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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the importance of self-acceptance, and its effects on the behavior of the individual has been studied by a large number of psychologists. These inquiries have been stimulated by the theoretical views of many prominent psychologists and psychiatrists - Adler (1); Horney (13); Sullivan (25); Murphy (17); Lecky (14); Fromm (2); Rogers (22); Combs (3); Snygg (3); and other theorists who have emphasized the consequences derived from a person's perception of himself. Lecky states, "that all of an individual's values are organized into a single system, and that the nucleus of this system, is the individual's valuation of himself" (13, p. 155). The self functions as the basic frame of reference from which we evaluate environmental occurrences (3, p. 146; 25, p. 303; 17, p. 12; 14, p. 115; 7, p. 241; 22, p. 444). Because of the self's important position, the manner in which it manifests itself will be a major factor in determining whether a person will become adjusted or maladjusted in his interaction with his surroundings. A person's
adjustment will be in proportion to the degree of demarcation between perception of self and its relationship to reality.

Rogers states that adjustment exists when "the concept of self is such that all the sensory and visceral experiences of the organism are, or may be, assimilated on a symbolic level into a consistent relationship with the concept of self" (22, p. 513). Thus, the individual's frame of reference, or self-concept, needs to be concordant with his experience in order to facilitate accommodation with the environment.

Furthermore, an individual's behavior toward environmental phenomenon is affected by his evaluation of himself; that is, a person who is self-accepting will be more adaptive to his social surroundings (9, p. 151; 12, p. 232). Fromm states, "The man who has a recognition of his true self will have a productive orientation to living" (2, p. 1423). Likewise, he mentions, "The person who has enjoyed good early relationships will have respect and love for himself, will be able to cherish and love others, and will be able to use his capacity in fruitful work" (2, p. 1423). Referring again to Rogers, "When the individual perceives and accepts into a consistent and an integrated system all his sensory and visceral experiences, then he is necessarily more understanding of others and is more
accepting of others as separate individuals" (22, p. 520). The relationship between realistic perception of the environment, and the acceptance of self, and their corresponding relationship which determines whether a person will be empathic towards others, is the reasoning behind some of the theorist's prediction that adjusted persons will be accepting of others and accepted by others.

Similarly, many of the first studies dealing with self-acceptance were primarily concerned with the relationship between acceptance of self and the acceptance of others; while more recently the additional relationship between acceptance of others and being accepted by others has been investigated.

In the previously quoted statements by Fromm and Rogers, a positive relationship between acceptance of others and self-acceptance was predicted. This relationship is also emphasized by many other authors. Sullivan states, "If there is a valid and real attitude toward the self, that attitude will be manifest as valid and real toward others. It is not as ye judge that ye shall be judged, but as you judge yourself so shall you judge others" (25, p. 151). Horney shows what will happen when an individual is not self-accepting: "Being unable to accept himself as he is, he cannot possibly believe that others, knowing him with all his shortcomings, can accept
him in a friendly or appreciative spirit. . . . This may lead to a subtle poisoning of all human relations. We may become unable to take any positive feelings of others at their face value” (13, p. 135).

Furthermore, this self-concept will be persistent because the self interprets all of its perceptions according to this distorted concept; therefore, when a person's self-concept is degrading, and cannot be accepted by the self, his behavior will be self-defeating. As Combs and Snygg state: "The stability of the phenomenal self makes change difficult by causing us (1) to ignore aspects of our experience which are inconsistent with it or (2) to select perceptions in such a way as to confirm the concepts we already possess" (8, p. 153). The individual, because of these defence mechanisms which help to preserve his integrity, will not be able to judge the responses of others adequately unless he has a realistic self-accepting perception of himself; he will see others as accepting or rejecting according to his interpretation of their feelings toward him. For example, when a person's interior frame of reference is distorted his perception of the situation will be changed to support his misconception, and he will therefore not be able to deal with another person's attitudes objectively.
This relationship has also been noted by Adler in a person with feelings of inferiority; he found that they tend to depreciate others (1). Because of these previously mentioned defences, it appears that the individual who is not self-accepting may either manifest his behavior as an over-evaluation or an under-evaluation of self when measured by an objective device; therefore, it may be necessary for the observer to perceive high and low self-acceptance as a distortion of reality. This hypothesis will be investigated in the present study.

Self-acceptance has been related to acceptance by others in this statement by Rogers: "The person who accepts himself thoroughly, will necessarily improve his relationship with those with whom he has personal contact, because of his understanding and acceptance of them" (22, p. 522).

The importance of a person's feelings toward himself is evident, and it has been stated by some investigators that the majority of problems brought to a clinic are due to unfortunate concepts of self. Therefore, the inter-relationships between self-acceptance, acceptance of others, actual acceptance by others, and the perceived acceptances by others or the individual's insight into the environmental surroundings should be a fruitful topic of investigation.
In the previous pages, some of the relationships between a few concepts have been suggested. A positive correlation is expected between self-acceptance and acceptance of others; and a person who accepts himself can be expected to be accepted by others. Furthermore, it has been suggested that a person who is accepting of others will be accepted by others. Also, it would be predicted that there will be an interacting influence between a person's accuracy of perceiving his immediate environment and the expected relationships cited above.

Related Literature

Studies by Seeman, Stock, and Sheerer engendered the experimental study of the relationship between self-acceptance and the acceptance of others. Their studies took place in the clinical setting where they could note the progressive changes, if any, between reference to self and others. Content analysis was done by a board of judges who rated the subject's statements on the categories of positive, negative, and ambivalent feelings toward self and others (12, p. 491). Seeman found in his study that "the number of positive self-references increased and the number of negative self-references decreased during therapy without any concomitant change in the feelings toward others" (12, p. 491).
But both Stock and Sheerer found a correlation between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. They used ten cases in their studies, three of which were the same. Stock stated in her study:

The total results of this study indicate a definite relationship exists between the way an individual feels about other persons. An individual who holds negative feelings toward himself tends to hold negative feelings toward other people in general. As his feelings about himself change to objective or positive, feelings about others change in a similar direction.

Separate and rather specific factors can be identified within the general area of feeling about others. Feeling toward the self are shown to be correlated in varying degrees with these different aspects of feelings toward others. It was found in this study that attitudes toward individuals in a social relationship correlated more highly with self attitudes than did feelings in the area of family relationships or more impersonal relationships. It was also indicated that there is a close correspondence between self attitudes and the feelings about the relationships with others (24, p. 180).

Sheerer found a product-moment correlation coefficient of .51, which was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence between self-acceptance and acceptance of others (25, p. 175).

Phillips (19), derived a questionnaire in order to investigate the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. He found that it is possible to elicit directly by way of question-and-answer technique such attitudes, and that they are related to a statistically
significant degree. Furthermore, this study showed that the observations made in clinics in regard to self-other attitudes are also true in a normal population.

Similarly, Berger (5) who also constructed an inventory to measure self-acceptance and the acceptance of others, found that a positive relationship exists between these two concepts.

In a study done by Katharine Omwake, a comparison of scales developed by Berger, Phillips, and Bills, Vence, and McLean was done. Bill's inventory is called "An Index of Adjustment and Values" and is a comparison between self-concept and ideal-concept scores (4). It is one of the more popular inventories, and has good validation studies (4), (21), (3). Omwake found good agreement between the measuring devices, and she also found evidence to support a positive relationship between self and other acceptance. She summarized her findings as follows:

There is evidence that in the normal population, as well as in those undergoing therapy, attitudes toward the self appear to be reflected in attitudes toward other people; the lower the opinion of the self, the lower the opinion of others. Only when the self is regarded with a fairly high degree of acceptance is it possible to relate effectively to others, to understand them, and to regard them as persons of worth (12, p. 445).

Another method used to measure self-acceptance and acceptance of others is called the G-Technique: "The person is given a packet of statements and is asked to sort
them into a prearranged distribution along a continuum from those most characteristic of the person doing the sorting to those least characteristic of him" (12, p. 432). A Q-Sort can be made up of adjectives as well as statements, and the directions can be manipulated in order to receive information about self-concept, ideal-self concept, or concept of other individuals or groups. Many authors feel that the degree of difference between self-concept and ideal-self is a good measure of adjustment and self-acceptance (4), (26). For example, studies conducted by Rogers and his associates, and Bill’s "Index of Adjustment" are based on this relationship.

Sainn, in a recent study, using the Q-Sort technique, investigated the relationships between the acceptance of the father and teacher in relationship to the acceptance of self: "Results indicate that self-acceptance is significantly correlated with acceptance of father and with acceptance of teacher and perceived similarity is a significant variable influencing the generalization of self-acceptance" (26, p. 41). These findings differ from Stock's results in that the correlation was high in family relationships; but agrees in that there is a high correlation between self-acceptance and attitude toward individuals in a social relationship. The difference may be
the result of using different techniques, or more likely, because Stock's subjects were from a clinic.

Another relationship was brought into the study of self-acceptance by Reese. Reese used a scale developed by Lipsett which is a self-concept and ideal-concept scale, and two sociometric scales. These scales were administered to fourth, sixth, and eighth grade subjects. He found a curvilinear relationship between acceptance of others, acceptance by others, and acceptance by best friends; the subjects were placed in three groups according to their scores on the self-concept scale. The sociometric results were not found to be related to discrepancy between ideal-self and self-concept scores. The author stated that "The discrepancy score obtained by subtraction may not be a valid measure of self-acceptance" (20, p. 474). This question about whether the discrepancy score between self-concept and ideal-self concept is a reliable measure of self-acceptance has been mentioned by other authors (27, 15).

Zelen (30) did a similar study with sixth grade children in which he used a sociometric device plus additional measures of adjustment. A positive correlation was found between acceptance of self, acceptance of others, and acceptance by others. This relationship between acceptance
of self and acceptance by others may exist only in this young population. The child's concept of himself is more likely to be affected or derived from the immediate group, and therefore, his concept of himself will be similar to the group's feelings toward him. Conversely, an older person has formed his concept of himself through interaction with many groups and will not be as dependent upon the feelings of others in a particular group as directly as a child. Therefore, there may be a discrepancy found between the individual's concept of himself and a particular group's concept of him which is not necessarily the effects of maladjustment or misinterpretation of reality.

In order for the relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance by others to have any significance and psychological meaning, it is necessary to use a group of subjects that have associated with one-another over a period of time, and have had frequent intervals of interaction. Also, as shown by Williams (23), measurement of an individual's perceived acceptance by others may show a person's insight into his social environment better than actual acceptance.

Another important personality trait while investigating self-acceptance was measured by Wylie (23). He measured the defensiveness of 378 airmen and found that individuals who were low in self-acceptance were high in
defensiveness. In a related study, Calvin and Holtman's results showed that: "Individuals who manifest poor insight regarding their own level of adjustment are more likely to be maladjusted than are those who show good insight" (6, p. 44). Both of these studies support the theoretical background which stresses the importance of realistic environmental interpretation and its effects on self evaluation.

Further investigation of personality traits and the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others was done by Fey using the "Edward Personality Preference Schedule" and ratings of the perceived and ideal self. His findings were summarized as follows:

The high self-acceptance low acceptance of others group uniquely endorsed items which suggest that they over-estimate their personal acceptability to others while ascribing degraded motives to those about them. The high self-acceptance and high acceptance of other group seems healthiest in its positive confidence in self and others, asserting self-determination and accepting personal responsibility. The low self-acceptance and high acceptance of others group almost timidly shuns leadership, while the low acceptance of self and low acceptance of others group... had low introspection scores, impulsivity, low morale, over-dependence and a marked tendency to accommodate others (9, p. 48).

This delineation of personality factors of the individuals who portray contrasting relationships between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, demonstrates, that these
concepts are important, meaningful, and can also be measured with objective tests.

The next three studies deal with Roger's hypothesis that: "The person who accepts himself will, because of this self-acceptance, have better interpersonal relations with others" (22, p. 522). McIntyre's subjects were 224 men from two dormitories occupied by second-semester freshmen who had lived in these dormitories since the beginning of the year. One sociometric study was done on each floor, and the subjects were rated from most to least accepted according to their selection by the other students on their dormitory wing. Then the upper and lower twenty-five percent of each group were given the "Phillips Attitude-Toward-Self Scale" and other questionnaires: "The results of this study gave no support to Roger's views that better interpersonal relations are a function of better attitudes toward self and others" (16, p. 626).

This next study by Fey was prompted by the negative findings of McIntyre. Because of a previous study done by Fey (11) which showed that individuals defended themselves interpersonally when attitudes of self-acceptance and of acceptance of others do not vary together, he hypothesized, "That acceptance by others is in part a function of the pattern of interrelationships between one's attitudes"
toward himself and those toward others" (10, p. 274). He felt that neither self-acceptance nor acceptance-of-others scores can form the basis for reliable prediction of other personality characteristics, but that maybe their combination will.

Fey formulated a scale to measure expressed attitudes of self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and estimated acceptability to others; further elaboration on this scale will be found in the following chapter. He also asked the subjects to "list the five of your classmates whom you like best—just as persons" (10, p. 274). From this tabulation, a forth datum—actual acceptance—was obtained. In addition to these four primary measurements two discrepancy scores were derived: First, acceptance of self scores minus acceptance of others scores; secondly, estimated acceptability scores minus actual acceptance scores. The subjects in this study were 58 third-year medical students. The results of this study are as follows:

1. Subjects with high self-acceptance scores tend also to accept others \((r^2 = +.43)\) to feel accepted by others \((r = +.71)\), but actually to be neither more nor less accepted by others \((r = +.07)\) than subjects with low self-acceptance.

2. Individuals with high acceptance-of-others scores tend to feel accepted by others \((r = +.43)\) and tend toward being accepted by them \((r = +.20 < .10)\).

3. Individuals with high self-acceptance minus acceptance of others tend to accept themselves
to reject others (r = +.26), but actually to be rejected by others (r = -.27). This finding is confirmed by the correlation between acceptance-of-self minus acceptance-of-others and estimated acceptability minus actual acceptance scores (r = +.37, p < .01); these same subjects significantly overestimate their acceptability.

4. In the sample, estimated acceptability is generally unrelated (r = .00) to actual acceptance.

5. Self-acceptance and acceptance-of-others scores are positively related but, taken singly, fail to distinguish groups of most and least acceptance of individuals. The only measure which distinguished the least acceptable from the most acceptable subjects is the tendency of the former to think relatively less well of others (10, pp. 274-5).

Williams' study was stimulated by the negative findings of both McIntyre and Fey concerning the relationship between acceptance-of-self and acceptance-of-others with actual acceptability to others. Furthermore, Williams questioned the ability of the scale devised by Fey to measure estimated acceptability to others, mainly, because of its zero correlation with actual sociometric acceptance scores. Therefore, this study is mostly a check of Fey's findings.

The scale which was devised by Fey was used in this study. Williams introduced a sociometric technique to measure predicted acceptance by others to replace Fey's scale of estimated acceptability to others—he asked: "How many do you think will list you among the five they like best?" (28, p. 439). The subjects were 74 members of two
social fraternities; they were presented with a numbered, alphabetical list of the eligible members of their fraternity from which they were asked to indicate by means of the number beside each name the answers to the previously mentioned sociometric question.

The results of this study are generally similar to McIntyre's and Fey's inquisitions: "While it was demonstrated in this study that subjects can predict their acceptance by others, no evidence was found that acceptance by others is related to acceptance of self, acceptance of others, or the interrelationship of these two variables" (28, p. 441). There were two main differences found in Williams' study which contrasted with Fey's study. First, although there was agreement in the findings that persons who think relatively much better of themselves than they do of others tend to feel accepted by others; there was no evidence that the same persons actually are significantly less well liked by others as Fey found. Secondly, there was no evidence found to support Fey's finding that the discrepancy score between self-acceptance and acceptance of others are related to acceptance by others. Furthermore, the positive correlations in Williams' study were higher than in Fey's study except for the diverse conclusions mentioned above.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is fourfold: (1) to investigate the predicted relationships between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, (2) to investigate self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and their interrelationship with acceptance by others, (3) to investigate the patterns of interrelationship between self-acceptance, acceptance of others, actual acceptability to others, and predicted acceptability to others, and (4) to investigate an hypothesized curvilinear relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance by others.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be investigated:

1. There will be a positive relationship between self-acceptance scores and acceptance-of-others scores.

2. There will be a positive relationship between both self-acceptance scores and acceptance-of-others scores with actual acceptability to others scores.

3. There will be a positive relationship between actual acceptance by others scores and predicted acceptability to others scores.

4. There will be a positive relationship between discrepancy scores between actual acceptance by others scores and predicted acceptability to others scores with self-acceptance scores.
5. There will be a higher middle third acceptance by others than both the upper and lower third on the self-acceptance continuum.
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CHAPTER II

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Population

The subjects used in this study were taken from two social fraternities at North Texas State University, located in Denton, Texas, which has approximately 10,000 students. The two fraternities chosen for this inquiry were selected at random from the ten social fraternities at North Texas. Forty-two of the subjects were taken from one fraternity and thirty-two from the other. The subjects used had all been members of their respective fraternities for at least one year. The majority of the participants were in their junior or senior year of college.

Description of Instruments

The scale formulated by Fey (1) to measure expressed attitudes of self acceptance, acceptance of others, and estimated acceptability to others was used in the present study. This scale consists of forty-five items: twenty questions dealing with acceptance of self; twenty questions concerning acceptance of others; and five questions about estimated acceptability. These items were evaluated on a
continuum from 1 (almost always) to 5 (very rarely). The split-half reliability of the scale is: acceptance of self .84; acceptance of others .90; and estimated acceptability .89 (1).

In addition to Fey's scale, two sociometric questions were asked the subjects. These questions were administered with an alphabetical list of the members participating in the study. The first question stated: "Indicate, by means of the number beside each name, the five of your fraternity brothers whom you like best—just as persons?" From this tabulation, actual acceptance was obtained, each student's score was the number of his fraternity brothers that chose him.

The second question which was used to obtain predicted acceptability was taken from William's (2) study. He used it to replace Fey's (1) estimated acceptability score because of its zero correlation with actual acceptance. This tabulation—predicted acceptability—was found to have a .68 correlation with actual acceptance. Therefore, this question was used in this study to measure a person's perception of his own acceptability instead of Fey's score of estimated acceptability. The question stated: "How many do you think will list you among the five they like best?"
Procedure

The testing was administered during the regularly scheduled weekly meetings. Names of members who had been in the fraternity for at least one year previous to the meeting were listed on an alphabetical list. The examiner was introduced to the group by the president of the fraternity with the explanation that he was conducting a study, and would need everyone's attention and cooperation.

The examiner handed each member the alphabetical list and explained that only the persons with their names on the list would participate in the study. The others were excused from the session.

After the general questions were answered, the subjects were given the Fey scale. Each subject was told to put his number from the alphabetical list in the space provided on the scale. Then the directions printed on the scale were read to the group. Any questions about the directions were answered at this time. The subjects were reminded that there were three sheets of questions, and of the importance of not skipping any questions was emphasized. The subjects were also told that there were two parts to the testing, and to bring the first section to the examiner when finished.

When the scale was handed to the examiner, the subjects were given a printed form possessing the two sociometric questions. They were each told to read the
directions carefully. Each subject was instructed to put his number from the alphabetical list in the space provided. Participating subjects who were not present at the meeting were tested individually by the examiner.

Treatment of Data

In the present study, the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was utilized to compare acceptance of self (AS), acceptance of others (AO), estimated acceptability (EA), predicted acceptability (PA), and actual acceptance by others (AA).

An analysis of variance was used to determine whether persons with high, middle, or low self-acceptance scores within the two fraternity groups are more or less accepted by others. The F test was used to determine the significance of the differences among the three self-acceptance classifications for each of the fraternities.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data from the two fraternity groups acquired from Fey's scale were compared in order to determine whether the results could be combined into one population for analysis. The means, standard deviations, and t scores resulting from Fey's scale are given in Table I.

TABLE I

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND COMPARISON OF SCORES BETWEEN THE TWO SOCIAL FRaternities ON FEY'S SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fraternity I 32 Subjects</th>
<th>Fraternity II 42 Subjects</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>70.19</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>72.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>61.34</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>64.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences between the two groups, and therefore, these data were treated as being from the same population.
However, due to the nature of the sociometric measurement employed in this study, and the unequal number of subjects used from the two fraternity groups, these data could not be combined as were the results on Fey's scale. Consequently, the correlations between actual acceptability and predicted acceptability with the other criteria will be presented from each fraternity singly in columns six and seven of Table II.

**TABLE II**

**COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SOCIO-METRIC SCORES, FEY'S SCALE SCORES, AND DEVIATION SCORES BETWEEN PREDICTED ACCEPTABILITY AND ACTUAL ACCEPTANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Correlated</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>AS-PA</th>
<th>Individual Studies I &amp; II (5)</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level of confidence
*  Significant at .05 level of confidence
Table II, row 1, presents the coefficients of correlation between acceptance of self and the other measured variables. The correlation between acceptance of self and acceptance of others was positive and significant to the .01 level. Self-acceptance also correlated positively to the .01 level of confidence with estimated acceptability. The correlations between acceptance of self with both predicted acceptability and the deviation between actual acceptance and predicted acceptability were not significant. The correlation between actual acceptance, using the two groups individually and self-acceptance, was not significantly correlated with self-acceptance.

In Table II, row 2, are shown the coefficients of correlation between acceptance of others and the other measured variables. There is a positive correlation between acceptance of others and estimated acceptability as well as the previously mentioned positive correlation with self-acceptance to the .01 level of confidence. Acceptance of others was not significantly correlated with predicted acceptability, actual acceptance, or the deviation between predicted acceptability and actual acceptance.

Row 3 of Table II indicates the coefficients of correlation between estimated acceptability and the other variables measured. There appears to be conflicting relationships shown between estimated acceptability and predicted acceptability between the two groups measured.
The correlation between these two variables in Group II is positive to the .01 level of confidence, while the correlation in Group I has a definite negative tendency. Furthermore, the correlations of the two studies between estimated and actual acceptability is not consistent. It appears that Rey's measurement of estimated acceptability is not a reliable measurement, as was previously mentioned by Williams (3).

In Table II, row 5, predicted acceptability shows a positive relationship with actual acceptance. The Group I correlation is significant to the .01 level, and the Group II correlation is in a positive direction.

Table III shows an analysis of variance of actual acceptance scores of Group I and Group II between high, middle, and low self-acceptance scores.

**TABLE III**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE OF SELF, AND ACTUAL ACCEPTANCE WITHIN EACH GROUP TESTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraternities</th>
<th>Variation Source</th>
<th>Sum Sq</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>Bet. Groups</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Subjects</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>456.90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>466.70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>Bet. Groups</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>2.157*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Subjects</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>232.71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level of confidence
The F ratio of .289 of Group I was not statistically significant. However, the F ratio of difference in Group II was significant to the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the significance of difference between pairs of means was computed by the T test.

The mean for the high self-acceptance classification was 6.2, for the middle self-acceptance classification was 5.0, and for the low self-acceptance classification was 5.3. The differences between the high classification and the middle and low classifications were 1.161 and .370 respectively. This differences showed a positive tendency but were not significant.

Discussion

The following hypotheses were under investigation:

1. There will be a positive relationship between self-acceptance scores and acceptance-of-others scores.

2. There will be a positive relationship between both self-acceptance scores and acceptance-of-others scores with actual acceptability to others scores.

3. There will be a positive relationship between actual acceptance by others scores and predicted acceptability to others scores.

4. There will be a positive relationship between discrepancy scores between actual acceptance by others
scores and predicted acceptability to others scores with self-acceptance scores.

3. There will be a higher middle third acceptance by others than the upper and lower third on the self-acceptance continuum.

Each hypothesis will be considered in its order.

Hypothesis I

The obtained correlation between self-acceptance and acceptance of others was .33, and it is significant to the .01 level of confidence. Therefore, the hypothesis was confirmed. In the theoretical discussions of Lecky and Rogers, the importance of this relationship is emphasized. They mention consistently that a person must be accepting of himself before he can perceive others as individuals and accept them (2, 5). A survey of the related studies iterated in Chapter I also indicates that the majority of the studies support this finding (1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10).

Hypothesis II

The second Hypothesis, predicting a positive r between self-acceptance and acceptance of others with acceptance by others was not supported. The correlation of Group I and Group II between self-acceptance and actual acceptance were .03, and .25 respectively. Rogers stated, "The person who accepts himself thoroughly, will necessarily improve his
relationship with those he has personal contact, because of his understanding and acceptance of them" (5, p. 522). This hypothesis did not receive support in the present study; and likewise, the studies previously discussed by McIntyre, Fey, and Williams did not find a significant correlation between self-acceptance and actual acceptance by others (3, 1, 9).

It appears that this relationship may not exist in a "normal" adult population. But since Rogers formed this hypothesis from observation of his counseling clients, the present study should not be considered as a direct investigation of his hypothesis. This relationship may be found in individuals who have recently undergone therapy. Additionally, it should be noted, that studies on children have supported the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance by others (3). Further investigation should be done on this relationship.

The obtained rs of Group I and Group II between acceptance of others and actual acceptance were .01 and .21 respectively. Therefore, the second hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis III

A positive relationship between actual acceptance and predicted acceptability was related in the third hypothesis.
As was shown in the results, Group I had a .55 correlation significant at the .01 level of confidence, and Group II had a .09 correlation between actual and predicted acceptability. The low correlation in Group II suggests that this group of subjects was not as well integrated as Group I. The high correlation of Group I tends to support William's findings that predicted acceptability measures a person's perceived acceptance by other individuals better than Fey's scale score for estimated acceptability (9).

Furthermore, the correlations between estimated acceptability and the other variables are inconsistent. This seems to suggest that the scale can be affected significantly by individual's interpretation of the questions.

Hypothesis IV

The fourth hypothesis predicts a positive correlation between the discrepancy scores of actual choices and the number of perceived choices with self-acceptance. The obtained \( r \) between these two variables was .09, therefore, the hypothesis was not accepted. It appears that in a "normal" adult population, the ability of an individual who is self-accepting to perceive his acceptability to others, is not significantly greater than persons who are not self-accepting. This finding is in contrast with the theories
which hold that persons who are self-accepting have more insight into other persons feelings, than do those who do not have such self-acceptance.

Hypothesis V

The fifth hypothesis, purposing that the middle self-acceptance group from each fraternity would be accepted more by the members of the fraternity than either the high or low groups on the self-acceptance scale was rejected. The only group that tended toward having a significant deviation was the high self-acceptance group in Group II with a $t$ of 1.161.

The results of this study indicated that a person who is self-accepting is accepting of others, but is not more or less accepted by others than the low self-acceptance group; and, that they do not perceive their acceptability any better or worse than persons who are not self-accepting.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to investigate the relationships between self-acceptance, acceptance of others, predicted acceptability to others, and actual acceptance by others. The sample consisted of 74 members of two social fraternities at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas.

These fraternities were selected at random from the ten social fraternities at the university. The sample was restricted to the individuals who were presently active members of the fraternity, and had participated in its activities for at least one year.

Each fraternity was tested by the examiner at one of its regularly scheduled weekly meetings. First, an alphabetical list of the participating members was given to each participant; separate lists were derived for each fraternity. Second, Fey's scale for measuring self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and estimated acceptability was administered. Third, one sociometric question proposed by Williams and another by Fey were administered to obtain measures of perceived acceptability and actual acceptance.
The individuals not at the testing sessions were given the test individually by the examiner.

The main results and conclusions are listed as follows:

1. The correlation obtained between self-acceptance scores and sociometrically received actual acceptance scores of the two fraternities were .03 and .25 respectively.

2. The correlation obtained between self-acceptance scores and acceptance of others' scores was .38 significant to the .01 level of confidence.

3. The correlations obtained between acceptance of others' scores and sociometrically received actual acceptance scores of the two fraternities were .01 and .21 respectively.

4. The correlations obtained between the sociometrically received actual acceptance scores and the sociometrically given predicted acceptability scores of the two fraternities were .55 significant to the .01 level of confidence and .09 respectively.

5. The correlations obtained between the estimated acceptability scores and the sociometrically given predicted acceptability scores of the two fraternities were -.33 and .35, the second of which was significant to the .05 level of confidence.
5. The correlation obtained between self-acceptance scores and estimated acceptability scores was .50 which was significant to the .01 level of confidence.

7. The correlation obtained between acceptance of others and estimated acceptability was .49 which was significant to the .01 level of confidence.

3. The correlations obtained between estimated acceptability scores and the sociometrically received actual acceptance scores of the two fraternities were .07 and .42, the second of which was significant to the .01 level of confidence.

9. The correlation obtained between self-acceptance scores and the discrepancy scores between received actual acceptance by others scores and given predicted acceptability to others scores was .03.

10. The correlation obtained between acceptance of others scores and the discrepancy scores between received actual acceptance by others scores and given predicted acceptability to others scores was .11.

11. The results of the present study were similar to those of previous studies by McIntyre, Fey, and Williams. In all of these studies plus the present study, self-acceptance was significantly correlated to acceptance of others, but the correlation between both self-acceptance
and acceptance of others with actual acceptance was not significant.

12. It was concluded in the present study that an individual with high self-acceptance is accepting of others, but is not either more or less accepted by others. Also, high self-acceptance individuals do not show greater insight into their social environment than do persons of low self-acceptance.
APPENDIX I

Your number on the alphabetical list is ____.

Directions

Answer the following questions on the continuum from almost always 1 2 3 4 5 to very rarely.

Please: Circle your answers, and don't skip any questions.

1. 1 2 3 4 5 I'm a pretty relaxed sort of person. (AS)
2. 1 2 3 4 5 People are too easily led. (AO)
3. 1 2 3 4 5 I wish I were better looking. (AS)
4. 1 2 3 4 5 People are quite critical of me. (EA)
5. 1 2 3 4 5 I like people I get to know. (AO)
6. 1 2 3 4 5 People these days have pretty low moral standards. (AO)
7. 1 2 3 4 5 I feel shy and bashful. (AS)
8. 1 2 3 4 5 Most people are pretty smug about themselves, never really facing their bad points. (AO)
9. 1 2 3 4 5 I feel pretty sure of myself in situations. (AS)
10. 1 2 3 4 5 I can be comfortable with nearly all kinds of people. (AO)
11. 1 2 3 4 5 I get a "helpless" feeling. (AS)
12. 1 2 3 4 5 I tend to do or say things I'm sorry for. (AS)
Please: Circle your answers, and don’t skip any questions.
almost always 1 2 3 4 5 very rarely.

13. 1 2 3 4 5 All people can talk about these days, it seems, is movies, TV, and foolishness like that. (AO)

14. 1 2 3 4 5 I waste too much time. (AS)

15. 1 2 3 4 5 I feel "left out," as if people don’t want me around. (EA)

16. 1 2 3 4 5 People get ahead by using "pull," and not because of what they know. (AO)

17. 1 2 3 4 5 Just little things bother me. (AS)

18. 1 2 3 4 5 If you once start doing favors for people, they’ll just walk all over you. (AO)

19. 1 2 3 4 5 People seem to respect my opinion about things. (EA)

20. 1 2 3 4 5 People are too self-centered. (AO)

21. 1 2 3 4 5 People are always dissatisfied and hunting for something new. (AO)

22. 1 2 3 4 5 I’m not the person I pretend to be. (AS)

23. 1 2 3 4 5 With many people you don’t know how you stand. (AO)

24. 1 2 3 4 5 I’m pretty satisfied with the way I am. (AS)

25. 1 2 3 4 5 You’ve probably got to hurt someone if you’re going to make something out of yourself. (AO)

26. 1 2 3 4 5 I feel different from other people. (AS)

27. 1 2 3 4 5 People really need a strong, smart leader. (AO)

28. 1 2 3 4 5 I worry about what others think of me. (AS)
Please: Circle your answers, and don’t skip any questions.

almost always 1 2 3 4 5 very rarely

29. 1 2 3 4 5 I enjoy myself most when I’m alone, away from people. (AO)

30. 1 2 3 4 5 In social gatherings, I’m afraid I may say or do something foolish. (AS)

31. 1 2 3 4 5 I respect myself. (AS)

32. 1 2 3 4 5 If people knew what I’m really like, they’d be disappointed. (AS)

33. 1 2 3 4 5 I can’t seem to make up my mind about things. (AS)

34. 1 2 3 4 5 I wish people would be more honest with you. (AO)

35. 1 2 3 4 5 I’m very restless. (AS)

36. 1 2 3 4 5 I enjoy going with a crowd. (AO)

37. 1 2 3 4 5 People seem to like me. (EA)

38. 1 2 3 4 5 In my experience, people are pretty stubborn and unreasonable. (AO)

39. 1 2 3 4 5 I act the way I think other people want me to be. (AS)

40. 1 2 3 4 5 I can enjoy being with people whose values are very different from mine. (AO)

41. 1 2 3 4 5 I wish I knew an older person I could turn to for advice. (AS)

42. 1 2 3 4 5 Everybody tries to be nice. (AO)

43. 1 2 3 4 5 I’m apt to blurt out my opinion at the wrong time. (AS)

44. 1 2 3 4 5 The average person is not very well satisfied with himself. (AO)

45. 1 2 3 4 5 Most people seem to understand how I feel about things. (EA)
APPENDIX II

Your number on the alphabetical list is _____.

Directions

Refer to the alphabetical list of your fraternity brothers while answering these questions.

1. Indicate, by means of the number beside each name, the five of your fraternity brothers whom you like best—just as persons.
   A.
   B.
   C.
   D.
   E.

2. How many do you think will list you among the five they like best?
   Number _____.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS</th>
<th>AQ</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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