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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Self-rationalization is essential to success in a career and is predictive of the same, according to Mannheim (3). However, the psychological aspects of self-rationalization, in relation to career motivation, have not been extensively investigated by psychologists. The reason for this is that a test to measure self-rationalization, specifically, has not been available.

Danziger (1) recently developed a technique by which, he claims, self-rationalization can be measured. This technique involves a Future Autobiography which was validated with the use of white and Negro South African people.

Following a statement of the purpose of this study, the remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of a definition of rationalization, forms of social action, the relationship between self-rationalization and success in a career, and how they are related to modern society.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to investigate the relationship between self-rationalization and
self-concept, and 2) to investigate the relationship between two different types of self-concept, the private self or what a person thinks about himself and the social self or what a person thinks other people in his psychological group think about him.

This study only investigates a correlational relationship between these variables. However, if future studies should demonstrate that self-rationalization is determined by the private self and the private self, in turn, is a reflection of the social self, a person might improve his self-concept by entering a better environment and his self-rationalization would be increased. This would make his potential for success in a career much better.

Rationalization

Rationalization assumes a position of "central importance in at least one major theoretical system" of economic growth, according to Danziger (1). The theoretical system mentioned here is that of the German sociologist, Max Weber. It is important to note that Weber does not use the term rationalization in the generally accepted psychological sense of the term.

Psychologists ordinarily think of rationalization as one of the many defensive mechanisms which people use, a mode of behavior by which people, often unconsciously,
conceal the truth about their actions and/or beliefs.

However, Weber's use of the term rationalization is with a different connotation. Danziger defines it as follows:

The process of rationalization, which Weber traced in many field of social life, involves the organization of actions into a system which constitutes the optimum arrangement of means for bringing about a certain end. Social rationalization therefore involves a methodical and calculated choice of actions and runs counter both to "unthinking acceptance of custom" and to the tendency to react in an emotionally spontaneous way (1, p. 17).

Karl Mannheim, following Weber, speaks of two connotations of both rationality and irrationality (4). He states that these two are the most important of many existing connotations for the sociologist. Naturally, they become important to a psychologist, as well, when he is searching for the psychological aspects of such sociological behavior.

First, Mannheim discusses substantial rationality and a corresponding conception of irrationality. He says that "everything which is cognitive in substance" may be designated as substantial rationality. On the other hand, all "psychic phenomena which are not cognitive in substance; that is to say, instincts impulses, wishes, feelings" may be designated as substantial irrationality.

Second, Mannheim discusses functional rationality and its corresponding conception of irrationality. Functional rationality pertains to action that is organized to attain
an end. Mannheim says concerning cases of functional rationality:

In such cases we mean by the word "rational" not that a man is executing cogitative, cognitive, acts, but that a series of actions is so organized as to lead to a preconceived end, wherefore every link in the series receives a functional value (4, p. 14).

Mannheim gives two criteria by which the rationality of a series of actions can be determined (4). They are:

1. The "functional organization of activities directed toward a given end."

2. The "calculability of these activities from the standpoint of the external observer."

A society can manifest a high degree of rationality in either of two ways, according to Mannheim (4). The members of a society may possess a vast amount of knowledge and demonstrate a high plane of development intellectually. Or, the members of a society may show a high degree of organization in terms of their sequences of actions. This paper is concerned with the latter manifestation of rationality. In this sense, Mannheim's rationality and Weber's rationalization are comparable, if not identical.

Forms of Social Action

Weber outlines four forms which social action may take (6, p. 59; 8, p. 115). These categories do not
account for all of the types of behavior, but Weber feels that they do give us "certain conceptually pure forms of sociologically important types, to which social conduct is more or less closely approximated, or as is more usual, which constitute the elements joining to make it up" (6, p. 62). These four categories of social behavior are: goal-oriented, value-oriented, affectually-oriented, and traditionally-oriented.

Goal-oriented conduct is a rational-type of social action. It is based on the assumption or expectation that objects or individuals in a contact situation will behave in a certain way. The individual uses such expectations as "conditions" or "means" to achieve the goals which he has rationally chosen.

Value-related conduct is a type of social action which is governed by a conscious consideration of its own absolute worth. There is no ulterior motive involved in this behavior. Ethics, aesthetics, or religion generally provide the standard by which the worth or value of the conduct is determined. Value-oriented conduct is a rational-type behavior in its orientation toward an absolute value.

Affectually-oriented conduct is a type of social action which is especially emotional. Behavior, in this sense, is the result of an individual's "special configuration" of his own feelings and emotions.
Traditionally-oriented conduct is a type of social action which closely follows custom and practice.

Weber (6) points out several significant things with respect to rational conduct. One thing is that rational conduct which is goal-oriented is incompatible with affectually- and traditionally-oriented types of behavior. Rational conduct which is value-oriented generally consists of making decisions between goal-oriented and one of the other types of behavior: affectually-oriented or traditionally-oriented. Thus, value-oriented conduct may be a type of rational conduct in some cases. However, the more absolute it becomes, in terms of value-orientation, the more irrationality it acquires. This is true because it gives no thought to the consequences of its unconditional devotion to absolute value. Therefore, goal-oriented behavior alone is purely rational conduct. It must meet certain conditions to be truly rational. Weber says:

Rational conduct is of the goal-oriented kind when it is engaged in with due consideration for ends, means, and secondary effects; such conduct must also weigh alternate choices, as well as the relations of the end to other possible uses of the means and, finally, the relative importance of different possible ends (6, p. 61).

Careers

Goal-oriented behavior is characteristic of a career man. In fact, a career demands goal-oriented behavior
on the part of the career man. The man who enters a career and wants to be successful in it must be a goal-oriented person. His behavior cannot be tradition ally-oriented or affectually-oriented; nor can it be primarily value-oriented. The man must use a rational approach to conduct and organize his behavior toward his goal of being a success in a career.

It is easy to see that a career man must have a rational life style. Concerning career men, Wilensky says:

At work, these men play it safe, seek security, cultivate smooth human relations. In the community they put down many but shallow roots; they pack up and drop friends the way they buy and trade cars and homes -- speeding up the obsolescence of both. This is a life style which is active, group-centered, conforming, and fluid -- a pseudo-community pattern, unguided by stable values. Behavior both at work and off work is characterized by expedient conformity ("If I don't do this, I'll get into trouble") and by other-direction, or conformity as a way of life whatever the content of values and norms conform to ("A man should get along with the gang") (10, p. 330).

The career man is "other-directed" in the sense that Reisman (5) speaks of "other-direction." Concerning the other-direction of individuals, Reisman says:

What is common to all other-directeds is that their contemporaries are the source of direction for the individual -- either those known to him or those with whom he is indirectly acquainted, through friends and through the mass media (5, p. 22).

It should be mentioned that, though a career man is an other-directed man, the reverse is not necessarily true. An other-directed man may not be a career man.
The career man is an organization man in the sense that Whyte (9) speaks of the "organization man." Whyte says, concerning people who personify the organization man:

They are not the workers nor are they the white-collar people in the usual, clerk sense of the word. These people only work for the Organization. The ones I am talking about belong to it as well. They are the ones of our middle class who have left home, spiritually as well as physically, to take the vows of organization life, and it is they who are the mind and soul of our great self-perpetuating institutions (9, p. 3).

Actually, the career man or goal-oriented man probably pursues a rational life style for his own career benefit. In other words, he works for the organization and gives himself to it for the benefit it will bring him.

Wilensky (10) says that careers account for only a minority of the labor force. He also points out that Reisman and Whyte feel that the style of life of a career man provides a model which will spread throughout the population. Thus, it is apparent that a greater percentage of the population will become career people; if not by upward mobility, then by a filtering of the career and its accompanying style of life down into lower status occupations. Gross believes that this is already the case. He says:

We can speak of a career irrespective of the status of an occupation, and even in situations where the person changes occupation. All that is necessary is that there be some type of recognizable
pattern with at least roughly known probability. This means that we have some knowledge of the major kinds of events or phenomena which can produce these patterns and determine their probability of occurrence (2, p. 196).

Careers, in the generally accepted sense of the term, are still few as compared with the size of the population. Therefore, the number of occupations for which a rational life style is essential is small. However, as industrialization and bureaucratization continue to increase, the spheres of human activity which demand a functionally rational and calculable life style will increase. This leads into a discussion of modern society in relation to the things already discussed: forms of social action, the career, and rationalization.

Modern Society

Rationalization of conduct, in the goal-oriented sense, and the career are, to a large extent, products of modern society. They are promoted by and are essential to modern society. This is because there is a rational character inherent within this society. Weber refers to this modern society as a bureaucratic society. He says:

Naturally, bureaucracy promotes a 'rationalist' way of life, but the concept of rationalism allows for widely differing contents. Quite generally, one can only say that the bureaucratization of all domination very strongly furthers the development of 'rational matter-of-factness' and the professional expert (7, p. 240).
Weber (7) notes that bureaucracy is characterized by rules, means, ends, and matter-of-factness. And, the bureaucratic system has destroyed every other system of organization in its path. Weber speaks particularly of Patriarchialism, Patrimonialism, Feudalism, and Charismatic Authority which have been destroyed in places where the bureaucratic system has developed.

In a modern society, rationalization, or functional rationality, is assimilated into the life style of individual members of the society. This is because career success, which is valued so highly in this society, is dependent upon rational, goal-oriented behavior. This leads back into a discussion of self-rationalization.

Self-Rationalization

Mannheim says:

Concern with a career requires a maximum of self-mastery since it involves not only the actual processes of work but also the prescriptive regulation both of the ideas and feelings that one is permitted to have and of one's leisure time (3, p. 56).

According to Mannheim, self-rationalization involves a systematic control of impulses on the part of the individual. Self-rationalization is a presupposition to success in a career. A self-rationalized person's actions are guided by principle and directed toward a goal. The criterion by which a self-rationalized person judges and
controls his actions and impulses is that of contribution
to career success (1). Danziger says:

Thoroughgoing self-rationalization therefore involves the subordination of all other goals to the overriding goal of long-term self-interest as expressed in success in a career. This gives rise to a personality pattern which is quite unknown in many human communities, a pattern based on the systematic control of impulse in the interests of a deliberately formulated life plan. In other words, the gradual spread of rationalization to all areas of social life is accompanied by an increasing systematization of the life of the individual until, ideally, all his actions are co-ordinated in the service of a single goal, namely, personal success (1, p. 18).
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CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND, RELATED STUDIES, AND HYPOTHESES

Theoretical Background

The major theoretical system upon which this study is based is that of Alfred Adler. Hadley summarizes this theory as follows:

In place of Freud's libidinal instincts and Jung's principle of individuation Alfred Adler substituted an innate ego motive, propelling the individual toward a goal of security and adaptation to life. Adler's basic instinct was self-assertion, an inherent tendency in the organism to achieve superiority.... According to Adler, the manner in which the individual strives for security and adaptation constitutes his character or his "life style." This orientation toward life is unique with every individual, for it is determined by the individual's opinion of his own capacities, which, in turn, reflects his image of the sentiments of the community (17, pp. 73, 74).

Other background theory for the two relationships suggested in Adler's theory will be discussed separately. First, background theory will be presented for the relationship between the "private self" (or, an "individual's opinion of his own capacities") and the "social self" (or, an individual's perception or "image of the sentiments of the community"). Then, background theory will be presented for the relationship between the "private
self" and "self-rationalization" (or, "life Style"). The remainder of this section will be given to this discussion.

William James (21), in his *Principles of Psychology*, speaks of the social self. He states that the social self is the recognition which a person gets from his mates. According to James, a person actually has "as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him and carry an image of him in their mind" (21, p. 294). However, he says that these people generally fall into certain categories. Therefore, in a practical sense, a person has "as many social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares" (21, p. 294).

Cooley (11) discusses the social nature of the self. He carries his discussion further than does James. He says that the "social self is simply any idea, or system of ideas, drawn from the communicative life, that the mind cherishes as its own" (11, p. 147). According to Cooley, self-feeling or the concept of "I" has its origin in this social self. He stresses the interactional aspects of the social self and "I" by means of the concept of "the looking-glass self." He says that a person's self-feeling is determined by the attitude toward his self which he attributes to another mind. He says:

A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principle elements: the imagination of our appearance
to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification (11, p. 152).

Mead (27) discusses the development of the self as the product of the attitudes of other individuals and the group as a whole. He mentions two steps in what he calls "the full development of the self." They are as follows:

At the first of these stages, the individual's self is constituted simply by an organization of the particular attitudes of other individuals toward himself and toward one another in the specific social acts in which he participates with them. But at the second stage in the full development of the individual's self that self is constituted not only by organization of these particular individual attitudes, but also by an organization of the social attitudes of the generalized other or the social group as a whole to which he belongs (27, p. 58).

Newcomb (31) points out that more recent writers have not changed the emphasis on the self as a product of social interaction. This may be illustrated with the writings of Gerth and Mills (16) and Lindesmith and Strauss (23).

Gerth and Mills state that the "self-image develops and changes as the person, through his social experiences, becomes aware of others" (16, p. 84). They point out that it is only significant others who tend to have an influence upon the building and maintenance of the self-image. Finally, they state that a person's self-image, as the person matures, is taken over by him. The images
of him which are presented to him by others have less influence. They serve to facilitate or restrain the self-image.

Lindesmith and Strauss (23) speak of self-awareness as a product of social interaction. They say that this self-awareness is very similar to the imagination of how other people see you. In other words, it is similar to Cooley's "looking-glass self." Lindesmith and Strauss state that language is important to the individual for it is only through communication with others that self-awareness develops.

Attitudes toward the self, according to Bonney (3), are formed through parent-child relationships in early childhood. Of special concern here is the child's perception of his parents attitudes. Bonney says that a person's self-conceptions, during childhood and in later years, are also greatly affected by his experiences in groups outside the home (3, p. 130). This tends to lend support to the theory that the private self is a reflection of the social self.

The background theory for the relationship between the "private self" and the "social self" has been discussed. Now, this discussion turns to the relationship between the "private self" and "self-rationalization."
As pointed out in the introduction, Wilensky (41) claims that career progress is the result of an individual's life style; Weber (40) says that it is a result of rationalization; and, Mannheim (26) claims that it is the result of self-rationalization. Actually, all three of these terms refer to the same phenomenon. This paper uses the term "self-rationalization" to refer to this phenomenon.

Coates and Pellegrin (9) outline three theories which have been advanced for career causation and propose a theory of their own. These four theories are as follows: the individual causation theory, the social causation theory, the equilibrium theory, and the situational theory. If the relationship between self-rationalization and career progress is what this paper assumes it to be, then these four theories for career causation could have been offered as theories for self-rationalization.

According to Coates and Pellegrin, the individual causation theory holds that career progress is the result of individual attributes, such as native ability, hard work, and the demonstration of merit. They state that the social causation theory holds that career progress is the result of "social factors and occupational opportunities arising from historical circumstance" (9, p. 121).
Then, Coates and Pellegrin say that the **equilibrium theory** holds that career causation "takes into consideration the influence of social background, native ability, historical circumstances, and individual attributes, all of which interact with different intensities at various periods in the individual's career" (9, p. 121). Finally, they offer their own theory of career causation; this is the **situational theory**. This theory holds that career causation is the result of an individual's definition of the situation. This definition, according to Coates and Pellegrin, "is primarily determined by 1) his **occupational experiences** following initial occupational placement, and 2) the **attitudes, values, and behavior patterns** he acquires as a member of his occupational group" (11, p. 121).

As mentioned above, these four theories could have been offered as theories for self-rationalization instead of career progress. However, this paper proposes a self-concept theory to explain self-rationalization.

With respect to behavior in general, Bonney says:

> Recently a great many psychologists have placed much emphasis on the importance of our self-regarding attitudes as a source of motivation in all of our behavior. What we think of ourselves is being regarded as a factor of primary significance in explaining both our personal and our social behavior (3, pp. 126, 127).

Several personality theorists give self-concept a prominent place in their theoretical systems. Some give
it a more prominent place than others; this will be noticed in the following paragraphs.

Hartmann (18) states that human behavior is influenced by all three psychic systems; especially, beyond a certain age. He says that the ego normally accomplishes the formation of action, but that "other of its characteristics may derive from the id or the superego" (18, p. 364). Hartmann does not mention the self-concept as such, but he does give the ego system a prominent place in human behavior.

Combs and Snygg (10) say that a person's behavior is determined altogether by his "perceptual field." This perceptual field is the person's own "field of awareness" and it is unique with him. They state that the self-concept is a part of this perceptual field. They also say that this part of the perceptual field, the self-concept, is most responsible for human behavior. Therefore, the self-concept assumes a position of central importance to their theory of human behavior. Combs and Snygg also state that the self-concept is related to the adequacy of personality. They say:

The self-concept.....is an organization of self meanings or ways of seeing self, varying in importance or centrality in a given individual. The basic need of each of us, moreover, is to maintain and enhance this self. Adequate personalities have achieved a considerable degree of such need satisfaction. They see themselves more frequently in enhancing than in destructive ways (10, p. 240).
Young (42), writing about the "dynamic self-system," says:

A highly important psychological system relates to attitudes and knowledge concerning the self. Self-regarding attitudes and beliefs play a tremendously important role as determinants of social behavior and emotional experience (42, p. 531).

Rogers (36) gives the self-concept a very prominent place in his theory of personality. In fact, he makes it central to his theory. One of his propositions is: "Most of the ways of behaving which are adopted by the organism are those which are consistent with the concept of self" (36, p. 507). He says:

As the organism strives to meet its needs in the world as it is experienced, the form which the striving takes must be a form consistent with the concept of self. The man who has certain values attached to honesty cannot strive for a sense of achievement through means which seem to him dishonest. The person who regards himself as having no aggressive feelings cannot satisfy a need for aggression in any direct fashion. The only channels by which needs may be satisfied are those which are consistent with the organized concept of self (36, pp. 507,508).

Camilla Anderson (1), too, gives the self-concept a very prominent place in her theory of personality and human behavior. She says: "The pattern of life of every individual is a living out of his self-image; it is his road map for living" (1, p. 236).

Cameron (4) speaks of "self-reaction and role-taking." He says:
By a self-reaction we mean the behavior of an individual in direct relation to himself as a social object. A person's self-responses are, therefore, the specific patterns which he has acquired in relation to his own appearance, his competence, his conduct and his status. His self-attitudes are the behavioral backgrounds that facilitate and support specific self-responses. In configural terms, a self-response is the figure and its self-attitude the ground (4, pp. 97, 98).

Newcomb (31) speaks of two aspects of the self: the self as value and the self as resource. In the former, self-perceptions are ends in themselves, while, in the latter, self-perceptions are means to other ends. Newcomb uses the figure-ground analogy to illustrate his thinking (31, p. 230). The self as value is a situation where the self serves as figure and everything else, including behavior, is perceived as "means toward its preservation or enhancement." The self as resource is a situation where the self serves as ground and the goal toward which behavior is directed serves as figure.

Newcomb's "self as value" illustrates the theory that the private self is a reflection of or a product of the social self. His "self as resource" illustrates the theory that the private self determines life style or self-rationalization.

Related Studies

Gerard (15) states that two types of social comparison appear to affect self-evaluation. In the first type, the individual compares himself with others on a given
attribute. In the second type, he compares himself with, and his self-evaluation is influenced by, his conception of the way others see him. Gerard labels these two types of comparison direct and reflective comparison respectively. In a study designed to investigate the relative influence of these two types of social comparison, he found that an individual's self-appraisal is influenced by direct comparison of his performance with the performance of others. Then, he found that a positive bias in self-appraisal is introduced by reflected comparison. This seems to indicate that reflected comparison has a greater influence upon self-appraisal than does direct comparison.

Helper (19) has investigated the relationship between the self-evaluations of a group of eighth and ninth-grade children and the evaluations of these children by their parents. The results of this investigation show a small but a positive correlation between the children's self-evaluations and parental evaluations.

The study just mentioned used parental evaluations as a variable. In a similar study, Jourard and Remy (22) use perceived parental attitudes as a variable. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among parental attitudes, self attitudes, and security. Jourard and Remy found that self-appraisals and a person's perception of his parents' appraisals of him are correlated.
The results also indicate that psychological insecurity is a correlate of negative self-appraisal and negative perceived parental appraisals.

Davidson and Lang (13) have investigated the relationship between perceived teachers' feelings, on the part of school children, and their self-perceptions, academic achievement, and classroom behavior. The children were 89 boys and 114 girls in grades 4, 5, and 6 in a New York public school. This study produced several significant results; two will be mentioned. First, it was found that the children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them were positively and significantly correlated with their self-perceptions. Second, it was found that the children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings toward them were positively correlated with their academic achievement and their classroom behavior as rated by the teachers.

An experiment to investigate the relationship between the reactions of other individuals to a person and his self-conception has been performed by Videbeck (39). He reports that the findings tend to support the general view that self-perceptions are learned and that the reactions of others have a significant influence on the learning process.

It has been suggested by Manis (25) that a person's self-concept, as a collection of attitudes, opinions, and
beliefs about oneself, is no different than any other set of attitudes, opinions, and beliefs. In a study designed to test this suggestion, Manis found only partial support for it. Others' perceptions of the subjects were found to influence their self-concepts, but these self-concepts were not found to affect the views of others about the subjects. Though the results did not fully support Manis' suggestion, it is significant that the self-concepts of the subjects were influenced by the perceptions of them held by others.

Reeder, Donohue, and Biblarz (34) have done a study on the relationship between self-concept and the responses of others. They found that a negative self-concept is determined largely by the perceived and actual responses of others. On the other hand, they report that a positive self-concept must be accounted for by more than the responses of others. They suggest that characteristics such as age, urban or rural background, education, and socioeconomic status of parents could be significant variables. However, it is important to note that the responses of others do have an influence even on the more positive self-concepts.

A study has been done by Miyamoto and Dornbusch (29) to investigate certain aspects of the interactionist view of self-conception. Several points of significance are
revealed by the results. The authors report that the responses, or at least the attitudes, of others and self-conception are related. They also report that a person's perception of these responses or attitudes of others are more closely related to self-conception. Finally, they found that a person's "self-conception is more closely related to his estimate of the generalized attitude toward him than to the perceived attitude of response of members of a particular group" (29, p. 403).

Hicks (20) has investigated the influence of group flattery upon self-evaluation. The subjects were 12 groups of elementary psychology students; 42 males and 16 females. Hicks found that self-evaluation tends to shift upward as a result of group flattery. This seems to indicate that a person's self-concept, the private self, is related to the attitudes and responses of others toward the individual and his perception of these attitudes and responses.

The relationship between the evaluations expressed by others and an individual's self-concept has been investigated by Maehr, Mensing, and Nalzger (24). The study was concerned about the body concepts of adolescent boys. The subjects were 31 members of a high school physical education class. Maehr et al. found that the expressed evaluations of significant others do influence a persons self-concept. The effect of these evaluations is significant on items
which are directly approved or disapproved. There is some spread to related items, but hardly any effect upon unrelated items.

Davis (14) has studied the relationship between social-preferability and self-concept in an aged population. The subjects were 56 residents of a sectarian home for the aged. Davis tested the relationship between social-preferability and three different measures of the self-concept: the expression of the self-concept as "old," "young," "not old," or "not young;" the expression of the self-concept through personal complaints; and, the expression of the self-concept through the reporting of personal adjustment. Davis found a relationship between social-preferability and each of the latter two expressions of the self-concept. Even though he did not find such a relationship between social-preferability and the first expression of the self-concept, the data seem to indicate the possibility that the attitudes and reactions of others are related to self-concept.

Finally, another study which bears upon the relationship between the social self and the private self is one by Pelesuk (32). This study tends to corroborate the theory of Gerth and Mills (16) that, as a person matures, his self-image becomes more rigid; images of him which are presented to him by others tend to have less influence.
Pelesuk used 83 male students from the University of Michigan for his subjects. He found that a person's self-relevant attitudes and his attitudes toward significant others tend to resist change even when these significant others do not hold the same attitudes toward him as he holds toward himself. Pelesuk found that a person tends to use a wide range of rationalization in such situations. This, of course, is rationalization in the generally accepted psychological sense.

Inasmuch as a measure of self-rationalization has not been available until recently, no studies using self-rationalization as a variable, other than Danziger's (12), have been published. Very few, if any, have been done. Therefore, it is difficult to find any studies related to the hypothesized relationship between self-concept and self-rationalization which this study seeks to investigate. The studies reported here are only indirectly related to this hypothesized relationship.

Two studies done in South Africa, when considered together, suggest that there may be a relationship between self-concept and self-rationalization. The first study is the one in which Danziger (12) validated a measure of self-rationalization. He found that white university students in South Africa tend to make higher scores on the measure of self-rationalization than do their Negro
counterparts. The second study is one by Bloom (2) in which he investigates the relative self-concepts of Negro and white university students in South Africa. He found that the Negro students tend to have a more negative self-concept while the white students tend to have a more positive self-concept. These two studies, when viewed together, suggest the possibility that the self-concept and self-rationalization are related.

Several studies have been done on the relationship between self-concept and career success. This paper assumes that self-rationalization is essential to and predictive of career success as mentioned in Chapter I. Therefore, the relationships between self-concept and career success that have been found in the studies reported here are assumed to be the same as relationships between self-concept and self-rationalization.

Coates and Pellegrin (3) have investigated the relationship between self-appraisal and career success. There were 100 subjects in this study: 50 top-level executives in 30 large and bureaucratically structured business, industrial, governmental, and educational organizations; 50 first line supervisors in the same or similar occupational environments. The executives were asked to take the role of the "generalized other" in retrospectively appraising their own attributes and those of the first
line supervisors. These executives made several distinctions between themselves and the supervisors, Coates and Pellegrin say:

Among the distinctions most frequently made by executives between themselves and supervisors were: more energy, alertness, and initiative; aggressive as opposed to submissive attitudes; more understanding of and ability to get along with and manipulate people; greater willingness to assume responsibilities and make decisions; greater ability to deal with and impress superiors; better judgment and foresight; more magnetic, well-rounded, projective personalities; more tact and poise; better problem-solving ability; more adaptability to changing situations; more determination and strength of personal character; different definitions of the meaning of success; greater ability to sell themselves and their ideas, and to get things done through group effort; more education and training; different occupational and social contacts and opportunities; different loyalties and job interests (8, pp. 218, 219).

The supervisors were asked to do the same thing as the executives. They tended to concede to the executives the superiority which the executives claimed. Both the executives and the supervisors assumed the role of the generalized other in making their appraisals, but it is assumed that their responses also represent their private self-concepts.

Merenda, Musiker, and Clarke (28) have done a study, using the Activity Vector Analysis (AVA), on the relationship between the self-concept and success in sales work. The subjects were fifty-eight sales managers employed in a large direct sales organization. The AVA measures two aspects of the self-concept: the social self and the basic self. The social self is a measure of the adaptive
role which a person plays in a social setting. The basic self is a measure of or is the "core of being." The authors report: "Both the more successful and less successful groups substantially agreed as to the role that they had been called on to play. They disagreed as to their capabilities to carry this out" (28, p. 76). From this, it can be concluded that the way a person views his capacities is correlated with success in sales management. Therefore, the way a person views his capacities should be related to self-rationalization.

A study by Clarke (6) was done to "determine the relevance of selected AVA score profiles for prediction of success as a Loan Office Manager or Assistant Manager" (6, p. 405). The subjects were 39 office managers and assistant managers. Clarke found that AVA score profiles, age, and experience or training can be used to discriminate between potentially successful and potentially unsuccessful loan office managers and assistant managers. Therefore, the self-concept as revealed by the AVA profile, age, and experience or training should be related to self-rationalization.

Clarke (7) has also done a study to investigate the relationship between an AVA score profile and self-made company presidents. Clarke found that the AVA score profile can be used to discriminate between Self-made
President and Non-President occupations. This AVA score profile should be related to self-rationalization.

Several studies have been done on the relationship between self-concept and achievement in school. It seems that achievement in school would require a certain amount of self-rationalization. Therefore, a few of these studies are reported here.

Chickering (5) has investigated, among other things, the relationship between self-concept and achievement in school. The subjects were 107 ninth-grade students in a school on Long Island. Chickering found that the self-concept is positively correlated with school achievement.

Pyne (33) has investigated the relationships between certain psychological characteristics and athletic success in school. The subjects constituted the varsity basketball squads from high schools in the Minneapolis city and lake conferences for the playing season 1955-56. Among other things, Pyne found that the concept of self as a person is not related to athletic success, but successful athletes do rate higher on variables significant to athletic success than do unsuccessful athletes.

Self-concept has been investigated by Reeder (35) in relation to sociometric status, academic achievement, and classroom behavior. The subjects were middle-grade children.
Reeder found that self-concept is positively related to all three variables.

Stevens (38) has investigated the relationship between three aspects of the self-concept and academic achievement in college students. He found "that the three dimensions of the self-concept (self-insight, self-acceptance, salience of personality traits) which were investigated in this study are related to academic achievement" (38, p. 2532).

If it is true that achievement in school, both academic and athletic, requires self-rationalization to a certain degree, these studies just mentioned would seem to indicate a relationship between the self-concept and self-rationalization.

Two studies which have investigated the relationship between self-concept and aspirations will be discussed now. It is assumed that there is a definite relationship between aspirations and self-rationalization. The first study is one by Steiner (37). He used 44 students in an undergraduate class in psychology for his subjects. He found that "persons with high mean realistic self-rating scores" on the Brownfain scale have "larger positive goal attainment scores than other persons" (37, p. 352). The correlation is only about .15, but it is enough to suggest a relationship.
Morrison (30) has done a study on the relationship between the self-concept and occupational choice. He used two groups of subjects: 44 nursing students in their second semester of the first year of a three year training program; 43 education majors, primarily sophomores. The members of both groups described themselves, the occupational role they had chosen, and an occupational role which they had not chosen. Morrison found that there tends to be a greater relationship between self-perceptions and perceptions of chosen occupational roles than between self-perceptions and unchosen occupational roles. Occupational choice seems to be a function of aspirations. Therefore, it is assumed that the results of this study suggest a relationship between self-concept and aspirations.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study are drawn from the preceding theoretical background and related studies. They are as follows:

1. There will be a positive relationship between the private self and the social self.

2. There will be a positive relationship between the private self and self-rationalization.
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CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Method

The subjects for this study were 51 students in two freshmen classes in General Psychology for Teachers. They were about equally divided between the sexes. There were 23 subjects in Class 1 and 28 subjects in Class 2.

The instruments used in this study were Brownfain's (1) Self-Rating Inventory and Danziger's (2) Future Autobiography. The Self-Rating Inventory consists of 20 personality traits which all people possess to a certain degree; some people more, others less. Subjects rate themselves on each trait according to an 8-point scale. The least desirable point is represented by "1" and the most desirable point is represented by "8" on the Self-Rating Inventory. Only the extremes of each trait are defined on the Inventory for the subject.

In rating themselves on the Self-Rating Inventory, subjects are asked to compare themselves with the group of people to whom they belong or with whom they identify. This group is defined as a psychological group, not a formal group. In other words, subjects compare themselves with their peers, the people with whom they generally compare themselves.
As indicated in Chapter I, the Future Autobiography, as an instrument to measure self-rationalization, was validated by Danziger (2). It is explained here in some detail since it is a new instrument.

In their Future Autobiographies, subjects write about their expectations, plans, and aspirations for the future. The Future Autobiographies are scored by a content analysis. Seven variables are used to assess the degree of self-rationalization. They are: ego-reality statements, ego-phantasy statements, non-career values, economic interest, contingency statements, objective time reference, and time structure. All of these variables, except ego-phantasy statements and non-career values, are positively related to self-rationalization; the two variables excluded here are negatively related to self-rationalization.

Danziger's definitions (2, pp. 20,21) of these seven variables are paraphrased in the following paragraphs. Each definition is followed by an example taken from the Future Autobiographies which were written for this study.

Ego-reality statements concern the specific plans and intentions of the writer in regard to his future. They must be realistic, personal, and specific. An example of such a statement is, "In the near future, I expect to become a successful teacher in the field of Art."
Ego-phantasy statements are represented by references to or implications about the future which are highly improbable in the face of existing social circumstances. An example of this type of statement is, "I expect to be in the middle-upper or lower-upper income bracket by the time I am 50 years of age." This statement is seen to represent ego-phantasy especially when it is considered in the context of the Future Autobiography from which it is taken.

Non-career values are those which are in conflict with pure self-interest and its pursuit. These values "may be intellectual, artistic, moral, religious, political or social." A statement which demonstrates such a value is, "I would like to go overseas and help the children from the dark and dense jungles and foreign lands."

Economic interest, such as interest in investment and profitable activities, is significant. A statement which demonstrates a high degree of economic interest is, "As I approach retirement, I expect to be the head of a branch office of an insurance company and receiving a salary of $50,000 per year, possibly a little more." This statement also manifests ego-phantasy.

Contingency statements are those which make certain life plans dependent upon certain conditions. Some common terms in this connection are: "provided that," "presuming that," "whether," "if," and "depending." An example of a
contingency statement is, "If my goal (a top-ranking position in the coaching field) can be reached by 1975, I will settle my family in one city.....to give my children their education at the same school."

Objective time references may take the form of dates, ages, or time periods. An example of such a time reference is, "I hope to marry when I am 24 or 25 (years of age)."

Time structure in a Future Autobiography is significant; the more "distinct, successive phases" of a well-ordered career pointed out, the more self-rationalization is indicated. Such stages might be: "junior position in a firm," "setting up one's own business," "branching out on new investments," and "retirement and public activity." An example of such time structure is demonstrated in the following statement: "After working for a period of two to four years for the Federal Home Loan Bank, I hope to either become the manager of a small savings and loan association or become the second man, assistant manager, of a large association."

Both the Self-Rating Inventory and the Future Autobiography used in this study have been discussed. These tests were administered to the subjects by the present experimenter. The Self-Rating Inventory was administered to all subjects twice. One one rating, the subjects were
told, "We want to find out what kind of person you really think you are." They rated themselves according to the manner in which they saw themselves. On the other rating, the subjects were told, "We want to find out what kind of person you really think other people in your psychological group think you are." They rated themselves according to the manner in which they felt other people in their psychological group saw them. Finally, each subject wrote a Future Autobiography.

The instructions, which were given to the subjects in this study, for writing the Future Autobiography were almost identical with those which Danziger used in the validation of the instrument (2, p. 19). They are:

1. Beginning at the present (your past life history, up to now, need not be told), write a few pages concerning your expectations, plans, and aspirations for the future. There is no required length for these essays: anything from 2 to 4 pages (or about 500 to 1,000 words) would be quite acceptable.

2. The assignment assumes, of course, that you will live at least to the year 2010, when you will presumably be about 70 years of age.

3. Although you need not follow a strict chronological method year by year or decade by decade, it would be well to write of the near future as you see it, and then of the expectations appropriate to successive periods of middle age and life.

4. Please also write your name, sex, and present age on the paper which you hand in.

In Class 1, the subjects first rated themselves according to the way they saw themselves. Then, they rated
themselves according to the way they thought people in their psychological group saw them. The first rating was used as an index of the "private self." The second rating was used as an index of the "social self."

In Class 2, the order of administration was reversed. This was done to balance any influence which either type of rating may have had on the other. All subjects wrote their Future Autobiographies last.

Each class completed all tests during one 30-minute class period. Other than the time used to give and discuss the instructions, the subjects were given 10 minutes to complete the Self-Rating Inventory each time it was administered. They were given 40 minutes to write their Future Autobiographies. Several limitations of this procedure will be discussed in the section on Discussion of Data.

Each Self-Rating Inventory yielded 20 ratings; one for each trait. The sum of these ratings was used in the statistical analysis. The score from the Future Autobiographies which was used in the statistical analysis was derived in the following manner. Two raters independently scored the Future Autobiographies: one rater had just completed his master's degree program in psychology; the other rater was the present experimenter. The average score of these two ratings for each Future Autobiography was used in the statistical analysis.
It should be noted that the statistical analysis was done with only 49 of the initial 51 subjects. One subject was dropped from each class. This was because, in the judgment of the present experimenter, the scores assigned, by the two raters, to the Future Autobiographies of excluded subjects were not in close enough agreement to provide a reasonable consensus of the degree of self-rationalization indicated. The variances between the scores assigned to each of these two Future Autobiographies were five and seven points respectively. The scores assigned to the Future Autobiographies, by the two raters, had to show variances of four points or less in order for the corresponding subjects to be used in the statistical analysis.

Pearson's $r$ was used to calculate all correlations. Then, Fisher's $t$ was used to determine the significance of these correlations.

Presentation of Data

The first results reported here concern the scores on the Future Autobiographies; they have been mentioned in part already. The maximum possible score is 25. However, the scores, as determined by each rater, on the Future Autobiographies under study ranged from 6 through 20. It is interesting to notice the variance between the two
scores assigned to each Future Autobiography by the two raters. These variances, for all 51 subjects, appear in Table I.

TABLE I

VARIANCES BETWEEN SCORES ASSIGNED TO FUTURE AUTOBIOGRAPHIES BY THE TWO RATERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Future Autobiographies</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Points of Variance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the scores for the two Future Autobiographies for which there were score variances of five and seven points respectively had been dropped out of the study, inter-rater reliability coefficients were calculated. These coefficients are shown in Table II.

TABLE II

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR SCORES ASSIGNED TO THE FUTURE AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The inter-rater reliability coefficient was .69 for the scores in Class 1. For Class 2, this coefficient was .76. The reliability coefficient for all of the scores considered together was .76. All three of these coefficients are significant at the better than .001 level.

The results which bear on the specific hypotheses under consideration are now reported. As in the case of the inter-rater reliability coefficients, these results were obtained with the use of 49 of the initial 51 subjects. The results are reported for each class separately followed by a report of the results for all of the subjects considered together.

TABLE III
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES
UNDER STUDY FOR CLASS 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Self and Social Self</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Self and Self-Rationalization</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for Class 1 show a correlation of .36 for the relationship between the private self scores and the social self scores. This correlation is significant at the better than .001 level. The relationship between the private self scores and the self-rationalization scores is
represented by a correlation of .55. This correlation is significant at the better than .01 level. These findings are shown in Table III.

The results for Class 2 show a correlation of .91 for the relationship between the private self scores and the social self scores. This is significant at the better than .001 level. The relationship between the private self scores and the self-rationalization scores is represented by a correlation of .26. This correlation is not significant even at the .05 level. These findings are shown in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES UNDER STUDY FOR CLASS 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Self and Social Self</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Self and Self-Rationalization</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>N. S.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N. S. = no significance

The results for all of the subjects considered together are now reported. The relationship between the private self scores and the social self scores is represented by a correlation of .89. This correlation is significant at the better than .001 level. Then, the
relationship between the private self scores and the self-rationalization scores is represented by a correlation of .29. This correlation is significant at the better than .05 level. These findings are shown in Table V.

**TABLE V**

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES UNDER STUDY FOR ALL SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Self and Social Self</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Self and Self-Rationalization</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the relationship between social self scores and self-rationalization scores, though not hypothesized specifically in this study, was also determined. The findings are shown in Table VI.

**TABLE VI**

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL SELF SCORES AND SELF-RATIONALIZATION SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>N. S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>N. S.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N. S. = no significance
For Class 1, this relationship is represented by a correlation of .55; this is significant at the better than .01 level. However, for Class 2 the correlation was only .08; this is not significant at all. For all subjects considered together, the correlation was .18; this is not significant even at the .05 level.

Discussion of Data

It should be noted that this study has several limitations; they will be discussed now. First, the selectivity of the subjects used in this study may have biased the results. It is reasonable to believe that university students would possess a greater degree of self-rationalization than the average person. This is because they generally have higher aspirations than do people who do not attend college or university. It is also reasonable to believe that university students would have better self-concepts than does the average person. The reason for this is that an education is known to contribute to self-confidence. Therefore, this study may well have been influenced by the selectivity of the subjects.

Another limitation of this study is seen in the procedure. All tests were given during one 80-minute class period. The subjects' first self-ratings may have influenced their second self-ratings. For Class 1, this means that the ratings of the subjects on the way they saw
themselves may have influenced the subject's ratings on the way they thought other people in their psychological group saw them. For Class 2, this influence in reverse may have taken place; in other words, the subjects' ratings on the way they thought other people in their psychological group saw them may have influenced their ratings on the way they saw themselves.

Another limitation of this study is that it was not designed to test cause-effect relationships. However, the results of this study, if they are correct, suggest the possibility that such relationships may exist among the variables under study. This will be discussed in more detail later.

In spite of the limitations of this study, the results deserve some reflection. They are discussed here.

First, it is interesting to notice that, on scores assigned to the Future Autobiographies, the inter-rater reliabilities of .69 for Class 1, .76 for Class 2, and .76 for all of the subjects considered together fall within the range of inter-rater reliability coefficients which Danziger reported. He has found that inter-rater reliability coefficients vary between .66 and .86 (2, p. 22). This was with two or three raters. Less experienced raters received the lower reliabilities and more experienced raters received the higher reliabilities.
The raters of the Future Autobiographies in this study would have to be considered as less experienced raters. Therefore, the inter-rater reliability coefficients for them, which are somewhat better than the inter-rater reliability coefficients for less experienced raters which Danziger reported, are considered to be very good.

Apparently, Danziger's Future Autobiography (2) is an instrument which can be administered and scored with relative ease and objectivity. If it actually measures self-rationalization, which it seems to do, it will be of definite benefit to psychologists in predicting an individual's prospects of career success.

Psychologists have used a person's interests, as measured by an interest scale, to predict career success, but they have not used self-rationalization per se to do this. The reason for this is that a measure of this phenomenon has not been available. Danziger's Future Autobiography, however, seems to be an instrument with which self-rationalization can be measured and used to predict success. Since it involves a projective technique, its greatest value will probably be in the hands of a person who develops a feel for the instrument through repeated administration and scoring of it.

This discussion now turns to a consideration of the relationships between the variables under study. It will
deal only with the correlations obtained for all subjects considered together. The correlation of .89 for the relationship between the private self and the social self is significant at the better than .001 level. Then, the correlation of .29 for the relationship between the private self and self-rationalization is significant at the better than .05 level. These correlations seem to lend support to the specific hypotheses under study. These hypotheses are: 1) there will be a positive relationship between the private self and the social self, and 2) there will be a positive relationship between the private self and self-rationalization.

Though these correlations are significant, they do not signify any cause-effect relationships between the variables. However, they do suggest the possibility of such relationships. Further research designed to test cause-effect relationships needs to be done before any definite conclusions can be reached.

The reported findings on the relationship between social self scores and self-rationalization scores seem to lend added support to the possibility of the existence of the cause-effect relationships which Alfred Adler theorized with respect to the social self, the private self, and self-rationalization or life style. For all subjects considered together, the relationship between social self scores and self-rationalization scores is
represented by a correlation of .13. This is not significant even at the .05 level. The absence of a significant relationship between social self scores and self-rationalization scores indicates that this relationship cannot account for the reported relationships which confirm the specific hypotheses. However, it should be repeated that the confirmation of the specific hypotheses does not establish cause-effect relationships among the variables under study; it merely suggests the possibility that such relationships exist.

If future studies, designed to test such cause-effect relationships, demonstrate their existence, a person might improve his self-concept by entering a better environment. As a result of an improved self-concept, there would be an improvement in his self-rationalization. This would make his potential for success in a career much better.

Finally, the results of this study tend to corroborate the background theory and related studies which were reviewed in this study. However, further studies, designed to overcome the limitations of this study, need to be done to confirm the results and establish whether or not cause-effect relationships exist among the variables under study.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was twofold: 1) to investigate the relationship between two different types of self-concept, the private self or what a person thinks about himself and the social self or what a person thinks other people in his psychological group think about him, and 2) to investigate the relationship between the private self and self-rationalization. Since self-rationalization is essential to success in a career and is predictive of the same, an understanding of the psychological aspects of self-rationalization will also provide an understanding of the psychological aspects of career success.

The specific hypotheses for this study were: 1) there will be a positive relationship between the private self and the social self, and 2) there will be a positive relationship between the private self and self-rationalization. These hypotheses were suggested by Alfred Adler's theory of life style. He says that life style is determined by a person's opinion of his own capacities which, in turn, is a reflection of the sentiments of the community.
The instruments used in this study were Brownfain's Self-Rating Inventory (1) and Danziger's Future Autobiography (2). The Self-Rating Inventory was administered to the subjects twice. One score rating, the subjects rated themselves according to the way they saw themselves. On the other rating, the subjects rated themselves according to the way they thought other people in their psychological group saw them. The former rating provided an index of the private self. The latter rating provided an index of the social self.

Finally, the subjects wrote Future Autobiographies in which they discussed their expectations and plans for the future. The score on each Future Autobiography provided an index of self-rationalization.

The subjects used in this study were 51 students in two freshman classes in General Psychology for Teachers. They were about equally divided between the sexes.

However, only 49 of the initial 51 subjects were actually used in the statistical analysis. Two subjects were dropped from the study because the two raters who rated the Future Autobiographies did not reach sufficient agreement on the degree of self-rationalization indicated in these two Future Autobiographies.

Pearson's \( r \) was used to calculate the relationships between the variables under study. Then, Fisher's \( t \) was used to determine their significance.
Conclusions

Due to the limitations of this study, the results cannot be accepted with great confidence. These limitations involve the selectivity of the subjects and the inadequacies of the procedural design. However, the results deserve consideration.

The major findings were: 1) there is a significant positive correlation between the social self and the private self, and 2) there is a significant positive correlation between the private self and self-rationalization. These findings seem to confirm the specific hypotheses under study.

This study simply demonstrates correlational relationships among the variables under study. However, these relationships suggest the possibility that there may be cause-effect relationships among them which would confirm Adler's theory of lifestyle.

Added support is given to the possibility of cause-effect relationships among these variables by the findings which show that there is no significant correlation between the social self and self-rationalization. These findings demonstrate that this relationship cannot account for the relationships which tend to confirm the specific hypotheses under study.

Finally, it is concluded that Danziger's Future Autobiography is an instrument which can be administered
and scored with relative ease and objectivity. If it actually measures self-rationalization, which it seems to do, it will be of definite benefit to psychologists in predicting an individual's prospects of career success.

Recommendations

Further research, designed to overcome the limitations of this study and to investigate whether or not cause-effect relationships exist among the variables under study, needs to be done. Should such research confirm the findings of this study and establish the existence of the cause-effect relationships suggested in Alfred Adler's theory of life style, an individual's self-concept, his private self, might be improved by his entrance into a better environment. His improved private self would increase his self-rationalization; this would enhance his potential for success in a career.
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