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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Phenomena of Normality

In contrast to the abundant empirical knowledge and an impressive body of theory concerning the deviant and the diseased, the disturbed and the maladjusted, the anxious and the neurotic, there is little information and even less conceptual lucidity about the nature of psychological normality. Some educators would like to define their concept of normality in statistical and relativistic terms. Particularly in the field of mental health is such a point of view emerging. There seems to be a strong growing tendency to approach this undertaking by emphasis on the positive development with the treatment necessary but secondary.

Bonney and other authorities in the field of mental health have pointed out the need for a positive approach in achieving this goal of psychological normality. "... we should not think of a mentally healthy person simply in terms of absence of conflicts. The mentally healthy individual has conflicts, but he is usually able to resolve them in ways that further promote his social judgment and personal adequacy."\(^1\)

\(^1\)M. E. Bonney, *Mental Health in Education* (Boston, 1960), p. 121.
He further observes that:

The goals of mental hygiene must be stated in terms of continual growth toward positive ends. The "good life" must be seen as a constructive attainment, not simply as the absence of bad traits; both physical and mental health must be viewed as a state of well-being and not simply the absence of disease. Likewise, freedom is not simply the absence of restraints; nor is happiness simply the absence of sorrow.

Tregs and Katz reported a study of college students who had been rated for fourteen different evidences of "nervousness." Generally these traits were normally distributed, implying that both those subjects rated low and those rated high must be considered as abnormal. This does seem contradictory in that both these terms, abnormal and normal, are not clearly defined.

Putting statistical emphasis on the usual as the criterion of normality seems to imply, then, a criterion of conformity. The terms average, usual, ordinary, without reference to some group are meaningless and consequently seem to pose two problems: (1) Conformity is a dubious guide to conduct. Innovation is essential to a culture's survival, and conformity has been detrimental to the point that it undermines maturity and positive development of humans rather than their enhancement. In most instances, conformity has

---

2Ibid., pp. 121-122.

been shown to be related in some degree to pathologic personality processes. (2) Relativistic concepts of normality pose serious questions as to the reference group against which any individual should be assessed.

Behavior differs in all cultures. What is acceptably normal in one culture may not be acceptable or be considered normal in another. Conduct considered normal in one society may be pathological in another. This then, would falsely infer that the reference group is beyond appraisal.⁴

Wegrocki argues that it is the function or reaction to the behavior rather than the form, that defines its normal or pathological character. He implies that integrative adjustments to conflicts and problems should be the criteria in the evaluation of a normal person.⁵

Shoben answers that in order to be thoroughly integrative one must face his problems squarely and in so doing he comes to grips with certain problems concerning his own values.⁶

Thus, the normal person is seen as one who has learned that in many situations his greatest satisfaction is gained


by foregoing the immediate opportunities for comfort and pleasure for more remote goals. His expectations become more important than the mere satisfaction of the now. He learns self-control to the point where conformity consequently becomes a relatively unimportant issue.

The second characteristic in non-conformity due to good integrative adjustment is the acceptance of the possible consequences of one's behavior. He assumes responsibility for his own actions and neither whines nor asks to have his conduct overlooked.

The normal person shows some altruism in thought as well as behavior. He is able to act dependably in relationship to others as well as acknowledge his need for others.

He is able to form and maintain interpersonal relationships. He has learned that the relationship of mutuality with others is maintained only by his reciprocation.

A democratic social interest underlies the basis of everyday living for the normal individual. He incorporates the ideals and values of the larger group beyond his immediate clan as his frame of reference.

Finally, the normal person has ideals and standards that he tries to live up to even though they sometime seem out of his grasp. The constant striving to act in accordance with his own principles is optimum operational procedure for this person.
Symonds suggests that the differentiation between normality and abnormality is principally one of degree. It is generally agreed that the difference between the normal individual and the pathological individual is mainly quantitative rather than qualitative. The pathological individual does not possess a large amount of some quality that the normal person does not have. Neither does the normal person possess some quality in large amounts that the abnormal does not. Every normal person possesses potentialities of poor adjustments that if allowed to enlarge and magnify would produce a pathological individual. Conversely, the abnormal person is endowed with the capacities that would make him a normal well-adjusted individual.

Normality can, perhaps, be explained in terms of balance. In the normal person there is a balance between the drives, the ego restraints, the urges and the defenses against anxiety. No one characteristic supercedes the rest to result in an unbalanced, abnormal personality. There is a balance between the demands of society and the wishes of the individual. Possessing a good combination of traits, the normal individual is differentiated from the abnormal, then, not in the kind or amount of traits he has, but rather in how he views his conflicts and problems.

Normality as maturity has no upper limit and hence cannot be a fixed concept. There is no limit to the extent to which a person can socialize his tendencies, learn to tolerate
frustration, gain wider understanding of reality, learn to love more objectively. This too, should be a heartening concept of normality for everyone. No matter at what stage he is in his adjustment, he can take steps toward achieving a more mature development, resolving infantile tendencies, and developing a more socialized and integrated adjustment.  

Nearly all abnormal characteristics in adults may be found to be normal reactions in children. Normality consists in satisfactorily working out infantile wishes and anxieties to satisfactory conclusions. They are resolved in a socially and well-integrated manner to the advantage of the individual. 

Explained in terms of adequate functioning, there is evidence that the normal person can overcome severe threats and frustrating conditions. He may be expected to show discouragement and depression and tension, but his resiliency level is high and these set-backs do not disorganize his normal effectiveness. 

The normal person finds compromise solutions for conflicts that are insoluble. By using the various mechanisms of defense, compensation, substitution, sublimation, etc., he is able to receive fulfillment of his desires and wishes while at the same time he does not violate social sanctions. 

Horney finds it difficult to define normality in terms of behavior itself, "inasmuch as the same behavior may be normal or pathological according to its meaning for the

---

Normal behavior, while representing a straightforward and satisfying adjustment to the outer world, is realistic and straightforward.

However, these definitions do not imply that the normal person lives in a hey-day closely aligned to an utopic existence. Rather, it suggests that he often falls short of his ideals and expectations. He may behave in self-defeating ways and may evince feelings of guilt and depression, anxiety and worry. It is the wisdom with which he views these shortcomings that separate the normal from the abnormal. It is the individual's self concept and how he views himself that will prove the integrated, well-adjusted normal individual. Symonds suggests it is impossible to define normality or good adjustment. Inasmuch as criteria of normality vary from individual to individual, there is no standard of normality that applies equally to all times and all places. Each person makes the only adjustment possible for himself in the light of his experiences, his constitutional make-up and the circumstances under which he must operate.  

Related Research

Sociometric Studies


9Symonds, op. cit., p. 386.
Schults attempted, in a study, to develop procedures which would make it possible, sociometrically, to identify and then to predict by test performance the finer differences in the psychological health assumed to be present in a relatively homogeneous group of adult male, professional-level subjects.

He used a sociometric type test using three criteria as a basis for identification within the group. In addition, a social tensions study test, designed to measure the capacity for creatively penetrating broad social problems, was also administered. A third test, purporting to measure the effectiveness with which a person characteristically handles conflicts of a personal nature, was given in conjunction with the above mentioned two.

Schults found that it was possible sociometrically to identify and predict with low to moderate effectiveness, the quantitative differences in a variable which for the purpose of the study has been called psychological health.¹⁰

A sociometric study by Bonney with second grade students shows that those with high peer status definitely possessed positive traits, rather than the absence of negative traits. These children seemed happy, were in good humor and participated actively in all kinds of group activities. They

frequently engaged in verbal communication and were often found engaged in a friendly activity with other children.¹¹

On the other hand, these students could not be distinguished as a group from those of low acceptability in regard to attention-demanding behavior, aggressive, destructive acts, ignoring and rejecting behavior and the practice of making critical, rejecting remarks. (He infers that a positive approach by developing strong social assets rather than rejecting and avoiding liabilities would be the best rule to follow in developing children.)¹²

In still another study by Bonney involving college students, he found that those students not attending church received friendship choices beyond chance expectancy, and this difference in their favor was reliable. No family size showed any advantage over another in friendship choices.¹³

A third study by Bonney involving forty third-grade boys and forty-six third-grade girls, shows that sex difference, in social success and personal characteristics, though found to be small, tipped the scales in the direction of the girls. However, in only two areas were highly reliable sex differences


¹²Ibid., p. 484.

found. These traits were "fights," and "restless" and the more popular boys had reliably higher averages than the popular girls. The girls had higher means on the California Test of Personality but were only statistically reliable in "social skills."\(^{14}\)

**Projective Technique Studies**

In an investigation by Cox, to further clarify the concept of normal personality, a group of students from highly selective colleges were selected. It was assumed that election by their peers to positions of responsibility was further certification that these individuals did not depart adversely from the general pattern of behavior and emotion which makes for successful adjustment.\(^{15}\)

A psychological test battery consisting of a Scholastic Aptitude Test, Rorschach and Thematic Appreciation Test was administered in the first step of this study. A personal interview totaling six hours with a staff psychiatrist was the next step. Interviews with the parents of these individuals constituted the third and final step. The results obtained were compared with a group of twenty-two students who

\(^{14}\)M. E. Bonney, "Sex Differences in Social Success and Personality Traits," *Child Development*, XV (March, 1944), 63-79.

had been referred to the psychiatrist because of emotional problems enough to be a conspicuous handicap, but not enough to be psychotic.

The study showed that some individuals were able to make outstanding contributions to their community and gained deep satisfaction in the process with little or no stress and strain. Others paid a high price for similar adjustment. There was no significant relationship between level of emotional health and level of scholastic aptitude.

The selected group met the criteria for normalcy set up in the literature and far surpassed the psychiatric group in expected frequency in the use of F (the form response). In the color and shading ratios and in their production of M (the movement response), genuine differences were found between the selected group and the comparison group of students referred to the college psychiatrist.

Another study by Brockway, et al., suggested that a great deal more empirical research was needed to determine meaningful norms for the Rorschach. In particular, they stressed the influencing factors of sex, race, age, education and socioeconomic background. But, they go on to say, since the Rorschach interpretation is based in general on the basis of the optimum or well-adjusted Rorschach protocol, it seems logical to obtain norms for screened normal groups.  

Koss believes that projective techniques should be used in studies of normal personality development because they are highly reliable and have a better than chance coefficient of validity when correlated with "clinical, observational or historical criteria." 17

Some concepts of normality have been treated in other research studies using projective techniques as the means of assessment. In these instances normal individuals have been used only as a comparison with pathological groups. Three major errors can be noted in the use of normality in the available research studies.

First, the term is used to apply to those individuals not under psychological treatment. McReynolds' study in which he attempted to supply apperceptive norms for the Rorschach is a good illustration of this first error. He compares normals with all sorts of abnormal populations: mental defectives, schizophrenics, and paretics. His normals were twenty college students taken from an elementary psychology class and thirty-four volunteers, who were non-professional, non-college men, and had widely varying educational backgrounds. The implication here is that anyone not institutionalized can be considered normal. 18


Pascal and Suttell, in their attempt to establish norms for adults on the Bender-Gestalt Test, recognized a second error concomitant with research in this area: the use of the statistical norm as a criterion for obtaining a normal population. Consequently, the conclusions of this study are based on the false assumption that this population is emotionally healthy. They used two groups and labeled them normal versus psychiatric patients. They stated:

... previous studies suggest a fairly sizable proportion of the "normal" population to be in need of psychiatric assistance and therefore possible psychiatric patients, the very dichotomy on which our estimate of validity is based.\textsuperscript{19}

Nevertheless, they used the procedures hoping that the errors involved would not be too considerable.

The third error posed is the attempt to describe normality as an absence of traits present in pathological groups.

Cox and Sargent made a study involving thirty sixth grade boys—the fifteen most disturbed and the fifteen least disturbed as judged by psychologically sophisticated teachers and counselors. This group was given TAT's. The fifteen most stable TAT's were selected and sent to experienced and acknowledged experts in TAT interpretation. Out of fifteen possible choices, the experts labeled eleven of the protocols given by the stable children as being disturbed.

\textsuperscript{19} G. R. Pascal and B. Suttell, \textit{The Bender-Gestalt Test: Its Qualifications and Validity for Adults; With Scoring Manual}, p. 20.
The authors commented that the clinicians assumed that the normal (stable) record should in some respects be the opposite of the protocol produced by the subject that is ill. The difficulty in the above situation seemed to be no frame of reference for healthy children and the assumption that whatever abnormals are, normals must be the opposite.²⁰

In still another study involving fifty aviation cadets outstanding for their good adjustment to flight training as compared to fifty who failed out of flight training because of adjustment difficulties, Holtzmann and Sells cast much doubt on the ability of projective tests to identify the stable individual.²¹

Some related research and some of the pitfalls usually accompanying these studies have been presented. There are more investigations offering pertinent facts related to this study to be found in educational and psychological journals, but these quoted have been considered representative of existing studies and have direct bearing on this research of the normal personality.


Purpose of the Study

It was not the purpose of this research to develop an absolute measure of psychological health, which would permit a comparison of the research group subjects with persons in the general population. Rather, the intent of this study was to supply more data to further potential investigations in the systematic study of the normal personality as described in previous paragraphs.

In many psychological areas, the need for a theory about the normal personality is warranted. We are aware of the behavior changes taking place in individuals as a result of therapy. As Zax and Klein see it, "it would seem that the present need is for the development of a theory or even a set of loose hypothetical notions about 'normal' behavior to guide our observations and systematize our thinking."22

Being able to set up norms for normal personality is futile when viewing the realizations that any single set of norms would apply to all. Zax and Klein go on to say that what is common to all people may be important enough to permit the development of a relatively limited number of norms reflecting basic interpersonal environments which can be useful.

At any rate it would seem that what is now needed is a series of broad normative studies of a personal-social psychological nature. In addition

---

to providing norms which can be used as a foundation for behavioral criteria of "normality", they would provide a basis for determining just which dimensions of social group membership have significance for actual functioning. The availability of a criterion based on such indices would also provide a context in which to evaluate the significance of changes in the experiencing of subjects, either reported directly or reflected in their intratherapy verbal behavior.23

In view of these and other findings and the necessity for still additional information regarding the normal personality, this study was undertaken.

Hypotheses

Based on the assumption that normal adjustment may be indirectly assessed by investigating the peer status and attitudes of individuals, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

Hypothesis 1.—Those individuals judged by their peers to be in the highest 15 per cent of a group labeled "outstanding normal individuals," will also receive a reliably greater number of friendship choices.

Hypothesis 2.—Those students labeled outstanding normal individuals will tend to choose more friends among their peers than those individuals falling in the lowest 15 per cent of the group.

Hypothesis 3.—Those individuals rated by their peers as outstanding normal individuals will tend to be more liberal in their attitudes than those ranked low.

23Ibid., p. 445.
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, psychology majors and minors in their second, third, fourth, and fifth years were utilized. The classes were divided into two groups: sophomores making up the first group and juniors, seniors, and graduates at the master's level comprising the second group. The reason for this division was knowledge of peers within each group. The freshmen were not included in this study because previous tests showed little acquaintance volume among students in freshmen psychology classes. It was assumed that since sophomores were usually in their second year classes, they would be more familiar with students within these classes and consequently more qualified to nominate choices of individuals from within their own peer groups. The same assumption was made regarding the second group consisting of the juniors, seniors and graduate students.

Some factors that may have influenced the testing data were unavoidably present but were kept to a minimum. The names of some psychology students eligible for the study were left off due to absence at the time the lists were compiled.
A few students were transfer students, and though cautioned to nominate only those students whom they knew, some did rate their peers although they were not very familiar with them.

Techniques for Collecting Data

Nominations

The first test administered was a nominations test. Each student in both groups was given a mimeographed sheet of instructions on which was printed an introductory paragraph stating the purpose of the study. Briefly, the major purpose of the study was to try to arrive at a more adequate and valid description of what was meant by the term "normal" personality. To enhance this study, the individuals participating, ninety-eight sophomores and 100 juniors, seniors, and graduates, were asked to designate (from a mimeographed list of names) those students whom they considered to be good representatives of their concepts of a normal personality, and also to indicate those students toward whom they held the most friendly attitudes.

The students were requested to put their names on the top of the paper containing the list of names. They were asked to go through the list of names handed them and underline those whom they considered they knew either well or fairly well. They were then asked to put an N (to stand for
nominations) to the left of the names of five students whom they would nominate as being outstanding examples of normal individuals. It was pointed out that though it was true that practically all college students came under the broad category of normal, they were to designate those five whom they believed to be in the upper brackets of normal personality development.

Next, they were asked to put an F (for friendship) in front of the names of those students (no limits) they regarded as among their best friends or whom they would like to have as their best friends. They were cautioned to desist from participating in the study if they did not know anyone on the list.

The nomination choices and friendship choices plus the number of choices given were then tallied on a master sheet which contained the names of all those students participating in the study. A minimum of fifteen choices given an individual under the "known" category was set to make the student eligible for further study in Group II, while in Group I, the minimum was set at seven. By "known" was meant the number of times a student had his name underlined, which showed he was well known or fairly well known. Then by dividing the number of "knowns", the fifteen students in the upper 15 per cent of the nomination category in both groups were designated as the high group. The nomination procedure was used to arrive at
this grouping because peer judgments are considered to be a sound basis for determining normality. This is not to say that those individuals who did not place in the upper 15 per cent, and consequently in the high group, are not considered to be "normal" personalities. Rather, this term high shall be, from now on, understood to mean strictly those students who were placed in the upper 15 per cent of the total group by peer nominations on the criterion of being outstanding in normal personality functioning.

By the same method, the lowest 15 per cent of the total eligible group was arrived at and designated as the low group. The same definitions as to "normal" personality apply here as they did to the high group.

Friendship Choices

Number of friendship choices received was tallied after each name and then totaled. This constituted the friendship category. After each individual's name, the number of friendship choices given was totaled.

In addition to student judgments, faculty nominations were also obtained. Eight members of the faculty who teach courses in psychology and counseling were given a list of names consisting of thirty high and thirty low individuals. This list was arranged in alphabetical order and no faculty member had any knowledge as to the outcome of the student nomination. These faculty members were told to select those
students whom they considered "good examples of normal personalities." The eight faculty members gave fifty-eight nominations to students who were in the "high normal" grouping on the basis of student responses, and only seventeen to those in the "low normal" grouping according to student evaluations. These results are interpreted as showing a high degree of agreement between students and faculty members in designating students who are good representatives of normal personality.

Additional support for the selectivity of the high group is found in the fact that most of these individuals were also in a high category on the basis of nominations obtained from all psychology students and from psychology faculty members during the fall semester of 1960. The chief difference between the fall and spring testings was that during the fall the nominations were made on the criterion of "psychological maturity" which was broken down into fifteen trait descriptions. Fifteen of the thirty highs in the spring were also in the top category on the basis of the fall data. A few were not in the tested population in the fall. None of the highs in the spring was below average on the fall nominations.

Inventory of Beliefs

Because many psychologists over the past few years have demonstrated that opinions can be used as indicators of
basic personality structure, many attempts have been made
to measure this phenomenon objectively.¹

The beliefs which people have are reflections
of their values, and adjustments. From one
point of view they are responses and feelings,
the relationship among which helps to define
personality—that is, the mode of reaction to
self, to others, to institutions, and to ideas.
From another point of view, many statements of
opinion may be regarded as generalizations based
on facts, principles or concepts which are widely
shared by educators (and may be regarded as ob-
jectives of education) but which at the same time
are still regarded as matters of belief and in-
dividual interpretation by the layman or person
who possesses less breadth of understanding and
insight.²

This test should demonstrate the extent to which the
psychologically generally educated individual is character-
ized by independence, understanding, adaptiveness, flexibility
and tolerance as contrasted to the individual who responds
at the stereotyped, immature level by showing defensive,
conforming and resistant responses.

The fundamental assumption underlying the Inventory of
Beliefs is that key by which students who have personalities
most adaptable to the purposes of general education can be
discovered. An attempt was made to explore the manifestations
of these personality dimensions as relevant to the problems
of general education in terms of the individual's relations

² Ibid.
to ideas and intellectual abstractions, social groups and identifications, interpersonal relations, and the self.

This instrument was made possible under the sponsorship of the American Council on Education, Committee on Measurement and Evaluation. The norms were established on the results obtained from 4,724 students attending twenty colleges and universities in this country. It consists of 120 statements of common preconceptions which have been gathered from many schools and colleges. The students were asked to respond by means of a four-element key: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree.

All the studies of the reliability of the *Inventory of Beliefs* indicate that the instrument is stable enough to warrant its being used as either an individual or group measurement. In experimental studies two forms were used and reliability coefficients ranging from .89 to .94 based on Kuder-Richardson formula were obtained.

Validity studies undertaken were by face validity and agreement by judges. A tabulation of the latter responses showed more than 80 per cent agreement. Inter-test correlations were used in comparing the *Inventory of Beliefs* with the ACE Psychological Examination and other tests.

The low positive correlation between the *Inventory of Beliefs* and measures of more intellectual or cognitive factors, when compared to the high inter-test correlations between such measure, are
strongly suggestive of the non-cognitive nature of the dimensions being measured by the Inventory of Beliefs. 3

The students were given separate answer sheets and were instructed to write their names, classification and date on the top of the page. They were given thirty minutes to finish the test, but were allowed more time if needed. They were encouraged to complete the test. They were assured that there were no right and wrong answers and at no time would these results affect their grades. The students were assured that the responses were confidential and would be treated as such.

3Ibid., p. 12
CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the investigation will be examined according to the three hypotheses presented in Chapter I. The first hypothesis stated that those individuals judged by their peers to be in the highest 15 per cent of a group labeled "outstanding normal individuals," will also receive a reliably greater number of friendship choices than a correspondingly low group. Table I indicates the results of the comparison of nomination choices between the high and low groups.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF NOMINATION STATUS BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW NORMALITY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highs</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lows</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I shows that the total nominations received by the thirty students high in "normal" personality were 362 choices. This resulted in a proportion of 7.5 to 1 with the total number of choices for the lows being 48. A mean of 12 for the highs as compared to 1.6 for the lows shows a large
differentiation for the two groups. The reliability of difference is well below the 1 per cent level of significance showing that this difference is due to other than mere chance factors.

Many factors do not enter into this consideration and some of them have been mentioned in the former part of this study, but it is obvious from the large difference between the means of the two groups that the highs are persons characterized by a high degree of rapport with the responses of others with whom they associate. They are probably quick to sense the mood or feelings of others and make the appropriate reactions. They establish feelings of closeness, warmth and understanding with their friends.

The second hypothesis stated that students labeled outstanding normal individuals will tend to choose more friends among their peers than those individuals falling in the lowest 15 per cent of the group. Table II shows that the number of friendship choices received by the highs totaled 397 with a mean of 13.2 as compared with a total of 136 for the lows and a mean of 4.5. The reliability of this difference also was significantly well below the 1 per cent level of confidence.

A correlation coefficient (Pearson Product-Moment Method) was obtained between nomination choices of the highs and friendship choices. The coefficient obtained was +.84. This coefficient shows that there is a positive relationship
between those individuals considered high in "normal" personality and the number of friendship choices they received.

The first point which is apparent from the above data is that those individuals in the high group are sought as friends.

It has long been established in previous investigations that most individuals would like to align themselves with the "popular" personality. This individual could be a leader in any kind of organization, be outstanding in curricular as well as outside activities and be in constant demand to fill positions of leadership. As in the high group, it must be assumed that these individuals possess some characteristics that command they be placed in this group. These qualities and traits may be objectives that everyone desire for themselves.

Certainly we cannot overlook the fact that it is desirable to be seen in company with these high individuals, even though it may be a vicarious experience in itself. Possibly

---

**TABLE II**

**COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW GROUPS SHOWING RELATIONSHIP OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES RECEIVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highs</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lows</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these high students possess characteristics and traits which will enable others to be comfortable in their presence.

Referring to the previously cited study done by Bonney with college students, church affiliation showed no reliable advantage in developing the kind of individual who won friends in college.¹

Apparently when a person enters a group he establishes his social status within a relatively short time, and this status remains approximately constant over a period of years unless unusual circumstances arise in either his favor or disfavor.²

Another interesting facet pointed out by the data in Table III was the number of friendship choices given other individuals. Though the difference in totals between the highs (171) and lows (207) was only thirty-six choices and showed a mean of only six for the highs and 6.9 for the lows, there was still a significant enough difference to warrant the observation that the lows as a group were seeking a greater number of friendships than the highs. This shows that though the lows may be lacking in friendships, the majority of them are still seeking the companionship of others. Many lows gave friendship choices to highs which shows unreal


TABLE III

COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW GROUPS SHOWING RELATIONSHIP OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES GIVEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highs</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lows</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

choices and possibly some yearning and aspiration to be as popular as those individuals in the high group, or at least to be associated with them. There is certainly exhibited some amount of emotional expansiveness.

Of the thirty individuals in the low group, 20 per cent received no friendship choices, 6 per cent received one friendship choice each, and 8 per cent received over 5 choices. In the high group, only one boy gave no friendship choices. His self-concept may be so high, he may not consider friends necessary for his welfare. See Appendix.

Some individuals who are high in normal personality nominations may have no compulsion to feel that they must have many friends to be happy, but rather a few who return their feelings are all that are necessary. They assert their autonomy by not being highly dependent on other people for personal satisfactions since they have many resources within themselves and frequently prefer privacy more than most people
The level of significance is at the 40 per cent level of confidence which would mean that these data concerning friendship choices are not very reliable.

When both groups were considered as a composite there was a definite division of the sexes. Of the sixty students participating in the study, 77 per cent were boys and only 23 per cent were girls.

A brief examination of the figures reveals that a greater proportion of the boys (a ratio of 1.5 to 1) are represented in the high group as compared with the girls. A higher proportion of boys in a ratio of 7:1 is also found in the low group. This difference seems significant, but the initial proportion of boys to begin the study was much greater than the number of girls. Of the original group of psychology students, which totaled 198, only 30 per cent were girls.

Inventory Beliefs

On the Inventory of Beliefs Scale the highs had a mean of 87.4 as compared to the lows with a mean of 77.3. The reliability of this difference was at the 10 per cent level of confidence and consequently was rejected.

A correlation coefficient (Pearson Product-Moment Method) was obtained between the Inventory of Beliefs and nomination choices in high normal personality according to student evaluations. The coefficient obtained was +.31 which shows
that though there was some relationship between liberalism
of beliefs and nomination choices of high normal personality,
it is not demonstrable in this study that opinions can be
used as indicators of normal personality, as defined in this
research.

It is evident that the majority of the highs are very
liberal in their beliefs, but it is also cognizant that the
lows are also quite liberal in their attitudes. This inform-
ation may be regarded as representative of the typical
college student. As long as we continue to live in a demo-
ocratic society and continue to cultivate attitudes favorable
to social change and social invention, public responsibility
and open discussion of public issues, and the fruitfulness
of free inquiry, nothing less will suffice that we absorb
some of these attitudes to which we are constantly being
exposed.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY: CONCLUSION

Summary

This investigation was an attempt to supply more data to further potential investigations in the systematic study of the normal personality as defined in a previous chapter.

The first hypothesis formulated for investigation included the theory that those individuals judged by their peers to be in the highest 15 per cent of a group labeled "outstanding normal individuals," will also receive a reliably greater amount of friendship choices than a correspondingly low group. A second hypothesis offered for inquiry was that those students labeled outstanding normal individuals would tend to choose more friends among their peers than those individuals falling in the lowest 15 per cent of the group labeled outstandingly normal. The last hypothesis stated that those individuals rated by their peers as outstanding normal individuals would tend to be more liberal in their attitudes than those who were ranked low.

Sixty psychology majors and minors were selected by nominations to participate in this study. One hundred ninety-eight students were asked to designate from a mimeographed list of names those individuals whom they considered to be
good representatives of their concepts of a normal personality, and also to indicate those students toward whom they held the most friendly attitudes.

The upper 15 per cent receiving the most choices were considered to be in the high group and this totaled thirty students. A second group of thirty students were selected on the basis that they received the lowest amount of choices and fell in the lowest 15 per cent. These students were called the low group.

From these data, categories were formulated to help in the investigation of two of the hypotheses. These categories were called "friendship choices received," and "friendship choices given."

In addition to student judgments, faculty nominations were also obtained. Eight members of the faculty who taught courses in psychology and counseling were given a list of names consisting of the thirty high and thirty low individuals. They were told to select those students whom they considered "good examples of normal personalities." The results were interpreted as showing high degree of agreement between students and faculty members in designating students who are good representatives of normal personality.

Additional support for the selectivity of the high group was found in the fact that most of these individuals were also in a high category on the basis of nominations
obtained from all psychology students and from psychology faculty members during the fall semester of 1960.

A second test called the Inventory of Beliefs was also administered to establish degree of liberalism of the total group. The data resulting were used in the investigation of the remaining hypothesis. Correlation coefficients were obtained comparing nomination choices and friendship choices and nomination choices and Inventory of Beliefs scores.

Conclusion

The hypotheses of this study proved to be only partially supported. The highs do have greater amount of friendship choices received as compared with the lows, which clearly establishes the fact that they were sought as friends.

The second hypothesis stating the highs would tend to give more friendship choices was rejected. The results obtained from this study show just the reverse to be true. Though the difference between the means is very small, the data are consistent with other studies to advocate the rejection of this hypothesis. As mentioned in Chapter III of this study, students who are high in normal personality nominations may have no compulsion to feel that they must have many friends to be happy, but rather a few who return their feelings are all that are necessary. They assert their autonomy by not being highly dependent on other people for personal satisfactions.
since they have many resources within themselves and frequently prefer privacy more than most people.

The third hypothesis stating the highs have more liberal attitudes than the lows will also have to be rejected. Though the mean shows a difference of only ten points, the level of significance shows it to be at the 10 per cent level of confidence. In a study of this kind where the students come from all parts of the nation, one expects to find attitudes of all degrees of liberalism. It was not demonstrable in this study that opinions can be used as indicators of normal personality as defined in the research.
# APPENDIX

## TABLE IV

**SOCIOMETRIC STATUS SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Friendship Choices Received</th>
<th>Friendship Choices Given</th>
<th>Knowns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highs</td>
<td>Lows</td>
<td>Highs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highs</td>
<td>Lows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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