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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It was many years after the concept of the self was introduced that a serious interest was taken in this area of personality study. William James was probably the first to use the concept of the self when he introduced it as early as 1890 in his *Principles of Psychotherapy* (16). Sigmund Freud, in his later writings (10), developed his concept of the ego. Despite the possibilities of further explorations suggested by these men, an interest was not taken in this area until about the past two decades. Since the concept of the self was ignored by the behaviorists and the functionalists, who reigned in American psychology from the 1920's until the 1940's, it received little attention when it was introduced by James and Freud. Since about the mid-1940's, the picture has changed considerably. There has been, within the past two decades, a renewed interest in the self. A survey of psychological literature of the past twenty years reveals a barrage of writings and empirical investigations in this area.

Wylie (34), in the introduction to her book, *The Self Concept*, states that the self-concept theorists believe that one cannot understand and predict human behavior without
knowledge of the person's conscious perceptions of his environment. "Because of this central role accorded to conscious perceptions, cognitions, and feelings, these theorists have often been labeled 'phenomenological'" (34, p. 6).

Research dealing with the self generally falls into one of two categories: the phenomenal (or conscious) self and the nonphenomenal (unconscious or agent) self. This study is restricted to consideration of the conscious self.

The phenomenal theorists are in general agreement concerning the definition of the self. Raimy (27) first defined self-concept as follows: "The self-concept is the more or less organized perceptual object resulting from present and past observations . . . it is what a person believes about himself."

Rogers defines self-concept as:

an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; and the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experience and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence (28, p. 136).

Combs and Snygg define the phenomenal self as "... the individual's own unique organization of ways of regarding self: it is the Gestalt of his concept of self" (7, p. 126). They view the self as one's overall view of himself, the more or less complete or total opinion of one's self worth.
According to Rogers' hypothesis, those who are self-accepting should rate better sociometrically than those who have negative self-feelings. Those who possess self-concepts will so behave that others will react toward them positively. Those who possess negative self-concepts will so behave that others will react to them negatively. "The person who accepts himself will, because of this self acceptance, have better interpersonal relations with others" (28, p. 520).

Rogers, in another writing (29, p. 360), states that "... we have observed that appropriate changes in behavior occur when the individual acquires a different view of his world of experience, including himself." He says that his changed perception does not need to be dependent upon a change in the "reality," but may be a product of internal reorganization. He suggests that one might propose that the tensions called psychological maladjustment exist when the organized concept of self is not in accord with the perception actually experienced. This discrepancy between the concept of self and the actual perceptions is explained in terms of the fact that the self-concept resists assimilating into itself any percept which is inconsistent with its present organization. But if the self is free from any threat of attack, it is possible for the self to consider these previously rejected perceptions, to make new differentiations, and to reintegrate the self in such a way as to include them.
Bonney approaches Rogers' statement concerning the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, from a different point of view. He states: "The most important single factor determining how well we like others is the extent to which they help us like ourselves" (5, p. 130). According to Bonney's hypothesis, we will like others because they make or cause us to like ourselves. One of the reasons we like other persons is that they make us feel good, they compliment us in many ways, and in general, respond to us in a way that is consistent with our self-concept. These responses toward us make us feel good and cause us to like ourselves. They respond to us in a way that is consistent with our perception of our self. Consequently, we will like them in turn. The popular and well-accepted members of a group would be the ones who, by their words and actions, compliment the others and make them feel good by responding toward them in a way that is consistent with their self-concept.

Horney (14) insists that the individual who does not love himself is incapable of loving others. She says that one must love oneself before one can love another.

**STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

What this study proposes to do is to study the relationship between self-concept and sociometric status, and more important, to try to tie the three following hypotheses
together. On the basis of Rogers' and Horney's hypotheses (or theoretical constructs) it would appear that group members with favorable self-concepts would rank high sociometrically. On the basis of Bonney's hypothesis, it would appear that members of a group who score high on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one does things to cause others to like themselves, would also rate high sociometrically.

On the basis of Rogers' and Horney's constructs the following hypotheses were formed.

**Hypothesis I:** There will be a significant positive correlation between self-concept and sociometric status. Or, those individuals of a group with a high or favorable concept of themselves, will rank high sociometrically in the group, and those members of a group with a poor, low, or unfavorable self-concept will rank low sociometrically.

On the basis of Bonney's constructs, the following hypotheses were formed:

**Hypothesis II:** There will be a significant positive correlation between the scores made on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one behaves in such a way as to cause others to like themselves, and sociometric status. Or, those making high scores on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one so behaves as to cause others to like themselves, will rank high sociometrically.
Hypothesis III: There will be a significant positive correlation between the scores on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one's behavior engenders self-esteem in others, and self-concept. Or, those group members making high scores on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one's behavior engenders self-esteem in others, will have high self-concepts.

Statistical Treatment

To test the three hypotheses, Pearson's coefficient of correlations was computed between the respective variables. These correlation coefficients were computed by an IBM computer at the Computer Center at North Texas State University. To test the significance of the correlation coefficients, the $t$-test of significance of correlation was employed.

Related Research

It has been noted that investigation into the area of self-concept has been restricted, for the most part, to the past two decades; but, during the past two decades, there have been many investigations into this area. It is possible to review the literature concerning Rogers' and Horney's hypotheses, but there is no available research specifically related to Bonney's hypothesis.

Adler (1) was probably among the first to make an observation of a relationship between feelings toward the
self and feelings toward others when he contended that a "tendency to disparage" arose out of feelings of inferiority, as an overcompensation.

Along the same line of thought, Fromm (12) says that we should love ourselves, for self-love and the love of others go hand in hand. He proposes that a failure to love the self is accompanied by a basic hostility toward others which arises out of the suppression of the individual's spontaneity or of his "real" self. In her book, Remarks on the Philosophy of Mental Disorders, Reichmann (11) states that self-love is necessary "... because one can respect others only to the extent that one respects oneself. Or to put it differently, one can love others only to the extent that one loves oneself." She also says that where there is "... low self-esteem there is low esteem of others and fear of low appreciation by other people" (11, p. 168).

Silver (31, p. 167), in his dissertation, found that the level and stability of the self-concept was significantly associated with parental acceptance. He also found that the level and stability of self-concept ratings were also significantly associated with perceived measures of peer acceptance but not with actual measures of peer acceptance or with accuracy of social perception.

Berger (3), Omwake (25), Fey (8), Sheerer (30), Stock (32), Phillips (26), and Allen (2) found a significant
positive correlation between expressed acceptance of self and acceptance of others. The conclusions that each author draws from his study differ in some detail. For instance, Berger (3, p. 781) concluded that the variation in expressed self-acceptance accounts for a relatively small portion of the variation in expressed acceptance of others. From his study it follows that the relationship is not so invariable or of such a high degree that individual predictions can be made with accuracy. He goes on to say that the results "... do, however, indicate a good degree of association between the variables, and this serves to support and strengthen the theoretical consideration of Fromm and Horney."

Omwake (25, p. 445) concludes that his results support the hypothesis that there is a marked relation between the way the individual sees himself and the way he sees others; that is, those who accept themselves tend to accept others and to perceive others as accepting them; and those who reject themselves hold correspondingly low opinions of others and perceive others as being self-rejectant.

Zelen (35, p. 316) studied a group of children and found the same kind of relationship. He said that this suggests that liking others and being liked by others are reciprocal characteristics. Also, individuals with high group status tend to find many group members highly acceptable. He states that "these findings suggest that a child
who has positive feelings about himself is better able to devote his energies to the group activities and to cooperate more fully with others." The child with negative self-percepts may be constantly on guard against new perceived threats from others.

Fey (8, p. 275) asserts, "... it is quite possible that the genuinely self-accepting person truly accepts others, that he does not threaten them, and is rewarded in turn by their acceptance." Besides finding a relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, he also found that individuals with high self-acceptance scores tend to feel accepted by others.

Sheerer's (30, p. 174) and Phillips' (25, p. 80) conclusions did not vary too much from the usual conclusions in that they said that perception of others, feelings toward others, and acceptance of others are significantly related to the perception of the self, feelings about the self, and acceptance of the self.

Similar to Fromm's idea, Stock's idea (32, p. 179) is that an individual who holds negative feelings toward himself tends to hold negative feelings toward other people in general. He goes further and states that as an individual's feelings about himself change to objective or positive feelings, his feelings about others change in a similar direction.
Allen's study (2) is a little different from the previous ones reported. His conclusions are drawn from his work and therapy with children. He says that those who seem to like and respect themselves are inclined to be positive in their attitude toward others and to be generally less critical to those around them. Individuals who are prone to express negative attitudes toward others, and to be constant faultfinders also harbor negative attitudes about themselves.

A study indicating that maladjustment is related to discrepancies between self and ideal self was conducted by Turner and Vanderlippe (33, p. 205). Their group of subjects rated as well-adjusted had a correlation of .79 between self and ideal self ratings, whereas the group of poorly adjusted had a self/ideal-self correlation of .11. He said successful therapy should be accompanied by a reduction in the magnitude of self/ideal-self discrepancies. Also, self-concept should change more as a result of therapy than ideal concept since the latter is firmly anchored as general societal concept, whereas the former may be more idiosyncratic.

Horowitz (15, p. 213) in a similar study, investigated maladjustment as related to self-concept. He studied a population of children and found that the more anxious children tend to hold poorer self-concepts and tend to be less popular than less anxious children.
Brownfain (6, p. 605), investigating the stability of self-concept, suggests that subjects whose self-concept is stable (i.e., whose negative and positive self-ratings are minimally discrepant) are individuals who, according to several evaluations of adjustment, are the happier, more adequate members of the group. He also suggested that the individuals with an unstable self-concept will be the more poorly adjusted, unhappier members of the group. Among other things, he found that those individuals with a stable self-concept are better liked and considered more popular by the group; they see themselves more as they believe other people see them; they know more people in the group and are better known by the group and show less evidence of compensatory behavior.

Blackman (4, p. 233) designed his research within the framework of interpersonal congruence theory. Congruency was defined as the individual perceiving other people as attributing to him traits that he attributes to himself. Congruency theory places the locus of stability and change in individual behavior in the interaction process rather than in intra-individual structures. It states that when a person has congruent interpersonal relations with another individual, he will develop a liking for that person. Blackman's findings are consistent with this statement. He found that the others with whom an individual interacts most
frequently are perceived by the individual as having more congruent perceptions of himself than those with whom the individual interacts less frequently.

Hanlon (13, p. 217) concludes that if successful psychotherapy promotes better adjustment, a positive and significant high correlation should exist between measures of adjustment and the congruency of the self-concept and the ideal self. He found that there was a positive correlation between self-concept and the ideal self-concept. The overall tendency is toward a congruence of the two concepts of self. Also, he found a positive correlation between self-ideal congruence and total adjustment, but that maladjustment in a person need not require that his self-concept be negatively related to his ideal self. Where the correlation is minimal (less than r = .27), signs of maladjustment may already be manifest. In summary he concludes that "... the use of measures of self-ideal congruency in evaluating the extent of personality maladjustment appears justified."

Lundy's, Kathovsky's, Cromwell's and Shoemaker's study (21, p. 261) suggests that a person's sociometric choice will be attributed with personality characteristics acceptable to him more than with personality characteristics unacceptable to him. They suggest that he will attribute to disliked persons personality characteristics unacceptable to him more often than he will attribute those acceptable
to him. So, from the results of this study, it seems that we describe persons we like best as more similar to us than persons we least like.

Fiedler (9, p. 877) and Kipnis (19, p. 462) found similar results in their investigations. Fiedler (9, p. 877), using twenty-six fraternity men as subjects, requested each subject to describe himself, his ideal self, and his least-liked fellow group member by means of a Q sort. Kipnis (19, p. 462) also found that individuals perceived their friends to be more similar to them than others whom they liked less well. Also, subjects who perceived their best friends to be relatively unlike them changed their self-evaluations more in a six-week time interval than did subjects who perceived their best friends to be more like them. The subjects changed their self-evaluation during the six-week interval so that they perceived smaller differences between them and their best friends. This reduction in perceived difference occurred because they re-evaluated their friends.

Katz (18, p. 877) in his dissertation, studied the relationship between sociometric status, perception of sociometric status, and sociometric predictability. He concludes by saying that the correlations between sociometric status, perception of sociometric status, and sociometric predictability are statistically significant.
Norman (24, p. 130) studied interpersonal relationships and found that there was a positive significant correlation between the degree of acceptance by other individuals and insight into oneself. He also found that the group lowest in acceptance had the poorest scores in self-other identity, insight into self, and realistic perception of others.

Nahinsky (23, p. 363) assumed that junior officers choosing to make a career in the Navy were better adjusted to situations than were junior officers voluntarily leaving the Navy. Subjects from the two categories selected (Q-sorted) one hundred specially devised items to describe self, ideal officer, and typical officer. Correlations between self and ideal officer were significantly greater in the career group, from which it can be inferred that a feeling of inadequacy or not measuring up may be a correlate of poor situational adjustment. Because correlations between self and typical officer were also greater in the career group, it is suggested that a feeling of "fitting in" is an important correlate of situational adjustment.

All of the previous studies found significant positive correlations between self-concept and sociometric status or between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, but two investigators found contradictory results. McIntyre (22, p. 626) attempted to confirm the Rogers hypothesis that individuals with high self-acceptance ought to enjoy greater acceptance by others. Two groups, most and least
accepted, were given the Phillips questionnaire, which measures expressed attitude of self-acceptance and acceptance of others, and McIntyre found that neither of the scores differed significantly between the groups; he concluded that the "... results of this study in no way support Rogers' view that better interpersonal relations are a function of better attitudes toward self and others."

The other study finding negative results was Larson's (20, p. 1847). In his dissertation, he defined accuracy of self-concept as the congruence between a subject's self-rating and the mean-rating of his four best friends. He defined stability of self-concept by the amount of difference between two of the subject's self-ratings separated by an interval of time. He did not find a significant correlation between stability of self-concept and sociometric status. But he did find a significant positive correlation between a subject's rating by others and the sociometric status of the subject.
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CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Subjects

The sample of subjects that was used in this study was taken from three different high schools in two different rural communities in North Texas. Two of the schools were public high schools; the other school was a parochial high school. The subjects consisted of the senior class from each of the three schools. One school had eighteen students in its senior class, one had thirteen students, and the other had thirty-four senior students. Some of the subjects lived on farms; the others lived in the little communities. The two communities, located about eighty miles north of Dallas, are situated in a prosperous farming area in North Central Texas. Most, if not all, of the subjects came from middle class families employed in farming or a related occupation.

The three questionnaires were given and the data collected during the English IV class period while all the seniors were together in their respective schools. The regular English instructor gave the instructions and administered the tests because it was felt that the students would be more cooperative if the regular teacher administered the tests.
Description of Measuring Instruments

Measure of Self-Concept

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was selected to measure self-concept. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was developed by William H. Fitts. It was published by the Counselor Recordings and Tests of Nashville, Tennessee in 1965.

The standardization group from which the norms were developed was a broad sample of 626 people. The sample included people from various parts of the country and age ranges from twelve to sixty-eight. There were approximately equal numbers of both sexes, both Negro and white subjects, representatives of all social, economic and intellectual levels and educational levels from the 6th grade through the Ph. D. degree.

Concerning the validity and reliability of this instrument, Congdon (1) used a preliminary (1958) version of the Scale and still obtained a reliability coefficient of .88 for the Total Positive Score. Due to the fact that this Scale has only recently been published, there are no other studies available concerning the validity or reliability of this instrument.

The Scale consists of one hundred self-descriptive statements which the subject uses to project his own picture of himself. The Scale is self-administering for either
individuals or groups and can be used with subjects aged twelve or higher and having at least a sixth grade reading level.

The Scale is available in two forms, a Counseling Form and a Clinical and Research Form. Both forms use the same test booklets and test items but the two forms are scored differently. The Counseling Form was employed in this investigation. There are several factors that are scorable on the Counseling Form, but only the Total Positive Score was used since it was the most relevant factor. Fitts comments on the Total P Score:

Total P Score . . . is the most relevant score on the counseling Form. It reflects the overall level of self esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of worth and value, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth; see themselves as undesirable; often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy; and have little faith or confidence in themselves (2, p. 2).

The subject responds to each statement by circling one of the five answers. Depending on how the statement "fits" the particular individual taking the test, he circles one of the following answers: completely false; mostly false; partly false and partly true; mostly true; and completely true. The statements concern areas such as feelings about yourself; how you perceive yourself; how you think your parents and family see you; how you think your friends see you; and how you feel about your interpersonal relations.
All the subjects' scores were checked for defensiveness, indicated by a high defensive score. A highly defensive individual would consciously or unconsciously answer the questions in such a manner that his self-concept would be unrealistically high. Such defensiveness would invalidate the variable being measured. Three subjects appeared to be slightly defensive, but since there were just three from a total of sixty-five subjects, and also the defensiveness was only slight, the three subjects were not excluded from the sample. It was felt that this would in no way invalidate or significantly influence the results.

Sociometric Measure

In order to determine sociometric status, a sociometric questionnaire (See Appendix B) was given to the sixty-five subjects from the three senior classes. The questionnaire consisted of three criteria; personal, social, and work. Each of the three criteria had a positive aspect and a negative aspect. Questions 1 and 2 were the personal criteria, question 1 being the positive and question 2 being the negative aspect; question 3 and 4 were the social criteria, question 3 being the positive and question 4 being the negative aspect; questions 5 and 6 were the work criteria, question 5 being the positive aspect and question 6 being the negative aspect.
The instructor read the six questions to the students, instructing them merely to list, on a piece of paper, the desired names for each question. They were instructed to make their choices from within the senior class. The instructor told the students that the information would be kept confidential and the other students would not know who their choices for the six different questions were.

The instructor did not request any specific number of names on each question. She just instructed them to list names for each question, allowing the student to choose any number of names.

After listing their choices for each of the six questions, the students were instructed to sign their papers and fold them. When this was done, the papers were collected by the instructor.

Next, the experimenter quantified these sociometric choices by arbitrarily assigning a value of plus one to each name or choice listed for a positive question and a minus one to each name or choice listed for a negative question. Every time an individual was listed for a positive question, a value of one was added to that individual's total sociometric status score. Every time a name was listed for a negative question, a value of one was subtracted from that individual's total sociometric status score. Sociometric choices were thus converted into
numerical values in order to investigate the relation to the other two variables, self-concept and the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations Scale.

**Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations**

The third variable to be studied in this investigation was concerned with the extent to which an individual does things that would cause others to like themselves. To measure the extent to which one creates self-esteem in others, the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations was employed. The Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations is an unpublished questionnaire developed by Merl Bonney at North Texas State University. It was specifically designed to measure the extent to which one's behavior engenders self-esteem in others (See Appendix A). Because it is unpublished, there are no studies available concerning the reliability and validity of this instrument.

The questionnaire was originally designed to be used by one person to rate another or for the individual to rate himself. The questionnaire consists of thirty-three questions, with each question having four different levels or categories for answers. The individual rates himself or another by checking the level or category that "fits" him. Because the test was originally designed to measure or rate a specified individual, the questions were revised; instead of referring to a particular
individual, they were reworded so that the student could list his choice of individuals for each of the four different categories on each question.

The teacher instructed the students to read the question and the four levels or categories following each question. They were told to list the name of a class member by each category or level. The name listed for the category consequently "fit" that category, according to the individual answering the questionnaire, better than any other member of the class.

In scoring the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations the choices were quantified by arbitrarily assigning a value of three to the first level or category, two to the second category, one to the third, and minus one to the fourth and last level or category. An individual receiving a choice or being listed for a first category would, as a result, receive a value of three. If an individual was listed for a third level choice, he would receive a value of two. A person's score on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations would thus be the sum of the points acquired by summing up all his points earned on the thirty-three different questions answered by all the members of his class.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Presentation of Data

The results obtained from the procedures described in Chapter II were statistically examined as described in Chapter I. Coefficients of correlation, which demonstrate the relationship between the various variables, are given in Table I. They are also stated when needed at various points in the discussion. The t-test of significance of correlation for the various correlations between the variables is illustrated in Table II.

TABLE I

CORRELATION BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT, SOCIOMETRIC STATUS AND INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sociometric Status</th>
<th>Self-Concept</th>
<th>Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Personal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>331.29</td>
<td>202.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>157.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 5 per cent level of significance
TABLE II

SIGNIFICANCE OF CORRELATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Between Variables</th>
<th>r.</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1* and 2**</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 3***</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variable 1* = Sociometric Status  
**Variable 2** = Self-Concept  
***Variable 3*** = Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations

Self-Concept and Sociometric Status

Hypothesis I stated that there would be a significant positive correlation between self-concept and sociometric status. Those individuals of a group with a high or favorable concept of themselves will rank high sociometrically in the group, and those members of a group with a poor, low, or unfavorable self-concept will rank low sociometrically. A Pearson coefficient of correlation was employed to determine the relationship between these two variables, and revealed a positive correlation of .30 (See Table I). A t-test of significance of correlation indicated that the correlation of .30 between the variables self-concept and sociometric status was significant at the .05 per cent level of confidence (See Table II).
Sociometric Status and Inter-Personal Relation Scale

Hypothesis II stated that there would be a significant positive correlation between sociometric status and the scores made on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one's behavior engenders self-esteem in others. Those individuals making high scores on Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations will also rank high sociometrically. A positive correlation of .61 was obtained between sociometric status and scores on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations (See Table I). A t-test of significance of correlation revealed that the correlation of .61 was significant at the .05 per cent level of confidence (See Table II).

Self-Concept and Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations

Hypothesis III stated that there would be a significant positive correlation between self-concept and scores made on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one behaves in such a way that he causes others to like themselves. Those group members making high scores on the Inter-Personal Relation Questionnaire will have high self-concepts. A positive correlation of .19 was obtained between self-concept and score on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations. The t-test of significance of correlation revealed that the correlation of .19 was not significant at the .05 per cent level, although it was
significant well beyond the .10 per cent level of confidence. Had the test of coefficient of correlation reached .20, the hypothesis would have been confirmed.

Discussion of Data

The results presented in the foregoing section are similar to the research reported in Chapter I, in that this study also found a significant positive correlation between sociometric status and self-concept as proposed in Hypothesis I. This would tend to support the ideas suggested by Rogers, Fromm and Horney.

Hypothesis II, which stated that there would be a significant positive correlation between sociometric status and scores on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations, was tested and confirmed. A significant positive correlation of .61 was found to exist between these two variables. The results would tend to confirm Bonney's thesis that we like others because they make us like ourselves, in that individuals who score high on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations Scale also rank high sociometrically.

As previously stated, no related research was offered concerning Hypothesis III, since this idea has never been investigated. This is partially explained by the fact that Bonney's thesis, which is the center of Hypothesis III, is relatively new. No one to date has measured the extent to which one so behaves as to cause others to like themselves.
The lack of a significant correlation between self-concept and scores on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations, as postulated in Hypothesis III suggests two possible explanations: (a) either the relationship between self-concept and the mutually perceived relationships between people is influenced by factors other than those implied in Bonney's thesis or (b) the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale may not have been sensitive enough to "pick up" fine discriminations necessary for an adequate assessment as required for the present study.

In view of the fact that the obtained correlation was significant well beyond the 10 per cent level of confidence and that the writings of Rogers, Horney, Fromm and Bonney would make this relationship appear to be psychologically sound, the first explanation is tentatively rejected; on the other hand, since neither of the instruments used to examine this hypothesis possess demonstrable validity, the second explanation offered above would appear to be more reasonable. In addition, since the actual interaction of this sample population was not specifically assessed, it may be possible that some instrument such as Bales Interaction Process Analysis technique (1), used to assess the interaction of people in groups, may provide information that would make this relationship more obvious. Such an instrument would provide data concerning the positive and
negative communications between people as they occur over a period of time. A comparison of these data with that obtained from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations may provide greater support for Bonney's thesis. Any change in self-concept that might occur because of measurable positive communications directed towards an individual over a period of time would tend to support Bonney's thesis that we like others to the extent to which they make us like ourselves. Research designed to include such a measure of social interaction would need to be conducted and negative results obtained before the accuracy of Bonney's thesis could be questioned.
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CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the three variables, self-concept, sociometric status, and scores on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one behaves in such a manner as to cause others to like themselves. The importance of the variables, self-concept and sociometric status, in personality adjustment has long been recognized, but the other variable in this study, scores on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations, is new and has never been subjected to research. To test the relationship between these three variables and study the ideas proposed by Rogers, Fromm, Bonney, Horney and Reichmann, the following hypotheses were formed.

Hypothesis I: There will be a significant positive correlation between self-concept and sociometric status. Those individuals of a group with a high or favorable concept of themselves will rank high sociometrically in the group, and those members of a group with a poor, low or unfavorable self-concept will rank low sociometrically.

Hypothesis II: There will be a significant positive correlation between sociometric status and scores made on
a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one behaves in such a way as to cause others to like themselves. Those group members making high scores on the questionnaire will rank high sociometrically.

Hypothesis III: There will be a significant positive correlation between self-concept and scores on a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which one behaves in such a way as to cause others to like themselves. Those group members making high scores on the questionnaire will also have high self-concepts.

The sample of subjects consisted of sixty-five subjects. The subjects composed the senior classes from three small high schools located in two small communities in North Central Texas. One school's senior class had thirty-four members; one had eighteen; and the other had thirteen. The questionnaires used in this study were administered by the regular English IV teacher in the respective schools. It was felt that this would help insure the validity of the responses to the instruments.

The sociometric status of the sample of subjects was determined by administering a three-question sociometric questionnaire. This questionnaire provided personal, social, and work criteria, with a positive and negative aspect for each of the three criteria. Sociometric status was then computed and converted into quantitative terms for research purposes.
The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was administered to the groups in order to measure each individual's self-concept. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale is a recently published scale; consequently, validity studies on it are lacking. The Counseling Form was used. The Total P score, measuring overall level of self-esteem, was scored and used as the index of self-concept.

The third variable studied was measured by the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations. This is an unpublished questionnaire developed by Merl Bonney, at North Texas State University, in Denton, Texas. The Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations was designed to measure the extent to which one so behaves as to cause others to like themselves. The subjects of this study listed a name by each category on the thirty-three different questions. The four categories for each question were given values 3, 2, 1, and minus 1. Scores on the questionnaire were thus computed for each individual by simply adding up the value associated with each category for which that particular individual was listed.

To test the three hypotheses, Pearson's coefficient of correlation was computed between the respective variables. To test the significance of these correlation coefficients, the t-test of significance of correlation was employed.
The results of this study support Hypothesis I in that a significant positive correlation of .30 was found to exist between self-concept and sociometric status. This would provide support to the ideas proposed by Rogers, Horney, Fromm and Reichmann.

Hypothesis II proposed a significant positive correlation between sociometric status and scores on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations. The results of this study confirm this hypothesis with a significant correlation of .61.

The results of this study did not confirm Hypothesis III, since the obtained correlation of .19 between self-concept and scores on the Questionnaire on Inter-Personal Relations was significant well beyond the .10 per cent level of confidence, but did not reach the required .05 per cent level of confidence. Since there was only a .01 numerical value less than that required for an acceptable test of significance, a definite tendency was observed for those who scored high on the questionnaire to also hold a high or favorable concept of themselves.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONS

Directions: List a class member by each category, that would "fit" that category better than any other class member.

1. In a small group who stimulates others to talk about their experiences and accomplishments and asks their opinions and preferences on a wide range of topics?

   __Very generally in most groups
   __Sometimes in certain groups
   __Occasionally in a few preferred groups
   __Rarely or never in any group

2. Who indirectly compliments others by making favorable remarks in their presence about a category of people to which they belong, such as something commendable about Negroes, teachers, Germans, Mormons, old people, women, etc.

   __Quite often in numerous situations
   __Sometimes in particular kinds of situations
   __Occasionally in very selective situations
   __Rarely or never under any conditions

3. When meeting others who introduces some form of humor, such as kidding remarks, a story or pleasantries, or responds humorously to the remarks of others?

   __Quite frequently in most all small social gatherings
   __Sometimes when certain people are present
   __Occasionally when he feels very good with close friends
   __Hardly ever under any circumstances

4. In a group discussion situation who introduces (or contributes to) topics of discussion relating to matters of general interest, such as politics, sports, current books or shows, or topics of general local interest?

   __Very generally in nearly all groups
   __Sometimes in familiar groups
   __Occasionally in small groups of close associates
   __Seldom in any group
5. When talking with others who maintains good eye contact with them and shows other kinds of overt attentive responses, such as in posture and in voice and in being free from distractive behaviors?

- Very generally with nearly all people
- Usually with most people
- Fairly regularly, but only with close friends
- Not very consistently with anyone

6. Who helps others by doing such things as loaning books or household articles, offering a ride in his car, running errands for them when they are sick, or assisting them with their school work?

- Frequently for numerous people
- Sometimes for some people
- Occasionally for a few people
- Very seldom for anyone

7. Outside of work assignments, who initiates contacts with others for purely personal satisfactions, such as for companionship, small talk, social visiting, and exchange of stories and humor?

- Quite often with numerous persons
- Sometimes with some people he knows quite well
- Occasionally with a few close friends
- Hardly ever with anyone

8. In direct contacts with others who makes it clear by what he says and the way he acts that he wants them to respond in any manner that seems appropriate to them such as by simply telling a story, relating an experience, showing something he has made or purchased, and letting his associates feel free to make any response whatever that they wish to make without any cues from him as to how he thinks they should respond?

- Nearly always with everybody
- Usually with most people
- Sometimes with close associates
- Only occasionally with a few individuals
9. In his associations with these people who respond to them in ways which seem to be appropriate to the way they perceive themselves, such as accepting their view of themselves as an "intellectual", or as being socially inferior, or as possessing superior social prestige, or as having strong sexual or materialistic motivations?

- Most of the time with most individuals
- Sometimes with some persons
- Occasionally in special situations with a few individuals
- Seldom or never with anyone

10. When it becomes evident that he must strongly disagree with others' beliefs or actions who induces them to relate their side of the story, tell them clearly but unemotionally why he thinks they are wrong, but lets them know that his disagreement with them does not mean personal rejection?

- Generally with most people
- Sometimes with good friends
- Occasionally with a few of his best friends
- Seldom or never with anyone

11. Who says or does some things which serve to protect the self-esteem of certain other individuals, especially when they are involved in embarrassing situations, by "covering up" for them or by "giving them a way out" when they violate a form of social etiquette, make mistakes in grammar, say something foolish, or are devaluated because of an unsavory family connection?

- Quite often for numerous individuals
- Sometimes for a few people
- Occasionally for highly preferred persons
- Seldom or never for anyone

12. Who, as others interact with him, do they seem to assume is psychologically strong enough to stand humorous (and some not so humorous) attacks on him, such as ribbing or kidding him about a recent experience or a long-standing peculiarity, or making brutally frank remarks with an attitude of "I know he can take it"?

- Some do quite frequently
- Some do occasionally
- A few do on rare occasions
- This very rarely or never happens
13. In his relationships with people who shows considerable self-autonomy, as by obviously not agreeing with everything they say, by ignoring some of their behavior, by not catering to them with unasked-for services or gifts, and by obviously expecting to be treated as one of equal status with others present?

_____ Quite generally in nearly all social situations
_____ Sometimes with some people
_____ Occasionally with a few individuals
_____ Seldom or never with anyone

14. In his contacts with others who holds his own ground by insisting that others do their share of work in a joint undertaking, return things or money borrowed, pay their share of expenses, and listen to his side of disagreements?

_____ Nearly always in most all situations
_____ Usually in some kinds of situations
_____ Occasionally in certain group situations
_____ Seldom in any circumstance

15. In a small group who engages in kinds of behavior which the others perceive as being very mature and appropriate, such as telling jokes or making "wise-cracks" which are keenly enjoyed, introducing games or other forms of entertainment which are readily accepted, telling about experiences or things read which others respond to with interest and enjoyment?

_____ Quite often in numerous group situations
_____ Sometimes in certain kinds of situations
_____ Occasionally in very unusual situations
_____ Seldom or never in any kind of groups

16. Who influences others to participate in some forms of personal-social behavior which would be expected to raise their self-esteem, such as teaching or encouraging them to learn to dance, play bridge, initiate social contacts, or join a club?

_____ Numerous people over a period of years
_____ Some individuals over a period of years
_____ A few individuals under favorable circumstances
_____ Rarely or never
17. When he becomes friendly with others who treats them as individuals of equal personal adequacy, without any implications that his interest in them is primarily motivated by desires to try to save them from some kind of personal weakness, such as social rejection or loneliness?

- Quite generally with nearly all associates
- Usually with most people
- Fairly often with people who are only slightly known
- Seldom with anyone

18. Whose level of achievement or competence arouses admiration or respect in most of his age-level associates, as shown by their verbal or written statements, seeking him out for association or for advice, and evidences of wanting to be publicly identified with him?

These kinds of responses are shown:
- By a good many of his associates
- By some associates who know him very well
- By only a few associates
- Rarely by anyone

19. In responding to others who tell him about some of their serious personal faults, mistakes, unethical or immoral behavior, who maintains an non-judgmental attitude, such as by listening attentively but saying nothing, or by such remarks as "We all make mistakes", "So you think you made a fool of yourself", or by relating similar mistakes of his own?

- Frequently with numerous people
- Sometimes with certain people
- Occasionally with a few close associates
- Seldom with anyone

20. In talking with others who expresses his sincere and honest opinions about their clothes, beliefs, their cars, house decorations, etc.?

- Quite generally with nearly all people
- Usually with most people
- Occasionally with close associates
- Rarely with anyone
21. Whose personal support from others is based on his abilities, contributions, or social worth as opposed to appeals based on weakness or demands for sympathy?

____ Very generally with nearly all people
____ Usually with most people
____ Occasionally with selected individuals
____ Seldom with anyone

22. In his behavior toward other people who stimulates them to live up to their better conceptions of themselves, by inviting them to do things he knows are in accord with their higher standards, by verbally supporting such behavior standards, and by suggesting new ways of enhancing systems?

____ Quite often with numerous individuals
____ Sometimes with close associates
____ Occasionally with a few best friends
____ Seldom or never with anyone

23. When his associates suffer some kind of misfortune such as a serious illness or an accident, or are involved in such family reverses as divorce or desertion, who gives assurances, directly or indirectly, of his concern and continued personal support?

____ Very generally with all his associates
____ Usually with most of his more intimate associates
____ Occasionally with only his closest friends
____ Seldom or never with anyone

24. Who is discriminating in his use of praise and other expressions of appreciation, as shown by his giving such expressions only when someone has done something quite special for him, and when his feelings are genuine and sincere?

____ Very generally with nearly everyone
____ Usually with most people
____ Occasionally with selected individuals
____ Rarely with anyone

25. Who can sense accurately what is, and is not, most appropriate at a given time and place, such as knowing when to tell a joke, how long to keep talking on a particular topic, when to turn off a record-player, and when to go home?

____ Very generally in nearly all situations
____ Sometimes in most situations
____ Occasionally in very familiar situations
____ Only rarely with very close associates
26. When he is associated with others who are obviously in some kind of inferior category to himself because of social status, rank, educational or occupational level, who tries to make them feel comfortable by not flaunting his superiority and by playing up their assets?

Very generally in nearly all such relationships
Usually in most situations of this type
Occasionally with certain individuals
Seldom with anyone of this type

27. When his associates have some kind of success or highly satisfying personal experiences who shares their happiness by expressing feelings of joy for them, such as showing delight when they win a prize, get a promotion, announce an engagement of marriage, or get accepted into a desired social group?

Very generally with most of his associates
Sometimes with preferred individuals
Occasionally with very close friends
Seldom or never with anyone

28. When in the presence of others whose behavior is characterized by relaxation and poise, particularly in reference to being free from irritating mannerisms such as head scratching, muscle twitching, tapping and unpleasant sounds?

Very generally in nearly all situations
Usually in most groups
Occasionally when with close associates
Seldom in any inter-personal relationship

29. In his contacts with others who responds to them individually by making remarks which apply distinctly to them, by listening to their views, and by being sensitive to their expressed feelings, and their psycho-motor tensions?

Quite generally with most people
Sometimes with certain kinds of people
Occasionally with a few individuals
Seldom with anyone
30. In his associations with others who actively participates by being responsive to what others say, by showing animation and spontaneity, and by being in rapport with the on-going inter-personal exchange?

____ Very generally in nearly all associations
____ Sometimes in most associations
____ Occasionally in certain kinds of situations
____ Seldom or never in any situation.

31. When he is in a bad mood such as hostile, discouraged, morose, or depressed, who keeps his feelings to himself so that his inter-personal relationships are not affected?

____ Very generally in all inter-personal situations
____ Usually in most inter-personal contacts
____ Occasionally with some people
____ Seldom with anyone

32. Who compliments others for small evidences of personal qualities which he hopes to induce them to develop more of, such as praising them for showing indications of greater masculinity, responsibility, or affection?

____ Quite often with numerous people
____ Sometimes with some individuals
____ Occasionally with a few persons
____ Seldom or never with anyone

33. Whose personal appearance, clothes and grooming attractive and pleasing to others?

____ Practically all the time with nearly everyone
____ Usually with most people
____ Occasionally on special occasions
____ Seldom or never in any situation
APPENDIX B

SOCIOMETRIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

If the Students ask how many names to put for each question just tell them to list as many as they want. Also, mention the fact that they can use the same person or persons more than once. They will need to put their name on the paper. Tell them to use the student's first and last name.

Questions

I. Of the students in the Senior Class, who would you most prefer to have as a friend -- who would you most like to have as a good friend?

II. Of the students in the Senior Class, who would you least prefer to have as a friend -- who would you not care to have as a friend?

III. Of the students in the Senior Class, who would you most prefer to go riding around or fooling around with?

IV. Of the students in the Senior Class, who would you least prefer to go riding around or just fooling around with?

V. If the Senior Class undertook some big project and everybody had to work on the project, who in the Senior Class would you most prefer to work with?
VI. If the Senior Class undertook some big project and everybody had to work on the project, who in the Senior Class would you prefer to work with?
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