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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Psychologists are becoming increasingly aware of the role one's self-concept plays in determining behavior. Responses in accordance with one's self-regard act as a major factor in influencing perception, and the resulting experiences tend to reinforce the concept. Thus, adequate and inadequate personalities develop in the same way, as a product of the particular circumstances involved in the process of interaction with environment. An adequate self-concept gives the individual a feeling of confidence in coping with life, allowing spontaneity and flexibility in behavior. A sense of inadequacy, however, defines a self as incapable of dealing with events, often producing a rigid, vicious-circle kind of behavior that seems only to confirm its limitations.

A person may have a number of self perceptions which are unique unto himself. These are his experiences with and of himself, combining to form a self-concept that is relatively stable somewhere along a continuum from adequacy to inadequacy, self-approving to self-disapproving. Briefly, the theory of self-concept predicts that self-perception is of ultimate psychological significance in behavioral organization. Past
and present self-observations do not remain isolated concepts of self, but, rather, combine to form a patterned interrelationship or "gestalt" of self. Although the self-concept is, therefore, a product of inference, it is a valid concept. To the individual his self-perception, as well as all his other perceptions, has a feeling of reality. He seems to be, to himself, truly what his self-concept tells him he is.

Personal adjustment is related to the approval, disapproval, or ambivalence the individual "feels" for the self-concept. The adjusted person may dislike certain aspects of his self-concept but he is, on the whole, at ease with himself. A great deal of disapproval or ambivalence about one's self increases distress in connection with one's self-regard, resulting in a maladjusted, easily threatened individual. Ability to perceive situations in their proper perspective depends upon the level of personality integration obtained by the individual through his interactions with his various selves. If the situation is perceived as threatening, the insatiable drive of the organism toward protecting itself from threat must result in some sort of response. The response matches threat in magnitude, and as inadequate people feel more threatened, they almost always overact in exaggerated ways. Such behavior only intensifies the need for self-defense, resulting in continuous aggression, or, perhaps, defeatism.
It seems logical to assume that acceptance by others begins with self-acceptance. Although attitude toward self is the hardest to change, it can be done. Adolescence is the half-way time of life and the resulting trauma leaves deep scars.

Adolescence tends to be a time of development and of evaluation of values. The quest for the controlling values around which the individual may integrate his life is accompanied by an increasing awareness of "self," a development of self ideals, and an acceptance of self in harmony with those ideals. It is a time of conflict between youthful idealism and reality (9, p. 705).

The answer, in most cases, apparently lies in helping the confused half-child, half-adult accept and integrate all facets of his personality. Redefining the "good life" as one that includes synthesizing personality polarizations, rather than definite "either-or" behavioral aspects, greatly alleviates anxiety. Studies by Maslow, Bonney, Rogers, and others (17; 5; 21) support this. The productive, self-actualizing individual is one who functions in the full spectrum of human responses.

Their behavior is directed by both impulse and reason, they can both love and hate, they are dependent and independent, selfish and unselfish, childlike and mature, sensual and spiritual, masculine and feminine, sympathetic and aggressive, conforming and nonconforming, stereotyped and creative, happy and unhappy. Generally these apparent contradictions are found in the same individuals (6).

Perceptual reorganization of the emotionally disturbed adolescent is more practical than personality reorganization
when the individual otherwise has the capacity to function normally in society. Helping the parents understand how important it is to "accentuate the positive" without expecting to completely "eliminate the negative" appears to be the first step in self-acceptance.

... my studies support those of others which have shown that the chief differences between highly normal and socially maladjusted groups lie not in the kind of objective life conditions they have experienced but in their subjective evaluation of these experiences and in the persistence toward the realization of their potentials in spite of barriers. They have the ego strength to integrate all aspects of their beings into drives toward positive objectives (6).

These same investigators have shown that, as a rule, a child holds his relative position in a group regardless of population. A new population seems to define a person in the same manner as the old one. Why? Because that person carries his self-definition along with him. His physical field has changed but not his perceptual one. The answer, then, for movement toward the upper end of the adjustment-maladjustment continuum is readjustment of self-perception.

If the way in which the self is perceived has as close and significant a relationship to behavior as has been suggested, then the manner in which this perception may be altered becomes a question of importance. If a reorganization of self perceptions brings a change in behavior; if adjustment and maladjustment depend on the congruence between perception as experienced and the self as perceived, then the factors which permit a reorganization of the perception of self are significant (21).
One of the primary factors is acceptance by the parents of the many ups and downs of the adolescent. Seeking to establish and maintain a position for himself in his peer group, the adolescent tries many selves. As long as he has a healthy, basic "feeling" about himself, socially adaptable behavior will win out in the long run. It is the lot of the parents to live with the fads, tears, and confusions. An accepting parent who does not repress or project too much of his own adolescent development, and who builds for a positive self-concept will have an easier time of it. Professional counseling with parents may very well be the major factor in helping to bring a more than normally confused adolescent into line with acceptable behavior.

This study investigated the adolescent self-concept. The concern was with the relationship between peer status as measured by a reputation scale and self-concept as measured by how an individual feels he is perceived by others.

Related Research

According to Allport, good personal adjustment is primarily reflecting a sense of proportion.

The mature person expresses his convictions and feelings with consideration for the convictions and feelings of others; and he does not feel threatened by his own emotional expressions or by theirs. Such a sense of proportion is not an isolated attribute in personality. It comes about because one's outlook is generally of a realistic order, and because one possesses integrative values that control and regulate the flow of emotional impulse (2, p. 288).
A number of studies showed that well-adjusted people are relatively comfortable with their "selves" because they are more objective in their self-evaluation. In a study of over 200 sixth-grade children, Taylor and Combs (28) found that those children who were more willing to admit they had common weaknesses and faults rated themselves low on the same scale. The authors concluded that, because they were able to face up to their short-comings, these children were characterized by more objective attitudes toward themselves which aided them in making a more adequate and realistic social adjustment. Barron (3) randomly selected eighty graduate students for study. He found that those who were rated high on a nine-point scale for "all round soundness as a person" by members of the various university departments were vastly superior in self-insight to those rated low on the same scale. The high subjects were less egotistical, less defensive, and less distrustful in their interpersonal relations.

Self-appraisal is reflected in all phases of personality. Sears (24) compared children who had continuous success in school with those who had a long history of failure and found that the former set goals which were within their range of abilities while the latter had little regard for the possibility of goal attainment. The non-achieving group displayed little insight into their abilities or limitations. Walsh (29) found a significant difference in the self-attitude of high and low achievers in school. The underachievers perceived
themselves as rejected or isolated by the group and, apparently, acted-out their frustration in inappropriate and attention demanding behavior.

If, indeed, our interactions with others are determined largely by our self-concept, then sociometry will prove a sensitive instrument in measuring self-acceptance as well as peer acceptance. Schiff (23) was able to conclude from his data collected on 141 high school students that those who underestimated their peer-status as measured by sociometry did so because they assumed others shared their own low choice value opinion. These same students also tended to regard themselves as below the group average in their acceptance of others. Norman's (19) analysis of his data gathered on seventy-two men showed a significantly positive correlation between insight into oneself and degree of acceptance of others. The group attaining the "lowest acceptance of others" rating also scored low in realistic perception of others. In a study of the relationship between sociometric status and personality test scores, Phillips (20) found that children who were perceived negatively by their peers had the lower adjustment scores on the personality tests. Those children most often chosen by the other subjects had the more desirable scores on the personality tests. Gronlund (11) found a .44 correlation between sociometric status and perception of the correct sociometric status of self and of others. He suggests, upon the basis of his results, that increased accuracy in
perception of others' attitudes and feelings may lead to more effective social adaptability through better interpersonal contacts. Rogers (22) found that delinquents who scored highest in self-understanding also responded better to a counselor and had a much higher rate of satisfactory rehabilitation. Sheerer (25) found a person's feeling of self-worth to be significantly related to his attitude toward others. In an independent but supportive study, Stock (26) also found a definite relationship between self-concept and perception of others. By intense analysis of statement-content while in a counseling session she found a regular increase in respect for self and respect for others in those whose counseling was successful. Hartley (13) selected fourteen preadolescent boys, ages ten to twelve years, for close study. Once again the sociality of the individual was demonstrated to influence his judgment of the sociality of his peers.

Assumptions

It appears then, on the basis of these studies, that social and interpersonal interactions are directly related to how a person feels about himself. A well-adjusted person, striving to actualize his potential, is psychologically free to both realize and accept a difference in what he is now and what he would like to become. Because his psychic-energy is not tied up in denying discrepancies, he is better able to function normally in his sub-culture through positive
responses and attitudes toward his environment. Therefore, he is seen by his peers in a more favorable light.

On the other hand, an individual who is threatened by discrepancies in self and ideal-self is likely to react in a maladaptive fashion. A self too weak to accept attack will tend to act out his frustration by aggressive and hostile behavior, or may define himself as inferior and act in such a way as to reinforce this self-concept. The former will tend to be seen negatively by classmates, and the latter may not be seen at all.

Definition of Terms

Positive referred to that 5 per cent of the total student body who received the highest number of positive nominations from their peers on Section I of the Student Survey.

Negative referred to that 5 per cent of the total student body who received the highest number of negative nominations from their peers on Section I of the Student Survey.

Isolates referred to that 5 per cent of the total student body who received a combined total of two or less nominations, positive and/or negative, on Part I of the Student Survey.

Peer perception and peer acceptance were used interchangeably to describe the way the subject was perceived by his peers, either positively or negatively.

Self-perception and self-concept were synonymously used to designate self-attitude as expressed in the number of negative items checked on Section II of the Student Survey.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were projected at the beginning of this study:

I. Subjects who rated high in positive traits by their peers on a reputation measurement will tend to have a low negative score on a similar self-rating, while those who rate as highly negative will tend to also rate themselves high in negative self-perception. There will be a difference between the self-perception means of the positive group and the negative group with the latter having a significantly higher negative rating on self-perception.

II. Subjects who appear as isolates will tend to have a significantly higher negative self-perception than those who are rated high in positive traits by their classmates.
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CHAPTER IX
METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The subjects for this study were drawn from the student population of Ada Senior High School in East Central Oklahoma during May, 1964. Each of the 543 students enrolled completed a battery of tests designed to screen for the emotionally handicapped in the schools. Prepared by Eli M. Bower, California State Department of Mental Hygiene, and Nadine M. Lambert, California State Department of Education, this battery is published by the California State Department of Education.

One instrument for this battery, Student Survey, was selected for use in the present study. This measurement yields both peer and self-rating scores. Section I (See Appendix A), which could be subtitled Student Perception Test, contains twenty descriptive sentences of behavior. The odd-numbered items are those commonly associated with good emotional adjustment, and were designated as those of positive peer-value; the even-numbered are those associated with maladjusted emotional behavior and were designated as being negative in peer-value.

The teacher in each homeroom administered the test, and the students were told:

Education means learning about different subjects, about other places, other people, other ideas. But education also
means learning about ourselves, about our ideas and attitudes. The purpose of this survey is to help you find out and to help your teachers understand, how students your age see yourselves—and others your age, your classmates particularly. Your individual answers will not be discussed in class. However, the results of this survey, for the class as a whole, may be presented by your teacher at a later time.

On the following page there are twenty statements which describe different kinds of students. Think of someone who is most like or often like the described student in each statement. You may, if you wish, use the same student for more than one statement.

Immediately following completion of Section I, the students were asked to fill out the second part. Section II (See Appendix B), which could be called Self-Perception Test, contains the same twenty items as Section I, written for the first person. The teacher read the following instructions with the class:

Students have found it fun to guess which of the twenty statements teachers, classmates, and friends think are most typical of them. It has also been interesting to discover which of the twenty statements each student thinks is most typical of himself.

On the following pages you will find these statements, often repeated, in groups of four under questions like these:
Which one of these four students is **most** like you?

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is **least** like you?

Which one of these four students would your teacher think is **most** like you?

In other words, how do you see yourself? And, for better or worse, how do you think your classmates and your teachers see you?

There are no right and wrong answers; there is no grade or mark for filling out this form, nor is this a popularity contest. Your answers are confidential and have meaning only as they represent a clear-eyed effort on your part to see yourself as you think others see you, and as you—in a moment without false pride or vanity—see yourself.

Make only one choice for each question. Read each question carefully. Indicate your choice by placing an X on the line next to the number of your choice.

Results were then collected by the teachers and given to the staff of the local Guidance Center. There, the nominations were tabulated and scored.
CHAPTER II BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER III

RESULTS

For the purpose of this study, the number and valence of nominations on the peer reputation measurement served as a basis in selection of subjects for the present study. The three groups were formed by:

(a) the top 5 per cent in positive peer nominations;
(b) the top 5 per cent in negative peer nominations;
(c) the lowest 5 per cent in total number of combined choices.

Table I gives the number, range, and mean of peer nominations in each category. The ranges of nominations for the positive and negative groups were similar, although there was a difference of 10.88 in the means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84-33</td>
<td>50.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62-25</td>
<td>39.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2-0</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II shows the population breakdown among peer nomination groups. Although the subjects were selected on the basis of their scores on the Peer Perception Test, the sex and grade distributions were surprisingly even. There were forty males and forty-three females; twenty-seven sophomores, twenty-nine juniors, and twenty-seven seniors. Sex distributions within two of the three groups, however, were markedly uneven. While there were eleven males to sixteen females in the positive group, the ratio of negatives was twenty-four to three, and the ratio of isolates was five to twenty-four.

**TABLE II.**

**SEX AND CLASSIFICATION DISTRIBUTION AMONG PEER NOMINATION GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of negative self-ratings were obtained for each subject from Section II. This part contained thirty groups of descriptive sentences with four in each group. There were two positive and two negative traits in each grouping, and the subject was to check the one he felt others would most likely use to describe him. Only the odd-numbered,
negative items were tallied to give the amount of negative self-concept. Table III shows the range, mean and standard deviation of the three groups on this measurement. From a possible score of thirty, the range for the positives was zero to eight; for the negatives, zero to twenty-seven; and for the isolates, zero to eleven.

TABLE III
RANGE, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION ON THE SELF-PERCEPTION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate</td>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's $t$ was used to find the significance of difference between the means of the self-rating scale of the independent groups. Results are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF FISHER'S $t$ BETWEEN THE MEANS OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE, AND BETWEEN POSITIVE AND ISOLATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$t$ Needed</th>
<th>$t$ Obtained</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Level of Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive and Negative</td>
<td>2.678</td>
<td>5.421</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive and Isolates</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>3.689</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A definite relationship between perception by peers and self-concept was demonstrated. The positive group had a mean of 1.15 with a standard deviation of 1.77 on the self-rating scale. This was contrasted with a mean of 9.78 and a standard deviation of 7.92 on the same scale for the negative subjects. With fifty-two degrees of freedom, a t of 2.678 was needed to establish confidence at the 1 per cent level. The obtained t of 5.421 strongly confirmed the hypothesis that subjects rated as highly positive by their peers would tend to have a significantly lower score on negative self perception than students rated as negative by their peers.

The second part of the hypothesis was also statistically confirmed. Those subjects who appeared as isolates on the peer-nomination scale had a mean score on the self-rating test of 3.62 with sigma of 2.96. Computing these scores with those of the positive group yielded a t of 3.689. Going to the table with fifty-four degrees of freedom, a t of 2.668 was needed for acceptance at the 1 per cent level of confidence. Thus, it was reliably established that those subjects ignored by their peers on the reputation measurement had, significantly, a more negative self-perception than those perceived by the same population as having highly positive traits.

As a group, adolescents who were defined by their peers in a negative way also defined themselves in the same way.
Conversely, those seen by the same group as possessing positive traits had a positive self-regard.

Those subjects who appeared as isolates in this same population differed from the positive group in relationship to attitude toward themselves. Their self-concept was significantly more negative than the group seen as possessing positive traits.

Although not hypothesized, a definite sex difference was noted. Males accounted for 89 per cent of the negative group but only 19 per cent of the isolates. This difference in sex distribution would seem to indicate that boys tend to act out their feelings in a forceful and direct manner while girls are less inclined to do so.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Eighty-three high school students served as subjects to investigate the relationship between acceptance by peers and acceptance of self. One instrument from a battery of tests for screening the emotionally handicapped in a school population was used. Both parts of this particular test, Student Survey, were utilized in collecting data for the purpose of this study.

Scores on Section I, Student Perception Test, served as a basis in selecting subjects from a total school enrollment of 543. This part afforded students an opportunity to name schoolmates they considered most like twenty descriptive sentences, ten positive and ten negative. After tabulation of the results, the top 5 per cent in positive choices and the highest scoring 5 per cent in negative choices were grouped according to their valence. A third group was formed of those 5 per cents who received the fewest votes of combined value. These groups were designated as positive, negative, and isolates, respectively.

Section II, Self-Perception Test, contained thirty groups of traits with four descriptive items in each group, repeating Section I except reading in the first person. These were to be checked according to how the subject felt he was
perceived by others. Each group contained two positive and two negative descriptions and only one was to be checked. The negative items were later tallied, and the resulting number yielded the second measurement criterion, amount of negative self-concept.

Use of Fisher's $t$ in the statistical analysis resulted in acceptance of the full hypothesis to establish a definite relationship between peer perception and self-concept. Those students who were regarded as highly positive by their peers had a significantly lower score on negative self-concept than those who were seen as highly negative. Also those students who appeared as isolates had a significantly higher negative self-concept than the positive group.

Strongly supported by the statistical analysis of the present data, the self-concept theory seems to be a valid one. One's internal frame of reference, relatively stable along a continuum from positive to negative self-attitudes, acts as a guideline in determining behavior. Interpersonal relationships are, apparently, in accordance with one's intrapersonal regard. A person more at peace with himself is better able to establish and maintain positive affiliations with others. Negative feelings about one's self, however, manifest themselves in such a way as to hinder development of positive regard for others.
On the basis of these data, it was concluded that a positive self-regard is a major factor in acceptance by others as measured by a peer reputation measurement. Therefore, building up an individual's positive personality attributes results in a healthier self-concept and better personal adjustment.
APPENDIX A

Think of the name of a student who is MOST LIKE or OFTEN LIKE the student described. Write his or her name in the space provided to the left of each statement.

1. A student who is good in school work.
2. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.
3. One who can accept responsibilities.
4. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.
5. A student who is well liked.
6. One who has difficulty learning.
7. Someone who is helpful to others.
8. Someone who is interested in things he can do alone.
9. A person upon whom you can depend.
10. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.
11. One who is respected by other students.
12. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self and others.
13. Someone who will probably be a success in life.
14. A student who is often unhappy or "blue."
15. One who has lots of common sense.
16. A student who has more problems than other students.
17. Someone who has lots of self-confidence.
18. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
19. A person who is seldom sick.
20. A person who is moody.
APPENDIX B

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is LEAST like you?

1. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self and others.
2. One who can accept responsibilities.
3. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
4. One who has lots of common sense.

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is MOST like you?

1. A student who is good in school work.
2. One who has difficulty learning.
3. Someone who will probably be a success in life.
4. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.

Which one of these four students would your teacher think is LEAST like you?

1. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
2. Someone who has lots of self-confidence.
3. A student who is often unhappy or "blue."
4. A student who is good in school work.

Which one of these four students would your teacher think is MOST like you?

1. One who is respected by other students.
2. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.
3. Someone who will probably be a success in life.
4. One who has difficulty learning.

Which one of these four students is LEAST like you?

1. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.
2. A student who is good in school work.
3. Someone who is interested in things he can do alone.
4. Someone who will probably be a success in life.
Which one of these four students is MOST like you?

1. Someone who will probably be a success in life.
2. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
3. Someone who has lots of self-confidence.
4. A student who has more problems than other students.

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is LEAST like you?

1. A student who has more problems than other students.
2. Someone who is helpful to others.
3. Someone who is interested in things which he can do alone.
4. A student who is good in school work.

Which one of these four students is MOST like you?

1. One who is respected by other students.
2. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self and others.
3. A person upon whom you can depend.
4. Someone who is interested in things which he can do alone.

Which one of these students is LEAST like you?

1. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.
2. Someone who is helpful to others.
3. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self and others.
4. A student who is well liked.

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is MOST like you?

1. Someone who has lots of common sense.
2. A person who is moody.
3. Someone who has lots of self-confidence.
4. A student who has more problems than other students.
Which one of these four students would your teacher think is LEAST like you?

1. A student who has more problems than other students.
2. A person who is seldom sick.
3. Someone who is interested in things he can do alone.
4. Someone who is helpful to others.

Which one of these four students would your teacher think is MOST like you?

1. A student who is well liked.
2. A person who is moody.
3. Someone who has lots of self-confidence.
4. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self and others.

Which one of these four students would your teacher think is MOST like you?

1. Someone who has lots of common sense.
2. Someone who is interested in things he can do alone.
3. A person who is seldom sick.
4. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.

Which one of these four students would your teacher think is LEAST like you?

1. A person who is moody.
2. Someone who has lots of common sense.
3. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.
4. One who is respected by other students.

Which one of these four students is MOST like you?

1. One who can accept responsibilities.
2. A student who is often unhappy or "blue."
3. Someone who is helpful to others.
4. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.
Which one of these four students would your classmates think is MOST like you?

1. One who can accept responsibilities.
2. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
3. A person upon whom you can depend.
4. Someone who is interested in things he can do alone.

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is LEAST like you?

1. One who has difficulty learning.
2. A student who is well liked.
3. A person who is moody.
4. A person who is seldom sick.

Which one of these four students is LEAST like you?

1. A person who is moody.
2. One who has lots of common sense.
3. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.
4. A person upon whom you can depend.

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is MOST like you?

1. A person who is seldom sick.
2. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self or others.
3. One who is respected by other students.
4. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.

Which one of these four students would your teachers think is MOST like you?

1. One who can accept responsibilities.
2. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.
3. A person upon whom you can depend.
4. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
Which one of these four students would your teachers think is LEAST like you?

___ 1. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.
___ 2. One who can accept responsibilities.
___ 3. One who has difficulty learning.
___ 4. A student who is well liked.

Which one of these four students is MOST like you?

___ 1. A student who is well liked.
___ 2. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.
___ 3. Someone who has lots of common sense.
___ 4. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.

Which one of these four students is LEAST like you?

___ 1. One who has difficulty learning.
___ 2. Someone who has lots of self-confidence.
___ 3. One who gets upset when faced with a difficult school problem.
___ 4. A person who is seldom sick.

Which one of these four students would your classmates think is LEAST like you?

___ 1. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.
___ 2. One who is respected by other students.
___ 3. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.
___ 4. Someone who will probably be a success in life.

Which one of these four students would your teachers think is MOST like you?

___ 1. Someone who has lots of common sense.
___ 2. Someone who is interested in things he can do alone.
___ 3. A person who is seldom sick.
___ 4. One who has to be coaxed or forced to work with other students.
Which one of these four students would your classmates think is MOST like you?

1. Someone who is helpful to others.
2. A student who is often unhappy or "blue."
3. A student who is well liked.
4. A student who gets into fights or quarrels with other students.

Which one of these four students is MOST like you?

1. A student who is good in school work.
2. One who has difficulty learning.
3. A person who is seldom sick.
4. A person who is moody.

Which one of these four students is LEAST like you?

1. A student who has more problems than other students.
2. One who can accept responsibilities.
3. A student who is often unhappy or "blue."
4. One who is respected by other students.

Which one of these four students would your teachers think is MOST like you?

1. A student who is good in school work.
2. A student who is often unhappy or "blue."
3. Someone who is helpful to others.
4. A student who has more problems than other students.

Which one of these four students would your teachers think is LEAST like you?

1. One who makes unusual or odd remarks in class.
2. A person upon whom you can depend.
3. One who sometimes behaves in ways which are dangerous to self or others.
4. Someone who will probably be a success in life.
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