

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-29,872

SIRIPIPAT, Ampai, 1941-
A COMPARISON OF SELF CONCEPTS OF THAI AND AMERICAN
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1972
Education, psychology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1972

AMPAI SIRIPIPAT
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A COMPARISON OF SELF CONCEPTS OF THAI AND
AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
AMPAI SIRIPIPAT
Norman, Oklahoma
1972

A COMPARISON OF SELF CONCEPTS OF THAI AND
AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

APPROVED BY

Glenn R. Snider

Robert B. B.

Henry H. Smouse

Mary Clare Petty

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank her committee, Dr. Glenn R. Snider, chairman, Dr. Mary Clare Petty, Dr. Robert Bibens, and Dr. Albert D. Smouse for their support and encouragement during the doctoral program.

Special thanks and gratitudes go to four persons. First, Dr. Glenn R. Snider for his criticisms of the study. Secondly, Dr. Albert D. Smouse who supplied many ideas in the formulation and construction of this investigation. Thirdly, Dr. William H. Graves, under whom Directed Readings in perceptual psychology and measurement were informative and invaluable for the study, in terms of both theory and quantitative aspects. Fourthly, Miss Sumitra Angwatanakul, one of the writer's best friends, who made the arrangements for the Thai sample thus making this study possible. Her assistance and enthusiastic cooperation was of immense value.

The contribution from Dr. Alan Nicewander, Dr. Larry E. Toothaker, Dr. George Letchworth, and Mr. Jorge Mendoza were greatly appreciated.

Appreciation is also extended to

Miss Arporn Chartburus,
Dr. Bert L. Corr, and
Mrs. Chas L. Wiest,

administrative and school officials for their cooperation and assistance. For translating the Tennessee Self Concept

Scale, thanks are due to

Mrs. Sujitra Sawatdiwong,
Mrs. Mallika Tandhanan,
Miss Varunee Chantaranuwat,
Mrs. Walee Phantmanee, and again
Miss Sumitra Angwatanakul.

Others who provided invaluable assistance were the thirty seven judges who helped to construct one of the scales used, the classroom teachers in Thailand who helped to administer the tests, and finally, the office of Counselor Recordings and Tests for granting permission to translate the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	3
Need for the Study	6
Statement of the Problem	8
Hypotheses to be Tested	9
Definition of Terms	10
Overview of the Procedure of the Study	13
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Theoretical Framework Regarding the Self	15
Antecedents and Development of the Self	
Concept	19
Characteristics of the Self	25
Empirical Investigations Concerning Self	
Concept	29
Educational Implications of Self Concept	
Theory	34
Measurement of Self Concept	36
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	41
Description of the Sample	41
Description of the Instruments	41
Procedure for Collecting the Data	48
Treatment of the Data	48
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	49
Comparisons between Countries, Academic	
Groups and Sexes	49
Comparisons within the Thai Sample	62

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	64
Summary and Discussion	64
Conclusions	69
Recommendations	70
APPENDIXES	
A. CRITERION SHEET	72
B. TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE (TSCS)	73
THAI TRANSLATION OF TSCS	77
C. ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF SELF-REPORTING ITEMS GATHERED FROM THAI HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	84
THAI SELF-REPORTING ITEMS	92
D. ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THAI THURSTONE SCALE ...	102
THE THAI THURSTONE SCALE	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Subject Description	43
2. Reliability and Validity Coefficients of the Translated TSCS	47
3. Summary of F-Ratios and Cell Means for Analyses of Variance of TSCS Subscores	50
4. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Simple Main-Effects of the Behavior Subscore	57
5. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Simple Main-Effects of the Physical Self Subscore	58
6. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Simple Main-Effects of the Moral-Ethical Self Subscore..	59
7. Summary of F-Ratios and Cell Means for Analysis of Variance of the Total Positive Score	63

A COMPARISON OF SELF CONCEPTS OF THAI AND
AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Self perceptions comprise an important area for educational research, for, as Spiegler¹ pointed out, the way a student looks at himself often has an effect upon how he looks at school and how he performs in the classroom.

Self concept has been defined by Rogers² as "an organized, consistent conceptual Gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the 'I' or 'me' and the perceptions of the relationships of the 'I' or 'me' to others and to various aspects of life, together with the values attached to these perceptions." Rogers further pointed out that as a result of interaction with the environment, a por-

¹Charles G. Spiegler, "Provisions and Programs for Educationally Disadvantaged Youth in Secondary Schools," In P.A. Witty (Ed.), The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged, Sixty-sixth Yearbook, Part I (Chicago, Illinois: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967), pp. 40-63.

²Carl R. Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships, as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework," In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A Study of Science, III (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), pp. 184-256.

tion of the perceptual field gradually becomes differentiated into the self. This perceived self influences perception and behavior. Thus, an understanding of each individual's self concept is essential to understanding and predicting many aspects of his behavior.

Regardless of the differences in cultures, social and political structure, and the educational systems between Thailand and America, one major concern of education in both countries is fostering the development of individual capacities which will enable each human being to become the best person he is capable of becoming. The school, established as a formal socializing agent, should provide educational opportunities and experiences that would help the child in developing a self capable of controlling and directing his own behavior, enriching himself and others, and becoming a more fully functioning person.

Assertions about the primary concern of education were made by Boy and Pine¹ who maintained that a school cannot help the self to expand by merely providing cognitive experiences for its students. Facilitating development of self and providing a host of experiences is a significant concern to all educators. According to Combs and Snygg,² the goal of edu-

¹Angelo V. Boy and Gerald J. Pine, Expanding the Self: Personal Growth for Teachers (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1971), p. 105.

²Arthur W. Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior (rev. ed., New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959).

cation is the production of adequate personalities, people who can be counted upon to behave effectively and efficiently and to contribute freely to the welfare of all. They contended further that this goal of education could hold true in all societies, for all time, and for all people.

Background of the Study

That the construct "self concept" is considered a psychologically meaningful variable is evident from the voluminous studies in the literature dealing with this variable. Recent theory and research also point to the importance of the self concept in understanding, predicting and changing behavior. Several theorists, Lundholm,¹ Combs and Snygg,² Rogers,³ and Sarbin⁴ have viewed the self concept as central to man's behavior.

Diggory⁵ asserted that any account of thinking on the self would certainly trace its origin to early Greek writings. It began with the distinction made by Aristotle and others

¹Helge Lundholm, "Reflections upon the Nature of the Psychological Self," Psychological Review, XLVII (1940), 110-127.

²Combs and Snygg, op. cit., passim.

³Carl R. Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951).

⁴Theodore R. Sarbin, "A Preface to a Psychological Analysis of the Self," Psychological Review, LIX (1952), 11-22.

⁵James C. Diggory, Self-Evaluation: Concepts and Studies (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 1.

between the physical and nonphysical aspects of human functioning, with the nonphysical, or "soul," considered as the core of human functioning. This basic distinction of Aristotle was elaborated 2000 years later by the French philosopher Descartes who proposed the notion of "I" as the thinking, knowing, cognizing entity. This notion has much in common with what later theorists meant by "self" and it became one predecessor of the concept of self in psychology.

Review of literature concerning the self indicates that much of the contemporary theorizing about self concept derives from William James,¹ to whom the concept of self was rather global and incorporated two aspects: the empirical self or self-as-object; and the knowing self or self-as-process--an organized force with purpose and direction. James' empirical self was composed of three constituents: the spiritual self, the social self and the material self. After James' writings, a number of theorists began to establish and elucidate their concepts of self.

During the first half of the twentieth century, constructs concerning the self did not receive much attention from the behaviorist and functionalist psychologies which were dominating the American scene. With the emphasis on the exclusively scientific approach, the behaviorists opposed all other schools on questions of method and subject matter. They

¹William James, Principles of Psychology (2 vols.; New York: Dover, 1950), pp. 310-311.

contended that any theoretical concepts referring to internal phenomena were beyond the scope of psychology and considered the concept of self not essential in formulating psychological theory. Those theorists who did advocate the importance of the self weakened their theoretically tenuous position with respect to the prevailing trend in psychology by their neglect of rigorous experimentation.

Recently, however, there has been a marked proliferation of self theories, traceable to a number of influences. Sarbin¹ accorded the resurgence of the self to Allport's² book on personality, while Wylie³ cited two influences. One is the later writings of Freud who shifted his emphasis from the role of the id to ego development and functioning. Freud's concept of ego, as Diggory⁴ pointed out, had much in common with the notion of self as viewed by James and many other theorists. The other influence cited by Wylie is that the behavioristic models were found by the clinicians to be too limited and too passive to account for the human behavior they were observing.

¹Sarbin, loc. cit.

²Gordon W. Allport, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937), 1-189.

³Ruth Wylie, The Self Concept (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), p. 317.

⁴Diggory, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

Another notable influence in reintroducing the concept of self into psychology and education was the writing of Combs and Snygg. In their 1949 book, Individual Behavior (rev. ed., 1959), they did not favor the objective methods of general psychology which led only to normative predictions of behavior without specifying causal relations. To replace them, a method was proposed for predicting the behavior of individuals in specific situations. A basic assumption in their method is that all behavior is dependent on the actor's frame of reference, and the fundamental aim of all behavior is the preservation and enhancement of the self.

Although there was much writing on self theories during the 1940s and 1950s, there was very little empirical work done on the self concept prior to 1949. Since that time, however, there has been an increasingly large number of investigations. In the last few years, there has been an enthusiastic rebirth of interest in internal motivating forces and cognitive and symbolic processes, particularly with reference to the dynamic importance of the self in determining behavior.

Need for the Study

The need to study the self concept and to find out how the educational program from nursery school through college might help children and youth to acquire realistic attitudes of self-acceptance has been emphasized as the most important

task of psychology and education by Jersild.¹ Gordon and Combs² also pointed to a need for both longitudinal and normative research at all developmental levels, the clarification of terms, and the development of appropriate instrumentation. Reading empirical literature pertaining to self concept shows that there are numerous studies in different areas at different age levels using different measuring instruments and research designs to test a bewildering array of hypotheses. Wylie³ critically reviewed 493 articles and research reports on the self concept and, concluded that the total accumulation of substantive findings is disappointing, in view of the great amount of effort which has been expended involving avoidable methodological flaws, such as inadequate research designs, incongruent or inadequate operational definitions of the construct, and unreliable or invalid measuring instruments. She particularly criticized the case where an instrument has been developed and used only one time.

Since cross-cultural studies dealing with the construct "self concept" are extremely rare, it was hoped that the findings of this study would throw some light upon the

¹Arthur T. Jersild, In Search of Self (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952), pp. 3-5.

²Ira J. Gordon and Arthur W. Combs, "The Learner: Self and Perception," Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (1958), 433-444.

³Wylie, op. cit., p. 317.

nature of self concepts of the subjects in two different countries, or lead one to speculate the "why" of the differences of the construct. This preliminary study would probably form the basis upon which further cross-cultural research, correlational, longitudinal, or even experimental, dealing with the self could be conducted toward the end that certain cultures, educational methodologies and practices used by one country might be adopted or adapted to implement and strengthen those of another.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to compare the self concepts of American and Thai eleventh and twelfth grade students utilizing the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

More specifically it was intended to: (1) translate and restandardize (re-establishing reliability and validity) a published instrument--the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) from which self concept ratings of the Thai eleventh and twelfth grade students were determined, (2) compare self concept ratings of college-bound and non-college-bound groups, and (3) explore whether there is sex difference on self concepts.

The bases of comparison were the Total Positive Score, nine subscores (Identity, Self Satisfaction, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, Social Self, Self Criticism), and two derived scores (Variability

and Distribution Scores)

Hypotheses to be Tested

To make comparison of subjects in both countries, non-directional differences were hypothesized to exist on the subjects' TSCS scores. The null forms of the hypotheses to be tested for all twelve measures were:

1. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students.
2. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of male and female students.
3. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the college-bound and the non-college-bound students.
4. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students when they were grouped according to their programs of study.
5. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students when they were grouped according to sex.
6. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the college-bound and the non-college-bound students when they were grouped according to sex.
7. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students when they were grouped according to both sex and program of study.

In comparing subjects within the Thai sample, the null hypotheses to be tested for the Total Positive Score were:

1. There would be no significant difference among the means of the three academic groups.
2. There would be no significant difference between the means of male and female students.
3. There would be no significant difference between the means of the college-bound and the non-college-bound students when they were grouped according to sex.

Definition of Terms

Self Concept.--The manner in which an individual reflectively ascribes a number of statements, concerning his attitudes, his judgements and values toward his behavior, his ability, his body, his worth as a person, etc., to himself. It is the way each individual perceives and evaluates himself which represents the notion of self-as-object.

The Positive Score.--The most important score which reflects the overall level of self esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth; see themselves as undesirable; often feel anxious, depressed and unhappy; and have little faith in themselves.

The Variability Score.--This score provides a measure of consistency from one area of self perception to another.

High scores mean that the individual's self concept reflects little unity or integration. Well integrated people generally score below the mean but above the first percentile.

The Distribution Score.--A summary score of the distribution of the individual's responses across the five-point rating scale. It is a measure of certainty about the way one sees himself. High scores indicate that the person is very definite and certain in what he says about himself while low scores mean just the opposite. Low scores are found also at times with people who are being defensive and guarded.

The College-Bound Group.--The Thai college-bound group consists of two subgroups: (1) pre-science students and (2) pre-arts students who are the eleventh and twelfth grade students in Thailand whose programs of study required them to attend school no less than thirty-five weeks a year, five days a week and six hours a day.

The weekly thirty hours for the pre-science students comprised:

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Hours</u>
Thai	3
English	6
Social studies	3
Science	8 (Physics, chemistry, and biology)
Laboratory work	2
Mathematics	6
Arts and crafts	2
	<u>30</u>

The weekly thirty hours for the pre-arts students comprised:

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Hours</u>
Thai	5
English	8
Social studies	5
General science	4
Mathematics	2
Arts and crafts	2
Either additional math. or second foreign language	<u>4</u>
	<u>30</u>

Thai Non-College-Bound Group.--In the present study, this group refers to the eleventh and the twelfth grade students in the general stream whose program of study required them to attend school no less than thirty-five weeks a year, five days a week, and six hours a day. The weekly thirty hours for them comprised:

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Hours</u>
Thai	3
English	4
Social studies	3
General science	4
Mathematics	2
Arts and crafts	2
Elective	<u>12</u>
	<u>30</u>

The twelve hours (elective) per week can be elected every year from the following subjects: Thai, English, social studies, mathematics, second foreign language, commerce, secretarial work and other additional subjects.

American College-Bound Group.--The eleventh or twelfth grade students who expressed an intent to go to college and had algebra II plus one or more of the following courses: foreign

language, government, chemistry, and physics.

American Non-College-Bound Group.--The students in this group were classified into two categories: (1) the eleventh or twelfth graders who expressed an intent to not go to college; and (2) the students who had neither algebra II nor any other courses cited above.

Overview of the Procedure of the Study

Subjects.--The subjects who participated in the study were 150 high school students, 60 Americans and 90 Thais, selected from a central Oklahoma high school and an urban Thai secondary school, respectively. Of these, 50 per cent were males and 50 per cent were females.

Procedure.--In exploring possible differences between self concept ratings of Thai and American students, the self report technique (by directly asking the subjects to provide information about themselves) was used to determine self concept index. The basic assumption behind this approach is that the individual is in the best position to describe and report his own behavior. Strong and Feder¹ supported the use of the self report technique as follows: "Every evaluation statement that a person makes concerning himself can be considered a

¹Donald Strong and Daniel Feder, "Measurement of the Self Concept: A Critique of the Literature," Journal of Counseling Psychology, VII (1961), 170.

sample of his self concept, from which inferences may then be made about the various properties of that self concept."

Instrument.--The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was used to provide self concept ratings of the American subjects, and the same measure translated and restandardized (in terms of reliability and validity) provided the measurement of self concept ratings for the Thai subjects.

Statistical Analysis.--In determining possible differences between self concept ratings of the subjects of both countries, the twelve measures were subjected to a set of three-way factorial analysis of variance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature for this study was organized into six categories: (1) theoretical framework regarding the self, (2) antecedents and development of the self concept, (3) characteristics of the self, (4) empirical investigations concerning the self, (5) educational implications concerning self concept theory, and (6) measurement of the self concept.

Theoretical Framework Regarding the Self

There is a wide variety of theories which accorded an important or central role to the self concept (Adler, 1924; Mead, 1934; Lewin, 1935; Allport, 1937; Lecky, 1945; Sullivan, 1947; Rainy, 1948; Snygg and Combs, 1949; Freud, 1950; Cattell, 1950; and Rogers, 1951). Some of these theorists have been called phenomenological theorists because of their emphasis on the role of the conscious self concept in determining a person's behavior.

Allport¹ was one of the strongest advocates of the self as a key feature of personality. In addition to de-emphasizing the person's early motivations and his distant

¹Allport, op. cit., pp. 15-19, 23-25, 88-89, 138-140, 549-566.

past, he focuses on the individual's currently perceived experiences, his phenomenal self, and his unique pattern of adaptation. He also favors to view man as an integrated, bio-social organism.

George H. Mead¹ holds that self concept is a social product arising both as a function of relations with both other individuals and the organized community to which he belongs, and it is the community which provides the individual with a set of social values against which he compares his own characteristics. Mead divided the self into two parts: the "Me" is the conventional part which takes on or internalizes the attitudes and opinions of others and gives the self its basic structure; and the other part, the "I" is considered as spontaneous and creative. Mead maintained that if group life is rigid and restrictive, the "Me" dominates the "I" and individuality is minimal, but under appropriate social and economic conditions, the "I" can actively and creatively influence and restructure the social process.

The theory of Lecky² involves the value system which was considered as the core of personality and self consistency was emphasized as a primary motivating force in human behavior. Resistance to the assimilation of inconsistent value to the

¹George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934), pp. 158-178.

²Prescott Lecky, Self-Consistency (rev. ed., Garden City, New York: Double-Day Anchor, 1969), pp. 46-140, 80, 108-110, 123-124.

self organization is considered as a natural phenomenon which is essential for the maintenance of individuality. Raimy¹ declared that the self conception is a focal point of organization of behavior pattern and personality, and that self concept both influences and is influenced by the individual behavior. He further contended that positive self feelings will exist, and conscious tension is minimal as long as the self structure is firmly organized and no contradictory material is perceived. The extent to which the individual perceives the incongruence of discrepancies is a measure of his internal tension and determines the amount of defensive behavior.

Combs and Snygg² provide particularly clear statements of the phenomenological approach in which one conceives of personality wholly in terms of the individual's personal conception of the current situation--his phenomenal field. The self is seen as determiner of behavior, particularly emphasized is the role of awareness and consciousness as the cause of behavior. The specific form which the self will take, as pointed out, varies according to the culture, the social environment and the interpersonal relationship one experiences.

Rogers³ theory emphasizes the person's perceived reality, his subjective experiences, his organismic striving for

¹Victor C. Raimy, "Self-Reference in Counseling Interviews," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII (1948), 153-163.

²Combs and Snygg, op. cit., pp. 16-36, 122-164, passim.

³Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, pp. 92-100, 136-146, 202-222, 321, 431-442.

actualization. The self is considered as a conscious perception of self, developing as the result of direct experience with the environment and may also incorporate the perceptions of others. The experienced self in turn influences perceptions and behavior. Maladjustment occurs when the sense of self and a person's perceptions and experiences are in opposition and disharmony.

Hilgard¹ reviewed the writings about the defense mechanisms and concluded that the mechanisms of defense against anxiety and of self deception in the interest of self esteem, are comprehensible only if we accept the conception of self. Thus, all defense mechanisms imply self reference.

Many of the positions mentioned have in common an interest in subjective experience and a positive view of human nature. They approach personality as an organized whole rather than bits and pieces of behavior. Man is conceived as an active agent, purposeful and striving toward self-fulfillment, not simply as an agent driven by unconscious forces and motivated by the necessity to satisfy his biological needs. Behavior is considered as a goal-directed attempt of the organism to satisfy its needs and it is believed to be a function of the individual's perceptions. Thus, behavioral scientists should attempt to achieve an internal rather than external frame of reference.

¹Raymond E. Hilgard, "Human Motives and the Concept of the Self," American Psychologist, IV (1949), 374-382.

Antecedents and Development of the Self Concept

The development of self is seen by several theorists, e.g., Lecky¹ and Allport,² to be through the mechanisms of learning wherein the individual learns to differentiate the phenomenal field. He not only discovers what he is, but also what he is not and attaches values to it. This differentiation is moving toward greater clarity throughout life. Diggory³ stressed the striving situations to achieve goals as the chief occasions for self knowledge.

Review of the theories of self showed that the earliest years are considered most critical in forming the child's opinion of self. The self then is acquired, modified through accumulative experiences of the individual. The experiences accorded with the self concept are accurately perceived and symbolized in consciousness. The contrary ones are perceived selectively, distorted, and denied to awareness, either in whole or in part. Such incongruency generally leaves the person vulnerable to anxiety, threat and disorganization. The threatened person is more likely to have a narrow perceptual field, and this shrinking effect limits data needed for intelligent decision and action. This notion was confirmed by Combs⁴

¹Lecky, op. cit., pp. 45-64.

²Allport, op. cit., pp. 151-165.

³Diggory, op. cit., p. 54.

⁴Arthur W. Combs, "Intelligence from a Perceptual Point of View," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 662-673.

who outlined the procedure through which intelligence could be considered dependent on adequate self concept which shows the reciprocal nature of the internal and external world of the individual.

Thus, it is the person's self concept which turns to be a factor in determining the kind and quality of experience perceived, expanding and limiting the richness and variety of perceptions one selects.

Parental Influence.--The effect of experience in one's family is considered by Combs and Snygg¹ as the most dominant single factor in shaping the child's concept of self. Rogers² suggested that different types of interaction between parent and the child should have quite different consequents with respect to the child's self structure. He also presented the concept of the need for positive regard from others along with the need for positive self-regard.

A number of studies contributed to understanding the interplay between perception of parents and self concept, Jourard and Remy³ worked with 99 undergraduates and found significant correlation between the self cathexis score and the perceived attitudes of parents toward self. Similarly,

¹Combs and Snygg, op. cit., pp. 134-140.

²Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships," In S. Koch (Ed.) Psychology: A Study of Science, III (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), pp. 184-256.

³Sidney M. Jourard and Richard M. Remy, "Perceived Parental Attitudes, the Self, and Security," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIX (1955), 364-366.

security as measured by the Maslow Scale was found significantly related to attitudes toward self. Those who evaluated themselves negatively and who believed that their parents evaluated them negatively were more insecure.

Helper¹ tested a number of hypotheses concerning familial influences on the development of self concepts. His subjects were 50 high school freshmen and their parents. The students were given a list of adjectives and were asked to indicate their real selves, ideal selves, and least-liked selves, and to describe their mothers and fathers. Each parent also filled out the checklist, describing self, spouse, child and ideal child. It was found that the more the husband was seen by the wife as an ideal for their son, the more the son's ideal was like his father's ideal for him, and the more the son was like the father. The analogous relationship for daughter was not significant. Helper remarked that the finding is consonant with the common belief that mothers influence the psychological development of the children more than fathers do.

Concerning the effect of parental differences in their concepts of an ideal child on the child's self concept, Helper found that the greater the discrepancy between husband and wife in describing the ideal child, the more unstable was the child's ideal self.

¹Malcolm M. Helper, "Learning Theory and the Self Concept," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 184-194.

The investigation raises questions concerning differences in the way in which males and females develop self concepts. For males, whether the mother rewards father-like behavior seems to influence father-son similarity and also popularity among his peers. For females this sort of relationship is not found. Helper proposed that a different source of reward for self-descriptions must occur, perhaps from peers rather than from parents.

The hypothesis that self-acceptance is related to acceptance of parents was confirmed by a study done by Suinn¹ who used Q-sorts to measure self concept, ideal-self, perception of father and perception of ideal father in a group of 82 male high school seniors. Thus, sons who are rewarded for being like their father would be expected to accept both father and self, and to see themselves as like their fathers.

Aside from numerous correlational studies, experimental studies done by Videbeck² and continued by Nafzer³ have demonstrated that the concept of self does vary predictably with reaction of significant others.

The cited research suggests that an individual forms

¹Richard M. Suinn, "The Relationship between Self Acceptance and Acceptance of Others: A Learning Theory Analysis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 37-42.

²Richard Videbeck, "Self Conception and the Reaction of Others," Sociometry, XXIII (1960), 351-359.

³Martin L. Maehr, Josef Mensing and Samuel Nafzer, "Concept of Self and the Reaction of Others," Sociometry, XXV (1962), 353-357.

impressions of himself as the result of perceptual feedback from others. Of significant influence is from those who hold importance for him. This indicates that such feedback is accompanied by the evaluative information about self.

Environmental Influence.---Much evidence exists in the literature to support the belief that environmental factors play an important role in developing individual's self concept. Several environmental factors identified by Dai¹ are: the relation between self and others, the kind of personalities the person is associated with, what significant others think of him, the ways in which the socialization program is carried out and the culture after which his activities are patterned.

Anthropological cross-cultural investigations have clearly demonstrated the impact of socialization practices on personality differences. Whiting and Child² examined the child-rearing practices of some seventy-seven cultures, and found a reciprocal relationship between the severity of the socialization procedures and the cultural adjustment patterns. Where the socialization was harsh and punitive in childhood, adults are prone to anxiety and guilt, with tendencies to be suspicious of others as potentially hostile.

¹Bingham Dai, "Some Problems of Personality Development among Negro Children," Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, eds. Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray (2nd. ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. 547.

²John W.M. Whiting and Irvin L. Child, Child Training and Personality: A Cross-Cultural Study (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1953).

The general patterning of the culture is most profound in terms of resultant influence on personality. Yet, cultural subdivisions such as social-class membership are vitally important in deriving a large part of the child's learning environment. Sapir¹ stated that every individual is a representative of a social class or at least one subculture which may be abstracted from the generalized culture of the group of which he is a member.

Age.--The hypothesis that self concept becomes more integrated with age found support in the work of Engel.² It was found that the positive self concept scores increased significantly between two testings for the high school students. Conceivably, a steadily more positive self concept is characteristic as individuals pass through adolescence and into young adulthood.

Bloom³ studied the relationship between self-acceptance and age in a group of 83 male surgical patients at a VA hospital in New York. The group comprised of skilled workers, ages ranged from the early twenties to the late sixties. An adjective checklist was used as the index of the self concept. The relationship between self-acceptance and age was found to

¹Edward Sapir, "The Unconscious Patterning of Behavior in Society, in the Unconscious," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVII (1932), 229-242.

²Mary Engel, "The Stability of Self Concept in Adolescence," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVIII (1959), 211-215.

³Kenneth L. Bloom, "Age and the Self Concept," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXVII (1961), 534-538.

be curvilinear. The findings showed that self-acceptance increased steadily from age 20, reached a peak during the age period 50-59, and then began a steady decline. Bloom proposed the description of the aging process as followed:

During the 20-29 year period, most individuals are confronted by personal problems in a number of areas for which they seek solution. Some of these problems are: the need to make a satisfactory vocational adjustment; increased responsibility; anxiety over interpersonal, social, and sexual problem and so forth. These adjustment problems lead to doubts concerning the individual's self worth or self esteem, hence self acceptance is at a low ebb. As the individual finds solutions for these problems, self-acceptance increases until in the 40's most individuals have achieved some measure of stability. During the 50-59 year period, possibly as a result of stereotypes of aging along with concrete evidence of slow down in functioning, there comes the realization of getting old. The individual is again confronted by doubts and anxieties and thus self-acceptance declines.¹

In brief, the self is not instinctive. It is acquired and modified through every life experience. It possesses infinite capacity for growth and actualization. The main forces which shape the self are significant others. The form the self takes, depends on the quality of experiences the person has been exposed. The self concept in turns influences the person's perceptions and behavior.

Characteristics of the Self

The propositions of self theorists which have been reviewed highlight some important characteristics of self. Three

¹Ibid.

characteristics are summarized by Purkey;¹ that the self is organized, dynamic and learned.

Aspects of the Self.--One major system of classification has been to divide the self into two distinct parts, each of which has differential effects within the person. Self-as-object is the aspect of self comprising of a cluster of attitudes and sentiments the individual has about himself. The other aspect, self-as-process, is seen as a group of psychological processes that function as determinants of behavior. The latter implies a structural aspect of behavior and can be defined in terms of activities such as thinking, perceiving, and coping with the environment.

Using self-report instruments, Rentz and White² have demonstrated that these two aspects of self are independent although they were related in some respects. Their study led Graves³ to postulate that the self-report is more appropriate when considering the self-as-object, and the procedure of inferring self concept is more related to the self-as-process.

Despite their independence, these two notions are of equal importance. The self-as-object definition leads one to conceptualize behavior as manifestations of the self concept

¹William W. Purkey, Self Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 7.

²R. Robert Rentz and William F. White, "Congruence of the Dimensions of Self-as-Object and Self-as-Process," The Journal of Psychology, LXVII (1967), 277-285.

³William H. Graves Jr., "A Multivariate Investigation of Professed and Inferred Self Concepts of Fifth and Sixth Grade Students," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1972, p. 7.

and reflects meaningful individual differences along the dimensions, while the self-as-process definition leads toward explanation and prediction of behavior, toward reification, leads one to conceive of the self as responsible for behavior.

Clarity of Self Perception.--Although the self has the feeling of reality to the individual like all other perceptions, Combs and Snygg¹ pointed out that it is probably impossible for the individual ever to perceive the total organization of his self perceptions clearly at any moment. Rather he perceives those aspects of self which emerge from time to time from his daily experience. In agreement with this notion is McCandless² who commented that the self concept never seems to be an accurate representation of the self, it is usually a distorted picture. Wylie³ also stated, "It is implicitly or explicitly assumed by all theorists that the self concept is not entirely 'realistic,' and that lack of 'realism' may have psychodynamic significance and important behavioral consequence."

Stability, Consistency and Change of the Self.--Self theory proposes that the earliest and presumably most general aspects of the self concept develop in interactions between the child and parental figures. Later interactions with siblings, peers, teachers, colleagues, spouse, offspring, etc.

¹Combs and Snygg, op. cit., p. 129.

²Boyd R. McCandless, Children and Adolescents Behavior and Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961),

³Wylie, op. cit., p. 5.

are assumed to have various degrees of influence on changes in the self concept.

However, it is generally believed that an individual's concept of himself achieves a rather high degree of organization during the course of development and comes to resist change since self differentiation and self definition have taken place. There is also agreement among researchers that the self has a generally stable quality which is characterized by harmony and orderliness. Purkey¹ describes the self from this respect as "ultraconservative." Lecky² reported that the self resists change and strives for consistency. In an extensive investigation concerning this issue, Taylor³ found that self concept: (1) is highly consistent over varying time intervals, (2) is not affected much by temporary moods and feeling states, and (3) is mildly affected by repeated measurement (people with positive self concepts become slightly more positive with repeated measures, people with negative self concepts become more negative).

Combs and Snygg⁴ pointed out that the stability of the self makes change difficult by causing the individual to ignore aspects of one's experience which are inconsistent with it or to select perceptions in such a way as to confirm the concepts

¹Purkey, op. cit., p. 11.

²Lecky, op. cit., passim.

³Donald M. Taylor, "Changes in Self Concept without Psychotherapy," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIX, 1955, 205-209.

of self one already possesses. As a result, changes produced by events inconsistent with well-differentiated or fundamental self concepts are likely to be slow and laborious. Purkey,¹ however, conceived resistance to change as a positive feature. He reasoned that if the self varied much, the individual would lack a consistent personality.

Although stability and consistency of the self are considered as necessary, review of the literature indicates that very high levels of psychological consistency are not desirable in humans. This is to keep up with the dynamic changing society. Probably the best description of the self is that of Combs and Snygg² who stated, "An adequate self must be stable but not rigid, it must be changing but not fluctuating." They cited three factors that are likely to condition changes in self concept as: (1) the relation of the new concept to the present self organization, (2) the relationship of the new concept to the individual's basic need, and (3) the clarity of the experience of the new perception.

Empirical Investigations Concerning Self Concept

Self Concept and Academic Performance.--Numerous studies have shown consistent positive relationships between self concept and academic performance from elementary level through

¹Purkey, op. cit., p. 11.

²Combs and Snygg, op. cit., p. 163.

college. Coopersmith,¹ using a combination of self report and inferred self concept (yielded by the observer-as-instrument technique), found positive relationships between self concept and academic achievement in fifth and sixth grade students. Walsh² found that "high ability, low achievers," had a negative self-regard when matched with "high ability, high achievers." Barrett,³ using a dual approach (clinical and statistical with gifted children, grade five), reported that feelings of inadequacy among bright underachievers act as depressors which cause them to withdraw and refuse to compete. Bruck and Bodwin,⁴ using a Machover Draw-A-Person Test, found that underachievers had lower self concept scores, even after intelligence was controlled.

At the secondary level, Brookover, Thomas and Paterson⁵ found a significant positive correlation between self ratings of ability and general performance in academic subjects and

¹Stanley Coopersmith, "A Method for Determining Types of Self Esteem," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 81-94.

²Ann M. Walsh, Self Concepts of Bright Boys with Learning Difficulties (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966).

³Harry O. Barret, "An Intensive Study of 32 Gifted Children," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI (1957), 192-194.

⁴Max Bruck and Raymond F. Bodwin, "The Relationship between Self Concept and the Presence and Absence of Scholastic Underachievement," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVIII (1962), 181-182.

⁵Wilbur B. Brookover, Shailer Thomas and Ann Paterson, "Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement," Sociology of Education, XXXVII (1964), 271-278.

achievement in specific subject matter fields. Combs¹ explored the relationship between self perceptions and underachievement in high school boys and found that underachievers see themselves as less adequate and less acceptable. Washburn,² using a self report instrument he devised, investigated the patterns of self conceptualization in high school and college students. The resulting sets of self concepts were ranked on the basis of maturity. It was found that the college-bound groups, both boys and girls, scored significantly higher than the non-college-bound groups, boys and girls correspondingly on the three self levels with highest maturity ranking, sex differences and the differences between high school students and college students on various self patterns were also found but not significant.

At the university level, Irvin,³ using self report inventory with college freshmen, reported significant positive relationships between reported self concept and academic achievement.

In relation to social class which could be a factor related to both achievement and self concept, Soares and

¹Charles F. Combs, "A Study of Relationship between Certain Perceptions of Self and Scholastic Underachievement in Academically Capable High School Boys," Dissertation Abstract, XXIV (1963), 620.

²Wilbur C. Washburn, "Patterns of Self-Conceptualization in high School and College Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, LII, No. 3 (1961), 123-131.

³Floyd S. Irvin, "Sentence Completion Responses and Scholastic Success or Failure," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIV (1967), 269-271.

Soares¹ found more positive self perceptions among the disadvantaged black children than the advantaged white children. The study of Davidson and Lang² showed that a significant positive relationship between self reports and academic performance still remained when social class was controlled. It seems that the causes of negative self concepts tend to be more psychological than racial, social or economic.

For the influence of sex on self concept, Bledsoe,³ using self report instrument, reported that sex differences seemed to influence the relationship between self concept and achievement. It was found that self reports of boys correlated significantly with achievement. The analogous relationship for girls was not significant. Fink,⁴ who worked with 48 ninth grade students, found a significant relationship between adequacy of self concept (as rated by three psychologists) and level of academic achievement for boys but not for girls.

The research evidence clearly shows a persistent and significant relationship between self concept and academic achievement. However, this relationship appears quite clear

¹Helen H. Davidson and Gerhard Lang, "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers; Feelings toward Them Related to Self Perception, School Achievement, and Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX (1960), 107-118.

²Joseph Bledsoe, "Self Concept of Children and Their Intelligence, Achievement, Interests, and Anxiety," Children Education, XLIII (1967), 435-438.

³Martin B. Fink, "Self Concept as It Relates to Academic Underachievement," California Journal of Educational Research, LIX (1962), 57-62.

for boys, but less so for girls. Although the data do not provide clear cut evidence about which comes first--a positive self concept or scholastic success, a negative self concept or scholastic failure--they do indicate a strong reciprocal relationship.

Self Concept and Other Variables.--William and Cole,¹ using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale with sixth graders, found significant correlations between self concept measures and the following variables: Conception of school, social status at school, emotional adjustment, mental ability, reading achievement and mathematical achievement. Steiner² found that undergraduate students whose self appraisals are favorable tend to set their goals high relative to their past performance.

Berger³ demonstrated that there was a positive correlation between acceptance of self and acceptance of others. Further, according to Omwake,⁴ those who reject themselves hold a correspondingly low opinion of others and perceive

¹Robert L. Williams and Spurgeon Cole, "Self Concept and School Adjustment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (1968), 478-481.

²Ivan D. Steiner, "Self Perception and Goal Setting Behavior," Journal of Personality, XXX (1957), 344-355.

³Emanuel M. Berger, "The Relation between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 778-782.

⁴Katherine T. Omwake, "The Relation between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (1954), 443, 446.

others as being self rejecting. Stock¹ found that when a person's feelings about himself changed, his attitudes toward others changed in the same direction.

Other studies have pointed out the value of attitudes toward the self in the prediction of future performance in school. Haarer² found that the reported self concept of ability was better than IQ as a predictor of the achievement of both, public school boys and institutionalized delinquent boys.

Educational Implications of Self Concept Theory

The direct relationship between the child's self concept and his manifested behavior, perceptions, adjustment and academic performance demonstrate clearly the educational implications of self concept theory. They further indicate that educators, especially teachers, should be more concerned with what happened to the child's personality as well as his academic abilities. Thus, in attempting to help each individual develop fully, serious effort must be exerted to understand how each individual views himself and the world around him. Of greater concern to educators is the evidence that students with negative attitudes toward selves and their abilities

¹Dorothy Stock, "An Investigation into the Interrelationships between the Self Concept and Feelings Directed toward Other Persons and Groups," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 176-180.

²David L. Haarer, "A Comparative Study of Self Concept of Ability between Institutionalized Delinquent Boys and Non-Delinquent Boys Enrolled in Public Schools," Dissertation Abstract, XXV (1965), 6410.

rarely perform well in school. They tend to see themselves as less able, less adequate and less self-reliant than their peers.

If the self be viewed as the determiner of behavior, depending on a supportive environment for maximum growth and actualization, making self concept an integral part of the curriculum is a necessity. What teachers can do is to seek out ways to prevent the development of negative self concepts in students and to help each student gain a positive and realistic image of himself as a learner. Teachers need to evaluate themselves and the current educational policies and practices in the light of the relationship between the self and scholastic success and many other variables. Lecky¹ illustrated clearly how the negative self concept is acquired and why it is functioning. To attack the problem, he proposed eliminating the inhibiting self definition and concentrating on the values which offer some hope of unified action.

However, several studies have shown that it is possible to develop a curriculum in which the expected academic learning takes place while positive self concepts are being built. The key feature for the success is the teacher and his personal role. Davidson and Lang² explored the teacher-student interaction, and found that the students' perceptions of the teacher's feelings toward him correlated positively with

¹Lecky, op. cit., pp. 134-140.

²Davidson and Lang, loc. cit.

his self perception. Furthermore, the more positive the children's perceptions of their teacher's feelings, the better the academic achievement and the more desirable their classroom behavior as rated by the teacher. Staines' finding also asserted that the positive approach of the teachers led to a significant increment in self perception of the students.

In teacher roles as agents of the society, they become 'significant others' to the child. What the teachers believe and do, and how they treat him are critical in molding, maintaining and modifying the child's self concept. The interaction between the teachers' pre-determined judgement and self-fulfilling prophecy on the part of the child has been repeatedly pointed out. It is most important for teachers to remember that the child's self concept is not unalterably fixed. It is modified by every life experience, both in and out of school, at least through the maturing years. LaBenne and Greene² and Purkey³ have written extensively about how negative self concepts are instilled in the children and also about methods conducive to the enhancement of their self concepts.

Measurement of Self Concept

The private and subjective experiences of the individ-

¹J.W. Staines, "The Self Picture as a Factor in the Classroom," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXVII (1958), 97-111.

²Wallace D. LaBenne and Bert I. Greene, Educational Implications of Self-Concept Theory (Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1969).

³Purkey, op. cit., pp. 40-58.

ual can be studied by a variety of objective techniques. In the phenomenological view, the person may be his own best assessor. Mischel's¹ study showed that simple attitude statements on the California F Scale have been good predictors of successes in the Peace Corps. The volunteers were able to overtly predict whether or not they would be rejected at the end of training better than could be determined by indirect inventories, interviews, and projective tests.

In reviewing several other studies using self report and other techniques, Mischel² concluded that useful information about a person may be obtained most directly by simply asking him. The predictions made in simple direct self ratings and self reports generally, as Mischel pointed out, have not been exceeded by those obtained from more psychometrically sophisticated personality tests, from combined test batteries, from clinical judges and from complex statistical analysis.

A variety of methods for studying self concept have been: (1) Q-sorts, (2) rating scales (including questionnaires, adjective checklists and semantic differentials), (3) interviews, (4) projective techniques, (5) the Role Construct Repertory Test (Rep Test) devised by George Kelly,³ and (6) observer-

¹Walter Mischel, "Predicting the Success of Peace Corps Volunteers in Nigeria," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (1965), 510-517.

²W. Mischel, Introduction to Personality (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971), pp. 204-207.

³George A. Kelly, The Psychology of Personal Constructs, 2 vols. (New York: Norton, 1955).

as-instrument. Attention has also been given to the importance of nonverbal expressions, movements, and gestures in the study of persons. In another direction, Mischel¹ pointed out that efforts have been made to explore the use of psychedelic drugs as a method for observing changes in consciousness and to increase personal awareness.

Of all the cited techniques, the rating scale and the Q-sorts are the most frequently used instruments for inferring self concept. In the Q-sort which was developed by Stephenson,² the person takes a large number of cards, each containing a descriptive statement of personality traits, and sort them into categories in a forced distribution. These Q-sorts may be used for self description, to describe the ideal self, the least-liked self or to describe a relationship. The information yielded by a Q-sort may be of intrinsic interest or it may yield correlation with other data of interest.

For the rating scale, which was the type of instrument used in the present study, the procedure is to present the individual with a list of descriptive statements, or adjectives and ask him to check his standing on the stated characteristics. This self appraisal yields a self report. The basic assumption behind this approach is that the individual is in the best position to observe, describe, and report his own

¹Mischel, Introduction to Personality, p. 222.

²William W. Stephenson, The Study of Behavior (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

behavior.

The major critics of the self report have questioned the validity of the self report as a measure of self concept. The belief supporting their opposition is that while self concept is what an individual believes about himself, self report is only what the person is able and willing to disclose to someone else. The confusion between self concept and self report was discussed by Combs, Soper and Courson.¹ The need for greater precision of terminology and for approaches based upon observation of behavior was suggested. Their study demonstrated that children's self reports and self concept inferences made by trained observers are correlated but not highly.

With respect to this issue, Mischel² contended that the poor correspondence between self reports and actual behavior or ratings by observers may be attributed to a variety of motivational forces, i.e., deliberate faking, unconscious defensive reactions, lack of insight, etc. He also stated that the weak association may reflect the fact that most self reports involve higher order interpretation. In self ratings, the person is usually required to give a verbal report in the form of "yes" "no" or forced-choice response to indicate intensity or degree of agreement, often to highly ambiguous

¹Arthur W. Combs, Daniel W. Soper and Clifford C. Courson, "The Measurement of Self Concept and Self Report," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXIII, No. 3 (1963), 493-500.

²Walter Mischel, Personality and Assessment (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968), pp. 69-70, 75.

items and under artificial conditions. The tests do not deal with clear indices of the actual occurrence, frequency or strength of particular behaviors and do not ask the subjects to describe in detail his specific behavior in concrete situation. Mischel objected to the use of such verbal rating responses as an accurate index of typical nontest behavior. He believed that when persons are asked to describe or anticipate their own behavior, they may be as successful, or even more accurate than other experts or tests.

In relation to the issue concerning the validity of the self report index, Combs et al.¹ reported that the degree to which the self report can be relied upon as an accurate indication of the self concept depends upon such factors as:

1. The clarity of the individual's awareness
2. The availability of adequate symbols for expression
3. The willingness of the individual to cooperate
4. The social expectancy
5. The individual's feelings of personal adequacy
6. The feeling of freedom from threat.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Description of the Sample

The investigator intended to use twelfth grade students as subjects of the study. However, multiple factors e.g., administrative demands, research design, cooperation of the subjects, etc., necessitated inclusion of some eleventh graders.

The subjects (N=150) included 60 American and 90 Thai eleventh and twelfth graders. Of these, 50 per cent were males and 50 per cent were females.

The American Sample.--The sample consisted of two groups: the college-bound (CB) and the non-college-bound (NCB). Each group had 30 subjects, 15 males and 15 females.

The original pool of subjects consisted of 128 students (80 males and 48 females) comprising a large English senior class and a small vocational class (for juniors and seniors) at a central Oklahoma high school in Spring, 1972. Using the criteria listed in Appendix A, students were classified into three groups according to the number of college preparatory courses they had taken, none, one, or two or more. These three groups were later classified into two groups. One group was comprised of students who expressed intention of attending

college, had taken algebra II plus at least one other college preparatory course. The second group consisted of those expressing intention to not go to college, and had not taken any of the indicated college preparatory courses. From this reclassification, two groups of subjects comprising the American sample were randomly drawn. Each group contained 30 students, equally divided by sex, and were identified as group A (CB) and group B (NCB). Four of the 15 NCB males, however, were eleventh grade students.

The Thai Sample.--Since the Thai upper secondary levels are divided into three streams: pre-science, pre-arts, and general; the Thai sample consisted of three groups paralleling the divisions mentioned above. Each group contained 30 students with 15 males and 15 females. In making comparison between countries, the 60 pre-science and pre-arts students¹ were selected randomly in order to get 30 subjects (15 males and 15 females); and they represented the Thai CB group. The students in the general stream were considered as the NCB.

The 90 Thai subjects were selected randomly from the total population of 109 twelfth grade students (57 males and 52 females) of an urban Thai secondary school, in the academic year 1971 (June, 1971-March, 1972). In certain divisions, the number of the students specified by sex variable of the research design was limited. For example, in the pre-science division, male students outnumbered the females. Thus, selection of some eleventh graders was unavoidable. Cooperation

¹One subject had to be eliminated due to incomplete data on his retest.

was also taken into consideration. The subjects who were unwilling to participate in the study were dropped, and 22 eleventh grade students were randomly selected from the total population of the eleventh graders (117 students) to replace.

TABLE 1
SUBJECT DESCRIPTION

	Thai (N=90)		American (N=60)	
	Juniors	Seniors	Juniors	Seniors
Per Cent	24	76	7	93
Average Age	17yr. 1mo.	17yr. 7mo.	16yr. 11mo.	17yr. 10mo.

Description of the Instruments

In the present study, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS, see Appendix B) was used to provide self-ratings of the American subjects, and the same measure translated and restandardized (in terms of reliability and validity) provided the measurement of self-ratings for the Thai subjects.

Selection of the TSCS was based on several criteria. Aside from theoretical considerations, the instrument has been shown to be reliable, applicable to group administration, and relatively simple to score. It differs from other scales in that it is a multidimensional instrument, providing a wider range of information than single-score instruments; and it purports to assess the self-as-object of the self concept.

Description of the TSCS

The scale was developed by Fitts¹ in 1955. It is a self report inventory, providing a measurement of self esteem. It is self administering for either individuals or groups. It is a well-standardized, multidimensional instrument upon which a great deal of research has already been conducted. The scale consists of 100 self descriptive items to which subjects respond on a five-point bipolar scale (True VS False), according to their perception of the degree that the items applied to them. Ninety of the 100 items, equally divided as to positive and negative items, are grouped into a two dimensional, 3x5 scheme. One dimension yields three measures of an internal frame of reference: (1) Identity (how the individual sees himself), (2) Self Satisfaction (how he accepts himself), (3) Behavior (how he acts); while the second dimension yields five measures of an external frame of reference: (1) Physical Self, (2) Moral-Ethical Self, (3) Personal Self, (4) Family Self, and (5) Social Self. The remaining ten items, taken from the L-Scale of the MMPI comprise the Self Criticism scale.

A number of derived scores and subscores can be obtained. For the purposes of this study, nine subscores: Self Criticism, Identity, Self Satisfaction, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, and Social Self; and the three derived scores: Total Positive Score,

¹William H. Fitts, Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965).

Variability Score and Distribution Score formed the bases for comparisons of subjects in both countries.

Translation and Restandarization of the TSCS

The TSCS was translated independently by six judges who were English teachers with at least master's degrees in English. Besides unanimous agreement on translation among judges, interpretation was also checked on each item.

Validation Procedure.--For content validity, unanimous agreement among judges and the interpretation checked with the native speaker indicated that each item was translated correctly, and that it measured what the original item was measuring. For concurrent validity, an independent measure was developed using the Thurstone method of scale construction (the method of equal-appearing intervals). Correlation coefficients between the subject's score on this independent validating criterion and his score on the TSCS represented concurrent validity for the translated scale.

Construction of the Thurstone Scale.--Several groups of Thai high school students were asked to write out their opinion about themselves. About 230 self-reporting items (see Appendix C) were gathered and mimeographed on small slips, each statement on each slip. A set of these 230 slips along with eleven master slips lettered from A to K were given to each judge. Forty Thai judges were asked to sort them on an eleven point continuum ranging from "extremely unfavorable attitudes toward self," through "neutral," to "extremely favorable attitudes toward self."

Out of 40 judges, the sortings of 33 judges were used in the final tabulation to determine the scale value (median) and Q-value (Variability) for each item. Four were returned late, but were used in doing factor analysis upon which the final form of the scale was selected. The other three had to be eliminated due to improper sortings (less than 11 piles) and misunderstanding of the instructions.

After determining the scale values and the Q-values (see Appendix C), 60 items that had low interjudge variability (low Q's) covering all gradations from one end of the scale to the other were selected to be subjected to factor analysis procedure. The items with high Q's, considered ambiguous due to low agreement among judges were eliminated. Twenty four variables that had high intercorrelations were then selected, and comprised the final form of the scale (see Appendix D). They were presented in random order, not in order of scale values.

Method of Scoring.--In taking the Thurstone scale, the subjects were instructed to check only the items that describe themselves. According to Thurstone and Chave,¹ there are two alternative procedures of scoring which will probably give the same results. One procedure is to assign a rank number to each statement in the scale and calculate the average rank order of the statements which the subject has endorsed. The other procedure is to compute the arithmetic mean of the scale

¹L.L. Thurstone and E.J. Chave, The Measurement of Attitude (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929).

	P	I	SS	B	PhS	MES	PS	FS	SoS	SC	V	D
Test-retest Reliability with Two Week Interval (TSCS)												
T	.85	.83	.76	.76	.80	.76	.73	.74	.82	.77	.58	.66
A	.87	.77	.86	.83	.69	.82	.81	.83	.84	.74	.51	.70
Correlation Coefficients between the TSCS and the Thurstone Scale												
T	.72	.61	.49	.71	.49	.52	.72	.54	.44	-.50	-.21	.25
Nationality Code:	Thai (T); American (A)											
Score Code:	Positive Score (P) Personal Self (PS) Identity (I) Family Self (FS) Self Satisfaction (SS) Social Self (SoS) Behavior (B) Self Criticism (SC) Physical Self (PhS) Variability Score (V) Moral-Ethical Self Distribution Score (MES) (D)											

Procedure for Collecting the Data

In Thailand, administration of the instruments (the TSCS and the Thurstone scale) was undertaken by the classroom teachers, while in the United States, the investigator administered the tests with the assistance of the teachers. Both samples were informed that taking the test was for research purposes. Interpretation of the items was not allowed. This was done to guard against different interpretations on ambiguous items by different teachers. Every attempt has been made, wherever possible, to control the factors that might affect the validity of the self report index (see Chapter II, p. 40). Numbers were assigned to the subjects and used as identification instead of names. Cooperation was also taken into consideration. Except for absentees, all subjects were administered the retest at two-week intervals.

Treatment of the Data

To determine possible differences between countries, academic groups, as well as differences between sexes for the subjects in both countries, a three-way factorial analysis of variance was performed on the twelve measures yielded by the TSCS. To explore the differences among the three groups of the Thai sample: the pre-science, the pre-arts, and the general, a two-way factorial analysis of variance was run on one index, the Total Positive Score.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Comparisons between Countries,

Academic Groups and Sexes

The dependent measures analyzed in the present study were the TSCS Total Positive Score, three row and five column subscores (Identity, Self Satisfaction, Behavior; Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self and Social Self), Self Criticism subscore, and two derived scores (Variability and Distribution). These twelve measures were subjected to a set of 2x2x2 (two countries by two academic groups by two sexes) analyses of variance. Summaries of the results of these analyses are presented in Tables 3 through 7. For these analyses, .05 level of significance was employed.

As shown in Table 3, the 2x2x2 analyses of variance yielded no significant differences between Thai and American students on the TSCS Total Positive Score. When the row and column subscores were analyzed, differential main-effects were found on five subscores: Self Criticism, Identity, Behavior, Physical Self and Moral-Ethical Self. Since the interaction terms between country-academic group were found on the latter three measures, the simple main-effects were further analyzed. The .05 level of significance was adopted

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF F-RATIOS AND CELL MEANS FOR ANALYSES
OF VARIANCE OF TSCS SUBSCORES

Source of Variation	df	Positive Score		Identity	
		MS	F	MS	F
C (Country)	1	1904.00	2.47	924.07	8.64**
G (Academic Group)	1	149.62	0.19	21.67	0.20
S (Sex)	1	2650.75	3.43	350.21	3.28
C x G	1	3434.69	4.45*	118.01	1.10
C x S	1	0.12	0.00	138.67	1.30
G x S	1	691.19	0.90	110.21	1.03
C x G x S	1	104.50	0.13	10.21	0.10
Error	112	772.11		106.92	
		Means		Means	
C ₁ (Thailand)				115.07	
C ₂ (America)				120.62	
Thai CB		313.87			
Thai NCB		326.80			
American CB		332.53			
American NCB		324.68			

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Source of Variation	df	Self Satisfaction		Behavior	
		MS	F	MS	F
C (Country)	1	180.07	1.16	735.07	6.71*
G (Academic Group)	1	249.41	1.60	0.21	0.00
S (Sex)	1	421.87	2.71	138.67	1.27
C x G	1	49.41	0.32	1620.67	14.79**
C x S	1	85.01	0.55	2.41	0.02
G x S	1	85.01	0.55	49.41	0.45
C x G x S	1	297.67	1.91	10.21	0.09
Error	112	155.73		109.59	
				Means	
C ₁ (Thailand)				102.88	
C ₂ (America)				107.83	
Thai CB				99.17	
Thai NCB				106.60	
American CB				111.47	
American NCB				104.20	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Source of Variation	df	Physical Self		Moral-Ethical Self	
		MS	F	MS	F
C (Country)	1	508.41	10.35**	343.41	5.53*
G (Academic Group)	1	130.21	2.65	23.41	0.38
S (Sex)	1	0.41	0.01	310.41	5.00
C x G	1	255.21	5.20	279.07	4.49
C x S	1	0.01	0.00	1.41	0.23
G x S	1	106.41	2.17	27.07	0.44
C x G x S	1	63.07	1.28	12.67	0.20
Error	112	49.12		62.13	
		Means		Means	
C ₁ (Thailand)		64.37		61.22	
C ₂ (America)		68.48		64.60	
S ₁ (Male)				61.30	
S ₂ (Female)				64.52	
Thai CB		61.87		60.13	
Thai NCB		66.87		62.30	
American CB		68.90		66.57	
American NCB		68.07		62.63	

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Source of Variation	df	Personal Self		Family Self	
		MS	F	MS	F
C (Country)	1	38.53	0.72	195.07	3.43
G (Academic Group)	1	14.28	0.28	31.01	0.55
S (Sex)	1	0.03	0.00	31.01	0.55
C x G	1	202.80	3.81	95.41	1.68
C x S	1	4.80	0.90	130.21	2.29
G x S	1	2.70	0.05	14.01	0.25
C x G x S	1	26.13	0.49	54.67	0.96
Error	112	53.22		56.76	

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Source of Variation	df	Social Self		Self Criticism	
		MS	F	MS	F
C (Country)	1	100.83	1.67	1009.20	32.64**
G (Academic Group)	1	50.70	0.84	80.03	2.59
S (Sex)	1	842.70	13.98**	50.70	1.64
C x G	1	3.33	0.05	100.83	3.26
C x S	1	120.00	1.99	67.50	2.18
G x S	1	70.53	1.17	0.53	0.12
C x G x S	1	45.63	0.76	19.20	0.62
Error	112	60.26		30.92	
		Means		Means	
C ₁ (Thailand)				30.43	
C ₂ (America)				36.23	
S ₁ (Male)		61.42			
S ₂ (Female)		66.72			

**p < .01

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Source of Variation.	df	Variability Score		Distribution Score	
		MS	F	MS	F
C (Country)	1	28.03	0.17	31.00	0.04
G (Academic Group)	1	112.13	0.69	392.37	0.56
S (Sex)	1	0.53	0.00	2493.37	3.56
C x G	1	7.50	0.05	3131.37	4.46*
C x S	1	73.63	0.45	190.00	0.27
G x S	1	0.13	0.00	255.19	0.36
C x G x S	1	73.63	0.45	226.81	0.32
Error	112	163.66		701.34	
				Means	
Thai CB				101.73	
Thai NCB				108.33	
American CB				112.97	
American NCB				99.13	

*p < .05

for all analyses.

According to the analyses summarized in Table 4 through 6, the null hypothesis that there would be no difference between the means of the Thai and the American students was rejected for college-bound students on the three subscores. It was concluded that the American CB students rated themselves significantly higher than the Thai CB students on Behavior, Physical Self and Moral-Ethical Self ($p < .01$). For the simple main-effects of academic group, significant differences were found for Thai students ($p < .01$) on Physical Self subscore and for both Thai and American students on Behavior. The results indicated that the Thai NCB students scored themselves significantly higher than the Thai CB students on both measures, while significant difference within the American sample was found on one measure--the Behavior subscore, with the CB students scoring themselves higher than the American NCB.

When the subjects were grouped according to their programs of study (college-bound VS non-college-bound), no significant differences were found between academic groups on any of the twelve measures. In testing the influence of sex on self concept, significant differences were not found on the Total Positive Score, row subscores, Self Criticism, or derived scores. However, sex-linked differences were found on two of the five column subscores: Moral-Ethical Self ($p < .01$) and Social Self ($p < .01$) with girls scoring them-

TABLE 4
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIMPLE
MAIN-EFFECTS OF THE BEHAVIOR SUBSCORE

(i) CG Summary Table:

	g_1	g_2	Total
c_1	2975.01	3198.00	6173.01
c_2	3344.01	3126.00	6470.01
Total	6319.02	6324.00	

(ii) Analysis of Variance for Simple Main-Effects:

Source	df	MS	F
C at g_1	1	2269.35	20.71**
C at g_2	1	86.40	7.88**
G at c_1	1	826.76	7.56**
G at c_2	1	792.14	7.23**
Error	112	109.59	

**p < .01

TABLE 5
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
SIMPLE MAIN-EFFECTS OF THE
PHYSICAL SELF SUBSCORE

(1) CG Summary Table:

	g_1	g_2	Total
c_1	1856.01	2006.01	3862.02
c_2	2067.00	2042.01	4109.01
Total	3923.01	4048.02	

(11) Analysis of Variance for Simple Main-Effects:

Source	df	MS	F
C at g_1	1	741.96	15.01**
C at g_2	1	21.59	0.44
G at c_1	1	375.00	7.63**
G at c_2	1	10.40	0.21
Error	112	49.12	

**p < .01

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
SIMPLE MAIN-EFFECTS OF THE MORAL-
ETHICAL SELF SUBSCORE

(i) CG Summary Table:

	g_1	g_2	Total
c_1	1803.99	1869.00	3672.99
c_2	1997.01	1878.99	3876.00
Total	3801.00	3747.99	

(ii) Analysis of Variance for Simple Main-Effects:

Source	df	MS	F
C at g_1	1	620.94	9.99**
C at g_2	1	1.66	0.03
G at c_1	1	70.44	1.13
G at c_2	1	232.14	3.74
Error	112	62.13	

**p < .01

selves higher on these two dimensions than boys.

When the Thai and the American students were grouped by their programs of study, the results revealed significant differences of interaction between country and academic group on the Total Positive Score ($p < .05$). Analysis of subscores and derived scores yielded significant differences of country-academic group interaction on one row subscore--Behavior ($p < .01$), two column subscores: Physical Self ($p < .05$) and Moral-Ethical Self ($p < .05$) and one derived score--the Distribution Score ($p < .05$). On all significant differences the Thai NCB scored themselves higher than the Thai CB, while the American CB rated themselves higher than the American NCB.

For the effects of interactions between sex and country, sex and academic group, and sex, academic group and country on self concept scores, no significant differences were found on any of the twelve measures analyzed.

In the present study it was specifically hypothesized that:

1. There would be no significant difference between self concept scores of the Thai and the American students.

Two of the twelve measures yielded by the TSCS were found statistically significant with the American students scoring higher on both measures. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted on the rest ten measures.

Analysis of the simple main-effects showed that the American CB rated themselves higher than the Thai CB on three measures, and that the Thai NCB scored higher than the Thai CB

on two measures while the American CB rated themselves higher than the American NCB on one measure.

2. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of male and female students.

Two of the twelve measures discriminated between males and females. The null hypothesis was, therefore, accepted on the rest ten measures.

3. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the college-bound and the non-college-bound students.

No significant differences were found between the academic groups on any of the twelve measures. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted on all twelve measures.

4. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students when they were grouped according to their program of study.

Significant differences for country-academic group interaction were found on five of the twelve measures. On all significant differences, the Thai NCB rated themselves higher than the Thai CB, while the trend was reverse for the American students. The null hypothesis was accepted on seven measures.

5. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students when they were grouped according to sex.

No significant country-sex interactions were found on any of the twelve measures. Thus, this null hypothesis was accepted on all twelve measures.

6. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the college-bound and the non-college-bound students when they were grouped according to sex.

No significant difference for academic group-sex interaction was found on any of the twelve measures. The null hypothesis, therefore, was accepted on all twelve measures.

7. There would be no significant difference between mean self concept scores of the Thai and the American students when they were grouped according to both sex and program of study.

No significant difference was found for the country-academic group-sex interaction on any of the twelve measures. The hypothesis was also accepted on all twelve measures.

Comparisons within the Thai Sample

Since the Thai sample consisted of three academic groups: pre-science, pre-arts, and general (NCB), a further check on the possibility of program of study differentially affecting self concept scores was conducted. A 3x2 (three academic groups by two sexes) analysis of variance was run on the Total Positive Score of the Thai students. Summaries of the results are presented in Table 7. Although the analysis showed no significant differences between sexes or academic group-sex interaction, a differential effect was found among the academic groups. Probing with Tukey's HSD test, the results indicated that the NCB scored themselves significantly higher than the pre-arts ($p < .01$).

TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF F-RATIOS AND CELL MEANS FOR ANALYSIS
OF VARIANCE OF THE TOTAL POSITIVE SCORE

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Academic Group	2	4095.93	4.53**
Sex	1	558.66	0.62
Academic Group x Sex	2	131.10	0.14
Error	83	904.77	

Means of TSCS Total Positive Score

Pre-Science (CB ₁)	314.59
Pre-Arts (CB ₂)	303.30
General (NCB)	326.80

**p < .01

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary and Discussion

The present study was undertaken to determine whether there was any difference between self concept ratings of Thai and American high school students. Differences due to two other sources of variability, academic group (college-bound VS non-college-bound) and sex, as well as interactions between the three sources of variation were also investigated.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), a well-standardized, multidimensional instrument was used to provide self concept scores for the American students and the same instrument translated and restandardized (in terms of reliability and validity) provided self concept measures for the Thai students. The validation procedure was conducted by constructing a new self concept scale using the Thurstone method of scale construction (the equal-appearing interval method). The Thai version of the TSCS was found to have satisfactory reliability and validity (test-retest reliability .85 and concurrent validity .72). The scales were administered to 150 eleventh and twelfth grade students (90 Thais-- 60 CB and 30 NCB, and 60 Americans--30 CB and 30 NCB) ran-

domly selected within categories from certain classes of a central Oklahoma high school and an urban Thai secondary school. The between-country comparison, however, was based on the data of 120 subjects (60 Thais and 60 Americans). Each consisted of two academic groups, 30 students each with 15 males and 15 females. The bases for comparison were the twelve measures yielded by the Counseling Form of the TSCS; Total Positive Score, Identity, Self Satisfaction, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, Social Self, Self Criticism, Variability Score and Distribution Score. The twelve self concept indicies were subjected to a set of three-way ($2 \times 2 \times 2$) factorial analyses of variance.

The results of this study revealed no significant difference between the Thai and the American students on the Total Positive Score--the overall self esteem index. The finding of no difference between the means of the students from both countries on this score confirmed what Fitts and Hammer¹ have pointed out that, the variables such as age, sex, race and education do not cause significant self concept differences across groups. However, analyses of subscores showed significant differences on two measures: Identity and Self Criticism, with the American students showed more favorable sense of identity and that they were more open and capable of self criticism. The climate of freedom in the American

¹William H. Fitts and William T. Hammer, The Self Concept and Delinquency (Nashville, Tennessee: Nashville Mental Health Center), Research Monograph No. 1, July, 1969.

school or family may have had a part in making American students more capable of self criticism than the Thai students as shown by subscore comparisons.

Further analysis showed that the American CB rated themselves higher than the Thai CB on three dimensions: Behavior, Physical Self, and Moral-Ethical Self. Although significant, the differences on the respective subscores between countries were not extreme. The patterns of the scores of both samples were similar, with the Americans' neither overly high nor the Thais' unduly low. Moreover, the Thai students as a group did not differ in the degree of their consistency and certainty of self concept from the American students. The Variability scores indicated that the subjects of both samples were emotionally healthy, well-integrated individuals.

Analysis of simple main-effects indicated that the American CB rated themselves higher than the American NCB on the Behavior dimension. The trend was reverse for the Thai sample, where the Thai CB was found to score lower than the NCB on Behavior and Physical Self. Significant interactions of country by academic group found on the Total Positive Score, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self and Distribution Score also indicated the same trend of difference. Furthermore, the analysis within the Thai sample also showed that the NCB scored significantly higher than the pre-arts (one of the two Thai CB groups) on the Total Positive Score--the overall self esteem index.

It is interesting that for the Thai sample, the NCB had higher self perceptions than the CB. Since the placement procedure was done on the basis of academic achievement, it was expected that the CB students, both the pre-science and the pre-arts, would tend to score higher than the NCB. A consideration of factors which might lower the CB's low self evaluations, despite better academic achievement or high status, seems to be in part a result of anxiety and pressure relating to academic work and especially the national examinations (both final and entrance) which are highly competitive. Another factor may be due to failures in areas not tapped in the present inventory or high standards to which the individuals rigidly adhere. As Soares and Soares¹ pointed out, lower self perceptions can be expected where the burdens are greater.

On the other hand, high self evaluation on the part of the Thai NCB may have been due to less pressure in the school for academic achievement. It may be that they are satisfied with themselves, or are functioning according to expectations held by their parents, hence, high self perceptions result. It also may result from successful experiences in areas not tapped in the inventory.

In determining differences between sexes, female students perceived themselves favorably on two dimensions: Moral-Ethical Self and Social Self. This result was in concert with

¹Soares and Soares, loc. cit.

the findings of Graves¹ and Davidson and Lang.² Since females mature both physically and socially at an earlier age than males, this factor probably contributed to higher means for females.

The analysis of differential effects of academic programs on self concept supported the null hypothesis between the means of the CB and the NCB. The result was contrary to the findings of Washburn³ who found that college preparatory students have more mature self concepts than non-college-preparatory students. Had significant differences been found to confirm Washburn's findings, it would have supported the use of personality factors along with academic achievement as bases for predicting future success among college applicants.

Within the Thai sample comparison, there was a significant difference on the Total Positive Score between the CB₂ (pre-arts) and the NCB, with the means favoring the NCB. Although the design of the present study did not permit conclusive causal statements, the results do indicate that the NCB students do not necessarily suffer from a lower sense of personal worth. The result confirmed what Soares and Soares⁴ found with culturally disadvantaged children that, despite their low status and handicap, they showed higher self percep-

¹Graves, op. cit., p. 45.

²Davidson and Lang, loc. cit.

³Washburn, loc. cit.

⁴Soares and Soares, loc. cit.

tions than the advantaged children. The American CB, on the other hand, scored higher than the American NCB on only one dimension of self, the Behavior.

In Thailand, there is a common practice of utilizing academic achievement as a basis for placement of students. The answer to the question of whether this practice has effects on self perceptions of the students must await future research replicating the present study. Future research in this area should involve a larger number of students, students from private schools or from different cities, and with designs which control for variables such as level of aspiration and expectations of parents. Longitudinal research concerning the evaluation of shifts in self concept before and after placement would probably throw some light on the problem.

Conclusions

Do educational institutions in the American society actually develop in students a higher level of self esteem and personal worth than schools in Thailand? The results of this study indicate in general, that a typical middle class, white American high school apparently is no more successful in this regard than a similar school in Thailand, a country which has a different background of so-called democratic values and culture. The findings of the investigation led to the conclusion that, despite cultural differences, the American and the Thai high school students in general, did not differ in terms of self esteem, personal worth, consistency, or certainty

of self concept.

Although male and female students, in general, did not differ in their personal worth, significant differences on two dimensions of self (Moral-Ethical Self and Social Self) with the means favored females are in congruent with the findings of previous studies shown females having several self indicies than males.

The CB and the NCB students did not differ in their self perceptions in any aspect. Had the scale measured self concept of ability, there would have been significant differences between the two academic groups.

Comparison of the three groups within the Thai sample led to the conclusion that, the Thai NCB students, despite their lower academic achievement, did not necessarily suffer from lower self esteem.

Recommendations

Because generalization is limited to the population sampled, future research might include replication of the present study with a larger number of subjects, with subjects from other schools or cities, and also with other populations, i.e., junior high school students, and college students, to see whether the findings are generalizable to those populations. It would be interesting also to replicate the study, using the American students and other nationalities.

Future research designed to further standardize the Thai edition of the TSCS would be another fruitful research undertaking. Norms for the Thai people should be established so that future research using only the Thai subjects can be meaningfully interpreted.

APPENDIX A

CRITERION SHEET

This study is for the purpose of comparing students in Thailand with students in the United States. Please check each sentence that helps to describe you.

- I. ☐ I have taken or am enrolled in Algebra II.
☐ I have had or am enrolled in foreign language, government, chemistry, or physics.
- II. ☐ I am going to attend a four-year college.
☐ I am not planning to attend a four-year college.
☐ I am undecided.

Name _____

Teacher _____

APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE (TSCS) WILLIAM H. FITTS, PH.D.

INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your number and the other information. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in the booklet.

The statements in the booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item. Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

Since the item numbers are not arranged in order, as you start, be sure that your answer sheet and the booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other. Begin with the right hand column first. The best way to do it is to check the item numbers along while answering.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

Responses-

Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
1	2	3	4	5

You will find the response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

1. I have a healthy body.
 3. I am an attractive person.
 5. I consider myself a sloppy person.
 19. I am a decent sort of person.
 21. I am an honest person.
 23. I am a bad person.
 37. I am a cheerful person.
 39. I am a calm and easy going person.
 41. I am a nobody.
 55. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.
 57. I am a member of a happy family.
 59. My friends have no confidence in me.
 73. I am a friendly person.
 75. I am popular with men.
 77. I am not interested in what other people do.
 91. I do not always tell the truth.
 93. I get angry sometimes.
-
2. I like to look nice and neat all the time.
 4. I am full of aches and pains.
 6. I am a sick person.
 20. I am a religious person.
 22. I am a moral failure.
 24. I am a morally weak person.
 38. I have a lot of self-control.
 40. I am a hateful person.
 42. I am losing my mind.
 56. I am an important person to my friends and family.
 58. I am not loved by my family.
 60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.
 74. I am popular with women.
 76. I am mad at the whole world.
 78. I am hard to be friendly with.
 92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
 94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.
-
7. I am neither too fat nor too thin.
 9. I like my looks just the way they are.
 11. I would like to change some parts of my body.
 25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior.
 27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God.
 29. I ought to go to church more.
 43. I am satisfied to be just what I am.
 45. I am just as nice as I should be.
 47. I despise myself.
 61. I am satisfied with my family relationships.
 63. I understand my family as well as I should.
 65. I should trust my family more.
 79. I am as sociable as I want to be.
 81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.
 83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint.
 95. I do not like everyone I know.
 97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.

8. I am neither too tall nor too short.
 10. I don't feel as well as I should.
 12. I should have more sex appeal.
 26. I am as religious as I want to be.
 28. I wish I could be more trustworthy.
 30. I shouldn't tell so many lies.
 44. I am as smart as I want to be.
 46. I am not the person I would like to be.
 48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.
 62. I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).
 64. I am too sensitive to things my family say.
 66. I should love my family more.
 80. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.
 82. I should be more polite to others.
 84. I ought to get along better with other people.
 96. I gossip a little at times.
 98. At times I feel like swearing.
-
13. I take good care of myself physically.
 15. I try to be careful about my appearance.
 17. I often act like I am "all thumbs".
 31. I am true to my religion in my everyday life.
 33. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.
 35. I sometimes do very bad things.
 49. I can always take care of myself in any situation.
 51. I take the blame for things without getting mad.
 53. I do things without thinking about them first.
 67. I try to play fair with my friends and family.
 69. I take a real interest in my family.
 71. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living).
 85. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.
 87. I get along well with other people.
 89. I do not forgive others easily.
 99. I would rather win than lose in a game.
-
14. I feel good most of the time.
 16. I do poorly in sports and games.
 18. I am a poor sleeper.
 32. I do what is right most of the time.
 34. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.
 36. I have trouble doing the things that are right.
 50. I solve my problems quite easily.
 52. I change my mind a lot.
 54. I try to run away from my problems.
 68. I do my share of work at home.
 70. I quarrel with my family.
 72. I do not act like my family thinks I should.
 86. I see good points in all the people I meet.
 88. I do not feel at ease with other people.
 90. I find it hard to talk with strangers.

100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

วิธีทอม (ชุดที่ ๑)

ข้อความในแบบสอบถามข้างล่างนี้จะช่วยให้นักเรียนบรรยายถึงตัวเอง
ขอให้นักเรียนอ่านและแปลความหมายของประโยคเอง อย่าสอบถามกัน

โปรดตอบแบบสอบถามตามที่นักเรียน เห็น ว่าตัวเองเป็นอย่างไร หรือ
ให้คิดว่านักเรียนกำลังบรรยายหรือพรรณนาถึงตัวเองให้ตัวเองฟัง ขอให้นักเรียนทำ
ทุกข้อ ให้นักเรียนอ่านแต่ละประโยคอย่างรอบคอบ แล้วจึงเลือกคำตอบหนึ่งในห้า
อันคับที่จัดไว้ให้ในกระดาษคำตอบ โดยเขียนวงกลมล้อมรอบหมายเลขที่นักเรียนเลือก

ถ้านักเรียนอยากจะเปลี่ยนคำตอบหลังจากที่ทำไปแล้ว ให้เขียนเครื่องหมาย
+ กับคำตอบเดิม แล้วเขียนวงกลมล้อมรอบคำตอบใหม่

หมายเหตุ

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------|
| ๑. | = | ผิดหมด |
| ๒. | = | ผิดเป็นส่วนใหญ่ |
| ๓. | = | ผิดบ้างถูกบ้าง |
| ๔. | = | ถูกเป็นส่วนใหญ่ |
| ๕. | = | ถูกหมด |

ชุดที่ ๑

๑. ฉันมีร่างกายแข็งแรง
๓. ฉันเป็นคนสวย (หรือหล่อ ถ้าเป็นชาย)
๕. ฉันคิดว่าฉันเป็นคนเหลวไหล
๑๘. ฉันเป็นคนที่ดีคนหนึ่ง
๒๑. ฉันเป็นคนซื่อสัตย์
๒๓. ฉันเป็นคนเลว
๓๗. ฉันเป็นคนร่าเริง
๓๘. ฉันเป็นคนใจเย็นและไม่พิถีพิถัน
๔๑. ฉันเป็นคนที่ไม่สำคัญอะไรนัก
๔๕. ฉันมีครอบครัวที่พร้อมจะช่วยเหลือฉันเสมอ
ไม่ว่าฉันจะมีปัญหาอะไร
๕๗. ฉันเป็นสมาชิกของครอบครัวที่มีความสุข
๕๘. เพื่อน ๆ ไม่มีความเชื่อถือในตัวฉัน
๗๓. ฉันให้ความเป็นมิตรกับทุกคน
๗๕. ฉันเป็นที่นิยมในหมู่เพื่อนชาย (หญิง)
๗๖. ฉันไม่สนใจเรื่องราวของคนอื่น
๘๑. ฉันไม่ได้พูดความจริงเสมอไป
๘๓. ฉันโกธเป็นบางครั้ง

๒. ฉันชอบให้ตัวเองมองดูสวยงามและประณีตเรียบร้อย
อยู่ตลอดเวลา
๔. ฉันเจ็บมันปวดนี้อยู่ตลอดเวลา
๖. ฉันเป็นคนป่วย
๒๐. ฉันเป็นคนเคร่งศาสนา
๒๒. ฉันเป็นคนผิดศีลธรรมจรรยา
๒๔. ฉันเป็นคนไม่ค่อยมีศีลธรรม
๓๘. ฉันสามารถควบคุมตัวเองได้ดี
๔๐. ฉันเป็นคนที่มีแต่ความเกลียดชังผู้อื่น
๔๒. ฉันกำลังจะเป็นบ้าอยู่แล้ว
๕๖. ฉันเป็นคนสำคัญของเพื่อน ๆ และครอบครัวของฉัน
๕๘. ครอบครัวของฉันไม่รักฉัน
๖๐. ฉันรู้สึกว่าครอบครัวของฉันไม่มีความไว้วางใจ
ในตัวฉัน
๗๔. ฉันเป็นคนกว้างขวางในหมู่เพื่อนฝูง
๗๖. ฉันกำลังเกลียดทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างในโลกนี้
๗๘. ฉันเป็นมิตรกับใครก็ไม่ค่อยง่าย ๆ
๘๒. บางครั้งฉันคิดถึงสิ่งที่เลวทรามที่ไม่ควรแม้แต่จะพูดถึง
๘๔. บางครั้งเมื่อรู้สึกไม่สบาย ฉันออกจะฉุนเฉียวหรือหงุดหงิด

๓. ฉันไม่อ้วนหรือผอมจนเกินไป
๔. ฉันพอใจในรูปร่างลักษณะของฉันทั้งที่เป็นอยู่
๑๑. ฉันอยากเปลี่ยนบางส่วนของร่างกายของฉัน
๒๕. ฉันพอใจในความประพฤติที่ถูกตองตามท่านองคสองขรรม
ของฉัน
๒๗. ฉันพอใจในการบำเพ็ญตัวทางศาสนา หรือความศรัทธา
ของฉันแล้ว
๒๘. ฉันควรจะไปวัดหรือโบสถ์ใหม่มากกว่านี้
๔๓. ฉันพอใจในตัวฉันทั้งที่เป็นอยู่ขณะนี้
๔๕. ฉันเป็นคนดีเท่าที่ฉันควรจะเป็น
๔๖. ฉันเกลียดตัวเอง
๖๑. ฉันพอใจในความสัมพันธ์ในครอบครัวของฉัน
๖๓. ฉันเข้าใจครอบครัวของฉันเท่าที่ฉันควรจะเข้าใจ
๖๕. ฉันควรจะไว้วางใจครอบครัวของฉันใหม่มากกว่านี้
๗๔. ฉันเข้าสังคมเก่งเท่าที่ฉันต้องการ
๘๑. ฉันพยายามเอาใจคนอื่น แต่ก็ไม่ได้ทำมากจนเกินไป
๘๓. ฉันไม่เก่งทางด้านสมาคมเลย
๙๕. ฉันไม่ชอบทุกคนที่ฉันรู้จัก
๙๖. บางครั้งฉันก็ซ้ำเรื่องตลกที่ลามก

๘. ฉันไม่สูงหรือเตี้ยจนเกินไป
๑๐. ฉันไม่รู้สึกสบายเท่าที่ควร
๑๒. ฉันควรจะมีลักษณะดังบุคคลเพศตรงข้ามมากกว่านี้
๒๒. ฉันเคร่งในศาสนาถึงที่ฉันต้องการ
๒๔. ฉันอยากให้ฉันเป็นคนที่น่าไว้นับถือใจมากกว่านี้
๓๐. ฉันไม่ควรพูดคำไหนมากนัก (หมายความว่าฉันพูดค
อยู่เสมอ)
๔๔. ฉันเก่งเท่าที่ฉันอยากจะเก่ง
๔๖. ฉันไม่ไ้เป็นบุคคลที่ฉันอยากจะเป็น
๔๘. ฉันอยากให้ฉันเป็นคนที่ไม่ยอมแพ้อะไรง่าย ๆ
๖๒. ฉันปฏิบัติตัวต่อพ่อแม่เท่าที่ฉันควรจะทำ
(หรือเคยปฏิบัติตัวกับพ่อแม่ถ้าท่านไม่มีชีวิตแล้ว)
๖๔. ฉันคิดมากเสมอต่อสิ่งที่ควรรอบรู้ฉันพูด
๖๖. ฉันควรจะมีรักใคร่ของฉันมากกว่านี้
๘๐. การวางตัวของฉันกับผู้อื่นเป็นที่น่าพอใจแล้ว
๘๒. ฉันควรจะมีสุขภาพที่แข็งแรงมากขึ้น
๘๔. ฉันควรจะมีเพื่อนให้ดีกว่านี้
๘๖. ฉันมีเงินเป็นครั้งคราว
๘๘. บางครั้งฉันอยากสงบ

๑๓. ฉันระมัดระวังเกี่ยวกับสุขภาพของฉันเป็นอย่างดี
๑๕. ฉันพยายามและระมัดระวังให้ตัวเองนำบุญเสมอ
๑๗. ฉันเป็นคนทำอะไรซุ่มซาม
๓๑. ฉันปฏิบัติศรัทธาตามหลักศาสนาหรือศีลห้าอยู่เป็นประจำวัน
๓๓. ฉันพยายามแก้ไขเมื่อรู้ว่าฉันกำลังทำสิ่งไม่ดี
๓๕. บางครั้งฉันก็ทำสิ่งที่เผลอมาก
๔๔. ฉันสามารถจะดูแลตัวเองได้เสมอ
ไม่ว่าจะอยู่ในสถานการณ์ใด ๆ ก็ตาม
๕๑. ฉันยอมรับฟังคำติเตียนได้โดยไม่โกรธ
๕๓. ฉันมักจะทำอะไรโดยไม่คิดเสียก่อน
๖๗. ฉันพยายามที่จะยุติกรรมต่อเพื่อน ๆ และครอบครัวของฉัน
๖๙. ฉันให้ความสนใจหรือใส่ใจในครอบครัวของฉันอย่างแท้จริง
๗๑. ฉันยอมให้พ่อแม่ของฉัน (ฉันทำตัวถึงที่ทำงานต้องการแม้ว่าฉัน
จะไม่อยากทำ ฉันเคยยอมให้พ่อแม่ถ้าท่านเสียชีวิตแล้ว)
๘๕. ฉันพยายามที่จะเข้าใจความคิดเห็นของผู้อื่น
๘๗. ฉันเข้ากับผู้อื่นได้ดี
๘๘. ฉันไม่เคยบอกโทษให้ใครได้ง่าย ๆ
๘๙. ในการแข่งขันกีฬาใด ๆ ฉันอยากชนะมากกว่าแพ้

๑๔. ฉันรู้สึกสบายเป็นส่วนมาก
๑๖. ฉันเล่นกีฬาไม่เก่งเลย
๑๘. ฉันนอนไม่ค่อยหลับ
๓๒. ฉันทำแต่สิ่งที่ถูกต้องอยู่เสมอ
๓๔. บางครั้งฉันใช้ชีวิตที่ไม่ถูกต้อง
เพื่อทำให้ผลงานดีขึ้น
๓๖. ฉันมีความลำบากในการทำสิ่งที่ถูกต้อง
๕๐. ฉันแก้ปัญหาต่าง ๆ ของฉันได้โดยง่าย
๕๒. ฉันเปลี่ยนใจบ่อย ๆ
๕๔. ฉันพยายามหนีจากปัญหาต่าง ๆ ที่เกิดขึ้นแก่ฉัน
(ไม่คิดสู้)
๖๘. ฉันช่วยครอบครัวทำงานบ้าน
๗๐. ฉันมักจะทะเลาะกับครอบครัวของฉัน
๗๒. ฉันไม่ได้ประพฤติตัวดังที่ครอบครัวของฉันอยากให้ทำ
๘๖. ฉันเห็นส่วนดีของทุกคนที่ฉันรู้จัก
๘๘. ฉันไม่รู้สึกเป็นกันเองกับผู้อื่น
๙๐. ฉันรู้สึกลำบากใจที่จะพบกับคนแปลกหน้า
๑๐๐. ฉันผลัดวันประกันพรุ่ง เป็นบางครั้งบางคราว

APPENDIX C

SELF-REPORTING ITEMS GATHERED FROM THAI HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS (English Translation)

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
1.	9.4	1.8	My parents love me dearly.
2.	4.7	2.8	I think I am unlucky.
3.	4.2	2.8	I get bored easily.
**4.	4.2	1.4	I feel lonely very often.
5.	3.6	2.6	Sometimes I think life is not worth living.
6.	5.8	3.0	I am pretty (or handsome).
7.	8.3	2.7	I like to travel.
*8.	6.8	2.0	I like to please people.
9.	2.2	2.7	I am bossy with other people.
**10.	9.1	1.4	My family lives together peacefully.
11.	4.7	2.3	I am not a good student.
12.	8.8	2.2	I like to plan things carefully, well ahead of time.
13.	10.0	1.8	I love my family.
*14.	8.6	1.6	I have never been malicious toward anyone.
*15	3.5	2.1	I do not know how to study.
**16.	4.4	1.4	I am not sociable, I feel embarrassed talking to people I am not acquainted with.
17.	3.1	3.4	If I were not afraid of being caught or blamed, I would do several bad things.
18.	5.8	2.8	After doing any important thing, I always think that I should have done better.
19.	2.9	3.4	I like to have distinguished friends, because they help me to be important in the society.
20.	4.2	3.0	Even after I have made a decision, it is not hard for people to make me change my mind.
*21.	2.9	1.7	I get jealous when people get higher scores than I do.
22.	4.4	2.3	I do not like people easily.
23.	5.0	2.0	Sometimes I want to be alone.
24.	7.3	2.8	I am always worried about my exams and my study.
25.	3.4	2.1	I think people tend to take advantage of me.

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
26.	3.5	2.2	I can hardly keep my feelings, I always show my anger and dissatisfaction.
27.	4.6	2.2	I am afraid to express myself.
28.	4.5	2.2	I think my mind is not good.
29.	4.5	1.6	I value punctuality.
30.	4.9	3.0	I am a little bit selfish.
31.	3.9	1.8	I do not have much confidence in myself.
*32.	8.6	1.6	I love tranquility.
33.	6.3	3.0	I am a regimented person.
34.	5.3	2.6	I have not used all the capacities that I have.
**35.	7.8	2.1	My friends always listen to and trust me.
**36.	7.2	2.1	My judgement is good.
**37.	3.4	1.5	I do not have any good personality.
38.	4.9	3.1	I do not care what other people are thinking about me.
**39.	8.9	1.7	My family trusts me.
40.	3.1	2.3	I am not interested in school work.
41.	5.1	5.2	I am not two-faced.
42.	4.4	2.3	I do not enjoy going out.
43.	4.1	2.0	I like to tease other people in order to have fun and get acquainted.
44.	1.8	2.0	I always talk rudely.
45.	2.1	2.2	I cut class quite often.
46.	8.6	1.8	I like to help people who are in trouble.
47.	4.5	2.3	Nobody understands me very well.
48.	6.9	2.7	I hate to wait.
49.	6.6	3.2	Nobody can hurt me easily.
50.	8.8	1.7	I am important to my family.
51.	7.9	2.5	I like to play games and sports very much.
*52.	4.2	1.8	I have strong feelings toward everything.
**53.	1.8	2.0	I tend to think of people pessimistically.
54.	6.4	3.3	I like to listen to music.
**55.	4.0	1.5	I do not know how to behave with older people.
56.	4.5	2.6	I am touchy.
57.	5.5	3.3	I want to win in every game that I play.
58.	5.0	2.2	I like to dress-up.
59.	8.3	2.2	I always feel guilty when I do something wrong.

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
60.	7.2	2.3	I do not like to take advantage of other people, nor to be taken advantage of.
**61.	7.2	2.1	I like to tell jokes to my friends.
62.	3.3	2.1	When I have to do something difficult, I do not even want to try.
63.	4.8	3.1	I lie sometimes.
64.	3.4	2.0	I am often in trouble because of doing things without thinking.
*65.	6.2	1.5	I like to go to parties.
**66.	3.2	1.7	I cannot get along well with other people.
67.	2.6	2.1	I think my friends try to avoid me.
68.	6.1	3.5	I have a good figure.
69.	2.7	2.3	I am not happy being in my family.
*70.	9.1	1.7	I am proud to have been born in my family.
**71.	3.9	1.6	I cannot control myself very well.
72.	5.4	2.1	I do poorly in sports.
**73.	2.6	1.5	I always do things emotionally.
74.	3.9	2.3	I always think that I will cause trouble to other people.
75.	8.2	2.4	I am proud of the way I behave.
76.	4.1	2.7	I do not always do what I ought to do.
77.	8.5	3.0	I stop and think things over before doing anything, even though it is a trivial matter.
*78.	6.2	2.1	I put my thoughts into words quickly.
79.	9.1	2.2	I am a responsible person.
80.	4.1	2.6	I tend to worry for quite a while about things that happened.
81.	7.7	2.5	I enjoy talking to people.
82.	7.6	2.7	I do not have too many close friends, but we really love, trust and help each other.
**83.	8.6	1.3	I prefer to work by myself.
*84.	7.6	2.2	My friends turn to me when they are in trouble.
*85.	5.8	2.3	I am sincere to others, but I am not sure that they are sincere to me.
86.	8.5	2.2	I trust my best friends.
*87.	5.6	1.9	I do not like crowded and noisy parties.
88.	5.6	2.2	I do not like the adults to be interested in me.
89.	8.6	2.2	I think my life is worthwhile.
90.	7.9	2.9	I do not like to be forced.
91.	7.3	3.0	I do not like to complain.

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
92.	4.0	2.0	Sometimes I do not care what will happen to me.
93.	7.8	2.8	Everyone who knows me generally likes me.
94.	4.1	1.8	I feel blue quite often.
*95.	5.3	2.0	Sometimes I think of things I do not want anybody to know.
96.	4.2	2.4	I am not healthy.
97.	3.9	2.1	It is hard for me to understand my lessons.
98.	2.5	2.2	Many teachers have prejudices against me.
99.	3.4	2.2	I am so casual and playful that nobody takes me seriously.
100.	5.4	3.0	I am a very open person. I hardly keep a secret except when it is a serious promise.
101.	4.5	2.4	I tend to like and believe others easily.
102.	9.1	1.1	I believe that I will be successful in the future.
103.	4.2	1.8	I always think that I am a child.
104.	8.1	1.8	I am easy to be friend with and can be trusted.
105.	5.6	2.9	I am quick-tempered once in a while.
106.	8.4	2.0	I would rather act than talk.
107.	7.3	3.4	I am intelligent.
108.	8.3	2.0	I never feel ashamed doing the right thing.
109.	4.3	3.0	I feel I have not done anything useful to the society.
110.	2.9	2.5	I do not like to study.
111.	8.1	2.2	I hate quarreling.
112.	3.8	1.9	Nobody understands me.
113.	7.1	2.3	I am important to some of the people I know.
**114.	2.7	2.1	Nobody in my family understands me.
115.	7.5	2.4	I always have confidence in myself.
116.	4.2	2.1	I trust noone except myself.
117.	4.7	2.2	I am nervous and excited when I speak in front of the class.
118.	4.8	2.3	It is hard for me to concentrate on something.
119.	3.7	2.6	Everything I do is bound to work out badly for me until I have to give up.
120.	4.2	3.1	Sometimes I think I am no good at all.

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
*121.	9.4	1.5	I think that being sincere and honest is good.
122.	5.7	2.7	I would rather study by myself than in class.
123.	2.9	2.6	I do not have a bright future.
124.	3.2	3.0	I have never been successful in anything in my life.
*125.	4.9	1.6	I am too honest.
126.	4.0	2.7	I am a worrying person.
127.	2.3	2.1	I am not a well-mannered person.
128.	8.4	3.0	I have good mental health.
129.	5.6	3.0	My characteristics are much better than others.
130.	7.9	3.1	I have various kinds of abilities.
**131.	7.0	2.2	I am always lucky.
132.	2.4	2.6	I am lazy.
133.	5.4	3.1	I like to dream.
134.	2.3	2.4	I am selfish.
*135.	8.3	1.7	I like to have fun within certain limits.
136.	3.4	2.9	I am emotional.
*137.	8.8	1.7	I like neatness.
138.	3.1	2.1	I am an undecided person. I change my mind a lot.
*139.	6.4	2.0	I do not trust strangers.
140.	7.6	2.5	I am delighted to do anything for my friends.
*141.	0.8	2.2	I am polite to older people but make fun behind their backs.
142.	8.4	1.9	I love my friends, and have many good friends.
143.	2.7	2.5	I do not have good table-manner.
**144.	1.8	1.5	I like to criticize and blame others, even if I am no better than they are.
**145.	8.3	1.4	I can get along with people of all ages.
*146.	4.8	1.7	It is hard for me to get acquainted with people.
*147.	5.1	2.2	What I like is different from what other people like.
148.	4.5	2.7	I find it hard to take no for an answer.
149.	2.6	2.3	I do not want anyone to be better than I am.
150.	4.6	3.4	I feel that my thinking is always right.
**151.	3.2	1.7	I do not like to read, I like to play and do not use my time properly.
152.	3.8	2.1	I am passive, and slow at work.

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
153.	8.3	1.9	I am tenacious.
154.	6.7	2.2	I can discuss intelligently.
155.	1.1	3.0	I always cheat on my exams.
156.	4.9	3.6	I expect perfect result in everything I do.
157.	2.9	2.8	My benefits must always come first.
158.	4.1	1.8	I can cry easily.
159.	6.7	2.2	I like excitement and adventures.
160.	3.5	2.1	I am stingy.
161.	3.8	2.5	I gossip at times.
162.	3.4	2.1	I am quarrelsome.
163.	8.7	2.3	I like to read books.
164.	8.3	2.5	I like all kinds of sports.
165.	8.6	1.7	I am an optimistic person.
166.	8.1	2.3	I am joyful.
167.	3.2	2.2	I like to postpone things till to-morrow.
168.	5.1	3.1	I am not interested in things not relevant to me.
169.	4.8	2.1	I do not know how to put my imaginative ideas into practice.
*170.	2.2	1.8	I am disobedient and never listen to older people.
171.	8.7	2.4	I love nature.
*172.	2.5	1.4	I am irresponsible.
173.	7.6	2.2	I like to have fun and listen to jokes.
174.	8.8	2.2	I am proud to be me.
175.	7.7	2.2	I am a serious person.
176.	5.8	3.3	I do unto others as they do unto me.
177.	3.9	2.2	I get angry easily.
178.	3.2	2.8	I am boastful.
179.	2.1	2.3	I am not punctual and am always late for appointment.
*180.	9.2	1.4	I am reasonable.
181.	9.2	1.9	I like fairness.
182.	3.2	2.1	I am impulsive.
183.	3.0	2.3	Being a liberal spender always causes me financial problem.
*184.	8.2	1.7	I am quite a generous person.
185.	3.8	1.5	I am hot-tempered.
186.	2.5	1.9	I am gullible.
187.	4.7	1.8	I am not up-to-date.
*188.	7.9	1.4	I have quite a happy life.
189.	5.9	1.9	I like to go to the movies.
190.	7.6	2.4	I love niceness.
*191.	3.4	1.7	I always think that I am the most inferior person in the group.

Item Numbers	Scale Values	Q's	Statements
**192.	9.5	1.6	Once I make a promise, I always keep it.
193.	6.4	2.8	I am reserved and distant except to intimate friends.
*194.	6.4	2.1	I enjoy working alone.
*195.	5.1	2.0	I am shy in the presence of the opposite sex.
**196.	2.1	2.1	I am a revengeful person, and it is not easy for me to forgive.
197.	6.4	3.4	I am a very ambitious person.
*198.	4.3	1.8	My temperament changes easily.
199.	6.1	3.1	I am interested in the opposite sex.
*200.	5.4	1.2	I am not eloquent.
*201.	4.6	1.9	I am afraid to go anywhere alone.
202.	5.2	2.6	I am afraid to be with the opposite sex.
203.	8.3	2.1	I have good friends and I think I can live in good society.
204.	5.6	3.0	I get along easily with other people, even with strangers.
205.	8.7	2.1	My friends trust me.
206.	5.5	3.0	I am proud of my music talents.
*207.	7.6	2.0	I have a fine sense of humour.
208.	3.9	2.3	I am nobody.
209.	4.9	1.8	I always do what my friends do.
210.	3.1	2.4	I want to be good, but I am lazy.
211.	6.5	2.9	I am not talkative.
212.	3.9	2.7	I like to imitate other people.
213.	4.8	2.1	I have an attitude that things will work themselves out.
**214.	3.9	1.3	I am a wavering person.
*215.	4.7	1.0	I am shy.
216.	3.4	2.3	I feel useless very often.
217.	4.7	1.8	I am ugly.
218.	4.1	2.4	I am a nervous person.
219.	4.1	1.9	It is hard for me to go to sleep.
*220.	4.5	2.0	I always consult people for their advice.
*221.	8.9	1.9	I am prudent.
222.	7.1	2.8	I hardly show my feelings.
*223.	7.6	2.1	I am humble.
224.	7.1	2.8	I have good health.
225.	8.5	1.8	I do not get discouraged easily.
226.	3.4	2.3	Nobody really loves me.
227.	4.1	2.6	Being criticized and scoled hurt my feeling badly.

Item Numbers	Values	Q's	Statements
228.	8.2	2.2	I do not like to gossip.
229.	6.8	2.2	I have done a lot of good things for others, but nobody acknowledges my contribution.
230.	5.7	2.2	I think being a good student is more important than being attractive.

*Items selected to be subjected to factor analysis.

**Items selected after doing factor analysis.

ประโยคแสดงความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับตัวเอง

ที่รวบรวมได้จากนักเรียนมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ ๔ - ๕

๑. พ่อแม่รักฉันมาก
๒. ฉันรู้สึกว่าเป็นคนไม่มีโชค
๓. ฉันเป็นคนเบื่อบะไรง่าย
- *๔. ฉันรู้สึกเปล่าเปลี่ยวบ่อยครั้ง
๕. บางครั้งฉันคิดว่าชีวิตนี้ไม่น่าอยู่
๖. ฉันเป็นคนสวย (หรือรูปหล่อ ถ้าเป็นชาย)
๗. ฉันชอบทัศนาศรท่องเที่ยว
- *๘. ฉันชอบเอาใจผู้อื่น
๙. ฉันชอบวางอำนาจกับคนอื่น
- **๑๐. ครอบครัวของฉันอยู่กันอย่างสงบสุข
๑๑. ฉันเป็นคนเรียนหนังสือไม่เก่ง
๑๒. ก่อนที่จะทำอะไร ฉันมักจะวางแผนโครงการไว้ล่วงหน้าอย่างรอบคอบเสมอ
๑๓. ฉันเป็นคนรักพ่อแม่พี่น้อง
- *๑๔. ฉันไม่เคยคิดมุ่งร้ายใคร
- *๑๕. ฉันขู่มึงสื่อไม่เป็น
- **๑๖. ฉันเข้าสังคมไม่เป็นและเกือเขินเมื่อคุยกับคนที่ไม่คุ้นเคย
๑๗. ถ้าไม่กลัวถูกตำหนิหรือจับได้ ฉันคงทำสิ่งที่ไม่สมควรหลายอย่าง
๑๘. หลังจากทำอะไรที่สำคัญไปแล้ว ฉันมักจะเก็บมาคิดว่าฉันน่าจะทำได้ดีกว่านั้น
๑๙. ฉันชอบคบคนรวย คนเก๋ หรือคนเก่ง เพราะเขาช่วยให้ฉันมีความสำคัญในสังคม
๒๐. แม้ฉันจะตัดสินใจแน่วแน่แล้ว คนอื่นก็สามารถเกลี้ยกล่อมให้ฉันเปลี่ยนใจได้
- *๒๑. ฉันไม่ชอบให้ใครแสดงความท้อใจเมื่อเขาได้คะแนนดีกว่าฉัน

๒๒. ฉันเป็นคนไม่ชอบใครง่าย ๆ
๒๓. บางครั้งฉันอยากอยู่คนเดียวเงียบ ๆ
๒๔. ฉันกังวลเกี่ยวกับการ เรียนและการสอบแต่ละครั้งของฉัน
๒๕. ฉันรู้สึกว่าคนอื่นชอบมาคบโกยผลประโยชน์จากฉันเสมอ
๒๖. ฉันเก็บความรู้สึกไม่ได้ มักจะแสดงความโกรธและความไม่พอใจให้คนอื่นเห็นเสมอ
๒๗. ฉันขาดความกล้าในการแสดงออกต่าง ๆ
๒๘. ฉันรู้สึกว่าสมองฉันไม่ค่อยดี
๒๙. ฉันเห็นว่าการตรงต่อเวลานั้นดี
๓๐. ฉันเห็นแก่ตัวบ้างนิดหน่อย
๓๑. ฉันไม่ค่อยมีความมั่นใจในตนเอง
- *๓๒. ฉันรักความสงบ
๓๓. ฉันเป็นคนเจ้าระเบียบ
๓๔. ฉันยังไม่ได้ใช้ความสามารถที่มีอยู่ให้เต็มที่
- **๓๕. ฉันเป็นคนที่เป็นห่วงความผิดเพี้ยนและให้ความเกรงใจเสมอ
- **๓๖. วิจัยญาณฉันอยู่ในเกณฑ์
- **๓๗. ฉันมีบุคลิกไม่ดี
๓๘. คนอื่นจะคิดอย่างไรกับฉัน ไม่ทำให้ฉันเดือดร้อนเลย
- **๓๘. ฉันเป็นคนที่ครอบครัวยาวใจ
๔๐. ฉันไม่ค่อยสนใจการเรียนเท่าใดนัก
๔๑. ฉันเป็นคนที่ไม่ชอบทำที่ต่อหน้า นำไปว่าลับหลัง
๔๒. ฉันไม่ค่อยชอบเที่ยว
๔๓. ฉันชอบยั่วเย้าคนอื่นเพื่อให้เกิดความเป็นกันเองและสนุกสนานเท่านั้น
๔๔. ฉันเป็นคนพูดจาหยามคาย
๔๕. ฉันหนีเรียนบ่อย

- ๔๖. ฉันชอบช่วยเหลือคนที่ประสบความเดือดร้อน
- ๔๗. ไม่มีใคร เข้าใจฉันสัก
- ๔๘. ฉันไม่ชอบการรอกอย
- ๔๙. ไม่มีใครทำให้ฉันเจ็บใจง่าย ๆ
- ๕๐. ฉันมีความสำคัญต่อครอบครัวของฉัน
- ๕๑. ฉันชอบเล่นกีฬามาก
- *๕๒. ฉันเป็นคนที่มีความคิดรุนแรงในทุกเรื่อง
- **๕๓. ฉันชอบคิดถึงคนอื่นในแง่ไม่ดี
- ๕๔. ฉันชอบฟัง เพลงมาก
- **๕๕. ฉันไม่รู้ว่าจะปฏิบัติตนกับผู้อื่นให้อย่างไรดี
- ๕๖. ฉันเป็นคนใจน้อย
- ๕๗. ฉันอยากมีชัยชนะในการ กีฬาทุกอย่างที่ฉันลงแข่ง
- ๕๘. ฉันชอบแต่งตัวมาก
- ๕๙. ฉันมักจะไม่สบายใจ เวลาทำความผิด
- ๖๐. ฉันไม่ชอบเอาเปรียบหรือเสียเปรียบใคร
- *๖๑. ฉันชอบคุย เรื่องซ้ำซากให้เพื่อนฟัง
- ๖๒. เวลาทำอะไรที่ยาก ฉันไม่ยอมทำเลย
- ๖๓. ฉันพูดปดเป็นบางครั้ง
- ๖๔. ฉันมักจะประสบความยุ่งยาก เพราะ เป็นคนทำอะไรโดยไม่คิด
- *๖๕. ฉันชอบไปงานเลี้ยงหรืองานพบปะสังสรรค์
- **๖๖. ฉันเข้ากับคนอื่นไม่ค่อยได้
- ๖๗. ฉันรู้สึกว่าเป็นเพื่อน ๆ หลีกเลี้ยงที่จะคบหาสมาคมกับฉัน
- ๖๘. ฉันเป็นคนรูปร่างดี
- ๖๙. ฉันไม่มีความสุขเมื่ออยู่ในครอบครัวของฉัน
- *๗๐. ฉันภูมิใจที่เกิดมาในครอบครัวของฉัน

- ** ๗๑. ฉันบังคับใจตัวเองได้ไม่ยาก
- ๗๒. ฉันเล่นกีฬาไม่เก่ง
- ** ๗๓. ฉันมักจะทำอะไรโดยใช้อารมณ์เป็นที่ตั้ง
- ๗๔. ฉันมักจะคิดว่าฉันทำให้คนอื่นเขาเดือดร้อน
- ๗๕. ฉันภูมิใจที่สามารถประพาศิตนได้สมวัย ไม่นอกสู้นอกทาง
- ๗๖. ฉันไม่มั่นคงกับความตั้งใจของฉัน
- ๗๗. ฉันคิดก่อนทำเสมอ แม้ว่าจะเป็นเรื่องเล็กน้อย
- * ๗๘. ฉันพูดได้เร็วเท่าที่ฉันคิด
- ๗๙. ฉันมีความรับผิดชอบต่อนาทีที่ได้รับมอบหมาย
- ๘๐. ฉันมักจะเก็บมาวิตกกังวลถึงสิ่งที่ทำไปแล้วเป็นเวลานาน
- ๘๑. ฉันชอบสนทนาปราศรัยกับคนทั่ว ๆ ไป
- ๘๒. ฉันมีเพื่อนสนิทหลายคน แต่เรารัก ไว้วางใจ และช่วยเหลือกันจริง ๆ
- * ๘๓. ฉันชอบทำงานด้วยตัวเองมากกว่าที่จะอาศัยผู้อื่น
- * ๘๔. ฉันเป็นที่พึ่งของเพื่อนเวลาที่พวกเขาเดือดร้อน
- * ๘๕. ฉันมีความจริงจังต่อผู้อื่น แต่ไม่แน่ใจว่าผู้อื่นจะจริงจังต่อฉัน
- ๘๖. ฉันไว้วางใจเพื่อนรักของฉัน
- ๘๗. ฉันไม่ชอบงานเลี้ยงอีกทีและมักจะดื่มจนเมา
- ๘๘. ฉันไม่ชอบให้ผู้อื่นมาสนใจฉันมากนัก
- ๘๙. ฉันรู้สึกว่าชีวิตฉันมีค่า
- ๙๐. ฉันไม่ชอบให้ใครมาบังคับฉัน
- ๙๑. ฉันไม่ชอบบ่น
- ๙๒. บางครั้งฉันไม่แยแสว่าอะไรจะเกิดขึ้นแก่ตัวฉัน
- ๙๓. ทุกคนที่รู้จักฉันโดยทั่วไปแล้วชอบฉัน
- ๙๔. ฉันรู้สึกเศร้าสลดบ่อยครั้ง
- * ๙๕. บางครั้งฉันคิดถึงเรื่องที่ไม่อยากให้ใครรู้เลย

๘๖. สุขภาพของฉันไม่ค่อยจะดีนัก
๘๗. ฉันเป็นคนที่เขาใจบทเรียนไวยากรณ์
๘๘. อาจารย์หลายท่านเมื่อคิดถึงฉัน
๘๙. ฉันชอบพูดเล่นเสมอจนผู้อื่นไม่เชื่อฉัน
๙๐๐. ฉันเป็นคนเปิดเผยมามาก เก็บความลับไม่อยู่ ยกเว้นเรื่องที่สัญญากันจริง ๆ
๙๐๑. ฉันมีจิตใจอ่อนไหว ชอบและเชื่อคนง่าย
- *๙๐๒. ฉันเชื่อว่าฉันจะประสบความสำเร็จในชีวิต
๙๐๓. ฉันมักจะคิดว่าฉันเป็นเด็กอยู่เสมอ
๙๐๔. ฉันเป็นคนที่ยิ้มง่ายและไว้วางใจได้
๙๐๕. ฉันใจร้อนในบางโอกาส
๙๐๖. ฉันชอบทำมากกว่าพูด
๙๐๗. ฉันเป็นคนเรียนเก่ง
๙๐๘. ฉันไม่รู้สึกละอายใจในการทำสิ่งที่ฉันเห็นว่าถูก
๙๐๙. ฉันรู้สึกว่ามีอะไรบางอย่างให้แก่งัดแงะมาก
๙๑๐. ฉันไม่ชอบเรียนหนังสือ
๙๑๑. ฉันเกลียดการทะเลาะเบาะแว้ง
๙๑๒. ไม่มีใครเข้าใจฉันเลย
๙๑๓. ฉันมีความสำคัญสำหรับเพื่อนบางคน
- **๙๑๔. คนในครอบครัวไม่เข้าใจฉันเลย
๙๑๕. ฉันมีความเชื่อมั่นในความคิดความสามารถของฉันเสมอ
๙๑๖. ไม่มีใครที่ฉันจะไว้วางใจได้ยกเว้นตัวฉันเอง
๙๑๗. ฉันกระตือรือร้นและตื่นตัวตลอดเวลาที่ทำงานมาก ๆ
๙๑๘. เป็นการยากที่จะให้ฉันใจจดใจจ่ออยู่กับสิ่งใดสิ่งหนึ่ง
๙๑๙. ทุกอย่างที่ทำให้ฉันทำเหมือนจะยากจนฉันต้องเลิกกลับไป
๙๒๐. บางครั้งฉันรู้สึกว่าฉันเป็นคนไม่มีอะไรดีเลย

- *๑๒๑. ฉันเห็นว่าคุณซื่อสัตย์และการจริงใจต่อผู้อื่นนั่นก็
- ๑๒๒. ฉันชอบศึกษาด้วยตัวเองมากกว่าที่จะเรียนในชั้น
- ๑๒๓. อนาคตฉันภูมิใจมัน
- ๑๒๔. ฉันไม่เคยประสบความสำเร็จในสิ่งใดทั้งสิ้น
- *๑๒๕. ฉันเป็นคนขี้เกียจเกินไป
- ๑๒๖. ฉันเป็นคนขี้วิตกกังวล
- ๑๒๗. ฉันเป็นคนที่ไม่ค่อยมีมารยาท
- ๑๒๘. ฉันมีสุขภาพจิตดี
- ๑๒๙. ฉันมีนิสัยดีกว่าคนอื่นอีกมาก
- ๑๓๐. ฉันมีความสามารถหลายด้าน
- **๑๓๑. ฉันเป็นคนโหดก็อยู่เสมอ
- ๑๓๒. ฉันเป็นคนเกียจคร้าน
- ๑๓๓. ฉันเป็นคนชอบคิดฝัน
- ๑๓๔. ฉันมีนิสัยเอาแต่ใจตัวเอง
- ๑๓๕. ฉันชอบความสนุกสนานแต่ไม่เกินไปขอบเขต
- ๑๓๖. ฉันเป็นคนเจ้าอารมณ์
- *๑๓๗. ฉันรักความสะอาดและความเป็นระเบียบเรียบร้อย
- ๑๓๘. ฉันเป็นคนลึกลับ ชอบเปลี่ยนใจ
- *๑๓๙. ฉันไม่ไว้วางใจคนแปลกหน้า
- ๑๔๐. ฉันเสียสละเพื่อเพื่อนได้เสมอ
- **๑๔๑. ฉันเป็นคนหน้าไหว้หลังหลอก
- ๑๔๒. ฉันเป็นคนที่รักเพื่อนและมีเพื่อนรักมากมาย
- ๑๔๓. ฉันมีมารยาทไม่ค่อยดีในการรับประทานอาหาร
- **๑๔๔. ฉันชอบกล่าวติเตียนผู้อื่นโดยที่ตัวเองก็ไม่มีอะไรดีกว่าเขา

- **๑๕๕. ฉันคบกับคนใดทุกเพศทุกวัย
- *๑๕๖. ฉันคบคนให้สนิทไต่ยาก
- *๑๕๗. ฉันชอบอะไร ไม่เห็นเหมือนคนอื่น ๆ
- ๑๕๘. ฉันไม่ชอบให้ใครทอปปี้เสียงฉัน
- ๑๕๙. ฉันไม่ชอบให้ใครมาตีเค่นเกินฉัน
- ๑๖๐. ฉันมีความรู้สึกว่าคุณค่าของฉันถูกทอปปี้เสมอ
- **๑๖๑. ฉันไม่ชอบอ่านหนังสือ ชอบเล่นและแบ่งเวลาไม่ถูก
- ๑๖๒. ฉันเป็นคนเฉื่อยชาและทำงานช้า
- ๑๖๓. ฉันเป็นคนเข้มแข็งอกทน
- ๑๖๔. ฉันเป็นคนพุดจาทันผู้ทันคน
- ๑๖๕. ฉันทุจริตเวลาสอบเป็นประจำ
- ๑๖๖. ฉันหวังผลเลิศในทุกสิ่งที่คุณทำ
- ๑๖๗. ผลประโยชน์ฉันต้องมาก่อนของผู้อื่นเสมอ
- ๑๖๘. ฉันร้องไห้เก่ง
- ๑๖๙. ฉันชอบความตื่นเต้นและการผจญภัย
- ๑๖๐. ฉันเป็นคนตระหนี่เหนียวแน่น
- ๑๖๑. ฉันนับหาเป็นครั้งคราว
- ๑๖๒. ฉันชอบเอาชนะผู้อื่น
- ๑๖๓. ฉันชอบอ่านหนังสือ
- ๑๖๔. ฉันชอบกีฬาทุกชนิด
- ๑๖๕. ฉันเป็นคนมองโลกในแง่ดี
- ๑๖๖. ฉันเป็นคนร่าเริง
- ๑๖๗. ฉันชอบผลิตภัณฑ์ประจำวัน

- ๑๖๘. ฉันไม่ค่อยอยากรู้ในสิ่งที่เกี่ยวกับตัวฉัน
- ๑๖๙. ฉันเป็นคนมีความคิดมาก แต่ไม่ค่อยรู้วิธีที่จะนำเอามาใช้
- * ๑๗๐. ฉันเป็นคนถือ ไม่ค่อยเชื่อฟังผู้ใหญ่ในทุกกรณี
- ๑๗๑. ฉันชอบธรรมชาติ
- * ๑๗๒. ฉันเป็นคนไม่ค่อยมีความรับผิดชอบ
- ๑๗๓. ฉันชอบความสนุกสนานและ เรื่องตลกโปกฮา
- ๑๗๔. ฉันภูมิใจที่เกิดมาเป็นตัวฉัน
- ๑๗๕. ฉันเป็นคนเอาจริง เอาจัง
- ๑๗๖. ฉันเป็นคนชนิดที่ "ใครดี ดีตอบ ใครร้าย ร้ายตอบ"
- ๑๗๗. ฉันโกรธง่าย
- ๑๗๘. ฉันเป็นคนซื่อๆ
- ๑๗๙. ฉันเป็นคนไม่ตรงต่อเวลาและขาดเสมอต่อการนัดหมาย
- ** ๑๘๐. ฉันเป็นคนมีเหตุผล
- ๑๘๑. ฉันรักความยุติธรรม
- ๑๘๒. ฉันเป็นคนทุนหันพลันแล่น
- ๑๘๓. ฉันใช้จ่ายเงินอย่างไม่ประหยัด ทำให้มีปัญหาเรื่องการ เงินเสมอ
- * ๑๘๔. ฉันมีจิตใจเอื้อเฟื้อต่อผู้อื่นพอควร
- ๑๘๕. ฉันใจร้อนมาก
- ๑๘๖. ฉันเป็นคนหุนเหิง
- ๑๘๗. ฉันไม่ทันสมัย
- ๑๘๘. ชีวิตฉันมีความสุขพอสมควร
- ๑๘๙. ฉันชอบดูภาพยนตร์มาก
- ๑๙๐. ฉันเป็นคนรักสวยรักงาม
- ๑๙๑. ฉันมักจะคิดว่าฉันเป็นคนที่ดีที่สุดในหมู่เพื่อนฝูง
- ** ๑๙๒. ถ้าฉันสัญญากับใครแล้ว ฉันมักจะรักษาสัญญาอย่างเคร่งครัด

- ๑๙๓. ฉันเป็นคนเจี๊ยบขี้นม ยกเว้นเวลาอยู่กับเพื่อนสนิท
- *๑๙๔. ฉันเป็นคนชอบทำงานโดยลำพัง
- *๑๙๕. ฉันขี้อายเวลาอยู่กับเพศตรงข้าม
- **๑๙๖. ฉันเป็นคนเจ้าคิดเจ้าแค้นและให้อภัยแก่คนยาก
- ๑๙๗. ฉันเป็นคนทะเยอทะยานมาก
- **๑๙๘. อารมณ์ฉันเปลี่ยนแปลงง่าย
- ๑๙๙. ฉันสนใจในเพศตรงข้าม
- *๒๐๐. ฉันพูดไม่เก่ง
- *๒๐๑. ฉันไม่กล้าไปไหนตามลำพัง
- ๒๐๒. ฉันไม่กล้าอยู่กับเพศตรงข้ามตามลำพัง
- ๒๐๓. ฉันมีเพื่อนดี และคิดว่าจะอยู่ในสังคมที่ดีได้
- ๒๐๔. ฉันเข้ากับคนง่าย แม้แต่กับคนแปลกหน้า
- ๒๐๕. เพื่อน ๆ มีความไว้วางใจในตัวฉัน
- ๒๐๖. ฉันมีความภูมิใจในความสามารถทางดนตรีของฉัน
- *๒๐๗. ฉันมีอารมณ์ขันบ่อย ๆ
- ๒๐๘. ฉันค่อนข้างสนุกสนาน
- ๒๐๙. ฉันเป็นคนตามเพื่อนฝูง
- ๒๑๐. ฉันอยากไต่เต้าแต่ขี้เกียจ
- ๒๑๑. ฉันเป็นคนเจี๊ยบ ๆ ไม่พูดมาก
- ๒๑๒. ฉันเป็นคนชอบเจออย่าง
- ๒๑๓. ฉันมีทัศนคติที่ว่า "เฉยไว้แล้วทุกอย่างจะดีเอง"
- **๒๑๔. ฉันเป็นคนลึกลับและตัดสินใจช้า
- ๒๑๕. ฉันเป็นคนขี้อาย

- ๒๑๖. บ่อยครั้งที่ฉันรู้สึกว่าเป็นคนไร้ประโยชน์
- ๒๑๗. ฉันเป็นคนขี้อิจฉา
- ๒๑๘. ฉันเป็นคนขี้ตื่นและขวัญเสียง่าย
- ๒๑๙. ฉันเป็นคนหลับยาก
- * ๒๒๐. ฉันต้องการคำแนะนำจากผู้อื่นเสมอ
- ๒๒๑. ฉันเป็นคนอารมณ์เย็นและสุ่ม
- ๒๒๒. ฉันเก็บความรู้สึกไว้เก่ง
- * ๒๒๓. ฉันเป็นคนด้อมทนน
- ๒๒๔. ฉันมีสุขภาพแข็งแรง
- ๒๒๕. ฉันไม่ยอมย่อท้อต่อสิ่งใ้ง่าย ๆ
- ๒๒๖. ไม่มีใครรักฉันจริง
- ๒๒๗. การถูกวิจารณ์และถูกดู ทำร้ายจิตใจอย่างเหลือหลาย
- ๒๒๘. ฉันไม่ชอบนินทาใคร
- ๒๒๙. ฉันทำบุญคุณให้เพื่อนและส่วนรวม แต่ไม่มีใคร เห็นความดีของฉัน
- ๒๓๐. ฉันเห็นว่าการเรียนเก่งสำคัญกว่ามีหน้าตาดี

* Items selected to be subjected to factor analysis.

** Items selected after doing factor analysis.

APPENDIX D

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THAI THURSTONE SCALE

Please read each statement carefully, and circle only the item numbers that come closest to describing you. You may select as many as you want. Please ignore the numerals that come after the item numbers. They are numeral codes to be used for statistical purposes.

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| 1. | 4.2 | I feel lonely very often. |
| 2. | 9.1 | My family lives together peacefully. |
| 3. | 4.4 | I am not sociable, I feel embarrassed talking to people I am not acquainted with. |
| 4. | 7.8 | My friends always listen to and trust me. |
| 5. | 7.2 | My judgement is good. |
| 6. | 3.4 | I do not have any good personality. |
| 7. | 8.9 | My family trusts me. |
| 8. | 1.8 | I tend to think of people pessimistically. |
| 9. | 4.0 | I do not know how to behave with older people. |
| 10. | 7.2 | I like to tell jokes to my friends. |
| 11. | 3.2 | I cannot get along very well with other people. |
| 12. | 3.9 | I cannot control myself very well. |
| 13. | 2.6 | I always do things emotionally. |
| 14. | 8.6 | I prefer to work by myself. |
| 15. | 2.7 | Nobody in my family understands me. |
| 16. | 7.0 | I am always lucky. |
| 17. | 1.8 | I like to criticize and blame others, even if I am no better than they are. |
| 18. | 8.3 | I can get along with people of all ages. |
| 19. | 3.2 | I do not like to read, I like to play and do not use my time properly. |
| 20. | 9.2 | I am reasonable. |
| 21. | 9.5 | Once I make a promise, I always keep it. |
| 22. | 2.1 | I am a revengeful person, and it is not easy for me to forgive. |
| 23. | 4.3 | My temperament changes easily. |
| 24. | 3.9 | I am a wavering person. |

วิธีตอบ (ชุดที่ ๒)

ไปรอ่านข้อความข้างล่างนี้และเขียนวงกลมล้อมรอบ เฉพาะ เลขลำดับที่
ของข้อความที่นักเรียนเห็นว่าตรงกัน หรือใกล้เคียงกับนิสัยใจคอ ลักษณะ ฯลฯ ของตัวเอง

ไปรอ่านและแปลความหมายของประโยคเอง และอย่าใส่ใจกับเลขพจนานุกรม
หลังเลขอันดับที่ ซึ่งเป็นเลขโคตที่จะเอาไปใช้ในการคำนวณหาผลทางสถิติในภายหลัง

เลขที่

๑. ๔.๒ ฉันรู้สึกเปล่าเปลี่ยวบ่อยครั้ง
๒. ๔.๑ ครอบครัวยุคของฉันอยู่กันอย่างสงบสุข
๓. ๔.๔ ฉันเข้าสังคมไม่เป็นและ เกือบเงินเมื่อคุยกับคนที่ไม่น่าเคย
๔. ๓.๔ ฉันเป็นคนที่เพื่อน ๆ พึงความศรัทธาเห็นและให้ความเกรงใจเสมอ
๕. ๓.๒ วิจารณ์งานฉันอยู่ในเกณฑ์
๖. ๓.๔ ฉันมีบุคลิกไม่ดี
๗. ๔.๔ ฉันเป็นคนที่ครอบครัวยาวใจ
๘. ๑.๔ ฉันชอบคิดถึงคนอื่นในแง่ไม่ดี
๙. ๔.๐ ฉันไม่รู้ว่าจะปฏิบัติตนกับผู้อื่นได้อย่างไร
๑๐. ๓.๒ ฉันชอบคุยเรื่องข่าวขันให้เพื่อนฟัง
๑๑. ๓.๒ ฉันเข้ากับคนอื่นไม่ค่อยได้
๑๒. ๓.๔ ฉันมักจับใจตัวเองได้ไม่ทัน
๑๓. ๒.๒ ฉันมักจะทำอะไรโดยใช้อารมณ์เป็นที่ตั้ง
๑๔. ๔.๒ ฉันชอบทำงานด้วยตัวเองมากกว่าที่จะอาศัยคนอื่น
๑๕. ๒.๓ คนในครอบครัวยุคของฉันไม่เข้าใจฉันเลย
๑๖. ๓.๐ ฉันเป็นคนโหดที่อยู่มาก
๑๗. ๑.๔ ฉันชอบกล่าวติเตียนผู้อื่นโดยที่ตัวเองก็ไม่มีอะไรดีกว่าเขา
๑๘. ๔.๓ ฉันคบกับคนได้ทุกเพศทุกวัย
๑๙. ๓.๒ ฉันไม่ชอบอ่านหนังสือ ชอบเล่นและแบ่งเวลาไม่ถูก
๒๐. ๔.๒ ฉันเป็นคนมีเหตุผล
๒๑. ๔.๔ ถ้าฉันสัญญากับใครแล้ว ฉันมักจะรักษาสัญญาอย่างเคร่งครัด
๒๒. ๒.๑ ฉันเป็นคนเจ้าคิดเจ้าแค้น และให้อภัยแก่คนยาก
๒๓. ๔.๓ อารมณ์ฉันเปลี่ยนแปลงง่าย
๒๔. ๓.๔ ฉันเป็นคนลึกลับและตัดสินใจช้า

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Gordon W. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.
- Barrett, Harry O. "An Intensive Study of 32 Gifted Children." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI (1957), 192-194.
- Berger, Emanuel M. "The Relation between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 778-782.
- Bledsoe, Joseph. "Self Concepts of Children and Their Intelligence, Achievement, Interests, and Anxiety." Children Education, XLIII (1967), 435-538.
- Bloom, Kenneth L. "Age and the Self Concept." American Journal of Psychiatry, CXVII (1961), 534-538.
- Boy, Angelo V. and Pine, Gerald J. Expanding the Self: Personal Growth for Teachers. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1971.
- Brookover, Wilbur B.; Thomas, Shailer; and Paterson, Ann. "Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement." Sociology of Education, XXXVII (1964), 271-278.
- Bruck, Max, and Bodwin, Raymond F. "The Relationship between the Presence and Absence of School Underachievement." Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVIII (1962), 181-182.
- Combs, Arthur W. "Intelligence from a Perceptual Point of View." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 662-673.
- Combs, Arthur W., and Snygg, Donald. Individual Behavior. (rev. ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959.
- Combs, Arthur W.; Soper, Daniel W.; and Courson, Clifford C. "The Measurement of Self Concept and Self Report." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXIII, No. 3 (1963), 493-500.

- Combs, Charles F. "A Study of Relationship between Certain Perceptions of Self and Scholastic Underachievement in Academically Capable High School Boys." Dissertation Abstract, XXIV (1963), 620.
- Coopersmith, Stanley. "A Method for Determining Types of Self-Esteem." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 81-94.
- Dai, Bingham. "Some Problems of Personality Development among Negro Children." Personality in Nature, Society and Culture. Edited by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray. 2nd. ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.
- Davidson, Helen H., and Lang, Gerhard. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings toward Them Related to Self Perception, School Achievement and Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX (1960), 107-118.
- Diggory, James C. Self Evaluation: Concept and Studies. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Engel, Mary. "The Stability of the Self Concept in Adolescence." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVIII (1959), 211-215.
- Fink, Martin B. "Self Concept as It Relates to Academic Underachievement." California Journal of Educational Research, LIX (1962), 57-62.
- Fitts, William H. Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Fitts, William H., and Hammer, William T. The Self Concept and Delinquency. Nashville, Tennessee: Nashville Mental Health Center, Research Monograph No. 1, July, 1969.
- Gordon, Ira J., and Combs, Arthur W. "The Learner: Self and Perception." Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (1958), 433-444.
- Graves, William H., Jr. "A Multivariate Investigation of Professed and Inferred Self Concepts of Fifth and Sixth Grade Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1972.
- Haarer, David L. "A Comparative Study of Self Concept of Ability between Institutionalized Delinquent Boys Non-Delinquent Boys Enrolled in Public Schools." Dissertation Abstract, XXV (1965), 6410.

- Helper, Malcolm M. "Learning Theory and the Self Concept." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 184-194.
- Hilgard, Raymond E. "Human Motives and the Concept of the Self." The American Psychologist, IV (1949), 374-382.
- Irvin, Floyd S. "Sentence Completion Responses and Scholastic Success or Failure." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIV (1967), 269-271.
- James, William. Principles of Psychology. 2 vols. New York: Dover, 1950.
- Jersild, Arthur T. In Search of Self. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.
- Jourard, Sidney M., and Remy, Richard M. "Perceived Parental Attitudes, the Self, and Security." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIX (1955), 364-366.
- Kelly, George A. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. 2 vols. New York: Norton, 1955.
- LaBenne, Wallace D., and Greene, Bert I. Educational Implications of Self Concept Theory. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.
- Lecky, Prescott. Self-Consistency. rev. ed. Garden City, New York: Double-Day Anchor, 1969.
- Lundholm, Helge. "Reflections upon the Nature of the Psychological Self." Psychological Review, XLVII (1940), 110-127.
- McCandless, Boyd R. Children and Adolescents Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Maehr, Martin L.; Mensing, Josef,; and Nafzer, Samuel. "Concept of Self and the Reaction of Others." Sociometry, XXV (1962), 353-357.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mischel, Walter. Introduction to Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.
- Mischel, Walter. Personality and Assessment. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

- Mischel, Walter. "Predicting the Success of Peace Corps Volunteers in Nigeria." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (1965), 510-517.
- Omwake, Katherine T. "The Relation between Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (1954), 443, 446.
- Purkey, William W. Self Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Raimy, Victor. "Self-Reference in Counseling Interviews." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII (1948), 153-163.
- Rentz, R. Robert, and White, William F. "Congruence of the Dimensions of Self-as-Object and Self-as-Process." The Journal of Psychology, LXVIII (1967), 277-285.
- Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, Carl R. "A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships, as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework." In S. Koch (Ed.) Psychology: A Study of Science. III. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Sapir, Edward. "The Unconscious Patterning of Behavior in Society in the Unconscious." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVII (1932), 229-242.
- Sarbin, Theodore R. "A Preface to a Psychological Analysis of the Self." Psychological Review, LIX (1952), 11-22.
- Soares, Anthony T., and Soares, Louise M. "Self Perceptions of Culturally Disadvantaged Children." American Educational Research Journal, VI (1969), 31-45.
- Spiegler, Charles G. "Provisions and Programs for Educationally Disadvantaged Youth in Secondary School." In P.A. Witty (Ed.). The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged. Sixty-sixth Yearbook, Society for the Study of Education, 1967, pp. 184-210.
- Staines, J.W. "The Self Picture as a Factor in the Classroom." British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXVIII (1958), 97-111.
- Steiner, Ivan D. "Self Perception and Goal Setting Behavior." Journal of Personality, XXX (1957), 344-355.
- Stephenson, William W. The Study of Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

- Stock, Dorothy. "An Investigation into the Interrelations between the Self Concept and Feelings Directed toward Other Persons and Groups." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIII (1949), 176-180.
- Strong, Donald and Feder, Daniel. "Measurement of the Self Concept: A Critique of the Literature." Journal of Counseling Psychology, VII (1961), 170.
- Suinn, Richard M. "The Relationship between Self Acceptance and Acceptance of Others: A Learning Theory Analysis." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 37-42.
- Taylor, Donald M. "Changes in Self Concept without Psychotherapy." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIX (1955), 205-209.
- Thurstone, L.L., and Chave, E.J. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Videbeck, Richard. "Self Conception and the Reaction of Others." Sociometry, XXIII (1960), 351-359.
- Walsh, Ann M. Self Concepts of Bright Boys with Learning Difficulties. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.
- Washburn, Wilbur C. "Patterns of Self Conceptualization in High School and College Students." Journal of Educational Psychology, LII, No. 3 (1961), 123-131.
- Whiting, John W.M., and Child, Irvin L. Child Training and Personality: A Cross-Cultural Study. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Williams, Robert L., and Cole, Spurgeon. "Self Concept and School Adjustment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (1968), 478-481.
- Wylie, Ruth C. The Self Concept. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.