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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this conceptual paper is to expound on the concept of integrality or wholeness. It provides a discussion of how integrality could be possessed and preserved and why it is important in an ever changing and demanding business and social environment. It examines the phenomena of fragmentation, compartmentalization, and disintegration – the flipsides of integrality – and their consequences in business.

This paper also explains the need to re-visit the purpose of business and the distinction between its means and ends. Through an extensive review of literature, it presents the increasing need to promote the value of the human person and to put him at the center of organizational growth.

It also provides insights on how the call for greater humanism in business could be addressed. By looking at the case of the Institute for Integrality, Inc., it hopes to encourage more initiatives along the line of integral human development.

1. The phenomena of fragmentation, compartmentalization, and disintegration

Fragmentation stems from having a “divided life,” living a distinct set of values in the workplace and changing masks in non-work setting (Alford & Naughton, 2001, p. 7) whereas compartmentalization is the repression of moral values, desires, and emotions in specific environments, thus stunting the consistent practice of virtues (Rozuel, 2011). The psychological, physical, and family breakdowns affecting the well being of persons (Hechanova, Uy, & Presbitero, Jr., 2005) are other forms of disintegration. All these phenomena have ignited a wide-range of business tragedies in recent decades, making breaks in trust rampant in a capitalist society (Child and Rodrigues 2004) and thus, leading to a “crisis of trust, inequality, and sustainability” (Jackson and Nelson 2004, 2).

Ferguson and Milliman (2008) identified the inauthenticity of the values system constructed by leaders and its poor articulation and implementation as root sources of the tragedies. Jaakson, Reino, and Vadi (2008) referred to the divergence between personal and organizational practices and values as the result of lack of commitment and conflicts of interests amongst people. The prevalence of values deficit in the workplace had been evident throughout the Mexican crisis in the eighties, the Gulf war in the early nineties, the Asian financial crisis in late nineties, the scandals of Enron and other accounting firms in 2002-2004, and the world financial breakdown that broke out in 2009, possibly pointing to a general crisis of capitalism.
Moreover, nations that demonstrated remarkable economic progress through consumption booms are now facing “new crises of obesity, smoking, diabetes, depression, and other ills of modern life.” These illnesses are consequences of the addictions and insatiability generated by excessive consumerism (Sachs, 2012). The world economy has shifted its focus from the production of basic and necessary goods and services to the creation of unrestricted desires that propagate self-indulgency (Bencze & Alsop, 2011). The result is “mindless consumerism,” corroding authentic human growth in the long haul (Kaul & Abhishek, 2007).

Examining the various complexities negatively affecting businesses and individuals and determining their roots, the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace identified four major challenges for Christian business leaders. The first is globalization, which has significantly expanded the world economy albeit, on the downside, it provided the venue for businesses to assume new freedom with reduced sense of accountability and responsibility. The second is communication technology, which has led to “a world of instant gratification and an overabundance of information” wherein what is important is driven out by what appears to be urgent. Another threat is the “financialization of the economy,” accompanied by “commoditization and short-termism” and, consequently, dysfunctional behaviors. The last is cultural changes, often characterized by individualism and relativism (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace 2012, 7-10).

In the end, the problems of greed - sometimes referred to as “infectious greed” (Clarke 2005, 599) - and materialism, rooted in self-interest, have led to an individualistic view of work and a general breakdown in trust (Green, 2009), thus making it difficult to practice values and virtues in the workplace (Naughton, 2006). Nevertheless, the current breakdown of capitalism has given business no other option but to pursue a cohesive value system as an evident ingredient for long-term sustainability (Stainer, 2006).

Oslington (2010) pointed out the importance of building organizations that understand well the value of each human person and have the ability to pursue transformations in mutual trust, commitment, and solidarity. All these could be synthesized via more holistic thinking, interdisciplinary dialogues, and mutual learning (Stormes, 2010), the vital elements for integral human development.

2. The need to promote the value of the human person

The phenomena of disintegration point to the call for greater humanism in business. There is a need to reflect on the value of the human person and to re-think the purpose of business, i.e., that “the business of business is the human person” (Sandelands, 2008, p. 93). There is a call to counter the tendency of business towards a “narrow and dismal idea of the human person” (Sandelands, 2008, p. 93), treating persons as “means to ends rather than ends themselves,” equating their value to “what they produce rather than who they are” (Cusick, 2006, p. 24). It should be clear that the persons are not merely factors of production nor instruments for the pursuit of wealth accumulation (Sandelands, 2008). To avoid the degradation of the human person, one needs to have a clear distinction between ends and means so that the authentic progress of people and their right to live “worthwhile lives” are defended as organizational end-goals (Anand & Sen, 2000, p. 2038). In the workplace, persons have to be
able to affirm and build their dignity and self-worth, empowering them to realize their fulfillment as human beings (Zigarelli, 1993).

Organizations have to give priority to promoting personal growth, defined as the process of achieving a “whole self” state, a strong foundation for moral strength and stability (Rozue, 2011, 688). Miller and Timothy (2010) espoused “The Integration Box” framework for the pursuit of an integrated and holistic life through the integration of the development of the mind, body, and spirit in any given context – which they framed as The 4E’s (Ethics, Expression, Experience, Enrichment). Lerner (2002) explained that integral human development requires organizations to address the full scale of needs of its people in a “systematic, organized character” (p. 16).

While only few organizations will assume total responsibility for the growth of its people (Scott, 2003), recent business tragedies have shown that classical economic principles are not sufficient to maintain corporate sustainability (Nirenberg, 2009). The high costs of ethical fiascos (Thomas, Schermerhorn and Dienhart 2004) have made businesses recognize more the role of right values and consistent ethical behavior (Ferguson and Milliman 2008) in providing people with “the depth, substance, and integrity,” which are so necessary to thrive in a competitive environment (Sundrum n.d.).

Burke (2007) pointed out that a solid ground for the dignity of persons is openness and receptiveness toward values – defined as aspects of reality that are attractive, enriches life, and, therefore, merits approbation. Life becomes more pleasant and worthwhile when there is “openness to values, discernment of values, response to values, assimilation of values” (p. 110). This values-based business environment fosters self-discipline and allows for integral human development (Grassl and Habisch 2011). Businesses need to provide this type of environment in the workplace when facilitating integral personal growth, following the claim of most psychologists about the multiplicative and interactive relationship of nature and nurture (Lerner, 2002). In such a work environment, the person and the organization develop simultaneously. The person incarnates a virtue-based character while the organization develops a common good-oriented organizational character (Alford & Naughton, 2001).

This view of the human person supports and provides reason for the claim of Jackson and Nelson (2004) that persons ought to be placed at the center of organizational development. This corporate philosophy on the value of the human person – as opposed to treating the person as a mere factor of production – is the starting point in the Integrality Theory of the Person proposed by Atienza and Santiago (2013). The consideration of corporate philosophy as the independent variable is taken from the discourse of Follet (1924), in her work entitled Creative Experience, that human behavior is a function of the environment.
3. Foundational theories supporting the integrality theory

As the strength with which integrality could be achieved highly depends on how the environment fosters the nurturing of people, this section of the literature review presents some foundational theories that support this type of environment.

The stewardship theory espoused by Donaldson and Davis (1989, as cited in Davis, Schoorman, & Donaldson, 1997) defines managers as stewards who promote pro-organizational attitude and give importance to employee welfare and satisfaction. Steward managers do not act out of self-interests but are only interested in propagating the talents and well-being of their people (Sirico, 2000).

In psychology, Magnusson (1989, as cited in Lerner, 2002) stressed the importance of context in human development. His concept of reciprocity between the person and his environment provides a strong foundation for personal growth. His Holistic Person-Context Interaction Theory explained how the person behaves depending on his environment and synthesized how the individual plays an active role in an integrated, dynamic, and multi-faceted person-environment system as follows:

1. The individual functions and develops as a total, integrated organism.
2. Individual functioning within existing mental, biological, and behavioral structures, as well as developmental, change, can be best described as complex, dynamic processes.
3. Individual functioning and development are guided by processes of continuously ongoing, reciprocal interaction among mental, behavioral, and biological aspects of individual functioning, and social, cultural, and physical aspects of the environment.
4. The environment, including the individual, functions and changes as a continuously ongoing process of reciprocal interaction among social, economic, and cultural factors (Lerner 2002, 176).

In economics, Schumacher (1973) led a turning point by highlighting the need to provide people with good work for the sake of his growth. This means that work should have a meaningful design, not a mind-numbing and nerve-racking structure. This principle of Schumacher (1973) had many following. Mele (2002) also advocated that the person has an absolute value over things, those that should just be seen as instruments. Kennedy (2002) likewise held the belief that the ideal work is that which brings out the full potential of the person, citing as reason the words of John Paul II that “all work is ultimately for the person; the person is not for work” (55).

Also inspired by the work of Schumacher (1973) on people-centered economics, Alford and Naughton (2001) made an analogous claim through their faith-based management proposition. They emphasized the significance of virtues among people as the foundation of individual character and common good as the base of organizational character. They defined virtues as “internal qualities” that contribute to the personal growth of people and the creation of a community of persons. Within the organizational common good context, stakeholders have to contribute to promoting a holistic view of human development (Alford and Naughton 2002).

4. The integrality construct

Integrity is a construct that pertains to the state of being integral. The word integral, according to the Webster dictionary, is an adjective which means possessing everything essential or lacking nothing while integrality is a noun referring to the state of being integral, which could also mean being or relating to integers or whole numbers in mathematics. Integer is a Latin word, an adjective translated as whole, entire, intact, unbroken or complete.

In this paper, it is argued that, while there are many challenges that a person encounters inside and outside the workplace, it is possible to remain integrated and not to breakdown amidst so much pressures, by pursuing integrality through the process of integration. In attending to the welfare of people, integral human development - which pertains to looking after the different aspects of the life of an individual and aiming for his integral or holistic growth - has to be a main agenda (Benedict XVI 2009).

To understand the foundations of integral human development, this study reviewed some key principles, models, theories, and initiatives along this line. The different frameworks discussed in this sub-section are contributory, in one way or another, to the development of the integrality concept and the Model of Integration – the end-product of this study.

Naughton (2006) provided an important lead in understanding integration. He explained that integration stems from the rightful ordering of our “being, doing and having” (p. 9) and from closing the break between “who we ought to be and who we actually are” (p. 10). Figure 15 shows the three dimensions of life – work, leisure, and integration - that a person ought to face (Naughton, 2009). They correspond to three fundamental life questions, respectively: “What am I working for?” (p. 34), “What am I resting in?” (p. 35), “What am I living for?” (p. 36). The
goal is to achieve unity in life through proper integration based on a healthy relationship between work and leisure.

More recently, Argandona (2009) presented a similar perspective through the three types of motivators for the modern worker - extrinsic, intrinsic or transcendent. Extrinsic goods are those that reside outside of the person (e.g., salary, recognition, reward). Intrinsic goods are inside the person (e.g., satisfaction, knowledge, skills, and challenges). Transcendent goods are those sought for the good of others (e.g., virtues, values, and common good).

5. The integral human development continuum

In the workplace, the process through which integrality could be attained is via integral human development interventions. To understand well the evolution of human development interventions in business, a continuum showing the extreme ends of human development interventions and their corresponding foundational theories and their forerunners was reviewed in this paper. The low-end refers to a technical and efficiency-oriented approach to human growth. The middle section includes interventions that address other dimensions of the nature of man (aside from productivity) – e.g., emotional intelligence, community building, leadership. The high-end pertains to a holistic and integral approach to people development, which encompasses the low- and middle-end and incorporates moral, spiritual, and values formation, in addition to the usual mental, social, and skills training.
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The efficiency approach to human development could be drawn from the principles of Taylor (1911, as cited in Sheldrake, 2003) and Fayol (1937, as cited in Sheldrake, 2003), the pioneers of scientific management. Using the assumption that increased external pressures could address the general tendency of employees to work at a slow speed, Taylor (1911, as cited in
Sheldrake, 2003) proposed a scientific and systematic time study, which stimulated efficient management through greater control of the different production areas. His concept of human progress centered on achieving maximum efficiency that is highly dependent on managerial control (Sheldrake 2003). This view, however, limited management theory to a set of technical procedures (Scott, 2003).

Fayol (1937, as cited in Sheldrake, 2003) emphasized the division of labor according to technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, and managerial activities. He came up with fourteen principles of management, which included discipline, centralization, subordination, unity of command, unity of direction, remuneration, and scalar chain, among others. He defined authority as the “right to give orders and the power to exact obedience” (Sheldrake 2003, 47).

In the middle of the continuum are the human development interventions championed by modern management theorists – such as Drucker and McGregor - who acknowledged the need to understand the different aspects of the nature of man. In his many works on modern management, Drucker already incorporated the intrinsic value of man and his need for personal fulfillment (Maciariello and Linkletter, 2011). He stressed on the need to take care of the “whole man” since one cannot simply “hire a hand” because “its owner always comes with it” (Drucker 1954, 262). Likewise, Drucker (1959) recognized that knowledge advancements can convert the person into “a biological machine run by manipulation of fears and emotions, a being without beliefs, without values, without principles, without compassion, without pride, without humanity altogether” (Drucker 1959, 257). He therefore supported the exercise of spiritual values when using power so that interests of persons are authentically served. In his Concept of the Corporation, Drucker (1946) advocated the importance of being committed to the personal fulfillment of organizational workers.

Meanwhile, McGregor (1960) came up with Theory Y, which united personal with organizational goals. Considered as an “optimistic philosophy,” Theory Y promoted the conviction that the responsible use of intellect and reason enable persons to grow within the context of the organization and manage his destiny (Gabris, 1998, as cited in Sorensen & Minahan, 2011). To reinforce his Theory Y and concept of “self-fulfilling prophecy,” McGregor espoused appreciative inquiry as a strong foundation for effective leadership, team management, and organizational change.

At the high-end of the continuum is the Catholic social teaching, which is anchored on two main pillars - “the inviolable dignity of the human person and the transcendent value of moral norms” (Stormes, 2010, p. 9) - and puts “the good of all people and of the whole person” as its main goal (Sandelands, 2008, p. 96). The last CST document released was the encyclical entitled Caritas in Veritate, written for the fortieth anniversary of Populorum Progressio, a treatise on the importance of a genuine and universal solidarity. Caritas in Veritate emphasized the role of charity, the love that has to be shared and communicated for the attainment of integral human development (Benedict XVI 2009). This charity or love illumined by truth can guide economics, business, and ethics towards the authentic growth of each person and of all humanity (Stormes, 2010). Earlier, John Paul II (1981) wrote Laborem Exercens, a discourse on the ultimate reason and value of human work, that is, in leading back the person to the design of his
Creator. It highlighted that, through his work, man can share in the activity of his Creator and thereby perfect himself.

6. The call for greater humanism in business

In response to the call to promote the Catholic social teaching in society, the Institute for Integrality, Inc., a multi-disciplinary training and consulting institution, dedicated to inspiring people to live integrated lives, was founded by the author of this paper. Through training programs and consultancy services that address the full range of needs of people – physical, mental, spiritual, emotional, and social - the bottomline objective of the Institute is to help people attain personal enrichment, happiness, fulfillment, and purposefulness. Hence, it factors in the growth of the faculties of the human person in the pursuit of integral human development. As its corporate name suggests, the Institute is committed to integrality, a profound and challenging concept rooted in authentic “selfhood of persons” (Crosby, 1996, p. 23).

To carry out the aims of the Institute for Integrality, Inc., a model of integration needed to be done to serve as foundation for all its initiatives. For this, the main ideas of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas who both held the ontology of “oneness” of the person served as a guide. Moreover, the works of modern philosophers in the persons of Karol Wojtyla (St. John Paul II) and John Crosby – specifically, The Acting Person (Wojtyla, 1979) and The Selfhood of the Human Person (Crosby, 1996) were sources of powerful ideas. From Wojtyla (1979), the complementary connection between transcendence and the integration of the person in action, together with the principles of self-determination and self-possession were important considerations. Meanwhile, Crosby (1996) provided crucial insights on self-presence, which is anchored on the inner integration of the person.

From the significant insights of Wojtyla (1979) and Crosby (1996), the model of integration used by the Institute for Integrality, Inc. was derived. This model recognizes that all persons desire personal enrichment, happiness, fulfillment, purposefulness, and completeness as bottomline objectives. It also recognizes that the person has a full range of needs - physical, mental, spiritual, emotional, and social, which are the key aspects of integral human development. To achieve integrality, we need to harmonize all these aspects of human development in our inner self, which we all have and which is where integration happens.
At the very heart and center of this model is the inner integration of the person, the state by which the person experiences that he is master of his self, that he is not at a loss about himself (self-presence) through the use of his human powers – the intellect and the will, emotions and body – in a conscious and purposeful manner through reflection.

Through insightful reflection (reflecting on insights), the intelligence gets to connect the scientific-technological, economic-business, and social-political insights to arrive at answers to the question: "What is my purpose in the world?" and "How do all these insights position themselves with that purpose?" Through intentional reflection (reflecting on intentions), the will wants the good, fosters dominion over the actions of the person, and taps his creativity to answer the question “How will I carry out my purpose in the world?” All these will make one an insightful, reflective, purposeful and self-mastered person.

A visual presentation of this model of integration is provided below for easier understanding of various stakeholders. On the left side is a person who is able to gather the five aspects of human development. In the middle is a person who is able to integrate his inner self through the use of his intellect and will. On the right side is a person who is able to incarnate his bottomline objectives through his very own self.
(A series of Frequently Asked Questions and their corresponding answers is also provided in the Annex.)

7. The need for a holistic organizational leadership

In organizations, the model of integration provided above is best promoted by a holistic approach to leadership that could best promote integrality – 3P Leadership, which is, essentially, leadership that knows how to integrate means and ends. The 3P construct of leadership followed the decomposition of success presented by Merton (1938). I decomposed the notion of leadership into three: personalist, principled, and proficient leadership. The first two correspond to activities success (Merton, 1938) since the improvement of persons and the acquisition of principles are important indicators of having successful activities. On the other hand, product success (Merton, 1938) greatly depends on the proficiency of a leader in the different areas of leadership (Atienza 2011). This proficiency can serve to sustain trust and credibility, factors that ease access to authentic followership and cooperation (Robbins 2008).
Personalist Leadership makes the leader focus on the development of each person under his or her care, promoting authentic “humanism or working for people” (Teehankee, 2008, p. 98), as opposed to “instrumentalism or working through people” (p. 98). This humanism considers the integral growth of employees as a clear objective of the company (Teehankee 2008).

Principled Leadership is when leaders aim to live, develop, and promote values (or principles). Empowerment of both leaders and employees in values is what will give wisdom to consider the bigger picture of business as not solely for profits (Naughton & Specht, 2011). Meanwhile, Proficient Leadership empowers the leader to generate, refine, and act on the vision and objectives of the organization, providing the link between strategic planning and operational decision-making (Gluck 1981), through his or her proficiency in the different areas of leadership and management.

8. The experience of promoting integral human development

To establish the relevance of what the Institute stands for, an analysis of data from various training events carried out by the Institute for Integrality, Inc. was done. During its soft launch in 2012, the Institute conducted a survey on perceptions about integral human development, its viability and attractiveness, possible reactions of the market, responsibility of leaders in promoting it, etc. It used the Likert scale – wherein a rating of 5 meant “Strongly Agree” and a rating of 1 meant “Strongly Disagree.”

Percentages of Agreement on Statements Referring to Integral Human Development Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think that most organizations have yet to recognize the intrinsic value of every person, not based on what he can do or produce.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think it would be easy to make most organizations understand that the person is not merely a factor of production but should be the center of organizational development.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My perception is that few organizations promote the integral or holistic development of people.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that few organizations are capable of promoting integral human development.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I believe that persons should not rely on their superiors for their integral growth.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe that leaders play an important role in promoting integral human</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I believe that it is the responsibility of the person, not the organization, to achieve integral development.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>44%</th>
<th>24%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. I think that there are many obstacles to achieve integral human development in the workplace.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>18%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. I think that many people need help to understand and achieve integrality.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The results of the survey gathered from 45 respondents showed that 84 percent of these participants strongly agreed that leaders are responsible for promoting integrality and that many people have yet to know and achieve integrality. Meanwhile, 76 percent of the respondents believed that “most organizations have yet to recognize the intrinsic value of every person, not based on what he can do or produce.”

It was also interesting to note that 40 percent of the participants neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement “I think it would be easy to make most organizations understand that the person is not merely a factor of production but should be the center of organizational development.” This result opened room for more inquiry on the viability of bringing out our message to a bigger population.

Another occasion that gave the opportunity to run a survey on how audiences would receive the concept of integrality was during the launch of the Leadership Integration Program – The Making of a Complete Leader in September 2013. For the first day, one of the first talks was on Integrality: Principles and Perspectives on Integral Personal Growth. One of the questions asked for the evaluation was: Which key ideas on integrality did you find most useful? Responses to this question yielded positive results, indicating the comprehensibility and relevance of the integrality advocacy, as follows:

- Sustaining completeness in every aspect of one’s life
- Striving to be a more holistic individual
- Being whole from being divided
- Focusing on the development of a person, not on the target result
- That a person is not treated as part but as a whole; one needs to be complete in order to lead
- The principle of integrality
- That people are the most important aspect of an organization – they should be nurtured as individuals and not just as workers
- To listen to oneself and other people
- Integrality means wholeness or completeness as a person
- A person will not have personal growth unless that person has relational growth
- Adaptations of integral human development
- Being consistent in what you are thinking/feeling and what you are doing
Integrity is much like a gift – it should be whole. Integrity focuses more on the nurturing/stewarding – the end is to deliver philanthropically.

- Persons are whole and not just a part; To combat the divided life in a person for the benefit of any organization this person will belong to
- Unity – wholeness
- The advancement and good of every man – the whole man; the concept of gift to others as the maxim of integrity
- The integrality theory of the person

Another event prior was the *Integrity Youth Leaders Congress* held in June 2014 with the theme *Forming the Salt of the Millennial Generation through Leadership and Integrality*, attended by 65 students from ten universities and colleges. This youth congress was organized with the help of seven interns under the Student Integrality Program (siPro) of the Institute, who were prepared and empowered to take the lead in mounting the inter-university *Integrity Youth Leaders Congress 2014* through a series of talks, trainings, and discussions on integrality. From their reflections on integrality, it could be deduced that they needed repeated interventions in order to gain a better understanding of integrality albeit they were easily able to visualize brokenness and disintegration as the battlefronts.

In essence, the events organized by the Institute for Integrality, Inc. shows the relevance of explaining integrality to the rest of society, in the face of many forms of brokenness happening and experienced by many persons in society. The Institute, therefore, will have to find more creative ways to spread the message of integrality in order to make it more accessible to as many as possible.
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### Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

#### 1. What is Integrality?
Integrality is the state of becoming integral.

#### 2. What is the meaning of the word integral?
The meaning of the word integral is found in its Latin root word *integer*, an adjective that means whole, entire, intact, unbroken or complete.

#### 3. What does it mean to be integral?
To be integral is the act of forming into a unified whole.

#### 3. What are the requisites to achieve integrality?
All the essential aspects of a person that are necessary for his human life to flourish.

#### 4. What is integral development?
Integral development is the development of all these essential aspects: the physical, mental, spiritual, emotional, and social.

#### 5. Why is there a need to develop all and not just some of these aspects?
There is a need to develop all and not just some of these aspects because they all are the necessary elements of human life and therefore cover the full range of the human needs of a person.

#### 6. How does a person know s/he is achieving integrality?
A person knows s/he is achieving integrality when he experiences being able to harmonize all those aspects by and from his own inner self as opposed to merely organizing and accumulating them.

#### 7. What does this harmonizing lead to?
It leads to inner wholeness or personal integration.

#### 12. How does the will of the person contribute to one’s reflection and consequently, self-presence?
Through intentional reflection (reflecting on one’s intentions), the person wants the good, fosters dominion over one’s actions, & taps one’s creativity to answer the question “How will I carry out my purpose in the world?” This makes a person a conscious, reflective, purposeful, and responsible actor.

#### 13. Why is it important to anchor integrality on purpose?
It is important to anchor integrality on purpose because purpose gives meaning, which ultimately, completes and unites a person into a whole.

#### 14. What are the consequences of achieving integrality?
Integrality empowers the person to achieve the bottomline objectives of one’s life.

#### 15. What are considered bottomline objectives in the life of a person?
The bottomline objectives of the person generally consist of personal enrichment, happiness, fulfillment, purposefulness, and completeness.

#### 16. What is the opposite of integrality?
The opposite of integrality is brokenness, the non-achievement of the person to be a unified whole.

#### 17. What are the manifestations of brokenness?
The manifestations of brokenness are the divided life, the compartmentalized life, the absence of a role-person merger, self-deception, among others. All these make a person absent to oneself.
### 8. What is this inner or personal integration?
It is the state by which the person experiences that he is master of his self, that he is not at a loss about himself (self-presence).

### 9. What does self-mastery, self-presence mean?
Self-mastery, self-presence means that a person is able to use his human powers – the intellect and the will, emotions and body – in a conscious and purposeful manner through reflection.

### 10. What is reflection?
Reflection is the process of looking within oneself for the purpose of bringing all his powers into a unified whole. Integrality cannot be achieved without reflection.

### 11. How does the intellect of the person contribute to one’s reflection and consequently, self-mastery, self-presence?
Through insightful reflection (reflecting on one’s insights) about himself, other people, and the world at large, the intelligence expands itself beyond the confines of the scientific-technological, economic-business, and social-political affairs. This leads him to arrive at truths that can answer the question: "What is my purpose in the world?" and "How do all these affairs position themselves with that purpose?" He becomes then an insightful, reflective, purposeful and self-mastered person amidst all these human affairs. He integrates everything from that purpose.

### 18. What is the root cause of brokenness?
The root cause of brokenness is values deficit, which makes the inner integration of the person difficult to achieve.

### 19. How does the external environment affect the whole process of integration?
The external environment affects the person in a positive and negative way. However, through inner integration, one is able to transcend or rise above the challenges brought by the external environment.

### 20. What are the benefits brought to society by integrality?
Integrality contributes to the promotion of giving in society because integrality can only be achieved within the context of the gift of self. This is because personal growth is a function of relational growth since man is a social being.

### 21. Can anyone aim for integrality?
Yes, integrality is for everyone.

### 22. When is integrality fully achieved?
Integrality is a non-stop and a lifelong process. A person may achieve integrality at a certain point in one’s life but it can only be kept and maintained if one is truly committed to the inner integration of self, which never stops.
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