Why a Logoteleological Meaning-Centered Science Was Necessary

Structural Gaps in Existing Psychological and Organizational Frameworks

Luis A. Marrero, Boston Institute for Meaningful Purpose

February 18, 2026

Abstract

Across psychology, organizational science, and social theory, numerous frameworks have sought to improve well-being, motivation, leadership effectiveness, and human flourishing. Despite substantial theoretical development and applied innovation, long-term global indicators—including workplace engagement, anxiety prevalence, loneliness, and institutional trust—have remained stagnant or worsened in many regions (Gallup, 2023; WHO, 2023; World Values Survey, 2022). This persistence suggests not a failure of effort but a structural explanatory gap. This paper proposes Logoteleology, the scientific architecture underlying Meaningful Purpose Psychology, as an integrative, meaning-centered framework designed to address this gap. Unlike approaches that treat meaning as an outcome variable or a subjective construct, Logoteleology conceptualizes meaning as a structured, organizing system that shapes perception, belief formation, valuation, motivation, action, and consequences. By integrating insights from existential analysis (Frankl), individual psychology (Adler), analytical psychology (Jung), social cognitive theory (Bandura), positive psychology (Seligman), and systems theory, Logoteleology offers a coherent architecture for understanding why well-intentioned interventions may fail to produce durable change. The paper outlines the theoretical foundations of this framework, contrasts it with related traditions, and proposes directions for empirical investigation.

Introduction: The Paradox of Persistent Human Struggle

Over the past century, psychology and related disciplines have generated robust frameworks for understanding and improving human functioning. Evidence-based therapies, leadership development models, motivational frameworks, and well-being science have expanded dramatically. Yet global indicators of human flourishing present a complex picture.

Reports from the World Health Organization (2023) show rising rates of anxiety and depression worldwide. Gallup (2023) reports that global workplace engagement remains low, with stress levels at historic highs. Loneliness has been identified by public health authorities as a growing concern across multiple societies (WHO, 2023). Simultaneously,

F:\authorluismarrero.wordpress\Luis Articles 2026\Logoteleological meaning centered science\Why a Logoteleological Meaning.docx

Page 1

organizational change efforts frequently underperform relative to projected outcomes (Kotter, 2012).

These patterns do not imply failure of prior traditions. On the contrary, fields such as positive psychology (Seligman, 2011), existential psychology (Frankl, 1963), cognitive-behavioral science (Beck, 1976), and systems thinking (Bertalanffy, 1968) have made enduring contributions. However, the persistence of macro-level challenges suggests that existing models may not fully account for deeper structural determinants of human action.

This paper argues that a core explanatory layer—meaning as an organizing architecture—has remained insufficiently formalized across disciplines. Logoteleology emerges as an integrative framework for clarifying this structural layer.

Theoretical Background: Meaning Across Traditions

Frankl and Existential Orientation

Viktor Frankl (1963, 1967) positioned meaning as a fundamental motivational force. Logotherapy emphasized the human capacity to choose one's attitude toward unavoidable suffering. Frankl's contribution was existential and phenomenological; however, he did not formalize a structural model of how meaning organizes cognition, belief systems, and behavioral outcomes across domains.

Logoteleology builds upon Frankl by specifying the structural dimensions through which meaning operates: interpretive schema, belief formation, valuation hierarchies, internal experience, attitudinal orientation, and purposive direction.

Adler and Teleological Striving

Adler (1956) emphasized purposiveness in human striving. Individual psychology framed behavior as goal-directed, often compensatory. Adler's teleology recognized forward movement toward perceived goals. However, it did not differentiate between inherited, compulsive, aspirational, or consciously constructed meaning structures.

Logoteleology extends Adler by distinguishing between purposiveness that is structurally coherent versus purposiveness that reproduces dysfunction due to unexamined meaning frameworks.

Jung and Symbolic Interpretation

Jung (1964) highlighted archetypal structures and symbolic interpretation as shaping psychic life. While Jung's analytic psychology emphasized meaning-making through myth

and symbol, it did not formalize an applied model for examining how contemporary belief systems systematically organize decision-making within organizations or social systems.

Logoteleology integrates Jung's symbolic insight but operationalizes meaning as structurally observable across belief hierarchies and decision pathways.

Bandura and Cognitive Mediation

Bandura's (1986, 1997) social cognitive theory introduced self-efficacy as a mediating variable between belief and action. This contribution clarified how belief shapes behavior. However, Bandura did not conceptualize the broader architecture from which beliefs themselves emerge.

Logoteleology situates self-efficacy within a layered meaning system, suggesting that efficacy beliefs are nested within larger interpretive and valuation structures.

Positive Psychology and Flourishing

Seligman's (2011) PERMA model operationalized well-being across positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. Meaning appears as one dimension among others.

Logoteleology diverges by proposing that meaning is not one dimension of flourishing but the organizing matrix through which all dimensions are interpreted and pursued.

Systems Theory and Structural Causality

General systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968) and cybernetic models describe feedback loops and structural interdependence. However, they rarely specify the interpretive meaning-layer through which actors define system inputs and outputs.

Logoteleology posits that meaning functions as an interpretive filter within systemic loops.

The Structural Architecture of Logoteleology

Logoteleology conceptualizes meaning as a layered architecture:

1. Interpretation of reality
2. Belief formation
3. Value prioritization
4. Internal experience regulation
5. Attitudinal orientation
6. Purposive direction

These dimensions interact recursively through feedback mechanisms, shaping action and consequence. When coherent, individuals and systems exhibit clarity, agency, and adaptive functioning. When distorted or implicit, dysfunction may persist despite intervention.

Persistent Trends: Empirical Context

Table 1

Global Indicators of Psychological and Organizational Strain (Selected Reports)

Indicator	Trend	Source
Workplace engagement	Low global average (~23%)	Gallup (2023)
Anxiety prevalence	Increasing globally	WHO (2023)
Loneliness reports	Rising across age groups	WHO (2023)
Institutional trust	Volatile/declining in many nations	WVS (2022)

These trends do not invalidate existing frameworks. Rather, they suggest that durable transformation requires attention to the deeper architecture through which individuals and institutions interpret and enact change.

Filling the Structural Gap

Logoteleology does not replace prior traditions. It integrates them within a meaning-centered explanatory structure. The framework proposes that interventions fail durably when:

- Interpretive assumptions remain implicit.
- Valuation hierarchies conflict with stated goals.
- Motivational drivers are misaligned with the professed purpose.
- Feedback loops reinforce initial distortions.

Thus, persistent dysfunction may be structurally organized rather than accidental.

Implications for Research

Future inquiry may explore:

- Cross-sectional analysis of interpretive coherence and well-being.
- Organizational case studies examining valuation alignment.
- Development of structured qualitative protocols assessing meaning layers.
- Longitudinal tracking of purposive clarity and outcome stability.

F:\authorluismarrero.wordpress\Luis Articles 2026\Logoteleological meaning centered science\Why a Logoteleological Meaning.docx

Importantly, Logoteleology is presented as a theoretically integrated explanatory proposal rather than an empirically finalized model.

Conclusion

The persistence of global psychological and organizational challenges suggests the need for integrative frameworks that address deeper structural determinants of human action. Logoteleology proposes that meaning functions not as a subjective add-on but as the organizing architecture of perception, belief, valuation, motivation, and consequence.

By clarifying this layer, Meaningful Purpose Psychology seeks to contribute constructively to the ongoing interdisciplinary effort to understand and improve human flourishing.

References

Adler, A. (1956). The individual psychology of Alfred Adler. Basic Books.

Antonovsky, A. (1987). Unraveling the mystery of health. Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2002). The pursuit of meaningfulness in life. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), Handbook of positive psychology (pp. 608–618). Oxford University Press.

Beck, A. T. (1976). Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders. International Universities Press.

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). General system theory. George Braziller.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). Mindset. Random House.

Edmondson, A. (2018). The fearless organization. Wiley.

Frankl, V. E. (1963). Man's search for meaning. Beacon Press.

Frankl, V. E. (1967). Psychotherapy and existentialism. Washington Square Press.

Gallup. (2023). State of the global workplace: 2023 report. Gallup Press.

Jung, C. G. (1964). Man and his symbols. Doubleday.

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). Leading change (Rev. ed.). Harvard Business Review Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. Online
Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1).

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). Flourish. Free Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline. Doubleday.

World Health Organization. (2023). World mental health report. WHO Press.

World Values Survey Association. (2022). World Values Survey Wave 7 dataset.