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Even though the area of transpersonal psychology has been gaining
attention over the last twenty-five years, considerable debate re­
garding its scientific validity, pragmatic value and relationship to
humanistic psychology has arisen (e.g., Bugental, 1972; Ellis,
Rowan, 1989; Schneider, 1987, 1989; Walsh, 1989; Wilber, 1989a,
1989b, 1989c, 1989d). Many of the problems mentioned in the
literature cited above can be traced to the commonly acknowledged
difficulty of utilizing conventional scientific and epistemological
methodologies to a) generate any valid and reliable knowledge
about transpersonal states of consciousness and b) validate the
constructs proposed by the increasing variety of transpersonal
theories developed to explain such experiences (e.g., Grof, 1985;
ulty has been largely interpreted by mainstream psychologies as
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reflecting the unscientific and hence unreal nature of transpersonal states of consciousness, proponents within the movement (e.g., Grof, 1985; Walsh & Vaughan, 1991; Wilber, 1990) credit the apparent trans-verbal, trans-rational, and trans-egoic nature of these experiences for the fact that they cannot be adequately studied or even understood through the use of traditional methodologies. For example, Wilber (1990) has stated that due to the nature of transpersonal experiences, they

... are no longer in the realm of intelligibilia but transcendelia and accordingly, when the data of transcendelia are put into verbal or phenomenological form, not only is the essence of the apprehension obscured or even lost, it tends to degenerate into contradictory or paradoxical statements (p. 74).

Wilber contends that the only means of acquiring valid knowledge about transpersonal states of consciousness is through the experience of them, a point which has been recognized by others (e.g., Frank, 1977). Moreover, the difficulty of applying science to the spiritual domain has been identified as creating a notable constraint on the understanding and validation of transpersonal theory and the development of transpersonal psychology as a science (Walsh & Vaughan, 1991).

The authors of the current paper are in general agreement with the transpersonal movement regarding the ineffability of transpersonal states of consciousness and the shortcomings of conventional science to produce any valid knowledge about them. However, we contend that while there are formidable barriers to the use of conventional research methodologies to understand transpersonal experience per se, it is less difficult for researchers to apply both qualitative and quantitative research methods to the development of transpersonal theory and to the operationalization and verification of testable hypotheses and concepts derived from such theory. Examples of this can be found in the literature (e.g., see Thomas, Brewer, Kraus & Rosen, 1993). Given that empirical knowledge regarding such areas as the impact of transpersonal experience on identity, lifestyle, relationships, personal philosophy and motivation (White, 1973) has been described as notably deficient (Walsh & Vaughan, 1991), we argue that it would be prudent to attempt to provide empirical evidence through every acceptable means available (e.g., qualitative and quantitative methods) to support predictions about behavior and self-perception derived from transpersonal theory.

To this end, we are in agreement with Friedman (1983) who asserts that "the development of adequate measures of transpersonal concepts is a major requirement if empirical work is to proceed in the field of transpersonal psychology" (p. 37). We propose that despite
the problems of objective tests, the development of psychometric measures is desirable for transpersonal psychology. Such instruments would allow for the standardized empirical examination and verification of transpersonal concepts in a manner which, due primarily to their pragmatic advantages (e.g., ease of administration to large groups; do not require a great deal of methodological expertise to use for the generation of useful data), would lend for the rapid development of a cumulative body of knowledge about the transpersonal dimension; knowledge which could also be readily compared to other areas of psychology that have traditionally relied on the use of standardized tests (e.g., personality, psychopathology).

It is important to add that we are not advocating the superiority of conventional quantitative methodologies over qualitative approaches for the study of the transpersonal domain. Similarly, we are not advancing the position that standardized measures are a better approach to verifying transpersonal theory than is, for example, the phenomenological method (e.g., Patrik, 1994; Walsh, 1993). Instead, we simply put forth that objective testing should receive more serious and systematic attention for transpersonal research than it has and that it should be viewed as an adjunct to existing research methods for the study of the transpersonal domain.

Examination of the existing literature reveals that there are a surprising number of standardized self-report measures which could be used in transpersonally oriented research (see MacDonald, LeClair, Holland & Alter, 1993). For example, several inventories have been developed to assess the extent to which a person has had a mystical, peak, or spiritual experience, including the Mystical Experience Scale (Hood, 1975), the Peak Scale (Mathes, Zevon, Rater & Joerger, 1982), the Spiritual Orientation Inventory (Elkins, Hedstrom, Hughes, Leaf & Saunders, 1988) and the Index of Core Spiritual Experience (Kass, Friedman, Leserman, Zuttermeister & Benson, 1991). There are also other measures which assess transpersonal orientations and belief systems, such as the East-West Questionnaire (Gilgen & Cho, 1979), the Holistic Living Inventory (Stoudenmire, Batman, Pavlov & Temple, 1985), the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972), and the Transpersonal Orientation to Learning (Shapiro & Fitzgerald, 1989). However, none of these measures have been systematically used in any transpersonal research and most of them have been marginally developed and validated. Also, given the centrality that the notion of identity and the process of identification are accorded in virtually all transpersonal theories (e.g., see Walsh & Vaughan, 1991), it is remarkably difficult to find a measure which operationalizes aspects of identity from a transpersonal perspective. To date, there are only two measures, namely, the self-transcendence
The self-concept is measurable scale on the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI; Cloninger, Svrakic & Przybeck, 1993), and the Self Expansiveness Level Form (SELF; Friedman, 1983). The authors of this paper assert that it would prove valuable to the transpersonal area to have a well developed and validated measure of transpersonal identity because it would allow for the examination of the relationship to more conventional psychological constructs and for the verification of predictions about an individual's identity which are generated from transpersonal theory. For this purpose, the present study focused on the SELF.

Generally stated, the SELF is a measure of self-concept which has been developed using a strategy referred to by Friedman (1983, p. 37) as "psychological cartography". Friedman begins by making a distinction between the Self and the self-concept. He contends that the Self (i.e., the fundamental nature of identity, consciousness and reality put forth by transpersonal theories and the mystical world view which transcends not only the differentiation of self from not-self but all distinctions) is the ground or territory from which the self-concept is derived. Though the Self is itself "invariant and unmeasurable" (Friedman, 1983, p. 38), the self-concept, defined as that which is consciously experienced as forming an individual's personal identity, is measurable. Using Sampson's (1978) notion of internal versus external locus of identity and Shostrom's (1963) temporal dimension of self-concept, which views self-identity varying on the basis of present-centeredness versus a past or future orientation, Friedman (1983) developed a spatial-temporal cartography of self-concept that maps out the area of the Self which is contained within the boundaries of an individual's sense of self in terms of both a past, present or future time orientation and a contracted or expanded spatial orientation. From this, Friedman devised the concept of self-expansiveness which is "the amount of the true self, or the universe of possibilities, which is contained within the boundary demarcating self from non-self through the process of self-conception" (Friedman, 1983, p. 39). In consideration of the above, the SELF can be understood as a measure of self-concept expansiveness which assesses individual differences in self-concept in terms of temporality (or the extent to which a given individual uses past, present and future in their definition of self) and space (or the extent to which a person uses a contracted-e.g., I am the atoms of my body c-or enlarged-e.g., I am the ocean spatial sense).

Extrapolating from his spatial and temporal dimensions which he views as "orthogonally positioned in a two-dimensional space, extending away from their point of intersection in two directions" (Friedman, 1983, p. 39), Friedman conceptualized three levels of self-expansiveness which he labelled the personal, middle and transpersonal. The personal level, seen by Friedman (1983) as the
point of intersection between the temporal and spatial dimensions, involves identification with aspects of reality which are normally considered to be part of an individual's self concept. In relation to the spatial-temporal cartography, the personal level can be understood as the "here-and-now" of the individual (Friedman, 1983, p.39).

Alternatively, the transpersonal level of self-concept involves an "extension of the self-concept sufficiently beyond the here-and-now, such that there is a dissolution of the individual's perception of self as an isolated biosystem existing only in the present time" (Friedman, 1983, p. 39). The transpersonal level concerns the extent to which respondents identify with aspects of reality that are considered outside the normal self-concept and which involve extensions of an individual's self-concept into past and/or future time orientations and contracted or expanded spatial orientations.

Friedman (1983) never made an effort to establish the meaning of the middle level, focusing virtually all of this attention on the personal and transpersonal levels alone. Despite this, and given Friedman's spatial-temporal cartography, the middle level can be understood as encompassing aspects of self-concept which have some aspects of spatial-temporal expansiveness but are not expanded to the point which results in the dissolution of separate egoic identity. Thus, self-concept on the middle level could include objects which represent a mildly contracted or expanded spatial sense, as reflected in identification with body parts, movements or gestures (e.g., I am my hand, I am my facial expressions) or with social roles and relationships (e.g., I am my social behaviors). Similarly, the middle level would encompass self-concepts which include identification with memories of one's life and/or plans for expectations regarding the future (i.e., aspects of a past and/or future temporal orientation to self-identity).

Friedman (1983) utilized his three level conception of self-expansiveness to develop an eighteen item self-report inventory, made up of three subscales, each one corresponding to a level of self-expansiveness, which he found to have satisfactory reliability and validity (see Measures section). Outside of Friedman (1983), no research has been done utilizing the SELF. The SELF in its totality can be found in Table 1.

The purpose of this paper was to examine the Self Expansiveness Level Form (SELF; Friedman, 1983) both in terms of its reliability and validity and in its relation to two major measures of personality, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Briggs & Myers, 1987), and the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI; Costa & McCrae, 1985). The present investigation has taken the form of two studies. In both, we attempt to assess the reliability of the
Each of us has a unique sense of who we are, our conception of self or identity. The following concepts could possibly describe a person's view of themselves. The purpose of this questionnaire is to explore the degree of willingness you have in using each of these concepts to describe yourself. Using the scale below, carefully consider each concept and choose the letter which best expresses your willingness to use that concept as an answer to the question, "WHO AM I?" Write that letter to the left of the concept in the space provided. There are no right or wrong answers and you are requested to answer on the basis of your own experiences and beliefs, not just on the basis of logic. Take your time and feel free to go back and change your answers. If you have trouble deciding any of these, please make your best choice and do not leave any unanswered.

A  VERY WILLING TO USE TO DESCRIBE MY SENSE OF SELF OR IDENTITY
B  SOMEWHAT WILLING
C  NEITHER WILLING NOR UNWILLING
D  SOMEWHAT UNWILLING
E  VERY UNWILLING TO USE TO DESCRIBE MY SENSE OF SELF OR IDENTITY

1. My emotions and feelings as experienced in the present. (Personal Level)
2. Thoughts and feelings I experienced as a child. (Middle Level, Past Temporal)
3. The unique individual that I am in the present. (Personal)
4. The social relationships which I experience. (Middle Level, Enlarged Spatial)
5. The way I behaved in living my life as a child. (Middle Level, Past Temporal)
6. Experiences of all life forms of which I am one. (Transpersonal Level, Enlarged Spatial)
7. Sensations from parts of my body, such as my heart, that I experience. (Middle Level, Contracted Spatial)
8. The way I behave in living my life in the present. (Personal Level)
9. Future happenings which I will experience. (Middle Level, Future Temporal)
10. My thoughts and ideas as experienced in the present. (Personal Level)
11. The way I will behave in living my life in the future. (Middle Level, Future Temporal)
12. The individual atoms of my body. (Transpersonal Level, Contracted Spatial)
13. The physical surroundings which have an influence on my behavior. (Middle Level, Enlarged Spatial)
14. All that happened before my lifetime which has in some way influenced me. (Transpersonal Level, Past Temporal)
15. The behavior of parts of my body, such as my facial expressions. (Middle Level, Contracted Spatial)
16. My attitudes and values in the present. (Personal Level)
17. The entire universe beyond time which is me in an ultimate sense. (Global Transpersonal Level)
18. The beings who might descend from me in the distant future who may not have human form. (Transpersonal Level, Future Temporal)

Note. The scales to which each of the SELF items belong are indicated in parentheses.
SELF via interitem consistency and test-retest reliability. Both studies also examine factorial validity and the relationship of the SELF to sex and age. It was generally expected that the SELF would produce satisfactory reliability and factorial validity. Moreover, we expected that sex and age would not meaningfully relate to the SELF subscales. Specific to study one, we examined the relationship of the SELF to a measure of ego dysfunction called the Ego Grasping Orientation (EGO; Knoblauch & Falconer, 1986). Conversely, in study two, we investigated the relationship of the SELF to a non-pathological measure of social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, an inventory designed to assess Jung's (1971) theory of personality types, and the NEO Personality Inventory, a measure which is founded on a five factor model of trait personality (Digman & Inouye, 1986; McCrae & Costa, 1987; Norman, 1963) and claimed to be the most complete and comprehensive measure of normal personality currently available (Costa & McCrae, 1985; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Given that the personal subscale is supposed to be assessing more conventional aspects of identity, we generally expected to find a number of significant relationships between the personal subscale, and the EGO, MBTI, and social desirability. Alternatively, taking in consideration that a) the transpersonal subscale is supposed to assess aspects of identity which extend beyond the usual limits of the self-concept, and b) the contention in the transpersonal literature that identity can extend beyond personality (i.e., people are capable of identifying with objects normally considered to be outside of personality; e.g., Walsh & Vaughan, 1980, 1991; Wilber, 1977, 1978), we did not expect the SELF transpersonal subscale to obtain any notable relationships with the scales of the MBTI and the NEO-PI nor with the EGO and social desirability.

STUDY ONE: METHOD

Subjects

Subjects consisted of 142 undergraduate students (48 males, 94 females) at the University of Windsor in the Fall 1989 semester who volunteered to participate based upon written informed consent. The mean age was 24.9 years. The ages ranged from 18 to 67 years.

Measures

Self Expansiveness Level Form (SELF: Friedman, 1983). The SELF is a paper and pencil test which consists of eighteen randomly ordered self-descriptive statements that are rated by an
examinee on a five-point Likert scale for the degree of willingness of the examinee to identify with the test items. The general concept that the SELF is designed to assess is self-expansiveness, which has been operationalized as three distinct levels based upon a spatial-temporal cartography of self-concept. The three levels are the personal, middle and transpersonal. Each level of self-concept corresponds to a subscale on the SELF.

The personal subscale, made up of five items, was included to assess the degree of identification that a person has with the here-and-now level of the self. Friedman (1983) states that the personal subscale can best be understood as measuring Western conceptions of positive mental health. The transpersonal subscale, also consisting of five items, was designed to assess a person's "degree of identification with aspects of reality beyond that which is ordinarily conceived as being part of the individual" (Friedman, 1983, p. 40). Further stated, the transpersonal subscale assesses the extent to which an individual's self-concept extends beyond the here-and-now to the point where identity transcends normal egoic consciousness. Four of the five items of the transpersonal subscale are used to operationalize the extremes of Friedman's spatial and temporal dimensions (e.g., contracted and expanded spatial; past and present temporal). One item was designed as a global indicator of transpersonal identity. The middle subscale, made up of eight items, is said to serve as a bridge between the personal and transpersonal levels of self-expansiveness and can be understood as tapping aspects of the self-concept which go beyond the here-and-now but which do not result in the dissolution of a person's sense of separate self. This would include such potential aspects of identity as identification with the body, past and future behaviors, and social interactions. Two items are used to operationalize each of the directions of the spatial-temporal dimensions of self-concept. Friedman (1983) states that research into the meaning of the middle subscale has been minimal, though he suspects that it may have potential value. The middle subscale was included primarily to increase the overall face validity of the SELF (i.e., even though specific knowledge of what the middle scale assesses is not available, the inclusion of its items gives the SELF the greater appearance as being a measure of something valid; see Anastasi [1988] for a discussion of face validity).

In terms of its known psychometric properties, Friedman (1983) did a number of analyses focusing on the personal and transpersonal subscales. With reference to reliability, the SELF has demonstrated good interitem consistency as was manifested in Spearman-Brown reliability coefficients of .81 and .78 for the personal subscale and .66 and .68 for the transpersonal subscale. Test-retest reliability completed over a two-week period has also been shown
to be adequate with the personal and transpersonal subscales obtaining correlations of .83 and .80, respectively.

The validity of the SELF was examined by Friedman (1983) using a variety of techniques, all of which have resulted in favorable support for the test. In terms of convergent validity, the transpersonal subscale has been significantly correlated to the Mystical Experiences Scale (Hood, 1975). The personal subscale has been significantly correlated to the Time Competence Scale and the Inner Supports Scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1963), and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) Total Positive Score and the Self-Description Inventory Total Score.

Turning to discriminant validity, the relationships between the personal and transpersonal subscales and a range of measures including age, sex, intelligence, social desirability and a number of measures of response style on the Tennessee Self Concept scale, have been examined. The only significant correlations that were obtained existed between the transpersonal subscale and age and a measure of response style, and the personal subscale and age. In terms of known groups validation, the personal and transpersonal subscales were able to differentiate a student group from a yoga group. Moreover, the transpersonal subscale was able to differentiate a student group from a group consisting of members of the Association for Transpersonal Psychology. Criterion validity has also been shown to be satisfactory as was indicated by significant correlations found between personal and transpersonal subscale scores and a yoga teacher's ratings of transpersonal realization found in a group of yoga students. Lastly, Friedman (1983) performed two principal components analyses on SELF scores obtained from two student groups. In both analyses, Friedman found six factors. In the first analysis, no clear subscale factors emerged, though all personal subscale items loaded heaviest on the first factor. In the second analysis, all personal subscale items loaded heaviest on the first factor, while all but one of the transpersonal subscale items loaded heaviest on the second factor.

*The Ego Grasping Orientation (ego; Knoblauch & Falconer, 1986).* The EGO is a measure of Taoist orientation which assesses ego grasping, a construct defined as "a dualistic stance that is marked by the person's attempts to make things more positive while striving to eliminate the negative aspects of human experience" (Knoblauch, 1985, p. 55). Knoblauch (1985) has further stated that an individual high in ego grasping would, according to the Taoist perspective, be highly motivated by egoic idealism and ego centeredness. The EGO takes the form of a twenty-item true false questionnaire that is scored in the direction of ego grasping.
Test takers are required to read each item and determine if the statement is true or false as applied to themselves. The greater the EGO score, the greater the ego grasping by the individual.

In terms of its assessed psychometric properties, the EGO has demonstrated good interitem consistency as is evidenced in coefficient alphas of .81 and .82. The EGO has also been correlated to ten measures based on conventional Western conceptions of personality and psychopathology. Significant positive correlations were obtained between the EGO and the Beck Mood Inventory (Beck, 1978), the Depression Proneness Inventory, the Dysthymic Scale (Depue et al., 1981), the Cyclothymic scale, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory [trait anxiety only] (Spielberger, 1983), and the Repression Sensitization Scale (Byrne, 1964). Significant negative correlations were obtained between the EGO and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), the Socialization scale of the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957) and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). These findings indicate that the EGO is a measure of ego dysfunction.

Procedure

Subjects were recruited from three undergraduate classes at the University of Windsor during the fall semester 1989. Subject participation was voluntary and was contingent upon the subject signing a consent form indicating he/she understood the purpose of the study and the terms of participation. Subjects were tested with identical versions of the EGO and SELF on two occasions, twelve weeks apart at the end of class time. Each test session took approximately fifteen minutes to complete. Due to subject attrition, the total subject sample decreased from 142 in the first test session to 84 in the second session. The loss of subjects was attributed to the following: no extrinsic rewards were given for participation; the terms of participation indicated that the student was free to withdraw from the study at any time; the test-retest period was long enough for students to lose interest in completing the tests. The age mean for the subject sample in the second test session was 25.7 years and the ages ranged from 18 to 67 years.

RESULTS

SELF subscale and EGO scores were obtained using the scoring procedures specified by the test authors (Friedman, 1983; Knoblauch & Falconer, 1986). In test session one (n=142) and two (n=84), respectively, the EGO obtained mean scores of 7.03 and
TABLE 2

COEFFICIENT ALPHAS, TEST-RETEST CORRELATIONS AND CORRELATIONS OF THE SELF SUBSCALES TO SEX, AGE AND EGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>PER</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>TRANS</th>
<th>EGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGO</td>
<td>-34***</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For SELF PER= Personal, MID= Middle, TRANS= Transpersonal, For coefficient alphas and correlations with age, sex and EGO N=142; for test-retest correlations N=84. For sex, male=1, female=2; *: p<.05, **: p<.01, ***: p<.001. @: For EGO, coefficient alpha was not calculated; instead, split-half reliability was calculated using Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (Anastasi, 1988).

6.83, the SELF Personal subscale produced mean scores of 21.33 and 21.31, the Middle subscale produced mean scores 000.22 and 29.20, and the Transpersonal subscale had mean scores of 14.89 and 15.50.

Table 2 presents the correlations between the SELF subscales and age, sex, EGO, coefficient alphas and test-retest correlations. For the EGO, split-half reliability and correlations with age and sex are also included for inspection.

Factorial validity was assessed for the SELF using test session one data in a principal components analysis. The analysis of SELF item scores resulted in the extraction of five factors (using a varimax factor rotation), that had eigenvalues greater than 1.00 and which accounted for 59.30 percent of the total score variance (see Table 3). Retaining only those items which obtained factor loadings of .40 or greater, we found that each item of the SELF loaded heavily on only one of the five factors and that the emergent factor structure appears to parallel the scales of the SELF. The first factor consists of the five transpersonal subscale items and clearly represents the transpersonal level of self-expansiveness. The second factor can be characterized as the personal level since it contains all five personal subscale items. Factor three is made up of the two middle subscale items used to operationalize the future temporal orientation. The fourth factor contains three middle subscale items: two used to operationalize the past temporal orientation and one used for the enlarged spatial orientation. The fifth factor also
TABLE 3
PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR THE SELF USING TEST SESSION ONE (N=142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
<th>FACTOR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-TRAN</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-TRAN</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-TRAN</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-TRAN</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-TRAN</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-PER</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-PER</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-PER</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L0oPER</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-PER</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-MID</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-MID</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-MID</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-MID</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-MID</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PER = Personal subscale items; MID = Middle subscale items; TRAN = Transpersonal subscale items. Only the factor loadings AO or greater are presented.

contains three middle scale items among which are the two items used to operationalize the contracted spatial orientation and one used for the enlarged spatial orientation.

STUDY TWO: METHOD

Subjects

Subjects consisted of 209 introductory psychology students at the University of Windsor enrolled in the Winter 1992 semester. All subjects volunteered to participate based upon written informed consent. The sample was made up of 48 males and 161 females.
The mean age was 21.78 years and the standard deviation was 5.31 years. Ages ranged from 18 to 48 years.

**Measures**

*Self-Expansiveness Level Form (SELF; Friedman, 1983).* A description of the SELF has already been provided above.

*Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Form G (MBTI; Briggs & Myers, 1987).* The MBTI is a Jungian type inventory which utilizes a paper and pencil self-report format. It is made up of ninety-four forced-choice items which constitute the four bipolar discontinuous scales that are derived from Jung’s (1971) theory: Introversion-Extraversion, Intuition-Sensation, Thinking-Feeling and Judging-Perceiving. Respondents are classified to one of sixteen personality types according to the largest score obtained for each bipolar scale (e.g., if a person scores higher on Introversion than Extraversion, Intuition than Sensation, Feeling than Thinking and Judging than Perceiving, then they would be classified as an Introverted Intuitive, Feeler Judger).

In terms of its psychometric properties, the MBTI has been extensively researched. The MBTI has demonstrated good reliability as has been evidenced in split half reliability coefficients consistently ranging from .66 to .92 and test-retest correlations ranging from .56 to .89 for all the MBTI scales (Carlyn, 1977; Carlson, 1985). Validity findings on the MBTI have generally revealed that it is a satisfactory measure of the constructs underlying it (Carey, Fleming & Roberts, 1989; Carlson, 1985; Carlyn, 1977; Croom, Wallace & Schuerger, 1989; Martin & Bartol, 1986; Myers & McCaulley, 1985; Shifflett, 1989; Sipps & Alexander, 1987; Sipps, Alexander & Friedt, 1985; Thompson & Borrello, 1986a, 1986b; Tzeng, 1984).

*NED Personality Inventory-Form S (NED-PI; Costa & McCrae, 1985).* The NEO-PI is based on the last fifty years of factor analytic research on personality and is a measure of the five main factors or domains which have been most commonly and consistently found in research. The factors, each of which is conceptualized as unidirectional, are Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. The first three domains consist of six facets each of which are summed to arrive at a total domain score. The facets for the Neuroticism domain are Anxiety, Hostility, Depression, Self-Consciousness, Impulsiveness and Vulnerability. The facets for the Extraversion domain are Warmth, Gregariousness, Assertiveness, Activity, Excitement Seeking and Positive Emotions. For the Openness domain, the facets are Openness to Fantasy, Aesthetics, Feelings, Actions, Ideas and Values.
Agreeableness and Conscientiousness do not contain any facets or subscales.

The NEO-PI is a paper and pencil self-report inventory that is made up of 181 self-descriptive statements to which respondents use a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, to rate the extent to which each statement describes themselves. Item responses are numerically coded and summed to obtain facet scores and domain scores. Both individual scale scores and score profiles are used for interpretive purposes. The NEO-PI exists in two forms; Form S or the self-rating form and Form R or the external raters form.

The scales of the NEO-PI have produced internal consistency reliabilities ranging from .85 to .93 and test-retest correlations ranging from .86 to .91. Correlations of the NEO-PI with the Eysenck Personality Inventory, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test, Holland's Self Directed Search and a number of measures of well being provide strong evidence of good construct validity. Lastly, correlations between NEG-PI scores obtained with Form S from spouse and peer ratings obtained with Form R range from .50 to .70 (Costa & McCrae, 1985; Hogan, 1989).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-CSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). This paper and pencil self report measure consists of thirty-three true-false items which are used to assess the degree to which a person responds in a socially desirable fashion. Research involving the M-CSDS has been plentiful and largely indicative of satisfactory validity and reliability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Robinson & Shaver, 1973; Smith, 1967; Wiggins, 1968).

Procedure

Eleven groups consisting of approximately twenty subjects each were tested with the SELF on two occasions two weeks apart. At the first test session all subjects also completed the M-CSDS, MBTI, and NED-PI. It took subjects, on average, ninety minutes to complete these measures. The second session took approximately fifteen minutes to complete across all groups.

RESULTS

Raw scale scores for the SELF, MBTI, NED-PI and M-CSDS were obtained using the scoring procedures specified by the test authors (Friedman, 1983; Briggs & Myers, 1987; Costa & McCrae, 1985;
Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The means and standard deviations for the SELF subscales across sessions one and two, respectively, were as follows: Personal (Mean = 21.46, 21.20; SD = 2.92, 2.69), Middle (Mean = 30.95, 29.79; SD = 4.49, 4.48), Transpersonal (Mean = 14.58, 13.88; SD = 3.92, 4.27).

Reliability of the SELF scales were checked by examining inter-item consistency using session one data and test-retest correlations. The personal, middle and transpersonal subscales obtained coefficient alphas of .75, .67 and .65 and test-retest correlations of .57, .57, and .69, (all significant at p<.001), respectively.

Table 4 shows the obtained correlations between the SELF scales and subject sex (coded as male = 1 and female = 2 in the analysis), age and M-CSDS and MBTI scores. Alternatively, Table 5 presents the correlations found between the SELF and the NEO-PI domains and facets.

Lastly, test session one SELF item scores were used to complete a principal components analysis. Using a varimax rotation, the calculations resulted in the extraction of five factors that had eigenvalues greater than 1.00 and which accounted for 56.9 percent of the total score variance (see Table 6). Each of the SELF items were accounted for in the analysis and only one item, belonging to the transpersonal scale, loaded heavily on more than one factor.

| TABLE 4 | CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE SELF SCALES AND SUBJECT AGE, SEX, M-CSDS AND MBTI SCALES (N=209) |
|---------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| VARIABLE | PERSONAL | MIDDLE | TRANSPERSONAL |
| Sex      | .18** | .18** | -.04 |
| Age      | .07 | .07 | .06 |
| M-CSDS   | .17* | .09 | .12 |
| MBTI Scales | | | |
| Introversion | -.24*** | -.21** | -.02 |
| Extraversion | .25*** | .22** | .05 |
| Intuition | .11 | -.05 | .11 |
| Sensation | -.21** | .02 | -.08 |
| Thinking | -.13 | -.15* | -.04 |
| Feeling | .14* | .13 | .06 |
| Judging | .07 | .16* | -.00 |
| Perceiving | -.10 | -.16* | -.00 |

Note. Subject sex was coded as male = 1 and female = 2 in the analysis. *: p < .05, **: p < .01, ***: p < .001
### TABLE 5
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SELF SCALES AND THE NEG-PI DOMAIN SCORES USING TEST SESSION ONE DATA (N=209)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEG-PI Domains</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>TRANSPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For NEO-PI domains, N = Neuroticism, E = Extraversion, G = Openness, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness; for NEG-PI facets, N1 = Anxiety, N2 = Hostility, N3 = Depression, N4 = Self-Consciousness, N5 = Impulsiveness, N6 = Vulnerability, E1 = Warmth, E2 = Gregariousness, E3 = Assertiveness, E4 = Activity, E5 = Excitement Seeking, E6 = Positive Emotions, 01 = Fantasy, 02 = Aesthetics, 03 = Feelings, 04 = Actions, 05 = Ideas, 06 = Values. *: p<.05; **: p<.01; ***: p<.001.
TABLE 6  
PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR THE SELF USING TEST SESSION ONE DATA IN STUDY TWO (N=209)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Noll</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-PER</td>
<td>.4937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-PER</td>
<td>.7193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-MID</td>
<td>.4864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-PER</td>
<td>.7344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0opER</td>
<td>.7175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-PER</td>
<td>.6608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-TRAN</td>
<td>.6023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-TRAN</td>
<td>.4996</td>
<td>.4197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-TRAN</td>
<td>.7225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-TRAN</td>
<td>.7964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-MID</td>
<td>.5447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-MID</td>
<td>.6670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-TRAN</td>
<td>.6104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-MID</td>
<td>.4882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-MID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue 3.98 2.28 1.59 1.26 1.11  
% variance 22.1 12.7 8.9 7.0 6.2  

Note. PER = Personal subscale items; MID = Middle subscale items; TRAN Transpersonal subscale items. Only factor loadings .40 or greater are presented.

Retaining only those items which obtained factor loadings of .40 of greater, the emergent factor structure resembles what we found in study one but with some variations. The first factor extracted in this analysis consists of all the personal scale items and one middle scale item used to operationalize the enlarged spatial orientation. The second factor consists of four of the five transpersonal scale items and can be characterized as the transpersonal level. Factor three is made up of five items including the two middle subscale items operationalising a contracted spatial orientation, the transpersonal items used to operationalize its contracted spatial and the past temporal orientations, and another middle scale item used for the enlarged spatial orientation. Generally, based upon an inspection of item content, this factor can be interpreted as reflecting
spatiality in self-concept. Factor four consists of the two middle scale items used to define a past temporal orientation to self-concept. Lastly, factor five is made up of the two middle scale items used to define a future temporal orientation.

DISCUSSION

The results of our investigations have provided some interesting information on the nature of the SELF specifically, and on the global relationship of transpersonal identity to a number of conventional psychological constructs, more generally.

From a psychometric standpoint, our findings provide substantial support for the SELF. In terms of reliability, the SELF scales have demonstrated satisfactory interitem consistency as is revealed in coefficient alpha values of moderate strengths. Adequate test-retest reliability is also indicated with the strong correlations obtained between the SELF scales using data gathered over two-week and three-month retest intervals. Generally, the SELF can be viewed as a fairly consistent and stable measure of self-concept.

Validity evidence is also in favor of the SELF. First, the SELF personal and transpersonal scales exhibited good factorial validity as found in their emergence as largely discrete factors in two independent principal components analyses. Similarly, the middle scale demonstrated some degree of factorial validity as was manifested in its items forming separate factors based on their operationalizations (e.g., contracted spatial items formed one factor, past temporal items formed another, and future temporal items yet another). The only exception to this trend involves the two middle scale items used to assess the enlarged spatial orientation (i.e., items 4 and 13). In both analyses, these items loaded on different factors (factors four and five in study one and factors one and three in study two), suggesting that they may be unreliable and lacking in validity. This result may reflect the differences in item content found in the two enlarged spatial middle scale items. Inspection of middle scale item content reveals that similar content is used for all items designed to operationalize a given temporal or spatial orientation, except for the enlarged spatial items. For example, both middle scale items used to operationalize the contracted spatial orientation (items 7 and 15) make reference to identification with body parts. Likewise, the past and future temporal items (items 2, 5 and 9, 11) mention childhood experiences/behaviors and future behaviors, respectively. Conversely, the enlarged spatial items make reference to identification with social relationships (item 4) and one's physical surroundings (item 13). In consideration of this, the validity of these items may be improved by rewording the items to reflect more similar content. Neverthe-
less, even though our findings suggest that the transpersonal and personal levels form fairly stable factors, more research is needed to assess the reliability of the factor structure of the middle level of self-expansiveness.

Second, the correlations obtained between the SELF and subject age and sex and the measures of ego dysfunction, social desirability and personality suggest that the SELF subscales have satisfactory convergent and discriminant validity. To elaborate, the correlations found between the SELF and subject age and sex across both studies suggest that the SELF appears to be assessing constructs which are independent of age. Moreover, the transpersonal scale seems to be measuring a construct which is not influenced by subject sex. The obtained significant correlations between sex and the personal and middle scales indicate that females tend to score higher on these scales than males do. Given the fact that these correlations are of weak strength, they may be artifactual, produced by biases in the subject sample. In both studies undergraduate students were used. Conversely, these findings may simply indicate that men and women define themselves differently on the personal and middle levels of self-expansiveness. This possibility appears to be somewhat reasonable when one considers factors in identity formation, such as gender identity (e.g., masculinity/femininity), which generally differentiate men from women on the level of the individual and not the trans-individual. Such a possibility could be examined by correlating the SELF to a measure of gender identity, such as the Bern Sex Role Inventory (Bern, 1981). Nonetheless, future research using non-university samples is recommended to determine the robustness of these correlations.

The relationships found between the SELF and the M-CSDS indicate that the middle and transpersonal subscales are not affected by social desirability. The obtained significant correlation found between the personal subscale and the M-CSDS reveals that social desirability may influence these scores. However, the correlation is of low strength and it may be an artifact of the present study. Conversely, this finding may indicate that the personal subscale is a measure of well being; it has been suggested in the literature (e.g., McCrae, 1986) that measures of social desirability may simply reflect well being in volunteer respondents. Further research is needed to investigate these possibilities.

The correlations obtained between the SELF subscales and the EGO reveal that the middle and transpersonal subscales are assessing constructs independent of ego dysfunction. The significant negative correlation between the EGO and the personal subscale is consistent with the operationalization of these measures; the EGO assesses ego dysfunction and the personal subscale taps aspects of identity related to Western notions of positive mental health.
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The findings involving the SELF and the MBTI give excellent support for the validity of the transpersonal subscale; no significant correlations were found with any of the MBTI scales. This is consistent with the conceptual foundations of the transpersonal subscale; it is designed to assess aspects of self-concept which are not totally subsumed within an individual’s egoic identity. The concepts measured by the MBTI can be understood as concerning different modalities of ego functioning (lung, 1971). The obtained significant correlations with the personal subscale and the MBTI indicate that the subscale is empirically related to the constructs of extraversion and feeling and inversely related to introversion and sensation. Similarly, significant correlations found between the SELF middle subscale and the MBTI indicate that the middle scale assesses constructs similar to extraversion and judging while it is inversely related to introversion, perceiving and thinking. Though the finding of significant relationships between these SELF subscales and the MBTI is consistent with reason (i.e., the personal and middle subscales assess aspects of the self-concept which are considered to be more a part of conventional identity and personality), none of the correlations are of exceptional strength. This suggests that the SELF, as a measure of self-concept, is related to, but does not assess personality as operationalized by the MBTI. Nonetheless, the specific relations found between the SELF and MBTI scales may be robust. Research is needed to determine if the observed relationships are reliable.

The findings involving the NED-PI suggest a similar interpretation as provided for the MBTI; self-concept as measured by the SELF is moderately related to personality but is not adequately explained by it. The SELF personal subscale correlated significantly to all five of the NED-PI domains and to ten of the eighteen NED-PI facets scores. Also, the middle subscale significantly correlated to four of the five NED-PI domains and to eight of the NED-PI facets. Lastly, the transpersonal subscale was found to significantly relate to the NED-PI openness domain and to the NED-PI facets of positive emotions, openness to aesthetics and openness to ideas. As with the MBTI, none of these correlations are of sufficient strength to indicate an equivalence of constructs between the measures. Moreover, the pattern of correlations is consistent with the nature of the SELF; the personal and middle subscales assess more conventional aspects of identity which are likely to be accounted for to a limited extent by measures of personality. Conversely, even though the findings involving the transpersonal subscale are generally consistent with a transpersonally defined self-concept (e.g., people with a transpersonal sense of self would tend to define themselves as open to experience, generally, and to ideas and beauty, specifically, and more likely to report experiences of positive emotions), the obtained correlations are meager in strength and suggest that the subscale is assessing aspects of self-concept which
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are not accounted for by the five-factor model of personality. This interpretation is consistent with transpersonal literature that states that identity can extend beyond conventional boundaries of self and personality (Grof, 1985; Walsh & Vaughan, 1980, 1991; Wilber, 1980, 1981, 1990). Nevertheless, many of the obtained correlations may reflect meaningful relations between the SELF subscales and the NEO-PI domains and facets. More research is needed to ascertain the reliability of these findings.

In general, the results of these investigations are consistent with expectation and have two important implications. First, we found that the SELF is a measure with satisfactory reliability and validity, indicating that its use in future research is warranted. Outside of the suggested research mentioned above, the relationship of the SELF to other measures of self-concept needs to be investigated. Furthermore, attempts should be made at developing an interpretive system for SELF subscale scores; Friedman (1983) did not devise or suggest any method of score interpretation, and there is some question as to the meaning of specific subscale scores as well as the significance of the subscale scores in relation to each other (e.g., what does a score of 12, 25 and 8 on the personal, middle and transpersonal subscales, respectively, tell us about an individual's self concept?). If the SELF is to be successfully used in research, then knowledge of the meaning of its scores is essential. Our findings indicate that the SELF personal and middle subscales appear to be measuring constructs which are largely accounted for in existing measures of personality and mental health, whereas the transpersonal subscale seems to be assessing something which is independent of measures of ego functioning and personality. This information may prove useful to future researchers attempting to accomplish such a task.

Second, and more specifically, our discovery that the transpersonal subscale is not related to measures of ego functioning or personality implies that transpersonal aspects of self-concept are not addressed or accounted for by conventional theories and measures of personality. This takes on a special significance in light of the facts that a) the NEO-PI is hailed as the most complete and comprehensive measure of normal personality available (Costa & McCrae, 1985), and the five-factor model as the most complete theory (Goldberg, 1993); and b) the relation between the self-concept and personality suggested by mainstream literature on the topic indicates that, when one is studying personality using self-report measures, one is also studying self-concept (McCrae and Costa, 1988). In particular, it suggests that there may be a unique stable transpersonal dimension of identity which lies outside of the five-factor model of personality. This possibility could be explored through a conjoint factor analysis of NEO-PI and SELF item scores. Such an analysis would have been undertaken in our second study, but the results are consistent with expectations.
sample size was too small to have produced reliable findings. Future research to evaluate this possibility is strongly suggested.

Interestingly, some literature has recently appeared which not only arrives at the same conclusion as this paper regarding the absence of the transpersonal dimension in mainstream theories of personality and the possibility of the existence of a specific dimension of the same, but also attempts to address the problem through the development of a standardized measure. Cloninger, Svrakic and Przybeck (1993) state that "... character traits associated with spirituality have usually been neglected in systematic research and omitted from personality inventories that purport to be comprehensive, including the five factor model" (p. 981). In recognition of this situation, Cloninger et al (1993) have included a character dimension (i.e., a component of self-concept otherwise referred to as a characterological response set) in their comprehensive seven-factor psychobiological model of character and temperament designed to account for the transpersonal aspects of identity. Referred to as self-transcendence, this dimension is defined generally as the "identification with everything conceived as essential and consequential parts of a unified whole" (Cloninger et al., 1993, p. 981). More specifically, self-transcendence is seen as involving "a state of 'unitive consciousness' in which everything is part of one totality" (Cloninger et al., 1993, p. 981). Emerging from this and approaching the dimension in terms of a developmental process, Cloninger et al. divide self-transcendence into three components or facets. These are self-forgetful versus self-conscious experience (i.e., absorption into an experience to the point where one forgets one's self), transpersonal identification versus self-differentiation or isolation (i.e., identification with aspects of reality outside one's individual personal self) and spiritual acceptance versus rational materialism (i.e., the experience of relationships which cannot be explained through reason or proven through objective means).

Using this conception of self-transcendence in combination with the other six factors of personality (i.e., the four biologically based temperament factors of novelty seeking, harm avoidance, reward dependence and persistence, and the additional self-concept or character dimensions of self-directedness and cooperativeness), Cloninger et al. (1993) devised a 226-item true-false paper and pencil measure called the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI). Though the TCI is a relatively new instrument, initial factor analytic work reveals that self-transcendence, assessed in terms of its three components, emerges as an independent dimension of personality (Cloninger et al., 1993). Moreover, in a study comparing the ability of the TCI and the NEG-PI to differentiate individuals with personality disorders of varying symptomology from each other, Svrakic, Whitehead, Przybeck and Cloninger (1993) report data from earlier unpublished work showing that the NEG-PI
obtained strong multiple correlations with all of the TCI factors (multiple correlations ranging from .63 to .83) except for persistence and self-transcendence (multiple r = .36 and .30, respectively). As was found in the present study, these findings indicate that the NEO-PI does not account for transpersonal aspects of identity. Similarly, outside of a negative correlation between self-transcendence and the presence of symptomology for schizoid personality disorder (r = -.23, p < .05), Svrakic et al. (1993) found that self-transcendence "is not a common characteristic of traditional concepts of personality disorder" (Cloninger et al., 1993, p. 982), as defined by the DSM-III-R. Based on their findings, Cloninger et al. (1993) argue that despite the inadequate representation of the transpersonal dimension in existing theories of personality and personality disorders, literature suggesting that spirituality is "important for the adjustment and personal satisfaction of many people, particularly those over 35 years of age" (Cloninger et al., 1993, p. 982; e.g., see Jung, 1933), supports the contention that further study of self-transcendence to better establish its clinical importance using both clinical and non-clinical samples is warranted.

In conclusion, the findings of the present study, along with the work of Cloninger et al. (1993) and Svrakic et al. (1993), suggest that if we want to acquire a complete understanding of human identity we must go beyond conventional views of personality and self-concept and begin serious consideration of, and investigations into, its possible transpersonal dimensions. In doing this, the primary explanatory principle for self-concept will have to shift from personality to include explorations into the processes of identification and self-evaluation themselves, a stance which has been consistently taken by transpersonal theorists (e.g., Walsh & Vaughan, 1991).
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