

A CORRELATIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SELF-CONCEPT
AND INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR

By

KENNETH W. MORRISON

II

Bachelor of Arts
Parsons College
Fairfield, Iowa
1962

Master of Arts
Northeast Missouri State University
Kirksville, Missouri
1967

Certificate of Specialist
Southern Illinois University
Edwardsville, Illinois
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1975

Thesis
1975D
11879c
cop. 2

MAY 12 1976

A CORRELATIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SELF-CONCEPT
AND INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth W. Clair

Thesis Adviser

Ralph A. Beaman

Judith E. Dobson

Lawrence M. Hynson Jr.

D. N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

938972

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. J. Kenneth St. Clair, who served as chairman of his advisory committee, for his incomparable assistance throughout this study; to Dr. Ralph Brann, Dr. Judith Dobson, and Dr. Lawrence Hynson appreciation is also expressed for their encouragement and guidance.

To Dr. James Yelvington, thanks for the interest and assistance.

Appreciation is also expressed to my colleagues in the College of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh for their "continuous" encouragement.

A very special thank you to Dr. Edward Whitworth for his assistance and encouragement.

To the writer's family, Phyllis, Mary Kay, and Mitch, appreciation is expressed for their patience and very practical help during the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM.	1
Statement of the Problem.	2
Significance of the Study	3
Definition of Terms	4
Limitations of the Study.	6
Summary	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Introduction.	9
Self-Concept Theories	9
Self-Concept Development.	11
Self-Concept and Interpersonal Behavior	12
Rationale	19
Hypotheses.	19
Summary	19
III. PROCEDURES	23
Introduction.	23
Instrumentation	23
Firo-B Validity	25
Firo-B Reliability.	28
Self-Esteem Inventory	29
Sample Selection.	32
Data Collection	32
Treatment of Data	33
Summary	33
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.	35
Introduction.	35
Subsidiary Analysis	38
Supplemental Analysis	40
Summary	43
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	44
Introduction.	44
Findings.	44
Major Conclusions	45

Chapter	Page
V. (CONTINUED)	
Further Considerations and Discussion	46
Recommendations for Further Study	49
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	54
APPENDIX A - INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING AND INTERPRETING THE SELF- ESTEEM INVENTORY AND THE INVENTORY WITH APPROPRIATE RESPONSES MARKED	56
APPENDIX B - FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION-BEHAVIOR SCALE (FIRO-BC).	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Names and Symbols for Firo-B Scales	24
II. Relation to Firo Inclusion Scale and Attitude Toward Significance in Politics	26
III. Relation Between Firo Control Scale and Attitudes Toward Political Autocratic Behavior.	26
IV. Firo Scores of Various Occupational Groups.	27
V. Reproducibility of Firo-B Scales.	29
VI. The Spearman rho Statistical Measurement of the Relationship Between the Self-Esteem Inventory Scores and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scores	36
VII. Correlation of Subscale 01 of the Firo-B to Subscales 02, 04, and 06.	38
VIII. Correlation of Subscale 02 of the Firo-B to Subscales 05 and 06	39
IX. Correlation of Subscale 04 of the Firo-B to Subscales 05 and 06	39
X. Correlation of Subscale 05 of the Firo-B to Subscale 06.	40
XI. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for the Self- Esteem Inventory.	41
XII. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior Instrument	41
XIII. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for Male and Female Students for the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior Instrument	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

It is probable that our more reflective ancestors huddled around a fire in some forgotten cave, pulled their animal skins close around their shoulders and passed the time thinking about their fears, their desires, and how they felt about themselves. Some time during this dawn of man's history man began to give serious thought to his non-physical, psychological self. Later, with the advent of written history, writers would describe this awareness in terms of spirit, psyche or soul. During the Middle Ages the concept of soul was further developed by theologians, who stressed its immortality and superiority to the body in which it dwelled.¹

A turning point in man's thinking about his nonphysical being came in 1644, when Rene' Descartes wrote his Principles of Philosophy. Descartes proposed that doubt was a principal tool of disciplined inquiry, yet he could not doubt that he doubted. He reasoned that if he doubted, he was thinking and therefore, he must exist. Other philosophers of this period, among them Spinoza and Leibnitz, added their ideas about the mystery of the nonphysical aspect of man. Terms such as mind, soul, psyche, and self were often used interchangeably with scant regard for an invariant vocabulary or scientific experimentation.²

Systematic conceptualization of the self began with William James in the 1890's and continues to the present. James in 1890 described

the infant without a self at birth. He suggested that the self develops to become the sum total of "I", the knower or experiencer, and "me", the self that is known or experienced.³

In 1902 Charles Horton Cooley, in considering the meanings of "I", described a social self since labeled "the looking-glass self." Cooley's basic premise was that the self imagines a perception of itself in the mind of another and this affects behavior. Cooley's self-idea has three basic elements: (1) the imagination of one's appearance to the other person; (2) the imaginations of the other person's appraisal of that appearance; and (3) some kind of self-value feeling.⁴

The self consists, in part at least, of the accumulated experiential background, or backlog, of the individual. It is what has been built, since his life began, through unique experience and unique purpose, on the individual's unique biological structure. The self is therefore unique to the individual. However, this individual self is built almost entirely, if not entirely, in relationship to others.⁵

Statement of the Problem

To study self-concept as other oriented, one must integrate into the study the phenomena of interpersonal behavior. William C. Schutz has developed The Postulate of Interpersonal Needs, which states:

(A) Every individual has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. (B) Inclusion, control, and affection constitute a sufficient set of areas of interpersonal behavior for the prediction and explanation of interpersonal phenomena.⁶

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between self-concept and interpersonal behavior. Therefore, the

following research questions constitute the thrust of this investigation: Is there a relationship between self-concept and interpersonal behavior? Is there a relationship between self-concept and the interpersonal need for inclusion? Is there a relationship between self-concept and the interpersonal need for control? Is there a relationship between self-concept and the interpersonal need for affection?

Significance of the Study

It is a personal tragedy and social waste when a student spends year after year experiencing defeat and failure in school. The causes of the failure and the effects of the failing experience are complex, but a continuous and central factor in both cause and effect is the way in which a student views himself and his abilities.⁷

In 1964, Brookover, Thomas, and Patterson conducted a study which had three purposes: (1) to determine whether the student's concept of his ability in school is significantly and positively related to academic performance; (2) to see if the self-concept is differentiated into specific self-concepts which correspond to specific subject-matter areas; and (3) to see if the self-concept is significantly and positively correlated with the student's perception of how significant others view his ability.

The method employed was to study the self reports of over 1,000 seventh grade, white students in an urban school system. Each child was given the Self-Concept Ability scale, to determine his concept of his own ability, both in general and in particular subjects.

After the I. Q. was factored out, the students' reported concepts of their own ability and their grade-point averages were found to be

significantly and positively correlated. Brookover and his associates concluded that the relationship is substantial even when measured I. Q. is controlled. Finally, the study reported the self-concept is significantly and positively correlated with the perceived evaluations of the student by other significant people. In summarizing their research, Brookover, Patterson, and Thomas concluded that self-concept of academic ability is associated with academic achievement at each grade level.⁸

Since the self-concept is significantly and positively correlated with the perceived evaluations of the student by other significant people, the establishment of a relationship between self-concept and interpersonal behavior would produce new and valuable insights into self-concept development.

Definition of Terms

Self-Concept--A person's view of himself; the fullest description of himself that a person is capable of giving at any particular time.⁹

Interpersonal Need--A requirement for a person to establish a satisfactory relation between himself and other people. "Relation" refers to the amount of interchange between himself and others, and the degree to which he originates and receives behavior.¹⁰

Inclusion Behavior--The interpersonal need for inclusion is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to interaction and association. "Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from originating or initiating interaction with all people to not initiating interaction

with anyone and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always initiating interaction with the self to never initiating interaction with the self. On the level of feelings, the need for inclusion is defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual interest with other people. This feeling includes (1) being able to take an interest in other people to a satisfactory degree and (2) having other people interested in the self to a satisfactory degree. With regard to the self-concept, the need for inclusion is the need to feel that the self is significant and worthwhile.

Control Behavior--The interpersonal need for control is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to control and power. "Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from controlling all the behavior of other people to not controlling any behavior of others and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always being controlled to never being controlled by them. With regard to feelings, the need for control is defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual respect for the competence and responsibility of others. This feeling includes (1) being able to respect others to a satisfactory degree and (2) having others respect the self to a satisfactory degree. The need for control at the level of perceiving self is the need to feel that one is a competent, responsible person.

Affective Behavior--The interpersonal need for affection is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory

relation with others with respect to love and affection. Affection always refers to a dyadic relation. "Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with others somewhere on a dimension ranging from initiating close, personal relations with everyone to originating close, personal relations with no one and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them on a dimension ranging from always originating close, personal relations toward the self, to never originating close, personal relations toward the self. At the feelings level, the need for affection is defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual affection with others. This feeling includes (1) being able to love other people to a satisfactory degree and (2) having others love the self to a satisfactory degree. The need for affection, defined at the level of the self-concept, is the need to feel that the self is lovable.

Limitations of the Study

Scientific investigation constantly faces problems of measurement. Because of the amazing complexity of human behavior, behavioral science has encountered particularly difficult measurement problems. The greatest difficulty in measuring the self-concept results from the fact that each person's self-concept is private, personal, and not directly observable. However, it is believed that people are in varying degrees of contact with their phenomenal selves, and each person has some kind of concept of himself that he can share if he is willing to do so. Also, it is believed that each person is constantly revealing his self-concept through his behavior, even though behavior seems deceptive and

misleading. One simple and direct way to obtain at least a sample of the self-concept is to ask people to report or describe their self-concept. Fitts' position is that a carefully designed self-report measure currently provides the best way of assessing the self-concept, particularly for groups.¹¹

This study did not attempt to control external variables such as home environment, social background, or parental relationship.

Summary

Chapter I has supplied the general background of the study and a statement of the problem investigated. The pertinent terms were defined, and the limitations of the study were articulated.

Chapter II includes the review of related literature concerning self-concept and interpersonal behavior. Also, Chapter II contains the rationale and a statement of the hypotheses which provide the direction of the study.

Chapter III presents in detail the instrumentation utilized in the study. The sample selection and data collection are described in the third chapter, as well as the initial treatment of the data.

The presentation and analysis of data will be provided in Chapter IV.

Chapter V will present the findings and the major conclusions drawn from the findings. Also, Chapter V will include further considerations and a discussion of the further considerations, as well as the recommendations for further research.

FOOTNOTES

¹William W. Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970), p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 3.

³William James, Principles of Psychology (New York, 1890), 2 Vols.

⁴C. H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order (New York, 1902).

⁵Earl C. Kelley, "The Fully Functioning Self," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming (Washington, D. C., 1962), p. 9.

⁶William C. Schutz, The Interpersonal Underworld (Palo Alto, California, 1966), p. 13.

⁷William W. Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970), p. 13.

⁸W. B. Brookover, A. Patterson, and S. Thomas, Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement, U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 845 (East Lansing, Michigan, 1962).

⁹Robert A. Harper, Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1951), p. 170.

¹⁰Definitions referring to interpersonal needs and behavior taken from: William C. Schutz, The Interpersonal Underworld (Palo Alto, California, 1966), pp. 18-19, p. 191.

¹¹William H. Fitts, The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization, Research Monograph No. 3 (Nashville, Tennessee, 1971), p. 39.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Today, self-concept is the subject of an enormous body of theory and research. Gordon and Gergen noted that psychology and sociology had accounted for over 2,000 publications concerning the self. They also noted the great number of variables that have been examined in relationship to the self.¹

Considering the vast amount of theory and research available regarding self-concept, this study will primarily address itself to the literature devoted to self-concept and the interpersonal processes.

Self-Concept Theories

C. H. Cooley was one of the earliest social psychologists to explore the idea of self. He recognized that the social milieu from which a person comes contributes heavily to how a person sees himself. With this idea in mind, he developed a theory of the self that was concerned primarily with how the self grows as a consequence of interpersonal interactions.²

A somewhat more sophisticated view of the self was developed by G. H. Mead, who, as Cooley, felt it was necessary to root the self in the social conditions relevant to the individual and to derive the

content of the self from the interaction between the individual and his social world. Mead's self is an object of awareness, rather than a system of processes. That is, a person comes to know himself and respond to himself as he sees others responding to him. Mead's self is a socially formed self which grows in a social setting where there is social communication. He further suggests that a person can have as many selves as there are numbers of social groups in which he participates.³

Closely related to the social interaction ideas of Mead and Cooley is the theoretical position of Sullivan, a psychiatrist who developed what has been called an interpersonal theory of personality development. As Sullivan sees it, from the first day of life, the infant is immersed in a continual stream of interpersonal situations in which he is the recipient of a never-ending flow of "reflected appraisals." It is through his assimilation of these reflected appraisals that the child comes to develop expectations and attitudes toward himself as an individual.⁴

Perhaps the single most important assumption of modern theories about the self is that the maintenance and enhancement of the perceived self is the motive behind all behavior (Snygg and Combs, 1949; Rogers, 1951; Combs and Snygg, 1959). In other words, each of us is constantly striving to maintain, protect, and enhance the self of which he is aware. If this is true, then it follows that experience is perceived in terms of its relevance to the self and that behavior is determined by those perceptions.⁵

Self-Concept Development

The self-concept develops out of interaction with a number of variables. Two such variables, interaction with people and reaction from people, provide the bases of the self. Brooks (1963) states "that the child appears upon the human scene without self; the self is a social product conceived and born in the process of social interaction."⁶

The self is acquired and modified through the accumulated experiences of the emerging individual. This miraculous accomplishment has been pictured by numerous writers and researchers, among the most graphic accounts being those of Cooley (1902), Mead (1934), Sullivan (1947), Jersild (1952), Block (1952), Faber (1962), Kelly (1962), Goldstein (1963), and Coopersmith (1967).⁷

The self emerges as a consequence of learning experiences with other human beings and the introjection of their values and attitudes. Generally speaking, the self-concept initially may be considered an "other concept", a concept assumed by a child as a composite of the feelings conveyed to him by those about him and weighted in relation to the significance of those "others" in a kind of gross "mirror image" of these views of others.⁸

John Kinch (1963) offers a general theory of self-concept in one sentence: "The individual's conception of himself emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual."⁹

The following are implicit in most considerations of the self-concept which take this stance and are suggested as basic postulates of the theory: (1) the individual's self-concept is based on his

perception of the way others are responding to him; (2) the individual's self-concept functions to direct his behavior; and (3) the individual's perception of the responses of others toward him reflects the actual responses of others toward him. These postulates are not expected to hold under all conditions, but they offer a parsimonious resume' of research findings.¹⁰

Self-Concept and Interpersonal Behavior

Swan's research (1970) illustrates interpersonal competence as perceived and rated by others, to be related to self-concept.¹¹ Both Lynch (1968) and Vargos (1968) demonstrated a relationship between perceptions of self and the way one reacts to life's happenings. Persons with positive self-concepts gave evidence of being able to use both negative and positive experiences to enhance their psychological growth, while persons with negative self-concepts became more defensive and wary of life as a result of negative experiences. That is, persons with a high frequency of positive experiencing were more likely to have positive self-concepts.

Specifically, Lynch's study was developed to examine the characteristics of intense human experience and investigate the relationship of this experience to individual openness and self-concept. The term "intense experience" refers to the event which was reported by the subject as having had the greatest impact on his life.

Part I of the study consisted of 217 subjects who responded anonymously to a two-part questionnaire (Part A, most intense experience, Part B, evaluation of its effects). Three trained judges classified the responses into the following categories: Part A, either a

Pleasure, a Suffering, a Bitter-Sweet, or a Sweet-Bitter experience; Part A, as an experience with Another Person(s), or with Self, or with the External World; Part B, an Opening or Closing experience.

Part I was designed to examine the Pleasure and Suffering characteristics of intense experience. A Pleasure experience was defined as the most fulfilling and satisfying experience the subject ever had. A Suffering experience was the reverse. The results indicated that a significantly greater number of intense experiences were judged to be Suffering experiences than were judged Pleasure. Additionally, a significant difference was found to exist between the reported effects of Pleasure and Suffering experiences. Pleasure experiences were judged almost exclusively to Open the individual, i.e., to reduce defensiveness and increase the seeking of wider ranges of experiencing, where Suffering experiences were judged to Close the individual, i.e., increase defensiveness and encourage avoidance.

It was found that Bitter-Sweet experiences, those which contained the elements of suffering and pleasure, were recognized to be predominantly pleasurable and Opened to the individual significantly more often than Closed, while the reverse was true for Sweet-Bitter experiences, ones which contained the elements of pleasure and suffering and were recognized to be predominantly suffering.

The first part also explored the significance of the human relationship in intense experience. The results showed that the frequency of experiences judged to be with Another Person(s) was significantly greater than the number judged with Self, and with the External World.

Part II of the study, using 55 subjects, examined the relationship between the inferred Opening and Closing effects of intense experience

and the individual's level of self-esteem as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS). It was found that the individuals whose reported experiences were inferred to be Opening were significantly higher in their overall level of self-esteem, as measured by the TSCS, than those who reported experiences inferred to be Closing.

An additional portion of the study consisted of classifying the narratives according to content. The major themes of experiences judged Pleasure-Opening consisted of low relationships, meaningful communication, and doing something on one's own. Of experiences judged Suffering-Opening, the most frequently mentioned were death of a parent or relative and leaving home. The greatest frequency of experiences judged Suffering-Closing occurred in the death or suicide of a relative or friend and the divorce or breakup of one's spouse or fiancée.

Viewing the study generally, reported intense experiences were found to be predominantly Suffering and to occur with Another Person(s). The effects of Suffering and Sweet-Bitter experiences were inferred to be generally Closing, while the Pleasure and Bitter-Sweet experiences overwhelmingly Opened the individual. Additionally, there appeared to be a definite relationship between "High" level of self-esteem and the quality of Openness.¹²

Another study concerning self-esteem and behavior by W. Simon and E. Bernstein was conducted to test the prediction, derived from the theory of cognitive balance, that the correlation between an individual's liking for others and his perception of liking for himself is dependent upon his self-esteem. Sixth graders scoring high and low on Cooper-smith's Self-Esteem Inventory were requested to list (a) the names of the five children with whom they would most like to be in the seventh

grade and (b) the names of all the children whom they thought would put them down on their lists. As predicted, it was found that subjects with high self-esteem were more likely ($P < .05$) to believe that people whom they liked reciprocated these positive feelings.¹³

Consistent with these findings, Frankel, Duncan (1966), Richard (1966), Seeman (1966), McClain (1969), and Thomas and Seeman (1971), found that persons who were perceived by their peers as being unusually effective, typically evidenced more positive self-concepts than did persons who were perceived as more nearly average in their day to day behavior.¹⁴

Social interaction is the medium of exchange through which one hones his perceptions of the outside world, develops his interpersonal skills, expands his intelligence, and acquires attitudes about himself. Tenenbaum and Deutch and Brown, among others, appear to have demonstrated this aspect in their research.¹⁵

The literature reviewed and presented thus far in this study tends to support the proposition that self-concept and interpersonal behavior processes are related.

However, not all the literature reviewed for this study suggested as strongly that such a relationship existed between self-concept and interpersonal behavior processes.

Although self-esteem is generally assumed to be a major factor in determining behavior, there has been relatively little research directed toward clarifying its significance and dynamics. Studies in such diverse areas as recall of completed and incompleting tasks (Rosezweig, 1938), level of aspiration (Sears, 1940), reactions to threat (Lazarus and Longo, 1953), and responses to conformity pressures (Asch, 1948)

have concluded that self-esteem is a significant contributing variable. However, there have been relatively few direct studies of this variable.¹⁶

In 1970, S. Fullerton conducted a study of self-concept for better understanding of school adjustment behavior problems. Three areas were selected for study: (1) development of self-concept; (2) relationship of self-concept to school adjustment; and (3) induced change in self-concept and related behavior.¹⁷

To study self-concept development, comparisons were made of 36 primary students and 36 junior high students. It was hypothesized that the junior high students would use more attributes in self description, and that the attributes would be of higher abstraction level than those used by primary students. The findings strongly supported these hypotheses, with differences between groups statistically significant at the .001 level.

Relationship between self-concept and school adjustment was examined by comparing two groups of junior high students. One group (N=22) was randomly selected, and the other group (N=24) was selected by school counselors as having school adjustment problems. It was found that the "problem" students had significantly lower self-concept scores (.01 level), and that the "problem" students used attributes of significantly lower abstraction level (.001). In addition, it was found that a rank-order correlation between abstraction level and self-concept scores was only .28, indicating that self-concept development and self-concept evaluation are separate variables.

As an attempt to induce change in self-concepts and behavior, an Experimental (E) group of 12 "problem" students was allowed to assist

elementary children in a special teacher-helper program for six to eight weeks. Changes in self-concept scores, attendance, and achievement were computed for the E group, and compared with a Control (C) group matched according to age, sex, grade level, attendance record, achievement level, and "problem status".

It was found that significant improvements in self-concept scores and in discrepancy scores were made by the E group but not by the C group (.05 level). However, no significant improvements were made in number or abstraction level of attributes used, or in attendance or grade averages.

It was concluded that there is a sequence in self-concept development in terms of number and abstraction level of attributes used in self description, and that abstraction level and self-concept scores are related to school adjustment problems. Further, changes in self-concept scores can be induced by participation in a teacher-helper program, but abstraction level and school behavior does not change concurrently with these changes in self-concept.¹⁸

The purpose of the study of C. McAdams was to determine the relationship existing between perceived interactions, as measured by the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scale (Firo-B) and those actually occurring in the classroom, as measured by the Flanders system of interaction analysis. One conclusion of the study was that the Firo-B scale did not prove to be a successful predictor of classroom climate when the climate was defined in terms of the Flanders system of interaction analysis.¹⁹

Another study written by R. W. Jack, involving inner-city students at the fifth grade level, was conducted to determine whether or not a

relationship existed between oral communication skills and their self-esteem. One major finding indicated that there was no significant relationship between pupil's perception of their oral communication skill and of their self-esteem.²⁰

G. W. Briggs, under the supervision of E. Paul Torrance, conducted a study to investigate the possibility of a rise in self-esteem as a result of implied discrepancy in perception of peer regard on the self-esteem level of fifth and sixth grade students.

Twelve classrooms were randomly selected from 60 fifth- and sixth-grade classrooms in two Georgia counties. This involved 301 subjects from a total population of approximately 1,740 students. Utilizing a Solomon Four Group Design, the students were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions: experimental-pretest, experimental-no pretest, control-pretest, or control-no pretest. The 12 classrooms were contacted during a one week period in which a pretest was administered to those students in the pretest groups. A sociometric was given to all the subjects, and they made an estimate of their standing on the sociometric. One week later, the classes were recontacted. The experimental groups were given the treatment which entailed informing the student he had underestimated his real level of peer regard. All of the students were then given a posttest Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. The students who had been given the treatment were debriefed.

No significant differences occurred as a result of the treatment. It was concluded that an implied discrepancy in perception of peer regard had no effect on the student's self-esteem level as reflected in the Coopersmith SEI.²¹

Rationale

As the researcher stated previously, the literature reviewed does not present total agreement that self-concept and interpersonal behavior are related.

Therefore, for testing purposes the hypotheses are stated in the null form. The researcher adopted the .05 level of significance for acceptance of hypotheses.

Hypotheses

Based on the preceding rationale, the following hypotheses were developed.

H.1. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for inclusion.

H.2. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for control.

H.3. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for affection.

H.4. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for inclusion.

H.5. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for control.

H.6. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for affection.

Summary

Chapter II has presented the review of related literature concerning self-concept theories, self-concept development, self-concept

and interpersonal behavior. The rationale developed from the reviewed literature was followed by a statement of the hypotheses directing the study.

Chapter III includes explanation of the instrumentation utilized in the collection of data and a description of the sample selection. Also, this chapter articulates the initial treatment of the collected data.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹William H. Fitts, The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization, Research Monograph No. 3 (Nashville, Tennessee, 1971), p. 13.
- ²Don E. Hamachek, Encounters with the Self (New York, 1971), p. 48.
- ³Ibid., p. 49.
- ⁴Ibid., p. 3.
- ⁵William W. Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970), p. 10.
- ⁶John J. Pietrofessa, George E. Leonard, and William Van Hoose, The Authentic Counselor (Chicago, 1971), pp. 25-26.
- ⁷William W. Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970), p. 10.
- ⁸Richard C. Nelson, Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School (New York, 1972), pp. 45-46.
- ⁹William H. Fitts, The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization, Research Monograph No. 3 (Nashville, Tennessee, 1971), p. 52.
- ¹⁰Ibid., pp. 13-14.
- ¹¹Ibid., p. 88.
- ¹²S. Lynch, "Intense Human Experience: Its Relationship to Openness and Self-Concept" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1968), Dissertation Abstract.
- ¹³W. Simon and E. Bernstein, "The Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Perceived Reciprocal Liking: A Sociometric Test of the Theory of Cognitive Balance," The Journal of Psychology, Vol. 79 (1971), pp. 197-201.
- ¹⁴William H. Fitts, The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization, Research Monograph No. 3 (Nashville, Tennessee, 1971), p. 98.
- ¹⁵Don E. Hamachek, Encounter with the Self (New York, 1971), p. 17.
- ¹⁶Stanley Coopersmith, "A Method of Determining Types of Self-Esteem," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 60 (1960), p. 87.

17S. Fullerton, "Development and Change in Self-Concept Descriptions and Concurrent Changes in School Behavior of Junior High School Students" (Unpublished dissertation, University of Oregon, 1970), Dissertation Abstract.

18Ibid.

19Charles McAdams, "A Comparison of Behavior Patterns of Music Teachers in Selected Universities Utilizing Interaction Analysis and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scale" (Unpublished dissertation, East Texas State University, 1970), Dissertation Abstract.

20R. W. Jack, "A Study of Children's Perception of Their Oral Communication Skills and of Their Self-Esteem" (Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1970), Dissertation Abstract.

21G. W. Briggs, "The Effect of Implied Discrepancy in Perception of Peer Regard on the Self-Esteem Level of Fifth and Sixth-Grade Students" (Unpublished dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970), Dissertation Abstract.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter will explain the two instruments employed in this study, the sample selections, and also the data collection and treatment procedures.

Instrumentation

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations

Orientation-Behavior

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations-Behavior measuring instrument, hereafter referred to as the Firo-B, was developed to construct a measure of how an individual acts in interpersonal situations, and to construct a measure that will lead to the prediction of interaction between people based on data from the measuring instrument alone. In this second regard, Firo-B is somewhat unique among personality tests. It is designed not only to measure individual characteristics but to measure specifically characteristics that may be combined in particular ways to predict relations between people.¹

This study utilized the children's form of the Firo-B, the Firo-BC, which was scaled on fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children in New

York. The Firo-BC employs the same methodology and relies on the same theoretical considerations as the Firo-B.

Firo-B therefore is designed to measure the individual's behavior toward others (e) expressed and the behavior he wants from others (w) wanted in three areas of interpersonal interaction. This measure leads to six scores: expressed inclusion behavior (e^i), wanted inclusion behavior (w^i), expressed control behavior (e^c), wanted control behavior (w^c), expressed affection behavior (e^a), and wanted affection behavior (w^a).²

TABLE I
NAMES AND SYMBOLS FOR FIRO-B SCALES³

	Expressed Behavior	Wanted Behavior
Inclusion	e^i I make efforts to include other people in my activities and to get them to include me in theirs. I try to belong, to join social groups, to be with people as much as possible.	w^i I want other people to include me in their activities and to invite me to belong, even if I do not make an effort to be included.
Control	e^c I try to exert control and influence over things. I take charge of things and tell other people what to do.	w^c I want others to control and influence me. I want other people to tell me what to do.
Affection	e^a I make efforts to become close to people. I express friendly and affectionate feelings and try to be personal and intimate.	w^a I want others to express friendly and affectionate feelings toward me and to try to become close to me.

Firo-B Validity

Content Validity

Content validity is determined by showing how well the content of the test samples the class of situations or the subject matter about which conclusions are to be drawn. If the theory underlying the use of the Guttman scales is accepted, then content validity is a property of all legitimate scales and, therefore, of all Firo-B scales.

If all the items are measuring the same dimension, and if they are all of descending popularity, then they must represent a sample of items from that dimension. Any other item in that dimension fits between or beyond scale items according to the percentage accepting the items and an individual's response to the new item is at least 90 per cent reproducible from his scale score. This implies that any sample of items in this dimension would rank respondents in essentially the same way; therefore, the sampling of the universe of items yields a satisfactory content validity.⁴

Concurrent Validity

Concurrent validity is evaluated by showing how well test scores correspond to measures of concurrent criterion performances or status. This validity area refers to studies which attempt to demonstrate differences, on the basis of the new measuring instrument, between already existent groups or between people with already known attitudes. Past studies include an investigation of Firo-B and political attitudes, Firo-B and occupational choice, and Firo-B and conformity behavior.

These studies represent several different areas where there was an opportunity to measure concurrent validity.⁵

TABLE II
RELATION TO FIRO INCLUSION SCALE AND ATTITUDE
TOWARD SIGNIFICANCE IN POLITICS

Individual Political Significance				
FIRO Inclusion	High	High 22	Low 15	$\chi^2 = 3.19$ $p < .05$
	Low	13	21	

Political Individual Significance Scale (Reproducibility = .94)

To a statistically significant degree, those scoring high on the Firo inclusion scale - liking to associate with people - tended to feel that the individual is significant in politics.⁶

TABLE III
RELATION BETWEEN FIRO CONTROL SCALE AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD POLITICAL AUTOCRATIC BEHAVIOR

Political Autocrat				
FIRO Control	High	High 22	Low 14	$\chi^2 = 3.16$ $p < .05$
	Low	14	21	

Political Autocrat Scale (Reproducibility = .91)

To a significant degree, those high on Firo control - liking to control others - tended to support autocratic behavior in politics.⁷

TABLE IV
FIRO SCORES OF VARIOUS OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

	Affection	e ^c	w ^c
Air Force Officers (N=864)	Low	High	High
Industrial Supervisors (N=39)	High	High	High
Public School Admin. (N=40)	High	Low	Low
Student Nurses (N=60)	High	Low	Low
Occupational Interpersonal Elements			

Perusal of the results reveals them to be on the whole reasonable. That officers and supervisors should be high on control and officers low on affection seems congruent with stereotypes of their roles. Beyond speculative interest, interpretation is risky. For one thing, interpretation is complicated by the fact that it is difficult to distinguish whether certain personality types are attracted to certain occupations or whether practicing the occupation determines the orientation.⁸

Conformity

The results of experiments by Asch concerning the relationship between conformity and Firo scores indicates that people who do not

change are high participators, who say it is not important for them to be liked. Those who change tend to like strict rules. This configuration suggested the possibility of looking for personality types made up of patterns of scores from all three interpersonal need areas to explain opinion changes.

The evidence so far seems to indicate most strongly that those who profess little need to be liked, who do not like to be governed by rules, and who express themselves freely tend not to change their opinion when under social pressure.⁹

Therefore, Firo-B is sufficiently able to indicate a possible relationship between conformity behavior and personality type.

Firo-B Reliability

Coefficient of Internal Consistency

The coefficient of internal consistency is the measure based on internal analysis of data obtained on a single trial. Essentially, this measure indicates the degree to which the items are homogeneous, or measuring the same thing. The usual test for internal consistency is the split-half method, i.e., the correlation between scores on two halves of the test. However, since the scales of Firo-B are all Guttman scales, reproducibility is the appropriate measure of internal consistency. If the items have the cumulative property, their unidimensionality is established.¹⁰

The reproducibility for all scales is very high and consistent over all samples.

TABLE V
REPRODUCIBILITY OF FIRO-B SCALES¹¹

Scale	Reproducibility	Number of Subjects
e ⁱ	.94	1615
w ⁱ	.94	1582
e ^c	.93	1554
w ^c	.94	1574
e ^a	.94	1467
w ^a	.94	1467
Mean	.94	1543

Coefficient of Stability

Coefficient of stability refers to the correlation between test scores and scores on retest after a time lapse. For Firo-B this is an important measure, since interpersonal orientations are presumably stable traits. A Harvard study indicated the probability of an individual's jumping from a high to a low, or a low to a high, is very slight - about ten per cent.¹²

Self-Esteem Inventory

The Self-Esteem Inventory, hereafter referred to as the SEI, was developed by Dr. Stanley Coopersmith. The final forms of the inventory were initially administered to two fifth and sixth grade classes of both boys and girls. The scores ranged from 40 to 100, with a mean

of 82.3 and S. D. of 11.6. The mean score for the 44 boys was 81.3, S. D. of 12.2; the mean score of the 43 girls was 83.3, S. D. of 16.7. The difference between the mean scores for boys and girls was not significant. The form of the distribution was skewed in the direction of high self-esteem. Five weeks later the inventory was readministered to one of the fifth grade classes. With a sample of 30 fifth grade children, test-retest reliability after the five-week interval was .88.¹³

Later, the Inventory was administered to a total of 1,748 children attending the public schools of central Connecticut. These children were more diverse in ability, interest, and social background than the initial sample. In the Connecticut study, the mean for the males was 70.1, S. D. 13.8, which was not significantly different from that of the girls - 72.2, S. D. 12.8. The distribution of scores obtained from this sample was also skewed in the direction of high self-esteem. Test-retest reliability after a three-year interval with a sample of 56 children from this population was .70.¹⁴

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) has been administered to over 40,000 children and adults in the past five years. The subjects who responded to the inventory were generally participating in research studies or in special educational or clinical programs intended to enhance self-esteem. The subjects included both adults and children ranging across the entire socioeconomic range and members of many ethnic and subcultural groups.¹⁵

The following studies have been summarized by the Self-Esteem Institute; however, original sources will be footnoted.

O. Kimball (1972) administered the Self-Esteem Inventory to approximately 7600 public school children in grades four through eight and reported: (1) Percentile equivalents showed a consistency of score values at a given percentile regardless of the population considered. There was no evidence indicating a need for separation of norms at each grade level. No difference in Self-Esteem Inventory scores once grade levels for males or females or for both sexes were combined. Males tended to be higher than females. (2) Kuder-Richardson reliabilities (KR-20) were generated for each grade level. The following reliabilities were obtained: grade four, = .92; grade five, = .87; grade six, = .88; grade seven, = .89; and grade eight, = .90.¹⁶

Fullerton (1972) used the Self-Esteem Inventory with 104 boys and girls of middle-class background in grades five and six. The children were mentally gifted (I. Q. = 130+). The study was designed to examine relationships between self-esteem, self-disclosure, and risk taking. For each construct, self-ratings and behavioral observations were obtained. The procedure was intended to analyze the relative contributions of common trait variance and common method variance to the correlations between different measures of the same construct (convergent validity); and to examine the construct validity of the concepts in terms of discriminant validity (multitrait, multimethod, matrix, Campbell and Fiske, 1959).

The validity coefficient between SEI and BRF, $r = .44$, $p < .005$ thus indicating substantial support for the convergent validity of self-esteem. The marked contrast between this significant validity value and the small insignificant heterotrait heteromethod correlations (i.e., $-.05$, $.11$, $.00$, and $.02$) provides substantial evidence for the discriminant validity for self-esteem.¹⁷

Sample Selection

The participants involved in this study were 73 students in the Broken Arrow Public School System, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma. Specifically, the students were all in the fifth grade of Southside Elementary School, Broken Arrow System. This particular grade level was chosen primarily for two reasons: the first reason is that Coopersmith suggests that at some time preceding middle childhood the individual arrives at a general appraisal of his worth, which remains relatively stable over a period of years and second, Schutz suggests the most helpful time for examination of interpersonal relations is during the elementary years.

Data Collection

Upon selection of the school system to be included in the sample, permission was sought and gained from the Director of Elementary Education to conduct the study.

After permission was granted, the Elementary Director suggested Southside Elementary School and communicated the necessary information to the Principal of that school.

In the process of administering the instruments, students involved were assured of the anonymity of their responses. The only demographic data asked for was age and identification of sex. It was expressed quite clearly that no individual student would be identified in any manner in the final report of the study. The instructions to the students before administering the instruments were the following:

(1) These instruments are not tests but rather like questionnaires to seek your ideas and perceptions.

(2) There are no right or wrong answers.

(3) The questions are about you and no one knows the answers better than you.

(4) There is no time limit.

(5) When you have completed your answer sheets, please place them upside down on the table and return quietly to your homeroom.

Responses were obtained from all fifth grade students present on the day of May 2, 1975.

Treatment of Data

Responses to the Firo-B and SEI were hand scored by the writer according to the instructions given by the author of each instrument. The scores were then treated using a correlation program developed by the Oklahoma State University Computer Center.

Summary

Chapter III has described the procedures implemented in sample selection, data collection, and initial treatment of the data. The instruments utilized in the study were described and reliability and validity data were reported. Data from the study will be presented and analyzed in Chapter IV.

FOOTNOTES

¹William C. Schutz, The Interpersonal Underworld (Palo Alto, California, 1966), p. 58.

²Ibid., p. 58.

³William C. Schutz, The Firo Scales: Manual (Palo Alto, California, 1967), p. 5.

⁴William C. Schutz, The Interpersonal Underworld (Palo Alto, California, 1966), p. 66.

⁵Ibid., p. 66.

⁶Ibid., p. 70.

⁷Ibid., p. 71.

⁸Ibid., p. 73.

⁹Ibid., pp. 73-77.

¹⁰William C. Schutz, The Firo Scales: Manual (Palo Alto, California, 1967), p. 5.

¹¹Ibid., p. 5.

¹²Ibid., pp. 5-6.

¹³Stanley Coopersmith, The Antecedents of Self-Esteem (San Francisco, California, 1967), p. 10.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁵Self-Esteem Institute, "Norms for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory" (San Francisco, California, March, 1974), p. 1.

¹⁶O. Kimball, "Development of Norms for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory: Grades Four through Eight" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1972).

¹⁷W. S. Fullerton, "Self-Disclosure, Self-Esteem, and Risk Taking" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1972).

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The presentation and analysis of data for this study will be reported in a general form and then as the data relate specifically to each hypothesis.

All of the six hypotheses of correlation between the Self-Esteem Inventory and each of the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior subscales were accepted in the null form. The hypotheses were accepted at the .05 confidence level.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for inclusion.

The data in Table VI represent the analysis of the correlation between the SEI and the interpersonal expressed need for inclusion. The relationship was analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic; the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal expressed need for inclusion was $\rho = .14$, with a probability of .124. Therefore, hypothesis 1, stated in the null form, was accepted.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for control.

The data in Table VI represent the analysis of the correlation between the SEI and the interpersonal expressed need for control. The relationship was analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic; the

correlation between SEI and the interpersonal expressed need for control as, $\rho = .11$ with a probability of .183. Therefore, hypothesis 2, stated in the null form, was accepted.

TABLE VI
THE SPEARMAN ρ STATISTICAL MEASUREMENT OF THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SELF-ESTEEM
INVENTORY SCORES AND THE FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL
RELATIONS ORIENTATION-BEHAVIOR
SCORES

Instruments	Subscale	N	ρ	Sig.
SEI-Interpersonal Expressed Need for Inclusion	(01)	73	.14	.124
SEI-Interpersonal Expressed Need for Control	(02)	73	.11	.183
SEI-Interpersonal Expressed Need for Affection	(03)	73	.08	.239
SEI-Interpersonal Desired Need for Inclusion	(04)	73	.00	.499
SEI-Interpersonal Desired Need for Control	(05)	73	-.10	.201
SEI-Interpersonal Desired Need for Affection	(06)	73	.05	.341

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for affection.

The data in Table VI represent the analysis of the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal expressed need for affection. The relationship was analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic; the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal expressed need for affection as, $\rho = .08$, with a probability of .239. Therefore, hypothesis 3, stated in the null form, was accepted.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for inclusion.

The data in Table VI represent the analysis of the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal desired need for inclusion. The relationship was analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic; the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal desired need for inclusion as, $\rho = .00$, with a probability level of .499. Therefore, hypothesis 4, stated in the null form, was accepted.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for control.

The data in Table VI represent the analysis of the correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for control. The relationship was analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic; the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal desired need for control as, $\rho = .10$, with a probability level of .201. Therefore, hypothesis 5, stated in the null form, was accepted.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for affection.

The data in Table VI represent the analysis of the correlation between SEI and the interpersonal desired need for affection. The relationship was analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic; the

correlation between SEI and the interpersonal need for affection as, $\rho = .05$, with a probability of .341. Therefore, hypothesis 6, stated in the null form, was accepted.

After examination of each hypothesis, the researcher again suggests that it is reasonable to conclude that the SEI is independent of each of the Firo-B subscales.

Subsidiary Analysis

In a subsidiary analysis, it was found that some of the Firo-B subscales were correlated with each other.

TABLE VII
CORRELATION OF SUBSCALE 01 OF THE
FIRO-B SUBSCALES 02, 04, AND 06

Interpersonal Expressed Need for Inclusion (01)	Interpersonal Expressed Need for Control (02)	$\rho = .67$	$p < .001$
Interpersonal Expressed Need for Inclusion (01)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Inclusion (04)	$\rho = .51$	$p < .001$
Interpersonal Expressed Need for Inclusion (01)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Affection (06)	$\rho = .49$	$p < .001$

Subscale 01 was significantly correlated with subscales 02, 04, and 06, $\rho = .67$, $p < .001$, $\rho = .51$, $p < .001$, and $\rho = .49$, $p < .001$, respectively.

TABLE VIII
CORRELATION OF SUBSCALE 02 OF THE
FIRO-B TO SUBSCALES 05 AND 06

Interpersonal Expressed Need for Control (02)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Control (05)	rho .47	p < .001
Interpersonal Expressed Need for Control (02)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Affection (06)	rho .53	p < .001

Subscale 02 was significantly correlated with subscale 05, rho = .47, p < .001, and with subscale 06, rho = .53, p < .001.

TABLE IX
CORRELATION OF SUBSCALE 04 OF THE
FIRO-B TO SUBSCALES 05 AND 06

Interpersonal Desired Need for Inclusion (04)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Control (05)	rho -.23	p < .05
Interpersonal Desired Need for Inclusion (04)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Affection (06)	rho -.30	p < .05

Subscale 04 was significantly correlated with subscale 05, rho = -.23, p < .05, and subscale 06, rho = -.30, p < .05.

TABLE X
CORRELATION OF SUBSCALE 05 OF THE
FIRO-B TO SUBSCALE 06

Interpersonal Desired Need for Control (05)	Interpersonal Desired Need for Affection (06)	rho .64	p < .001
--	--	---------	----------

Finally, subscales 05 and 06 were significantly correlated, rho = .64, $p < .001$.

Subscale 03 was not significantly correlated with any of the other Firo-B subscales.

Supplemental Analysis

The mean score for the Self-Esteem Inventory administered to the total student sample was 14.3. The mean score for the male students was 13.6, and the mean score for the female students was 14.9. The standard deviation for the Self-Esteem Inventory administered to the total sample was 3.4. The standard deviation for male students was 3.9 and 2.8 for female students. These and other pertinent data are presented in Table XI.

The mean scores and standard deviation are presented for the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior Instrument in Table XII.

The mean scores and standard deviation are presented separately for male and female students in Table XIII.

TABLE XI
 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION
 FOR THE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

Sample	Range	Mean	S.D.	N
Total Student Population	6-23	14.3	3.4	73
Male Students	6-19	13.6	3.9	36
Female Students	6-23	14.9	2.8	37

TABLE XII
 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE
 FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION-
 BEHAVIOR INSTRUMENT

Sample	Subscale	N	Mean	S.D.
Total Students	Expressed Need for Inclusion (01)	73	6.1	2.1
Total Students	Expressed Need for Control (02)	73	5.4	2.1
Total Students	Expressed Need for Affection (03)	73	3.3	2.5
Total Students	Desired Need for Inclusion (04)	73	3.8	3.7
Total Students	Desired Need for Control (05)	73	6.0	2.1
Total Students	Desired Need for Affection (06)	73	5.6	1.9

TABLE XIII
 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR MALE AND
 FEMALE STUDENTS FOR THE FUNDAMENTAL
 INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION-
 BEHAVIOR INSTRUMENT

Sample	Subscale	N	Mean	S.D.
Male Students	Expressed Need for Inclusion (01)	36	5.7	1.9
Male Students	Expressed Need for Control (02)	36	5.2	3.4
Male Students	Expressed Need for Affection (03)	36	3.0	1.6
Male Students	Desired Need for Inclusion (04)	36	3.9	2.4
Male Students	Desired Need for Control (05)	36	5.7	2.5
Male Students	Desired Need for Affection (06)	36	5.4	1.9
<hr/>				
Female Students	Expressed Need for Inclusion (01)	37	6.4	2.0
Female Students	Expressed Need for Control (02)	37	5.6	1.8
Female Students	Expressed Need for Affection (03)	37	3.7	2.2
Female Students	Desired Need for Inclusion (04)	37	3.8	2.5
Female Students	Desired Need for Control (05)	37	4.4	4.6
Female Students	Desired Need for Affection (06)	37	5.7	1.9

Summary

The six major related hypotheses of the study were tested and results were summarized in this chapter. All six of the hypotheses were accepted in the null form. The final portion of the chapter presented subsidiary and supplemental data.

Chapter V presents the findings and the major conclusions drawn from the findings. Also, Chapter V includes further considerations and a discussion of the further considerations, as well as the recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was designed to determine if a significant positive correlation existed between self-concept and interpersonal behavior processes. The instruments utilized to investigate the possible correlation were the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior Scale.

These two instruments were administered to the sample which consisted of 73 fifth grade students from Southside Elementary School of the Broken Arrow School System.

The data collection took place during the spring semester of 1975. The data were analyzed using the Spearman rho statistic.

Findings

The findings of this study were as follows:

1. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for inclusion as measured by the SEI and Firo-B.

2. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for control as measured by the SEI and Firo-B.

3. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal expressed need for affection as measured by the SEI and Firo-B.

4. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for inclusion as measured by the SEI and Firo-B.

5. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for control as measured by the SEI and Firo-B.

6. There is no significant positive correlation between self-concept and the interpersonal desired need for affection as measured by the SEI and Firo-B.

Major Conclusions

This investigation was an exploratory study of the relationship between self-concept and the interpersonal behavior processes. Specifically, the study was designed to determine if a correlation existed between these two entities by utilizing the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior measuring device for this particular sample.

Considering the significance level of this study and an adequately large sample, $N = 73$, it is reasonable to conclude that the Self-Esteem Inventory is independent of each Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscale. Had any sizeable dependencies existed between the two measuring devices, it is likely that data would have revealed them.

Further Considerations and Discussion

The researcher's original inclination was to hypothesize that significant positive correlations existed between the scores of the Self-Esteem Inventory and each of the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscales scores. Therefore, the significance of the study resided in the possible establishment of a relationship between self-concept and interpersonal behavior processes, thus, providing new and valuable insights into self-concept development.

However, the confirmation of null hypotheses of the study, although not generalizable to other groups, indicates there is no significant positive correlation between the two instruments utilized in the study to investigate the possible correlation between self-concept and interpersonal behavior.

The following further considerations have been drawn from the findings of this study to explain the acceptance of the null hypotheses.

1. The lack of significant positive correlation between the Self-Esteem Inventory and Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscales may be partially attributed to the size and composition of the sample of the current study.

In general, the larger the sample, the higher its degree of reliability. The essential thing for the researcher to recognize is that both size and representativeness of the sampling have an important bearing on the results obtained.¹

The sample in this study is not particularly large nor is the current sample truly representative. However, considering the exploratory nature of this study, the sample is quite adequate; but the lack of size and representativeness may have affected findings of this study.

2. The lack of significant positive correlation between the Self-Esteem Inventory and Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscales may be partially attributed to the grade level involved in the current study.

The literature reviewed for this study indicated that the fifth grade is an ideal level for measuring self-concept development and interpersonal behavior processes. However, in view of the findings of the current study, the researcher suggests the lack of a stratified sample may have affected the findings of this study.

The possibility also exists that the concept of self, by the time a student reaches fifth grade, is stabilized to the point where interpersonal behavior processes may not dramatically affect reporting of self-concept.

3. The lack of significant positive correlation between the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscales may be partially attributed to the instrumentation utilized in the current study.

The instruments utilized in the study are both self report inventories, and the problems of self report were explained in the limitations section of this paper. The literature reviewed for this study indicated that the two instruments selected by the researcher are both highly valid and reliable. However, the researcher suggests the utilization of these two specific instruments may have affected the findings of the study.

The researcher made the assumption that self-concept evaluation would give an accurate determination of self-concept development. As Strong and Feder state:

Every evaluative statement that a person makes concerning himself can be considered a sample of his self-concept, from which inferences may then be made about the various properties of that self-concept.²

Based on the results of this study, the researcher suggests that this may not be a valid assumption; and it may have affected the findings of the current study.

4. The lack of significant positive correlation between the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscales may be partially attributed to the assumption made by the current study that self-concept development and self-concept evaluation are similar in their relationship to interpersonal behavior processes.

A similar and related assumption made by the researcher was that the terms self and self-concept are synonymous. The possibility exists that the two terms are quite different by definition. If the self is defined as being inherent and the self-concept defined as being learned, it may be reasonable then to question which of the two entities would be reported by an individual responding to a questionnaire concerning characteristics of "self". The researcher also suggests that it may not be a valid assumption, and it may have affected the findings of the current study.

5. The lack of significant positive correlation between the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscales may be partially attributed to the lack of control of specific and selected external variables of the current study.

The exploratory nature of this study did not necessitate control of external variables such as home environment, social background, or parental relationship. However, the researcher suggests the lack of

control of such external variables may have affected the findings of the current study.

Recommendations for Further Study

More research is needed to validate the findings and conclusions of this study. The following recommendations seem to be most pertinent for further investigation.

1. A similar study should be conducted which involves a larger or more representative sample. An investigation involving an entire school system could possibly be valuable or a truly representative random student sample that would allow for generalization of results.

2. A similar study should be conducted which involves a student sample other than fifth grade students. An investigation involving a student sample from many grade levels might provide additional insight into deciding the most appropriate age or grade for administering self-concept and interpersonal relations questionnaires.

3. A similar study should be conducted which utilizes other measuring instruments. The researcher suggests the following instruments as possible alternatives:

THE BLEDSOE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE. The BSCS, which was designed by Joseph Bledsoe of the University of Georgia, has been used with success from the third through the eighth grades (Bledsoe, 1967). It consists of a checklist of 30 trait-descriptive adjectives.

THE SELF-APPRAISAL SCALE. Another recent self-report inventory is the SAS, developed by Helen Davidson and Judith Greenberg of the City College of the City University of New York for their research on scholastic achievers from a deprived background (Davidson and Greenberg,

1967). It consists of 24 items, each of which has been tested for its intelligibility to fifth grade children.

THE HOW-I-SEE-MYSELF-SCALE. This popular instrument was developed by Ira Gordon of the University of Florida from 1958 to 1967. It was devised from the categories developed by Jersild (1952), out of the compositions of children. The scale consists of a 40 (elementary form) or 42-item (secondary form) five-point scale. Additional information may be found in Gordon (1966, 1968) and Yeatts (1967).

Q-SORT. Q-Sort is not so much an instrument as it is a method. It requires the subject to sort a number of self-reference statements (usually 70 to 150 items) into a series of piles or classes along a continuum of appropriateness of self-description, from those "most like" him to those "least like" him. The number of items sorted into each pile is specified in such a way that the resulting frequency distributions approximate that of a normal distribution. For an extensive reference on this method, see Cummins (1963).

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL. The semantic differential technique of measuring the "meaning systems" of individuals was developed by Charles Osgood of the University of Illinois. The method is described in detail in Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaun (1957). Basically, it involves sets of polar adjectives such as Happy-sad, Hard-soft, and Slow-fast, with five to seven spaces between each set. The concept to be measured is placed at the top of the scale, and the subject is to place a check somewhere along the continuum to indicate his attitude. It is a popular and flexible method of measuring the dimensions of one's system of meanings about himself and the world in which he lives.

There are other commercially produced self-report inventories which are designated to be used by individuals with special training in psychometrics. Two of the more popular are the TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE (Fitts, 1964) and the CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY (Gough, 1956).³

Also, the researcher suggests the possible use of the Firo-F (for feelings) developed by William C. Schutz. This instrument is a measure of an individual orientation toward expressed and wanted feelings in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. These feelings are respectively importance, competence, and lovability.⁴

4. A similar study should be conducted which investigates the correlation between self-concept development and self-concept evaluation in relation to interpersonal behavior processes. One possible method for investigation of the correlation between self-concept development and self-concept evaluation may be the utilization of observation techniques.

5. A similar study should be conducted which attempts to control specific and selected variables. Specifically, a study might be conducted which attempts to control such variables as home environment, social background, and parental relationship.

The preceding five recommendations are only the major suggestions for further research.

In conclusion, this study indicated no significant positive correlation between the two instruments utilized to investigate the relationship between self-concept and interpersonal behavior. Further, this study concluded that the Self-Esteem Inventory is independent of each Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior subscale.

Therefore, the most salient value of this particular research was the finding of the lack of dependence between the two instruments and the generation of the possibility of the lack of a dependency relationship between self-concept and interpersonal behavior processes.

FOOTNOTES

¹Tyrus Hillway, Introduction to Research (Boston, 1969), pp. 196-197.

²D. Strong and D. Feder, "Measurement of the Self-Concept: A Critique of the Literature," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 8 (1961), p. 170.

³William W. Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970), pp. 61-62.

⁴William C. Schutz, The Interpersonal Underworld (Palo Alto, California, 1966), p. vi.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Assagioli, Roberto. The Act of Will. New York: Viking Press, 1973.
- Assagioli, Roberto. Psychosynthesis. New York: Hobbs and Company, Inc., 1965.
- Briggs, G. W. "The Effect of Implied Discrepancy in Perception of Peer Regard on the Self-Esteem Level of Fifth and Sixth-Grade Students." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970.)
- Brookover, W. B., A. Patterson, and S. Thomas. Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement. U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 845. East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University.
- Cooley, C. H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribner's, 1902.
- Coopersmith, Stanley. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: W. M. Freeman and Company, 1967.
- Coopersmith, Stanley. "A Method of Determining Types of Self-Esteem." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 3 (1960), pp. 87-94.
- Fitts, William H. The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization. Research Monograph No. 3. Nashville: Dede Wallace Center, Studies on the Self-Concept Rehabilitation, 1971.
- Fullerton, S. "Development and Change in Self-Concept Descriptions and Concurrent Changes in School Behavior of Junior High School Students." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1970.)
- Fullerton, W. S. "Self-Disclosure, Self-Esteem, and Risk Taking." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1972.)
- Hamachek, Don E. Encounters with the Self. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971.
- Harper, Robert A. Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Hillway, Tyrus. Introduction to Research. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1969.

- Jack, R. W. "A Study of Children's Perception of Their Oral Communication Skills and of Their Self-Esteem." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.)
- James, William. Principles of Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1890.
- Kelley, Earl C. "The Fully Functioning Self." Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962, p. 9.
- Kimball, O. "Development of Norms for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory: Grades Four through Eight." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1972.)
- Lynch, S. "Intense Human Experience: Its Relationship to Openness and Self-Concept." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1968.)
- McAdams, Charles. "A Comparison of Behavior Patterns of Music Teachers in Selected Universities Utilizing Interaction Analysis and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scale." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University, 1970.)
- Nelson, Richard C. Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Pietrofessa, John J., George E. Leonard, and William Van Hoose. The Authentic Counselor. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1971.
- Purkey, William W. Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Schutz, William C. The Firo Scales: Manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1967.
- Schutz, William C. The Interpersonal Underworld. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1966.
- Self-Esteem Institute. "Norms for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory." San Francisco, California: Self-Esteem Institute Publications, 1974, p. 1.
- Simon, W., and E. Bernstein. "The Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Perceived Reciprocal Liking: A Sociometric Test of the Theory of Cognitive Balance." The Journal of Psychology, Vol. 79 (1971), pp. 197-201.
- Strong, D., and D. Feder. "Measurement of the Self-Concept: A Critique of the Literature." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 8 (1961), p. 170.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING AND INTERPRETING THE
SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY AND THE INVENTORY
WITH APPROPRIATE RESPONSES MARKED

Instructions for Scoring and Interpreting
the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI)

Coopersmith

There are two forms of the Self-Esteem Inventory: A contains 58 items and a total of five subscales, B contains 25 items and no subscales. Form A provides a general assessment of self-esteem which may be broken down into component subscales depending on the goals and interest of the tester but which may also be used without such differentiation. Form B is briefer, does not permit further differentiation, and takes about half the administration time of Form A. The total scores of Forms A and B correlate .86, a finding which has been established to a markedly similar extent on four different samples. This is not surprising since Form B was based on an item analysis of Form A and includes those 25 items which showed the highest item-total score relationships of scores obtained with Form A. Validating information is presented in Coopersmith's monograph "The Antecedents of Self-Esteem" (Freeman, San Francisco, 1968).

Form A: 58 items

There are five subscales which cycle in sequence the length of the SEI. These subscales are:

General Self	Items 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17; etc.
Social Self-Peers	Items 4, 11, 18, 25, 32, 39, 46, 53
Home-Parents	Items 5, 12, 19, 26, 33, 40, 47, 54
Lie Scale	Items 6, 13, 20, 27, 34, 41, 48, 55
School-Academic	Items 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49, 56

As noted above, the subscales do not have to be scored separately with the exception of the Lie Scale. The responses indicating high self-esteem and low Lie, defensive reactions are noted on the enclosed scored copies of the SEI.

The scores are reported as:

- I. Total number correct of all scales excluding Lie (a maximum of 50).
- II. A separate score total number of responses indicative of defensive, Lie reaction (a maximum of 8).

For convenience sake, the total SEI score is multiplied by two so that maximum score is 100.

Thus SEI score $50 \times 2 = 100$
Lie score $8 = 8$

In the event that separate subscales for a given purpose are desired, the responses are scored and noted separately in the same manner as the Lie Scale.

Age Range: Has been used without difficulty on a group basis with populations ranging from nine to adult level. Older groups are not comfortable with the wording of several items which may accordingly be altered to suit the sample. College student samples have not indicated any resistance to the present wordings of these two forms. In samples with children younger than nine or where the educational experience has not resulted in an average reading or conceptual level, rewording and/or individual administration may be required.

Sex: The two forms are used for both males and females. In most studies there were no significant differences between the esteem level of males and females tested.

Distribution: In most samples the curve is skewed in the direction of high self-esteem. The means have been in the vicinity of 70-80 and the standard deviations approximately 11-13. More specific information is reported by Coopersmith. Quite obviously there are no exact criteria of high, medium, and low self-esteem. This will vary with the sample, distribution, theoretical considerations, etc. Employing position in the group as an index of relative self-appraisal, Coopersmith has employed the upper quartile as indicative interquartile range as indicative of medium esteem.

Norms:

SEI preadolescents (9-15) = 70.1 females
72.2 males

SEI young adults (16-23) = 76.0

Form A

ITEMS 6, 13, 20, 27, 34, 41, 48, 55 are
LIE DEFENSIVE SCALE (8 items)
MAXIMUM TOTAL SCORE = 50
8 LIE ITEMS

SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY (SEI)

Please mark each statement in the following way:
If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check (✓) in the column "LIKE ME."
If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check (✓) in the column "UNLIKE ME."
There are no right or wrong answers.

		LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
	1. I spend a lot of time daydreaming. _____		✓
	2. I'm pretty sure of myself. _____	✓	
	3. I often wish I were someone else. _____		✓
	4. I'm easy to like. _____	✓	
	5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together. _____	✓	
LIE	6. I never worry about anything. _____		✓
	7. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class. _____		✓
	8. I wish I were younger. _____		✓
	9. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could. _____		✓
	10. I can make up my mind without too much trouble. _____	✓	
	11. I'm a lot of fun to be with. _____	✓	
	12. I get upset easily at home. _____		✓
LIE	13. I always do the right thing. _____		✓
	14. I'm proud of my school work. _____	✓	
	15. Someone always has to tell me what to do. _____		✓
	16. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new. _____		✓
	17. I'm often sorry for the things I do. _____		✓
	18. I'm popular with kids my own age. _____	✓	
	19. My parents usually consider my feelings. _____	✓	
LIE	20. I'm never unhappy. _____		✓
	21. I'm doing the best work that I can. _____	✓	
	22. I give in very easily. _____		✓
	23. I can usually take care of myself. _____	✓	
	24. I'm pretty happy. _____	✓	
	25. I would rather play with children younger than me. _____		✓
	26. My parents expect too much of me. _____		✓
LIE	27. I like everyone I know. _____		✓
	28. I like to be called on in class. _____	✓	
	29. I understand myself. _____	✓	
	30. It's pretty tough to be me. _____		✓

		LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
	31. Things are all mixed up in my life. _____		✓
	32. Kids usually follow my ideas. _____	✓	
	33. No one pays much attention to me at home. _____		✓
LIE	34. I never get scolded. _____		✓
	35. I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to. _____		✓
	36. I can make up my mind and stick to it. _____	✓	
	37. I really don't like being a boy - girl. _____		✓
	38. I have a low opinion of myself. _____		✓
	39. I don't like to be with other people. _____		✓
	40. There are many times when I'd like to leave home. _____		✓
LIE	41. I'm never shy. _____		✓
	42. I often feel upset in school. _____		✓
	43. I often feel ashamed of myself. _____		✓
	44. I'm not as nice looking as most people. _____		✓
	45. If I have something to say, I usually say it. _____	✓	
	46. Kids pick on me very often. _____		✓
	47. My parents understand me. _____	✓	
LIE	48. I always tell the truth. _____		✓
	49. My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough. _____		✓
	50. I don't care what happens to me. _____		✓
	51. I'm a failure. _____		✓
	52. I get upset easily when I'm scolded. _____		✓
	53. Most people are better liked than I am. _____		✓
	54. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me. _____		✓
LIE	55. I always know what to say to people. _____		✓
	56. I often get discouraged in school. _____		✓
	57. Things usually don't bother me. _____	✓	
	58. I can't be depended on. _____		✓

Form B

The responses indicating high self-esteem are noted in the enclosed, scored copy of Form B. The score is reported as a single score with a maximum of 25, indicative of high self-esteem. The number of correct responses is noted, then multiplied by four ($25 \times 4 = 100$), providing a figure which is comparable to the Self-Evaluation score obtained on Form A (excluding the Lie).

Name _____ School _____
 Class _____ Date _____

Please mark each statement in the following way:

If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check (✓) in the column "LIKE ME."

If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check (✓) in the column "UNLIKE ME."

There are no right or wrong answers.

	LIKE ME	UNLIKE ME
Example: I'm a hard worker. _____		
1. I often wish I were someone else. _____		✓
2. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class. _____		✓
3. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could. _____		✓
4. I can make up my mind without too much trouble. _____	✓	
5. I'm a lot of fun to be with. _____	✓	
6. I get upset easily at home. _____		✓
7. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new. _____		✓
8. I'm popular with kids my own age. _____	✓	
9. My parents usually consider my feelings. _____	✓	
10. I give in very easily. _____		✓
11. My parents expect too much of me. _____		✓
12. It's pretty tough to be me. _____		✓
13. Things are all mixed up in my life. _____		✓
14. Kids usually follow my ideas. _____	✓	
15. I have a low opinion of myself. _____		✓
16. There are many times when I'd like to leave home. _____		✓
17. I often feel upset in school. _____		✓
18. I'm not as nice looking as most people. _____		✓
19. If I have something to say, I usually say it. _____	✓	
20. My parents understand me. _____	✓	
21. Most people are better liked than I am. _____		✓
22. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me. _____		✓
23. I often get discouraged in school. _____		✓
24. Things usually don't bother me. _____		✓
25. I can't be depended on. _____		✓

APPENDIX B

FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION-
BEHAVIOR SCALE (FIRO-BC)

PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 64-67, "Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior Scale (FIRO-BC)", copyright by Consulting Psychologists Press, not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at Oklahoma State University Library.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

FIRO-BC

William C. Schutz, Ph.D.

Marilyn Wood, M.A.

These questions ask about how you feel or act with other children. There are no right or wrong answers: everybody has his own ideas.

Try to tell how you really act, not how you wish you acted or how someone else wants you to act.

Please put a number in every box after you read the directions at the top of each page.

NAME _____

GRADE _____ AGE _____

DATE _____ BOY _____ GIRL _____

	I	C	A
e			
w			

Place a number from 1 to 6 in the box in front of each question.

For the questions on this page, the numbers mean:

1. most children 2. many children 3. some children 4. a few children

5. one or two children 6. no children

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to make other children do what I want them to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't get very friendly with other children. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to be very friendly and to tell my secrets to other children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like other children to choose me for a friend. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to invite me to take part in what they're doing. | <input type="checkbox"/> I take orders from other children. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> What I do depends a lot on what other children tell me. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act very friendly to me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act as if they don't know me very well. | <input type="checkbox"/> I try to be friendly to other children. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to take charge of things when I am with other children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to ask me to join in what they are doing. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I act unfriendly with other children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I follow what other children are doing. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to ask me to take part when they're talking about something. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like other children to get to know me very well. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I let other children take charge of things. | <input type="checkbox"/> I try to have close, warm friendships with children. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act friendly to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> I let other children tell me what to do. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to have other children do things the way I want them done. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act very friendly and tell me their secrets. |

For the questions on this page, the numbers 1 to 6 mean:

1. almost all the time 2. a lot of the time 3. sometimes 4. once in a while

5. almost never 6. never

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> When other children are playing games, I like to join them. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to ask me to join in what they're doing. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to take charge of things when I'm with children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I let other children tell me what to do. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to have close, warm friendships with children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act not too friendly to me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like other children to invite me to their houses when they are having friends over. | <input type="checkbox"/> I try to include other children in my plans. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> What I do depends a lot on what other children tell me. | <input type="checkbox"/> I try to be the boss when I am with other children. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act as if they don't know me very well. | <input type="checkbox"/> I try to get very friendly with other children and to tell them my secrets. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> When a group of children gets together to do something, I like to join in with them. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to invite me to things. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to make other children do what I want them to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> I follow what other children are doing. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to have close friendships with children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like other children to get to know me very well. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like to be invited to parties. | <input type="checkbox"/> When children are going things together, I like to join them. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I take orders from other children. | <input type="checkbox"/> I try to have other children do things I want done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I like children to act very friendly to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> When I'm going to do something, I try to ask other children to do it with me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I try to take part in clubs and school groups. | <input type="checkbox"/> I like other children to choose me for a friend. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> I like to go to parties. |

For the questions on this page, the numbers 1 to 6 mean:

1. almost all the time 2. a lot of the time 3. sometimes 4. once in a while

5. almost never 6. never

I like to tell other children what to do.

I try to have other children do things the way I want them done.

I try to have friends that I can be very friendly with and tell my secrets to.

I try to have other children around me.

I join clubs.

VITA

Kenneth W. Morrison

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A CORRELATIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SELF-CONCEPT AND INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Ottumwa, Iowa, November 19, 1939, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Morrison.

Education: Attended grade school in Ottumwa, Iowa; graduated from Ottumwa High School, Ottumwa, Iowa, in 1958; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Parsons College, with a major in English, in May, 1962; received the Master of Arts degree from Northeast Missouri State University, with a major in Secondary School Administration, in May, 1967; received the Certificate of Specialist degree from Southern Illinois University, in August, 1969; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree from Oklahoma State University in July, 1975.

Professional Experience: English teacher in Belle Plaine, Iowa, public schools, 1962-1965; English teacher in Ottumwa, Iowa, public schools, 1965-1966; Education instructor at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 1967-1968; NEXTEP Research Fellow in the College of Education, Southern Illinois University, 1968-1969; Education instructor at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 1969-1974; Graduate Assistant in the College of Education, Oklahoma State University, 1974-1975.