

A STUDY OF THE SELF CONCEPTS OF A GROUP OF ADOLESCENT
STUDENTS AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THESE
SELF CONCEPTS AND BEHAVIORAL RATINGS

by

Kenneth Miller Grierson

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Education
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

June 1961

APPR

(Adviser for the Thesis)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer gratefully acknowledges the inspiration, encouragement and continuing interest provided by the writer's original adviser, the late Dr. Patrick Killgallon. The writer is deeply indebted to Dr. John Lallas for his invaluable guidance and support during the latter phases of this study. To the other members of the doctoral committee, Dr. Leona Tyler, Dr. Raymond Lowe, Dr. Charles Warnath and Dr. Walter Hill is extended sincere appreciation for their interest. Special thanks are due to Miss Nancy Clarke, Mr. Andrew Melnychuck and Mr. George Ewanchuck for their willing participation as evaluating teachers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Philosophical Background of Interest in the Self-Theory	6
Theoretical Structures	6
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	29
Procedures	29
The Pilot Study	30
IV. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	41
Results of the Self-Concept Scales	41
Results of Behavioral Rating Scores	49
The Relationships between the Different Self-Concepts and the Behavioral Ratings.	51
The Relationships between Pairs of Self-Concept Discrepancies	52
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
Summary	55
Conclusions	55
Recommendations	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61
APPENDICES	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. IQ Distribution of the Sample	31
2. Mean, Standard Deviation and Critical Ratios for the Three Self-Concept Scales	41
3. Comparison between Expected and Obtained Fre- quencies for the Self-Concept Quotient Distribution	43
4. Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit of the Self-Concept Quotient Distribution	44
5. Comparison between Expected and Obtained Fre- quencies for the Peer Self-Concept Quotient Distribution	45
6. Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit for the Peer Self-Concept Quotient Distribution	46
7. Comparison between Expected and Obtained Fre- quencies for the Teacher Self-Concept Quo- tient Distribution	47
8. Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit for the Teacher Self-Concept Quotient Distribution	48
9. Mean and Standard Deviation of Behavioral Rating Scores	49
10. Goodness of Fit for Behavioral Rating Scores Obtaining Expected Frequencies	50
11. Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit for the Behavioral Rating Scores	50
12. Correlations between the Self-Concepts and Behavioral Ratings	51
13. Correlations between Discrepancy Scores of Three Self-Concept Discrepancies	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Current psychological literature shows revitalized concern about the exploration of self as a legitimate subject for psychological study. It is seldom possible to locate precisely the stimulus for re-awakened interest in a field of study. So it is in the area of self-concept. G. W. Allport (1943) did much to stimulate interest in this field and was responsible in large measure for providing a turning point in modern psychology. He felt that there should be an intense study of the ego (or self). He contended that modern psychology had become sidetracked into other avenues of study which would not be as productive and useful as the self approach.

The importance of the self in the field of educational psychology is obvious when one considers the impact of the school upon the fostering or fixation of certain attitudes, interests, aspirations, values and ideals. All these are implicit in the view an individual has of himself. For educators, more than any other professional group, the study of self has an importance and application which demands full exploration of all possibilities for utilization of such a theoretical construct.

A. T. Jersild (1952) pointed this up clearly when he spoke of the staggering magnitude of the need for doing something in our educational program to help children and youth to acquire realistic attitudes of self-acceptance. He found a large proportion of young people entering adulthood who were burdened with anxiety, hostility, defensive attitudes towards themselves and others, feelings of guilt, inferiority or other forms of self-disparagement and self-mistrust. He urged that a program of study be undertaken to find to what extent and in what ways the normal process of education might achieve the kinds of benefit which result from the psychotherapists' efforts in re-educating his patients.

The school is often accepted as second in importance to the home as a place of influencing a child's attitude. Nonetheless, it can play an extremely important role in modifying or reinforcing the child's attitudes toward himself and others. Therefore, fullest utilization of the most effective measures for establishing proper attitudes and values is a prime responsibility of the school. This can only be done best when a fuller understanding of each person's views of himself can be ascertained.

In the whole field of guidance there is a growing realization of the importance of self. D. Super (1951) commenting upon adjusting to vocational life states that an individual's exploration of his own feelings and attitudes brings about not only self understanding but a self acceptance which

releases the individual emotionally so that he is free to face facts and to deal with them rationally. In relation to choosing an occupation Super contends that one is in effect choosing a means of implementing a self concept. It is clear therefore that more than the labor market situation needs to be explored in order to conduct effective vocational counseling.

In the field of personal guidance considerable support to this view can be obtained. N. Hobbs (1949) perhaps speaks for most when he states that the self provides direction for the life of the individual by selectively responding to the environment, admitting those stimuli which are tolerable to the self, and excluding, or distorting those which are unacceptable to the self.

Adolescent psychology falls within the field of general psychology. Many problems are peculiar to this period in an individual's life. It is a period of great turbulence in the development of attitudes toward self and others. The effects of adolescent changes in the self are not widely known nor are their implications generally appreciated. The adolescent is struggling to attain independence and self-direction which should accompany maturity. This process of necessity requires some periodic re-evaluation of oneself in terms of the adult world into which one is rapidly approaching.

Although there has been mounting interest in, and study of the self, in recent years the preponderant emphasis has

been placed on the self of the adult. Very little has been directed toward the self in adolescence, and very few studies indeed have attempted to explore the self of Grade IX level pupils. In this regard there are some unanswered questions which constitute the problems of this particular study.

1. In what manner are self-concept scores of adolescents distributed?
2. How consistent are the self-concept scores of adolescents in the following three areas, self-concept, peer self-concept and teacher self-concept?
3. What are the relationships between self-concept scores and observed behavioral ratings?
4. How consistent are the discrepancies between different pairs of self-concepts? This refers to the magnitude of the differences between self-concept scores in one area when compared with self scores in another area.

The present study was undertaken to attempt specifically to answer these questions in an effort to contribute to closing the large gap of lack of information of adolescent concept of self.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The self theory approach toward understanding personality has achieved tremendous popularity and support within the past fifteen years. This sudden surge of interest in the field brought with it many and varied approaches towards the analysis of self. Many of the approaches had common elements and differed only in the emphasis given to one particular aspect of the self. In much of the experimental work conducted lines between the various approaches were crossed, i.e., relationships between one certain kind of self and another were explored.

Although the self should in broad perspective be considered a single entity, yet due to the different stresses placed on the manner of examining the self, different "schools" seem to have been formed each with a special point of view. It will be noted in reading the literature that these "schools" far from being mutually exclusive actually have conducted research which strengthens the position of another "school" as well as its own.

Realizing the dangers inherent in classifying the literature of self an attempt will be made to set forth the principal outstanding approaches together with some of the

experimental work done relative to those frames of reference. Again it should be pointed out that the differences are in emphasis rather than basic beliefs.

Philosophical Background of Interest in the Self-Theory

A. Dualism

In philosophical literature, Kant and Schopenhauer discussed the self. At this time a distinction was created between the subjective "I" and the objective "me." The "I" was considered as the "knower" and "me" as the "object of knowledge." This dual concept of self has been the subject of much discussion and controversy.

B. Transcendentalism

This particular conception of self is described by J. S. Moore (1933) who stated that the self was an integration of feelings, desires and ideas. He rejected the dualism of Kant and Schopenhauer by uniting the "I" and the "me." The soul, he contended, was not another self from the mind.

Theoretical Structures

A. Empirical Ego

William James (1948) in referring to the self as the "empirical ego" provides a definition of self which is extremely inclusive. To him self is the sum total of all that a person possesses, his body structure, his abilities, his

friends, his enemies, his family, his avocations, his material possessions, and all other events or objects which have impinged on his life. He classified the self under three headings: (1) its constituents, (2) self feelings, and (3) actions of self seeking. James was one of the earlier and intensive theorists in this field and did much to spark the imagination of others to come, including Allport.

Sarbin (1952) undertook to review some of the main conceptions of the ego, finding over a dozen variants, some of which were: the physical self, the material self, the projective self, the pure ego, the ethical self, the inferred self, and the social self. He considered these as substructures of the total cognitive structures which are required through experience. In his discourse the use of the term "self" was synonymous with the term "ego."

B. Psychoanalytic Self

Symonds (1951) approaches the ego and the self from the psychoanalytic point of view. Although the self and the ego are different entities, he contends that there is considerable interaction between the two. The self is how a person thinks of and values himself. It also helps to determine how he will attempt to enhance these thoughts or to defend them. If the self is enhanced, he feels, the ego processes are more likely to function more effectively. Symonds also introduces an element of self which he terms self-ideal; he goes on to

x

describe how this develops through childhood into adolescence.

In this approach to self, Symonds has the support of some theorists influenced by Freud, such as Adler who put considerable stress on the importance of understanding how a person feels about himself in situations to which he is exposed.

Hilgard (1953) maintains that the theories that have evolved from Freud, Jung, Adler and others all imply a self-reference. To feel guilty for example, is to conceive of the self as having made bad choices, therefore self-reference enters in. A basic human need to Hilgard is to restore or maintain an adequate level of self-esteem. Anxiety is produced by the fear of the loss of self-esteem which essentially is self-concept.

C. Evolving Self

Allport, (1937) one of the earliest exponents of and contributors to the study of self, postulated an evolving self. This self is made up of many different selves each of which may develop in different ways and at different rates until they become integrated into a complete personality structure. Some of the entities include bodily sense, self-identity, self-esteem, self-image, and the rational self. Generally the "ego" and the "self" are not distinguished. However, he does make one distinction. The ego is the product of the actions of the self. The self can be considered as the acting process, whereas the ego is the resultant object.

Allport reviewed the sensationalistic and Gestalt conceptions of self from which he evolved the idea that the ego

develops gradually and with great difficulty. An infant, he states, does not recognize himself as an individual. With growth, self-involvements and concepts develop which are indispensable to the production of memory, judgment, motivation, intelligence, etcetera.

Allport, in one of his early works, collected from the different psychological constructs different conceptions of the ego as found in the literature of that time. From these he selected the following which he felt to be of primary importance.

- The ego as the knower.
- The ego as object of knowledge.
- The ego as primitive selfishness.
- The ego as dominance-drive.
- The ego as a passive organization of mental processes.
- The ego as a "fighter for ends."
- The ego as a behavioral system.
- The ego as the subjective organization of culture.

He felt that these eight concepts are not separate entities but that they could be subordinated under one inclusive theory of the ego, and citing from experimental evidence concluded that ego involvement or the total participation of the self as knower, organizer, observer, status seeker and social being incorporates several if not all of the former entities listed.

Another outstanding contributor to the study of an evolving self is Jersild (1957) who compiled a comprehensive summary of psychological conceptions of the self. Five years earlier in his book, In Search of Self, he set forth a number

of different selves including self, self-ideal, social-self. However, they were not clearly enough differentiated nor was it shown adequately how these selves were synthesized into a unified whole. His later work demonstrated more clearly the integration and synthesizing of different selves in the total functioning of the individual. He brings in self-perceptions, self-impressions, values, convictions, attitudes, role, feelings, and background, all intertwining and impinging upon each other to make up the overall feeling of a unified self. He stressed the importance of understanding of self in the educational program. He contended that the most important contribution which could be made to a person is to help him achieve a realistic concept of self. This would go far in reducing anxiety prevalent within young people and would result in better functioning, more productive, happier people. Jersild makes a statement which appears paradoxical. He states that the self is both constant and changeable. He explains this by saying that it includes the constant nature of the individual plus all that is conditioned by time and space and that is changeable. That is, the self is the nucleus around which experiences are integrated into the uniqueness of the individual.

To Chein (1944) the self evolves as a state of awareness. It has no reality apart from awareness. The ego is a motivational-cognitive structure built around the self.

Wattenburg (1955) who is primarily concerned with

personality development during the adolescent years visualizes the growth of the concept of self as a vital aspect in personality growth of adolescents. Level of aspiration, attitudes of superiority and inferiority as well as other aspects relating to the self are discussed in his book. Wattenburg states the thesis that maturing personality growth evolves with increasing self-insight and development of a concept of self which is realistic.

Overstreet (1952) discusses the development of building the self-concept as partly dependent on cultural factors. He states that in an authoritarian era the self-concept of self-depreciating submissiveness and obedience is promoted. He deplores the factors which go into the emergence of such an era. In order to build a sound self-image, i.e., development of feelings of worth, an individual must develop goodwill feelings toward those in authority over him. This can best be done by reducing fears, hostilities and irritations bred of parental exercise for power.

The change in self-concept is derived through time and experience or is an evolving self, so postulates Super (1951) who also states that a rather firm degree of stability is attained by the time late adolescence is reached. The derivation of self-concepts according to Super stems from inherent aptitudes, physiological make-up, opportunity to play roles, and the meeting of approval (or disapproval) by superiors and peers.

Some experimental efforts to explore the growing or evolving self have been made. Caplin (1955) observed four-year-olds in a play therapy situation. The self-evaluation as observed through behavioral change demonstrated a gradual adjustment toward a pattern more consistent with cultural norms. In children of this age group, Caplin noted that experiences in social situations assisted in evolving a more adequate concept of self. Klausner (1953) has demonstrated experimentally that socio-economic factors influence the development of the self-concept.

D. Self-Consistency

Following Allport's paper of 1937 was to be found a monumental effort in a book entitled Self Consistency written by Prescott Lecky (1945). In this volume he presents his fundamental thesis which is that the nucleus of all actions, thoughts and feelings, is the individual's idea or conception of himself. Any idea impinging upon the individual, if inconsistent with the individual's conception of himself, cannot be assimilated, but instead gives rise to an inconsistency which must be removed as promptly as possible. He further states that personality integration is the result of unifying attitudes and beliefs (either by selection or rejection) in the direction of self consistency. This means that an individual must define for himself the nature of the totality which he is. This having been done, it is difficult to alter the opinion one holds of oneself. Nevertheless it is

sometimes necessary. The change in concept of self will then of necessity be very gradual. Lecky gives a striking illustration of the effects of such resistance in the case of an intelligent student who is deficient in spelling. This student defined himself as a poor speller. In order that he be true to himself, his misspelling of a certain proportion of words became a moral issue. He misspelled words for the same reason that he refused to become a thief. That is, he behaved in a manner consistent with his idea of himself.

Brownfain (1952) specifies some of the most important selves in one's personality structure. Here he includes the self he really believes he is, the self he aspires to be, the self as he feels others view him, the self he hopes he is at present and the self he fears he is at present. The problem in developing a sound personality structure is to crystallize and identify these selves, then to make them as consistent as possible to each other. This unification into a consistent pattern would be the process which would strengthen the personality and would ameliorate strength-sapping anxieties.

Rogers and Dymond (1954) introduced a special dimension into the explanation of maladjustment. This dimension they termed the self-ideal, and concerned the discrepancy between the real-self and ideal-self. Maladjustment to them meant that the discrepancies between these two entities was too great and the reduction in the discrepancy would result in

diminishing the maladjustment.

Bugental (1949) contended that well integrated individuals were more likely to view themselves in a similar way in various situations. This is directly in line with Lecky's self-consistency theory.

McQuitty (1950) is basically in agreement when he takes the position that the self-concept is an integrating phenomenon. An adequate personality to him, is one which is well integrated or the parts consistent, which is to say the individual can accept into his organized concept of self all the interpretations of reality, including of course perceptions relating to himself.

Of late years, Hurlock (1953) has taken the stand that the individual's concept of self is the fundamental core of the personality structure. What a person thinks of himself, his abilities and his disabilities, will determine the characteristic form of his behavior. She feels that the self-concept is reasonably fixed, and although certain changes do occur, the changes are for the most part slight. Hurlock opposes Lindgren's view (which is stated later) with respect to self-concept stability during adolescence. She claims that the self-concept becomes quite stable in adolescence.

Sherif and Cantril (1947) as well as Smith (1950) basically emulate the writings of Lecky. Abnormal behavior is produced through a distortion of the ego reference. They do attach much more importance to the sociological factors than

Lecky does, however, contending that diverse sociological groups exert great influences on the development of the ego.

Ausubel (1954) generally echoes the views of most authorities in developmental psychology. In discussing adolescent behavior he expresses the view that self-concept occupies a prominent place in the individual's psychological field. At this age he notices a considerable upward revision of self-estimate and level of aspiration. This reaction produces a marked contrast to the carefree and extroverted self of later childhood. The adolescent self becomes a more crucial and clearly delimited object of awareness. This implies a narrowing of the gap between the self-concept and self-ideal and is thus in agreement with Havighurst (1949) who states that the ideal-self is especially important in directing behavior and shaping character during the years of adolescence when major life decisions must be made and when parental example and precept are no longer accepted with blind faith.

Of the many approaches or emphases of self, Lecky's "school" more than most has prompted exploration by empirical methods. The idea of the importance of consistency was found to be a provocative stimulation to many persons who endeavored to put his idea to the test. The studies cited are designed to illustrate the nature and scope of the experimental work done rather than provide an exhaustive survey of the field.

A procedure for obtaining self-group discrepancy scores

is reported by Calvin and Holtzman (1953) who demonstrate that these scores are sufficiently stable to warrant serious consideration as new measures of personality. Very recently Hickman (1957) in investigating the self-related concepts in five areas observed that the size of the discrepancies between the self-concepts clearly served as a measure of personality adjustment. His criteria were the M.M.P.I. and the Rorschach.

Phillips (1951) used a sociometric device to study self-other relationships. With the use of his questionnaire he demonstrated positive relationships (in excess of .50) between attitudes towards self and towards others. A similar type of study is reported by Berger (1952) in which he found the self-accepting person much more likely to accept others than the non-accepting person. A further confirmation of these findings can be noted in McIntyre's (1952) results which showed considerable positive relationship between attitudes toward self and towards others. Zuckerman (1956) reporting on a study of ninety mental patients and normals of adult level found that self-acceptance served as a measure of adjustment amongst normal adults but that it did not serve as an accurate index of adjustment with the patient group. However, as a group the patients were more dissatisfied. This is one of the few researches showing contrary evidence to most experiments concerning self-acceptance and adjustment.

Fein (1951) and Fey (1955) used the Frunkel Brunswick F Scale and other instruments. Fein found that self-acceptance

was most closely linked with the discrepancy between the self and ideal-self.

E. Homeostatic Self

This refers to the concept that a being or individual lives in a state of equilibrium. The organism resists any attempt to disturb this condition. It is constantly seeking to regain equilibrium if impinged upon by any disrupting force. Stanger (1951) views self-concept as an entity in this principle of homeostasis. The state of homeostasis is disrupted if one's concept of self is unrealistic in the complex interactions between the self and the external situations.

Axline (1947) supports this view when she suggests that poor reading and resultant emotional disturbances probably stem from the inability of the child to resolve the conflict between a conception of himself as a poor reader and a concept of himself as a good reader. Until the child can modify his conception of himself to the extent that he will consider himself as an adequate reader he will resist efforts to change him into being a good reader.

F. Self As the Directing Force

This emphasis toward self resembles that of Lecky and Rogers but differs very slightly in the interpretation of how the directing force is developed. Lindgren (1954) considers the self as it relates to mental health. He states that the

self is the directing force which produces the activities and skills required to meet one's needs and to maintain a high level of mental health. This self has been formed through the perceiving of a portion of the world gradually differentiated and set apart from the rest of the world. If objects or events outside of his immediate sphere are seen as being important to his welfare he becomes ego-involved in them.

Lindgren goes on to say that separating or splitting within the self occurs, resulting in different selves. On occasion the gap or disparity between the selves can be very great such as between the real self and the idealized self. The greater the disparity the greater the development of feelings of anxiety and insecurity. Lindgren contends that this discrepancy is likely to be greater during adolescence than at any other time.

Hanlon (1954) concurs with Lindgren's contention. He too put particular emphasis on the two selves, namely real-self and ideal-self. He asserts that maladjustment would be gauged by noting this discrepancy regardless of age or intelligence level of the individual.

Although Lindgren believes essentially as Rogers does with respect to self theories, he makes a distinction in how the self develops. To Lindgren a portion of the world which an individual perceives gradually becomes differentiated from the rest of the world. This becomes the self. It is that portion which is within the control of the individual. He

goes on to state that this self operates to organize and direct the activities of the individual in ways that assist him to meet his needs.

G. Phenomenological Self

Here again the distinction between this "school" and others is not great. Reaction to outside influences is given more emphasis in this construct. Snygg and Combs (1949) have stimulated considerable interest in developing the theory of phenomenological psychology. Their contention is that the behavior a person displays is dependent upon the concept he has of himself. In short, the self can be considered as both the "doer" and the "object" at the same time. In order for a shift of the self-concept to be effected, many repetitive experiences of a specific kind are required. Generally the self can be considered as stable. Outside forces if employed consistently and often enough however, can effect the manner in which the self is perceived.

Combs (1949) in a separate publication expanded on this somewhat by stating that the two frames of reference are first, the external where we observe the behavior of an individual as an outside observer and secondly, the phenomenological frame where we are concerned with the individual perceptions of himself in his environment. Combs leaned most heavily on the latter although he attempts a marriage of these frames of reference. He considers maladjustment as a perceived threat to the self. Therapy may attempt to produce change in the

individual's perception of self or his perception of external events or both. If the environment is immodifiable, he contends' therapy will only be effected by a change in the perception of himself.

Hobbs (1949) suggests that there are a number of personality theories but in these continually there is a re-emergence of a concept of self which at first supplemented and later superseded other theories because the other theories have been tried and found wanting. If one were to select a single criterion of what a person is to become that criterion must be in terms of the phenomenological self.

McLeod (1949) cautions us to beware of over-simplification of a single simple theory of self. Having made the warning, he goes on to say that a great contribution is being made to human understanding through the phenomenological approach. He points out that the self is a natural system capable of generating its own needs and concludes that the self is the point of origin of all motivation, i.e., every act springs from disequilibrium within the self.

Smith, Bruner and White (1950) stress the importance of accepting self-concept as a fuller and more adequate current personality theory. Whether we use the term Phenomenal Self, Ego, Self-Image or some other, it is evident to them a major contribution to the understanding of behavior results from noting a person's reactions to his experiences in terms of self-reference.

H. Self-Actualization

This theoretical approach grew out of the work done in non-directive counseling under the leadership of Carl Rogers at the University of Chicago. Rogers, the most prolific contributor to modern self-theory, has provided the greatest impetus to study and research in this field in recent years. Rogers (1947) contends that the key to understanding human behavior is to see the way an individual perceives himself. The self is composed of perceptions concerning the individual, and it is the organization of these perceptions which affects the behavior of the individual.

As the most notable researcher in the area of the study of self, Rogers (1954) and his associates have accumulated much evidence during the past fifteen years. The evidence has been in the form of sound film recordings, sound recordings, transcripts, behavioral observations and use of self-analysis scales. It must be recognized that the experimental group with which he dealt was a rather select one, the subjects being made up of college students who sought out counseling service. Although this group may not have been representative, the high incidence of effective counseling based on this theoretical construct would make it appear that it might be considered for general application. This type of approach in research might be termed the qualitative approach where prime determiner of values is the counsellor's subjective judgment of the degree to which change in self-concepts

has occurred.

Rogers personally supervised many of the research studies in the realm of self. He also set the stage for other investigators by posing problems to be solved and suggesting various approaches to the solving of those problems. He achieved this by exposing the methods and techniques which he had found to be fruitful. It was Rogers more than anyone else who promoted the development of assessment techniques of self. His inspiration and empirical approach was profoundly instrumental in carrying on appraisal of and varying interpretations of self and how understanding of self could be applied in life situations.

To illustrate the extent of his influence and to focus attention on the kinds of questions researchers have been trying to solve in this field a number of the most widely known studies are presented. They have all evolved in one way or another from Rogers' influence.

The most widely accepted self-concept scale is that of Bills (1951) known as the Index of Adjustment and Values. It is made up of 49 adjectives which subjects rate on a five point scale. The Index attempts to measure in three areas namely, self-concept, self-ideal, and self-acceptance. Reliability coefficients ranging from .83 to .91 are reported for the different measures. This instrument has been most useful in detecting considerable depression, extremes in level of aspiration, and extreme emotionality.

Webb (1952) devised a list of traits for each of which a rating of from 1 to 7 was possible. The subjects were asked to rate themselves on these trait continua. Then each was asked to rate the others in the group. Generally there was some disparity between the individual's concept of himself and the group's concept of him. Generally in a desirable trait there was self-overevaluation and in undesirable traits self-underevaluation.

Another instrument developed within the past decade was that of Brownfain (1952). He selected twenty-five personality traits and had college students rate themselves on these traits. He then separated the negative self-concepts from the positive ones. The conclusion Brownfain reached from his study was that subjects with stable self-concepts were better adjusted than those with unstable self-concepts. A somewhat similar type of test was devised by Worchel (1958) in which a self-rating scale of fifty-four items was employed. This was called the S.A.I. or the Self Activity Inventory. The results indicated a positive relationship between one's self-evaluation of adequacy and ability to perform in a frustrating situation.

Another recent study is that of Taschuk (1957) who selected seventy-seven statements from self-descriptive essays and placed each statement on a five point scale from "very true about me" to "not true about me." From the responses

self-concept scores in four broad categories were developed. The Self Rating Inventory was the basic instrument in two other studies, those of Cowen (1956) and Zimmer (1954). Cowen studied the adjustment of college students who scored high and low on negative self-concepts. He found no indication that low negative self-concept ratings were characteristic of the best adjusted individuals. On the other hand Zimmer, using the same tool with the same type of subjects, found supporting evidence for the idea that low negative self-concept scores were related to better adjustment. Further, Zimmer observed that discrepancies between self-concept and ideal self scores did not directly indicate conflict.

One attempt has been made to examine several instruments designed to measure self-other relationships. This was done by Omwake (1954) who examined Berger's, Phillip's and Bills' instruments. She found that all three served as useful tools in studying the self-concept.

One kind of approach employed in self-concept research might be termed 'self-concept in terms of some external frame of reference.' One external frame of reference is performance in class. Sumner (1949) noted least discrepancy between self-values and aspirations in the upper quarter of the class. Torrance (1954) revealed that there was little relationship between self-estimates and achieved standings but, when given an opportunity to re-evaluate themselves, a general downward revision was found in the direction of a more realistic

self-evaluation. This is essentially the finding of Mitchell (1945).

Still another frame of reference is that of personality tests. Colvin (1956) used the M.M.P.I. to study relationships between adjustment and self-ideal discrepancies. He observed that students who show poor insight into their level of adjustment are more likely to be maladjusted than those showing good insight. Another observation made was that the more poorly adjusted were more self-depreciating. Similarly Taylor and Combs (1952), using the California Test of Personality, demonstrated that children with satisfactory self-concepts, also scored satisfactorily on the personality test as well as being able to better accept damaging statements about themselves.

The T.A.T. was used by Dymond (1948) to study self-other patterns and she concluded that the T.A.T. seems to provide a valid method of revealing internalized patterns which represent the subject's view of his interpersonal relations. Dymond, after having just concluded her study, was taken to task by Child (1956) who checked the T.A.T. against a self-rating questionnaire of two hundred items. He found no significant relations and hence could not corroborate Dymond.

A third technique employed in self-concept research might be termed analysis of behavior. This deals primarily with the psychotherapeutic setting. Rogers and Dymond (1954), using self-statements made in therapy, demonstrated that

discrepancy between the self and ideal indicated stress, tension and maladjustment. Brownfain (1952) noted that subjects with consistently stable self-concepts were better adjusted than those with unstable self-concepts. (Johanson (1953) observed that the effectiveness of vocational counseling significantly increased with the development of increase of self-knowledge.) Sheerer (1949) in examining counseling cases concluded that a definite relationship existed between acceptance of self and acceptance of and respect for others. Raimy (1948), using transcribed recordings of fourteen cases, found that improved clients were making preponderantly more self-approving statements, therefore he concludes successful counseling involved essentially a change in the client's self-concept. Berdie (1954) voices the same conclusion as he too noted improvement of self-ratings after successful counseling. Rogers, Kell and McNeil (1948) in studying delinquents found that future adjustment depended primarily on the individual's understanding of himself and the reality situation. Stock (1949) found that a person who had negative feelings about himself almost invariably had negative feelings toward others. Holt (1951) found that self-insight showed statistically significant relationship to intelligent living and social adjustment. Jersild (1957) from studying self-referent statements deduced that the more genuinely a person at any level of age or social prestige, realizes his own selfhood, the greater is his capacity to relate to others and greater is his opportunity

to fully realize his potentialities.

Another technique quite widely used is the W.A.Y. (Who Are You) technique. Bugenal (1952) and Hanlon (1954) and many others used this method for acquiring self attitudes. The Q technique, developed by Stephenson (1953) has been receiving more popularity recently as a method for investigating the self-concept. McGregor (1955) adapted the Q sort to study self-group, self-ideal, self-group ideal and ideal-group relationships in adolescents. He observed some tendency for self-concepts to conform to group ideals. Block and Thomas (1955), using self-sorts and ideal-sorts showed a relationship between self-satisfaction and the social dimension of adjustment. Levy (1956) using actual-ideal sorts, arrived at the conclusion that discrepancies between the actual and ideal self-concepts appeared to be far more significant than considering both separately. Chodorkoff (1954), also using the Q sort as well as adjustment rating by judges, concluded that an individual's perception of himself and self-description are good criteria for his personal adjustment. Butler and Haigh (1954) employed the Q sort to test the hypothesis that people who came for counseling are dissatisfied with themselves and following counseling their dissatisfaction with themselves was reduced. They concluded that self-esteem (which to them is the congruence between self and ideal-sorts) increases as a direct result of client-centered counseling.

Gross (1948) constructed and partially standardized a scale for measuring self insight from which evolved a formula. The formula was subjected to rather rigorous examination and was found to provide valuable information with respect to identifying sense of achievement, reasoning ability, contemplative attitude and initiative. Grossman (1951) went further and constructed and validated two tests. Adaptations of the Guilford Martin and T.A.T. tests were employed. The amount of insight a subject possessed was measured by the degree of discrepancy between the manner the subject answered certain items and the way the psychologist felt he should answer the item.

Gough (1955) developed the adjective check-list as a personality assessment technique and found it useful in differentiating between social stereotypes.

The research that has been conducted clearly indicates that no absolute conclusions can be reached either about the best specific technique or indeed about the self-theory itself. However, there are some strong indications as seen by much corroborative research cited that self-concept theory and specific practices in specific situations are effective. With further future research, refining of instruments, and perhaps synthesizing of points of view a great contribution may be made toward a fuller understanding of human personality.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is an attempt to analyze adolescents' concepts of themselves in three frames of reference and to relate their concepts of themselves to the types of behavior they display in the school setting as observed by teachers.

Procedures

The design has been prepared to explore the following research questions.

1. Are self-concepts of adolescents normally distributed?
2. Do adolescents who are self-deprecatory, tend to think that other groups think of them in deprecatory terms?
3. Do adolescents who are self-enhancing tend to think that other groups think well of them?
4. Are self-deprecating adolescents those who generally display behavior traits considered to be more undesirable than traits displayed by self-enhancing adolescents?
5. Are self-concept discrepancies between different pairs of selves consistent?

The Pilot Study

Three Grade IX classes served as the pilot study group. Four other pupils were selected arbitrarily as representing a cross-section of pupils on the basis of social acceptability, achievement and intelligence. These four pupils served as judges to evaluate each of the adjectives on the check list. The kinds of rating appeared to adequately differentiate between self-enhancing and self-deprecatory words. The actual distributions of self-concept scores were sufficiently varied to give an indication that this plan of research would be feasible with another group. The study provided much information for the refining of administrative and scoring procedures employed in the actual research.

A. Selection of the Sample

One hundred pupils were selected from the four Grade IX classes of one junior high school in the city of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. The particular school selected was one in which the writer taught. The writer, however, did not teach the pupils who were in the sample group. This particular school was selected because of the cooperation which could be elicited from the staff toward relinquishing their classes for the periods required for the administration of the tests. The willingness of the three teachers involved as evaluators of pupil behavior was also instrumental in the selection of this school.

In this sample there were 56 boys and 44 girls. Of these 100 students there were 5 for whom no IQ ratings were available. For those for whom IQ results were available there were two different IQ tests on record. The Detroit beginner's test was administered in Grade I. The Laycock Mental Maturity Test was administered in Grade V. Table 1 shows the distribution of the IQs for the two tests.

Table 1. IQ Distribution of the Sample

Mean IQ for the group from Detroit Test	109 (N = 57)
Standard Deviation of Detroit Test	14
Mean IQ for the group from Laycock Test	109 (N = 94)
Standard Deviation of Laycock Test	14

It should be noted at this point that both the Detroit and Laycock tests have an elevated IQ in terms of the population of Grade IX Edmonton pupils. Investigation with test results of both of these tests have shown the Laycock IQ average for Edmonton to be 106 and the Detroit IQ test average for Edmonton to be 110. In view of these results it would appear that the IQ mean of the sample group approximates that of the city population from which the sample was taken. It can be concluded then that in terms of intelligence ratings this sample can be considered as a representative group. The particular school from which the sample was selected drew from both the upper and lower income groups.

B. Selection of Judges

In order to obtain some criteria of the worth or value

of each adjective checked, it was felt that some person or a group would have to determine the degree to which a specific adjective was self-enhancing or self-deprecatory. It was first thought that a group of mature, experienced teachers who had a fairly complete understanding of adolescent psychology would be a suitable group to serve as judges. However unbiased a teacher may be, his value system might not be in accord with those of Grade IX students. Therefore, it was felt that the judges for evaluating the adjectives should be from the peer group of the subjects in the study.

Initially it was planned to select randomly from the sample those who would serve as judges. This posed two problems: (1) Would a small sample chosen randomly be representative? and (2) Would the rating of the adjectives influence the manner in which the students would later check the items when the self-concepts were appraised?

It was felt that representative peer judgment could best be obtained by utilizing those pupils who had been selected by all the adolescents in the school to represent the views of the entire student body in the various affairs within the school. This group was the student council and classroom representatives, duly elected by ballot. Edwards¹ has indicated similarity between different groups within a sample when rating the desirability of statements to be used in a self-reference scale. The views of these judges then can probably be considered as representative.

¹Allen L. Edwards, The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research (New York: The Dryden Press, 1957).

C. Development of Instruments

Introduction to Gough's Adjective Check List and Its

Use.--H. Gough, working in the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research at the University of California devised an appraisal instrument for assessing the self-concept of adults. He selected the adjective check list approach which he felt was meaningful, sufficiently complex in scope to cover the ordinary range of behavior observed, and susceptible of systematic analysis. He found this a satisfactory method for determining the self in various experiments he conducted.

Several reliability studies have been conducted with this instrument. Reliability coefficients obtained range from .63 to .73, which although somewhat lower than other psychological instruments displays sufficient consistency that it can be considered a useful psychological tool.

The self-concept instrument employed in this research is the identical tool devised by Gough. The use of the instrument differed only in the weighting of adjectives which formed a part of this study. The reasons for selecting this instrument for this particular study were as follows.

1. There is a wide coverage of descriptive adjectives which permits considerable scope in expression of how one feels about himself.
2. Pupils are not forced to commit themselves about any attitude or feeling about which they are uncertain or confused.
3. This list could be readily administered in a single

37-minute period thereby minimizing disruption of the regular school instructional program.

4. The responses to the list could be objectified and subsequently treated statistically.

Computation of Self-Concept Values.--Each adjective was assigned a numerical value ranging from 0 to 5 based on the ratings of the judges. The total number of points earned by any particular individual was the sum total of all values attached to the words he checked. This total was divided by the number of items he checked. The final quotient was multiplied by 100 to remove the decimal.

An illustration may assist in clarifying the procedure followed. (See Appendix 3.) Pupil number 1 on the self-concept administration checked 86 words. The total value of the words was 288 points. This total divided by the number of words gave the following $\frac{288}{86} = 3.34$. The quotient was then multiplied by 100 to remove the decimal producing the Self-Concept Quotient 334.

Three separate administrations provided three different sets of self-quotients depending on the frame of self-reference attached to each administration.

Computation of Self-Discrepancy Values.--There was incorporated into this study an examination of self-concept discrepancies and the interrelatedness of these discrepancies.

In this particular study the object was to determine how consistent were the discrepancies between the various pairs

of self-related concepts. Do pupils who have minimal discrepancies between Self-Concept and Peer Self-Concept also have small discrepancies between Self-Concept and Teacher Self-Concept as well as between Peer Self-Concept and Teacher Self-Concept? Do pupils who have greatest discrepancies between two sets of self-related concepts, have most divergent scores between the other paired categories?

In order to obtain the information to answer such questions the following procedures were followed.

- (a) Three different discrepancy scores were obtained for each pupil, namely,
 Self-Concept, Peer Self-Concept discrepancy
 Self-Concept, Teacher Self-Concept discrepancy
 Peer Self-Concept, Teacher Self-Concept discrepancy.
- (b) Discrepancies in each category were set up in table form showing the distribution of discrepant scores ranging from 0 to 119, the range of discrepancies.
- (c) By use of the Pearson product moment of correlation the relationships between the various discrepancies were calculated. The results are noted in Table 13.

The Behavior Rating Scale.--The Behavior Rating Scale was devised to obtain an external measure for the sample group. The external group selected in this study was the teachers most intimately connected with the pupils for whom self-concept scores were obtained.

The scale was devised so as to assess in a simple manner adult judgment values for these pupils. In order to simplify the decision making for the teachers doing the rating and to make for more simple statistical treatment, each trait was dichotomized in terms of whether each specific individual

possessed that trait to a greater or less degree than the average. (See Appendix 2)

The traits selected for the scale were taken from a number of sources. An attempt was made to extract those traits most commonly recognized as important and indicative of the entire personality structure of the adolescent individual. Of necessity when limiting the number of traits to 27, many traits had to be eliminated. However, those traits found most often amongst forms of behavior assessed by well known experts were drawn together to form the list.

The sources from which the trait names were obtained included McQuitty's (1950) list of personality traits, Yeager's (1935) traits of prospective teacher candidates; Haggerty, Olson and Wickman's (1930) well known Behavior Rating Schedule; Rogers' (1931) adjustment scale, Kelley's (1935) essential traits of human life, selected self-referral type items from the California Psychological Inventory and Allport's (1936) comprehensive list.

In many instances different terms were employed by different authors to imply the same basic trait. In such cases the most commonly understood trait name was selected. At all times throughout the delineation of traits an effort was made to maintain as comprehensive coverage of traits as possible and still secure a simple well understood short list for easy checking.

The ratings were further set up in such a way that the

statements were of a positive, desirable nature. When checked on the left column this indicated that the particular individual being assessed was considered to have better than average quality in each trait examined. In this way a positive value of plus 1 was awarded to each check in the left column. Similarly, a value of minus 1 was awarded to each check in the less desirable or right column. Simply by adding all the check marks in the left column and subtracting from this total the number of check marks in the right column a whole number behavior rating score could be obtained. The behavior rating score for each individual was obtained by averaging the behavior rating scale score of all the teachers involved with that individual.

D. Administration of Instruments

Rating of the Adjectives.--Each of the judges was asked to evaluate each adjective in terms of how much or how little a self-statement using the adjective would be indicative of feelings of personal worth. Each judge was asked to affix values to each adjective ranging from 1 to 5. (See Appendix 5.) These judges were asked also to indicate the words which to them were not understandable. This request was made to determine which words were beyond the understanding of most pupils. The plan was to discard any words which fewer than half of the judges knew. Interestingly enough, none of the 300 adjectives had to be discarded as all the words were indicated as being known by a majority of the judges.

*but does this
visually show
possibilities
rest of 5, 7*

The values given to each adjective by each of the judges were added and the average worth of that adjective thus arrived at, i.e., the total score obtained for a certain adjective was divided by the number of judges who assigned a value to that adjective. This average score was considered as the self-concept score for that particular adjective. An example may help to clarify the manner in which this self-concept value was obtained.

The first term, absent-minded, was given a weighting of 1 (very self-deprecatory) by thirteen of the judges. Fifteen other judges gave it a value of 2. One judge gave it a value of 3. To average these, the following method was used:

$$\frac{(13 \times 1) + (15 \times 2) + (1 \times 3)}{\text{Number of judges responding}} = \frac{13 + 30 + 3}{29} = \frac{46}{29} = 1.59$$

Hence absent-minded was given a self-concept value of 1.59.

(See Appendix 4.)

This procedure was followed for each of the 300 adjectives of the check list.

The Self-Concept Scale Administration.--Each of the 100 pupils in the selected sample was given a copy of the adjective check list. Directions as to how to use the scale were issued orally while the pupils read the directions to themselves. (See Appendix 6.) Any questions as to the clarification of what was required was dealt with immediately after these directions were read. One regular class period was required for the completion of this test. This procedure was followed

in the four classrooms involved on the same half day so that no opportunity was afforded the pupils to discuss the check list with the other pupils.

One week later the same test was administered in the same manner with the emphasis being placed on peer-self. (See Appendix 7.) One week after this the teacher self-concept was elicited in precisely the same manner. (See Appendix 8.)

Behavioral Rating Scale Administration.--Each of the evaluating teachers was asked to rate each pupil in the traits listed. (See Appendix 2.) Two specific suggestions were made to them. First, they were encouraged to evaluate all of the pupils to be dealt with one trait at a time, i.e., trait number 1 about being outgoing and freely expressive to be rated for all of the pupils before going on to trait number 2, etc. This request was made in order to avoid a "halo" effect and thus obtain a more objective evaluation for the entire group. Second, each teacher was asked to evaluate only those traits he or she felt in a position to evaluate. For example, if a particular pupil was not well known to the teacher only a few traits were to be checked whereas a pupil known intimately could be evaluated on all 27 traits.

E. Analysis of the Data

The data gathered was examined and the following kinds of analyses were made:

1. The self-concept scores were examined as to the means, and standard deviations. Critical ratios were calculated to determine the significance between the means.

2. The distributions of the sets of self-concept scores were tested for normality using the chi-square method.

3. The distribution of scores of the behavioral rating scale was tested for normality by the chi-square method.

4. Intercorrelations were calculated for the following pairs of relationships (Pearson product moment method).

Self-Concept and Peer Self-Concept

Self-Concept and Teacher Self-Concept

Self-Concept and Behavior Rating Scale

Peer Self-Concept and Teacher Self-Concept

Peer Self-Concept and Behavior Rating Scale

Teacher Self-Concept and Behavior Rating Scale

Self and Peer Self-Discrepancy, and Self and Teacher Self-Discrepancy

Self and Teacher Self-Discrepancy, and Teacher Self and Peer Self-Discrepancy

Self and Peer Self-Discrepancy, and Peer Self Teacher Self-Discrepancy.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Results of the Self-Concept Scales

The distributions of the three self-concept scales were examined. Comparisons between the distributions were tabulated. The results of the calculation of mean scores, standard deviation and critical ratio for the three different self-concept scales are noted in Table 2. The means of the self-concept and peer self-concept scales were observed to be very similar, whereas the teacher self-concept score mean was somewhat divergent. The t test was employed to determine the degree of significance of the differences between the means.

Table 2. Mean, Standard Deviation and Critical Ratios for the Three Self-Concept Scales

	M	SD	t
Self-Concept	342.8	32.7	.90
Peer Self-Concept	342.4	34.2	
Teacher Self-Concept	329.5	41.0	2.54*

*Significant at the .02 level.

A critical ratio of .90 between the self-concept mean and the peer self-concept mean indicates that there is no significant difference between these two measures, using the .05 level of confidence as the criterion. On the

other hand a critical ratio of 2.54 between the self-concept mean and the teacher self-concept mean indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between these two measures at the .02 level of confidence.

In order to determine how closely the distributions of the self-concept scores resemble the normal distribution, the chi-square test for normality was applied. Guilford's (1956) method as noted on page 241 was employed and the results are set down in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

It should be noted that Table 3 provides the preliminary data for the calculation of P for the Self-Concept Quotient distribution as noted in Table 4. Similarly, Tables 5 and 7 lead into Tables 6 and 8, respectively.

The self-concept distribution yielded a P at .60 level of confidence. The peer self-concept distribution yielded a P of .07 and the teacher self-concept distribution yielded a P of .21. If we accept the .05 level as the criterion for significance we must accept the hypothesis that the differences between the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies are not sufficient to reject the idea that the scores were normally distributed. It can be concluded then that the self-concept scores are normally distributed.

Table 3. Goodness of Fit for Self-Concept Quotient Distribution Obtaining Expected Frequencies
(p. 121, Guilford)

(1) Scores	(2) Midpoint X	(3) Deviation x	(4) Standard Score z	(5) y from Table B	(6) fe	(7) fo
441-460	450.5	107.7	3.27	.0019	.1	1
421-440	430.5	87.7	2.36	.0247	1.5	2
401-420	410.5	67.7	2.07	.0468	2.9	1
381-400	390.5	47.7	1.46	.1374	8.4	3
361-380	370.5	27.7	.88	.2709	16.6	20
341-360	350.5	7.7	.24	.3876	23.7	25
321-340	330.5	-12.3	-.38	.3711	22.7	27
301-320	310.5	-32.3	-.99	.2400	14.7	12
281-300	290.5	-52.3	-1.60	.1109	6.8	6
261-280	270.5	-72.3	-2.21	.0347	2.1	2
241-260	250.5	-92.3	-2.82	.0075	.5	1

$$x = X - 349.2$$

$$z = x/32.7$$

y from Table B

$$fe = \left(\frac{1N}{\sigma}\right) y \quad \frac{1N}{\sigma} = 61.2$$

Table 4. Chi-Square Test for Self-Concept
Quotient Distribution
(p. 241, Guilford)

(1) Scores	Original Grouping		Regrouped Frequencies		Cell Discrep. fo-fe	Squared (fo-fe) ²	Cell-Square Contingencies $\frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe}$
	fo	fe	fo	fe			
1	.1	}	4	4.5	-.5	.25	.055
2	1.5						
1	2.9						
3	8.4		3	8.4	-4.6	21.16	2.520
20	16.6		20	16.6	3.4	11.56	.696
25	23.7		25	23.7	1.3	1.69	.071
27	22.7		27	22.7	4.3	18.49	.815
12	14.7		12	14.7	-2.7	7.29	.497
6	6.8	}	9	9.4	-.4	.16	.017
2	2.1						
1	.5						

$$\chi^2 = 4.671$$

df = no. of categories -1

df = 6

P approx. .60 level of confidence

Table 5. Goodness of Fit for Peer Self-Concept Quotient
Distribution Obtaining Expected Frequencies
(p. 121, Guilford)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Scores	Midpoint X	Deviation x	Standard Score z	y from Table B	fe	fo
421-440	430.5	88.1	2.56	.0150	.88	
401-420	410.5	68.1	1.99	.0550	3.22	1
381-400	390.5	48.1	1.41	.1477	8.64	10
361-380	370.5	28.1	.82	.2849	16.67	25
341-360	350.5	8.1	.24	.3902	22.83	23
321-340	330.5	-11.9	-.35	.3752	21.95	15
301-320	310.5	-31.9	-.93	.2607	15.25	12
281-300	290.5	-51.9	-1.52	.1255	7.34	9
261-280	270.5	-71.9	-2.40	.0224	1.31	4
241-260	250.5	-91.9	-2.69	.0107	.63	
221-240	230.5	-111.9	-3.27	.0020	.01	1

$$x = X - 342.4$$

$$z = x/34.2$$

y from Table B

$$fe = \left(\frac{1N}{\sigma}\right) y \quad \frac{1N}{\sigma} = 58.5$$

Table 6. Chi-Square Test for Peer Self-Concept
Quotient Distribution
(p. 241, Guilford)

(1) Scores	Original Grouping		Regrouped Frequencies		Cell Discrep. fo-fe	Squared (fo-fe) ²	Cell-Square Contingencies $\frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe}$
	fo	fe	fo	fe			
0	.88						
1	3.22		11	12.74	-1.7	2.89	.227
10	8.64						
25	16.67		25	16.67	8.3	68.89	4.139
23	22.83		23	22.83	.2	.04	.001
15	21.95		15	21.95	-6.9	47.61	2.173
12	15.25		12	15.25	-3.2	10.24	.671
9	7.34		9	7.34	1.7	2.89	.393
4	1.31						
1	.63		5	1.95	3.0	9.00	4.103
0	.01						

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2 &= 11.707 \\ df &= 6 \\ P &= .07 \end{aligned}$$

Table 7. Goodness of Fit for Teacher Self-Concept Quotient
Distribution Obtaining Expected Frequencies
(p. 121, Guilford)

(1) Scores	(2) Midpoint X	(3) Deviation x	(4) Standard Score z	(5) y from Table B	(6) fe	(7) fo
421-440	430.5	101.0	2.46	.0194	.94	1
401-420	410.5	81.0	1.97	.0576	2.82	3
381-400	390.5	61.0	1.48	.1335	6.53	4
361-380	370.5	41.0	1.00	.2420	10.83	14
341-360	350.5	21.0	.51	.3500	17.12	24
321-340	330.5	1.0	.02	.3987	19.50	16
301-320	310.5	-19.0	-.46	.3608	17.64	11
281-300	290.5	-39.0	-.95	.2541	12.43	13
261-280	270.5	-59.0	-1.43	.1337	6.54	9
241-260	250.5	-79.0	-1.92	.0636	3.11	4
221-240	230.5	-99.0	-2.41	.0220	1.08	1

$$x = X - 329.5$$

$$z = x/41.1$$

y from Table B

$$fe = \left(\frac{iN}{\sigma}\right) y \quad \frac{iN}{\sigma} = 48.9$$

Table 8. Chi-Square Test for Teacher Self-Concept
Quotient Distribution (p. 241, Guilford)

(1) Scores	Original Grouping		Regrouped Frequencies		Cell Discrep. fo-fe	Squared (fo-fe) ²	Cell-Square Contingencies $\frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe}$
	fo	fe	fo	fe			
1	.94						
3	2.82		8	10.29	-2.3	5.29	.504
4	6.53						
14	10.83		14	10.83	3.2	10.24	.946
24	17.12		24	17.12	6.9	47.61	2.780
16	19.50		16	19.50	-3.50	12.25	.678
11	17.64		11	17.64	-6.6	43.56	2.469
13	12.43		13	12.43	.8	.64	.051
9	6.54						
4	3.11		14	10.73	3.3	10.89	1.015
1	1.08						

$$\chi^2 = 8.443$$

$$df = 6$$

$$P = .21$$

Results of Behavioral Rating Scores

The Behavioral Rating Scale produced a considerable range in scores. One pupil received a rating of plus 27, the highest possible for an individual. Another pupil obtained a score of minus 19, which meant that in the opinion of the teachers this pupil possessed 19 more traits on the undesirable side of the ledger to those on the desirable side. Table 9 indicates the mean score of all the rating scores and also provides an indication of variability within the distribution.

Table 9. Mean and S.D. of
Behavioral Rating Scores

Mean	+5.42
S.D.	11.22

The kind of distribution of scores obtained from the Behavioral Rating Scale are to be noted in Tables 10 and 11.

If we accept the .05 level of confidence for statistical significance we must conclude from the .04 value obtained that the behavioral rating scale scores are so divergent from what might be expected in the normal population that this particular distribution was not representative of a normally distributed trait.

Table 10. Goodness of Fit for Behavioral Rating Scores
Obtaining Expected Frequencies
(p. 121, Guilford)

(1) Scores	(2) Midpoint X	(3) Deviation x	(4) Standard Score z	(5) y from Table B	(6) fe	(7) fo
-15 to -20	-17.5	-22.9	-2.04	.0498	2.66	3
-9 to -14	-11.5	-16.9	-1.50	.1295	6.93	12
-3 to -8	-5.5	-10.9	-.97	.2493	13.51	12
+3 to -2	.5	-4.9	-.44	.3621	19.37	9
+4 to +9	6.5	1.1	.10	.3970	21.24	24
+10 to +15	12.5	7.1	.63	.3290	17.60	18
+16 to +21	18.5	13.1	1.17	.2013	10.77	16
+22 to +27	24.5	19.1	1.70	.0940	5.02	6

$$x = X - 5.42$$

$$z = x/11.22$$

y from Table B

$$fe = \left(\frac{1N}{\sigma}\right)y \quad \frac{1N}{\sigma} = \frac{600}{11.22} = 53.5$$

Table 11. Chi-Square Test for Goodness of Fit for the
Behavioral Rating Scores
(p. 241, Guilford)

(1) Scores	Original Grouping		Regrouped Frequencies		Cell Discrep. fo-fe	Squared (fo-fe) ²	Cell-Square Contingencies $\frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe}$
	fo	fe	fo	fe			
3	3	2.66	15	9.59	5.4	29.16	3.04
12	12	6.93					
12	12	13.51	12	13.51	-1.5	2.25	.17
9	9	19.39	9	19.39	-10.4	108.16	5.52
24	24	21.24	24	21.24	2.8	7.84	.37
18	18	17.60	18	17.60	.4	.16	.01
16	16	10.77					
6	6	5.02	22	15.79	6.2	38.44	2.43

$$\chi^2 \text{ or Total} = 11.54$$

df = no. of categories less one

df = 5

P = .04 level.

The Relationships between the Different Self-Concepts
and the Behavioral Ratings

The Pearson product moment of correlation technique was employed to determine the existing relationships between the different self-concepts and the behavioral ratings. Six relationships in all were found and are listed in Table 12.

Table 12. Correlations between the Self-Concepts
and Behavioral Ratings

	Self- Concept	Peer Self- Concept	Teacher Self- Concept	Behavioral Ratings
Self-Concept	-	.55	.46	-.06
Peer Self-Concept		-	.53	-.01
Teacher Self-Concept			-	.21
Behavioral Ratings				-

Perhaps the most significant outcome of this study is with respect to these relationships. The self concept- peer self concept correlation of .55 demonstrates a positive relationship between these two elements. Generally speaking then, pupils who thought highly of themselves, also thought their peers thought highly of them. Similarly, the correlations of .46 and .53 in the other relationships also suggest some consistency in self-assessment when taken on a group basis. It must be noted of course that this does not mean

that every individual is consistent in these areas. The r value is not sufficiently high to make any categorical statements. Rather, there is an indication or suggestion that most adolescents are reasonably consistent in their self-evaluation in different frames of reference.

The other aspect of Table 12 is perhaps equally significant. The r 's of $-.06$, $-.01$ and $+.21$ give strong evidence toward refuting the thesis that pupils who think highly of themselves display favorable behavior traits as observed by teachers in the school setting. It is to be expected that the highest correlation of the three was when teachers' ratings were compared with how pupils thought teachers viewed them. Yet this relationship was very low and little or no confidence can be attached to it.

The Relationships between Pairs of Self-Concept Discrepancies

Three separate relationships between pairs of discrepancies are shown in Table 13.

The purpose of obtaining these relationships was to determine whether or not there was consistency in discrepancies between the different selves. For example, are pupils who obtain relatively similar scores in the categories Self-Concept and Peer Self-Concept, likely to have relatively similar scores in the third dimension, that of Teacher Self-Concept? In the

Table 13. Correlations between Discrepancy Scores of Three Self-Concept Discrepancies

	S.C.- Peer S.C. Discrepancy	S.C.- Teacher S.C. Discrepancy	Peer S.C.- Teacher S.C. Discrepancy
S.C.- Peer S.C. Discrepancy	-	.17	.11
S.C.- Teacher S.C. Discrepancy		-	.39
Peer S.C.- Teacher S.C. Discrepancy			-

same manner do those pupils whose scores are most divergent between two particular categories generally have most divergent scores between the other pairs of self-concepts? An outline of the procedure followed may assist in clarifying the concept of discrepancy relationships. Pupil 1 obtained a raw score difference of 22 points between his self-concept quotient and peer self-concept quotient. (See Appendix 3.) When taking the dimensions of self-concept and teacher self-concept, pupil 1 obtained a 12 point difference.' In comparing this pupil's peer self-concept and teacher self-concept scores a 34 point difference was noted. Altogether pupil 1 had rather varying discrepancies.

Pupil 12, on the other hand, had low and rather consistent discrepancies, i.e., no more than 5 points difference between any two pairs of scores. An effort was made to determine whether most pupils' scores were closely related (as

with pupil 12) or not.

Table 13 shows relationships of .17, .11 and .39.

These figures indicate that generally speaking it was not true that certain pupils had minimally discrepant scores in all three self-concept areas and others had maximally discrepant scores in all areas. Another way of stating this would be, pupils whose scores were closely related in two self-concept areas not necessarily had scores closely related in the third area. True, there was a positive relationship and in the one pair of discrepancies matched, began to approach a relationship to warrant examination. However, on the whole it could be said that self-concept discrepancies were not consistent enough in the three self-concept areas noted in this study to merit the assumption of consistency. It was interesting to note that the highest relationship found was where the Teacher Self-Concept was the common element in the discrepancies. It is possible that the low relationships could in part be a reflection of rather low reliability measures found with self-concept discrepancies as noted in several studies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study of self-concept, which although relatively new with respect to vigorous research, has been opened up to such an extent that a great many avenues have been touched. This study confined itself to the self-concepts of a specific grade level of adolescents in making a comparison between how adolescents look at themselves and how teachers look at them. To the best of the author's knowledge this is a unique contribution to the field.

In attempting to study adolescent self-views and teachers' opinions of adolescents, one special instrument was created and another instrument adapted for this purpose. The instrument and the adaptation although derived from established devices have not been subjected to the critical analysis that is given to published tests.

Conclusions

The five research questions adopted in this study were:

1. Are self-concepts of adolescents normally distributed?
2. Do adolescents who are self-deprecatory tend to think

that other groups think of them in deprecatory terms?

3. Do adolescents who are self-enhancing tend to think that other groups think well of them?

4. Are self-deprecatory adolescents those who generally display behavior traits considered to be more undesirable than traits displayed by self-enhancing adolescents?

5. Are self-concept discrepancies between the different pairs of selves, consistent?

In examining the data related to these questions, certain findings and implications clearly stand out.

1. Self-concepts of adolescent students are normally distributed and can be treated in the same manner as other psychological measurements.

2. Adolescents, as a group think more highly of themselves than they feel teachers think of them. Also as a group adolescents think about as much of themselves as they feel their peers think of them. It would appear that with the significant difference between the means of the self-concept scores and teacher self-concept scores, one could assume that adolescents have the feeling that teachers visualize their pupils as being of less worth than they really are. As a corollary, it could be inferred that adolescent pupils think of their teachers not as much in terms of supportive, encouraging and inspiring forces as they do in terms of those qualities which tend to make a person feel less important or worthwhile. This may be a reflection of

adolescent views of adults generally.

3. Self-deprecatory adolescents display a great range of behavior in the school situation. Teachers, by observing pupils' behavior, can obtain virtually no information about how individuals feel about themselves. To obtain an understanding of pupils' values, attitudes and inner feelings some other means than ordinary observation of classroom behavior is required. It would seem that a large per cent of adolescents act in school using defense mechanisms. Many put on a "front" of being happy and well adjusted whereas in actuality they possess inner feelings of insecurity and below average feelings of worth and importance.

These findings point to the great need of specialized personnel in the schools whose function it is to *infer* determine the degree of inner security possessed by individuals and to advise the regular teacher of these basic inner feelings and needs so that more appropriate and positive use can be made of the teacher's time and capabilities.

4. Self-concepts of adolescents fail to show consistency. The marked differences which many adolescents manifested between the three self-concept areas tested suggests a confusion in the minds of many as to how one actually should view oneself. With substantial divergence between how one views oneself and how one feels one is viewed must come a conflict as to the role an individual should assume. The knowledge of such divergent feelings is important to the

arsenal of information which school guidance personnel should possess in order to do effective guidance with adolescents.

It should be noted that certain limitations are present in this study. The conclusions stated are to be interpreted within the context of these limitations.

The sample group employed in this research was of necessity a small sample from one school, and although the results indicate that this group in some respects resembles the normal distribution of pupils in the general population, it cannot be concluded that this sample is necessarily representative in all aspects, nor are the views of the teachers selected necessarily representative of teachers at large. Due to the lack of demonstrated reliability of the behavior rating scale and the previously mentioned factor of questionable reliability of discrepancy scores, the results obtained should be considered with appropriate reservations.

The generalized conclusions which have been made must be construed as tentative or possible ones which although applying in this investigation perhaps may not apply to the population at large. This does not mean that the findings are of little worth. Unless and until the results noted and conclusions reached are found to be invalid through attempts at verification, serious consideration should be given to the idea that these conclusions may be true statements of actually existing conditions.

Recommendations

In attempting to envisage the practical worth of the foregoing study, several ideas were derived which to the writer appeared to have merit. These ideas for following up on the work done are set forth as recommendations.

1. The nature and results of the foregoing study should be submitted to the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research of the University of California whereby the findings can supplement various researches which have been conducted using the Gough adjective check list.

2. A validation study should be made to determine whether or not the self-concept quotient can be considered as a valid personality assessment tool for adolescent pupils.

3. Investigation should be made (using the self-concept instrument) into a comparison of delinquents and non-delinquents with a view to the use of this technique as a predictor of prospective delinquency.

4. A follow-up of the sample group employed in this study could be done to determine if and to what degree self-concepts of matriculating (from senior high school) students differ from those pupils who do not matriculate. ?

5. More skilled guidance personnel should be provided in school systems to assess the personality structures of pupils. The assessment should be done with proper instruments and professional skill. Provision should be made for

guidance workers to interpret to the regular teachers the personality dynamics of their pupils, thereby promoting more thorough understanding of the pupils and more effective teaching techniques.

6. A comparison should be made of adult values of adjectives and adolescent values of adjectives. This might provide a maturity index which may prove of worth in further understanding adolescents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, G. W. Personality, A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.
- _____. "The Ego in Contemporary Psychology," Psychological Review, L (1943, 451-76.
- _____. Trait Names, A Psycho-Lexical Study. Princeton, N.J.: Psychological Review Co., 1936.
- Ames, Louise Bates. "The Sense of Self of Nursery School Children as Manifested by Their Verbal Behavior," Journal of Genet. Psychology, LXXXI (1952), 193-232.
- Anderson, Camilla M. "The Self-Image: A Theory of the Dynamics of Behavior," Mental Hygiene, XXXVI (1952), 227-44.
- Ausubel, D. P. Theory and Problems of Adolescent Development. New York: Gruen & Stratton, Inc., 1954.
- Axelrod, H. S., Cowen, E. M., and Heilizer, F. "Self-Concept Conflict Indicators and Learning," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 242-45.
- Axline, Virginia M. Play Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.
- Beery, G. S. "Experiment in Self-Analysis," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVII (1946), 11-24.
- Berdie, R. F. "Scores on Strong and Kuder in Relation to Self Ratings," Journal Applied Psychology, XXXIV (1950), 42-49.
- _____. "Changes in Self Ratings as a Method of Evaluating Counseling," Journal Counsel. Psych., I (1954), 49-53.
- Berger, Emanuel M. "The Relationship between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal Soc. Psychology, XLVII (1952), 778-82.
- Bieri, James, and Trieschman, Albert. "Learning as a Function of Perceived Similarity to Self," Journal of Personality, XXV (1956), 212-25.
- Bills, R. W. "An Index of Adjustment and Values," Journal of Consult. Psych., XV (1951), 257-61.

Bills, R. E. "Rorschach Characteristics of Persons Scoring High and Low in Acceptance of Self," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVII (1953), 36-38.

_____. "A Comparison of Scores on the Index of Adjustment and Values with Behavior in Level of Aspiration Tasks," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVII (1953), 206-12.

_____. "A Validation of Changes in Scores on the Index of Adjustment and Values," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVII (1953), 135-38.

_____. "Acceptance of Self as Measured by Interviews and the Index of Adjustment and Values," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVIII (1954), 22-24.

_____. "Self Concepts and Rorschach Signs of Depression," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVIII (1954), 135-37.

_____. "Personality Changes during Student-Centered Teaching," Journal of Ed. Research, L (1956), 121-26.

_____. "Progress with Research with the Index of Adjustment and Values," Unpublished Manuscript, University of Kentucky, Lexington, 1953. (Mimeographed.)

Blake, R. R., and Ramsey, G. V. Perception: An Approach to Personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

Block, J., and Thomas, H. "Is Satisfaction with Self a Measure of Adjustment?" Journal of Abnormal and Soc. Psych., LI (1955), 254-59.

Brownfain, J. J. "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal Soc. Psych., XLVII (1952), 597-606.

Bugental, J. F. "The WAY Technique," Journal of Personality, XVIII (1952), 483-98.

_____. and Gunning, E. C. "Investigations into Self-Concept: Stability of Reported Self Identifications," Journal of Clin. Psych., XI (1955), 41-44.

Bugental, J. F. "An Investigation of the Relationship of the Conceptual Matrix to the Self-Concept," (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Ohio State University, 1949).

_____. "A Method for Assessing Self and Not-Self Attitudes during the Therapeutic Series," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVI (1952), 435-39.

- Butler, J. M., and Haigh, G. V. "Changes in Relation between Self-Concepts and Ideal Concepts Consequent upon Client Centered Counseling," in Psychotherapy and Personality Change, eds. C. R. Rogers and R. F. Dymond. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Colvin, A. D. "Further Investigation of the Relationship between Manifest Anxiety and Intelligence," Journal of Consult. Psych., XIX (1956), 280-82.
- _____. and Holtzman, W. H. "Discrepancy between Self-Concept and Inferred Self," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVII (1953), 39-44
- Caplin, C. Emotional Problems of Early Childhood. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1955.
- Cattell, R. B. Personality: A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.
- Chein, I. "The Awareness of Self and the Structure of the Ego," The Psychological Review, XLI (1944), 305-14.
- Child, I. L., et al. "Self-Ratings and T.A.T.: Their Relations to Each Other and to Childhood Background," Journal of Personality, XXV (1956), 96-114.
- Chodorkoff, B. "Adjustment and the Discrepancy between the Perceived and Ideal Self," Journal of Clinical Psych., X (1954), 266-68.
- _____. "Self Perception, Perceptual Defense, and Adjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Soc. Psych., XLIX (1954), 508-12.
- Combs, A. W. "Phenomenological Concepts in Non Directive Therapy," Journal of Consult. Psych., XII (1949), 197-208.
- _____. "Clinical Practice and Personality Theory," Journal of Abnormal Soc. Psych., XLIV (1949), 29-35.
- Cowen, E. L. "An Investigation into the Relationships between Two Measures of Self Regarding Attitudes," Journal of Clinical Psych., XII (1956), 156-60.
- _____. "The Negative Self Concept as a Personality Measure," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVIII (1954), 138-42.
- Dai, B. "A Sociopathic Approach to Personality Organization," American Soc. Review, XVII (1952), 44-49.

- Diller, L. "Conscious and Unconscious Self-Attitudes after Success and Failure," Journal of Personality, XXXIII (1954), 1-11.
- Dollard, J., and Miller, N. E. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.
- Dymond, R. F. "Relation of Insight and Empathy," Journal of Consult. Psych., XII (1948), 228-33.
- Fein, E. "The Use of Judges in Psychological Experiments," Journal of Clin. Psych., VII (1951), 98-100.
- Fey, W. F. "Acceptance of Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnorm. Soc. Psych., L (1955), 274-76.
- _____. "Correlates of Certain Subjective Attitudes toward Self and Others," Journal of Clin. Psych., XIII (1957), 44-49.
- Fienkl-Brunswick, E. "Mechanisms and Self-Description," Journal Soc. Psych., X (1939), 409-20.
- _____. "Personality Theory and Perception," in Perception: An Approach to Personality, eds., R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.
- Friedman, I. "Phenomenal, Ideal and Projected Conceptions of Self," Journal of Abnorm. Soc. Psych., LI (1955), 611-15.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans Green, 1953.
- Gough, Harrison G. "Reference Handbook for the Gough Adjective Check-List," University of California, 1955. (Mimeographed.)
- Gross, L. "Construction and Partial Standardization of a Scale for Measuring Self-Insight," Journal of Soc. Psych., XXXVIII (1948), 219-36.
- Grossman, D. "The Construction and Validation of Two Insight Inventories," Journal of Consult. Psych., XV (1951), 109-14.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.
- Haggarty, M. E., Olsen, W. C., and Wickman, E. K. Behavior Rating Schedules and Manual. Yonkers: World Book Co., 1930.

- Hall, C. S., and Lindsey, G. Theories of Personality. New York; John Wiley and Sons, 1957.
- Hanlon, T. E., Hofstoetter, P. R., and O'Conner, J.P. "Congruence of Self and Ideal Self," Journal of Consult. Psych., XVIII (1954), 215-18.
- Havighurst, R. J. Adolescent Character and Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949.
- _____. and MacDonald, D. V. "Development of the Ideal Self in New Zealand and American Children," Journal of Educ. Research, XLIX (1955), 263-73.
- _____. Robinson, M. Z., and Dorr, M. "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence," Journal of Educ. Research, LI (1946), 241-57.
- Heibredner, E. Seven Psychologies. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1933.
- Helper, M. M. "Learning Theory and the Self Concept," Journal of Abnorm. Soc. Psych., LI (1955), 184-94.
- Hickman, Norman W. "The Role of Self Related-Concept-Discrepancies in Personal Adjustment." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Oregon, 1957.
- Hilgard, E. R. Introduction to Psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953.
- _____. "Human Motives and the Concept of Self," American Psychologist, IV (1949), 374-82.
- Hobbs, N. "Guidance and Some Recent Developments in Psychological Theory," Canadian Journal of Psych., III (1949), 67-72.
- Holt, R. R. "Accuracy of Self-Evaluations, Its Measurement and Some of Its Personological Correlates," Journal of Consult. Psych., XV (1951), 95-101.
- Horney, K. The Neurotic Personality of Our Time. New York: Norton, 1937.
- Hurlock, E. Developmental Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.
- James, William. Psychology. New York, World Publishing Co., 1948.

CHIEFTAIN BOND

100% COTTON FIBER

MADE IN U.S.A.

- Jersild, Arthur T. In Search of Self. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.
- _____. The Psychology of Adolescence. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957.
- Johanson, D. G. "Effect of Vocational Counseling on Self Knowledge," Educ. Psychol. Measurement, XIII (1953), 330-38.
- Jourard, Sidney M., and Remy, Richard M. "Individual Variance Score: An Index of the Degree of Differentiation of the Self and the Body Image," Journal of Clin. Psych., XIII (1957), 62-64.
- Kamm, R. B., and Wren, C. G. "Client Acceptance of Self-Information in Counseling," Ed. Psych. Measurement, X (1950), 32-42.
- Kelley, Truman L. Essential Traits of Mental Life. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Kenny, D. T. "Influence of Social Desirability on Discrepancy Measures between Real Self and Ideal Self," Journal of Consult. Psych., XX (1956), 315-18.
- Klausner, Samuel Z. "Social Class and Self Concept," Journal Soc. Psychol., XXXVIII (1953), 201-05.
- Koffka, Kurt. "The Gestalt Interpretations of Personality," in Psychological Theory, eds., Melvin H. Marx. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.
- LaFon, Fred. "Behavior on the Rorschach Test and a Measure of Self Acceptance," Psychological Monographs, in Psychological Abstracts XXIX, No. 5713 (1955).
- Lecky, P. Self Consistency: A Theory of Personality. New York: Island Press, 1945.
- Levy, Leon H. "Meaning and Generality of Perceived Actual-Ideal Discrepancies," Journal of Consult Psych., XX (1956), 396-98.
- Lindgren, Henry C. Mental Health in Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1954.
- Louttit, C. M., Review of Snygg, D., and Combs, A. W. Individual Behavior: A New Frame of Reference in Psychology, in Psychol. Bull., XLVII (1950), 170.

- McLeod, R. B. "The Phenomenological Approach to Social Psychology," The Psychological Review, LIV (1947), 193-210.
- _____. "New Psychologies of Yesterday and Today," Canadian Journal of Psychology, III (1949), 199-212.
- _____. "Perpetual Constancy and the Problem of Motivation," Canadian Journal of Psychology, III (1949), 57-66.
- McGregor, John R. "A Study of the Self-Concept and Ideal-Concept in Adolescence," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, I (1955), 5-16.
- McIntyre, Charles J. "Acceptance of Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Soc. Psych., XLVII (1952), 624-25.
- McQuitty, L. L. "A Measure of Personality Integration in Relation to the Concept of Self," Journal of Personality, XVIII (1950), 461-82.
- Mead, George H. Mind Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mitchell, C. "How Valid Are Pupils' Self-Evaluations," Clearing House, XIX (1945), 486-88.
- Miller, Kent S., and Worchel, P. "The Effects of Need-Achievement and Self-Ideal Discrepancy on Performance under Stress," Journal of Personality, XXV (1956), 176-90.
- Moreno, Jacob L. Mental Catharsis and the Psychodrama. Boston: Beacon House, Inc., 1944.
- O'Dea, J. D., and Zeran, F. R. "Effects of Counseling," Personnel and Guid. Journal, XXXI (1953), 241-44.
- Omwake, Katherine T. "The Relationship between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others' Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal Consult. Psych., XVIII (1954), 443-446.
- Overstreet, B. "Building the Self-Image," National Education Association Journal, XLI (1952), 14-15.
- Phillips, E. L. "Attitudes toward Self and Others," Journal Consult. Psych., XV (1951), 79-81.
- Raimy, V. C. "Self-Reference in Counseling Interviews," Journal Consult. Psych., XII (1948), 153-63.

Rockowitz, M. "Know Thyself: Techniques in Pupil Self-Evaluation," High Points, XXX (1951), 50-56.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

_____. Measuring Personality Adjustment in Children Nine to Thirteen Years of Age. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931.

_____. and Dymond, R. F. Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

_____. Kell, W. L., and McNeill, H. "The Role of Self-Understanding in the Prediction of Behavior," Journal Consult. Psych., XII (1948), 174-86.

_____. "Psychometric Tests and Client-Centered Counseling," Educ. Psych. Measurement, VI (1946), 139-44.

_____. "The Organization of Personality," American Psychologist, II (1947), 358-68.

_____. "A Co-ordinated Research in Psychotherapy," Journal Consult. Psych., XIII (1949), 149-53.

Sarbin, Theodore, R. "A Preface to a Psychological Analysis of the Self," The Psychological Review, LIX (1952), 11-22.

_____. and Farberow, N. L. "Contributions to Role-Taking Theory," Journal Abnormal Soc. Psych., XLVII (1952), 117-125.

Sheerer, Elizabeth T. "The Relation between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others in Ten Counseling Cases," Journal Consult. Psych., XIII (1949), 159-75.

Sherif, M., and Contril, H. The Psychology of Ego Involvements. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1947.

Smith, M. B. "The Phenomenological Approach to Personality Theory," Journal Abnormal Soc. Psych., XLV (1950), 516-22.

Snygg, Donald. "The Need for a Phenomenological System of Psychology," The Psychological Review, XLVIII (1941), 404-24.

_____. and Combs, A. W. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper Brothers, 1949.

- Snygg, Donald. "Predicting the Behavior of Individuals," Canadian Journal of Psych., III (1949), 19-29.
- Stagner, R. "Homeostasis as a Unifying Concept in Personality Theory," The Psychological Review, LVIII (1951), 5-17.
- Stephenson, William. The Study of Behavior; Q Technique and Its Methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Stock, Dorothy. "An Investigation into the Interrelations between the Self-Concept and Feelings Directed toward Other Persons and Groups," Journal Consult. Psych., XIII (1949), 176-80.
- Strang, R. M. "Self Adolescent Views on One Aspect of Their Development," Journal Educ. Research, XLVI (1955), 23-32.
- Sumner, F. C. "Sex Differences in Levels of Aspirations and in Self Estimation of Performance in a Classroom Situation," Journal of Psych., XXVII (1949), 483-90.
- Super, D. E. "Vocational Adjustment Implementing a Self-Concept," Occupations, XXX (1951), 88-92.
- _____. "A Theory of Vocational Development," American Psychologist, VIII (1953), 185-90.
- Symonds, Percival W. The Ego and the Self. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.
- Taschuk, William A. "An Analysis of the Self Concept of Grade Nine Students," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1957.
- Taylor, C., and Combs, A. W. "Self-Acceptance and Adjustment," Journal Consult. Psych., XVI (1952), 89-91.
- Thorne, F. C. "Directive Psychotherapy," Journal of Clin. Psych., VIII (1945), 155-62.
- Torrance, E. P. "Some Practical Uses of a Knowledge of Self-Concepts in Counseling and Guidance," Educ. Psych. Measurement, XIV (1954), 120-27.
- Troyer, Maurice E. "Self-Evaluation as a Goal in Guidance," Journal Consult. Psych., VI (1942), 289-96.
- Wattenberg, William W. The Adolescent Years. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1955.

Webb, W. B. "Self-Evaluation Compared with Group Evaluations," Journal Consult. Psych., XVI (1952), 305-07.

Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, Division of Publications, 1928.

Worchel, Philip. "Personality Factors in the Readiness to Express Aggression," Journal Clin. Psych., XIV (1958), 355-59.

Yaeger, T. C. An Analysis of Certain Traits of Selected High-School Seniors Interested in Teaching. New York: Teachers College, 1935.

Zimmer, Herbert. "Self-Acceptance and Its Relation to Conflict," Journal Consult. Psych., XVIII (1954), 447-49.

Zuckerman, Marvin. "Acceptance of Self, Parents and People in Patients and Normals," Journal of Clin. Psych., XII (1956), 327-32.

APPENDIX 1

The Adjective Check List

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Date _____

DIRECTIONS: This pamphlet contains a list of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put a check-mark in front of each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

_____ absent-minded	_____ attractive	_____ coarse
_____ active	_____ autocratic	_____ cold
_____ adaptable	_____ awkward	_____ commonplace
_____ adventurous	_____ bitter	_____ complaining
_____ affected	_____ blustery	_____ complicated
_____ affectionate	_____ boastful	_____ conceited
_____ aggressive	_____ bossy	_____ confident
_____ alert	_____ calm	_____ confused
_____ aloof	_____ capable	_____ conscientious
_____ ambitious	_____ careless	_____ conservative
_____ anxious	_____ cautious	_____ considerate
_____ apathetic	_____ changeable	_____ contented
_____ appreciative	_____ charming	_____ conventional
_____ argumentative	_____ cheerful	_____ cool
_____ arrogant	_____ civilized	_____ co-operative
_____ artistic	_____ clear-thinking	_____ courageous
_____ assertive	_____ clever	_____ cowardly

Appendix 1 continued

☐ cruel	☐ enthusiastic	☐ hasty
☐ curious	☐ evasive	☐ headstrong
☐ cynical	☐ excitable	☐ healthy
☐ daring	☐ fair-minded	☐ helpful
☐ deceitful	☐ fault-finding	☐ high-strung
☐ defensive	☐ fearful	☐ honest
☐ deliberate	☐ feminine	☐ hostile
☐ demanding	☐ fickle	☐ humorous
☐ dependable	☐ flirtatious	☐ hurried
☐ dependent	☐ foolish	☐ idealistic
☐ despondent	☐ forceful	☐ imaginative
☐ determined	☐ foresighted	☐ immature
☐ dignified	☐ forgetful	☐ impatient
☐ discreet	☐ forgiving	☐ impulsive
☐ disorderly	☐ formal	☐ independent
☐ dissatisfied	☐ frank	☐ indifferent
☐ distractible	☐ friendly	☐ individualistic
☐ distrustful	☐ frivolous	☐ industrious
☐ dominant	☐ fussy	☐ infantile
☐ dreamy	☐ generous	☐ informal
☐ dull	☐ gentle	☐ ingenious
☐ easy going	☐ gloomy	☐ inhibited
☐ effeminate	☐ good-looking	☐ initiative
☐ efficient	☐ good-natured	☐ insightful
☐ egotistical	☐ greedy	☐ intelligent
☐ emotional	☐ handsome	☐ interest narrow
☐ energetic	☐ hard-headed	☐ interests wide
☐ enterprising	☐ hard-hearted	☐ intolerant

Appendix 1 continued

___ inventive	___ organized	___ rattlebrained
___ irresponsible	___ original	___ realistic
___ irritable	___ outgoing	___ reasonable
___ jolly	___ outspoken	___ rebellious
___ kind	___ painstaking	___ reckless
___ lazy	___ patient	___ reflective
___ leisurely	___ peaceable	___ relaxed
___ logical	___ peculiar	___ reliable
___ loud	___ persevering	___ resentful
___ loyal	___ persistent	___ reserved
___ mannerly	___ pessimistic	___ resourceful
___ masculine	___ planful	___ responsible
___ mature	___ pleasant	___ restless
___ meek	___ pleasure-seeking	___ retiring
___ methodical	___ poised	___ rigid
___ mild	___ polished	___ robust
___ mischievous	___ practical	___ rude
___ moderate	___ praising	___ sarcastic
___ modest	___ precise	___ self-centered
___ moody	___ prejudiced	___ self-confident
___ nagging	___ preoccupied	___ self-controlled
___ natural	___ progressive	___ self-denying
___ nervous	___ prudish	___ self-pitying
___ noisy	___ quarrelsome	___ self-punishing
___ obliging	___ queer	___ self-seeking
___ obnoxious	___ quick	___ selfish
___ opinionated	___ quiet	___ sensitive
___ opportunistic	___ quitting	___ sentimental
___ optimistic	___ rational	___ serious

Appendix 1 continued

_____ severe	_____ strong	_____ unexcitable
_____ sexy	_____ stubborn	_____ unfriendly
_____ shallow	_____ submissive	_____ uninhibited
_____ sharp-witted	_____ suggestible	_____ unintelligent
_____ shiftless	_____ sulky	_____ unkind
_____ show-off	_____ superstitious	_____ unrealistic
_____ shrewd	_____ suspicious	_____ unscrupulous
_____ shy	_____ sympathetic	_____ unselfish
_____ silent	_____ tactful	_____ unstable
_____ simple	_____ tactless	_____ vindictive
_____ sincere	_____ talkative	_____ warm
_____ slipshod	_____ temperamental	_____ wary
_____ slow	_____ tense	_____ weak
_____ sly	_____ thankless	_____ whiny
_____ smug	_____ thorough	_____ wholesome
_____ snobbish	_____ thoughtful	_____ wise
_____ sociable	_____ thrifty	_____ withdrawn
_____ soft-hearted	_____ timid	_____ witty
_____ sophisticated	_____ tolerant	_____ worrying
_____ spendthrift	_____ touchy	_____ zany
_____ spineless	_____ tough	
_____ spontaneous	_____ trusting	
_____ spunky	_____ unaffected	
_____ stable	_____ unambitious	
_____ steady	_____ unassuming	
_____ stern	_____ unconventional	
_____ stingy	_____ undependable	
_____ stolid	_____ unemotional	

Reproduced by special permission of the copyright holder.

APPENDIX 2

Behavioral Rating Scale

Name of Student _____	More than Average	Less than Average
1. Is outgoing and freely expressive	_____	_____
2. Is generous and sharing	_____	_____
3. Participates socially	_____	_____
4. Is trustworthy	_____	_____
5. Is well organized in his work	_____	_____
6. Completes tasks: Carries through activities	_____	_____
7. Is punctual and in reg. attendance	_____	_____
8. Has self confidence and assurance	_____	_____
9. Is interested in helping others	_____	_____
10. Is friendly and warm in manner	_____	_____
11. Has leadership qualities	_____	_____
12. Is open minded	_____	_____
13. Maintains attention	_____	_____
14. Accepts decisions well	_____	_____
15. Is mentally agile and alert	_____	_____
16. Displays good humor and cheerful disposition	_____	_____
17. Lacks feelings of resentment	_____	_____
18. Solicits group reaction	_____	_____
19. Is free from worries	_____	_____
20. Is dependable	_____	_____
21. Is considerate	_____	_____
22. Is approving: Speaks well of others	_____	_____
23. Maintains calmness in trying situations	_____	_____
24. Is stable and even tempered	_____	_____
25. Is enthusiastic	_____	_____
26. Conforms	_____	_____
27. Is active in constructive tasks	_____	_____

APPENDIX 3

Self-Concept and Behavior Rating Raw Scores

Pupil	Sex	IQ		SC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	SC Quotient	PSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	PSC Quotient	TSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	TSC Quotient	Behavior Rating				SC and PSC Discrepancy	SC and TSC Discrepancy	PSC and TSC Discrepancy
		Detroit	Laycock										By Teacher A	By Teacher B	By Teacher C	Average			
1	F	110	123	288	86	334	196	55	356	142	44	322	13		2	8	22	12	34
2	F	129	142	99	31	319	63	20	315	37	13	284	13		11	12	4	35	39
3	F	131	143	318	97	327	127	40	317	61	20	305	13		9	5	10	22	12
4	F	131	143	240	71	338	206	55	374	156	42	371	17	7	11	14	36	33	3
5	F	105	112	139	49	283	145	62	233	139	59	235	17		11	14	36	33	3
6	F		123	186	61	304	104	38	273	161	46	350	19	19	11	13	50	2	48
7	F		114	259	71	364	162	44	368	79	24	329	19		15	17	31	46	77
8	F			353	107	329	129	42	307	58	18	322	7	3	1	4	4	35	39
9	F		128	326	93	350	254	68	373	175	50	350	7		7	7	22	7	15
10	F	132	136	213	62	343	110	28	392	69	19	363	3		1	2	23	0	23
11	F		97	306	85	360	161	44	365	130	36	361	5	17	7	10	49	20	29
12	F		130	430	124	346	306	87	351	387	110	351	5		7	6	5	4	1
13	F	102	106	226	67	337	138	38	363	85	26	326	27	21	25	24	5	0	5
14	F	109	114	295	80	368	108	39	276	61	20	305	7		3	5	26	11	37
15	M	113	129	411	135	304	203	66	307	174	56	310	5		7	6	92	63	29
16	M	111	112	226	62	364	110	28	392	59	15	393	25	11	13	17	3	3	6
17	M	115	107	215	59	364	62	15	413	61	17	358	-17		1	-8	28	29	1
18	M	119	114	379	104	364	329	90	365	234	65	360	15		21	18	49	6	55
19	M	126	120	202	73	276	178	67	265	82	33	248	27	13	21	20	1	4	5
20	M	122	121	196	53	369	150	42	357	93	25	372	17		7	12	11	28	17
21	M		106	87	26	334	71	20	355	33	13	253	27	19	17	21	12	3	15
22	M		126	211	53	398	167	43	388	213	55	387	19	17	17	18	21	81	102
23	M	107	105	298	91	327	203	56	362	148	41	360	21		21	21	10	11	1
24	M		122	88	32	275	89	25	356	28	11	254	15		11	13	35	33	2
25	M	116	109	282	69	408	127	32	396	56	15	373	17		15	16	81	21	102
													5		3	4	12	35	23

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Pupil	Sex	IQ		SC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	SC Quotient	PSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	PSC Quotient	TSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	TSC Quotient	Behavior Rating				SC and PSC Discrepancy	SC and TSC Discrepancy	PSC and TSC Discrepancy
		Detroit	Laycock										By Teacher A	By Teacher B	By Teacher C	Average			
26	M	92	120	266	85	312	249	72	345	217	59	367	13			17	33	55	22
27	M	108	118	152	47	323	89	28	317	47	18	261	13		21	11	36	62	50
28	F	100	98	223	66	337	174	47	370	134	42	319	-15	7		-4	33	18	51
29	F	104	103	228	65	350	135	46	293	196	58	337	-5	23		9	57	13	44
30	F	103	96	328	107	306	300	90	333	294	88	334	-11	1		-5	27	28	1
31	F	101	104	416	120	346	310	93	333	319	90	354	9	5		7	13	8	21
32	F	112	102	320	90	355	161	49	328	80	28	285	-9	5		-2	27	70	43
33	F		101	277	77	359	73	22	331	97	28	346	5	19		12	28	13	15
34	F		113	421	121	347	317	93	340	258	77	335	7	21		14	7	12	5
35	F	106	118	558	161	346	379	108	350	291	85	342	5	9		7	4	4	8
36	F	93	100	372	105	354	127	37	343	83	23	360	19	11		15	11	6	17
37	F	116	114	156	46	339	134	34	394	164	49	334	-17	-3		-10	55	5	60
38	F		92	220	57	385	105	28	375	110	32	343	15	5		10	10	42	32
39	M		82	340	93	366	333	101	329	253	79	320	-1	-5		-3	37	46	9
40	M	120	120	121	33	366	167	45	371	100	35	285	3	25		14	5	81	86
41	M			158	46	343	142	52	273	264	74	355					70	12	82
42	M		102	269	73	368	234	63	371	211	57	370	3	7		5	3	2	1
43	M	109	102	309	91	339	258	72	358	69	20	345	-3	-21		-12	19	6	13
44	M		123	303	107	283	190	65	292	105	38	276	15	1		8	9	7	16
45	M		114	255	67	380	134	37	362	134	33	406	-1	13		6	18	20	44
46	M		97	260	80	325	234	67	349	144	41	351	7	19		13	24	26	2
47	M	127	113	398	106	375	332	94	353	256	85	301	-9	-19		-14	22	74	52
48	M	122	106	237	72	329	252	73	345	46	16	287	-7	-17		-12	16	42	58
49	M		118	584	191	305	252	82	307	83	31	267	11	23		17	2	38	40
50	M		92	257	69	372	193	50	386	133	50	266	-5	15		5	14	106	120

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Pupil	Sex	IQ		SC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	SC Quotient	PSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	PSC Quotient	TSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	TSC Quotient	Behavior Rating				SC and PSC Discrepancy	SC and TSC Discrepancy	PSC and TSC Discrepancy
		Detroit	Laycock										By Teacher A	By Teacher B	By Teacher C	Average			
51	M			330	115	286	144	50	288	80	27	296	11	23		17	2	10	8
52	F		106	442	119	371	257	65	395	227	62	370	19		7	13	24	1	25
53	F	114	122	236	69	342	134	41	326	39	14	278	17	9	-9	6	18	64	48
54	F	124	116	248	74	335	144	42	342	47	15	313	7		1	4	7	22	29
55	F	92	101	189	56	337	133	38	350	47	15	313	-17		-3	-10	13	24	37
56	F		104	271	82	330	208	58	358	96	26	369	15		17	16	28	39	11
57	F	74	89	245	71	345	104	30	346	41	15	273	-5		-9	-7	1	72	73
58	F		98	178	49	363	65	17	382	57	16	356	19		13	16	19	7	26
59	F	89	101	364	107	340	196	61	321	182	61	298	-9	-25	-9	-14	19	42	23
60	M	115	105	105	31	338	51	18	283	59	20	295	-9		-3	-6	55	43	12
61	M		97	172	61	282	130	37	351	122	35	348	-19		-9	-14	69	64	3
62	M	110	82	87	27	322	95	28	339	58	20	290	-5		-5	-5	17	33	49
63	M	71	98	150	35	428	112	29	386	112	32	350	-7		-7	-7	42	78	36
64	M	129	135	176	56	314	58	20	290	35	12	291	19		25	22	24	23	1
65	M	100	100	172	51	337	199	59	337	120	41	292	-17		-21	-19	0	45	45
66	M	104	87	277	82	337	241	70	344	164	54	303	-15		-17	-16	7	34	41
67	M	81	92	81	24	337	109	30	363	86	26	330	-1		-5	-3	26	7	33
68	M	95	125	253	70	361	191	55	347	187	46	406	19		25	22	14	45	59
69	M		98	129	40	322	124	42	295	78	24	325	9		-7	1	27	3	30
70	M		95	248	70	354	163	53	307	118	35	337	-3		-11	-7	47	17	30
71	M	107	114	225	73	308	131	45	291	89	32	278	17		23	20	17	30	13
72	M			268	84	319	191	61	313	73	27	270	5		15	10	6	49	43
73	M	118	114	205	56	366	97	27	359	97	24	404	27		23	25	7	38	45
74	M		92	215	60	358	170	52	326	94	28	335	-1		3	1	32	23	9
75	M		95	121	39	310	128	41	312	103	31	332	-9		5	-2	2	22	20

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Pupil	Sex	IQ		SC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	SC Quotient	PSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	PSC Quotient	TSC Total	No. Adjectives Checked	TSC Quotient	Behavior Rating				SC and PSC Discrepancy	SC and TSC Discrepancy	PSC and TSC Discrepancy
		Detroit	Laycock										By Teacher A	By Teacher B	By Teacher C	Average			
76	M	98	98	148	38	389	76	20	380	93	25	372	7		3	5	9	17	8
77	M	111	103	268	72	372	126	39	323	63	19	331	-11		-1	-6	49	41	8
78	M			223	60	371	190	51	372	193	48	402	-5		-1	-3	1	31	30
79	F	107	104	345	99	348	196	56	350	160	55	290	-19	-13	-5	-16	2	58	60
80	F	117	103	200	54	370	200	59	338	105	35	300	-1	-25	-12	-13	32	70	38
81	F		116	226	93	243	355	123	288	162	66	245	-13	-7	-19	-13	45	2	43
82	F	110	101	251	71	353	200	52	384	151	43	351	7		7	7	31	2	33
83	F	111	121	406	119	341	298	88	338	237	69	343	21	23	21	22	3	2	5
84	F		92	188	59	318	99	32	309	81	28	289	-11	-9	-1	-7	9	29	20
85	F	118	105	249	68	366	180	49	367	158	44	359	-11	19	5	4	1	7	8
86	F	115	99	263	73	360	120	33	363	63	18	350	-5		3	-1	3	10	13
87	F	115	123	237	69	343	145	40	362	68	21	323	21	11	19	17	10	20	39
88	F		84	211	69	305	140	37	378	57	15	380	-17	11	-7	4	73	75	2
89	F		110	304	89	341	236	64	368	163	53	307	-17		1	-8	27	34	61
90	M		109	537	167	321	173	46	376	83	34	345	9		15	12	55	24	31
91	M	131	118	310	87	356	203	53	383	138	38	363	19		21	20	27	7	20
92	M	110	97	174	50	348	227	66	343	142	40	355	-9		-17	-13	5	7	12
93	M		123	324	88	368	297	93	319	375	107	350	25		25	25	49	18	31
94	M		111	677	225	300	339	92	368	170	45	377	4		21	13	68	77	9
95	M		116	376	113	321	363	105	345	176	48	366	5		21	13	24	45	21
96	M	78	93	513	160	320	196	64	306	310	99	313	-7		3	-2	14	7	7
97	M	126	108	212	63	336	196	55	356	260	98	265	-11		-7	-9	20	71	91
98	M		101	174	49	355	206	61	337	94	26	361	13		1	7	18	6	24
99	M		102	168	46	365	91	25	364	75	22	340	-1		13	6	1	25	24
100	M			264	79	334	221	58	381	132	34	388	-9			-9	47	54	7

APPENDIX 4

Compilation of Judges' Responses

Adj. No.	Adjective	Number of Judges Checking Each of the Categories					Value of Adj.
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Absent-minded	13	15	1	-	-	1.59
2	Active	-	-	3	18	4	4.04
3	Adaptable	-	-	1	16	11	4.36
4	Adventurous	-	1	1	13	10	4.28
5	Affected	8	4	11	-	3	2.46
6	Affectionate	-	-	3	11	13	4.38
7	Aggressive	-	-	2	8	16	4.92
8	Alert	1	1	-	12	14	4.32
9	Aloof	-	6	1	4	4	3.40
10	Ambitious	-	2	1	9	16	4.36
11	Anxious	-	3	11	5	6	3.56
12	Apathetic	1	6	7	1	1	2.69
13	Appreciative	1	1	3	12	9	4.04
14	Argumentative	1	7	6	4	3	3.05
15	Arrogant	4	1	3	2	3	2.92
16	Artistic	-	-	4	11	14	4.34
17	Assertive	-	-	8	7	3	3.72
18	Attractive	1	1	1	5	18	4.46
19	Autocratic	-	1	3	4	4	3.81
20	Awkward	12	12	-	-	-	1.50
21	Bitter	21	6	-	1	-	1.22
22	Blustery	8	6	7	-	2	2.22
23	Boastful	12	7	-	2	6	2.37
24	Bossy	16	6	-	1	5	2.04
25	Calm	1	1	6	15	3	3.69
26	Capable	-	-	1	13	13	4.06
27	Careless	12	12	-	-	3	1.94
28	Cautious	-	3	9	11	5	3.06
29	Changeable	1	7	8	7	2	3.01
30	Charming	2	-	2	5	18	4.83
31	Cheerful	1	-	2	15	10	4.01
32	Civilized	1	1	7	14	4	3.05
33	Clear-thinking	2	-	3	12	11	3.96
34	Clever	3	-	-	3	23	4.48
35	Coarse	3	13	3	2	-	2.19
36	Cold	15	8	2	2	-	1.67
37	Commonplace	2	4	12	2	-	2.70
38	Complaining	13	11	1	-	1	1.65
39	Complicated	5	7	7	2	5	2.81
40	Conceited	14	4	1	-	5	2.08
41	Confident	3	-	1	15	8	3.91
42	Confused	5	19	3	-	1	2.18
43	Conscientious	-	2	2	12	4	3.90
44	Conservative	1	3	5	12	3	3.54

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

45	Considerate	1	-	2	11	15	4.34
46	Contented	1	1	6	11	6	3.80
47	Conventional	-	1	4	12	4	3.90
48	Cool	5	3	4	8	6	3.27
49	Co-operative	1	-	1	16	10	4.21
50	Courageous	1	-	2	6	17	4.33
51	Cowardly	25	2	-	-	1	1.22
52	Cruel	23	4	-	-	-	1.15
53	Curious	2	5	16	4	-	2.81
54	Cynical	9	5	1	-	-	1.40
55	Deceitful	13	5	1	-	1	1.55
56	Daring	-	1	6	10	10	4.07
57	Defensive	-	-	4	18	3	3.71
58	Deliberate	3	3	13	5	1	3.04
59	Demanding	7	9	3	3	4	2.54
60	Dependable	-	1	2	13	11	4.25
61	Dependent	1	3	4	8	11	3.93
62	Despondent	4	5	1	5	1	2.62
63	Determined	1	2	4	9	6	3.77
64	Dignified	3	-	1	7	13	4.87
65	Discreet	-	2	6	3	3	3.50
66	Disorderly	12	12	-	1	-	1.60
67	Dissatisfied	10	11	3	-	1	1.84
68	Distractible	6	17	3	-	-	1.89
69	Distrustful	18	6	1	1	1	1.56
70	Dominant	4	3	2	4	9	3.50
71	Dreamy	1	7	9	1	10	3.43
72	Dull	18	8	-	1	-	1.41
73	Easy-going	1	2	11	10	4	3.50
74	Effeminate	4	3	4	2	-	2.31
75	Efficient	-	-	4	8	12	2.31
76	Egotistical	3	4	1	4	1	2.69
77	Emotional	2	3	9	7	1	1.27
78	Energetic	-	1	1	12	11	4.32
79	Enterprising	-	1	4	13	8	4.08
80	Enthusiastic	-	-	4	11	12	4.30
81	Evasive	2	6	5	1	1	2.53
82	Excitable	1	5	11	5	3	3.16
83	Fair-minded	-	-	5	13	9	4.15
84	Fault-finding	8	8	4	3	2	2.32
85	Fearful	7	15	3	-	2	2.07
86	Feminine	-	-	11	6	11	4.00
87	Fickle	5	10	1	1	1	2.05
88	Flirtatious	5	4	7	1	8	3.12
89	Foolish	16	9	-	-	-	1.36
90	Forceful	3	7	7	7	4	3.07
91	Foresighted	1	8	3	8	3	1.36
92	Forgetful	12	14	3	-	1	1.80
93	Forgiving	-	-	6	11	10	4.15
94	Formal	-	2	5	14	3	3.75
95	Frank	-	1	7	8	9	4.25
96	Friendly	-	-	4	11	12	4.30
97	Frivolous	4	1	4	4	3	3.06
98	Fussy	3	14	4	2	3	2.53

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

99	Generous	-	-	1	10	13	3.72
100	Gentle	-	-	2	13	9	4.25
101	Gloomy	11	13	1	-	1	1.73
102	Good-looking	1	1	1	8	15	4.35
103	Good-natured	-	1	2	7	11	3.52
104	Greedy	20	5	-	1	-	1.31
105	Handsome	-	-	3	3	18	4.63
106	Hard-headed	5	6	2	4	2	2.58
107	Hard-hearted	8	10	1	3	4	3.71
108	Hasty	5	13	6	1	-	2.12
109	Healthy	1	-	5	12	7	3.96
110	Headstrong	5	9	3	3	5	2.76
111	Helpful	-	-	3	11	10	4.38
112	High-strung	2	13	5	3	3	2.69
113	Honest	1	-	1	9	14	4.40
114	Hostile	12	8	2	2	2	2.00
115	Humorous	-	1	2	12	11	4.26
116	Hurried	1	9	10	1	-	2.51
117	Idealistic	-	1	4	12	9	4.54
118	Imaginative	1	-	5	15	4	3.96
119	Immature	10	12	4	1	-	1.85
120	Impatient	9	14	2	1	2	2.04
121	Impulsive	1	11	9	3	2	2.77
122	Independent	3	6	5	10	3	3.15
123	Indifferent	6	9	6	5	1	2.48
124	Individualistic	5	6	2	8	2	2.83
125	Industrious	1	-	2	7	13	4.35
126	Infantile	13	9	-	2	1	1.41
127	Informal	3	7	9	4	3	2.92
128	Ingenious	3	7	1	10	6	3.33
129	Inhibited	1	5	5	2	-	1.69
130	Initiative	1	-	5	9	5	4.30
131	Insightful	2	8	3	6	1	2.80
132	Intelligent	2	-	-	5	18	4.48
133	Interests-narrow	8	14	1	2	1	2.00
134	Interests-wide	-	-	1	12	11	4.07
135	Intolerant	2	9	3	5	3	2.91
136	Inventive	1	-	3	12	9	4.12
137	Irresponsible	10	7	4	2	-	1.76
138	Irritable	16	6	3	-	1	1.62
139	Jolly	1	-	1	13	12	4.29
140	Kind	1	-	2	10	15	4.36
141	Lazy	15	13	-	-	-	1.46
142	Leisurely	-	7	12	5	2	3.08
143	Logical	-	-	2	16	6	4.16
144	Loud	7	17	-	1	2	2.41
145	Loyal	2	1	-	14	10	4.07
146	Mannerly	-	-	1	12	12	4.44
147	Masculine	-	-	3	7	14	4.46
148	Mature	-	-	1	9	12	4.50
149	Meek	1	13	7	-	-	2.29
150	Methodical	1	2	6	8	3	3.50

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

151	Mild	-	2	9	10	4	2.64
152	Mischievous	5	12	3	4	1	2.36
153	Moderate	-	1	11	10	4	2.69
154	Modest	-	5	6	7	9	3.74
155	Moody	10	15	1	1	-	1.74
156	Nagging	17	10	1	-	-	2.59
157	Natural	-	2	5	13	7	3.92
158	Nervous	3	17	6	-	-	2.12
159	Noisy	7	12	2	2	1	2.33
160	Obliging	-	-	3	11	11	4.32
161	Obnoxious	4	9	2	2	2	2.42
162	Opinionated	2	-	4	9	3	3.61
163	Opportunistic	2	1	1	8	7	4.42
164	Optimistic	-	6	3	11	4	3.54
165	Organized	-	1	1	9	11	4.36
166	Original	1	1	3	15	8	4.00
167	Outgoing	-	3	6	7	2	3.44
168	Outspoken	2	17	5	2	-	2.04
169	Painstaking	3	1	6	11	3	3.42
170	Patient	-	1	5	13	8	4.04
171	Peaceable	-	4	5	12	6	2.74
172	Peculiar	11	9	3	1	4	2.21
173	Persevering	2	3	5	4	5	3.79
174	Persistent	4	7	5	6	3	2.64
175	Pessimistic	8	7	1	3	2	2.24
176	Planful	-	1	2	17	5	4.04
177	Pleasant	-	-	3	6	17	4.54
178	Pleasure-seeking	-	1	8	9	8	3.54
179	Poised	-	1	2	11	14	4.36
180	Polished	1	-	3	11	11	4.19
181	Practical	-	-	3	18	6	4.11
182	Praising	-	1	-	16	8	4.24
183	Precise	1	2	4	10	7	3.83
184	Prejudiced	3	6	4	1	2	2.56
185	Preoccupied	1	11	7	3	1	2.65
186	Progressive	-	1	3	15	8	4.11
187	Prudish	3	9	3	-	-	2.00
188	Quarrelsome	12	11	2	1	-	1.69
189	Queer	22	4	-	2	-	1.36
190	Quick	-	1	2	13	7	4.13
191	Quiet	-	3	11	10	3	3.48
192	Quitting	12	9	3	1	-	1.53
193	Rational	3	5	6	12	2	3.18
194	Realistic	1	-	3	14	7	3.74
195	Rattlebrained	15	10	-	2	1	1.77
196	Reasonable	1	-	3	11	11	4.19
197	Rebellious	1	14	4	6	1	2.69
198	Reckless	11	9	2	3	1	2.00
199	Reflective	-	8	10	5	2	3.04
200	Relaxed	1	-	5	13	9	4.04

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

201	Reliable	-	-	3	5	20	4.61
202	Resentful	4	13	3	2	2	2.38
203	Reserved	1	2	9	14	2	3.14
204	Resourceful	-	-	2	15	9	4.27
205	Responsible	-	2	1	11	11	4.24
206	Restless	4	16	6	1	-	2.15
207	Retiring	3	16	5	3	-	2.67
208	Rigid	3	11	4	7	3	2.93
209	Robust	2	5	5	4	2	2.94
210	Rude	20	6	-	-	-	1.23
211	Sarcastic	12	9	2	1	1	1.80
212	Self-centered	8	5	4	1	4	2.41
213	Self-confident	-	4	2	10	8	3.92
214	Self-controlled	1	1	2	9	9	4.08
215	Self-denying	2	6	6	6	5	3.20
216	Self-pitying	6	10	4	3	3	2.50
217	Self-punishing	8	5	5	8	2	2.68
218	Self-seeking	-	5	9	8	2	2.71
219	Selfish	19	6	-	-	-	1.24
220	Sensitive	2	8	5	8	4	2.78
221	Sentimental	-	3	4	11	5	3.81
222	Serious	1	1	6	11	5	3.75
223	Severe	3	6	6	2	1	2.56
224	Sexy	5	7	4	3	9	3.50
225	Shallow	1	13	7	3	-	2.71
226	Sharpwitted	2	-	2	12	10	4.07
227	Shiftless	5	8	5	5	-	2.65
228	Show-off	9	10	3	2	4	2.36
229	Shrewd	3	2	8	7	5	3.36
230	Shy	4	17	3	1	-	2.20
231	Silent	3	8	10	3	2	2.77
232	Simply	4	15	6	1	-	2.15
233	Sincere	-	1	4	19	3	4.00
234	Slipshod	6	10	4	1	1	2.18
235	Slow	7	17	4	-	-	1.88
236	Sly	4	5	3	11	4	3.22
237	Smug	8	9	4	2	3	2.35
238	Snobbish	18	5	1	1	3	1.79
239	Sociable	-	-	3	14	10	4.68
240	Soft-hearted	-	2	6	12	8	4.26
241	Sophisticated	1	8	1	6	8	3.50
242	Spendthrift	1	17	2	-	1	2.19
243	Spineless	14	7	3	-	-	2.08
244	Spontaneous	2	2	10	6	1	3.10
245	Spunky	4	4	2	11	1	3.05
246	Stable	-	3	3	11	6	3.43
247	Steady	-	-	6	14	7	4.52
248	Stern	1	11	8	4	3	2.88
249	Stingy	15	8	1	1	-	1.52
250	Stolid	1	3	1	4	-	2.80

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

251	Strong	-	-	2	14	10	4.31
252	Stubborn	2	19	2	3	-	2.23
253	Submissive	1	5	4	3	-	3.08
254	Suggestible	-	1	4	15	3	3.87
255	Sulky	10	10	2	-	1	1.78
256	Superstitious	6	13	6	-	-	2.00
257	Suspicious	5	12	7	1	-	2.16
258	Sympathetic	-	-	6	14	7	4.04
259	Tactful	-	3	2	8	7	3.95
260	Tactless	9	9	4	-	-	1.78
261	Talkative	3	15	4	3	-	2.21
262	Temperamental	4	15	5	1	-	2.04
263	Tense	1	16	9	-	-	2.31
264	Thankless	13	10	-	3	1	1.85
265	Thorough	1	1	5	13	7	3.89
266	Thoughtful	-	1	4	10	13	4.25
267	Thrifty	-	2	3	10	13	4.37
268	Timid	4	17	6	-	1	2.40
269	Tolerant	-	-	6	7	8	4.09
270	Touchy	4	16	3	1	1	2.16
271	Tough	5	-	4	9	9	3.63
272	Trusting	1	-	6	12	9	4.00
273	Unaffected	-	6	8	10	1	3.24
274	Unambitious	14	9	2	1	2	1.86
275	Unassuming	2	9	7	2	1	2.57
276	Unconventional	-	9	7	3	-	2.68
277	Undependable	15	10	-	1	-	1.50
278	Understanding	-	1	3	11	12	4.18
279	Unemotional	2	7	8	6	2	1.96
280	Unexcitable	4	8	4	10	1	3.22
281	Unfriendly	14	11	2	-	-	1.56
282	Uninhibited	4	2	6	-	-	2.17
283	Unintelligent	13	12	-	-	-	1.41
284	Unkind	20	7	-	-	-	1.26
285	Unrealistic	5	17	3	-	-	1.54
286	Unscrupulous	7	6	5	1	-	2.00
287	Unselfish	2	-	-	12	10	4.17
288	Unstable	6	8	3	2	-	2.05
289	Vindictive	4	6	5	-	-	2.07
290	Versatile	1	1	1	9	3	3.80
291	Warm	-	2	5	14	7	3.93
292	Wary	2	1	10	5	1	3.11
293	Weak	13	11	2	2	-	1.39
294	Whiny	15	7	2	-	1	1.20
295	Wholesome	-	3	4	8	10	4.00
296	Wise	1	2	-	7	17	4.38
297	Withdrawn	2	7	8	2	1	2.70
298	Witty	-	1	2	12	11	4.27
299	Worrying	6	15	6	1	-	2.07
300	Zany	2	2	5	2	4	3.20

APPENDIX 5

Directions for the Judges

The following pages contain a list of adjectives. Parentheses (brackets) are placed after each adjective. In each, you are to place a number from one (1) to five (5). Think in terms of a person saying that word about himself. If he would be "running himself down" severely (in your judgment) place a 1 in the parenthesis. If he would think very highly of himself by saying that word place a 5 in the parenthesis. The numbers 2, 3 and 4 are used to indicate as follows:

- (2) if he somewhat belittles himself
- (3) if you are uncertain whether this word said by a person about himself would indicate that person is thinking well of himself or poorly of himself.
- (4) if a person saying this thinks rather well of himself.

Samples

popular (5) thinks well of himself
queer-looking (1) runs himself down considerably
hard-working (4) thinks rather well of himself.

Remember it is your judgment you are to record in each parenthesis. You may disagree with the samples. They are merely to suggest to you what numbers "go with" what a person would think about himself.

If there any adjectives you do not understand, leave the parentheses blank and underline the word not understood.

APPENDIX 6

Instructions for Using the Adjective Check List

On the following pages you will find a number of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put a check mark in the space before each adjective which describes you. If a certain adjective is true about you check it.

Don't worry about the items you have passed but go right on without spending too much time on any one adjective. Check the adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

If there are any adjectives you do not understand, simply leave them, and go on to those whose meanings you do know.

APPENDIX 7

Instructions for Using the Adjective Check List

On the following pages you will find a number of adjectives. Please read them carefully and put a check mark before each adjective which describes the way your friends see you. Remember it is how you feel your friends think of you that is important, this time.

If you are uncertain about a certain adjective, say to yourself "Do most of my friends think I am _____?" If you think the answer to your question would be yes then go ahead and check that adjective.

Don't worry about the items you have passed but go right on without spending too much time on any one adjective. Check the adjectives which tell how you feel your friends think of you at present.

If there are any adjectives you do not understand, simply leave them and go on to those whose meanings you do know.

APPENDIX 8

Instructions for Using the Adjective Check List

On the following pages you will find a number of adjectives. Please read them carefully and put a check mark before each adjective which describes the way your teachers see you. Remember it is how you feel your teachers think of you that is important, this time.

If you are uncertain about a certain adjective, say to yourself "Do most of my teachers think I am _____?" If you think the answer to your question would be yes then go ahead and check that adjective.

Don't worry about the items you have passed but go right on without spending too much time on any one adjective. Check the adjectives which tell how you feel your teachers think of you at present.

If there are any adjectives you do not understand, simply leave them and go on to those whose meanings you do know.

APPENDIX 9

Behavior Rating Scale

Name of Student _____

Date _____

Teacher _____

Instructions for Using the Rating Scale

1. These ratings are to represent your own private considered judgments. Please do not consult anyone in making them.

2. In rating this person disregard every trait but the one you are considering. Many ratings are rendered valueless if the rater allows himself to be influenced by a general favorable or unfavorable impression he has formed of the person.

3. Try as much as possible to obtain your ratings on the basis of observed behavior.

4. It is suggested that item one be rated for all the students being rated, then going on to item two for all the students, etc. This will help to keep clearly in mind the trait dimensions to be considered.

5. Place a check (x) on the line where you think your rating of this person is. You may place your check (x) at appropriate points between the descriptive phrases if you wish, although in most instances you will find the descriptive phrases of adequate coverage. Use pencil so that you may erase and change your ratings if you find it necessary.

6. Try to make your ratings by comparing him with children of his own age.

7. If you are uncertain as to how to rate an individual on a certain trait, omit that item rather than make a dubious judgment

8. The masculine pronoun (he) has been used throughout for convenience. It applies whether the person you are rating is male or female.

MADE IN U.S.A.
50% COTTON FIBER
CHIEFTAIN BOND
Meenah

Typed by Mrs. Lloyd L. Armes