

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindor

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

---

9-4-1962

### The influence of situational variables on level of self-acceptance.

Kenneth S. Solway  
*University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Solway, Kenneth S., "The influence of situational variables on level of self-acceptance." (1962). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6318.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6318>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email ([scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca)) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

THE INFLUENCE OF SITUATIONAL VARIABLES  
ON  
LEVEL OF SELF-ACCEPTANCE

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies through the  
Department of Psychology in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts at Assumption  
University of Windsor

by  
Kenneth S. Solway  
B.A., Assumption University of Windsor, 1960

Windsor, Ontario  
1962

**ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**

UMI Number: EC52497

### INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

**UMI**<sup>®</sup>

---

UMI Microform EC52497

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC  
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway  
PO Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Approved by:

M.A. Record e.s.B.

R.A. Kelly

B.R. Philip

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

## ABSTRACT

Carl Rogers (1951) maintains that the self-concept and self-acceptance are consistent components within individuals. Numerous attempts to verify this proposition have been unable to produce clear results. The present study has examined the influence of experimentally induced success and failure on consistency of self-acceptance.

Three groups of 20 subjects, matched on the basis of age, sex, intelligence and level of self-acceptance, were selected to test the hypothesis. One group was called the success group, a second, the failure group and the third, the control group. Performance on a fictional perceptual discrimination task supposedly related to success or failure in university graduation was employed to provide the experimental conditions.

A complex analysis of variance was applied to scores on a self-acceptance test before and after the induction of success and failure. An F value of .63 not significant at the 5% level of confidence was obtained. A significant difference was obtained, however, at the 1% level of confidence within the success group. Results are tentative in the absence of test reliability.

## PREFACE

Experimentation with the concepts of 'self' and 'self-acceptance' has been greatly hampered due to methodological and theoretical problems. In this study the problem concerning consistency or generality of self-acceptance is investigated. Since Carl R. Rogers has been most influential in this field, Roger's definitions are employed operationally to define 'self' and 'self-acceptance'. The specific hypothesis tested was that experimentally induced success and failure would have no significant effect on the level of self-acceptance.

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to Reverend M. A. Record, C.S.B., M.A., for his advise and guidance in the preparation of this study. Similar gratitude must also be extended to Brother R. Philip, F.S.C., Ph.D., and Dr. Rudolf A. Helling, Ph.D., for their counsel and inspiration. The author would also like to thank the students who took part in the experimentation. Finally, this project might never have been completed without the help of Reverend R. C. Fehr, C.S.B., Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
ABSTRACT . . . . .	iii
PREFACE . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Background of Related Research . . . . .	2
Research Involving the Generality of Consistency of Self . . . . .	3
Purpose of Present Research . . . . .	5
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	8
II METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	10
Experimental Sample . . . . .	10
Instrument Employed to Measure Self-Acceptance . . . . .	12-A
Experimental Procedure . . . . .	14
III PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS . . . . .	16
Main Analysis . . . . .	16
Supplementary Analysis . . . . .	
Part I . . . . .	18
Part II . . . . .	19
IV DISCUSSION OF RESULTS . . . . .	22
Main Analysis . . . . .	23
Supplementary Analysis . . . . .	26
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	31
Summary . . . . .	31
Conclusions . . . . .	32
APPENDIX A (1) . . . . .	35
APPENDIX A (2) . . . . .	36
APPENDIX A (3) . . . . .	37
APPENDIX B . . . . .	38
APPENDIX C (1) . . . . .	41
APPENDIX C (2) . . . . .	42
APPENDIX D . . . . .	43
APPENDIX E . . . . .	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	45

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Matching of Success (S), Failure (F) and Control (C) Groups for Level of Self-Acceptance Score, Age, Intelligence (N-20)	11
2.	Matching of Success (S), Failure (F) and Control (C) Groups for Sex . . . . .	11
3.	Significance of Differences Between the Three Groups for the 5 Most Desirable Traits and 5 Least Desirable Traits . . . .	12
4.	Analysis of Variance for Changes in Level of Self-Acceptance in Three Groups (Success, Failure, Control) Before and After the Experimental Induction of Success and Failure . . . . .	17
5.	Significance of Difference for Self-Acceptance Scores Within Groups After the Experimental Conditions . . . . .	18
6.	Significance of Difference Within Groups After the Experimental Conditions for Positive and Negative Traits . . . . .	20



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Research in self-psychology has flourished despite both theoretical and methodological problems concerning the nature and existence of a self-concept. Interest in this field was first generated by such writers as Fromm (1939) and Horney (1937) who claimed that love of one's self was a necessary preliminary for love of another. Adler (1924) wrote that a tendency to disparage arose out of a feeling of inferiority as an over-compensation. Sullivan (1947) defined psychiatry as the study of interpersonal relations and claimed that an individual manifests mental health or mental disorder within these relations.

The greatest influence which became the key to the resurgence of interest in self and self-in-relationship in personality dynamics was provided by Rogers and his associates at the University of Chicago. Rogers' (1951) hypothesis that a person who accepts himself thoroughly will necessarily improve his relationship with those with whom he has personal contact, because of his greater understanding and acceptance of them, led to a series of empirical studies attempting to test these propositions.

## BACKGROUND OF RELATED RESEARCH

Positive relationships between acceptance of self and good interpersonal relations were discovered by Rainy (1948), Sheerer (1949), Stock (1949), Bills, Vance and McLean (1951), Rudicoff (1952), Mowrer (1953), Butler and Haigh (1954) Hanlon, Hoffstaetter and O'Connor (1954), Kennedy (1958) and Omwake (1959). Meanwhile Meltzer (1953), Fey (1954), Zimmer (1954) and Zuckerman (1956) report negative findings; self-acceptance is not related to good interpersonal relations.

Another series of studies dealing with self-acceptance and adjustment was also stimulated by Rogers (1951). He stated,

It would occur that when all the ways in which the individual perceives himself -- all perceptions of the qualities, abilities, impulses and attitudes of the person and all perceptions of himself in relation to others -- are accepted into the organized conscious concept of the self, then this achievement is accompanied by feelings of comfort and freedom from tension which are experienced as psychological adjustment.

Empirical evidence in favor of Rogers' formation is provided by McQuitty (1950), Cowen (1953), Chase (1957), Rapaport (1958), Smith (1958), Turner and Vanderlippe (1958) and Akeret (1959). The results of Freedman's study (1955) reject a simple relationship between acceptance of self and adjustment, while Chodorkoff (1954) and Block and Thomas (1955) argue against a linear relationship and point to a curvilinear relationship between the two variables.

## Research Involving the Generality or Consistency of Self

Because consistency or generality of the self-concept and self-acceptance has often been assumed, relevant literature is quite scanty. Butler and Haigh (1954) report a rise in the level of self-esteem and adjustment as a consequence of client-centered therapy. A product-moment correlation of .01 between self and ideal self-concepts was found in a group prior to client-centered therapy. After therapy a correlation of .36 is reported. For the control group this correlation remained between .57 and .58.

Thorne (1954) found that following induced failure on a mirror drawing task, subjects whose initial level of self-acceptance was high tended to lower their self-ratings in the direction of a more realistic evaluation while originally low self-accepting subjects tended to increase self-acceptance scores and showed concern over loss of self-esteem. These results suggest that self-acceptance is influenced by environmental events and that persons respond self-reflexively to perceived successes and failures.

Sharma (1956) found that significant changes in self-esteem did occur under conditions of stress and support. Two experimental groups changed their self-esteem scores significantly more than the control group but the pattern of change was uninterpretable. Further, those whose self-esteem scores changed under stress were found to have exhibited different personality characteristics in the pretest than those who changed in the supporting situation.

Stotland and Zander (1958) on the other hand, found that performance on a visual motor task (competition on a puzzle) did not produce any consistent consequences on self-evaluation a) in the area of visual motor coordination ability employed in the task, or b) in the individual taken as a whole. These results coincide with an earlier experiment performed by Stotland, Thorley, Thomas, Cohen and Zander (1957). Their hypothesis that general self-esteem was too enduring a characteristic to be effected by a single experimental failure on a puzzle was substantiated.

In accordance with their hypothesis, Diggory and Magaziner (1959) report that subjects who failed on a capacity on which they had originally rated themselves low did not change as many self-ratings nor change them as much as did the original high-raters. However, no significant effects on global self-evaluation ratings were found for either group.

Wylie (1961) in a survey of literature on self-concept experimentation concludes that subjects will, under certain conditions, change their characteristic level of self-evaluation after experimentally induced success and failure. These changes, however, are more likely to occur on the experimental task itself, or on the characteristic which has been evaluated rather than on the entire self-acceptance framework. She concludes,

Numerous scaling and measurement problems make the changes which do occur difficult to interpret. Findings of no change in global self-regard after a single failure are congruent with self-concept theory but such null findings cannot be clearly interpreted without experimental replication.

## PURPOSE OF PRESENT RESEARCH

The problem for this proposed research grows out of the need of refined theoretical and methodological constructs in "self" experimentation. Heretofore research in this area has been difficult to interpret.

### Theoretical and Methodological Problems in the Area

There is no single definition of the self which would be acceptable to all. Two meanings out of many predominate first, the self as subject or agent, second, the self as the individual who is known to himself (English and English, 1958). The terms "self", and "self-acceptance" and "self-concept" are commonly used with reference to the latter. Although the majority of research on self-acceptance has been based on Rogers' phenomenological theory, there is a whole gamut of empirical studies based on other theories which incorporate this construct. (Block and Thomas, 1955, La Forge and Suczek, 1955).

Research has been hampered because of the logically impossible task of establishing an external criterion with which to validate self-acceptance tests. A survey of the literature reveals that a new self-acceptance test is devised for virtually every experiment (Crowne and Stephens, 1961). Apparently, it is assumed, first, that these instruments have face validity; and second, that they measure similar characteristics of the self-acceptance construct.

Acceptance of face validity assumes adherence to

the validity of self reports -- a construct of Rogers' phenomenology. Wylie (1961) puts forward the view that it would be naive to imply that an individual's self report is determined solely by his phenomenal field:

... it is obvious that such responses may also (reflect) be influenced by (a) subject's intent to select what he wishes to reveal to the E; (b) subject's intent to say that he has attitudes or perceptions which he does not have; (c) subject's response habits, particularly those involving introspection and the use of language; (d) a host of situational and methodological factors which may not only induce variations on (a), (b) and (c) but may exert other more superficial influences on the responses obtained.

Criticism extends also to the construct validity of self-acceptance instruments. We have already noticed that the numerous self-acceptance tests have been assumed to be equivalent operations for measuring the characteristics incorporated in the concept. Empirical evidence does not support this assumption. Cowen (1956) reports no correlation between two self-acceptance measures derived from self, ideal-self discrepancy scores (Bill's Index of Adjustment and Values (IAV) (1952) and Brownfain's (1952) Self-Rating Inventory). Omwake (1954) reports a correlation of .55 between the IAV "self-acceptance" score and the "self" score on the (1951) Attitudes Toward Self and Others Questionnaire of Philips; and a correlation of .49 between the "self-acceptance" score on Bill's IAV and Berger's (1952) "self-acceptance" scale.

Another problem in the construction of "self-acceptance" measures involves the method of selection of

test items. Theoretical considerations involved in the definition of the concept of "self" renders universal selection of "self-evaluative" behaviour impossible. As a result, it is further impossible to calculate a representative sample of self-referent behaviour items and to generalize from one experimental setting to another.

The instrument used to measure "self-acceptance" may impose external boundaries on the subject's freedom of response. If so, we have prevented true expression of the subject's conscious feelings. Jones (1956) reports that in a free choice Q-sort setting, both normal and abnormal subjects produced a V-shaped sorting rather than the expected normal distribution.

The influence of social desirability (Edwards, 1957) on test items of both "self-acceptance" and "self-report" inventories must also be considered. Edwards (1957) provides evidence concerning the tendency for subjects to attribute to themselves personality statements with high socially desirable scale values and the tendency to disassociate statements with low scale values. Kenny (1956) gave 25 self-descriptive items employed by Zimmer (1954) to a group of judges for social desirability scaling. When these items were given to three independent groups of subjects in the form of a questionnaire, a self-descriptive rating scale and a Q-sort, rank order correlations with the SD scale were .82, .81, and .66 respectively. Cowen and Tongas (1959) report a product-moment correlation of .91 between social desirability ratings and the "self-concept" score on Bill's IAV

and a correlation of .96 between social desirability ratings and the "ideal self" score. Neglecting control of this variable on a "self-acceptance" instrument would render impossible a distinction of test results as a) a measure of self-acceptance; b) a measure of the need for the testee to conform to his conception of what is socially desirable.

The final problem is primarily theoretical; the generality of the "self-acceptance" concept. While difficulty in establishing the generality of the "self-concept" results from the inadequacy in refinement of "self" or "self-concept" definition, there is also an empirical need of evidence to prove or disprove the temporal stability of self-acceptance; the consistency of self-acceptance from one situation to another and the stability of self-acceptance in reference to different aspects of the self (e.g. moral "self" or intellectual "self").

The present study cannot fully resolve these conflicts. An attempt has been made to reduce the influence of the social desirability variable. The relevant literature has been carefully screened in the selection of a self-acceptance measure. Also, much effort has been consumed in reducing temporal and other influences.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Rogers (1951) suggests that:

As a result of the interaction with the environment and particularly as a result of evaluational interaction with others the structure of the self is formed - an organized fluid but consistent conceptual pattern of the perception of characteristics and relationship of the "I" and "me" together with values attached to their concepts.



It is also assumed (Butler & Haigh, 1954) that an individual will be able to order his self-perceptions along a continuum of value ranging from "like me" to "unlike me", and a continuum of value ranging from "like my ideal" to "unlike my ideal". The discrepancy between placement of the same characteristics on the two scales would yield operationally (a) the manner in which an individual views himself as possessing a given trait; (b) the degree to which he values this state. The total discrepancy between "self" and "ideal" would yield a measure of "self-acceptance". These constructs suggest that an individual's level of "self-acceptance" should not be significantly influenced by situational variables.

Crowne and Stephans (1961) suggest that if consistency in self-acceptance is found,

it would be reasonable to construe the self-concept, from which the discrepancy notion of self-acceptance is derived, as a meaningful variable on which there are consistent differences between subjects, and it would be highly appropriate to think of individuals in terms of their characteristic levels of self-acceptance. To the degree that self-acceptance is a function of variables associated with specific situations or types of situations, however, it will be more fruitful to investigate self-evaluative behaviour per se and its situational determinants.

This study proposes to investigate 1) the generality or consistency of self-acceptance; 2) the influence of experimentally induced success and failure on the level of self-acceptance.

It is hypothesized that experimentally induced success or failure will have no significant effect on levels of self-acceptance as defined by Rogers (1951).

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The present study has for its primary purpose the verification of Carl Rogers' hypothesis (1951) concerning the consistency of self-acceptance. The essential methodology of the study consisted in the administration and re-administration of a self-acceptance test to three equated groups of subjects. Re-administration of the self-acceptance test to two of the groups occurred immediately after the experimental induction of success and failure. The third group served as a control, hence were not exposed to the experimental conditions. This chapter deals first with the experimental sample selected; secondly, with the instrument used to measure self-acceptance; and thirdly, with the experimental procedure.

#### Experimental Sample

The total sample consisted of 176 Introductory Psychology students. From these 60 were selected and divided into three equal groups. The criterion for selection was that each of the groups contained a normal distribution of self-acceptance scores. Subjects were also selected so that the means of the groups were matched as closely as possible for level of self-acceptance, age (to the last birthday), intelligence (as measured by the College and

School Ability Test) and sex. Because a prediction of their success or failure in graduation from university was later divulged to 40 of this experimental sample, subjects employed in this study were, with few exceptions in preliminary or first year university.

Tables 1 and 2 indicate that there were no significant differences between groups of any of these variables.

Table 1

Matching of Success (S), Failure (F) and Control (C) Groups for Level of Self-Acceptance Score, Age, Intelligence (N=20)

		<u>S</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>t</u>
<u>Self-Acceptance</u>	<u>Mean</u>	76.40	71.85	74.55	SF = .80 FC = .45
	<u>S.D.</u>	23.74	17.13	22.92	CS = .33
<u>Age</u>	<u>Mean</u>	19.75	19.65	19.35	SF = .40 FC = .85
	<u>S.D.</u>	.61	1.87	1.31	CS = .14
<u>Intelligence</u>	<u>Mean</u>	308.37	309.90	309.05	SF = .44 FC = .09
	<u>S.D.</u>	6.47	8.13	7.80	CS = .48

\*  $t = 2.03$  for  $P = .05$

\*\*  $t = 2.72$  for  $P = .01$

Table 2

Matching of Success (S), Failure (F) and Control (C) Groups for Sex

	<u>S</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>M</u>	12	12	12
<u>F</u>	8	8	8

Edwards (1957) has revealed a tendency for subjects to endorse personality statements with high socially desirable scale values and to disassociate statements with low scale values. The 58 personality traits that were employed to measure self-acceptance in this study were scaled for their social desirability along a seven-point continuum (Appendix D) by a group of 43 introductory psychology students not used in the original sample. In this manner a social desirability scale value (Appendix E) was determined for each of the traits. On the 'Actual Possession of a Trait' scale the five most socially desirable traits, determined in the above mentioned manner were measured for each of the three groups in the main study. No significant difference on this variable between the groups was found as may be seen in Table 3, which gives the t values for the differences between groups.

TABLE 3

Significance of Differences Between the Three Groups for the 5 Most Desirable Traits and the 5 Least Desirable Traits

	<u>Success (S)</u>	<u>Failure (F)</u>	<u>Control (C)</u>	<u>t</u>
<u>5 Desirable Traits</u>				
<u>Mean</u>	3.79	3.88	3.78	SF = 0.69 FC = 0.42 CS = 0.04
<u>5 Undesirable Traits</u>				
<u>Mean</u>	1.55	1.48	0.33	SF = 1.92 FC = 1.48 CS = 0.33

t = 2.13 for P .05

t = 3.75 for P .01

On the basis of the analysis presented in Table 3 and the fact that the groups were homogeneous it was concluded that they were equated on the social desirability variable. Thus, the probability of endorsement of socially favourable or socially unfavourable items was the same for each of the groups.

Finally since the experimental conditions involved perceptual discriminations, subjects who complained of poor eyesight were eliminated.

#### Instrument Employed to Measure Self-Acceptance

Rogers (1951) maintains that an individual has a "self-concept" previously described as the individual's conscious and consistent pattern of perception of the "I" and "me". Rogers also maintains that an individual has an "ideal-self concept" or a concept of what he would most like to be. The degree to which an individual's "self-concept" is congruent or discrepant with an individual's "ideal-self concept" yields an index of self-acceptance.

Since the self is, by nature, not directly accessible to study, it can be studied only when it reveals the conscious verbal self. This is in accordance with Rogers' (1951) self hypothesis.

In this study, subjects were asked to rate 58 self-referent items (Appendix B) on two seven-point rating scales (Appendix C). Symonds (1924) suggests that seven is the optimal number of classes for rating human traits.

Kennedy (1958), in her study, requested 180 high

school senior and junior girls to list 16 adjectives (8 they liked in others; 8 they did not like) and to give a brief definition or description of the qualities listed. These subjects were also asked to categorize these qualities as social, intellectual, moral or physical, intending to focus their attention on the several aspects of personality. Frequency distributions yielded 176 qualities liked and disliked. In order to get some variance in the sorting of the adjectives and at the same time to have important concepts, adjectives mentioned more than five and less than eighteen times were chosen. Eighty adjectives fell within these cut-off points. A group of 30 girls were then asked to make a self-sort, employing these adjectives. The twenty showing the least variance, those chosen as being highly characteristic or very uncharacteristic were eliminated, leaving 60 adjectives for the final sorting of items. In the present study, two adjectives were omitted since it was felt that they would be inappropriate for the group tested. The use of a rating scale is based upon an experiment reported by Jones (1956), already cited.

The initial scale is titled the "Actual Possession of a Trait" (Appendix C (1) ). The latter is entitled the "Ideal Possession of a Trait" (Appendix C (2) ). The absolute sum of individual item discrepancies, disregarding the direction of discrepancy, will represent the level of self-acceptance. This procedure has been employed by Bills (1951), Sharma (1956) and Worchel (1957).

## Experimental Procedure

Initially, subjects (seen as a group) were given the self-acceptance test with instructions to be as honest as possible. They were told that the experimenter only would see their results and that group results rather than individual results were being investigated.

As a method for the induction of success and failure, each subject was seen individually. Students in Group S (Success Group) and Group F (Failure Group) were informed that they were taking part in another research project, undertaken by the Psychology Department and were requested to take a perceptual discrimination test.

An instrument constructed to determine the differential threshold of length was used to measure perceptual discrimination. Subjects were required to choose one peg differing in length from a group of four. The test was introduced by the following remarks:

You are now taking part in a perceptual discrimination test. We all know that one sign of wisdom is the ability to be intellectually discriminative. College students have been severely condemned for "parrotting back" the words of their professor, unable actually to apply what they have learned to new situations. Thus a graduate college student may still not be able to distinguish a good piece of art from a poor one (e.g. literature).

Much research in psychology of late has been centered around the relationship between perceptual and intellectual discrimination. The score you receive on this test will be compared with the scores of first year students from the U.S. We will be able to tell you what percentage of college students who obtained the same score as you have completed university. These percentages have been shown to be pretty reliable from one university to

AGGREGATION UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

another in the States. As far as we know, this is the first time it has been given at a Canadian university.

Each subject made twenty length discriminations. After each five discriminations, subjects in Group S were told they were doing quite well; subjects in Group F were told they were doing quite poorly, but to continue trying "even harder".

Subjects in Group S received highly favourable scores; subjects in Group F, low scores. The success group were told that four out of every five students who received the same score as they, graduated from university; the failure group were told that only one out of every five receiving a similar score graduated from university. Both groups also received information that the perceptual discrimination test proved to be an extremely reliable predictor of success ("eighty percent of the time"), in graduation at the University of Michigan. Immediately after they had received their score, each student was asked to re-take the self-acceptance test. Group C (Control Group) was also re-administered the self-acceptance test, individually, but they were not given the perceptual discrimination test.

After the second test, each student was asked if he had undergone any experiences during the interval between tests which might have significantly affected his self-esteem. This interval was a minimum of two weeks.



## CHAPTER III

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The present study has a two-fold purpose: first, to investigate the consistency or generality of self-acceptance; second, to investigate the effects of experimentally induced success and failure on the level of self-acceptance. To test this proposition, a complex analysis of variance with a triple classification (viz: Success, Failure, Control) was employed. Simple t tests for significance differences between means were used for a more complete analysis of the data.

Chapter III inspects the results of these calculations with a view to acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis.

#### Main Analysis

The absolute sum of individual item discrepancies has been used, disregarding the direction of discrepancy to represent an individual's level of self-acceptance.

In order to test the main hypothesis that experimentally induced success or failure would have no effect on level of self-acceptance a complex analysis of variance was employed. The results of this analysis are seen in Table 4.

Table 4

Analysis of Variance for Changes in Level of Self-Acceptance in 3 groups (Success, Failure, Control) Before and After the Experimental Induction of Success and Failure

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Variance Estimate
Individuals	434,125.88	177	2,452.68
Groups	52.22	2	26.11
Test Scores Before and After	547.60	1	547.60
Group x Test Scores Interaction	199.55	2	99.78
Remainder	28,056.35	177	158.51
Total	462,981.60	359	
For Groups	$F_{2,177} = 0.01$		
For Test Scores	$F_{1,177} = 3.45$		
For interaction	$F_{2,177} = 0.63$		

It is noted in Table 4 that the F value for the difference between groups using level of self-acceptance scores both before and after the experimental conditions was .01, which is not significant. An F value of 3.45 for the difference between self-acceptance scores before and after the experimental conditions for the three groups taken together is also noted in Table 4. This value is not significant but approaches significance at the 5% level of confidence ( $F = 3.84$  for  $P = .05$ ).

The final F value of .63 was obtained for the difference in self-acceptance scores between the groups as effected by the experimental induction of success and failure. This ratio was not significant.

#### Supplementary Analysis

Part I. The main analysis of the data reflects a trend towards increased self-acceptance, reflected by the lower scores after the experimental induction of success and failure. This trend was manifest when before and after scores of the three groups taken together were compared. These results suggested additional analysis of the data in order to determine to what extent these trends were operating within each group (viz: success, failure, control).

Table 5 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 5

Significance of the Difference for Self-Acceptance Scores Within Groups After the Experimental Conditions.

Group	Before		After		t value
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Success	76.40	23.74	63.30	22.39	3.72**
Failure	71.85	17.13	66.50	23.18	1.63
Control	74.55	22.92	70.30	23.60	1.91

\* t = 2.09 for P = .05

\*\* t = 2.86 for P = .01

Table 5 testifies that a significant increase in the level of self-acceptance at the 1% level of confidence has occurred within the group after the experimental induction of success. The change in the control group is significant at the 10% level of confidence ( $F=1.729$  for  $P=.10$ ). In fact somewhat significant changes are apparent in all three groups. These findings are in keeping with the results of the analysis of variance which reflected a trend operating after the experimental conditions in the three groups combined.

Part II. The results thus far have been calculated with reference to the absolute sum of individual item discrepancies for each person within a group. Of the 58 items 28 were designated positive or desirable personality traits, and 30 were designated negative or undesirable personality traits. A supplementary analysis was performed to determine whether the experimental induction of success and failure effected self-acceptance differently with respect to these positive and negative traits. Table 6 presents the results of this supplementary analysis.

Table 6

Significance of Difference Within Groups After the Experimental Conditions for Positive and Negative Traits

Group	Before Mean	Standard Deviation	After Mean	Standard Deviation	t value
<u>Success</u>					
Pos. Traits	30.90	16.07	23.80	18.55	2.52*
Neg. Traits	31.30	16.72	24.90	17.12	2.11*
<u>Failure</u>					
Pos. Traits	29.30	10.90	28.10	14.10	1.47
Neg. Traits	26.25	15.57	28.60	16.12	.77
<u>Control</u>					
Pos. Traits	26.45	13.22	29.95	12.12	1.40
Neg. Traits	28.80	22.50	33.95	19.91	1.24
* t = 2.09 for P = .05					
** t = 2.86 for P = .01					

Table 6 reveals that significant changes at the 5% level of confidence did occur within the success group for both positive and negative traits before and after the experimental conditions. However, it is apparent that the induction of success or failure did not differentially effect the two kinds of traits within each group.

In summary, the main findings in the present chapter indicate that there was no significant difference in level of self-acceptance between three groups (viz: success, failure, control) as the result of the experimental conditions imposed in this study. There is however, an over-all trend operating within the three groups taken together. This trend is significant at the 1% level of confidence within the

success group. Positive personality traits were shown not to be more significantly effected by the experimental conditions than negative personality traits.

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

On the basis of the Rogerian notion of self and self-acceptance (1951) it was hypothesized that experimentally induced success or failure would produce no significant differences in level of self-acceptance. Three matched groups, each of 20 students, selected from Introductory Psychology classes were used to test this hypothesis. Success and failure were experimentally induced using false norms applied to a perceptual discrimination test which supposedly predicted success or failure in university graduation.

Results presented in the main analysis of the foregoing chapter indicate that the hypothesis may be accepted, but only with reservation. This finding corroborates the general tendency manifest in previous research in this area. While the over-all shift between the groups before and after the experimental conditions lacked significance, a general trend was revealed. The main analysis also discloses that the mean self-acceptance score for each of the three groups were reduced after the experimental conditions. Thus there was an increase in level of self-acceptance for each of the groups.

Since the main analysis of the data revealed a trend with regard to changes in level of self-acceptance operating in the three groups taken together, a supplementary

analysis of the data was performed to investigate these changes as they existed within each group. Results of the supplementary analysis indicated a statistically significant increase in level of self-acceptance within the success group but not in the other groups, although the changes for these groups were in the same direction as for the success group.

Part II of the supplementary analysis reveals that positive and negative personality traits were not differentially effected by the experimental conditions.

It is the aim of the present chapter to discuss the above-mentioned findings in the light of previous studies in the area of the self concept, and to put forth some possible reasons for these results. The issues concerning the main hypothesis will be considered first. This will be followed by a discussion of the minor findings as derived from the supplementary analysis of the main hypothesis.

#### Main Analysis

In the previous chapter it has been shown that self-acceptance as defined by Rogers (1951) is not significantly influenced by success or failure. These results support those established in previous investigations. Stotland, Thorley, Thomas, Cohen and Zander (1957) working with a college sample found that general self-esteem was too enduring a characteristic to be influenced by a single



experimental failure on a puzzle task. Diggory and Magaziner (1959) in their study with a group of male college students, found no significant effect on global self-evaluation due to failure on a capacity which subjects initially rated as instrumental to goal achievement. No significant change in self-evaluation was also reported by Harvey, Kelly and Shapiro (1957). In the latter study, four degrees of unfavourable evaluations of the self made by other persons served as a method for the induction of failure.

While these studies agree in acceptance of the hypothesis that experimentally induced failure will not significantly effect level of self-acceptance it must be remembered that the experimental method for the induction of failure and hence, the degree of failure induced varies within each study. Each study also employs a different measuring instrument. The synthesis of the results of these studies as a verification of the hypothesis forwarded in the present study is therefore risky, since one study is not an exact replication of the other.

In the present research, it was felt that the experimental conditions may not have been sufficiently stimulating to produce significant changes in self-acceptance. Only two members of the failure group and four members in the success group stated, when questioned, that their self-acceptance changed as a result of the simulated test of success or failure. Thus the experimental task may have been qualitatively inappropriate for a university student.

A second reason for the failure to obtain significant changes in level of self-acceptance may be due to the homogeneity of the groups. Subjects in all three groups were matched for age, sex and intelligence. All subjects were either preliminary or first-year university students.

Since previous research with university students, cited above, indicates that this population is resistive to changes in self-evaluation, a more heterogeneous population may produce more significant results.

Unsuccessful attempts to produce changes in level of self-acceptance of university students by the experimental induction of success and failure may indicate that university students are quite self-satisfied. It is reasonable to assume that a single experimental success or failure would have little effect on a group who have already accepted themselves. Dittes (1959) found impulsivity of closure on three ambiguous tasks which were administered following the reception of experimental devaluation, only with subjects of characteristically low esteem. The experimental devaluation seemed to have no effect on the behaviour of subjects who had characteristically high self-esteem. Since the present study used university students this factor may also partially explain the lack of significant results.

While the mean self-acceptance scores for each group were not significantly different the level of self-acceptance varied for each individual within each group. Groups were chosen so that each would equally cover the

58792  
ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

entire range of self-acceptance scores. These heterogeneous distributions within each group may also have accounted for the failure to obtain significant results. Significant results may have appeared if the experimental sample were composed of three distinct groups each categorized by low, high or average self-acceptors. Further research concerning consistency of self acceptance might find this latter hypothesis quite valuable.

Interpretation of the findings in this study must take into account the lack of evidence in support of the validity and reliability of the self-acceptance test used therein. In this respect, however, the test does not differ from other measures of self-acceptance; research in the area of "self" psychology will be hampered until a reliable test of self-acceptance is constructed.

#### Supplementary Analysis

The first section of this chapter has discussed findings which concern the main hypothesis of this study. It was shown that results corroborate previous investigations concerned with the influence of experimentally induced success and failure on level of self-acceptance. The present section discusses three minor findings derived from the supplementary analysis of the main hypothesis.

First, the main analysis in Chapter III revealed an over-all trend in changes of self-acceptance scores before and after the experimental conditions. This trend was further

reflected by the discovery that the mean self-acceptance score within all the groups was reduced, i.e. there was an increase in self-acceptance after the induction of success, after the induction of failure, and also within the control group. The most pertinent question is why the induction of failure caused an increase in self-acceptance.

Rogers (1951) has stated that an individual reacts with the purpose of maintaining and enhancing a favourable self-picture. On the other hand, an individual supposedly strives to maintain his basic self-concept, i.e. he will resist information which is discrepant with his long-standing views about himself. This may mean that he will reject highly favourable reports about himself if they are inconsistent with his self-picture. It is more likely, however, that he will resist unfavourable information of himself whether it is congruent or incongruent with his self-picture. If a self-picture is going to be altered it will be altered in the direction of enhancement rather than devaluation. Dittes (1959) has shown that subjects with low self-esteem have a stronger need to receive a good evaluation from the group than subjects with characteristically high self-esteem.

With this in mind, since the failure group not only resisted material which devaluated them, but, in fact, increased in self-acceptance, it might be inferred this behaviour compensated for their failure or served as a defense for their failure.

Defensive behaviour manifested in self-evaluative behaviour has been previously demonstrated. Diller (1954)

measured self-acceptance both overtly and covertly on a seven-point rating scale before and after failure on a simulated intelligence test. After failure no significant changes in self-ratings occurred on the overt scale. On the covert scale a decrease in self-estimates significant at the .05 level of confidence was revealed. Harvey, Kelly and Shapiro (1957) report that the more informed the sources and the more negative the failure, the greater the amount of tension for the individual. In the present study the source of failure was a set of false norms established through administration of the test to a similar sample of university students. This procedure may have induced defensiveness.

Another factor which might have produced defensive behaviour was the method by which the self-acceptance test was given. Initially subjects were tested as a group. They were asked to be as honest as possible and they were told that group, not individual scores, were being studied. Under these circumstances defences for the entire group may have been lowered and a more exact picture of the individual's subjective feelings of himself obtained. The second testing session took place immediately after the induction of success and failure; subjects were seen individually by a graduate psychology student. Within these conditions it may well be that subjects reacted more defensively. Hence these test scores would reflect a less true but a higher incidence of self-acceptance within each group. These circumstances may have been influential to the extent that they counteracted or

stabilized reduction in self-acceptance which should reasonably have appeared in the failure group. Meanwhile, the success group was able to use their success as a rationalization for their increased level of self-acceptance.

The latter point contributes to a clarification of a second minor finding; the induction of success caused a significant change in level of self-acceptance within the success group. Significant changes within a success group were also discovered by Diller (1954) on his overt self-rating scale. Diller explains that when an individual experiences success, as opposed to failure, he feels no threat in maintaining his self-concept; in fact, the success may enhance it. Self-ratings for Diller's success group rose on the covert scale as well but in a less definite way. Mention was made previously that while Diller's overt scale reflected no significant changes for the failure group, there was a change at the 5% level of confidence towards a decrease in self-ratings on the covert scale. Diller remarks,

It is possible then that those attitudes which could not be expressed overtly, such as those held by the failure group, were reflected on a covert level, while those attitudes held by the success group could be manifested overtly and, therefore did not need to be expressed as strongly on a covert level.

The final minor finding concerned the evaluation of desirable and undesirable personality traits within an individual's global self-concept. Discrepancies between ideal and actual possession of a trait were summed for both desirable

or positive personality traits and undesirable or negative personality traits. These discrepancies or evaluations were not differentially effected by the experimental conditions. It seems then, that acceptance of desirable and undesirable characteristics within the self-concept are concomitantly altered with changes in total or global acceptance of self. No previous research has been discovered to support or contradict this finding.

The preceding sections have been concerned with an interpretation of the analysis of the results presented in Chapter III. It is felt that the main explanation of the finding that the experimental induction of success and failure did not significantly influence level of self-acceptance was the qualitative inappropriateness of the experimental task for university students who are seemingly quite self-satisfied. Interpretation of this research must be guarded, however, since there is no evidence at hand to support the reliability or validity of the self-acceptance measure. The results of the present research are in keeping with previous investigations, none of which have employed a completely satisfactory measuring instrument.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The efficacy of research in self psychology has been limited due to many theoretical and methodological problems in the area. Experimentation has led to a need for establishing evidence confirming the notion of consistency of self-acceptance. In this study, the situational variable was the experimental induction of success and failure. The constructs of Rogers (1951) were used operationally to define self-acceptance. Hence, self-acceptance is a total discrepancy score disregarding the direction of discrepancy between placement of the same characteristics on two similar scales. One scale was entitled the "Actual Possession of a Trait", the other the "Ideal Possession of a Trait."

Sixty psychology students were placed in three groups of twenty each. Groups were matched on the basis of four criteria; 1) age; 2) intelligence on the basis of the total score on the School and College Ability Test; 3) sex; 4) level of self-acceptance. One group became the Success Group, a second, the Failure Group, and the third, the Control Group.

Prediction of failure or success in university on the basis of scores received on a fictional perceptual



discrimination test was used as a method for the induction of success and failure. A complex analysis of variance was employed to determine the effects of the experimental conditions on the three groups. The significance of differences between means within the groups was determined by an analysis of the trends revealed by the main statistical procedure.

An F value of .63, not significant at the 5% level of confidence, was found for the interaction of the experimental induction of success and failure on the three groups. However, there was a significant change within the success group at the 1% level of confidence and a significant change within the Control Group at the 5% level of confidence. The latter suggests trends operating within groups.

No significant differences were found for the effect of the experimental conditions on changes within positive or negative personality traits.

#### Conclusions

The main finding of the present research was that experimentally induced success and failure do not significantly alter level of self-acceptance. This result confirms other similar investigations. It is felt however, that the relevance of one study to another study in this area of psychology is limited, since the degree of inducement and hence the experimental conditions vary within each of these studies.

There are several reasons why the experimental

conditions in this particular study may not have produced significant changes in self-acceptance. First, the method of induction of success and failure may not have been sufficiently stimulating to produce marked changes in self-acceptance. Second, the experimental task, a simulated intelligence test, may have been inappropriate for a group of university students. Third, the groups were homogeneous, comprised of a group of university students who, in the light of previous research, are shown to be highly resistive to changes in self-concept and consequently are probably quite self-satisfied. Fourth, there were heterogeneous distributions of level of self-acceptance scores within each group; a more homogeneous sample of self-acceptors may have produced more indicative results. Finally, there is little evidence to prove or disprove the validity and reliability of the self-acceptance measure employed in this study. In this respect it is felt that all studies concerning self-acceptance are similarly open to criticism.

Another finding in this study revealed a trend operating towards an increase in self-acceptance for all three groups before and after the experimental conditions. This trend was statistically significant in the success group and approaches significance in the failure and control groups. The explanation given for these changes was that the failure group compensated for its failure on the experimental task by attempting to appear self-acceptant. The success group,

meanwhile utilized the experimental success as a rationalization to appear more self-accepting. Another explanation forwarded was that defensive behaviour was encouraged in the second administration of the self-acceptance test. On this occasion subjects were observed by a graduate psychology student.

A final finding of this study was that the acceptance of desirable and undesirable traits are concurrent with acceptance of total self.

## APPENDIX A (1)

Relevant Data Regarding the Members of the Sample Under Study  
Success Group

	Sex	Age	SCAT	SA <sub>I</sub>	SA <sub>II</sub>
1	M	21	308	46	42
2	F	19	323	46	53
3	M	21	306	50	66
4	F	19	306	50	71
5	M	21	301	55	51
6	M	20	306	59	51
7	F	21	304	61	45
8	M	20	314	63	39
9	F	19	305	69	33
10	M	18	317	71	70
11	M	20	303	76	36
12	F	18	302	79	62
13	F	19	304	83	62
14	M	20	307	86	65
15	F	19	315	87	69
16	M	22	299	90	78
17	F	18	310	101	55
18	M	22	306	115	110
19	M	19	311	119	86
20	M	19	320	132	122

SA<sub>I</sub> = Self-Acceptance score before experimental conditions.

SA<sub>II</sub> = Self-Acceptance score after experimental conditions.

## APPENDIX A (2)

Relevant Data Regarding the Members of the Sample Under Study  
Failure Group

	Sex	Age	SCAT	SA <sub>I</sub>	SA <sub>II</sub>
1	M	19	310	44	44
2	M	20	309	45	44
3	F	19	308	47	29
4	M	21	308	50	55
5	F	19	309	56	64
6	M	22	311	54	67
7	M	20	309	58	44
8	F	20	308	63	78
9	F	18	323	63	55
10	M	21	281	68	66
11	M	18	316	71	78
12	M	20	308	76	53
13	F	19	316	77	70
14	F	18	306	81	52
15	M	21	310	83	66
16	M	19	313	87	45
17	M	18	315	90	90
18	F	19	309	98	99
19	M	23	311	104	114
20	F	19	305	122	117

SA<sub>I</sub> = Self-Acceptance before the experimental conditions

SA<sub>II</sub> = Self-Acceptance after the experimental conditions

## APPENDIX A (3)

Relevant Data Regarding the Members of the Sample Under Study  
Control Group

	Sex	Age	SCAT	SA <sub>I</sub>	SA <sub>II</sub>
1	M	20	319	37	25
2	F	21	309	48	53
3	M	19	294	49	43
4	M	21	306	50	40
5	M	23	318	54	37
6	F	19	317	55	44
7	M	19	301	63	64
8	F	18	311	58	74
9	F	18	320	68	83
10	M	20	324	70	79
11	F	18	299	77	77
12	F	18	311	77	64
13	M	20	306	87	70
14	M	19	312	89	81
15	M	20	314	94	74
16	M	20	307	72	82
17	M	19	303	90	84
18	F	19	308	102	106
19	M	19	303	113	102
20	F	17	299	128	114

SA<sub>I</sub> = Self-Acceptance score before the experimental conditions

SA<sub>II</sub> = Self-Acceptance score after the experimental conditions

## APPENDIX B

## PERSONALITY TRAITS

1. Attractive - Dresses in good taste, is pleasing to look at, does the most with what she has.
2. Healthy - Good physical condition, complexion clear, eyes glowing and alive.
3. Tactful - Says the right thing at the right time, seems to feel the fitness of things.
4. Artificial - Wears too much jewellery, too much make-up, wears too dressy clothes, is loud.
5. Prejudiced - Not open to suggestions, sees only one point of view, mind is made up before discussion.
6. Coordinated - Body control, calm not fidgety, good at sports.
7. Moody - Too easily affected by what happens, petulant, changeable in her attitude towards others.
8. Original - Does not borrow the ideas of others, has ideas of her own, is an independent thinker.
9. Sensitive - Is easily hurt, touchy, easily offended.
10. Modest - Dresses as she ought, acts as she ought with boys, does not try to attract attention to herself with clothes that are unbecoming.
11. Good Listener - Listens to others instead of always talking, is interested in what others have to tell.
12. Respectful - Gives respect to those she should, has regard for the opinions of those who have had experience.
13. Cautious - Very careful, unwilling to make a mistake, won't try new things.
14. Brilliant - "Brainy", clever, gets very good marks.
15. Gullible - Easily taken in, swallows everything she is told.
16. Persevering - Sticks to a job until it is finished, is persistent about getting things accomplished, keeps trying.
17. Ambitious - Will work to achieve a goal, wants to get ahead.
18. Pleasant Expression - Looks cheerful, looks friendly, seems happy, gay and alive.
19. Confused - Indecisive, muddled, "dizzy".
20. Inferior - Is afraid to say what she thinks, afraid to assert an opinion, has no confidence in herself or in her ideas, is always apologizing.
21. Gossipy - Carries the news of any "juicy" event.
22. Prudent - Knows the right thing to do when faced with a problem, thinks before acting, gives good advice when asked for it, is practical.
23. Grateful - Appreciates what is done for her and expresses thanks.
24. Gentle - Soft-spoken, movements not brusque, but graceful, voice well modulated.
25. Loyal - Keeps a confidence, can be trusted, is faithful to her friends.
26. Principled - Sticks to ideals, stands by what she knows is right, has control over her emotions and passions.

27. Witty - Sees funny side of things; can keep you laughing, says clever things.
28. Generous - Shares her things with others, gives her time to help others, self-sacrificing, will help anyone who needs it.
29. Broad-minded - Tolerant of the opinions of others, listens to their ideas, unprejudiced.
30. Popular - Well-liked by others, has personality and charm.
31. Confident - Has faith in herself, does not think that she is wrong all the time.
32. Obedient - Tries to do what she is told is right.
33. Loquacious - A continual talker, tries to dominate the conversation, will talk an "ear" off you.
34. Alert - Keen in mental penetration, understands quickly, alive to what is going on, is on the ball.
35. Complaining - Always talking about her problems, has gloomy outlook, is sad and grouchy.
36. Uncooperative - Will not help with anything, will not lend a hand for a cause.
37. Dependent - Wants the other to take the lead, has no initiative.
38. Envious - Does not like to see others get rewards, seems sad when others get noticed in games.
39. Immature - Silly, does not act her age.
40. Good Sport - Can "take it", will congratulate someone who wins from her.
41. Boring - A "dead head", just mopes around, won't join in the fun, is tiresome, is hard to make friends with.
42. Unreliable - Does not keep promises or secrets, cannot be depended upon to do what she says she will.
43. Selfish - Cares only about herself, is stingy, disregards others, wants her own way all the time, not willing to help others.
44. Disagreeable - "Disgruntled look", and wears a frown most of the time, pouts, looks mad at everyone.
45. Phony - Tries to make a false impression, a fake, an "apple-polisher".
46. Narrow-minded - One track mind, can only talk about Elvis Presley or cars.
47. Conceited - Egotistical, brags about what she has, is always talking about herself, boastful.
48. Discourteous - Does not know the correct thing to do or say, is crude and rude.
49. Nervous - Makes many unnecessary movements, restless, twitches, blinks her eyes.
50. Gushy - Overly friendly, sentimental, too affectionate.
51. Interesting - A conversationalist, has interesting things to tell, the conversation keeps rolling, holds your attention.
52. Sincere - Straightforward with others, frank and honest with others, says what she thinks.
53. Pessimistic - Always looks on gloomy side of life, a "wet blanket", sees the worst side of everything.



54. Petty - Holds grudges, finds minor defects in others and magnifies them.
55. Awkward - Clumsy, walks awkwardly, moves hands and makes gestures that are not graceful, has poor posture.
56. Expressionless - "Dead pan" expression, no animation in appearance.
57. Timid - Avoids people when possible, is bashful, shy and easily embarrassed.
58. Trusting - Is not suspicious, has confidence in the goodness of others.

## APPENDIX C (1)

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_  
 Position in Family \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Brothers \_\_\_\_\_  
 No. of Sisters \_\_\_\_\_

## ACTUAL POSSESSION OF A TRAIT



- 0. Not at all
- 1. Slight
- 2. Mild
- 3. Average
- 4. Considerable
- 5. Strong
- 6. Extreme

There are 58 personality traits listed. Notice the seven point rating scale above. Please rate each of the traits ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE YOU ACTUALLY POSSESS IT, on the chart below.

e.g. if a person rated the trait 'loquacious' as 3 he would feel that he was loquacious to an average degree; if a person rated the trait 'alert' as 6 he would feel that he was alert to an extreme degree.

<u>Trait Rating</u>	<u>Trait Rating</u>	<u>Trait Rating</u>
1	20	39
2	21	40
3	22	41
4	23	42
5	24	43
6	25	44
7	26	45
8	27	46
9	28	47
10	29	48
11	30	49
12	31	50
13	32	51
14	33	52
15	34	53
16	35	54
17	36	55
18	37	56
19	38	57
		58

## APPENDIX C (2)

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SEX: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Position in Family: \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Brothers \_\_\_\_\_  
 No. of Sisters \_\_\_\_\_

## IDEAL POSSESSION OF A TRAIT

Scale



- 0. Not at all
- 1. Slight
- 2. Mild
- 3. Average
- 4. Considerable
- 5. Strong
- 6. Extreme

There are 58 personality traits listed. Notice the seven point rating scale below. Please rate, on the chart below, each of the traits ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE YOU WOULD MOST LIKE WITHIN YOURSELF TO POSSESS IT.

e.g. if a person rated the trait 'loquacious' as 3 he would feel that he would most like (within himself) to be loquacious to an average degree; if a person rated the trait 'alert' as 6 he would feel that he would most like (within himself) to be alert to an extreme degree.

Trait Rating

1 \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
 4 \_\_\_\_\_  
 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 \_\_\_\_\_  
 7 \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 \_\_\_\_\_  
 10 \_\_\_\_\_  
 11 \_\_\_\_\_  
 12 \_\_\_\_\_  
 13 \_\_\_\_\_  
 14 \_\_\_\_\_  
 15 \_\_\_\_\_  
 16 \_\_\_\_\_  
 17 \_\_\_\_\_  
 18 \_\_\_\_\_

Trait Rating

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 \_\_\_\_\_  
 21 \_\_\_\_\_  
 22 \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 \_\_\_\_\_  
 25 \_\_\_\_\_  
 26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 \_\_\_\_\_  
 28 \_\_\_\_\_  
 29 \_\_\_\_\_  
 30 \_\_\_\_\_  
 31 \_\_\_\_\_  
 32 \_\_\_\_\_  
 33 \_\_\_\_\_  
 34 \_\_\_\_\_  
 35 \_\_\_\_\_  
 36 \_\_\_\_\_

Trait Rating

37 \_\_\_\_\_  
 38 \_\_\_\_\_  
 39 \_\_\_\_\_  
 40 \_\_\_\_\_  
 41 \_\_\_\_\_  
 42 \_\_\_\_\_  
 43 \_\_\_\_\_  
 44 \_\_\_\_\_  
 45 \_\_\_\_\_  
 46 \_\_\_\_\_  
 47 \_\_\_\_\_  
 48 \_\_\_\_\_  
 49 \_\_\_\_\_  
 50 \_\_\_\_\_  
 51 \_\_\_\_\_  
 52 \_\_\_\_\_  
 53 \_\_\_\_\_  
 54 \_\_\_\_\_  
 55 \_\_\_\_\_  
 56 \_\_\_\_\_  
 57 \_\_\_\_\_  
 58 \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX D

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SEX: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Position in Family: \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Brothers \_\_\_\_\_  
 No. of Sisters \_\_\_\_\_

## SOCIAL DESIRABILITY OF A TRAIT

Scale



0. Not at all
1. Slight
2. Mild
3. Average
4. Considerable
5. Strong
6. Extreme

There are 58 personality traits listed on the following pages. Notice the seven point rating scale above. Please rate, on the chart below, each of the traits ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE YOU FEEL THEY ARE DESIRABLE IN OTHERS.

e.g. if a person rated the trait 'loquacious' as 3 he would feel that to be loquacious to an average degree is desirable in others; if a person rated the trait 'alert' as 6 he would feel that to be alert to an extreme degree is desirable in others.

Trait Rating

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

Trait Rating

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

Trait Rating

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

## APPENDIX E

## Social Desirability Rating of the 58 Personality Traits

Trait	Social Desirability Rating	Trait	Social Desirability Rating
attractive	4.67	popular	4.09
healthy	4.49	confident	4.26
tactful	4.35	obedient	3.67
artificial	0.58	loquacious	1.02
prejudiced	0.74	alert	4.70
co-ordinated	3.74	complaining	0.49
moody	1.21	uncooperative	0.47
original	4.21	dependent	1.23
sensitive	1.42	envious	0.62
modest	4.35	immature	0.72
good listener	4.69	good sport	4.51
respectful	4.77	boring	0.67
cautious	1.93	unreliable	0.40
brilliant	4.65	selfish	0.35
gullible	1.42	disagreeable	0.51
persevering	4.74	phony	0.47
ambitious	4.86	narrow-minded	0.58
pleasant expression	4.60	conceited	0.49
confused	0.77	discourteous	0.44
inferior	0.93	nervous	1.30
gossipy	0.65	gushy	1.44
prudent	4.65	interesting	4.42
grateful	4.53	sincere	4.67
gentle	4.05	pessimistic	1.02
loyal	4.98	petty	0.67
principled	4.74	awkward	1.86
witty	3.65	expressionless	1.02
generous	4.40	timid	1.67
broad-minded	4.58	trusting	3.95

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, A. The practice and theory of individual psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1924.
- Akeret, R. V. Inter-relationships among various dimensions of self-concept. J. Counsel. Psychol., 1959, 61, 199-201.
- Berger, E. M. The relationship between expressed acceptances of self and expressed acceptance of others. J.abnorm. soc.Psychol., 1952, 47, 778-783.
- Bills, R. E., Vance, E. L., and McLean, O.S. An index of adjustment and values. J.consult.Psychol., 1951, 257-261.
- Block, J., and Thomas. H. Is satisfaction with self a measure of adjustment? J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1955, 51, 254-259.
- Brownfain, J. J. Stability of the self-concept as a dimension of personality. J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1952, 47, 597-606.
- Butler, J. M. and Haigh, G. V. Changes in the relation between self-concepts and ideal concepts consequent upon client-centered counseling. In Rogers, C.R. and Dymond, R.F. (Eds.), Psychotherapy and Personality change. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 55-75.
- Chase, P. H. Self-concepts in adjusted and maladjusted hospital patients. J.consult.Psychol., 1957, 21, 495-497.
- Chodorkoff, B. Self-perception, perceptual defense and adjustment. J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1954, 49, 508-512.
- Cowen, E. L. The negative self-concept as a personality measure. J.consult.Psychol., 1954, 18, 138-142.
- Cowen, E. L. An investigation of the relationship between two measures of self-regarding attitudes. J. clin. Psychol., 1956, 12, 156-160.
- Cowen, E. L., and Tongas, P.N. Social Desirability of terms in self-concept Inventory. J.consult.Psychol., 23, 1959, 361-365.
- Crowne, P. C. and Stephens, M. W. Self-acceptance and Self-evaluative behaviour: A critique of Methodology. Psych. Bulletin, 1961, 58, 2, 104-127.

- Diggory, J.C. and Magaziner, D.E. Self-evaluation as a function of instrumentally relevant capacities. Bull. de l'Ass. int. de Psychol., appl., 1959, 8, 2-19.
- Diller, L. Conscious and unconscious self-attitudes after success and failure. J. pers., 1954, 23, 1-12.
- Dittes, J. E. Effect of changes in self-esteem upon impulsiveness and deliberation in making judgments. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1959, 58, 273-275.
- Edwards, E. L. The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research. New York: The Dryden Press, 1957.
- English, H.B. and English, Ava C., A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytic terms. New York: Longmans Green, 1958.
- Fey, W. F., Acceptance of self and others and its relation to therapy readiness. J. clin. Psychol., 1954, 10, 269-271.
- Freidman, I. Phenomenal, ideal and projected conceptions of self and their inter-relationships. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 611-615.
- Fromm, E. Selfishness and self-love. Psychiatry, 1939, 2, 507-527.
- Hanlon, T.E., Hofstaetter, P.R. and O'Connor, J.P. Congruence of self and ideal self in relation to personality adjustment. J. consult. Psychol., 1954, 18 (3), 215-218.
- Harvey, O.J., Kelley, H.W. and Shapiro, M.M. Reactions to unfavourable evaluations of the self made by other persons. J. pers., 1957, 25, 398-411.
- Horney, Karen. The neurotic personality of our time. New York: W. W. Norton, 1937.
- Jones, A. Distribution of traits in current Q-sort methodology. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 90-95.
- Kennedy, Sister Mary Paulina. Acceptance of self and acceptance of others as interdependent variables in interpersonal relations. Dissert. Abstr., 1958, Cath. U. of America.
- Kenny, D.T. The influence of social desirability on discrepancy measures between real and ideal self. J. consult. Psych., 1956, 20, 315-318.

- Laforge, R. and Suczek, R. The interpersonal dimension of personality; III. An interpersonal check list. J. pers., 1955, 24, 94-112.
- MacQuitty, L.L. A measure of personality integration in relation to the concept of self. J. pers., 1950, 18, 461-482.
- Mowrer, O.H. Technique and description, history and critique. In Mowrer, O.J. Psychotherapy: theory and research. New York: London Press, 316-375.
- Omwake, Katherine T. The relation between acceptance of self and acceptance of others shown by three personality inventories. J. consult. Psychol., 1954, 18, 443-446.
- Phillips, E. L. Attitude toward self and others: a brief questionnaire report. J. consult. Psychol., 1951, 15, 79-81.
- Raimy, V.C. Self-reference in counseling interviews. J. consult. Psychol., 1948, 12, 153-163.
- Rapaport, Gerald M. Ideal self instructions, MMPI profile changes, and the prediction of clinical improvement. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 459-463.
- Rogers, C.L. Client-centered therapy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rudicoff, Evelyn C., A comparative study of the changes in content of the self, the ordinary and the ideal in eight cases. In Rogers, C.L. and Dymond F. (Eds.), Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957, 85-98.
- Sharma, S.L. Some personality correlates of changes in self-esteem under conditions of stress and support. J. Educ. & Psychol Baroda, 1956, 14, 154-165.
- Shearer, Elizabeth T. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self, and acceptance of and respect for others in ten counselling cases. J. consult. Psychol., 1949, 13, 169-175.
- Smith, G.M. Six measures of self-concept discrepancy and instability. Their intercorrelations, reliability and relations to personality measures. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 101-112.



- Stock, Dorothy. An investigation into the interrelationships between self-concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. J.consult.Psychol., 1949, 13, 176-180.
- Stotland, E., Thorley, S., Thomas, E., Cohen, A.R., and Zander, A. The effects of group expectations and self-esteem upon self-evaluation. J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1957, 54, 55-63.
- Stotland, E., and Zander A. Effects of public and private failure on self-evaluation. J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1958, 56, 223-229.
- Symonds, P.M. On the loss of reliability in ratings due to coarseness of the scale, J.exp.Psychol., 1924, 7, 456-461.
- Turner, R.H. and Vanderlippe, R.H. Self-ideal congruence as an index of adjustment. J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1958, 57, 202-206.
- Wylie, Ruth C. The self concept; A critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Zimmer, H. Self acceptance and its relation to conflict. J.consult.Psychol., 1954, 447-449.
- Zuckerman, M., Baer, M.A., Monaskin, I., Acceptance of self, parents and people in patients and normals. J.clin.Psychol., 1956, 12, 327-332.

## VITA AUCTORIS

Kenneth Samuel Solway, son of Gertrude R. and Alex A. Solway, was born on February 12, 1940, in Windsor, Ontario. He attended Patterson Collegiate Institute, Windsor, Ontario and was graduated in 1957.

He entered Assumption University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario in 1957 and received the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in June, 1960. In 1960 he was accepted in Graduate School at Assumption University of Windsor where he received an assistantship in the Department of Psychology.