



Theoretical Basis and Definitions of the Pedagogical Terms ‘Personal Order’ and ‘Personal Disorder’, for Self-Management of Human Resources, and the Achievement of an Optimal Social Existence as Human Beings

Chamaida Inés Tabares Márquez

International Cooperation and Development University of La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain.

University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK.

Email: abu0100098549@ull.edu.es

Email: chamaidainestabaresmarquez@gmail.com

Abstract

The pedagogical terms "Personal Disorder" and "Personal Order" were established with the intention to be able to refer to the state of presence necessary for human beings to contribute to social order in every aspect of their life. As family, business, work, religion, etc. These terms are intended to integrate the basic obligations and responsibilities of social beings, to be able to reach full potential, and to be able to help others reach theirs. Consequently, we can have more effective societies, and therefore, a better world. It was fundamental the contributions of Hedley Bull (1932-1985) from his main work, "The Anarchical Society", and the observational research method to corroborate. According to Bull, social order is created through life, truth, and property. So, with observational research it was confirmed how these elements contribute also to personal development throughout maintenance, really appreciation, and good use, of individual and collective resources. As human capital, natural resources, and local assets. Which contribute to social development, avoiding social anomie and, so, social disorder. Other contributions were taken also into consideration. As theories on fundamental human needs; the life experiences of the author; the African philosophy of Ubuntu; the General System Theory of Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1901-1972); the work of great pedagogues such as Pablo Freire (1921-1997) and Anton Makarenko (1888-1939); the work of important sociologists such as Anthony Gramsci (1891-1937), etc. Consequently, the fusion of all these works, studies, experiences, ideas, findings, and constructs, enabled the creation of the terms "Personal Order" and "Personal Disorder".

Keywords: Personal disorder, Personal order, Self-management, Social disorder, Social order.

1. Introduction

Institutions, organisms, business, and modern governments appear to lack the capacity on their own to solve many of the problems affecting most societies today, such as poverty. A problem which causes conflict, war, marginalization, etc. (Tabares, 2023).

To understand this, we can use as a reference the goals established by the United Nations at the 2000 Millennium Summit, which aimed to reduce global poverty by half by 2015 (Rodríguez, 2006). As these goals have not yet been met, they were therefore reformulated as Sustainable Development Goals by the United Nations in 2015 (Tabares, 2023; Tabares & Gonzalez, 2023).

However, the agonies of collapsed states like Somalia clearly demonstrate the consequences of people without state, nationality, organizations, businesses, etc. The consequences of social disorder, in this case caused by statelessness. Therefore, social order is not a luxury but a vital necessity, without which there can be not any prosperity, noneconomic, or non-social development (Chhibber, 1997, in Wallis & Dollery, 2001).

Therefore, social order in every aspect of life is fundamental to the well performance of individuals, and of the reliable administrative functions of modern societies, for citizen security, the provision of private and public services, etc. (Tabares, 2023). For which, citizens must be responsible individuals, with ethics and aesthetic contributions, and with the sense of collectivity, to make the best of everything, and so to make societies a better place, and not to cause harm on them. Then, they must be taking care, valuing, consuming, and making a responsible use of the natural, economic, and material resources, and local assets, and of the human capital, ensuring their preservation and continuity. For which, citizens must also be healthy, honest, and have sufficient resources to take responsibility for their own existence and that of their descendants in the best possible way, both ethically and aesthetically (Tabares, 2024a; Tabares 2024b). Because the public must be involved in the attainment of democratic and prosperous societies being responsible citizens, using their leisure time well, earning their living ethically, (Adler, 1998), receiving instruction, etc., and the basis of these social actions, as adults and developed citizens, may be in the three factors established by Bull (1977), to attain *social order*. Which are: *property, truth, and life*.

Consequently, for these reasons, emerged the terms '*Personal Order*' and '*Personal Disorder*'. Because they were created with the intention to educate about the consequences of lacking *property*, *truth*, and *life*. When individuals do not take into account the basic personal elements required for *social order* and so, for a potential development. Because those elements can enable the generation of economic, social, and personal benefits, and enabling also collaboration and cooperation at the regional, national, or international levels with a positive impact towards prosperity for all (Tabares, 2025).

However, before to attain '*personal order*', humans must go through development. Which is only possible through the provision, attachment, or acquisition of the resources required to cover the fundamental human needs. For such reason, a section has been dedicated to the presentation of the content on fundamental human needs.

2. Background

The motivation behind this research started with the work of Hedley Bull "The Anarchical Society" (1975). Because through this work flourished the connection which can exist between the elements established by Bull for *social order*, *life*, *truth*, and *property* (possessions or resources), with the human qualities and attributes that also enable harmony, cooperation, teamwork, and therefore, the achievement of goals and results, that can lead to development in all areas of human life, so in society in general.

Then, to analyse, understand, and verify such connection, it was necessary to delve first into the conceptual research of the fundamental needs for human development. Because without a proper human development, a society or community cannot exist, and without societies, *social order* cannot be.

Subsequently, then, was necessary carry on the conceptual research of the term *social disorder*, and analysis into the elements established by Hedley Bull for *social order*, *life*, *truth*, and *possessions*. As in this was it was possible to have a better comprehension of their possible analogues within the human and personal sphere. Analysis and findings which were corroborated through the observational research method.

3. Objective

The basics of this conceptual and observational research are understanding the terms *social order* and *social disorder*, which imply also the understanding of the fundamental human needs for human development, to be able to confirm and determine the existence of the pedagogical terms that could help people understand the impact their actions have on every aspect of their life, and that of others. As business, education, work, health, etc., so, towards *social order*.

Consequently, will be possible to understand the impact those actions can have towards *social order* on the following levels:

- On the level of personal development. The one the person can achieve themselves through *truth*, *life*, and *property*. Which are the fundamental elements for *social order*.
- On the level of social development. The development groups can achieve, as family, neighbours, students, etc. through the actions of the individuals.
- And on the level of communal or collective development. The development that the community, institutions, businesses, and organizations can achieve, so the society in general, through the actions of individuals within groups.

Because all personal actions, create a collectivity of actions, which can produce or enable a *social order* that allows for sustainability, and therefore, growth and prosperity.

Then, the general objectives of this study are three:

- Understanding the fundamental human needs for human development. Because a person must be fully developed to understand what must be done to improve their life and that of others.
- Understanding the term *social order*. Because without *social order*, the fulfilment of potential development, wellbeing, sustainability, grow and prosperity is more difficult.
- Define the pedagogical terms '*personal order*' and '*personal disorder*'. Because they are considered necessary for people to contribute personally to *social order* and to avoid *social disorder*. So, consequently, for people to have a greater chance of reaching their full potential spreading *social order* within any scenario. As communities, business, institutions, organizations, associations, etc. So, consequently pursuing *social order*, at the societal level.

4. Methodology

This research was conducted using qualitative methodology, as it mainly focuses on the interpretation, understanding, and verification of the main concepts of *social order* and *social disorder*. A social phenomenon which implies also the understanding of the human fundamental needs for development.

Consequently, the main research methods which were used in this study have been conceptual research and the observation research. Because were necessary the understanding and confirming of those concepts for the establishment, understanding, and corroboration of the pedagogical concepts of *personal order* and *personal disorder*.

4.1. Conceptual Research

The method of conceptual research is defined as a research method conducted through observation and analysis of existing information on a given topic. It does not involve practical experiments.

It relates to abstract concepts or ideas. Philosophers have long used it to develop new theories or interpret existing ones from a different perspective.

Some advantages of conceptual research are:

- Conceptual research focuses primarily on the research concept or theory that explains a phenomenon. What causes the phenomenon, what are its basic components, etc.? It is paper-and-pencil research.

- This type of research relies heavily on previous studies; no experiments are conducted, which saves time, effort, and resources. Additionally, more relevant information can be generated through conceptual research.
- Conceptual research is considered one of the most convenient forms of research. Because in this type of research, if the conceptual framework is ready, only the relevant information and literature need to be sorted (QuestionPro, 2025).

In this study, throughout the conceptual research, the literature review was essential, as it allowed for the development of a conceptual investigation of textual data related to the concepts of *fundamental human needs for development*, and *social order* and *social disorder* (Scribbr, 2025).

Consequently, to achieve this primary research objective, secondary sources of information were used, mainly data and information collected by other academic researchers through articles, books, blogs, etc. However, the most important source of information was "The Anarchical Society" of Hedley Bull (1977), as in there were the concept of *social order* is presented.

4.2. The Observation

Observation is one of the oldest and most fundamental research method approaches. It involves collecting impressions of the world throughout looking and listening, in a systematic and purposeful way to learn about a phenomenon of interest. Observational research assumes behaviour is purposeful, reflecting deeper values and beliefs. Although it may be conducted in a laboratory or another setting chosen by the researcher, it more typically takes place in natural settings to capture behaviour as it occurs in the real world. It usually involves direct contact between the researcher and participants. During observation, researchers gather both descriptive and relational data through observing behaviour in the setting of interest.

Observational research, like any research, begins with the selection of a research problem, which is often presented as an area of research interest. Although some researchers prefer to enter the field and begin observation immediately without the potential blinders of preconceived notions, many conduct a literature search to identify relevant indicators and explanatory concepts that may inform the project (McKechnie, et al., 2008). Which was the course of this study, as conceptual research was fundamental to clarify what was necessary to observe to compound the research and be able to establish and corroborate the terms *personal order* and *personal disorder*.

In this study particularly were used the covert naturalistic and participant observation. As the participants were unaware that the observation was taking place. As many times the actions used for the collection of data took place in situations which emerged spontaneously and unexpectedly in many diverse and different public scenarios. So, to carry on the research efficiently, no disturbance could be caused, because it was fundamental to take advantage and use efficiently the situation which emerged in front of the eyes of the researcher. As it was a valuable source of information. Additionally, because taking into consideration the ethical considerations, the researcher could not be obtrusive. Then observations only took place in public situations where people were not alone, respecting their intimacy and wellbeing, and protecting always their identity, their privacy, and their autonomy.

Naturalistic observations, implies that the study of the research subjects take place in their own environments, in natural and uncontrolled scenarios. So, in this way, it is possible to explore behaviours and actions without any outside influence or control. It is a research method used in field studies (Bhandari, 2023).

Participant observation implies the researcher immerses themselves in a particular social setting or group, observing the behaviours, interactions, and practices of the participants. In participant observation, the researcher is called a participant-observer, because they participate in the activities of the group while also observing the behaviours and interactions of the group (George, 2023).

The observation period took place between June 2023 and June 2025.

The naturalistic observation was used when the participants were observed in the distance, without being involved with the researcher, despite they were sharing the same space.

The participant observation was used when the researcher was also immersed in the activity with the participants.

Nevertheless, in any of the cases, the participants were not informed that they were observed and researched. Neither it was explained about the research that was taking place, as it could impact on their behaviour (Bhandari, 2023).

Then, the naturalistic observation research method was used throughout events, activities, actions, etc., observed from outside by the researcher. Where the researcher could identify negative actions related to lack of self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*. Which were hindering or stopping the development of such events, activities, actions, etc.

The participant observation research method was used in two types of scenarios:

1. When the researcher was taking part in events, activities, actions, etc., with just somebody else. Where the researcher was able to identify that the interaction was occurring with someone whose actions were hurting and were hindering or slowing down the development of an action, event, or activity. Product of lack of self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*. Which were causing negative actions and behaviours, as lots of criticism, shortage of collaboration, verbal abuse, misunderstandings, ignoring participation, silences on purpose, hindering access to resources, etc.

2. When the researcher was taking part in events, activities, actions, etc., with a group of people. Where the researcher could identify actions related to lack of self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*. Which were hindering or stopping the development of such events, activities, actions, etc., because of negative actions and behaviours. As hindering access to resources (as notes, materials, venues, etc.), ignoring other points of view, no doing what they promised to do, cancelling with very short time notice, etc.

Furthermore, some of such events, activities, actions, etc., were observed from outside, and others were experienced by the researcher throughout the interaction with somebody else, and throughout the interaction with a group of people.

For both types of observation, the data was collected through notes taking. Which implies writing down in an unstructured way anything that appeared relevant or important based on the research topic and interests (Bhandari, 2023).

5. Theoretical Frameworks

5.1. Fundamental Human Needs for Development, Motivation, and Personal Growth.

The human needs have been defined in different terms. Different main theories and approaches have been established to explain and show the relation between human needs, motivation, and so, personal development.

Firstly, was Abraham Maslow (Maslow, 1943; Maslow, 1954), who elaborated the *theory of the Hierarchy of Human Needs* (Cherry, 2024) (McLeod, 2025). Abraham Maslow stated that our actions are motivated by certain physiological and psychological needs that progress from basic to complex. So, Maslow established five different levels of hierarchy of human needs, starting at the lowest level with the ones known as *physiological needs*.

The *physiological needs* include those that are vital to survival. Some examples of *physiological needs* include Food; Water; Breathing, etc. At the second level the needs start to become a bit more complex, becoming primary the *needs for security and safety*. Some of the basic *security and safety needs* are financial security; Health and wellness; Safety against accidents and injury, etc. (Cherry, 2024). After *physiological and safety needs* have been fulfilled, the third level of human needs is *love and belonging*. Which refer to an emotional need for interpersonal relationships, affiliating, connectedness, and being part of a group.

The fourth level of human needs in the hierarchy of Maslow is *self-esteem*. Which Maslow classified into two categories: (i) esteem for oneself (dignity, achievement, mastery, independence) and (ii) the desire for reputation or respect from others (e.g., status, prestige).

At the fifth level are the *self-actualization needs*, which refer to the realization of the potential of a person, self-fulfilment, seeking personal growth, and peak experiences. This was the highest level in the hierarchy of Maslow, until Maslow expanded it to include *cognitive needs* as the level five. Where he included knowledge and understanding, curiosity, exploration, need for meaning, and predictability.

Maslow also included the *aesthetic needs* (Maslow, 1970^a). Which became the sixth level of needs with appreciation and search for beauty, balance, form, etc.; The level seventh includes the *self-actualization needs*. Which as mentioned before included realizing personal potential, self-fulfilment, seeking personal growth, and peak experiences (McLeod, 2025). Also, later were included the *transcendence needs* (Maslow, 1970b). Which became the eighth level of needs and includes the human desire to connect with a higher reality, purpose, or the universe (McLeod, 2025).

Later, in 1959, Frederick Herzberg designed the *Two-Factor Theory*. The Two-Factor Theory is based on the feedback collected in the USA of two hundred engineers and accountants regarding their personal feelings towards their working environments. So, Herzberg defined two sets of factors in deciding employees working attitudes and level of performance, named *Motivation & Hygiene Factors* (Robbins, 2009). Despite this theory refers to the work environment, it is important to consider it because the *Motivators & Hygiene Factors*, can be compared with life in any environment. Because the environment where we live, where we work, where we study, etc., can impact in our way of life. As it can facilitate good or bad living conditions, it can be safe or unsafe, people can relate healthily or through conflicts, people can be given responsibilities, or can be ignored, etc.

Motivation Factors are *Intrinsic Factors* that will increase the job satisfaction of the employees, while *Hygiene Factors* are *Extrinsic Factors* to prevent any dissatisfaction in the employees. (Yusoff, Kian, & Idris, 2013). Which Bevins (2018) referring as “Motivators” the “Satisfiers”, and as “Dissatisfiers” the “Hygiene” factors.

Herzberg in his original study identified *six Motivator Factors* that are determined intrinsically by the company or organization to the employees, and they include: 1. Recognition 2. Achievement 3. Possibility of growth 4. Advancement 5. Responsibility and 6. The work itself (Yusoff, et al, 2013). Motivators are referred to as “job content” due to their intrinsic nature of what is gained from Motivators (Herzberg, et al, 1959; Maidani, 1991).

Moreover, as *Intrinsic Factors* are human basic needs for psychological growth. Which are very effective in creating and maintaining more durable positive effects on the performance of employees towards their jobs. Then, *Intrinsic Factors* will propel employees to insert additional interest into their job, because when employees are well satisfied by motivational needs, their productivity and efficiency will improve (Robbins, 2009).

Additionally, Herzberg in 1959, in his original study identified *ten Hygiene Factors*, which are determined by the *extrinsic factors* of the job of an employee, and they include: 1. Salary 2. Interpersonal relations—supervisor 3. Interpersonal relations—subordinate 4. Interpersonal relations—peers 5. Supervision—technical 6. Company policy and administration 7. Working conditions 8. Factors in personal life 9. Status and 10. Job security (Herzberg, et al, 1959).

Extrinsic Factors are also well known as job context factors, as they are extrinsic satisfactions granted by other people for employees. Then, when all these external factors are achieved, employees will be free from unpleasant external working conditions that will banish their feelings of dissatisfactions. Consequently, these external factors serve as guidance for employers in creating a favourable working environment where employees feel comfortable working inside, however the employees will remain themselves neutral in, neither satisfied nor motivated (Robbins, 2009).

These two categories differ fundamentally and are independent of one another (Maidani, 1991), however they act with interdependence. Because as Herzberg furthered, full supply of *Hygiene Factors* will not necessarily result in job satisfaction by employees. Because this theory argues that meeting the lower-level needs (*extrinsic or hygiene factors*) of individuals would prevent them from being dissatisfied but would not motivate them to exert effort. Then, *Motivation Factors* must be addressed to increase the performance and productivity of employees (Robbins, 2009).

Consequently, both factors are needed to create the most favourable work environment, for both, employers and employees, and to create the most favourable growing environment for any human being. Because every person needs recognition, possibilities of achievement, possibilities of growth and advancement, responsibility,

actions (through volunteer, studying, farming, working, etc.), financial security, good interpersonal relations with neighbours, agents, etc., with fair policies, rules, and regulations, and an effective administration by the institutions, assuring good living conditions, security, etc., to be able to achieve their full potential.

Two years later, in 1961 the psychologist David McClelland published “The Achieving Society”, which articulated his model of human motivation (Harvard University, 2025), presented with his ‘*Theory of Three Needs*’. Which outlines that each person is motivated by *power*, *affiliation*, or *achievement* (Kurt, 2022). David McClelland developed this theory to explore how personal needs influence motivation and behaviour in the workplace, but this knowledge can also be applied on life in any scenario, to understand how people behave in relation to these needs. So, McClelland found out that:

- *People with a need for achievement* (nACH), or motivated by achievement, are always looking for the next goal to reach and new ways to advance or grow. They seek personal success and prefer to take on tasks with a high likelihood of success, as they are often reluctant to take risks because this could result in failing to meet their goals. Additionally, they are often working independently, because they prefer working alone to control more aspects of achieving their goals.
- *People with a need for affiliation* (nAFF), are driven by affiliation thrive on social interactions and relationships based on a sense of connection with others. They enjoy being seen as team players and are motivated by interactions with others and friendships with coworkers, customers, students, etc. As a result, they often satisfy that need by interacting in positions that involve teamwork, communication, and regularly put them in contact with people. Such as teachers, social workers, customer service personnel, retail sales, etc. They also tend to be concerned about how people feel and how people feel about them. Which makes it hard for them to implement orders that are unpopular, to discipline those they supervise, or to offer negative feedback.
- *Individuals with a need for power* (nPOW), or need for authority, are motivated by the status, prestige, influence, and elevated standing they can reach. This need can take two general forms. First, some people seek power by trying to better the overall setting around them, encouraging others to excel. In this way everyone achieves greater power and so can negotiate deals that make an entire department or company gain prestige. Second, others are more concerned about personal power and glory and enjoy most the idea of being in a position which enable them to make important decisions. They are motivated by what their accomplishments mean in terms of respect and status, often excelling in management or chair positions where they can assert control and lead others (Ungvarsky, 2024).

Later in 1964, was presented “*The theory of positive disintegration* (TPD)”, elaborated by the psychiatrist and psychologist Kazimierz Dabrowski. Who emphasized that in some circumstances are necessary internal discontent as stimulus for change or growth. So, he stresses *the need in some conditions of some symptoms as anxiety, obsessions, or depression, for human growth to occur in some settings*. As they may be the signs of the beginning of an advancing process of positive transformation (Laycraft, 2020), through five levels of development:

- Initial level or Primary Integration.
- Three levels referring to Increasing Complexity of Disintegration: Unilevel; Spontaneous Multilevel; and Organized Multilevel. And,
- Highest Level, which Dabrowski called Secondary Integration (Mendaglio, 2019).

Eight years later, in 1969, the psychologist Clayton Alderfer developed his *ERG Theory* (*Existence, Relatedness and Growth*) (Kurt, 2023), through a study concerned with developing and testing an alternative to the Theory of the Hierarchy of Needs of Abraham Maslow. His work was conducted by a questionnaire study with 110 employees at several job levels from a bank. As a result, the alternative theory is based on a *three-fold conceptualization of human needs: Existence, Relatedness, and Growth* (E.R.G) (Alderfer, 1969). As a model of human need, this theory has been validated by human experience (Ivancevich, et al., 2007), its construct has been also discussed in philosophical and empirical studies, and it is often included with other content approaches to motivation (Caulton, 2012).

The ERG theory of Alderfer is different from the Hierarchy of Needs theory of Abraham Maslow, even though Alderfer based the *ERG model* on the theory of Maslow (Ismail et al., 2023). In this theory, *the need of existence*, relates to physical and psychological survival; *the need for relatedness*, implies a sense of community and a good relationship with yourself; and *the need of growth*, relates to self-development, fulfilment and the sense of achieving your potential (World of Work Project CIC, 2024).

The ERG theory, does not assume lower-level satisfaction as a prerequisite for the emergence of higher-order needs (Alderfer, 1969). In other words, the priorities and motivations of an individual may be fluid and can move between the existence, relatedness, and growth levels of need over time. So, they can move upwards, and they can move downwards. Because in the Hierarchy of Needs of Maslow, individuals must have satisfied one level of needs before moving on to the next one. For example, humans must have satisfied their safety needs before they can be motivated by social belonging. However, Alderfer disagreed and in his model, individuals do not must have satisfied their existence needs before being motivated by their relatedness need. Additionally, Alderfer went further and stated that based on their life views different individuals potentially prioritize their needs in different orders. A standard example of this could be an actor who cannot pay his rent, but who is pursuing his passion, motivated by growth through the art of acting, potentially at the expense of his existence.

Alderfer also noted that is very important how individuals perceive their progression in relation to each of the levels of needs. Because if an individual feels they are making great progress at relatedness, they may be also increasingly motivated by growth, even though their relatedness need has not been fully satisfied. Similarly, if an individual feels frustrated with the progress they are making in relation to growth, they may abandon it and redouble their motivation in relation to relatedness (World of Work Project CIC, 2024).

Then, more than fifteen years later, was published “*Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*”, where the ‘*Self-Determination Theory*’ was presented by Edward L. Deci and Richard Ryan (Deci & Ryan, 1985). *SDT*, is a psychological theory that goes to the heart of the issues of happiness and human capabilities and deals directly with the ideas of human actualization and flourishing. The primary level of analysis of the theory is on individual psychological processes; however, the theory also addresses how social environments affect human

needs satisfaction, and motivation—whether the environments are experimentally induced or not, they grown naturally, (e.g., Vansteenkiste et al., 2004), as ongoing social contexts such as work groups or families (e.g., Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006), or are cultural and macro-economic systems (e.g., Chirkov, Ryan, Kim, & Kaplan, 2003; Deci, Ryan, Gagné, Leone, Usunov, & Kornazheva, 2001, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006). Then, *the Self-Determination theory*, can be defined as a framework that empirically addresses the basic psychological needs associated with well-being across development and cultures, and the motivational and social conditions that allow for fulfilment of these needs (Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006).

With this theory, the human fundamental needs were classified in two groups, *the physical or physiological needs* and *the psychological needs*.

The physical or physiological needs are the first needs of human beings, and the most basic and minimal needs of human beings. Such as the needs of food, clothing, shelter to meet the needs of relieving hunger, keeping out the cold and sleeping. If these needs cannot be met to a minimum, human beings cannot continue to survive and multiply (Wu & Han, 2021).

In relation to *the psychological needs*, the *Self-determination theory* (SDT) establish that there are at least three basic and universal human psychological needs:

The need for competence, which is the desire to feel effective in the interactions of one with the social and physical environments (Deci, 1975; White, 1959, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006).

The need for relatedness, which is the desire to belong, to care for, and feel cared for by others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Ryan, 1995, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006); and

The need for autonomy, the desire to feel volitional and to fully endorse the actions of your own self, (deCharms, 1968; Deci & Ryan, 1985).

The need for competence implies the exploratory nature of humans, which contributes to the growth and skill development of people, and helps them adapt to complex and ever-changing surrounds (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When people are not afforded opportunities to master the environment, or when they fail at their mastery attempts (e.g., they receive regular criticism and indicators of incompetence), they are likely to become unmotivated, displaying little motivation and functioning poorly. *The need for competence* maps well onto theories of self-efficacy, perceived control and expectancy value (Bandura, 1989; Carver, Sutton, & Scheier, 2000; Feather, 1992; Maddux & Gosselin, 2003; Pajares, 1996; Rotter, 1966, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006). Then, because the concept of competence is so pervasive in contemporary psychology, the postulate of a need for competence has been noncontroversial (Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006).

The need for relatedness assumes that people are naturally inclined to seek close and intimate relationships with others, and to work toward a sense of communion and belonging within social groups (Ryan, 1993; Baumeister & Leary, 1995, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006). This need goes beyond the importance of interdependence, as it is only satisfied when people experience supportive, and caring relationships in which they feel significant and respected. Then, it does not occur in toxic social environments. The need for relatedness implies the human tendency to engage in social-support systems (Ryan & Solky, 1996), to form secure attachments with primary caregivers (LaGuardia et al., 2000), and to transmit communal knowledge among individuals and between generations (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The construct of a *relatedness need* is consistent with the study of close relationships in social psychology (Reis & Patrick, 1996), and with various developmental perspectives such as the attachment theory (Bretherton, 1987; Shaver & Hazan, 1993). Then, the postulate of a *need for relatedness*, has been relatively non-controversial (Blass & Blatt, 1996).

The need for autonomy correlates with the self-organizational nature of human development, as people have the need to feel a sense of decision and authorship with respect to their life, so their behaviour. Also, because autonomy provides many adaptive advantages, including the ability to better regulate actions and emotions, the ability to become more internally coherent in the functioning of us, and the ability to disengage from exogenous goals when necessary (i.e., Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). The idea that people have a natural inclination to experience themselves as the origin of their behaviour was, to a certain extent, also emphasized by Nuttin (1984) when he introduced the concept of *causality pleasure*. Which implies that people experience an inherent satisfaction in being the cause of their own actions. Nonetheless, unlike *the needs for competence and relatedness*, specifying a *need for autonomy* has been highly controversial, with various authors suggesting that it is primarily a Western, male value rather than a universal need (Jordan, 1997; Markus, Kitayama, & Heiman, 1996, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006). However, the empirical evidence shows that *autonomy* is associated with enhanced well-being in Eastern as well as Western cultures (e.g., Chirkov et al., 2003; Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens, & Soenens, 2005, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006), and in women as well as men (Deci, La Guardia, Moller, Scheiner, & Ryan, 2006; Vallerand, 1997, in Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006).

According to SDT, when social contexts allow for the satisfaction of these *psychological needs*, the thriving and well-being of people is enhanced, whereas ill-being follows if the satisfaction of these needs on people is thwarted (Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006). Because just as plants need water and sunshine to grow and flourish, individuals require the experience of need-satisfying with psychological events in their daily lives to develop optimally and to thrive. Because the basic psychological needs for *competence*, *relatedness*, and *autonomy*, are essential to human flourishing and wellness (Ryan, 1995). Thus, whether need satisfaction is subjectively valued or culturally endorsed, failure to satisfy a need so defined is predicted to yield negative consequences across individuals and cultures (Vansteenkiste, et al., 2006).

Later, was presented the *Human Scale Development approach*, which connects the fulfilment of fundamental human needs with personal and social development. It was created by Manfred Max-Neef, and it was first published in Spanish in 1986 (Max-Neef, et al, 1986). *The Human Scale Development*, it is a development approach focused and based on the satisfaction of fundamental human needs of present as well as future generations, which assumes that social and personal development are inseparable. As a healthy society should advocate above all, for the development of every person and of the whole person. Because any fundamental need that is not adequately satisfied, reveals a human poverty, and each poverty generates pathologies and collective common pathologies. Consequently, through this approach it was understood that human needs must be understood as a system: that is

all human needs are interrelated and interactive, so no hierarchies exist within the system, with the sole exception of the need of subsistence to remain alive. This means that, on the one hand, no need is per se more important than any other; and, on the other hand, that there is no fixed order of precedence in the actualization of needs (that need B, for instance, can only be met after need A has been satisfied).

In this work is stated that it is impossible to state that the fundamental human needs are historically and culturally constant. However, they have a socio-universal character because people everywhere want to satisfy their needs. So, human needs can be classified according to many criteria, but in this work of Manfred Max-Neef (2007), human needs got organized into two categories: *existential needs* and *axiological needs*, which interact between them.

The existential needs are the needs of Being, Having, Doing, and Interacting; and *the axiological needs* are Subsistence, Protection, Affection, Understanding, Participation, Idleness, Creation, Identity and Freedom (Max-Neef, 2007). Then, *the axiological needs* are achieved through being, having, doing, and interacting.

Then, when each of these needs is not satisfied a poverty is revealed: Poverty of subsistence (Insufficient income, food, shelter, etc.); Poverty of Protection (Because of bad health systems, violence, arms race, etc.); Poverty of affection (Due to authoritarianism, oppression, exploitative relation with the environment, etc.); Poverty of understanding (Due to poor quality of education); Poverty of participation (Due to marginalization and discrimination); and Poverty of identity (Due to imposition of alien values upon local and regional cultures, forced migration, political exile, etc.). So, as it was mentioned before, each poverty generates pathologies, and collective pathologies as: Economic pathologies (Unemployment, external debt, and hyperinflation); Political Pathologies (Fear, violence, marginalization, and exile); Illiteracy Pathologies (communication barriers, learning difficulties, etc.); Individualism pathologies (breakdown of community bonds, decreased civic engagement, increased loneliness, feelings of inadequacy), etc.

For which, they also explain that *each need can be satisfied* at different levels and with different intensities, *within three contexts*, and that the quality and intensity, not only of the levels, but also of contexts will depend on time, place and circumstances. So, the *three contexts within needs are satisfied* are: (a) with regards to oneself, *personal* (Eigenwelt); (b) *with regards to the social group, as the family, and the wider community* (Mitwelt); and (c) with regards to the *environment*, as the bioregion, or the nation (Umwelt).

Then, needs not only indicate deprivations, but also, at the same time, individual and collective human potential. When needs are conceived as deprivation are restricted to that which is merely physiological. However, because needs also engage, motivate, and mobilise people, they are a potential, and eventually may become a resource. Then, the need to participate is a potential for participation, just as the need for affection is a potential for affection, love, appreciation, etc. (Max-Neef, 2007).

More recently in 1992, the psychologist Joe Griffin and Ivan Tyrrel, created the *Theory of the Human Givens Approach* (Human Given Services, 2025). Which sustains that *physical, psychological, and emotional needs* are inextricably linked and when these needs go unmet, individuals may be more likely to experience stress and other emotional and mental health concerns impacting on personal development (Good Therapy, 2019).

The Human Givens Approach defines *eight essential psychological needs* identified over decades of work by health and social psychologists, which are 1. The needs for autonomy, 2. Sense of control 3. Security 4. Connection 5. Attention 6. Achievement 7. Status and 8. Meaning. Then, it is by meeting our *physical, psychological, and emotional needs* that we survive and develop as individuals and as specie (Human Givens Institute, 2016).

About the nature of our *emotional needs*, there is widespread agreement, uncovered by decades of health and social psychology research. So, the main ones essential for our mental health are nine: 1. Security: safe territory and an environment which allows us to develop fully. 2. Attention (to give and receive it): like a form of nutrition. 3. Sense of autonomy and control: having decision to make responsible choices. 4. Emotional intimacy: to know that at least one other person accepts us totally for who we are, "warts" and all. 5. Feeling part of a wider community. 6. Privacy: opportunity to reflect and consolidate experience. 7. Sense of status within social groupings. 8. Sense of competence and achievement. And 9. Meaning and purpose: which come from being expanded in what we do and think. (Tyrrell & Griffin, 2016).

According to *the human givens approach*, individuals may not be getting their needs met due to three main reasons:

1. Environment: Something in our environment is interfering with our ability to get our needs met.
2. Damage: Something is wrong with our 'resources'. We are either missing or have incomplete instincts; and
3. Knowledge: We may not know what we need (Banham, 2022).

However, according to *the Human Givens Theory*, Nature also gave us innate '*guidance systems*' to help us meet our needs. They are '*our resources*', and they, together with our *essential needs, physical, psychological, and emotional needs*, make up the human givens.

'*Our resources*' which nature gave us to help us meet our human needs are eight and are the following ones: 1. The ability to develop complex long-term memory, which enables us to add to our innate knowledge and learn. 2. The ability to build rapport, empathise and connect with others. 3. Imagination, which enables us to focus our attention away from our emotions, use language, and solve problems more creatively and objectively. 4. Emotions and instincts, a guidance system whereby, through the release of a variety of neurotransmitters, hormones, and other chemical messengers, we are driven to act to meet our survival needs. 5. The conscious, our rational ability to check out our emotions, question, analyse and plan. 6. The ability to 'know', which is understanding the world unconsciously through metaphorical pattern matching. 7. An observing self, which is that part of us that can step back, be more objective, and be aware of itself as a unique centre of awareness, apart from intellect, emotion and conditioning. And 8. A dreaming brain, that preserves the integrity of our genetic inheritance (Tyrrell & Griffin, 2016).

Consequently, according to *the Human Givens Theory*, ensuring that the *physical, psychological, and emotional needs* of people are sufficiently well met and, that they are using their innate resources effectively (our human givens), is what underpins all successful healing, parenting, education, communication, and efficacy in organisational settings (Human Givens Institute, 2016).

As it can be seen, in relation to all the fundamental needs for motivation and growth mentioned above, there are few needs that seem to be missed by every author if we take into consideration the contribution of Hedley Bull (1977) for social order.

As *the need for truth*. Because as it is mentioned by Hedley Bull (1977), truth is a requisite for social order. Because if people have their needs covered but they cannot rely on honesty, it is detrimental for them and the rest.

Also, the *need for life*, a life full of health and wellbeing. Which implies *a sense of collective health and wellbeing* as a need. Because being aware of how the cause and effect of our actions impact on others, so in the community, will help us to being responsible. Which also will help to attain better ways of living, and better societies, with *social order* and harmony.

Additionally, it implies *the need of property*, the care, maintenance, and good use of the communal resources, as human capital, natural resources, and local assets through *work by all members of the community*. Because everyone who is part of the society can be given some responsibilities and do some work for its improvement, and mostly those who are unemployed, in prison, and receiving economic help from the government. Then, capable tasks should be determined for everyone, even if it is just for four hours or five hours a month. Which will depend on personal circumstances and life conditions.

In this way mostly everyone will be able to contribute to the care, maintenance and good use of the communal resources, and to the wellbeing of society. Consequently, it will also help to attain *personal order*, and so, *social order*. Because, as it is mentioned by Moore (2012), through our common humanity we can increase our capacity to live and work together, connecting resources and people, through the power of new and deeper humans and organizations relationships.

In this way, we can have a better community where residents can be proud, happy, fight-free, and healthy. Because when there is fragmentation of the community, community cannot be seen as a valuable supply full of basic human resources, required for democracy and rich societies. As cooperation, understanding, honesty, commitment, trust, etc.

5.2. Social Order

The word "order" can be related to the Greek term κόσμος (*kósmos*), which means *order*, and is the antithesis of chaos Χάος (*kháos or cháos*) (Centro Virtual Cervantes, 2025), which means disorder.

To discuss *social disorder*, it is necessary to mention Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). Thomas Hobbes was a British, English philosopher. In his most recognized work, "Leviathan" (1651), he discusses the concepts of Social Contract Theory, as well as the emergence of law (natural rights and legal rights), and criminology. We refer to Thomas Hobbes to define disorder because he relates disorder to the state of human nature, characterized by violence and conflict due to a lack of regulation, and a lack of order due to a lack of authority. Therefore, where men live in conditions of fear and continuous insecurity (Sorell, 2025).

This concept of the "state of nature" also appears in the writings of the Chinese thinker and philosopher Mozi, Mo-Tzu (470–391 BC) (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2025). For the Mohists, the most important implication of this hypothesis is that people will hold different and contradictory views about what is morally correct, based on which they will condemn one another. Consequently, the final result will be a state of violent conflict and chaos. A chaos that will be fully resolved by the establishment of a hierarchy of rulers and leaders who systematically enforce a unified conception of what is morally correct through surveillance and incentives. The conclusion of the argument is that such a solution is a necessary condition for *social and political order* (Loy, 2025).

On *social order*, it is necessary to mention Hedley Bull and his main work, "The Anarchical Society," where he presents his theory of the society of nation states and emphasizes the concept of *order in social life*.

According to Hedley Bull, *social order* can sometimes be defined in terms of obedience to rules of conduct, and sometimes more specifically as obedience to rules imposed by law, by an authority, as Thomas Hobbes and Mozi determined. However, according to Hedley Bull, *order in social life* is more closely related to the conformity of human behaviour to rules of conduct, and not necessarily to the rules imposed by law (Bull, 1977). Because, for example, primitive societies have order but no law, they do not have a constitution, and they have assumed what is right or wrong within their borders. The same occurs at the international society of nation states, where there is no body determining how countries should behave, but order is maintained.

Then, *social order* requires patterns of behaviour and conduct that lead to a particular outcome, and an arrangement of social life which promotes certain goals and values in relation to a purpose, such as the sustainability of society.

Summarizing, Hedley Bull described the term *social order* explaining that in our international society, there is no body that determines what should be done, and therefore it is an anarchical society, but one where order is maintained. Which occurs as there are three basic objectives: *life*, *truth*, and *property/possessions*. Because in any constellation of people, groups, or communities where there is no expectation of *security* from violence, or where there is no enforcement of *agreements*, or where there is no stability of *possessions*, it is difficult to call it a society. So, unless these goals are achieved to some extent, we cannot speak of the existence of a society or of social life, because the achievement of other goals requires the achievement of these basic goals to some degree, and that is why, in fact, all societies seek to promote them.

Subsequently, although other goals must be pursued, all societies recognize these goals, and all societies embody agreements or treaties that promote them.

First, regarding *life*, all societies help create patterns of behaviour that conform to security and against violence, with norms and laws that protect *life* and prohibit murder and assault.

Second, regarding *truth*, all societies help create patterns of behaviour, or laws that govern the fulfilment of agreements, and rules that prohibit the breach of contracts.

Third, regarding *property* (possessions), all societies help create patterns of behaviour or laws that govern the stability of possessions, with property rules or contracts.

Therefore, these are the elementary or primary conditions of social existence in this era. Consequently, the more society conforms to them, the more *social order* there will be. Because in the case of *life* (security), if people do

not have some security against the threat of death or injury at the hands of others, they are unable to devote sufficient energy or attention to other goals to achieve them. In relation to *truth*, all societies seek to ensure that promises, once made, are kept, or that agreements, once entered, are honoured. Because without this, agreements or treaties cannot be created or established to facilitate human cooperation in any field. Regarding *property* (possessions), all societies pursue the goal of ensuring that the possession of things remains stable to some degree. Because if ownership by individuals or groups cannot be stabilized or settled to some degree (whether through private or communal ownership, or some kind of mixture of the two), it is difficult to imagine a socially stable society with relationships of any kind, since the things that human beings want to own are in limited abundance.

Because, if people were supposedly completely egoistic about their need for material things, the stabilization of possession through property rules would be impossible. The same would be true if people were completely altruistic. The same would also be true if there were a total scarcity of the things people desire to possess—that is, if there were nothing—, as it would be impossible to enforce property rules. The same would also be true if there were a total abundance of the things people desire to possess. For example, if everyone could have a Lamborghini, a Rolex, gold, mansions, etc., property rules would be unnecessary. However, because human egoism is limited, as is human altruism, and so, are also the things people desire to possess, it becomes necessary to stabilize the possession of assets for social life to exist (Bull, 1977).

Conditions and circumstances, which can also be applied to people. So, in this way each person can find order with others and with themselves, through self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*. Which implies pursuing the stability of their *tangible and intangible possessions*; the good use of the *truth*; and with *security*, protecting their *life* with emotional, physical, mental, and spiritual health, with a good general health, and therefore, with people full of *life* in all human facets.

As people must be responsible of their own actions. As it is emphasized by Talcott Parsons in his work ‘The Social System’ with Edward A. Shils. Where he presents the Structure of Social Action (1937), explaining that the actions of individuals are the ones which made up the social system, being the most important part of such actions, so not the person but the role or functions executed by that person (Parsons & Shils, 2001). Then, through self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*, it is possible to construct *personal order*, so activate potential development, and contribute to *social order* in any scenario.

Because everything is done by persons. Then without people there are not institutions, cultures, religions, ideas, governments, businesses, societies, art, hobbies, etc. Human constructions, which are, as it was explained by Claude Lévi-Strauss in Structuralism, determined in a big part by unconscious patterns and structures as culture, norms, values, traditions, (Cassar, 2024), and power, as it was established by the Post-Structuralism (Crick, 2016). But which can also be consciously directed through self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*.

Then, because everything is a cause or an effect from an action, as established by the casual analysis (Klein, 1987), and everything can be constructed, as it is established by the constructivism (Jean Piaget [1896-1980], Lev Vygotsky [1896-1934], & Jerome Bruner [1915-2016], in Chand, 2024). Which is based on the concept that individuals actively construct or create their own knowledge and experiences, and so, their learning experiences determine the nature of their own reality, and part of their communal reality with others (Chand, 2024). Furthermore, it can be stated that through self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*, every person can construct their own reality and part of their reality with others in a consciously, responsible and positive way. So, then every person can establish their *personal order* in every aspect of their life, as business, education, work, hobbies, etc. Contributing to social order in such scenarios. So, in a social system, contributing to its *social order*. However, it may happen only if they are aware of the basic principles of *social order*, as *possessions*, *truth*, and *life*.

However, for this to happen, all fundamental human needs must be covered first, as it was mentioned before, or the person must reach a level of discontent which act as stimulus for transformation, as mentioned by Dabrowski (Mendaglio, 2019). Then, subsequently, governments, institutions, businesses, organisms, the community, and the individuals, must be supported to work into it. Because as it is established in the social theory of Structural Functionalism, the society can be described as a framework with its component parts and the interactions between them (Ormerod, 2019). Then, according to it, each of the institutions, relationships, roles, norms, individuals, and groups, are indispensable for the continued existence of the others and of society as a whole (Encyclopaedia Britannica & Duignan, 2025).

6. Results and Discussions

After a long, laborious, and meticulous conceptual investigation of the fundamental needs for human development and of the terms ‘*social order*’ and ‘*social disorder*’, it was important to confirm with the observation research method how the basic elements for *social order*, *truth*, *property*, and *life*, were also fundamental for personal development. As through the observation research method, it was possible to confirm how actions which implied a not good use of the truth; the not respect of the tangible and intangible possessions of oneself, of others, and of the community; and the not care, value, and use of the health in all human facets; were hindering or stopping the development of events, activities, action, etc. Then, consequently, they were obstacles for realization of activities, acts, or events, and were also hindering personal development, social development, and communal or collective development.

Furthermore, throughout the findings of the conceptual research and of the observational research, the pedagogical terms ‘*personal order*’ and ‘*personal disorder*’ could be developed and, as consequence, are analyzed below.

According to the findings of this research and what has been presented in the theoretical framework of this article, it can be stated that *social order* contributes to and fosters the full potential of people and that, therefore, the greater the disorder in a society, the less able people are to reach their full potential.

Because, for example, in relation to *possessions*, or *resources*, if I own my house, the property is mine, it is fully paid for, but I have decided to go on vacation and upon returning I find someone else living there. Furthermore, if, according to the government, I, as the owner, cannot do anything about the occupancy of my property. Consequently, that generates disorder in my life, a *personal disorder*, which negatively impacts social order. Because

my life is connected to the lives of other people and, therefore, generates temporary or permanent obstacles to the achievement of my own potential human development, and that of others.

Regarding the use of *truth*, it can be mentioned, for example, the Constitution of a particular country. Which establishes that all citizens have the right to work, housing, and equality before the law, but this is not fulfilled. A disparity which creates disruption in the lives of people, *personal disorder*. Which continuously contributes to *social disorder* through temporary or permanent obstacles that hinder human development. Because if institutions do not fulfill their functions as they should, people cannot count on their use and, as a result, may begin to distrust them.

About a *life*-related example, it can be mentioned the use of weapons, such as knives, or machetes, to deal with problems, or issues with others. Which causes people to feel threatened in their daily lives. So, if a solution is not provided, and such aberrance does not diminish but continues to grow, which will create disorder in the lives of people, *personal disorder*. Because temporarily or permanently, it impedes or hinders the achievement of potential human development, especially due to the psychological impact of such events. Consequently, it will probably be becoming a source of *social disorder*.

Of course, these mentioned examples may not have a significant impact on the stability of a country, but they can contribute to social anomie. Furthermore, if they are left unchecked, they can escalate into a threat and lead to civil war or revolution. Which could also generate disorder with an international impact, impeding freedom of movement, exports and imports, etc., and thus hindering the development of other communities or nationalities. Because, as Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) mentions, *social disorder* can be defined in circumstances of war and crisis, where people live in conditions of fear and insecurity. Consequently, when *social disorder* occurs, for example, due to conflict that arises in periods of war or revolution, people resort to violence, break agreements, and violate property rights in the pursuit of other values (LawTeacher, 2013).

Then, *what do the Anarchic Society of Hedley Bull, international relations, and society of states have to do with what a person can do to contribute to their own personal development, that of others, and therefore to the social order?*

After the conceptual and observational analysis, it was found that the elements of *truth*, *property*, and *life*, to contribute to *social order* are also taking place at the personal sphere to development be able to occur. So, personal development, groups development, and social development, which successively contribute to *social order*. So, individuals can find order with others, with the environment, and with themselves as it similarly happens in "The Anarchical Society" of Hedley Bull (1977) with nation states. Because through self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*, individuals can have personal order, then are able to achieve potential development, and contribute to social order in the following ways:

1. Respecting, caring, valuing, and doing a good use of their *tangible and intangible possessions*, and of the *communal resources*, as local assets, human capital, and natural resources.

2. Making good use of the *truth* and with perception of a good use of *truth* by the environment, through *honesty*, which is also entangled to *transparency, trust, reliability...*; and

3. Taking care of their *life*, throughout assisting their *emotional, physical, psychological*, and *emotional health*, and perceiving *security* from the environment. Then, with good health, with people full of life in all human facets, and with a safe environment through a good health care system, surveillance systems, law enforcement authorities, etc.

Then, effective self-management on *property*, *truth*, and *life*, can be defined as *personal order*. First, because societies are made up of people who can impact on their improvement. Second, because this applied to individual human beings within groups, communities, and societies, can be associated with stability, balance, and security in relation to others. And third, because if this is applied to oneself, can also contribute to stability, balance, and security at the individual and personal level.

So, *how can self-management on truth, property, and life within groups, communities, or societies be associated with stability, balance, and security in relation to others? And, therefore with personal order, personal development, and social order?*

Because regarding *life*, if I, for example, as a person, disrespect the lives of others. So, I use physical punishment or aggression of any kind. This causes trauma and imbalance in the victims. Consequently, instability and insecurity have been imposed on the victim through trauma, due to lack of self-management on *property*, *truth*, and *life*, which has been termed as a *personal disorder*. Because the body of a person is her or his tangible property, and the law prohibits the use of physical punishment. Consequently, the victim cannot reach his or her full potential unless the damage caused is repaired. And, of course, such *personal disorder* impacts on *social order* if it keeps going on. As the victim may need social service assistance, economic help from the government, regular consultations with professionals as psychologists, a psychiatrist, etc.

The same thing happens with the *truth*. If I, for example, am a person who tells lies. So, I say one thing but do another. This causes *personal disorder* in other people. Because I am causing imbalance, instability, and insecurity in others. Because, for example, if I have promised my classmate that I will help her with her exam, then I decide I do not feel like keeping that promise and I do not keep my word. Or, for example, if I tell my boss to count me in for the Sunday shift, but then I do not show up. Then, of course, those circumstances generate instability, imbalance, and insecurity, delaying or preventing potential development, and of course, impacting negatively on *social order* if it continues. As through the bad references of others, I may not be able to get a job, so I may become a person dependent on the government, or of others.

We can also say, the same happens with the concept of *property* (possessions or resources). Because when the *human capital or intangible resources of others*, such as their dignity, choices, personal space, trust, positive habits and practices, the physical limits of existence, the beneficial tastes and emotions, etc., are not appreciated or respected, it creates imbalance, instability, and insecurity. or what has been called *personal disorder*. Which also impedes or delays potential development and contributes to *social disorder* in the long term. Because, for example, if I keep telling my sister that she cannot go out with me when her friends are unavailable, because I have assumed her doings are wrong, and that her choices are useless. A kind of bullying which causes my sister to begin to avoid me, not answering my text messages, or keeping herself away from me. Consequently, as a response, I act as if nothing was happening, so, I do not respect her emotions or I am unable to identify them, due to my selfishness. Of course, that will also create instability, and imbalance, *personal disorder*. Anomaly which will impact negatively on the *social*

order of the family. Because it is a richer family environment, the one where collaboration, respect, help, understanding, etc., are the norm.

Additionally, the same applies to the *tangible or material possessions* of others. Because, if I do not respect the possessions of others, or there is no deep-rooted sense of community, and people steal or destroy the belongings of others, or if public or communal resources are misused. Like public spaces, health facilities, natural resources, natural beauty, human capital, etc., as described in the "Tragedy of the Commons" (Hardin, 1968). Such behaviors also create instability, imbalance, and insecurity, thereby *personal disorder*. Which implies obstacles to potential development and contributes in the long term to *social disorder*.

Because, as explained in the "Tragedy of the Commons," the individual and selfish use of a shared resource can lead to its depletion or destruction, harming everyone (Hardin, 1968). So, if as social beings, we fail to consider our personal responsibility with tangible resources. Which involves taking care, appreciate, use, or consume, responsible and effectively the resources publicly shared, including those provided by nature. Which is also related to the carrying capacity of spaces, and the needs and demands of others. As consequence, if we do those actions irresponsibly and ineffectively, we will be causing damage in the environment, neglecting the human capital, the communal assets, or creating an imbalance in the amount of resources publicly shared. Then, we are falling into *personal disorder*, and we will be hindering development, and negatively impacting the *social order* in the long term.

Furthermore, failure to consider the value of the communal assets, of the human capital, and of the natural resources, as the needs and demands for the maintenance of a space used or inhabited by humans, as well as their carrying capacity, will create instability, imbalance, and insecurity.

Because it would be difficult to accommodate 20 people in a room measuring 18 cubic meters, for example. However, if this can be done, it must be considered that 20 people will do quicker damage to that space and will require more resources. Like more electricity, more laundry, more cleaning products, etc. Because more often the room will need to be painted, cleaned, updated, etc. Which will be also difficult to implement when there is not enough space, when perhaps the stress associated with its living capacity prevents cooperation among its occupants, or when existing funds are insufficient for such care and maintenance. As a result, there will be a kind of chaos, or a *mini-social disorder*, because of the consequence of such actions that exceed established physical and personal limits.

The same applies to natural spaces. Since all spaces, both natural and constructed, have a supporting capacity. As they possess certain resources and have also needs and requirements for their maintenance if they are used or inhabited by people. Consequently, human, monetary, educational, material, and time resources are required. Because it is necessary to prune trees, remove weeds, harvest fruits, reduce environmental impact, prohibit or manage trash and waste, and so on.

To better understand this, we can consider what Bruce Logan, Director of the Pennsylvania Institute for Energy and Environment, stated. He explains that if we take into account the carbon dioxide a person produces when breathing, in addition to the carbon dioxide produced by each person when using fossil fuels in the car, for heating, for cooking, for activities, for hobbies, etc., 730 trees per person would be needed, or approximately seven acres. Which is about 28,000 square meters of forested land (Logan, 2021), to prevent wear and tear, and maintain sustainable development.

Also, it can be said, that the same applies to human capital, as there are needs that must be met to encourage healthy human development and maintain human well-being. Because, as it was seen at the beginning of this article, there are fundamental human needs for human well-being and development which must be met. Therefore, to achieve a quality of life and an adequate education in the era in which we live, to contribute to *personal order*, to potential development, and to *social order*, are needed natural resources, monetary resources, educational resources, etc. Which is also related to self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*, and the personal and individual carrying capacity of each person, and of those people who are interrelated to others through close family or who must take care of others. Like an elderly ex partner/spouse or extended family member, stepchildren, or an ill ex partner/spouse or extended family member, or a disabled ex partner/spouse or extended family member, etc.

Because, a person who cannot provide the necessary physical or physiological care, emotional care, and other types of care, such as financial, etc., for himself or herself, and as well, for those whose are dependent on them, they are creating *disorder* in their own lives and in the lives of their dependents too. Because when a person makes indiscriminate use of resources or embarks on projects they cannot sustain responsibly and effectively, it can lead to bankruptcy or to poverty. For example, if a person only has a minimum monthly income but decides to buy a luxury car, live with high standards, or spend more than they can earn. This creates *personal disorder*, hinders or delays potential development, and this can also contribute to social anomie (UNIR, 2025), and furthermore, it can also contribute to *social disorder* in the long term. Because, for example, in the UK in 2016, poverty cost the government £78 billion annually to cover human needs such as healthcare, social services, food, economic help, etc. (Martin, 2016). Money that could be used to create more infrastructure, improvements, etc., to promote more prosperity.

Additionally, how does self-management on life, truth, and property, when applied to oneself, also contribute to personal stability, balance, and security, supporting what has been called personal order? And consequently, how does it contribute to potential development and social order?

Because in relation to *truth*, when a person is not honest with themselves, it creates imbalance, instability, and insecurity. For example, if a person is very overweight but cannot see that they are obese and keeps telling themselves they are fine and do not need to change their meals. Consequently, this person through the lack of self-management on *truth*, creates instability, imbalance, and insecurity, *personal disorder* with respect to themselves. In this case, with respect to their own health. Which delays their potential development, and in the long term will impacts on the *social order*. Because they may lose their capacity to work, while they will change their buying behaviour as they may need more intake of food, and more medication, they may also need extra communal resources to maintain their life, as support worker, more medical appointments, etc.

A similar situation occurs when a person lies about themselves to others. For example, if they lie about what they know what to do, or how things can be improved. Like, for example, if someone claims to be a doctor or

lawyer, but then shatters the expectations of others. Consequently, they create instability, imbalance, and insecurity around them, what has been termed as a *personal disorder*, and will negatively impact *social order* if that continues. As it can obstruct the development of projects, actions, etc. Which may involve more resources, such as energy, time, money, etc.

Additionally, regarding *property, possessions, goods, or assets*, it may happen the same pattern. Because in the case of *intangible goods*, when a person unknow their human capital, such as personal values, deep personal goals, ethical and aesthetic standards, criteria, commitment, responsibility, social skills, collaboration, positive habits, participation, personal hygiene, talents, trust, etc. They find themselves in a state of imbalance, instability, and insecurity, *personal disorder*.

Because if a person does not know what they want, where they are going, what they like or dislike, or their personal, ethical, and aesthetic standards, they will not be able to set boundaries or respect themselves in social interactions, in their behaviors, or in their actions toward others. This, in turn, impacts *social order*, especially considering the impact that immorality, ugliness, broken, dirt, and damaged things (D'Amore, 2017), have on oneself and others. Consequently, they may not be able to care for and respect their own intangible resources, such as friendship, trust, intimacy, talents, etc., or the intangible resources of others, creating *personal disorder*, hindering potential development, and consequently impacting negatively on *social order* if a remedy is not put into place. As the person can end up in social isolation, unable to interact with others, leading to depression or other illnesses. Which can also impact on their capacity to work, study, etc.

Similarly happens in the case of the *tangible assets* of people. Because when a person lacks material assets, monetary assets, educational qualifications, etc., they will be in a state of enormous insecurity, imbalance, and instability. Because when a person has nothing to rely on, which will prevent them from progressing, causing *personal disorder*. Which will hinder or delay their potential development, which will impact on the *social order* if it is not corrected. As the person cannot be able to consume to develop themselves. For example, to get a driving license, study, acquire assets to facilitate their life, like a car, a computer, and so on. Consequently, the person can end up being a homeless person making extra use of communal resources.

The same occurs also when a person fails to manage their *tangible assets or possessions*, exceeding their personal and individual carrying capacity when taking on responsibilities or actions that exceed their means. When these actions or responsibilities require more resources than they can contribute, or more resources than they have. Consequently, this creates instability, imbalance, and insecurity. As for example, if a person only has a minimum monthly income but decides to open three businesses or buy a four-bedroom house without being able to afford it, they are committing to actions or responsibilities that they cannot manage responsibly and effectively. As a result, they will generate instability, imbalance, and insecurity, *personal disorder*. Because, for example, if the person cannot pay the mortgage they can lose their property. So, they will be creating disorder in their personal life, hindering or delaying their potential development, and impacting negatively on *social order*. As the person may end up in absolute poverty, losing also the family, developing mental health problems, etc.

Regarding *life*, it happens the same thing. Because when someone causes internal damage to themselves, with destructive behaviors or habits such as negative thinking, smoking, taking substances, eating poorly, etc. They are creating *personal disorder* inside, but also outside. Because their physical appearance will reveal their internal circumstances, creating a negative impact on themselves through their bad physical, mental, emotional and spiritual health, and around them. Which hinders or delays potential development and impacts negatively on *social order*.

Exactly, this also occurs when a person causes external harm to themselves, whether through self-harm, conflicts with others, or neglecting their appearance or physical well-being due to lack of social life, lack of exercise or sports, lack of education or enrichment, etc. Which, consequently, will cause instability, imbalance, and insecurity, which enforce *personal disorder*. Which hinders or delays potential development and affects negatively *social order*.

Then, having in consideration the work of Moore (2012), it can be stated that through lack of self-management on *truth, property, and life*, we are unaware of how our beliefs, thinking, feelings, and relationships with ourselves, with others, and with the environment influence our actions, and so, the result of such actions.

Furthermore, neglecting or not putting into practice self-management in relation to these elements of *social order, life, truth, and property*, is extremely negative. As it produces *personal disorder*, which can also contribute to the production of social anomie (UNIR, 2025), and so contributes to *social disorder*.

7. Definitions of Personal Order and Personal Disorder

Based on the reflections and findings through the observation and the conceptual research, it can be stated that *personal order* refers to self-management on *truth, property, and life*. Which implies organization, care, and abundance, in the existence of a person, of tangible and intangible *property, resources, or assets*, the good use of *truth*, and with full of *life*, through physical and mental health, so also with security. Which must happen at the personal sphere and in his or her environment, as it is explained below.

When a person has tangible and intangible *property/possessions* and manages and cares well for them, they possess a strong structure of resources which enables them to enhance their human capacity. Because it provides stability, security, and confidence, and allows for significant economic stability that can foster or boost their potential development and that of others.

Also, if the environment is rich in tangible and intangible *resources*, and these are properly cared for and maintained, the person finds themselves in an environment that provides happiness, joy, and harmony. Which allows them to use those resources for their own benefit and that of society.

Regarding *truth*, if a person is honest and can be trusted because they know always how to make good use of the *truth*, this of course also favors and fosters potential development for them and for others and positively contributes to *social order*.

Additionally, if the environment where the person stays is transparent, reliable, and effective by the wide good use of the *truth*, the person feels confident that their environment is supportive and trustworthy. Which contributes to wellbeing and development.

In relation to *life*, if a person is full of *life*, because the person lives a healthy *life*, cares for it, and respects it, emanating ethical, aesthetic, physical, emotional, psychological, and spiritual well-being. Subsequently, they can, of course, optimally and effectively cope with the activities, obstacles, problems, actions, and responsibilities necessary for their daily lives. Which in turn favors and fosters potential development for them and for others, positively contributing to *social order*.

Besides it, if the environment is healthy, not polluted, it is cared for, and maintained, with plenty of natural resources, natural beauty, local assets, and human capital, it contributes to the health of its inhabitants or users. So, it will be fostering wellbeing and personal development, so *social order*.

Then, *personal disorder* refers to all personal circumstances that arise from lack of self-management on *property*, *truth*, and *life*. Which implies poor organization, neglect, and deficiency in the social existence of people, and in the environment, of the three elements necessary for *social order*:

- *Property*: Possessions, resources, or assets. This includes tangible resources and intangible resources of the person, and the tangible and intangible resources of the community or society. Which includes the human capital, the natural resources, and the local assets included in those natural and built landscapes or environments.
- *Truth*: Honesty and good use of truth with themselves and with others, and by the environment institutions, social agents, organisms, worker, etc.). And,
- *Life*: Which implies health in all its human facets (physical and mental health), and security, with themselves, with other in the social sphere, with family, friends, neighbours, social agents, etc., and by the environment.

Because, as argued in the preceding paragraphs, the lack of self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*. Which implies the misuse, the shortage, and the lack of care or the neglect in these areas, (*property*, *truth*, and *life*), creates *personal disorder*, so delays or hinder potential development and negatively impact on *social order*.

This can be originated, as mentioned above, on two levels.

It can be originated on the personal level, when there is not a good use of the *truth* by the person; when the person lacks *resources* or those resources are neglected; when his or her personal and individual carrying capacity is exceeded resulting in a misuse or poor management of resources; and when his or her physical and mental health is not of good standard. Which implies a deficiency of attention to the fundamental human needs for maintaining human well-being and development.

It can also be originated in the environment, when the truth is not used by the collectivity; when the carrying capacity of natural and built spaces is exceeded; when the resources provided by the environment are poorly cared for and misused; and when the built or natural environment do not contribute to the good life of its inhabitant deteriorating their physical and mental health. Which is generally due to a lack of attention to the demands and needs for the maintenance and conservation of these spaces when they are used or inhabited by humans.

8. Conclusions

Attending the reflections and findings of this conceptual research and the observation research, mainly presented on the theoretical framework and the results of this paperwork, it can be affirmed that the relationship between *personal order* and *social order* is reciprocal, as it is the relationship between *personal disorder* and *social disorder*. Because our way of behaving toward ourselves, is reflected in our way of behaving toward others. Which will depend on whether we can have the basic elements of social order, *life*, *truth*, and *goods/possessions or resources*), and whether we apply self-management on them. Taking care for and maintaining them properly.

Because if we have them, but we don't care for, or we do not maintain them properly, we will be creating circumstances which can generate instability, imbalance, and insecurity in our lives, just as we create instability, imbalance, and insecurity in the lives of others related to us, *personal disorder*. Because the person is exposed to irresponsible and unrealistic actions and behaviors with drastic consequences. Because they may disrespect others, the environment, the law, or themselves, showing irresponsibility, rudeness, and immorality, causing repulsion and blockages, in addition to potentially causing outstanding accounts with the judicial system, while destabilizing the community. Consequently, hindering their personal potential development and that of others.

Similarly, it occurs when the resources provided by the natural or built environment inhabited by humans or used by them are not seen as a valuable resource which contributes to wellbeing, development, and *social order*. Then, in these cases, those environments are not properly cared for, they are not properly used, they are not valued, and their carrying capacity may be exceeded. Which impact negatively on *social order*. As it can deteriorate the health and wellbeing of its users and inhabitants, causing *personal disorder*, hindering development, and contributing to *social disorder*.

Because everything that aims at the destruction of the individual, and of the environment, will have a negative impact, producing *personal disorder*, contributing to social anomie, delaying or hindering potential development, proliferating chaos, and ultimately contributing to *social disorder*.

Because the existence of anyone is based on the relationship with the resources of his or her environment through self-management on *truth*, *property*, and *life*. As no person can survive inside a room, with no contact with anyone or with anything.

References

- Alder, M. (1998). *The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. Touchstone.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), 142–175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(69\)90004-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X)
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44(9), 1175–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.9.1175>
- Banham, B. (2022). *Human givens therapy*. Counselling Directory. <https://www.counselling-directory.org.uk/human-givens-therapy.html>

- Bevins, D. T. (2018). *Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation: A generational study* [Undergraduate honors thesis, Eastern Kentucky University]. Encompass. https://encompass.eku.edu/honors_theses/547
- Bhandari, P. (2023, March 13). *Naturalistic observation: Definition, guide & examples*. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.co.uk/research-methods/naturalistic-observations/>
- Blatt, S. J., & Blass, R. B. (1996). Relatedness and self-definition: A dialectic model of personality development. In G. G. Noam & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Development and vulnerability in close relationships* (pp. 309–338). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-97225-012>
- Bretherton, I. (1987). New perspectives on attachment relations: Security, communication, and internal working models. In J. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development* (pp. 1061–1100). Wiley.
- Bull, H. (1977). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. Columbia University Press.
- Carver, C. S., Sutton, S. K., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). Action, emotion, and personality: Emerging conceptual integration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(6), 741–751. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200268008>
- Cassar, C. (2024). *Claude Lévi-Strauss's structuralism and its influence on anthropological thought*. Anthropology Review. <https://anthropologyreview.org/influential-anthropologists/claude-levi-strausss-structuralism-and-its-influence-on-anthropological-thought/>
- Caulton, J. R. (2012). The development and use of the theory of ERG: A literature review. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 5(1), 2–8. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol5iss1/ELJ_Vol5No1.pdf
- Centro Virtual Cervantes. (2025). *Fichas con el tema "Cosmos"*. https://cvc.cervantes.es/ciencia/astronomia/100_conceptos_basicos/tema.php?ter=Cosmos&con=c33
- Chand, S. (2024). Constructivism in education: Exploring the contributions of Piaget, Vygotsky, and Bruner. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 12(1), 274–278. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378071316>
- Cherry, K. (2024). *Maslow's hierarchy of needs*. Verywell Mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-maslows-hierarchy-of-needs-4136760>
- Crick, N. (2016, October 26). *Post-structuralism*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.49>
- D'Amore, D. (2017). The art of beauty—Aesthetics & wellness. *AphA Elei*, 41, 65. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358090754>
- DeCharms, C. R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. Academic Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2025). *Mozi summary*. <https://www.britannica.com/summary/Mozi-Chinese-philosopher>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica & Duignan, B. (2025). *Structural functionalism*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-structure>
- Feather, N. T. (1992). Values, valences, expectations, and actions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48(2), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1992.tb00887.x>
- George, T. (2023, March 10). *What is participant observation? Definition & examples*. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.co.uk/research-methods/participant-observations/>
- GoodTherapy. (2019). *Human givens (HG): Benefits, techniques & how it works*. <https://www.goodtherapy.org/learn-about-therapy/types/human-givens>
- Hardin, G. (1968). *Tragedia de los comunes*. Universidad Francisco Marroquín. <https://cadep.ufm.edu/concepto/tragedia-de-los-comunes/>
- Harvard University. (2025). *David McClelland (1917–1998): Human achievement and motivation research*. <https://psychology.fas.harvard.edu/people/david-mcclelland>
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Human Givens Institute. (2016). *How human givens differs from other therapy approaches*. <https://www.hgi.org.uk/human-givens/why-human-givens-approach-therapy-different>
- Human Givens Institute. (2016). *What is an organising idea?* <https://www.hgi.org.uk/human-givens/introduction/what-organising-idea>
- Human Givens Services. (2025). *Human Givens College: Our tutors*. <https://www.humangivens.com/college/all-courses/tutors/>
- Ismail, T. N. T., Vadeveloo, T., Kamarunzaman, N. Z., Yusof, R., Aziz, F. M. M., & Rahmat, N. H. (2023). Exploring motivation for learning through Alderfer's theory. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(2), 149–167. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i2/14453>
- Ivancevich, J., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2007). *Organizational behavior and management* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Klein, D. M. (1987). Causation in sociology today: A revised view. *Sociological Theory*, 5(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/201989>
- Kurt, S. (2023, October 9). *Alderfer's ERG theory*. Education Library. <https://educationlibrary.org/alderfers-erg-theory/>
- Kurt, S. (2022, October 17). *McClelland's three needs theory: Power, achievement, and affiliation*. Education Library. <https://educationlibrary.org/mcclellands-three-needs-theory-power-achievement-and-affiliation/>
- La Guardia, J. G., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Within-person variation in security of attachment: A self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfillment, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(3), 367–384. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.3.367>
- LawTeacher. (2013, November). *The social contract theories of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke*. <https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/contract-law/the-social-contract-theories-of-thomas-hobbes-and-john-locke.php>
- Laycraft, K. C. (2020). The theory of positive disintegration as future-oriented psychology. *Annals of Cognitive Science*, 4(1), 118–126. <https://scholars.direct/Articles/cognitive-science/acs-4-014.php?jid=cognitive-science>
- Logan, B. (2021, September 15). How many trees are needed to take up the carbon dioxide I release every day? *PennState Institute of Energy and the Environment*. <https://iee.psu.edu/news/blog/how-many-trees-are-needed-take-carbon-dioxide-i-release-every-day>
- Loy, H.-C. (2025). *Mozi (Mo-tzu, c. 400s–300s B.C.E.)*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://iep.utm.edu/mozi/>
- Maddux, J. E., & Gosselin, J. T. (2003). Self-efficacy. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 218–238). The Guilford Press.
- Maidani, E. A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 20(4), 441–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102609102000405>
- Martin, G. (2016, August 1). The £78 billion cost of poverty in the UK. *Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations (SCVO)*. <https://tfn.scot/news/the-78-billion-cost-of-poverty-in-the-uk>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970a). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970b). *Religions, values, and peak experiences*. Penguin. (Original work published 1966)
- Max-Neef, M. (2007). *La dimensión perdida: La deshumanización del gigantismo*. Universidad de Texas. <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/a214274f-d731-4472-bfee-8f3c91d84261/content>
- Max-Neef, M., Elizalde, A., & Hopenhayn, M. (1986). *Desarrollo a escala humana: Una opción para el futuro*. CEPUR & Fundación Dag Hammarskjöld. https://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/1986/08/86_especial.pdf
- McKechnie, L., Baker, L., & Gold, R. (2008). Observational research. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2, pp. 573–576). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n295>
- McLeod, S. (2025). *Maslow's hierarchy of needs*. Simply Psychology. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>

- Mendaglio, S. (2019). Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration: Some implications for teachers of gifted students. *Supporting Emotional Needs of the Gifted (SENG)*. <https://www.sengifted.org/post/medaglio-dabrowski>
- Moore, P. (2012). *Community educators: A resource for educating and developing our youth*. Kettering Foundation Press.
- Nuttin, J. (1984). *Motivation, planning, and action: A relational theory of behavior dynamics* (R. P. Lorion & J. E. Dumas, Trans.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; Leuven University Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1986-97082-000>
- Ormerod, R. (2019). The history and ideas of sociological functionalism: Talcott Parsons, modern sociological theory, and the relevance for OR. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 71(12), 1873–1899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2019.1640590>
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543–578. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170653>
- Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (2001). *Toward a general theory of action* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351301527>
- QuestionPro. (2025). *Conceptual research: Definition, framework, example and advantages*. <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/conceptual-research/>
- Reis, H. T., & Patrick, B. C. (1996). Attachment and intimacy: Component processes. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 523–563). Guilford Press.
- Robbins, S. P. (2009). *Organizational behaviour* (13th ed., International version). Pearson Higher Education.
- Rodríguez, A. (2006). Comunidad y gobierno local en el escenario global. *Cuadernos de Administración*, 19(36), 226–247. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2250/225020349008.pdf>
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0092976>
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63(3), 397–427. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/1995_Ryan.pdf
- Ryan, R. M., & Solky, J. A. (1996). What is supportive about social support? On the psychological needs for autonomy and relatedness. In G. R. Pierce, B. R. Sarason, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Handbook of social support and the family* (pp. 249–267). Plenum Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-1388-3_11
- Scribbr. (2025). *Research methods: Definition, types, examples*. <https://www.scribbr.co.uk/category/research-methods/>
- Sorell, T. (2025). *Thomas Hobbes: English philosopher*. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Thomas-Hobbes/Political-philosophy>
- Tabares, C. [Dr. Tabares-Ikjot Kaur]. (2024a, September 30). *Educación y entorno* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qFC2fgwJd5w&t=620s>
- Tabares, C. [Dr. Tabares-Ikjot Kaur]. (2024b, November 10). *Educación y ubicación* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rVa7QGoyAMU>
- Tabares, C. [Dr. Tabares-Ikjot Kaur]. (2025, February 11). *Educación del desorden personal* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fyLm0k8-vNE>
- Tabares, C. (2023). *Crecimiento personal, económico, y social en la neoindustrialización*. Lots to Say Ltd.
- Tabares, C., & González, M. (2023). *Historia general de la cooperación universitaria en África y con África*. Lots to Say Ltd.
- Therapy Near Me. (2025). *9 emotional needs for mental health – Human givens counselling*. <https://www.therapy-near-me.com/articles/9-emotional-needs-mental-health-human-givens-counselling>
- Tyrrell, I., & Griffin, J. (2016). *What are the “human givens”?* Human Givens Institute. <https://www.hgi.org.uk/human-givens/introduction/what-are-human-givens>
- Ungvarsky, J. (2024). *Need theory (Three needs theory)*. EBSCO Research Starters. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/psychology/need-theory-three-needs-theory>
- Universidad Internacional de La Rioja (UNIR). (2025). *La teoría de la anomia según distintos autores y su relación con la criminalidad*. <https://www.unir.net/revista/derecho/teoria-anomia/>
- Vansteenkiste, M., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-determination theory and the explanatory role of psychological needs in human well-being. In L. Bruni & P. L. Porta (Eds.), *Handbook on the economics of happiness* (pp. 187–204). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2008_Vansteenkiste_Capabilities_Happiness.pdf
- Wallis, J., & Dollery, B. (2001). Government failure, social capital and the appropriateness of the New Zealand model for public sector reform in developing countries. *World Development*, 29(2), 245–263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(00\)00092-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(00)00092-9)
- World of Work Project CIC. (2024). *Alderfer's ERG theory of motivation: A simple summary*. <https://worldofwork.io/2019/02/alderfers-erg-theory-of-motivation/>
- Wu, X., & Han, J. (2021). Psychological needs, physiological needs and regional comparison effects. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 9464. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169464>
- Yusoff, W. F. W., Kian, T. S., & Idris, M. T. M. (2013). Herzberg's two-factor theory on work motivation: Does it work for today's environment? *Global Journal of Commerce and Management*, 2(5), 18–22. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262639924_Herzberg's_Two-Factor_Theory_on_Work_Motivation_Does_it_Works_for_Todays_Environment