

The Values Test & Assessment
THE VALUES TEST OVERVIEW
BASIC GUIDELINES for ADMINISTRATION AND INTERPRETATION

OVERVIEW:

The Values Test reflects assumptions about living and how people establish priorities. The instrument is based on Clare W. Graves' Emergent Cyclical Double-Helix Model of Adult BioPsycho-Social Systems Development, popularly called Value Systems, the Psychological Map™, the Emergent-Cyclical Model, "the Graves Theory," Differential Management, Levels of Existence Theory, and vMEMEs. The current version, along with the earlier Psychological Map™ (Forms A and B) assesses the mixture of Gravesian thinking systems the subject recognizes in him- or herself and their relative proportions: The test is self-scored and the accompanying profile can be used as an individual self-awareness tool, as a counseling device, or merged into group composites for O.D. applications.

Dr. Graves' model represents the developmental continuum of human thought with the emergence of what are now being called "MEMEs:" A meme is the psycho-social equivalent of a biological gene. They are information sets that can reproduce and spread among human populations and across generations. Memes are ways of thinking about things, the foundations of world views, and the decision structures on which value systems and ethical structures are based. Graves' original ground-breaking data identifies eight core landmark memes along with Entering and Exiting subsystems for each.

The original nomenclature reflects the interactive nature of the model. Alphabetized letter-pairs designate where in the hierarchy of complexity each system lies, as well as the combination of **Life Conditions** (LC's) in the milieu and neurological equipment which must be activated to resolve the kinds of problems such conditions present. The first 12 letters - A through M - are reserved for LC's the second twelve - N through Z - for (capacities in the human brain. Thus, "A" LC's call up least "N" capacities; "G" problems of existence require "T" ways of thinking if they are to be managed successfully. Eight core Value Systems (AN, BO, CP, DQ, ER, FS, GT, HU) are operating in today's world, with a ninth (IV) beginning to emerge at the conceptual leading-edge.

Because the letter-pairs can be confusing, we began using a color code in the late 1970's. These labels have the advantages of being simpler and removing some of the hierarchical "better than, worse than" components when discussing the model.

The color code is: BEIGE (AN - SurvivalSense), PURPLE (BO - KinSpirits), RED (CP - PowerGods), BLUE (DQ - TruthForce), ORANGE (ER - StriveDrive), GREEN (FS - HumanBond), YELLOW (GT - FlexFlow), and TURQUOISE (HU - GlobalView); the ninth will be CORAL.

The Values Test covers seven of these systems. The first and most basic Value System, AN (BEIGE), is not included because it is a pre-literate state not open to written assessment. The IV (CORAL) Value System is not yet distinct enough (1994) for viable statement design.

CONSIDERATIONS: LANGUAGE and TEMPERAMENT FACTORS

Those whose thinking is predominately in BO (PURPLE) and even CP (RED) are likely to have difficulty with the language and format of this test. Success in using it with subjects

whose base systems are in these bands depends on your skill and ability to interface with the people in a genuine, non-threatening, non-manipulative way. Generally, assessment through oral interviews and direct behavioral observation are more appropriate with tribal/mystical/clannish or tough/egocentric/aggressive people. The Values Test can be useful with at-risk populations, but recognize the need for careful monitoring and controls.

Because all tests such as this are syntactically loaded, a review of semantic choices and the reasoning behind assigning points to selections can be the most meaningful part of the experience. Since words can mean different things to different people, exploring the decision process is much more important than arguments about the stimulus phrases and their content. Look for the thinking behind choices and how points were allocated. Subjects can learn a lot by reflecting on their interpretations of statements and why they applied those meanings. You can learn a lot about the subject(s) as you observe the reasoning that goes on during these discussions and feed that back at an appropriate time.

ASSESSING the BO (PURPLE) SUB-SYSTEM

Because people operating primarily in the BO range tend to depend on oral rather than written channels, it can be argued that BO (like AN) is not open to pencil-and-paper assessment such as this; in its peak form, that is true. However, predominant BO thinking is rare in First World adult settings although PURPLE remains a strong sub-system in many of us and resurges during times of high stress such as disaster, grief, combat, violent crime, and serious illness. It is obviously a major phase in child development.

Even in individual profiles centered in the more complex levels, The Values Test picks up vestigial BO (PURPLE) ACCEPTANCE. That is because the Spiral is a continuum. People do not move from one Value System to another, but activate new Systems within their repertoires. It is a matter of proportion and predominance in the decision stack; not presence. You will find that the REJECTION data makes an even -stronger case for PURPLE as a component of everyday life as people claim distance (thus showing awareness) from these basic drives. BO (PURPLE) thinking does not go away; it is subsumed like AN beneath the complexity of more elaborate Value Systems that meet basic needs in more sophisticated ways. It is subject to reactivation if the LCs that match it return to prominence.

BO scores above the average are sometimes more a part of a generalized response to Sacrificial outer-directedness (the BO-DQ-FS-HU admixture) than mystical animism in First-World populations. They may indicate small-town upbringing, life in an inner-city block-tribe-clan, extended-family cultural norms, or certain religious preferences. In developing nations, immigrant populations, and groups where the Third-World component is still strong, BO (PURPLE) is often powerful because the B problems of existence are still immediate and pressing in the developing world.

On occasion, those who romanticize BO (PURPLE) systems from the FS (GREEN) "New Age," metaphysical chic, or similar perspectives have elevated scores on this scale because of the magical components and the spiritual connections to a close-knit group. Recognize the difference between LC's that concentrate of safety and security in a threatening, animistic world versus interest in affiliation through neo-spiritual bonds.

ASSESSING the CP SUB-SYSTEM

People whose thinking is CP-centered (RED) may not have the patience to finish the test according to instructions. Watch for check-marks in lieu of point distributions and be certain that both pages are completed. Stress anonymity and make sure that data will not be used adversely if RED is strong in the managerial group. If in doubt, do not introduce The Values Test to the population.

During his original research in the 1950's and 1960's, Dr. Graves had some difficulty convincing CP thinkers to participate in his studies. Their Expressive impulsivity interfered with the completion of any instruments which took very much of their time or revealed "secrets" about themselves. "What do I get for doing it?" was a common question. That has not changed. Do not force people to use this test unless they want to. Coerced data is garbage, anyway.

Beware of attempts at sabotage and check for incomplete or perfunctory responses if you suspect strong elements of CP in an individual or group. Reinforce instructions and remain available. Periodic "walk-arounds" sometimes help restrain CP and give BO a chance to ask questions safely. Subjects with a lot of RED are often quite intelligent and may try to "get at" the organization via the test. Once again, interviews and observations may yield better data unless you are particularly skillful at fitting the project into the needs of the CP mindset or have the support of the accepted leadership cadre.

SELF-REPORTED DATA

Since The Values Test profiles are based on self-reported data, you may wish to explore certain caveats with participants at the outset. First, people do not necessarily perceive themselves accurately. A flawed self-image can yield a distorted profile on any self-assessing instrument. An odd mood produces odd data.

Second, some people will report what they want to be, rather than what they may actually believe they are (the aspiration factor). The familiar "Halo Effect" may kick in. Finally, the situation in which the test is administered - both external/environmental and internal/biochemical - may impact on temperament variables that distort the data. We recommend that these factors be addressed prior to administering The Values Test and taken fully into account during interpretation of results. People must try and be honest with themselves; otherwise, the data is not very useful.

TYPES IN MINDS, NOT TYPES OF PEOPLE

This is a test of how people think, not what they believe. The eventual goal is to reach the level of brain processing systems that make decisions and the memes that establish parameters for ethics, morals, and purpose. This instrument is part of an effort to look at the conceptual containers that hold our values, not at the specifics of beliefs themselves. In the Gravesian view, knowing why one thinks something is much more significant than describing what one does or measuring the attitude. Make sure participants take the time to do this kind of review.

Emphasize that personalities are blends of memes - ways of thinking about things - not rigid typologies. There are no "RED's" and nobody is a "GREEN;" there are only individuals and groups who rely more or less on those systems within. Value Systems reflect the interaction of LC's (Life Conditions, or Problems/Conditions of Existence) with modes of coping that are latent in the mind/brain. Underscore the dynamic nature of people and organizations.

TEST FORMAT and ADMINISTRATION

The Values Test is on three sheets of coated NCR stock. Completing it involves three phases. The first two steps involve distributing points; the third is the scoring. On each of the top two pages are ten incomplete stimulus statements. Each is followed by seven possible completions. The stimulus statements are phrased for positive ACCEPTANCE on the blue top page and turn to negative REJECTION on the gray second page. The completion sets are identical on both sheets, with each phrased to convey one of Graves' nodal Value Systems.

Participants are to distribute 15 points among the seven possible completions on each question to indicate which best express his/her point of view. ACCEPTANCE (Like Me) is first, then REJECTION (Not Like Me). This forces a comparison of each Value System with the others. Be sure people write firmly with a sharp ball pen or pencil on a solid surface. The written point assignments must print through to the Tally Sheet (page three). Have them check for good copy before going too far. (Numbers can be copied directly to the Tally page if necessary.)

Be certain that everyone understands the requirement to use all 15 points on each question group, even though they may not be completely happy with the statements as phrased. You will hear "But I don't like any of them" and "But it's not right to choose among them." This is a forced-choice design. Respond to complaints by explaining that these are not discrete categories, but high-points along a continuum. Individuals are often mixtures and overlap is consistent with human nature. (After a bit of experience, you'll find process-based comments are excellent indicators of test results, particularly with respect to heavy DQ and FS orientations.)

For the scoring phase, the letter-pair combinations are the key. Blue ovals are for ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION points are in Gray ovals.-Have people begin with "GT Blue" and add all the points in the ten small blue GT ovals together and write the total in the middle-sized blue GT oval on the left page. Then they go to ER blue, CP blue, etc. Once the seven blue totals are complete, go to the gray and do the same. The totals for each letter-pair go in the corresponding middle-sized ovals, blue on the left page and gray on the right of the Tally Sheet.

The four largest ovals on the Tally Sheet are for cumulative EXTERNAL FOCUS SYSTEMS (add together BO, DQ, FS, and HU totals) and INTERNAL FOCUS SYSTEMS (add CP, ER, and GT) scores). Again, the blues are for ACCEPTANCE and the grays for REJECTION.

The next step is to transfer the totals from the Tally Sheet of the test to the display form, the Profile. The back of this single-fold has corresponding ovals for the eighteen totals generated on the test. The seven blue and seven gray RAW SCORES -the systems totals in the small ovals- go into the spaces across the center of the PROFILE page using the letter code. The four INTERNAL and EXTERNAL focus scores go in the large ovals at the top and bottom of the page:

If appropriate, you may wish to collect the Tally Sheets (page three) once everyone has transferred scores to their Profiles so you or a helper can tabulate group averages, highest-to-lowest score ranges, deviations, and plot other statistics. If people want their Tally Sheets back after the averages are calculated, have them write an arbitrary code - last digits of SSN, driver's license number, etc. - on the Tally page so they can retrieve them yet retain anonymity. In some organizations, people are threatened by discussing "values" and fear

reprisals if they reveal their feelings openly. Such a climate may contaminate the data if the process is not handled gracefully. However, if there is a trusting climate or The Values Test is being used in a counseling mode, simply have people write their names on the sheets for redistribution.

WHY ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION?

On the top blue page, the stimulus statements are affirmations. In this ACCEPTANCE group the participant selects completions with which he/she identifies. They are saying, "This sounds like me. This is what's important and this is how much."

The more points someone gives to statements from a particular Value System, the more significant it probably is in his/her life. Fewer points indicate less relevance. Since there are 150 points to distribute (10 questions x 15 pts. each), the maximum ACCEPTANCE score on any Value System is 150, the minimum 0. The number of points assigned each indicates the ACCEPTANCE priority, the ranking of systems within one's repertoire. This is most readily seen in the two bands of RAW SCORES across the middle of the Profile.

The second gray page is the REJECTION group. The stimulus statements here are phrased so the person reconsiders the same completions but weights them negatively, the most points going to those perceived to be most unlike the self. Again, the range is from 0 to a possible 150. The REJECTION data indicate ways of thinking with which the person does not identify, a "not like me" dimension. The assigning of points means the statements reflect Value Systems the person recognizes in the world, but then actively rejects.

There are two dimensions of interest in the REJECTION score. First, the data may indicate that the person finds the system different from his/her own way of thinking, but passes no particular judgment as to its merits, good or bad. Alternatively, the REJECTION scale can reflect a dislike and pro-active opposition to the way of thinking. That often leads to increased stress when they're dealing with people who ACCEPT the system strongly: Which of these is the case is largely a function of the system(s) one most strongly affirms on the ACCEPTANCE side and the subject's degree of OPEN or CLOSEDNESS. (One clue to CLOSEDNESS is the assignment of large blocks of points to single completions with little differentiation; i.e. many 12's or even 15's. Also look at the degree of discrimination in point spread - a few points assigned to several completions or just a couple with 5's and 10's.)

You see that ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION scores are not mutually exclusive. Subjects frequently **will** assign both ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION points to the same completions. Since the theory is about ways of thinking about things, not types of people, it is quite possible for a given Value System to be active in one aspect of living but discounted with regard to another. The point of view argues for personality as a complex blend of interacting forces. People can think about different things in different ways. Therefore, a given Value System can be appropriate to one context, but unsuited to another. Although this seeming inconsistency disturbs some participants (often Closed DQ profiles who would prefer blue and gray in perfect symmetry), understanding why it is possible becomes one of the most useful insights from The Value Test.

AVERAGES on the PROFILE SHEET

The Profile Sheet is printed in blue and gray just like the instrument itself. The 14 RAW SCORE ovals across the middle of the page indicate the relative weighting of the Value

Systems within the person's stack. (They may wish to draw it on the side.) Make sure participants understand that these total scores indicate the relative proportions of Value Systems as they assigned the 150 points in their individual profiles.

Extending vertically from the center are scales indicating average scores by percentiles. These are based on data from several hundred managers and supervisors, both from the U.S. and abroad. By plotting RAW SCORES onto these scales, the person can compare his/her score to a hypothetical "typical" participant at the 50% dotted horizontal line. Intervals on these scales are based on percentiles so they have very different ranges. For example, the 50% mid-point on the "CP Acceptance" scale is only 12 points, whereas on ER one must assign 46 to match the average. Someone will invariably ask why the scales are not all the full 150 points long. The decision only to display from the 10th to 99th percentiles was for ease of plotting and graphic clarity; they may tape on additional paper as needed!

Do not let people become confused by looking at their relative scale positions instead of comparative point totals in reading their profiles. An apparently "high" CP (RED) score of 20 as compared to the average could well be the fourth or fifth ranked in terms of the individual's RAW SCORE profile. In other words, a person's score could be markedly above the average line in a system like CP or HU, yet their dominant Value System could be somewhere else entirely.

Profiles of large First World entities will generally run within a point or two of the 50% average line. However, specialized organizations like sales teams, accounting, or counseling groups may show up quite differently from the average. These data are particularly useful in considering change, revising management systems, pay/benefit strategies, communication approaches, training methods, and motivational tactics. Although most large organizations reflect a good portion of the Value Systems spectrum, it's often possible to identify specific bands for intervention and tailored activity.

THE INTENSITY FACTOR

Having both ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION scores adds a third dimension to the data, an INTENSITY factor. This indicates the relative energy distribution among the sub-systems and their significance to the person. In a sense, it reflects how much attention the Value System gets and its impact on the overall coping repertoire. INTENSITY is the difference between ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION scores, the absolute value of the vertical spread on the Profile Sheet.

A very low INTENSITY (scores close together, both near the mid-page "0") often indicates a way of thinking that (a) has not yet developed in the person if it's toward the more complex FS, GT, HU scales, (b) has been abandoned as no longer relevant if in the less complex BO, CP, or even DQ scales, or (c) is overwhelmed by one or two very powerful Value Systems that currently dominate the person's thinking, leaving little room for other modes.

A high INTENSITY score occurs with strong ACCEPTANCE and/or very active REJECTION of a system. Another clue to high INTENSITY appears on the Profile Sheet population average scales. A number of points well beyond the 50% indicates a lot of energy focused on that system- pro, con, or both as compared to the average person. The way of thinking probably triggers strong feelings in the subject and may contain ego-involving topics.

A high INTENSITY may also show up when a system produces dissonance in the person. In such cases, both the ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION scales show large numbers of points, usually beyond the 50% line. This indicates that the way of thinking is perceived as both asset and liability. In areas of the person's life, it is appropriate and rewarded. In other contexts, it does not work effectively and may trigger punishment, either real or imagined. It is often an indicator of relatively high stress engendered by forces from within that Value System and often warrants further exploration in a counseling mode.

This kind of high energy and stress is typical of the Beta and Gamma Change States of Value Systems. At such times, the person is under pressure or in transition and experimenting with a new way of being. The direction of change is usually to greater complexity, but that is not guaranteed.

INTERNAL and EXTERNAL FOCUS SCORES

Within Graves' theory are two great families of Value Systems much like the Chinese yin and yang. In the Expressive (Internal Locus of Control) Systems - AN (BEIGE), CP (RED), ER (ORANGE), GT (YELLOW), etc. - power is within the individual. The "I" is dominant and priorities are set by the self, on one's own terms, and directed toward ends one deems important. Energy goes to gaining control of the external world and coming to survive, dominate, engineer, or understand it.

In the Sacrificial (External Locus of Control) Systems - BO (PURPLE), DQ (BLUE), FS (GREEN), HU (TURQUOISE), etc. - control is centered outside the individual. Thus, the "we" is powerful and priorities are derived from something greater than the self, a person, group, or force in which the individual is subsumed. Energy goes to understanding the inner self and finding peace of mind in the "folk," with the Truth, among the community, or as an Earthling.

These four scores are in the large ovals on the test scoring sheet and at the top and bottom of the Profile Sheet. The INTERNAL FOCUS SCORE is the total of points allocated to the three Expressive, I-oriented thinking systems. The EXTERNAL FOCUS SCORE is the total of points assigned to the four Sacrificial, we-centered thinking systems. There are FOCUS scores in both the ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION ranges.

You might think of these as the relative position of a pendulum in its arc between "me" and "we" orientations. The scores are also useful in counseling for change and development. The theory argues that Value Systems oscillate between the Inner and Outer poles, and change is usually from Sacrificial Order to Expressive Chaos and back at a higher level of complexity. In workshop and team-building contexts, comparison of similarities and differences in FOCUS provide opportunities for self-disclosure, trust-building, and preparations for change.

ANALYSIS of FOUR COMMON PATTERNS in SCORES

There are several common patterns that appear in The Values Test profiles. These examples are included as guidelines to help you in interpretation. They are not numerically precise or to scale.

ACCEPTANCE I

[1] Sharply Accepts - In this first case, the person assigns a large number of ACCEPTANCE points to ER statements while assigning that Value System only a few REJECTION

points. In such a case (and it is a common occurrence), there is a strong affirmation that the way of thinking is typical of the person and, most probably, appropriate in their world. When someone finds much about a way of thinking with which to identify, there is often relatively little negative energy attached to it. This is a zone of comfort, probably stability, and congruence.

[2] Sharply Rejects - In the second case, the person finds completions from the CP Value System to be quite apart from self-perception. Thus, many REJECTION points appear. The ACCEPTANCE score on that system is quite low. (On CP it is often 0; near-zero's are also frequent in BO and HLJ). Many people seem to have a fairly clear idea of the worldviews they accept and reject. One may hypothesize that the more someone moves toward the Closed state, the more extreme the Accept/Reject profiles will become. Note that in this example the FS Acceptance score is above the average, a profile that often rejects CP strongly.

[3a] Low Intensity (dimming) - The way of thinking seems (a) not to matter much or (b) to be over-ridden by one or two very powerful systems that consume most of their energy. There will be few points assigned in either the ACCEPTANCE or REJECTION scales of the system.

INTENSITY score; low energy is reportedly invested in that way of thinking. In the example to the left, BO may have been replaced by more complexity (also common in CP range). If that is the case, the person may fail to notice messages from that system and forget its relevance to others for whom it is still more centralized.

[3b] Low Intensity (pending) - The system may not have yet entered the person's view. When the INTENSITY score is low in the GT and/or HU scales, the Value System is likely to be addressing LC's and problems that are not relevant in the world that this person perceives. It does not mean the capacity is not present, but that the thinking has not awakened. If someone is CLOSED in the mid-range systems, the more complex thinking might not turn on without a significant or even traumatic event. If in an ARRESTED or OPEN state, it may surge once the necessary conditions appear.

[4] High Intensity (Transitional) - Finally, some people find both assets and liabilities in a way of thinking as it relates to their own world. In part of their lives, it is a positive and useful component of their being. In other parts, it is a negative element and may even engender punishment. When the INTENSITY is strong as in this FS example and both ACCEPTANCE and REJECTION are high, the system is a large energy/attention consumer. It relates to issues that are very current in the person's life. Often, this is a stress sign and an analysis of the forces involved may disclose ambivalence and/or fear generated by an Entering or Exiting state.

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS for INTERPRETATION

Here are some general observations on scores that may help you in interpretation. We find deviation of more than 10-20% from the average values is important and makes for a useful talking point with individuals. For groups, much smaller differences are significant. These comments are intended to provide a baseline for exploration of why the person selected the statements chosen, and what that may mean to the future. Remember, this instrument reflects ways of thinking about things, not types of people. Getting at the deep decision structures is the key to significant application of the model and The Values Test is only a tool to facilitate that process.

PURPLE - BO (2) -
ACCEPTANCE

- Person may be from a small town (tribal) past, or ethnic neighborhood in a large city.
- Often continues to go to class reunions and maintains extended family bonds.
- Some sub-cultures produce strong BO views of marriage and family issues. High BO scores may come out of this commitment to the home and extended family or even a very ritualized religion.
- Occasionally, people from tribal/animistic cultures will be found reflecting a genuine BO worldview. In Third-World populations and recent immigrants, high BO scores are commonplace.
- In First-World groups, elevated BO scores generally are a mix of Sacrificial systems, BO/DQ/FS.
- DQ authority figures may be "guru-ized" or mystified.
- FS New Age types pick up on the spirituality, shamanic elements, and groupness of BO thinking.

REJECTION

This is a very common place to put a lot of the 150 REJECTION points.

- Many people, particularly in the world of business and management, find Animistic/Magical thinking to be quite far from their perceived self-images.
- It is not until they begin to look at fantasy, emotion, superstition, and the fears in their own holy-of-holies that BO becomes clearly a part of their living.
- The expressed themes often rejected are dependency, magic, and reliance on spirits.
- This Value System is very close to nature's forces and "high-tech" thinkers have lost touch with it for the most part.
- People with high rejection scores may have real difficulty managing those who operate strongly in this way, often simply ignoring the B Conditions and Goals.
- This can be particularly troubling in multinational companies which employ a wide range of personnel.
- US managers may not recognize some of the vital BO needs and mystical concerns, particularly as an essential developmental stage for children.
- One who strongly rejects BO may also have moved out of it as a predominating system earlier in life,
- now busy proving how dysfunctional BO is.
- Such people may find it hard to fulfill the "chieftain" role necessary at this stage of child development and social evolution.

RED - CP (3) -

ACCEPTANCE

- Person may be angry or have been so during administration of the instrument so the elevated CP score indicates emotional content rather than thinking systems.
- Elevated CP scores often mark extreme frustration and the need to strike out.
- Beware of games on the part of clever people trying to "play with" the situation and read that data.
- Some people find themselves in win/lose adversarial predicaments where the CP world is what is.

- Although more common in "blue-collar" than "white-collar" work, the tough-guy style runs the gamut of organizational life.
- In street culture and populations from emerging nations with a large BO sub-system, high CP scores are frequent.
- These may not include anger; instead, they often reflect a keen awareness of what's appropriate behavior for the conditions at hand in a dog-eat-dog situation.
- This highly egocentric mode often masks high intelligence and keen insight.
- Sometimes CP-dominance is punished for nonconformity and that only validates the world view.
- Expect a strong, even inflated, self-concept and ego-defensive posturing if under perceived attack.

REJECTION

- The rejection of CP consistently gets more points than any place on the scale.
- Often interpreted as a "bad" or negative aspect of personality, even though it is an essential component of a healthy self-image and an appropriate means of coping with aggression-filled situations.
- Many people need to feel that this raw egocentrism is very unlike themselves, antithetical to their own moral codes and value systems.
- On reflection, many who reject CP strongly begin to see it in themselves in particular contexts, particularly if asked to recall the last time they were angry and "lost it" or felt true indignation and acted out.
- Pressure and stress may engender CP responses, and most of us have a "hot button" or two we prefer to deny.
- Much of contemporary religion is rooted in the transition out of CP toward unified complexity, so it's consistent that many participants want to dissociate from it.
- Lower than average Rejection scores often indicate one who has experienced CP strongly in the past and come to deal with it.
- This person may find dealing with P behaviors relatively easy and may help predominantly CP thinkers to be productive.

BLUE - DQ (4) - *ACCEPTANCE*

- Very common among people from highly structured environments.
- Theologies of fundamentalist Christianity or Islam, as well as old-line Catholicism and Orthodox Judaism often lead to higher DQ scores.
- Also common in rather staid bureaucracies where maintaining status quo is priority and obedient constancy rewarded.
- People who've had extensive time in the military some times exhibit elevated DQ, though this is no certainty.
- Involvement in Scouting and community volunteer programs are also fairly common where duty and obedience to authority are driving forces.
- Tends to focus on stability and preparations for the future, insurance, retirement, and indebtedness.
- Do not like change or uncertainty, concentrating on a consistent higher purpose in living that guarantees stability forever.
- Respects chains of command and responds to information from righteous higher authority.
- Prefers documentation and proof-reads carefully, even nit-picky.

REJECTION

- Rejection of DQ is often based in a negative experience with a highly structured person or rigid system.
- Look for rejection of content (obedience, regimentation, absolutes) rather than the systems itself.
- People who have been punished by DQ or feel stifled by a closed bureaucracy may try to move away from it by putting a lot of negative points into this system.
- Similarly, those who are moving from DQ toward ER often project to the next system by stepping hard upon the previous one.
- On occasion, the "protest too much" pattern appears and the high Rejection score actually shows a closed-mindedness about specific word choices in the test that are "impure" or "not right."
- Some of the DQ statements are loaded to very mainstream content and will not be appropriate to some religious or philosophical frameworks.
- Although one may think in absolutes, they may reject statements because of their particular themes.
- DQ tends to be literalist and thinks in dichotomies.
- Indicates a preference away from black-and-white without gray areas and toward some other perspective.
- Frustration with a status quo produces elevated Rejection.
-

ORANGE - ER (5)

ACCEPTANCE

- An entrepreneurial and option-oriented mindset which looks to grow, emerge, and improve with time.
- High scores usually reflect an awareness of economic factors and political issues in decision-making processes.
- Becoming more common in women as competitiveness and self-centeredness increase.
- This person may be frustrated with heavily structured systems, viewing them as unnecessary restraints on progress.
- The drive to move-and-shake and exercise influence will be strong, though may be concealed rather than overtly displayed.
- There's a bit of the gambler and risk-taker in someone with a high ER score.
- The person will often state a deep concern for the well-being of others, but usually admits to a me-first philosophy wherein good deeds usually bring reward back to the self, now or later.
- Elevated ER is common in sales and politics for those who prefer maneuvering for a "piece-of-the-action" on commission instead of a fixed salary.
- On the rise in the former USSR, particularly Russia, and E. Europe; surging in South Africa.

REJECTION

- High scores on ER rejection indicate discomfort with entrepreneurship, competition, and materialism.
- Those who are largely sacrificial thinkers find the I-orientation distasteful, perhaps evil.

- It often sounds mercenary and self-centered which is inappropriate for many DQ/FS theologies.
- One who is entering FS often rejects the ER past as the new way of thinking opens up and stabilizes with a new outer focus.
- Stability-seeking DQ people reject ER because it threatens the status quo and challenges righteous authority.
- Since ER involves risk taking, those not liking to take chances or who focus on safety find it very unlike themselves.
- In organizations moving from DQ toward ER, the "old hands" often reject ER as a means of rejecting the new order and change they don't understand but can't fight any longer.
- People with a broader perspective often report that the ER focus on achievement and relatively short term results frustrates them and precludes action of a larger vision.

GREEN - FS (6) - *ACCEPTANCE*

- Those choosing a lot of FS statements claim attentiveness to human concerns and feelings.
- Some of this emerges from the Judeo-Christian tradition of "love thy neighbor" though many other philosophies promote the egalitarian, humanitarian appreciation of living in "the now."
- Strong among those who've moved away from ideology toward a humanist bent and embrace a liberation theology or communitarian political model (beware of DQ thinking with FS contents).
- This person puts people issues ahead of schedules and production, sometimes ignoring rules in favor of perceived human benefits and getting along takes precedence over getting ahead.
- Priorities tend to be based on the feelings and situation at hand, rather than uniform standards or long term functional success.
- There is a lot of ambiguity in FS, and sometimes a difficulty in "nailing down" specifics.
- Groups are a common part of FS living, and there is likely a lot of interpersonal involvement.
- Consensus-building and well-being for all take up a lot of this person's time.
- Specificity in language is often difficult for strong FS because the relativism of thinking makes forced choosing of particular words difficult.
- Tends to like metaphor and abstract symbolism which romanticizes the BO way of being.

REJECTION

- FS is frequently rejected when people see it as a bleeding-heart, welfare state, socialistic, paternalistic model and equate the thinking with a political situation.
- Those who like to see themselves as self-sufficient and tough may dump on FS as being soft.
- Similarly, strong ER people may perceive the FS way of thinking as ambiguous, undirected, and standing in the way of progress.
- Those who can't see its sacrifice-for-us-all-to-prosper-together side believe it costs too much.
- Managers in many organizations, particularly in government, report that concern for people is a negative trait.

- They separate themselves from FS since they see it as a force that interferes with either "fair" or "realistic" management and calls for interpersonal competencies they may not have developed.
- This way of thinking may even be perceived as weakness or "give-away."
- Some people believe that having or displaying feelings is inappropriate.
- Look for a preference for favor self-control, autonomy, and strength.
- Sometimes draws fire from DQ because of the perceived "New Age" aspects (only a manifestation of FS, not the system) that step away from doctrine and foster humanistic approaches.

•
YELLOW - GT (7) -

ACCEPTANCE

- This person tends to be a curious loner, though usually capable of working in functional groups; they drop out of useless pro forma ones.
- The self-perception is often of intelligence, flexibility, and willingness to roll-with-the-flow.
- The themes of responding to one's own drummer and basing actions on personal, internalized principles ring clear.
- May express discomfort at over-simplified models and failure to recognize the true complexity at hand, yet tends to integrate differences.
- Sometimes, people who select lots of GT statements have a very strong sense of individual competence and self-worth, becoming arrogance and smug high-handedness in its negative forms.
- May have difficulty investing time in dealing with those having simpler world-views and become impatient with routines.
- There is a tendency to let others "do their own thing" as long as it does not appear harmful.
- Not driven by fear, loss of status, compulsiveness, threats of rejection, or other negative motivators.
- A high GT score often indicates one who dabbles in many arenas and has many interests.
- This is likely a person with diverse and seemingly unrelated competencies that eventually connect.
- It will be difficult to establish just what priorities really are as they frequently shift.

REJECTION

- Rejection of GT may come out of discomfort with the uncertainty and apparent chaos acceptable in this way of thinking.
- The statements lack the clear-cut answers of some of the others and the ambiguity theme is strong.
- Many people have never confronted the G Conditions, much less developed T behaviors.
- They can very honestly say that this is the most unlike themselves, not out of ignorance but from lack of experience at this level of complexity.
- Occasionally, points are assigned here to reject persons who have given the subject problems by introducing confusion or perceived disrespect.

- GT is often seen as a threat when it challenges and questions, so it gets a lot of rejection points out of anger and confusion with CP aggressive egocentrism.
- High rejection scores on this scale are relatively unusual and may suggest a particular relationship more than a general distaste.
- As the eighth system strengthens and GT becomes commonplace, activity at this end of the scale will increase.
- As FS enters GT, high Intensity scores are not unusual because the move to Second Tier thinking is stressful and energizing at the same time.
- Both Acceptance and Rejection increase with the move into this complex way of scarcity-based thinking with higher degrees of freedom but fewer absolutes.

TURQUOISE - HU (8) - *ACCEPTANCE*

- Look carefully for FS or even DQ which thinks it is HU because of the right words (not way of thinking).
- This is the most recently-emerged Sacrificial thinking and ought to carry themes of holism, interconnections, and ordered collective sacrifice for the good of living systems.
- It takes the view that Earth is a single living organism and that certain prices must be paid for all life to continue.
- People assigning many points to HU tend to be conceptual and a bit esoteric.
- Common choices for those in the advanced sciences, R & D, theologians, and others whose experience leads to a global villager perspective.
- There is often a powerful spirituality and a search for meaning and purpose in existence, but without dogma or doctrine.
- Expect comfort with the metaphysical without many of the "flaky" components of FS or show-off ER.
- Actual HU thinking is globalistic, extending across politics, religions, and vested interests.
- There is expansive awareness of broad concerns, though there may be no focused action without a strong supporting group.
- Learning is experiential and there seems to be a lot of intuitive data-gathering.
- Expect interest in alternative consciousness and activating more brain capacities, but not competition or flaunting of buzz-words.

REJECTION

- Common for many subjects, as this global view of existence has not yet dawned for them as relevant.
- The statements convey an abstractness and ambiguity that many people find distressing and confusingly vague.
- The wording of these statements is still quite a problem as a common language for this world view is not yet commonplace outside the jargon of particular disciplines.
- It is honest for most people to find this Sacrificial way of thinking unlike themselves or simply not to recognize it with a low Intensity score.
- Even those who put a lot of points here probably do so from aspiring FS as much as actualized HU.

- Don't let people confuse HU with New Age - that is just a phenomenon of er/FS - or New World Order which is just ER's vision of a global marketplace.
- People who are in rigid DQ systems often reject the non-dogmatic, uncertain nature of HU holistic orderliness through the apparent chaos.
- Similarly, the breach with nationalism and competitive drives is disturbing to many.
- Many religious traditions speak to the H conditions, but the activation of U systems and the integration of HU as a package is still only beginning.

BEHAVIORAL TRENDS as SCORES SHIFT

PURPLE B-O Level 2

LOWER »»»»»» ACCEPTANCE»»»»»» HIGHER

Need for safety and close-knit group Attachment to place/group of origin Need for reassurance and approval from boss One-on-one marriage bond and tight family Concern with mysticism, signs, and omens Attachment to tradition and ancestral ways

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION«««««« LOWER

Disregards spirits, magic, demons Expect action without frequent reassurance Does not depend on ancestral ways and tradition Uncomfortable being depended on as chief Assumes immediate needs will be met and safety assured Moves out of small protective groups and close bonding

RED- C-P Level 3:.....

LOWER »»»»»» ACCEPTANCE»»»»»» HIGHER

Concerned with personal power and control Reacts against being dominated or put down by others Lives for immediate gratification and here-and-now payoffs Sees strength and assertiveness as ways for living Relishes independent action without close supervision Acts to support image, reputation, and personal respect

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION «««««« LOWER

Opposed to impulsive and guilt-free behavior Not focused on self in a tough/macho context May have difficulty dealing with strong confrontation Heavy rejection often comes from strong DQ or FS viewpoints Rejects simple win/lose based on physical power or strength Uncomfortable with very assertive language or behavior

BLUE D-Q Level 4

LOWER »»»»»» ACCEPTANCE »»»»»» HIGHER

Identifies with search for purpose and meaning Prefers structure under objective rules and laws Respects directives from rightful higher authority Controlled by a higher power center external to the self Focuses on discipline, order, and behaving "the right" way Often involved in sacrifice of time/energy for greater good

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION «««««« LOWER

Tends to focus energy more expressively into the self May not vest power in higher authority, rank, or position Rejects dichotomous thinking based on policy or regulations May see structure as a restraint to personal freedom or progress Finds identity through reference other than like-believers Can reflect a reaction to an overly structured environment

ORANGE E-R Level 5.....

LOWER »»»»»» ACCEPTANCE»»»»»» HIGHER

Concern with progress, growth, and opportunities for the future Weighs options looking to maximize results and benefits

Tends to be entrepreneurial with many "irons in the fire". Is attuned to signs of material success and prosperity Sees organizations as means to ends, not ends themselves Views rules as open to pragmatic change to get results

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION «««««« LOWER

Uncomfortable with competitive marketplace environments Finds non-immediate material rewards less important May focus more on Sacrificial purpose than risk-taking to advance Considers economic basis for decisions less relevant Concerns with productivity and bottom-line results diminished Unwilling/unable to wheel-and-deal to achieve goals

GREEN F-S Level6.....

LOWER »»»»»» ACCEPTANCE»»»»»» HIGHER Decides issues based on experience and immediate senses Concerned with consensus and human factors Values feelings and quality of organizational climate Tuned-in to affect and moods as high priorities Adjusts time to fit perceived needs of people/situation Looks for greater purpose in living among equals

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION«««««« LOWER

Often feel people-factors intrude on production and add costs Prefers more specifics than the free-floating FS way May be uncomfortable in group settings and consensus mode Rejects the egalitarian view, looking for differences Considers displays of emotion inappropriate in context Expects people to be responsible for self and to contribute

YELLOW G-T Level 7

LOWER »»»»»»»» ACCEPTANCE»»»»»»»» HIGHER

Tries to enhance personal quality of being by learning more Looks for diversity and control of choices to keep interest Concerned with wide-spread and/or long-term implications Life based on internalized principles and self-generated drives Tends to survey forests more than tally up trees Sees rules as part of a broader system where function matters most

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION «««««« LOWER

Uncomfortable with the responsibilities of being a "free-spirit" May prefer a strong source of control external to the self Needs more certainty than the chaotic, random GT involves Finds similarity to CP if G Conditions aren't perceived Distaste for the free-choice and extent of individual control More comfortable in a less complex and ambiguous world

TURQUOISE H-U Leve18.....

LOWER »»»»»»»»»» ACCEPTANCE»»»»»»»»»» HIGHER

Concern with whole-Earth issues and broad movements Sacrificial and spiritually involved with the metaphysical Deals with abstract and conceptual matters comfortably Sees self as citizen of world more than member of narrow class Adds a flexible, questioning dimension to DQ doctrine and FS humanism Probably involved with a narrow social circle or seen as "odd"

HIGHER «««««« REJECTION«««««« LOWER

Zone of discomfort with broad scale concerns and wide focus Often prefers more specificity and cut-and-dried answers May never have thought about globalism or trans-national issues Finds threat in non-commitment or apparently vague goals Ethnocentric focus may preclude willingness to explore globalism Many people have never confronted H-level existence problems