personal characteristics which specifically reduce the capacity to acquire a target characteristic. The

acquisition of an incompatible trait (if the target is a trait) or attitude (if the target is an attitude) is the most obvious example here. More speculatively, the acquisition of one skill, like signing Ameslan, might interfere with a person's acquisition of a second skill, speaking English. A third possibility is that the person acquires characteristics which are not a direct hindrance in acquiring a target characteristic but do have consequences that in turn reduce the capacity to acquire the target characteristic. Reduction of capacity corresponds to a restriction in the range of intervening histories which will result in the acquisition of the target characteristics. Thus, although generalized tendencies to self-actualize or to elaborate one's system or to master the environment, and so on, over the life span become intelligible both normatively and as statistical and empirical generalizations, there need not be any corresponding independent, transcendent principle referring to a hypothetical something which brings about these developmental regularities and desiderata.

Actor, Observer, and Critic have a certain stage-like character, in that it appears to be typical for mastery to proceed in that order at a given developmental level. However, there is no conceptual requirement for a standard sequence, and it may be that there is less regularity in the sequence than there appears to be (Holt, 1979). There is also no requirement that all three components (AOC) be mastered at a given developmental level before moving on to the next level, although there appear to be observable consequences of deficits in any of the components at earlier levels.

CHARACTER OF THE PDM IN RELATION TO OTHER SYSTEMS

The PDM can be characterized in the following ways

Developmental

The PDM is a developmental model explicitly anchored in adult norms, rather than an attempt to characterize infants and children in terms of the intrapsychic processes which result in their overt behavior. In this respect it differs from such theories as those of Freud, Piaget, Erikson, Loevinger, and others. By virtue of this feature, the developmental levels can readily be empirically coordinated with age levels. This correspondence in turn facilitates the characterization of individuals as more or less psychologically healthy, or more or less significantly restricted in their capability for social participation.

Independent Typology and Stages

Personality typology and developmental stages are independent. In this respect, the PDM differs from the personality typologies associated with well-known developmental theories. Generally speaking, when a personality typology

and a set of developmental stages are found together in a given theory, it is fairly evident that one of the two sets (types or stages) "drives" the other. For example, where the outcome types are of interest, as in Erikson, the corresponding stages can be guaranteed by the simple expedient of defining "developmental tasks." Conversely, where the stages are of primary interest, as in Kohlberg, the corresponding types can be generated simply by defining them in terms of the behaviors or achievements associated with the stages (Ossorio, Note 2).

Conceptually speaking, there is no reason to require, and little reason to expect, that the typologies which are illuminating for describing and comparing adults are simple mirror images of the change processes or classes of intermediate accomplishments which provide illuminating markers with respect to the historical transition from birth to adulthood. That would be comparable to the notion that one had to classify the interesting places one might be visiting in terms of whether one arrived there by land, sea, or air, or whether one traveled by direct connection or with intermediate stops.

Thus, in the PDM, there is independent justification for the Relationship, Power, and Information typology and the levels of function.

The Relationship-Power-Information taxonomy is empirically based on observation, interaction, and intervention with both children and adults. These distinctions facilitate understanding and effective action.

A related set of distinctions associated with the FIRO-B (Schutz, 1957/1967) compares needs for affection, control, and inclusion. These are in some ways comparable to the Relationship, Power, and Information triad, though they can be subsumed under Relationship and Power. The FIRO-B categories have a significant amount of research and organizational application to testify to their utility (Buros, 1978).

With respect to the developmental levels, the FIRO-B categories embody a set of constraints or principles which it would be difficult to argue are merely empirical. Although there are limits to the comparability of different theories formulated in terms of different concepts, the following principles appear to provide a good fit to the sequencing found in Loevinger, Erikson, and others.

1. Infants begin with minimal abilities and cognitive resources, and cannot in general survive alone.
2. Participation in the social practices of the community is achieved piecemeal over time and provides a standard for normal development.
3. Adequate socialization requires personalization (identification, integration, and internalization) and not merely compliance or adjustment with respect to the values, standards, skills, social practices, and institutions of the community.
4. Personal expression of an unsocialized sort is not a social value, hence the

mastery of social practices has a certain kind of priority over internalization, identification, and so forth.

5. The ideal of socialization is the capability for constructive innovation, and not merely the achievement of a *modus vivendi* with the environment.

These principles are exemplified in the sequencing of the Levels of Function described above.

One of the features of the stage-typology types of classification is that, at least at the adult level, anything short of the last stage, whatever it might be, is almost of necessity pejorative. Correspondingly, the single nonpejorative stage-type provides no differentiation among "healthy" adults. In contrast, the Relationship, Power, and Information classification is inherently nonpejorative and does provide differentiation at any age level, yet it can be used in conjunction with diagnostic Level of Function descriptions.

Explicit Characterization of "Completion"

The PDM provides an explicit characterization of what constitutes complete acquisition or mastery of a level's material. In stage theories in which the completion of one stage is the normal precondition for going on, unanswered questions arise in regard to what constitutes completion. Informally, there is a good deal of agreement that completion amounts to functioning that is normative in some sense, that mastery may be more or less complete, and that complete mastery is generally acquired over time. There is, however, little or no satisfactory explication of what constitutes completion or why this is critical with respect to the next stage.

In the PDM, the use of Actor-Observer-Critic, functioning as a paradigm of human self-regulation, provides an illuminating conceptual criterion for complete mastery. It is both heuristic and suggestive in regard to why completion might be critical for the next stage. At a minimum, it introduces a qualitative distinction: achieving the incorporation of a particular content into a self-regulating mode of function. This appears to be more relevant than a simple quantitative notion of how much or how well one has learned. Self-regulation is more relevant because it does codify a crucial normative aspect of human behavior.

Three Dimensions

The PDM is a three-dimensional model which codifies several essential aspects of behavior. The obviousness of this feature should not obscure its importance. Traditional typologies are one-dimensional models, in that they provide explicitly a single set of coordinated categories. As previously noted, the set of categories generally corresponds to developmental stages. Although the implications of the categories and their differences are usually elaborated at some length,

these elaborations are themselves unsystematic; they contrast with a systematic typology and they exhibit the disadvantages of unsystematic, as opposed to systematic, formulation (Ossorio, Note 3).

In contrast, the PDM carries the systematization to three dimensions. Although the three are conceptually independent, they do not represent an arbitrary collocation. Instead, they provide for characterizations which are much more readily related to the Descriptive Psychology formulations of behavior than any of the well-known theory-based typologies:

1. The Mastery dimension is explicitly formulated in the Descriptive Actor-Observer-Critic terms.
2. The normative, participative aspects of the Level of Function dimension correspond to the Descriptive Psychology formulation of human behavior as social participation.
3. Formally, the levels of function correspond to abilities and more generally, powers of the individual. Both abilities and powers are basic categories of personal characteristics in Descriptive Psychology. Thus, the Level of Function dimension incorporates the Descriptive Psychology feature of explicitly considering behavior both as an expression of personal characteristics and as a participation in social forms.
4. The Relationship, Power, and Information dimension introduces explicit motivational and value concepts, and in this way provides for the assessment or description of these central behavioral and personal concepts (the Want parameter of behavior; the Value parameter of persons).
5. Collectively, the three dimensions of the PDM provide access to the cognitive, motivational, competence, and achievement parameters of behavior, and to the personal, rational, social, and normative aspects of human behavior as such.

Summary

On the whole, therefore, the PDM provides a structure of intermediate complexity which makes possible the efficient assessment and representation of the central aspects of persons and their behavior as formulated in Descriptive Psychology. In the Relationship, Power, and Information typology and the Levels of Function dimension, the PDM does show various kinds and degrees of similarity to the features of developmentally based and other typologies reported by psychologists. However, it does not duplicate these either in its fine detail, in the functional integration of the three conceptual dimensions of the model, or in its relation to the systematic formulations of Descriptive Psychology.

NOTATION AND PRINCIPLES FOR USING THE PDM

Location and Description

In using the model, the first task is to locate a person's behavior within the PDM structure, identifying a developmental level and a degree of completeness for each of the three approaches. Technically, this is accomplished by means of an "index" which specifies approach, developmental level, and degree of mastery. A person who is functioning at the Critic stage of level 4 in Relationship, for instance, would have a Relationship index of R4C. A great deal of information about a person's skills, behavior, interests, and probable options can be contained in a full 9-part designation of his or her behaviors according to the PDM. For this task, it is valuable to have a fair longitudinal sample of behavior, in preference to brief single occasions, since the accuracy of assessing the central tendency increases with the amount of observation available.

Communication

Knowing a person's approach, approximate developmental level, and degree of mastery makes it possible to speak or write to that person in language that is likely to be understood and to receive a positive response. For instance, a Power-approach person is usually task-oriented, and would generally prefer not to exchange social pleasantries before dealing with business issues. Conversely, it is often easier to do business with a Relationship-oriented person if one first "catches up" socially, and then states the business in a relaxed and personal manner. To foster growth in less-preferred approaches, it is usually more effective to state the material in both the familiar approach and the new approach. The language and allied practices of each approach have particular value in certain circumstances; a healthy adult can find use for communication in the style of all three approaches in the course of daily living.

Matches and Mismatches

In addition to its use as a framework for describing a person's behavior, the PDM appears to have applications to groups, systems, organizations, and jobs. It can be used not only to describe the qualities present in a person or situation, but also to design those qualities that would be desirable for a person or situation. If a person wishes to achieve a set of stated goals, it is possible to examine the goals in the light of the PDM classification to which they correspond, and see whether and what changes in the person's behavior might be desirable for the achievement of those goals. Where two or more persons are involved in a relationship or situation, a comparison of their respective indices can suggest directions for growth and change and the increase of behavioral options. Often the indices can help the people involved to avoid the most unpromising options and select

options that are likely to be successful. (An unpromising option would call for a person to function in ways in which he or she is not prepared to function.)

Informal Task Analysis and Selection

A full index consists of an index for each of the three approaches. If tasks are to be done or positions filled, a full index is needed. In this use of the PDM, a full index is constructed, reflecting the skilled behaviors required for the task or position. Selection is made by finding the available person who most closely fits that index. For instance, an R5O P5C I5A would probably be a better elementary school principal than an R2C P6C I4O, while the second person might be a better coach than the first.

USES OF THE PDM

At the beginning of this paper, some common problems and difficulties in social practices, particularly in various professional fields, were mentioned in support of the position that a model different from those now in common use—perhaps even a different *kind* of model—could be of service in such situations. The Positive-health Developmental Model has been used, in its present form or in earlier forms, in the following settings among others: a women's crisis center, a commune, three youth facilities, a state prison training group, a county mental health center, a school district (with senior staff), three hospitals, two psychiatric facilities, various training settings, and the private practice of psychotherapy (Vanderburgh, Note 4). Let us now look at some of the advantages of the PDM in general settings.

Communication

As a communication tool, the PDM can be used: (1) to speak or teach directly to a person's location on the model, for maximum precision of expression; (2) to say what is to be said from more than one approach or level, to give greater depth and clarity, to facilitate translation, and to increase the skills of the hearer; and (3) to model and teach different, perhaps more effective, ways of negotiating and solving problems.

Education

As an aid to education, the PDM can help to make behavioral goals appropriate, specific, and explicit. If, for instance, a child has Power skills far greater than his/her skills in Relationship and Information, specific goals in those two systems can be negotiated with the child (and perhaps his/her family). Tasks and assignments can be designed in such a way as to foster the desired skills, and the new skills can be described to the child in the terms already most familiar to him

or her. ("Pat, I see that you enjoy being captain of the team. If you want to do that job well, you will have to know the rules very well, and you will need to get along well with the other children.") As a child grows older, and begins to express vocational preferences, the PDM can help the child and his or her advisers to prepare him/her for the chosen fields, both personally and educationally. An Information-approach child who decides that he or she wants to be an Army general will need to acquire some fairly sophisticated Power skills to succeed in that ambition.

Societal Goals and the Individual

Even more important is the making explicit of the underlying model for the educational system, whether it be public or private, elementary, secondary, or advanced. In this area, the model has two uses. First, it can be used to evaluate an existing system, describing the range of skills and resources commonly provided as prerequisites for graduation. Second, it can be used to describe the skills and resources valued in a society, and suggest some modifications in an existing system that would render that system more likely to meet the needs of that society.

Some of the questions that arise in such uses are: What kind of person is the system designed to produce? How knowledgeable? How independent? How curious? How compliant? How individual? How creative? How cooperative? Is the kind of person who is likely to be produced by a particular educational system going to be the kind of citizen that country/state/city really needs? Will he or she find employment? How great a span of individual differences is tolerated within a particular society? Does that society's educational process reflect its values? Should those values be changed? How can a satisfactory number of healthy behavioral options be provided for each person within the system, while still meeting the needs of society?

It is possible that having the whole model available as a reminder of the wide range of options for human behavior could encourage educators, social scientists, and politicians to consider the questions raised above—and their implications—more seriously and more actively.

In addition to the applications of specific constellations of characteristics according to the model, as described above, there is a set of uses for the PDM that includes the full range of behaviors and personal characteristics contained in the model. In general, the open-ended, creative tasks (that is, those for which no specific guidelines are incorporated in the task definition) require this increased flexibility. A person may need, or be able to use, *any* resource in order to accomplish these tasks; therefore, it is desirable that *all* resources be available, so far as that is possible. For instance, the designing of a workable student-run court system in a school requires AOC mastery at a high level of competence in

all three approaches; the actual tasks of running the system, once it has been designed, can be specified and far more limited. Or, it is possible to *train* a person to fill a job that requires a particular set of skills, but the *education* of a person, the longitudinal development of a person, requires access to the whole model.

The Family

Parents who have a clear idea of the general range of social practices and personal characteristics commonly available in a particular culture can participate intelligently in their own preparation, and that of their children, for healthy, creative, and constructive life within that culture (and also, perhaps, transformation of that culture). When problems arise, the PDM and its distinctions can help to clarify both the problem and the principal behavioral options open to all who are involved.

Families using the PDM can identify healthy resources that need to be imported from outside the structure. A family in which Relationship skills are not highly valued, with a child whose primary system is Relationship, can look for opportunities for the child to develop his or her Relationship skills, and settings in which those skills are highly valued. Organizations like church groups, Scouts, and service clubs have been very useful in that kind of situation.

The basic assumption here is that a healthy adult will have appropriate skills in all three approaches, at comparable levels, and will know when and how to use them. Because of that assumption, a description of how that operates is not merely a description, because if the description shows areas which are underdeveloped, those areas stand out as places where additional development is desirable. Families also have opportunities, using the PDM, to increase parenting skills, to develop a wider spectrum of skills and appropriate social practices within the family structure, and to understand and value each other's special talents and resources.

Psychotherapy

In psychotherapy, the distinctions made in the PDM are useful in identifying difficulties in a positive, noncensorious way, and assessing improvement during the process. It is possible, using the PDM, to build a cooperative alliance between therapist and client which does not include inappropriate dependencies or an assumption of unequal value of the two allies. The PDM gives descriptions of various positions which can facilitate communication between clients and therapists whose primary approach and values are quite different.

It is also helpful in the selection of a therapist or acceptance of a particular client to have a clear idea of each person's behavioral resources. In general, Power-oriented clients seem to become extremely impatient working with non-

Power therapists; the therapist's values and skills may appear irrelevant, and his or her timing is likely to be very different from the client's. Although this may be productive in the end, the early stages can be difficult.

Relationship-oriented clients often adopt the values and social practices of a Power-oriented therapist, perhaps forming a dependent relationship with the therapist that does not facilitate autonomous behaviors. Information-oriented clients may not feel safe with a Power-oriented therapist, unless the process by which growth is to take place is valued by the therapist and made clear and explicit. Some of the most effective Power-oriented therapists make the therapeutic process look almost like magic, and that in turn fosters anxiety or dependency in some clients, while serving as real freedom for others.

It appears that it would be desirable for a therapist to have AOC mastery of all three approaches at a high developmental level; in practice, this may not always be the case.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODEL IN USE

Four characteristics of the PDM make it broadly useful. It is: (1) nonpejorative and supportive of positive health; (2) teachable; (3) flexible, adaptable to individual needs and styles; and (4) usable at a variety of degrees of precision and sophistication. This combination of characteristics provides for an increase of behavioral options in every use made of the PDM so far.

Nonpejorative

First, the model, when used for the purpose of description, is nonpejorative; that is to say, no position or set of descriptions is intrinsically insulting or degrading. A particular location on the PDM implies certain behavioral constellations and some probable options; similarly, it renders some other options highly unlikely. Use of the model also provides a framework within which to define, describe, and pursue the acquisition of a desired set of skills or range of behavior. (When it is used in this way, the PDM functions as a formally ipsative model, the first type described on page 274.) For example, a person whose primary approach is Relationship and whose second approach is Power might well need to acquire some information-handling and process skills if he or she desired to become a senior library researcher or information broker. A military academy might benefit by providing careful instruction and practice in all three approaches, if the desired end product were responsible, appropriately autonomous, and compassionate officers like Colonel Potter on *MASH*. The expectation that healthy change is possible—and desirable—is built into the PDM.

When an adult is functioning at a less than normative level, the PDM can be used for diagnosis and prescription; here the PDM is functioning as a developmental model of the norm-based variety (see page 281). Used to provide a

taxonomy for psychopathology, the PDM has the advantage of suggesting avenues for remediation.

Teachable

Second, the PDM is teachable. Children as young as five have learned to observe the approaches at work in themselves and others; the other two dimensions of the model have been taught to a few teenagers, but are most serviceable to adults. It takes about twenty-four hours of instruction and practice for a willing adult to acquire a workable acquaintance with the PDM (Compare this, for example, with the length of time needed to understand the rules of professional football.) And, because it is so teachable, the PDM is not likely to become the property of an elite. In situations where the PDM has been taught to senior staff, the staff members themselves begin to share it with others, and the use of the model spreads.

Since the PDM is basically an umbrella model, a person's present skills can be used in conjunction with it. It is not necessary to abandon one's own intelligence or experience to use the PDM; rather, they are enhanced by increased awareness of the range of options available in a particular set of circumstances.

Training persons to use the model. In its present form and in earlier forms, the PDM has been taught to several different kinds of groups: educators, clinicians, nurses, social workers, workshop participants, private-practice clients (both individuals and families), and managers of various sorts and levels. The model is taught similarly to all of these, although the teaching examples used may vary with the interests of the group engaged in learning the PDM.

To date, apart from presentations at conferences and workshops, the PDM has been taught in four-, eight-, twelve-, sixteen-, and twenty-four-hour format. Less than twelve hours seems to leave all but the most highly motivated persons with labels whose content is more complex than it appears at first to be. With the PDM, as with many other theories (Transactional Analysis, for instance), there seems to be an initial learning stage of fascination with the utility of the taxonomy. To fail to go beyond this stage is to use the content of the PDM (or some other theory) in the structure of another, not necessarily applicable, theory.

The sixteen-hour format most often consists of three four-hour sessions a week apart, a gap of two or three weeks, and a fourth four-hour session to refine skills, answer questions, and correct misconceptions. For instance, many people initially regard their own chosen approach as more or less fully described—or more or less desirable—than the others. The span of time covered by this format seems to provide a settling-in period, during which people's view of the desirability of or emphasis on the three approaches comes into closer balance.

The twenty-four-hour format, which not surprisingly provides the highest posttraining skill level, begins with an eight-hour session, followed by three

four-hour sessions a week apart, and a follow-up session two or three weeks later. Individuals who have made use of the information presented in this format quickly acquire considerable fluency in the use of the model, and find it useful in the modification of current social practices and the development of new social practices.

These latter two formats seem to facilitate a change in frame of reference for the person learning the PDM. Those who use the material soon find themselves aware of—and devising ways to use—new options or options previously overlooked for healthy behavior, both personally and professionally. (We are not here concerned with purely personal benefits, although they appear to be substantial for some individuals; that kind of assessment must wait for a proper evaluative procedure.)

The change in frame of reference mentioned above seems to include the following elements: (a) positive expectations of self, others, and situations; (b) a sharp reduction in the use of praise-blame, approval-disapproval dimensions for assessment; (c) increased respect for self and others; and (d) increased flexibility of thought and action.

These changes are shown in interactions on the job; in less need for direct and directive supervision; in increased competence in problem-solving with respect to both persons and objects; and in increased satisfaction with the job, or effective action to change the work situation. To date, evaluation of the PDM and its teaching has consisted of participant reports. Although these are highly positive, it is clear that it would be valuable to have a more objective assessment of these outcomes.

Because the model is relatively new, I have done almost all of the teaching of it. Its other functions (diagnosis and prescription for both individuals and systems, education and parenting, communication, and others) have all been performed successfully by persons I have trained in the use of the PDM, often in ways consistent with the model which would not have occurred to me to try, and in settings where I might have questioned its applicability.

Flexible

Third, then, by clarifying likely and unlikely options, the PDM provides great flexibility for all concerned. It is difficult to maintain a helpless position when information is available about several kinds of options. Moreover, several people looking at the same situation are likely to see different healthy options, all of which may be directly derived from the PDM. Three administrators, for example, confronted with the same problem might design three radically different solutions to the problem, all workable, all consistent with the model. So, the more informed users of the PDM present in a given system, the greater the increase in behavioral options.

Versatile

Fourth, and perhaps especially valuable, the model is usable at a variety of levels of precision and sophistication. A person who uses the PDM can be still learning from it after several years, yet a five-year-old can learn to ask Uncle Ted for information, Uncle Paul for companionship, and Uncle Bill for powerful intervention with his parents. At its most effective, the PDM provides a compact way of expressing a large body of information which is useful in problem-solving, in parenting and education, in management, and in personal change, both formal (as in psychotherapy) and informal. Because of the variety of skill levels at which the PDM can be used, it is not easily used coercively or manipulatively. In order to use it for more than extremely primitive labeling, a person needs to acquire some fluency in all three basic approaches. The closer a person comes to real—and comparable—understanding of all three approaches, the more likely it is that he or she will begin to be concerned with the improvement of the quality of life for himself or herself and others.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This article contains portions of the author's dissertation, prepared for submission to The Fielding Institute in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. in clinical psychology. Acknowledgment is made of the invaluable assistance of Peter G. Ossorio, Ph.D., University of Colorado at Boulder, in clarifying the relationship of this theory to the body of his work, and refining some aspects of its relationship to other theories. *Positive-health Developmental Model*. Copyrighted 1977, 1981. Address: Consultation in Human Relations, 10645 Tancred, Denver, CO 80234.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Ossorio, P. G. *Thirty-odd principles of status dynamics*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Descriptive Psychology, Boulder, Colorado, August 1980.
2. Ossorio, P. G. *Personal change and models of personal change*. Manuscript in preparation, 1981.
3. Ossorio, P. G. Personal communication, January 11, 1981.
4. Vanderburgh, J. *Uses of the Positive-health Developmental Model in clinical and nonclinical settings*. Manuscript in preparation, 1981.

REFERENCES

- Buros, O. K. *The eighth mental measurements yearbook*. Highland Park, N. J.: Gryphon Press, 1978.
- Holt, S. B. *Appraisal and competence in moral judgment and behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1980.
- Ossorio, P. G. Outline of Descriptive Psychology for personality theory and clinical applications. In K. E. Davis (Ed.), *Advances in Descriptive Psychology* (Vol. 1). Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press,

1981. (Originally published in 1970 as LRI Report No. 4d. Whittier and Boulder: Linguistic Research Institute.)
- Ossorio, P. G. *Clinical topics* (LRI Report No. 11). Whittier and Boulder: Linguistic Research Institute, 1976.
- Ossorio, P. G. *Positive health and transcendental theories* (LRI Report No. 13). Whittier and Boulder: Linguistic Research Institute, 1977.
- Schutz, W. C. *The FIRO scales* (Rev. ed.) Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1977. (Originally published, 1957.)