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A THE CONCEPT OF SELF

Over the past few decades much research has been done on various aspects of the "self" concept - a result of the provocative self theories of the phenomenologists Snygg and Combs, and Rogers (cf. Hall and Lindzey, 1959) and those of the social theorists, Sullivan and Horney.

This interest in the self is by no means new. No self-respecting psychologist in the early years of this century would have dreamt of propounding a theory or writing a textbook on psychology without making some reference to the self.

Self theory was given new impetus under the influence of Freud and his followers, but rapidly gained in disfavour when behaviourism and stimulus-response theories became popular. In 1934 Mead once more revived interest in the self, and under his influence, a spate of theories regarding the nature and development of the self-concept arose. Theorists such as Angyal, Schein, Sherif and Centrill, Murphy, Cattell and Sullivan, as well as Snygg and Combs, and Rogers, turned their attention to this aspect of personality. It became a popular topic, especially with the rise in popularity of Rogerian theories and methods and a vast amount of literature on aspects of the self-concept has accumulated (cf. Hall and Lindzey, 1959, Chap. 12).

The Introspectionists devoted much attention to the whole question of self and consciousness. Titchener defined it as "... the sum total of the conscious processes which run their course under conditions laid down by bodily tendencies" (1896, p. 54.). William James
gives a thought-provoking definition of the self, "... the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his body and his psychic powers." (1902, p. 291)

Freud used the term "ego" to describe that part of the personality which regulated perceptions, instinctual gratifications etc. Modern theorists differentiate between "self" and "ego". The "ego" is thought to be a group of processes (thinking, remembering, perceiving etc. sometimes referred to as the self-as-process.) The "self" has come to mean the person's attitudes, feelings, perceptions and evaluations of himself. (Hall and Lindzey, Chap. 12) Jung has also found a place for the self in his theory, in which he refers to the self as the midpoint of the personality around which all the other systems are constellated, resulting in unity, stability and equilibrium of the whole structure. (Hall and Lindzey, p. 85-86)

Mead emphasized the social origins of the self. "The self ... is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experience." (1934, p. 182)

Snygg and Combs have postulated a "phenomenal self" which "includes all those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual experiences as part or characteristic of himself... It is composed of perceptions concerning the individual and this organization of perceptions in turn has vital and important effects upon the behaviour of the individual." (1949, p. 15)

Sullivan and Hornery have stressed the social aspects of the development and functioning of the self. The self develops as a means of allaying anxiety caused by disapproval or forbidding aspects of the environment. It can be said that the self is not entirely synonymous with consciousness, but it does control the thought
processes in such a way as to prevent or minimize anxiety.

Sullivan defines the self-dynamism as "the relatively enduring organization of processes which manifests itself in situations related to the former experiences of anxiety; which situations it tends to change, and this change is in the particular way that avoids the occurrence of, or minimizes the severity of anxiety."

(1953,p.103) As a result of this anxiety, the self develops in a socially acceptable way so that the individual acts in a manner which suits the requirements of others, so that anxiety is avoided and feelings of self-satisfaction or self-esteem are maintained. Whenever a person finds himself in a situation where, due to his past experiences he anticipates the possibility of anxiety arising, he does something which will avoid the occurrence of anxiety.

Selective inattention is the most frequent way of preventing anxiety. In selective inattention one does not clearly note all the aspects of the situation, its character or its significance. The self thereby denies to awareness certain perceptual elements as a result of it's interpersonal experiences. (Hall and Lindzey, Chap. 4.)

The self is therefore formed by past experiences and "reflected appraisals" - the attitudes of significant persons in the environment and their approval or disapproval of certain ways of acting.

Rogers (cf.Halls and Lindzey, 1957) has propounded a self theory which is essentially similar to that of Snygg and Combs - the self is a pattern of conscious perceptions, ideas and attitudes about "I" or "me". It also distorts perceptions and experiences inconsistent with the self-structure, and develops as a result
of the individuals early experience with the environment and with himself.

Raimy (1948) has sought to explain the self-concept in terms of non-directive counseling theory. He asserts that the self-concept is a learned "conceptual system." Furthermore, the self regulates behaviour and these self-feelings may have little relation to reality, as, for instance, in psychotic individuals. It also determines how stimuli are to be perceived, and whether old stimuli are to be remembered or forgotten. The self may remain relatively unaltered under conditions involving considerable stress, but it may become changed under non-threatening conditions.

Jersild (1960) presents a comprehensive view of the self which seems to be reminiscent of the introspectionist stand mentioned earlier. "The self... is made up of all that goes into a person's experiences of his individual existence. It is a person's 'inner world'. It is a composite of a person's thoughts and feelings, strivings and hopes, fears and fantasies, his view of what he is, what he has been, what he might become and his attitudes pertaining to his worth." (p. 116) He distinguishes three components of the self. The first of these, the perceptual component, is "the way a person perceives himself - the image he has of the appearance of his body, the picture he has of the impression he makes on others." (p. 116) Other authors have called this component the "body image". A second component is the conceptual, the person's conception of his distinctive characteristics, his abilities, resources, assets, lacks and limitations, his conception of his background and his origins, and of his future." (p. 116) The
third component is the attitudinal, "including the feelings a person has about himself, his attitudes concerning his present status and future prospects, his tendency to view himself with pride or shame, his convictions concerning his worthiness or unworthiness and his attitudes (which may be mixed) of self-esteem and self-reproach. As a person reaches maturity, these attitudes relating to self include also the beliefs, convictions, ideals, values, aspirations, self-commitments that comprise what we speak of as a person's philosophy of life." (p. 116) Jersild indicates that, although the self is a subjective phenomenon, it is possible for a person to regard aspects of himself both as a subject and as an object.

The above brief exposition shows the essential similarities between the most important self theories. Past experiences are stressed as being of major importance in the formation of the self by almost all self theorists. There is also considerable agreement as regards the defensive function of the self - it prevents the arousal of anxiety or maintains the existing self-structure by ignoring or denying to awareness experiences and perceptions which are in conflict with the self.

B. THE CONCEPT OF SELF - ACCEPTANCE

The attitudinal component of Jersild's concept of the self implies the idea of acceptance or rejection of the self. Most authors do not include this aspect into the concept of self, but use a second concept, that of "self-acceptance", in their discussions of these problems.

LaFon defines self-acceptance as "... an
attitude that an individual has developed toward the picture or concept he has formed of himself through self-observation. It occurs on a continuum, that is, people may have varying degrees of self-acceptance or a relative lack of self-acceptance, or phrased differently, have varying degrees of self-rejection. Self-acceptance is essentially the same thing as self-esteem, how much the self is liked and respected, how adequate the self is felt to be." (1954, p. 1)

The term "self-acceptance" has especially become associated with Rogers' theory. The well-adjusted person is characterized by the ability to accept the self. When acceptance of the self is not present, maladjustment occurs. According to Rogers, "psychological maladjustment occurs when the organism denies to awareness significant sensory and visceral experiences, which consequently are not symbolized and organized into the gestalt of the self-structure. When this situation exists, there is basic or potential psychological tension." (1951,-p. 510) To Rogers, the essence of maladjustment is the individual's inability to accept perceptions regarding himself which are in conflict with his idealized self-structure. "Psychological adjustment exists when the concept of the self is such that all the sensory and visceral experiences of the organism are, or may be, assimilated on a symbolic level into consistent relationships with the concept of the self." (1951, p.513) Adjustment therefore becomes almost equivalent to acceptance of the self. The maladjusted individual is one who cannot accept the actual self for what it is, but formulates an ideal self. "Any experience which is inconsistent with the organization or structure of the self is perceived as a threat and the more of these
perceptions there are, the more rigidly the self-structure is organized to maintain itself." (Rogers, 1951, p.515)

A similar train of thought can be found in the writings of Horney. She considers the neurotic process to be a problem of the self. "It is a process of abandoning the real self for an idealized one, of trying to actualize this pseudo-self instead of our human potentials. ... Briefly, when an individual shifts his centre of gravity to his idealized self, he not only exalts himself, but also is bound to look at his actual self - all that he is at a given time, body, mind, healthy or neurotic - from a wrong perspective. The glorified self becomes not only a phantom to be pursued, it also becomes a measuring rod with which to measure his actual being ... he may at best be able to eliminate from awareness some disturbing discrepancies, but they continue to exist." (1950, p. 376)

Expressing these ideas in positive terms concerning the self-acceptant individual, Hobbs writes, "A person who achieves adjustment to the extent that he can, without distortion, admit to awareness, and symbolize sensory experiences arising from external and internal sources." (1955, p. 57)

On the basis of her clinical experience, Sheerer (1949) has enumerated twenty traits characteristic of the self-acceptant person. The self-acceptant individual tries to modify his behaviour to avoid trampling on the feelings of others, but is not motivated to do so out of "irrational fear of the judgement of others." Furthermore, the self-acceptant person is not unduly
affected by the praise or blame of others and can evaluate it objectively; he has self-confidence and self-esteem and lacks shyness and self-consciousness; he feels worthy and able to contribute to the general welfare; he does not expect rejection and his self-esteem does not deteriorate in the face of failure; he does not regard himself as "different" and he resists domination, acting in accordance with his own standards, without changing or regretting his behaviour in the face of criticism or opposition, or making excuses for his behaviour. "He feels equal, as a person, to others, neither inferior nor superior," (p. 169) and he also shows the ability to accept himself as he is, without resorting to distortion or denial, and prefers to change unpleasant aspects of his personality rather than deny, disguise or condone them. The self-acceptant person also shows an absence of guilt feelings, and shows the ability to assume responsibility for his own behaviour. Finally, Sheerer says, "An individual who expresses acceptance of and respect for self has internalized certain values and principles which serve as a general guide for behaviour. He relies upon this guide rather than on conventions or standards of other individuals."

LaFon (1954) adds certain other attributes, such as freedom from anxiety to the characteristics of the self-accepting person. "The person who rejects his self-picture is likely to be hostile towards himself and entertain hostile appraisals of other people and his environment." (p. 2) The non-self-accepting person is also inclined to be defensive and critical of others, particularly when this disparaging attitude arises.
out of a feeling of inferiority. "Ambivalence or uncertainty about the self-picture is also closely related to a lack of self-acceptance, since the person who accepts himself, who has a high level of self-esteem, who considers himself to be an adequate person cannot at the same time be ambivalent or uncertain about the way in which he perceives himself." (p. 2)

To this list Jersild (1960) adds the ability of the self-acceptant person to live "fairly comfortably" with his own emotions. "Self-acceptance involves a process of facing the facts and conditions of life, favorable as well as unfavorable, as candidly and as fully as possible." (p. 457)

From the above descriptions it can clearly be seen that the self-acceptant person has an adequate capacity for evaluating himself and his potentials accurately. The judgements of the self-acceptant person are more accurate, not only as regards himself, but as regards others as well. Because he does not feel threatened by others, he can view them objectively, with a minimum of distortion due to the interference of anxiety and his own neurotic needs.

The theorists who assimilate the self-concept into their personality theories are almost unanimous in emphasizing the relationship between self-acceptance and mental health. In fact, in Rogerian theory self-acceptance and being well-adjusted are almost synonymous, as has been pointed out above. Small wonder then that client-centred therapy aims at increasing self-acceptance. Rogers (1951) declares that by creating an unthreatening environment (the therapy situation) the individual whose self is on the defensive against
threats, utilizing such methods as distortion and denial, no longer feels that need, and consequently can, in this non-threatening situation, examine his perceptions, etc., and achieve a greater degree of acceptance of what he really is.

C. EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES ON SELF-ACCEPTANCE
   1. Methods of measuring Self-Acceptance

   These hypotheses concerning the self-concept and self-acceptance have stimulated many researchers to investigate various aspects. This has resulted in the development of numerous measures of self-acceptance.

   One of the most commonly used techniques for assessing the self-concept is the Q-sort method which originated with Stephenson in 1935. Basically, this method requires that the subject sort a set of statements to indicate how true they are of himself. Generally, approximately 100 statements are used and the subject is forced to sort them in such a way that the largest number of items fall in the middle of the series. The subjects are then required to sort the items again into 9 piles arranged on a continuum according to the degree which is characteristic of his ideal for himself. Again he is forced to place the largest number of items in the middle of the series, ensuring a quasi-normal distribution. Each item is assigned a value and a correlation coefficient computed between the subject’s self-image score and his ideal self-score. The higher the positive correlation, of course, the more self-acceptant he is. A strong negative correlation indicates a lack of self-acceptance. The most frequently used set of Q-sort items, is that of
Butler and Haigh, which has been used in the research on non-directive psychotherapy discussed by Rogers and Dymond. (1954)

Some researchers have made use of discrepancy scores as a means of measuring the individual's level of self-acceptance. These measures are based on the rationale that the greater the discrepancy between the "self" score and the "ideal" score, the less self-acceptant the individual is. When the subject's self-image is similar to his ideal (there is a low discrepancy score) he is self-acceptant.

Questionnaires are also frequently used as measures of self-acceptance. Here the subject is generally required to respond with "True" or "False" to a set of items believed to be associated with self-acceptance.

2. Studies on the Relationship between Self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others

Rogers has stated clearly that, "when the individual perceives and accepts into one consistent and integrated system all his sensory and visceral experiences, then he is necessarily more understanding of others and is more accepting of others as separate individuals." (1951, p. 520)

This relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others has been investigated by Berger (1952), Fey (1954), Phillips (1951), Sheeerer (1949), and Stock (1949), and all these researchers have reported positive results. Sheeerer (1949) and Stock (1949) made use of content analyses of self-references of persons undergoing therapy in their studies of acceptance of self and of others. Sheeerer reported a correlation of .51 between self-
acceptance and acceptance of others. Stock also found that the two measures correlated positively (.66). Berger and Phillips developed questionnaires based on Sheerer's description of the self-acceptant person. Both these researchers, and Fey, reported significant positive relationships between self-acceptance and acceptance of others.

Sex differences have also been found in relation to self-other acceptance. Berger (1955) applied his self-acceptance inventory to a number of college students and also to a number of maladjusted subjects. He found that the female subjects tended to score higher on acceptance of others than did the males in the study.

The above studies provide fairly conclusive proof of the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. Closely related to this matter is the question of the association between self-other acceptance and acceptance by others. Sullivan has emphasized that the self is made up of reflected appraisals. "If these were chiefly derogatory... then the self dynamism will itself be chiefly derogatory... it will entertain disparaging and hostile appraisals of itself." (1947, p. 10)

Turner and Vanderlippe (1958) found that in a test group of college students, those who scored high in self-congruence (self-acceptance) as measured by the Butler and Haigh set of Q-sort items, also tended to be more frequently chosen by their dormitory mates (were accepted by others).

Coopersmith (1959) and Zelen (1954) both used school children in their studies of this problem. Both obtained small, though significant relationships between self-acceptance (the former using a
specially designed Self-Esteem Inventory as a measure of self-acceptance, and the latter, the California Test of Personality Feelings of Personal Worth and the Who-Are-You test scored for self-acceptance and acceptance by peers.

Fey (1955) however, found that acceptance of self, as measured on his own self-acceptance scale did not correlate with acceptance by others. The subjects in this study were fifty-eight third year medical students who were requested to identify their responses by name and each had to name five others he liked best. Fey found that subjects scoring high in self-acceptance and high in acceptance of others were not popular. He also found that subjects scoring high in self-acceptance and low in acceptance of others were rejected.

Jourard and Remy (1955) also undertook to study this relationship. They tested the hypothesis that the attitude of the parents towards the subject's body would influence his own attitude; that a person's beliefs concerning his parents' attitudes towards his self will influence his attitude; and that subjects who believe that their parents hold negative attitudes towards their bodies and their traits will feel insecure. A forty-item body cathexis scale and a forty-item self-cathexis scale were developed. These scales were each completed three times, once on the basis of own feelings, once on the basis of believed mother's feelings, and once with reference to father's feelings. The results of the study indicated a significant positive correlation between self-cathexis (self-acceptance) and personal security, and body cathexis was likewise significantly
correlated. Acceptance by others was also found to be significantly related to self-acceptance. The fact that the subjects' beliefs concerning their parents' attitudes were used, makes little difference, as it is after all the way in which the subject perceives them that matters, and not what they really were.

3. Self-Acceptance and Adjustment

Rogers adopts the standpoint that the more self-acceptant the individual is, the better adjusted he will be. (1951, p. 510) This statement has stimulated many researchers to investigate this commonly-held belief, namely that the discrepancy between the individual's ideal self and the self-as-is, is an indication of maladjustment.

Calvin and Holtzman (1953) administered the MMPI to a number of students. Adjustment was tested in the following way: after the MMPI had been administered, each S was interviewed and then asked to rate himself and his associates on seven personality traits. The self-concept was the individual's self-rating minus the average rank on which the others placed him - a discrepancy score. They concluded that the poorer the individual's adjustment, the more self-depreciative he appeared to be. Maladjustment as rated by the group was directly related to maladjustment as measured by the MMPI. Individuals manifesting poor insight regarding their own level of adjustment are more likely to be maladjusted than those who show good insight.

Bills, (1954) also investigating this relationship, cor-
as measured by the Rorschach. The results of his study show that persons with a high discrepancy score tended to show more signs of depression on the Rorschach, notably in F - %, W:M ratios, Sum C and T/R categories.

The researches of Taylor and Jombs (1952) and of Sarbin and Rosenberg (1955) also offer support for Rogers' statement. Two hundred and five children of the same age, I.Q., educational level and socio-economic status were chosen as subjects in a study of the relationship between self-acceptance and maladjustment undertaken by Taylor and Jombs. On the basis of the results of the California Test of Personality, Elementary Form A, the children were divided into a maladjusted and an adjusted group. It was found that the well-adjusted children marked significantly more damaging statements as true of themselves than the maladjusted group, indicating both a higher degree of self acceptance and insight and also less defensiveness.

In Sarbin and Rosenberg's study, a group of normal and a group of maladjusted students were compared as to self-acceptance. The mean score of the control group was .89 and that of the neurotic group, .38. The neurotic subjects checked adjectives on the Gough Adjective Check List which showed a tendency towards "anxious, changeable, confused, dissatisfied, gentle, immature, nervous, self-centred" behaviour. (p. 80) The control group checked adjectives such as "active, adaptable, affectionate, conscientious, considerate, curious, dependable, friendly, fair-minded etc." (p. 80)
Zuckerman and Monashkin (1957) report a positive correlation between scores on the K scale and a measure of self-acceptance. On analysis of their MMPI profiles, Zuckerman and Monashkin found that the low self-acceptance group most often peaked on the D and Pt scales, which indicates a tendency to be depressed, pessimistic, worrisome, anxious, and self-doubting. The high self-acceptance group showed peaks on the Ma scale and a tendency, just short of significance, to peak on the Pd scale. (The K scale, which correlated positively with self-acceptance, is also related to a tendency to answer MMPI items in the direction of social desirability)

The self-dissatisfied subjects tended to score high on the D scale and showed significantly more peaks on this scale than the more self-acceptant subjects. Subjects with a low degree of self-acceptance tend to describe themselves as concerned about bodily functions (Hs), suspicious and oversensitive (Pa), possessing bizarre and unusual thoughts (Sc) and introverted (Si). Highly self-acceptant subjects peak more frequently on the Ma scale. Some characteristics of persons high on this scale are active, enthusiastic, disregarding social conventions.

Rosen (1956a and b) found that self-ideal discrepancies correlated with profile elevation in the Sc, Si, D and Ps scales of the MMPI. These results are similar to those obtained by Zuckerman and Monashkin. Berger (1955) also found that self-acceptance in college students, as measured by his Self-acceptance Scale, correlated negatively with certain scales on the MMPI (D, Pa, Pt, Sc for all the subjects, and Hs and Pd for the female group only. The male subjects scored significantly higher on the Hy scale.
Although the above researchers have offered considerable support for Rogers' hypothesis, conflicting results have been recorded by Friedman (1955) and Tamkin (1957 a & b), both of whom found that there was no significant decrease of self-acceptance in seriously maladjusted subjects.

In Friedman's study, self and ideal Q-sorts were made by three groups of male subjects, classified as normal, psychoneurotic and paranoid schizophrenic. The group of sixteen normal subjects obtained a median correlation of .63, the sixteen neurotic subjects .03, and the psychotic patients .43. The normal group showed the highest degree of self-acceptance, closely followed by the psychotic group. The psychotic group had considerably more self-esteem than the neurotics.

Tamkin also reports the failure of a measure of self-acceptance to discriminate between a control group of normals and a group of twenty-four schizophrenics. The mean normal self-acceptance score, as measured by the Scott-Duke Questionnaire (a self-administered, True False questionnaire based on Sheerer's description of the self-acceptant person and the L and K scales of the MMPI as a validity check) was 30.65 and that of the group of schizophrenics was 25.12.

This contradiction in results can perhaps be explained by a comparison of the groups of subjects employed in these studies. Tamkin and Friedman both used seriously maladjusted subjects in their studies; the other researchers used groups of normal or nearly normal subjects. It would seem as if the self-acceptance measures differentiate a group of persons scoring high on self-acceptance which includes a group of essentially maladjusted persons who have no insight and can see no fault in themselves (as was the case
here) and another group of genuinely self-acceptant persons possessing insight and conforming more truly to Shoerer's and LaFon's description.

In the classical Freudian and Neo-Freudian view, lack of insight is alleged to be accompanied by defensiveness and/or maladjustment. Rogers says... "The individual will not become anxious (and hence defensive) unless and until he becomes at least dimly aware of the disparity between his phenomenal self and views others hold of him. Of course, such a disparity may render him more potentially vulnerable, in the sense of increasing the likelihood that a discomfort-producing discrepancy will come to his attention. But until that eventuality does occur (i.e., until at least a dim awareness of the inappropriateness or incompleteness of the self-concept develops) lack of insight presumably would not lead to anxiety or defensiveness." (1951, p. 321)

In a similar vein, Jersild wrote... "Self-acceptance and understanding of the self are closely associated. To accept himself... he must be aware of himself. To accept his limitations he must be able to recognize them. Self-acceptance... requires awareness and perception." (1960, p. 457)

The research findings of Jhodorkoff (1954) tend to support these hypotheses. He secured the self-reports of thirty students by having them sort items into piles from most characteristic to least characteristic. Independent judges then made a Q-sort of each subject on the basis of their knowledge of the subject's Rorschach protocols, word association data, TAT's and background. A measure of perceptual defence was obtained by exposing threatening and neutral words, beginning with a subliminal exposure speed and in-
creasing it gradually until the subject was able to see all the words. The degree of perceptual defence was the difference in recognition thresholds for neutral words and threatening words. The results indicated that the higher the degree of agreement between self-ratings and the ratings of others (insight into self), the less perceptual defence there is and the better the personal adjustment of the individual is. Better adjusted individuals showed more insight into themselves and less perceptual defence than did the maladjusted subjects.

On the other hand, a study by Block and Thomas (1955) seems to indicate that self-acceptance is possible without insight. In this study, Block and Thomas found a positive correlation between scores on the De(Denial) scale and scores on a self-acceptance measure (Q-sort). A high score on the De scale reflects a tendency to deny characteristics and feelings of an adverse and personally disparaging nature. The correlation with the De scale was .41 and with the Ad (admission) scale a negative correlation of -.54 was recorded. A positive correlation was also found between scores on the MMPI Ego-control Scale developed by them, and degree of satisfaction with self (.44). Persons scoring high on the Ego-control Scale were described as aloof, distant and restrained in interpersonal relations, overconforming and delaying gratifications even when satisfaction would not be inconsistent with the individual's ultimate goals. A tendency to use mechanisms of repression and denial are also measured by this scale.
Other researchers, also relating MMPI scores to self-acceptance have recorded a relationship between self-acceptance scores and scores on the K scale. Berger (1955) records a positive correlation between scores on his Self-Acceptance Scale and scores on the K scale of the MMPI. Rosen (1956a, 1956b) found a correlation of .67 between self-ideal discrepancy scores and scores on the K scale and in the study by Zuckerman and Monashkin, mentioned earlier, a similar result was obtained.

Certain conclusions can be drawn from the research findings recorded here. Firstly, self-acceptance does seem to be related to acceptance of others, but the relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance by others (the influence of reflected appraisals) is not at all clear. Also the hypothesis that self-acceptance and adjustment are related, is well supported by the data available. The high self-acceptance scores of the schizophrenic subjects recorded in some of the studies is generally attributed to lack of insight.

Self-acceptance and insight were not always found to be related, and the unanimous finding that self-regard and K scores are related has led Block and Thomas (1955) to suggest that subjects reporting high self-acceptance might be "maladjusted deniers". These findings lead to the conclusion that high self-acceptance scores are not always an indication of good adjustment, but is sometimes associated with denial of maladjustment and the tendency to respond in a socially desirable direction. The problem seems to lie with the questionnaires and other measuring instruments which do not control the social desirability variable.
D. MEASURES EMPLOYED IN THE PRESENT STUDY

The research quoted in Section C readily reveals the fact that self-acceptance has been found to be related to various measures of adjustment. The inventory scales discussed below were chosen for inclusion in this study because each measure some facet of personality functioning associated with adjustment or maladjustment.

1. The Self-acceptance Inventory was used as a measure of the self-concept in this study.

2. The Personal Rigidity Scale - an inventory scale purported to measure rigidity - was used here to obtain a measure of maladjustment. Persons scoring high on this scale are given to self-doubt, are sensitive to criticism and show other traits incompatible with self-acceptance. Rigid behaviour is also characterized by defensiveness and a poor level of adjustment.

3. The Pittsburgh Scale of Social Extraversion-Introversion is an inventory scale which measures the individual's tendencies towards outgoing, sociable behaviour (a high score of this scale) or conversely, his tendencies towards withdrawal from social contacts, and a generally poorer level social adjustment.

4. The Pittsburgh Emotionality Scale is an inventory scale which measures "neuroticism". Persons scoring high on this scale show a poor adjustment level. Sarbin and Rosenberg (1955), Zuckerman and Kornshkin (1957) and others mentioned in Section C all report strongly negative correlations between neuroticism and self-acceptance.

5. The Dominance Scale is an inventory scale designed to measure dominant or "forceful, confident" behaviour. The dominant person is characterized by
self-confidence, poise, a sense of responsibility, resourcefulness and he has none of the negative traits such as self-doubt, tendencies towards worry, submissiveness, defensiveness and shyness which Sheerer (1949) and LaFon (1954) consider typical of the non-self-accepting person.

6. The Ego-strength Scale is an inventory scale which measures the individual's ego resources. The concept of ego-strength relates to this question of self-esteem and emotional adjustment. Cattell (1957) considers ego-strength to be largely describable as the absence of infantile ways of reacting, anxiety and depression, unrealistic thinking and inaccurate perceptions. Compare this view of ego-strength with that expressed by Rogers (see p. 6) concerning self-acceptance. It will be seen that ego-weakness and lack of self-acceptance are closely related.

7. The Socio-economic Status Scale is an inventory scale which measures the personality attributes associated with high and low socio-economic status. The personality attributes of the persons scoring high on this scale include poise, confidence in the self and others, fewer fears and anxieties, traits which are also found in the self-acceptant person. This scale also provides a measure of adjustment.

8. The Psychological Control Scale is an inventory scale which measures the degree of control present in the individual. Luft says that persons scoring high on this scale are characterized by "... constriction, ... intolerance of ambiguity and a tendency to deny feelings." (1957, p.20) This test gives a personality
picture of control and inhibition which contrasts with that obtained from the Emotionality Scale.

9. The Concealed Figures Test provides a measure of perceptual rigidity which was used to obtain another rigidity score.

10. Two Draw-a-Person scales were used in this study. a, The Draw-a-Person Quality Scale is, according to the authors, a measure of "functioning behavior, attitude toward the problem or task ahead, as well perhaps as attitude toward one's ability to handle such a task" (Wagner and Schubert, 1955, p.22).

b, The Body Image Disturbance Scale has also been used here. Strümpfer (1963) concluded that "a good body concept tended to be associated with good adjustment and absence of neurotic tendencies." This measure will then also provide a possible adjustment score.

11. Academic Achievement, is a real-life measure of intellectual functioning in a mildly stressful situation, viz. examinations and class tests. It provides a measure of the individual's ability to function in the face of stress.

This outline is followed by a more detailed treatment of the construction of and research on each of the measures.

1. Self-acceptance Inventory

The Self-acceptance Inventory (Form V for female subjects) was constructed by Goshoff (1962) for a study of the relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. It is an inventory of 45 forced choice items. Each item consists of a pair of statements matched so as to be approximately equated in
social desirability but contrasted with regard to self-acceptance. One member of each pair describes an attitude of acceptance or non-acceptance of the self, while the other member covers matters not related to self-acceptance. In answering the inventory the subject has to indicate (on a separate answer sheet) which member of each pair is most descriptive of herself. The forced-choice format was used since social desirability seemed to be an important variable in self-descriptions in terms of self-acceptance. The forced-choice format, supposedly, minimizes the opportunity for dissembling and faking. (Anastasi, 1961)

The initial pool of 151 items from which the self-acceptance Inventory was constructed, were collected from various sources. Items considered to cover the following areas were included; a feeling of independence, self-respect and a feeling of self-worth, a feeling of wanting to be an adult, a sense of vocation, and acknowledgement and acceptance of one's own shortcomings. Items were collected from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the California Psychological Inventory, and the Johnson Temperament Analysis. Other items were obtained by writing Sheerer's (1949) descriptions of the self-acceptant person in the declarative form. The discussions by Wyngaarden (1959), similarly, provided a number of items. Attempts were also made to write items describing concrete, everyday situations in which self-acceptance attitudes would be the basis for decision.

This list of items was submitted to six judges, five of whom were psychologists and one educational psychologist. The purpose of the collection of items
was explained in their instructions. They were requested to read the items critically for ambiguity and vagueness, to make improvements where they could suggest any, and to mark items which they considered best omitted. They were also asked to add items if any came to mind. In a further attempt to locate ambiguous items, they were requested to answer each question "yes" or "no", in the scoring direction of self-acceptance. On the basis of these judgements, items were revised, omitted and added. Items on which the answers of the judges differed were either rewritten or omitted.

A second preliminary form contained 230 items. Another pool of items, collected from the inventories mentioned above, as well as a number of original ones, were added to the self-acceptance pool. These new items were, in the opinion of three judges, not related to self-acceptance. The two groups of items were mixed randomly. In compiling this form, attempts were also made to write items in such forms that a wide range of social desirability was covered. This form was answered on a separate answer sheet.

For the purpose of item-analyses, this preliminary form was administered to a group of 240 female students. These included second and third year students in Psychology and Hygiene, third year students in Physics, and first year students in Geography and Chemistry. The majority of these students were taking degrees but about a quarter of them were diploma students, who usually are students without matriculation exemption.

The answer sheets were scored only on the items presumed to measure self-acceptance, using the scoring direction suggested by the six judges. On the basis of these "self-acceptance" scores the highest scoring
27 percent and the lowest scoring 27 percent of the subjects were selected. For these two groups item-counts were carried out on all items, i.e. both self-acceptance and non-self-acceptance items. For every item the number of "True" answers were counted and the counts were converted into proportions. Using a table provided by Walker and Lev (1953), these proportions for the upper and lower 27 percent groups were used to determine the correlation between each item and the total "self-acceptance score". In all instances where the correlation coefficient was negative, the scoring direction should only have been the "False" answer, rather than the "True" one used for the sake of simplicity in the item-counts.

In selecting the self-acceptance items, only items with item-total correlations significant at, or beyond, the .001 level were considered. Another set of items which showed item-total correlations as near as possible to zero, or at least not significant at the .05 level, was also selected.

The second step in the construction of the final form of the inventory consisted of determining the social desirability value of these two sets of items. These were required for the pairing of forced-choice items. Frequency of endorsement was used as an index of social desirability. For this purpose, item-counts were also carried out on the answer sheets of the middle 46 percent left out for the item-total correlations. The number of "True" responses to each item was thus determined for the total group of 240 subjects. These were converted into proportions.

Each forced-choice item was obtained by pairing
off two statements with equal proportions of endorsement (or with very small, non-significant differences) but with one showing a significant and the other a non-significant correlation with the self-acceptance criterion. Appendix A is a copy of this scale.

Boshoff (1962) studied the relationship between this scale and a number of hostility and prejudice scales in a group of 73 female first year students in Psychology. Highly significant correlations were found with the Zaks-Walters Aggression Scale, the Cook-Medley Hostility Scale, the Bendig Covert Hostility Scale, the Gough Prejudice (anti-semitism) Scale and the California Fascism Scale. The correlations were non-significant in the case of the Siegel Manifest Hostility Scale, Bendig Overt Hostility Scale and the MacCrone Scale of Attitudes towards the Bantu.

2. The Scale of Personality Rigidity.

This 39-item questionnaire was developed by Rehfisch (1958a) from data gathered in the course of assessments and field-testing at the University of California Institute of Personality Assessment and Research.

The subjects in this study were 80 advanced graduates from various university faculties, 80 senior medical students from the University of California Medical School and 100 Air Force Captains.

To obtain criterion ratings each subject was rated for rigidity by the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research staff, all of whom were graduate researchers and professional psychologists. The number of raters was never less than five and averaged eight. The interrater reliability of the
average rigidity rating ranged from .50 to .81, with an average of .73. The mean rigidity rating for each subject was the criterion for scale derivation.

The Scale of Personal Rigidity was compiled from a pool of 957 True/False personality items from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the California Psychological Inventory and a number of specially constructed items. The construction of the scale involved item analysis in which the highest and the lowest 25 per cent on rated rigidity were compared and items chosen according to the significance level of difference between the proportions of "true" responses among the high and low scoring subjects.

The reliability of the scale was estimated by means of the Spearman-Brown split-half formula. In order to approximate equivalence of halves, an attempt was made to match items from the two halves according to similarity of content. The corrected reliability was .72.

Rabfisch grouped the 39 rigidity items into several categories on the basis of an impressionistic content analysis, but he derived only one total score. He found that the highly rigid subjects were anxious and uneasy in social situations, and had a need for an orderly, predictable environment. These rigid subjects also showed perseverative behaviour, compulsive doubting and slowness in coming to a decision. Furthermore, they were conservative, conventional, given to self-doubt, misanthropic and miserly, sensitive to negative criticism and very concerned with work and study.

"Rigidity is a flexible concept", says Chown (1959 p.195). Cattell and Tiner have defined it as ". . . the difficulty with which old established habits
may be changed in the presence of new demands." (1949, p.321) Rokeach defined it as the ". . . inability to change one's set when objective conditions demand it" (1948, p. 259), and Goldstein considers rigidity to be ". . . adherence to present performance in an inadequate way." (1943, p. 209)

Although these definitions agree in general outline, namely, that rigidity is the inability to change, they are vague and differ in detail as to what aspect of the personality functioning is resistant to change. Accent is placed variously upon habits, set, discriminations, present performance, etc.

In addition, a number of different types of rigidity have been differentiated. Cattell (1943) outlined two types of rigid behaviour which had both previously been known as "perseveration": "process rigidity" which has been defined as ". . . a tendency for a former response to continue although a new stimulus has been substituted for the old one" (also called "mental inertia") (p.540) and "structural rigidity" - this is the resistance of a habit or personality trait to forces which might be expected to change it. The habit persists although a more rewarding response to the stimulus could be made.

Goldstein (1943), who was chiefly interested in rigidity which is a symptom of brain damage, differentiated "primary rigidity", which involved inability to change from one train of thought to another, and "secondary rigidity" (the patient, when faced with a problem too difficult for him, prefers the incorrect answer to none at all).

There are a number of methods used to measure rigidity. The oldest method (and the one on which most
Research has been done to measure rigidity by means of the Einstellung tests, first introduced into America by Luchins (1951).

Other methods of measuring rigidity make use of concept formation tasks, e.g., the use of the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test, the Weigl Card Sorting Test and Buss's Wooden Block Test.

Becker (1954) used anisokonic lenses, which produced distortions in stereoscopic perceptions, to test rigidity. Rigid subjects took longer to see the distortions and they also reported a lesser degree of distortion than did the non-rigid subjects.

The use of personality tests as a means of measuring rigidity is a later development, and the best-known example is the Wesley (1953) questionnaire of rigidity. This questionnaire is of the True/false type, consisting of 50 items believed to measure rigidity and 17 filler items drawn from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory L, F and Pt scales.

An evaluation of the traits considered typical of the person scoring high on the Personality Rigidity Scale by Rehfisch (1958), gives the impression of a poor level of adjustment in these individuals. The presence of such traits as self-doubt, sensitivity to criticism, and anxiety, is an indication of the absence of self-acceptance in the rigid person. It is probable that these two measures will correlate negatively.

3. The Pittsburgh Scale of Social Extraversion - Introversion.

Bendig (1962) prepared and administered an inventory containing 273 items to a group of students taking an
introductory course in Psychology. This inventory contained 48 items from the Maudsley Personality Inventory assumed to measure extraversion and neuroticism, and 40 Restraint and Thoughtfulness items from the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The items from these two tests were changed from the interrogative form to the first person declarative form. Also included were the 50 items from the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and 20 items from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Social Introversion (31) Scale. In addition to these items, 115 items from hostility and need-achievement scales were added as filler items. These items were then randomly mixed to form one questionnaire.

The subjects were divided into three sub-samples, A, B, and C containing 300, 300, and 200 subjects respectively and evenly divided into men and women.

The 116 items derived from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Maudsley Personality Inventory, were inter-correlated using the responses of the subjects in Sample A. Factor analysis resulted in the retention of 50 items measuring social extraversion-introversion (SEI).

The 50 items selected above were again factor analysed in conjunction with the 40 Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey items using the responses of the B group. Factor analysis resulted in 30 items considered best measures of SEI.

To determine the psychometric adequacy of the scale, the answer sheets of the subjects in Sample C were scored for the 30-item Extraversion-Introversion Scale and the scores correlated with those of the whole group and with those of each sex independently.
The mean SEI score for men and women differed very little. The scores for men averaged 17.6 and the mean score for women was 17.21. The standard deviation was recorded as 6.49 for the male group and 6.51 for the female group. Reliability was estimated using the Kuder-Richardson 20 formula on the scores of the male and female groups (.87 for the male group and .88 for the females).

This scale is still very new and no research has been recorded on the relationship between scores on this scale and on other measures. However, the concept of extraversion-introversion is an old one and a considerable amount of research, especially factor analytical studies, has been done over the past 20 years.

One of the most salient aspects of research on extraversion-introversion has been the preoccupation with the relationship between this facet of personality functioning and adjustment. Jung (1925) maintained the independence of the two dimensions, whereas Freud (1920) believed that introversion was the forerunner of neurosis.

Jung (1925) firmly believed that both extraversion and introversion were present in all people. The former is characterized by a candid, outgoing disposition and a considerable degree of self-confidence. Introversion typically is associated with a hesitant, reflective, retiring nature, which is always slightly on the defensive and prefers "to hide behind mistrustful scrutiny" (p.43) One of these attitudes becomes prominent as a result of experience, but the other is "undeveloped somewhere in the background" (p.55)

A comparison of the characteristics of the intro-
vert with those of the non-self-accepting person reveals a certain similarity.

Guilford has called attention to the "... very troublesome situation found by those who construct tests of E-I extraversion-introversion and of "neurotic tendency" - a difficulty in keeping the two types of tests from correlating significantly with one another." (1934, p. 331)

Much of the factorial research on extraversion-introversion is based on questionnaires which evolved from an earlier set of factorial studies by Guilford and Guilford (1934, 1935, 1939). Among these questionnaires are Guilford's Inventory of Factors STDTR (1940), the Guilford-Martin Inventory of Factors GA'TIN (1943), and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZT3, 1949, items of which appear in the scale under discussion).

Baehr (1952) analyzed data obtained from the GAMIN inventory and found that Thinking Introversion had a significant loading on her Emotional Instability factor.

Karson and Pool (1957) found guilt proneness to be strongly associated with introversion. Tyler (1951) in a factor analysis of the MMPI, differentiated two factors resembling extraversion introversion. Associated at the D (introversion) pole were significant loadings on the D scale, on the Hy, Pa, Pt, Re (Social Responsiblllity) and Sc scales, as contrasted with the significant loadings at the Ma (extraversion) pole - Ma, Pd, Do (Dominance) and St scales. The research findings of Kassebaum, Couch and Slater (1959) links D (introversion) with significant loadings on the R (Repression), Si, Re (Responsibility) and L scales on the MMPI. Ma appears at the extravert pole, along
with Im (Impulsivity) and several other scales suggestive of a social orientation, Lp (Leadership), Sp (Social Presence) and Sociability (Sy).

Generally, the findings of the researches discussed above, seem to indicate that introversion is associated with maladjustment. Bendig himself(1962), reports a non-significant tendency for scores on his Extraversion-Introversion Scale to be negatively associated with scores on his Emotionality (Neuroticism) Scale. (A high score on the SEI is indicative of tendencies towards extraversion, a low score indicates introversion).

Research quoted in Section 3 has offered fairly conclusive evidence as to the negative relationship between self-acceptance and adjustment, and the findings mentioned above indicate that introversion is a mal-adjusted way of reacting, so a negative correlation between scores on the Self-acceptance Inventory and scores on the Social Extraversion-Introversion Scale will probably be found in this study.

4. The Pittsburgh Scale of Emotionality (Em).

This inventory scale measuring Emotionality (neuroticism), was developed by Bendig(1962) together with the Social Extraversion-Introversion Scale discussed under 3 above. The procedure followed in the development of this scale was essentially similar to that used in the development of the SEI. An inventory containing items from the Maudsley Personality Inventory assumed to measure neuroticism, 40 Restraint and Thoughtfulness items from the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, items from the Taylor-Manifest Anxiety Scale and 20 items from the Social Introversion (Si) scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality In-
ventory. In addition to these items, 115 items from hostility and need-achievement scales were included as filler items. The inventory was administered to the same group of subjects mentioned in 3 above, and after factor analysis, 30 items were retained. These items were considered to be the best measures of emotionality.

The psychometric adequacy of the scale was determined by scoring the answer sheets of the subjects in the sample for emotionality and correlating them with those of the whole group and for each sex independently.

No significant sex differences were found between the means of the male and female groups. (14.16 and 14.60 respectively). The standard deviation was recorded as 7.07 for the male group and 6.92 for the females. Reliability, as estimated by the Kuder-Richardson 20 formula, was .89 for males and .88 for females on this scale.

Persons scoring high on the Em scale tend towards moodiness, emotional fluctuations, tension, sensitivity, anxiety and worry, feelings of indecision and worthlessness, loneliness, daydreaming, brooding over problems and introspection. Here again, the personality picture is one of maladjustment and such characteristics as feelings of worthlessness, sensitivity, tension and anxiety suggest that the high-scoring individual is lacking in self-acceptance.

5. The Dominance Scale

This scale was developed by Gough, McClosky and Meehl (1951) as part of a larger study on the relationship between dominance and political participation, the hypothesis being that dominant persons, because of their greater self-confidence and ambition, would be,
politically, more active than the more submissive type of person.

The Dominance Scale was constructed by means of the technique known as the "peer group nomination technique," in which the subjects were asked to nominate those of their group whom they considered most, and least, dominant. One hundred students (all members of a fraternity and a sorority at the University of Minnesota) and 124 scholars (all members of social science classes at North High School, Minnesota) took part in the study.

Each participant was provided with a personal data sheet calling for routine information (name, age, sex, etc.) and for selections of dominant and submissive students within their groups and for ratings of themselves on the dominance variable. Instructions were included, defining the dimension of dominance. The subjects were warned not to confuse dominance with domineering or autocratic behaviour and they were advised to rate the individual on the basis of his actual behaviour.

The high school students were required to rate the five most and five least dominant members of their class. The university students were in turn asked to rate the ten most and the ten least dominant members of the fraternity or sorority to which they belonged. Each scholar and student was then asked to rate himself for dominance on a 4 inch graphic rating scale, calibrated at half-inch intervals.

Each subject was then scored for dominance or submissiveness by giving him/her a score of plus one for each "most dominant" rating he/she received and minus one for each "least dominant" nomination. Criterion groups of most and least dominant subjects were
then derived. In the university student group, the criterion groups comprised the 25 most and 25 least dominant students, 13 males and 12 females in each group. The high school criterion groups contained the same number of dominant and submissive persons with the same male/female ratio as in the student group.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory profiles were available for 16 dominant and 16 submissive students (eight of each sex in each group). Analysis of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory items revealed 100 items which showed promise of discriminating between subjects high and low in dominance. These 100 items were then administered to the high school class. From the item analysis of the high school and the university groups, a total of 60 items was retained, all of which revealed the ability to differentiate the dominant and submissive subjects.

Use of the KR21 formula resulted a coefficient of equivalence of .79 for the combined distribution of the two samples.

When using peer ratings as a criterion, the Domi-
nance Scale shows good discriminating ability. The correlation between the dominance ratings and scores on the Dominance Scale was .599, with a standard error of .14 for the university group and .687, with a standard error of .09 for the high school group. The corre-
lation between self-ratings and scores on the Dominance Scale was .520, standard error .14, in the university group and .555, standard error .09, in the high school group.

The Scale for Dominance thus consists of a 60-
item questionnaire, in which one point is accorded to
each response which reflects dominance. Therefore, the higher the score, the more dominant the individual is.

Adler placed much emphasis on the role played by the striving for dominance or superiority in the life of the individual. (Hall and Lindzey, 1959, Chap. 4)

Maslow (1937) investigated the personality structure of dominant and submissive persons. He found the feeling of dominance (which he differentiated from merely occupying a position of prestige or power) to be associated with positive self feelings such as self-confidence, self-respect, a feeling of sureness in respect to people, a feeling of being able to handle people, absence of shyness, timidity, self-consciousness, embarrassment, and strength of character. Persons low in dominance described themselves in negative terms. They were characterized by uncertainty, lack of confidence, a feeling of being looked down upon, of wanting to be like some one else rather than like themselves, and lack of faith in their own abilities.

Another study undertaken by Maslow (1942) using university women as subjects, reports a significant negative correlation between dominance and self-consciousness. All the low scorers on dominance were pre-occupied with the shortcomings of their own personalities. The low-dominants almost always underestimated to a greater of lesser degree, their specific abilities, whereas the high-dominants usually guaged them much more accurately and realistically. The high scorers did not have feelings of inferiority, but were more realistic than the low-scorers in the recognition of real inferiorities. The low scorers were also found to be quieter, neater, politer, more conventional and ethical than the high scorers.
Inspection of the items comprising the Dominance Scale shows that the person scoring high on this scale is poised and self-assured. They have few self-doubts and therefore behave in an uninhibited, straightforward way. The impression gained is one of resourcefulness and optimism. Furthermore, dominant persons have a strong element of perserverance in their personality make-up. Generally, the impression obtained is one of good adjustment, and the presence of many traits characteristic of self-acceptance as well. A significant positive relationship will probably be recorded between self-acceptance scores and scores on the Dominance Scale.

6. The Ego-strength Scale.

The Ego-strength Scale (Es) was developed by Barron (1953) in an attempt to find a reliable measure with which to predict response to therapy. Individuals possessing a high degree of ego-strength would have a better prognosis than others with less ego-strength.

The Es scale consists of 68 items selected from the total pool of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory items (550). The criterion for this selection was a significant correlation with rated improvement in 33 psychoneurotic patients treated over a period of six months at a psychiatric clinic. Responses to the MMPI were obtained before the start of therapy and the improved and unimproved groups compared and items chosen which differentiated adequately between the two groups.

The sample of 33 patients was divided into two groups: 17 patients rated improved and 16 rated unimproved. Two skilled judges not involved in the therapy, rated improvement independently of each other.
A correlation of .91 was obtained between the ratings of the two judges.

When the two groups were scored on the 68-item scale the improved group had a mean score of 52.7 on the Ego-strength scale, as compared to the score of the unimproved group - .29.1 - a very significant difference.

Split-half reliability of the scale was .76 and the test-retest reliability on 30 patients after three months was .72. From an analysis of the responses of improved patients prior to therapy, Barron concluded that the patient with a good prognosis had the following characteristics: good physical functioning, good contact with reality and with other people, feelings of adequacy and vitality, physical courage and lack of fear. The unimproved group was characterized by many and chronic physical complaints, repressive and punitive morality, dissociation, confusion, submissiveness, phobias and infantile anxieties and emotional disturbance such as moodiness, inhibition, a strong need for seclusion, and worrisomeness.

The development of the Es scale evoked a considerable reaction from clinical psychologists everywhere, because, if the scale measured ego-strength as it was reported to do, it would fill a very real need and give a reliable guide to the amount and intensity of therapy needed and the measure by which the client might benefit from it.

Most of the research on this scale has been devoted to validation, but not all of it substantiates Barron's findings.

The findings of Levine and Cohen (1962) support Barron's assumption that the scale might "serve
as a predictor in any situation in which an estimate of personal adaptability and resourcefulness is called for." (1953, 333) The subjects in this study were 113 psychotic subjects, who had not been hospitalized for more than 90 days during the six months preceding admission. In addition to the administration of the Es scale, the patients were interviewed and given a Rorschach within a few days of admission. Scores on the Es scale were found to be positively related to the absence of both anxiety-depression and schizophrenic psychosis, but was unrelated to uncooperativeness and apathy. Subjects who reported feelings of depression, and feelings of anxiety and complained of their physical health, had significantly lower Es scores than subjects who did not exhibit these symptoms. Subjects who were withdrawn, suspicious and lacked "hospital goals" tended to score lower than subjects without these symptoms.

These findings accord well with the general interpretation advanced by Gottesman (1959) of his own findings, viz., that the Es Scale possesses substantial construct validity. In this instance, the Es scores of 31 severely delinquent boys, 31 emotionally disturbed adolescents, 25 D and Pt profiles on the MMPI from V.A. Hospital records, 21 Hs and Hy profiles and 25 schizophrenic profiles from the same source, were compared with a control group of normal adult males and boys.

The Es Scale broadly discriminated between the psychiatric and non-psychiatric adults and adolescents, but it did not discriminate adequately the degrees of psychiatric incapacitation. The Es scale indicated no ability to discriminate between delinquent and nor-
mal subjects.

Gottesman noticed a high correlation between Es and K scores on the MMPI. He hypothesized that this might reflect defensive test-taking attitudes and ability to recognize socially desirable descriptions of personality, in itself a measure of ego-strength (reality testing).

Quay (1955) also confirmed Barron’s statement as to the ability of the Es Scale to differentiate “ego-weak” and “ego-strong” subjects. The subjects in this study were 70 first admissions to a psychiatric hospital. The group consisted of a number of psychotics, psychoneurotics and patients with conduct disorders. A control group of student nurses and psychiatric attendents was also tested. As predicted, the hospitalized psychiatric patients scored significantly lower than the normals on the Es Scale, indicating the greater ego-strength of the latter group.

Further support for Barron’s findings was found by Crumpton, Cantor and Batiste (1960) who undertook a factor analytical study of the Es Scale. The subjects in this study were 110 male hospitalized patients, predominantly schizophrenic, (mean age 37.7 years) and 76 male medical students, (mean age 26). Of the fourteen factors differentiated, only one, factor VI, measuring a “lackadaisical attitude” showed no significant difference of means between patients and students. The student group was found to show a general absence of symptomatology, better home life, more aggression and also more maturity, better heterosexual adjustment and fewer symptoms of anxiety and tension and also fewer psychosomatic symptoms.
Barron and Leary (1955) did further research on the Es Scale and found that ego-strength as measured by the this scale was negatively related to most measures of psychopathology on the MMPI. The mean correlation was -.60 between Es scores and scores on the Hypochondriasis, Depression, Hysteria, Psychasthenia and Schizophrenia scales and -.50 with Paranoia in clinical samples. "What this suggests is that the prediction scale Es Scale is picking up a general factor of psychopathology in the MMPI, reflecting degree of maladjustment or ego-dysfunction irrespective of differential diagnosis," was the conclusion to which Barron and Leary came. (p. 245)

In Tamkin's construct validation study (1957), the subjects were male psychiatric patients divided into two groups, equivalent as to age, education and intelligence, of psychotics and secondly, neurotics and personality disorders. Tamkin found that the Es Scale failed to differentiate between the two groups. He comments as follows on the results: "This is particularly striking because the one group is composed almost entirely of schizophrenics, for whom ego-strength is considered to be extremely low." (p. 158)

Although Wirt (1955), using hospitalized psychiatric patients as subjects, obtained confirmation of the scale's ability to predict improvement from psychotherapy, Getter and Sundland (1962) found no significant relationship between scores on the Es Scale and improvement or hours spent in therapy. Sinnett (1962) noted that patients undergoing therapy improved in ego-strength as a result of therapy. His subjects were divided into two groups, a psychotherapy group and a group undergoing milieu therapy (control group). In the case of the group undergoing psychotherapy, a significant increase in
ego-strength was noticed. Most of these studies report a positive relationship between ego-strength and adjustment. The well-adjusted person is considered to have more ego-strength than the poorly adjusted individual.

Bellak (1958) has listed the many functions of the ego. Included in this list are reality testing, maintaining a good sense of reality, maintaining efficient thought processes, defence functions and generally organizing the personality and behaviour, and regulating and controlling the drives. The strong ego is one who can perform all these functions adequately.

As the Es Scale is a measure of adjustment, a high score on this scale (indicating a high degree of ego-strength) will probably be associated with a high self-acceptance score.

7. The Scale for the Personality Dimension of Socio-economic Status.

Gough (1956) drew up the items of this scale from a pool of 550 MMPI items. The basic technique of this study was the analysis of a large number of MMPI items in order to select those which would differentiate high and low status person.

The subjects in the study were 223 pupils in the last year of high school (90 boys and 133 girls). In a population of this size, there is generally a fairly good distribution of the three socio-economic classes, although it can be argued that the very low status children would have dropped out of high school before their final year.

Socio-economic status was measured by means of the Sims Score Card. In addition to the MMPI, the Maslow
Security-Insecurity Inventory, an I.Q. test (not named) and average marks for the preceding three years at high school, were used.

After administration of the Sims Score Card, the upper and lower class groups were chosen - approximately 38 subjects in each group, 20 girls and 18 boys. These groups were made up of subjects falling beyond one standard deviation above and below the mean. As regards the other tests administered, the I.Q. and grade averages showed significant class differences.

Item analysis of the MMPI items resulted in the retention of 34 items which significantly differentiated the high and low status groups at the .01 and .02 levels.

After a subjective inspection of the items, Gough classified them into five groups. His concept of the personality dimension of social status therefore encompasses the following characteristics: literary and aesthetic attitudes (the high status group showed higher scores in this category), social poise, security, confidence in self and others (again the high status group had higher scores); the high status group were also more broadminded, emancipated and frank as regards moral, religious and sexual values. The low status group manifested more fears and anxieties which were denied by the high status group and the high status group showed more positive, dogmatic and "self-righteous" opinions than the low status group.

These 34 items were then assembled on a scale and the original group of 223 subjects re-scored on this basis. The obtained mean was 17.43 and the standard deviation 4.783; for the girls alone the values were 17.496 and 5.058 respectively, and for the boys 17.354.
and 4.440. The corrected split half correlation was .739 and the standard error .065. Test-retest correlation on a smaller group of 101 students was .869 and the standard error was .100.

To test the validity of the scale, namely whether it could predict socio-economic status as measured by an objective index, a new group of 263 students (140 boys and 123 girls) were tested on the St (Social Status) scale and on the American Home Scale (a measure of socio-economic status). The correlation between the St scale and the American Home Scale for the entire group was .5, with a standard error of .06; The girls' group only correlated .512 with a standard error of .09 and the boys' group, .490, standard error .08.

From these results Gough concluded that the St scale had validity which is not limited entirely to the population and specific measurements from which it was derived.

In this same study, Gough found positive correlations significant at the .01 level between grade average and scores on the St Scale and scores on the Otis I.Q. and social status scores (St Scale).

Gough's findings have been largely substantiated by other research which has been done on the personality of individuals from various social classes. Bieri and Lobeck(1961), for example, found that the upper class group checked the managerial, autocratic, competitive and rebellious octants on the Leary-Interpersonal Checklist, whereas the lower status group checked the self-effacing masochistic and docile-dependent octants with greater frequency. These findings offer some support for Gough's findings that the upper class group was more forceful and confident than the lower class group.
Hoffeditz (1934) compared the Bernreuter scores of groups of high, middle and low class subjects and found appreciable class differences on the "neurotic-tendency" and "self-sufficiency" scales. All these differences were significant at the .001 level and the lower status group received less favourable scores.

Using the Brown Personality Inventory, Springer (1936) investigated the relationship between social status and test scores in a number of lower and middle class boys and girls. The subjects ranged from 9 to 15 years of age. Springer reports significantly greater mean neurotic scores on the low status group than for the high status. Maddy (1943) also reports a relationship between adjustment and social status. Her research involved a study of the relationship between personality and parental occupation, in which she tested 319 children. She found that the children of professional men achieved more favourable scores on the Pintner Aspects of Personality Inventory than did the children of semi-skilled workers. The difference, although statistically significant, was small.

On the other hand, Brown (1934), in a study standardizing his personality inventory, computed the relationship between the test scores and the pupils' scores on the Simms Score Card. His subjects were 441 school children. The correlation was non-significant and Brown concluded that "... neuroticism does not predominate in any particular social or cultural group."

The St Scale is not a measure of social status in itself, but rather of the personality attributes associated with certain levels of social standing. Gough (1956) noted that persons scoring high on this
scale were relatively poised, self-confident and free from anxieties and fears. These traits are generally associated with good adjustment and also with self-acceptance. It therefore seems probable that scores on the St Scale will be associated with high self-acceptance scores.

8. The Psychological Control Scale.

The purpose of this research by Luft (1957) was to develop a method of studying control in normal children and in their parents, as well as the relation between these two.

The first hypothesis was that children exposed to parents who were restrictive in psychological control would tend to develop restrictive controls for themselves. The opposite might be true of very lax parents, namely, that their children would also be lenient.

According to the second hypothesis, a child of parents who had unequal control scores would tend to adopt a degree of control closer to the lower end of the control continuum compared to the average psychological control score for children in general.

A preliminary study was undertaken on a group of 50 ten year old boys who were studied by means of a variety of methods: a level of aspiration test using a Koerth type pursuit rotor; clinical ratings based on children's responses to projective questions as well as to a brief interview independently conducted by two clinical psychologists; a tear-it-up test in which the children were asked to express preference for printed designs and disliked designs were torn up in the experimenter's presence, the rationale being that the inhibited child would tend to avoid such aggressive expressions.
The parents of thirty of the children were examined by means of a 76 item questionnaire, a test aimed at revealing the degree of psychological control ordinarily exercised by the parent in everyday life.

The results of the preliminary study were essentially negative, no positive correlations being found between the various measures.

The questionnaire for parents was refined and inconsistencies removed as a result of experience with the measure in the preliminary study.

A questionnaire for adolescents, consisting of 52 items was developed and the inconsistent items removed. Each item in the questionnaire was judged by four clinical psychologists and items unequivocally indicative of psychological control retained.

This questionnaire was then screened for comprehension by high school students by administering it to a sample group of students in the English class.

An adjective checklist consisting of 75 items, screened for comprehension by a typical high school group was drawn up from Thorndike’s word list for thirteen-year-olds. The favourable or unfavourable value of each item was determined empirically by getting the judgements of twenty-six high school students (boys and girls). Only items which were agreed upon by at least eighty per cent of the judges were retained. It was considered consistent with the definition of psychological control that the inhibited and controlling person would consider himself more favourable than the under-controlling one.

Three objective measures were to be made of the Draw-a-Person drawings: total size of the drawing, ratio of head to body size and measure of movement, the
rationale being that the freer the child, the larger
the total figure and the larger the head to body ratio
and the greater the movement ratio.

The Tachistoscope Letter Recall Test, a modification
of the procedure introduced by Angyal, in which letters
in various patterns were presented tachistoscopically
on a screen for about one half a second, was also ad-
ministered. It was expected that pattern consistency
and psychological control would be related.

The Figure Preference Test, the A.J.E.I.Q. and the
Iowa Achievement scores were also used in this study.

The parents' questionnaire consisted of two sect-
ions - the 52 items given to the adolescents and the 20
items dealing with child behaviour. These latter items
covered a variety of aspects of child-rearing as well
as everyday behaviour. They were also judged by four
clinical psychologists. The parents could indicate their
disagreement or agreement by checking each item as
either plus two or plus one, or minus two or minus one,
whereas adolescents could only answer "yes" or "no".

These tests were administered to 300 children in
their first and second years at high school. The
final population was reduced to 79 boys (mean age 14.5
years) and 25 girls (mean age 15.0 years) and their
parents, who only completed the parents' question-
naire.

The results showed an odd-even reliability (Spear-
man -Brown formula) of .72. The reliability of the
parents' full scale computed by means of the same for-
mula was .87, and for a group of skilled factory workers,
.91.

The measures of perceptual rigidity showed no
significant relationship with the adolescents scale for
psychological control. The relationship between letter recall and psychological control scores in the boys' group was significant at the .10 level of significance. Aesthetic preference was unrelated to the control scores. Children scoring high on this scale tended to describe themselves more favourable ($r = .47$ and .45 for boys and girls respectively), as was predicted.

It was predicted that children who were more strict with themselves would also be better achievers in high school. This was borne out by the significant correlation (.10 level) between Iowa Achievement scores and control scores.

Of the three measures of the Draw-a-Person Scale, only one measure (body to head ratio) was significantly correlated with control.

As an attempt to check the validity of the Psychological Control Scale, independent ratings from the teachers were obtained on the cooperativeness-rebelliousness continuum. It was assumed that highly controlled boys would be more conforming and more cooperative. A correlation of .302 was obtained between the two measures.

Fathers of both boy and girl groups measured consistently higher on the control scale than the mothers. They tended to be stricter both on themselves and on their children than the mothers were.

Psychological control in boys was positively related to psychological control in their parents. The correlations was slightly higher between control in mothers and in their sons than for fathers and sons.

Girls and their mothers were not significantly related on control scores, and psychological control in girls was negatively correlated with psychological control in their fathers ($-.60$).
The difference between the means for boys and the means for girls was not statistically significant. The trend is, however, for boys to be somewhat higher on control, even though they average about a half-year younger than the girls.

Luft, in describing the traits of the persons scoring high on this scale, says: "High control scores were considered indicative of constriction, orderliness, conformity, intolerance of ambiguity and a tendency to deny feelings. Low control scores were considered indicative of impulsiveness, greater expressiveness, and fluidity of feelings, more tolerance for ambiguity and less inhibition generally." (p, 20)

An analysis of the contents of the questionnaire leads to the following conclusions about high control people: they tend to lead well-organized lives, having planned all activities to avoid any disturbances or troubles. They seem well suited to routines. They are perseverant, punctual, often continuing with a task after others have given up. They are very conscientious and feel a strong need for achievement. There is a certain amount of constriction of interests and lack of enterprise and originality. They seem conservative and conforming.

As regards their emotional life - they are unperturbed by problems which arise, always remaining cool and calm. They are reserved, cooperative and have strong self-control.

The high scoring parent tends to be a strict disciplinarian, somewhat domineering and interfering. They have a good control over their emotions, are aloof and rather insen sitive, and also rather intolerant of other people.

This test, developed by Thurstone and Jeffrey (n.d.), comprises 49 items, each containing a stimulus figure on the left, and four complex figures on the right, some of which contain the stimulus figure. The subjects are required to examine the figures on the right and indicate those figures in which the stimulus figure appears in exact size and orientation. (See below)

As the instructions in the test booklet are in English, the instruction page was translated.

Time limits are set for both the fore-exercise and the test proper, three minutes for the former and ten minutes for the latter. When the fore-exercise had been completed and all instructions fully understood, the subjects were allowed to commence the test.

The Concealed Figures Test is scored with the aid of a scoring key which can be used for both the A and B forms of the test. The final score is derived by subtracting the number of complex figures wrongly marked from those correctly marked. The scoring formula is as follows: \( S = R - W \), where \( S \) is the score, \( R \) those correctly marked and \( W \) those incorrectly indicated. A glance at the scoring formula will show that negative scores are possible.

The Concealed Figures Test was derived from the A and B forms of the Gottschaldt Figures, an essentially similar test, containing figures designed by Gottschaldt. Thurstone and Jeffrey retained these figures but altered
the method of answering the test. The instructions differed therein that they advocated that the subjects tick off those complex figures containing the stimulus figure, whereas Gottschaldt's instructions demanded that the subjects draw the outline of the stimulus figure where it appeared in the complex figure.

The reliability of the Concealed Figures Test was calculated at .94 by Pemberton (cf. Thurstone and Jeffrey, n.d.) using the Split-half method.

This test is assumed by the authors to measure "flexibility of closure". Closure is a term which originated with Wertheimer, Koffka and Kohler (cf. Kuypers, 1953) in their early expositions of Gestalt theory. It was considered one of the organizing forces which determined perceptual organization. Mooney and Ferguson (1954) defined closure as "the moment of perceptual resolution, as the terminal phase of an act of perceptual contemplation... It's common manifestation would be the rapid, habitual recognition of commonplace objects and events; its measure being, presumably, in terms of perceptual speed."

There is a notable dearth of research on the Concealed Figures Test, and, excepting that from Thurstone's laboratory, few studies have dealt with this test.

Thurstone (1944) undertook a factorial study of perception, and a battery of 60 tests, including the Gottschaldt figures, A and B forms, was administered and the scores factor analyzed. The subjects were mostly undergraduates from the University of Chicago. All the tests, except the Test of Primary Mental Abilities, were individually administered.

From the results Thurstone concluded, "All the tests high on Factor A... represent the ability to form a per-
ceptual closure against some distraction. They also represent the ability to hold the closure against some distraction." (p. 78)

Factor analysis also revealed the presence of the Gottschaldt figures on Factor E. "Important here is the ability to shake off one set to form another. Freedom from Gestaltbildung might be an appropriate description in that it implies flexibility in manipulating several more or less conflicting or irrelevant gestalts. A lot of reasoning is involved." (p. 20)

In another study by Thurstone (1944), an attempt was made to relate scores on the Concealed Figures Test with administrative ability. A group of interns in public administration served as subjects in this study. The test results were compared with ratings of professional promise and success. The interns highest and lowest on ratings were compared as to test scores. This comparison showed that the Gottschaldt figures differentiated to a significant degree between most and least successful administrators. The most promising interns did better on the Gottschaldt test than did interns considered less promising.

Scores on the Concealed Figures Test have not only been found to be related to administrative ability, but also to age. Bosowitz and Korchin (1957) studied the ability to perceive closure in groups of old and young subjects by means of the Concealed Figures Test. The younger group completed significantly more items than the older group and with correction for this fact, the right-wrong performance of the younger group was significantly superior. The results of this study were viewed "as reflecting the . . . overly rigid cognitive functioning of the aged." (p. 96)
The Concealed Figures Test was also included in a factorial study of rigidity undertaken by Oliver and Ferguson (1951). A battery of tests was applied to six groups of university students. In a factor analysis of the results, Oliver and Ferguson identified three factors. Factor B was clearly a rigidity factor and the Concealed Figures Test was not significantly loaded on this factor. Factor C was not interpreted, and Factor A included, among others, the Concealed Figures Test and the Luchins Einstellung Test. The most significant loading was found on the Concealed Figures Test. Oliver and Ferguson interpreted this factor as a reasoning factor, although the Einstellung Test, assumed to measure rigidity, was significantly loaded on this factor only, and not on Factor E, their so-called "rigidity" factor.

This test was included in this study as a measure of perceptual rigidity, and, if perceptual rigidity is related to personal rigidity as measured by the Personal Rigidity Scale, a positive correlation should be found between scores on this test and self-acceptance scores. (High scores on the Concealed Figures Test indicates flexibility of closure, low scores rigid closure).

10. The Draw-a-Person Test

The Draw-a-Person Test (D.A.P.) is a widely used, comparatively simple personality test which was developed by Machover in 1949. According to Sundberg (1961), after the Rorschach, the Draw-a-Person test is the most widely used personality test applied in hospitals and clinics in the U.S.A.

The Draw-a-Person tests is very simple, economical
and quick to administer. It presents the subject with a partially structured situation. Machover (1951) has advised that the subjects be given a medium-soft pencil with an eraser on it, and a sheet of blank paper $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 inches in size, with the instruction to "draw a person". Should the subject protest that he cannot draw, he is reassured that skill in drawing does not enter into consideration. Except for instructing the subjects to draw a full figure, questions should be answered with a noncommittal "just as you please". When the first drawing has been completed, the subject is given another sheet of blank paper and instructed to draw a person of the opposite sex.

In this study the subjects were required to draw both a male and a female figure, but no hint was given as to which one was to be drawn first. The figure drawn first was to be marked with a "1".

There are several methods of interpreting the figure drawing. Machover (1951) has advocated an atomistic approach, in which the characteristics of the various limbs and body parts are noted and interpreted and a total score derived. The interpretation is psycho-analytically orientated on the basis of an over- or under-emphasis of certain body parts.

The inspection method is also frequently used in evaluating the figure drawings. The product scale approach which is to be used in this study, is a simplification of this global type of evaluation.

A number of scales have been devised for evaluating figure drawings. In this study two scales, the Quality Scale and the Body Image Disturbance Scale were used.
a, The Quality Scale

The Draw-a-Person Quality Scale was developed by Wagner and Schubert (1955) in an effort to arrive at an objective measure for judging the quality of the Draw-a-Person protocols.

The final Quality Scale consists of four pictorial scales - two profile view scales (one each for male and female figures) and two front view scales (also containing a male and a female figure drawing scale). Each scale has seven gradations from Quality 1 (very superior) to Quality 7. In addition to the four pictorial scales, a verbal description of the characteristics of each scale value is given.

In the development of the Quality Scale, the drawings of 1579 late adolescents and young adults were given to the judges with instructions to divide them into seven graded stacks from lowest to highest quality. The quality to be rated was effectiveness in drawing a life-like person. The piles from the highest to the lowest were to include the following percentages of the total: 2.5, 8.0, 23.0, 31.0, 23.0, 6.0, and 2.5 with the greatest number being sorted into the middle groups.

After the drawings had been classified into seven piles, the instructions were to go back and check for internal consistency in each group and to minimize overlapping between the piles.

The three raters then pooled their judgements and came to a final rating for each drawing and a representative profile and full-face drawing was chosen for each step of the scale.

The final scales, two profile and two full-face scales, can be used to aid in rating figure drawings for quality. The scales for male figures drawn by
males may be used to scale male figures drawn by females as well, although Wagner and Schubert mention that the female drawings of male figures are often younger-looking, more feminine, longer legged, show more eye detail and fewer profile views than male drawings of men figures.

In using the scales, it is suggested that the prints be removed from the folder and spread on a large table. Drawings should be divided into male and female figures before rating, and only one sex rated at a time. After all the drawings in the set have been distributed in appropriate piles, it is suggested that each pile be checked for internal consistency and overlapping. Wagner and Schubert's research indicates that when two skilled raters were used, the reliability coefficient was better than .90, and when novices rated the drawings a reliability coefficient of .80 was obtained. With use of the Quality Scale, the relationship between the ratings of novices rose to over .85. The relationship between the ratings of novices without the use of the scale was .60 as compared to .88 with use of the Quality Scale.

Test-retest reliabilities of .85 were obtained. The correlations were lower for the art students due in part to their additional training in figure drawing in the intervening period. When the coefficients are corrected for attenuation (due to lack of perfect measurement by the raters) the correlations range from .67 for art students to .92 for non-art students.

A correlation of .85 was found between the quality rating of the first figure drawn and that of the second figure. A comparison of the average ratings of students in two consecutive years shows a high degree of similarity.
Wagner and Schubert express the opinion that "the scale helps the rater avoid his personal predilections and prejudices." (1955, p. 12)

The correlations between average marks and Quality Scale ratings was .09 for the male freshmen, and .22 for the female freshmen, and .21 for the whole group. Correlations obtained between average marks for the first semester at university, and Quality Scale ratings were .41 and .38 respectively for two groups of Domestic Science students, and .34 and .37 in two groups of male students in Education and Industrial Arts. All these correlations were significant at the .01 level. Investigation of the scattergram of the relationship between scholastic achievement and the Quality Scale judgements, showed that students obtaining a scale value of 6 or higher were questionable cases and needed special guidance and help. The correlations between Quality Scale ratings and various educational tests (ACE Psychological Examination Linguistics Scale, Cooperative English Test, Buffalo Reading Test) ranged from .20 to .30.

In speculating as to what the Quality Scale measures, Wagner and Schubert postulated the following: "To be sure, it may be used as a test of art aptitude, but what more? Obviously it contains little of what is included in standard academic measures; nor yet is it equivalent to reading comprehension. It's low or absent r's with high school average, as compared with somewhat higher correlations with college success, together with it's relationship to dropping from college . . . suggests that it measures functioning behaviour, attitude towards the problem or task ahead as well, perhaps, as attitude towards one's ability to handle such a task." (p. 22)
In Strümpfer's (1963) research on the Draw-a-Person scales on a group of university students, no relationship was shown between Quality Scale ratings and total scores on the New South African Group Test with Verbal and Non-verbal I.Q.. No significant relationship was found, either, with scores on the Bell Adjustment Inventory (Home, Health, Social, Emotional and Total Scales), nor on the McFarland and Seitz' s Psychosomatic Inventory, nor on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. A correlation of -.39 with the Spatial Perception Test of the National Bureau for Educational and Social Research was found in this study. He also found significant correlations between Quality Scale ratings and ratings on a number of other Draw-a-Person scales, suggesting that Quality plays an important role in the judgements on the other Draw-a-Person scales as well.

b. Body Image Disturbance Scale

The term "body image" has been used in two senses: firstly, to denote the individual's perceptions of his physical characteristics, and secondly, the subject's general "attitudes which are associated with the body as social object," (but which have "little to do with the actual physical appearance of the individual's body.") (Fisher and Cleveland, 1958, p.367) The body image in either of these senses is assumed to be largely or entirely unconscious, but when the subject is asked to draw a figure, this body image is projected into his figure drawing.

Fisher and Cleveland have further defined the body image as: "... a term which refers to the body as a psychological experience, and focuses on the individual's feelings and attitudes towards his own body."
It is concerned with the individual's subjective experiences with his body and the manner in which he has organized these experiences. The assumption is that, as each individual develops, he has the difficult task of meaningfully organizing the sensations from his body—which is one of the most important and complex phenomena in his total perceptual field." (1958, p. 367)

Machover (Witkin et al., 1954) developed a checklist of drawing items to predict, on the basis of the individual's body concept, how well he would do on tasks requiring spatial judgements in very unstructured situations. The criterion for the selection of items in the Machover scale was the relationship between the items and scores on two spatial orientation tests. The subjects were divided into high and low and middle groups on the basis of their scores on these two tests. Those items which discriminated significantly between the groups were retained.

Fisher (1958) developed the Body Image Disturbance Scale used in this study from Machover's much longer scale. The items in Machover's scale, which required subjective, complicated judgements were omitted and 14 characteristics based on comparatively objective judgements were retained. This shortened form of the Body Image Disturbance Scale was developed in the course of an experiment on reactivity of the right and left sides of the body as a result of GSR stimulation. A correlation, significant at the .001 level, was found between reactivity and scores on the Body Image Disturbance Scale.

On this scale, a point is awarded for the presence of each one of the 14 signs of "body image disturbance." in the drawing. These are erasures, transparencies
denying the laws of perspective, lack of any body part, nose indicated only by two dots for the nostrils, mouth indicated only by a single line, one or both hands behind the back, very crude or peculiar clothing, shading of the body, lack of margins or delineating lines, figure markedly off balance, markedly unusual shading in the crotch area, lack of breasts in the female figure, and the opposite sex drawn first. The drawings are scored for the absence or presence of these signs only and not for the actual number of times they occur in the drawing. Each drawing is scored separately and the sum of the scores for male and female figures is taken. The higher the score, the greater the degree of disturbance of body image.

The validity of the figure drawing as a means of evaluating Body Image has been cast in doubt by many researchers. All interpretations of figure drawings are dependent on whether or not it is an adequate projection method. Kamano (1960) found some support for his hypothesis that figure drawings do indicate projection of the body attributes. A group of schizophrenic women were required to draw a female figure. Each drawing and the concepts "my ideal self", "my actual self" and "my least liked self" measured on the Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum Semantic Differential were compared. The results indicated that the subjects tended to project their "actual self" rather than an "ideal" or derogatory self.

Kotkov and Goodman (1953) also noted projection of the body attributes in the drawings of obese women, who tended to draw larger female figures than did the slimmer women. No significant difference was noted between the male figure drawings of the two groups.
This limitation of projection to the own-sex figure drawing was also noticed by Abel (1953). She found that persons with grievous facial disfigurement were more likely to project this abnormality in their drawings of persons of the same sex. A group of subjects with milder facial disfigurement showed a significantly lower amount of projection.

Berman and Laffal (1953) evaluated the body build of a number of subjects according to Sheldon's somatotypes and compared the somatotypes present in the figure drawings with their body build. A correlation of .35, significant at the .05 level, was found between the two ratings, indicating that projection of body type was present in a significant number of cases.

Thus far, the evidence for projection has been fairly strong. Projection would seem to be present in a significant number of cases, but there are always instances, the exceptions, which cast doubt upon the confirmation of the projection hypothesis. Wille (1954), for example, could find no relationship between the figure drawings (in disfigurement of the limbs) and the actual body disfigurement of amputees. In contrast, Schmidt and McCowan (1959), found that the figure drawings of physically disabled persons and normal persons could be distinguished from each other to a significant degree by blind analysis.

From the research findings of the abovementioned researchers, substantiation for the projection hypothesis is present, but the evidence is by no means conclusive. Fisher and Cleveland are of the opinion that "Although the figure drawing may be a potentially valuable method for studying body image . . . it is still mainly used in a vague, impressionistic manner, and there has been limited success in differentiating which aspects of the
drawing are linked with body image, which with drawing skill, and which are due to the manner in which the drawing was obtained" (1958, p. 35)

Strümpfer (1963) has concluded that "a good body concept tended to be associated with good adjustment and absence of neurotic tendencies," on the basis of significant negative correlations between Body Image Disturbance scores and the Social, Emotional and Total scores on the Bell Adjustment Inventory, as well as positive correlations with scores on the Psychosomatic Inventory. Part I of the latter test indicates physiological ailments or hypochondria and Part II gives a measure of psychological maladjustment. In view of the similarity of test groups in this and Strümpfer's study, negative correlations between Body Image Disturbance Scale scores and the measures of maladjustment used in this study would be expected.

11. Academic Achievement

The measure of academic achievement used in this study was the student's final mark in Psychology. This was obtained by adding the final examination mark to the year mark and obtaining an average score. The year mark consisted of the student's average score on class tests and assignments given by different lecturers in Psychology throughout the year.

Academic achievement, although it is largely dependent upon the subject's intelligence, is also very much influenced by his general level of adjustment. Considerable support has been found for this assumption. Roessel (1954), for example, reports that students who dropped out of the course, showed higher
(more abnormal) scores on 9 of the 10 MMPI scales used, than did the more successful students. He found that the higher the scores, the lower the student's academic achievement tended to be. The exception here was scores on the Masculinity-Feminity Scale. The students who achieved poorly did not differ markedly from the more successful group as far as I.Q. was concerned.

Babcock (1940) also found results which suggest that poor academic achievement is associated with maladjustment. He undertook a study in which 313 subjects ranging in age from 18 - 36 years were administered the Babcock-Levy Examination, a test of learning performance, considered a measure of mental efficiency. He correlated these scores of mental efficiency with scores on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. He found that the less efficient learners tended to score high on neuroticism, introversion and self-consciousness and low on dominance.

The results obtained by Stagner (1933) are very similar. In a study involving a number of first year university students, he found that low scores on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory Neurotic Scale, and high scores on the self-sufficiency and dominance scales are associated with good academic achievement. (r high dominance and good achievement was .71, with self-sufficiency, .56 and with a low neuroticism score, .50).

These results show that poor academic achievement is associated with poor adjustment. In this study, it can therefore be expected that the measure of academic achievement (the final year mark in the
case of Group A, and the first semester mark in the cross-validation group, will correlate positively with self-acceptance scores.
A. **SUBJECTS**

The subjects in this study consisted of 72 female students at the Potchefstroom University for C.H.E. all of whom were taking a first-year course in Psychology. The group was relatively homogenous as to age and intelligence. Their mean age was 18 years and months, and their mean I.Q. on the New South African Group Test (total score) was 116. With the exception of two, all of the subjects were Afrikaans speaking; the two English speaking subjects were well-versed in Afrikaans and experienced no difficulty with testing in this medium. This group will be referred to as Group A.

A cross-validation study was undertaken during the following year, in which 20 female students, from the same university, and taking the same course, served as subjects.

B. **TESTING PROCEDURE**

Group A subjects were asked to take part in the study and tests were applied over a number of weeks. The tests were administered during weekly practical classes (of 1 1/2 hours duration) and during regular lecture periods. The subjects were assured of the anonymity of their test responses and told that the results would be used for research purposes only.

The Self-Acceptance Inventory was first administered, and then the subjects were required to complete a personality questionnaire consisting of the various inventory scales. As the Concealed Figures Test is a time-limit test, it was administered at a time when all the subjects were available, as was the Draw-a-Person test.
The same procedure was followed with the Concealed Figures Test and the Draw-a-Person scales in the cross-validation group. In this instance the subjects were requested to complete the Self-Acceptance Inventory and the personality questionnaire at home. The low percentage of returns, notwithstanding repeated reminders, was the cause of the small number of subjects in the cross-validation sample.

The inventory scales used in this study, as well as those used by Boshoff (1962) were combined to form one long 445-item questionnaire. It was entitled "Persoonlikheidsvraelys" (Personality Questionnaire). The scale comprising this questionnaire included the Personality Rigidity Scale, the Emotionality Scale, the Extraversion-Introversion Scale, the Scale for the Personality Dimension of Socio-economic Status, the Dominance Scale, the Ego-strength Scale and the Psychological Control Scale, while the following scales used by Boshoff served as buffer items for the scales used in the present study: the Buss Durkee Inventory (OH and CH scores), the Cook-Medley Hostility Scale, the Manifest Hostility Scale, the Zaks-Walters Aggression Scale, the Gough Prejudice Scale and the McAnone Race Attitudes Scale. The items comprising these scales were all translated from English into Afrikaans and the items from the various scales were mixed randomly.

The subjects were requested to indicate their answers on a two-page answer sheet on which they had to mark the question as "true" or "false" opposite its number.

The Draw-a-Person Test was done on blank 10x8 inch paper. Since it was administered in a group situation, Machover's instructions could not be used.
The subjects were asked to draw a male and a female person, each on a separate sheet, starting with whichever one they wanted to. The first drawn figure had to be marked "1". They were requested not to draw "stick figures" and to make full-length drawings.
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. RELIABILITY OF VARIOUS MEASURES

In this study, the KR21 formula (Cronbach, 1960) was applied to most of the measures. The reason for this was that the majority of the inventories and tests contained an unequal number of items and the Spearman-Brown Split-half formula could not be used.

A comparison of the methods used for computing reliabilities in the original research and those used in this study, shows that in many cases the authors used the Split-half formula where we preferred the KR21. This can, in part, be attributed to the fact that in their original form two of the inventories contained an equal number of items, while in the present study it was necessary to omit the item, "I think Lincoln was greater than Washington." This item appears in the St Scale and in the Ego-strength Scale, and is obviously not applicable to South African subjects. This left an unequal number of items which necessitated the use of a method other than the split-half formula.

Table I shows the reliability coefficients that were found in the experimental group of 72 subjects.

The only information as yet available on the Self-acceptance Inventory is the KR21 coefficient of .68 obtained in this study. This is disappointingly low, although still acceptable for the purpose of group comparisons such as the present study.

The Personal Rigidity Scale contains 39 items, an unequal number, but Rehfisch (1956 a) used the Split-half method by pairing two items nearly equivalent in wording, thus obtaining an equal number of items. He obtained a reliability of .72 by this method, as compared to the KR21 inter-item consistency corre-
### Table 1

Reliability Coefficients of Measures Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>rtt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Rigidity</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Extraversion-Introversion</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego-strength</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Figures</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image Disturbance</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** - Except where indicated, the coefficients were obtained by means of the KR21 formula.

a Split-half, after Spearman-Brown Correction

b Interrater reliabilities, after Spearman-Brown Correction.
lation of .77 obtained in this study.

The Social-Extraversion-Introversion Scale yielded a KR21 reliability of .87 which compares very favourably with the KR20 formula reliability of .89 obtained by Bendig (1952).

The Emotionality Scale also had a reliability of .87 as compared with the KR20 reliability coefficient of .88 obtained by Bendig (1962).

The reliability coefficient of .76 obtained in this study for the Dominance Scale compares favourably with the KR21 coefficient of .79 obtained by Gough, McClosky and Meehl (1951) in their original research on this scale.

The KR21 reliability of the Ego-strength Scale was found to be .67 as compared to the Split-half coefficient of .76 and the test-retest reliability of .72 obtained by Barron (1953).

In Gough's (1956) research on the Socio-economic Status Scale, a Split-half reliability of .739 and a test-retest reliability of .869 was obtained. Owing to the item which was omitted, the KR21 inter-item consistency was measured in this research, which yielded a coefficient of .81.

A difference can also be noted between the Split-half reliability of .72 reported by Luft (1957) for the Psychological Control Scale, and the KR21 coefficient of .64 obtained in this study.

The odd and even halves of the Concealed Figures Test were correlated (as it is a timed test) and the Spearman-Brown Correction formula applied. The reliability was found to be .85. Using the Split-half method, Pemberton (cf. Thurstone and Jeffrey, n.d.) found a coefficient of .94 for this test.
The ratings of two judges on the two Draw-a-Person scales were correlated. The Spearman-Brown Correction formula was used and a reliability coefficient of .93 was obtained for the Quality Scale and a coefficient of .90 for the Body Image Disturbance Scale. The uncorrected reliabilities for these two scales were .86 and .80 respectively. Wagner and Schubert (1955) reported a coefficient of over .90 when two skilled raters were used and .88 when novices rated the protocols. Test-retest reliabilities of .85 were obtained. Strümpfer (1963) using a similar group of students, obtained uncorrected interrater reliabilities of .80 for the Quality Scale, and .66 for the Body Image Disturbance Scale. After application of the Spearman-Brown Correction formula the reliabilities were .92 and .86 respectively. Fisher (1958) mentioned no reliabilities.

B. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

If a group is not unselected with reference to the variables that are to be studied, coefficients of correlation between these variables are likely to be spuriously low in this group. Compared to the general population, student groups are in numerous respects selected groups. For this reason, it is necessary to determine whether the present group was selected as to the variables studied. Since none of the measures was standardized in South Africa, norms with which the present group can be compared are not available. This leaves the somewhat unsatisfactory alternative of assuming that in the general population these measures would all show a normal distribution around their midpoints, and then to compare the means
Table 2
Maximum Score Obtainable, Standard Deviations and Means obtained in Groups A and E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Rigidity</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Extraversion-Introversion</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego-strength</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>38.35</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.44</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Figures</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>69.80</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>88.27</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image Disturbance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the present group with the midpoints of the various scales.

Table 2 shows the maximum obtainable scores on each measure, as well as the means and standard deviations that were found in the experimental and cross-validation groups.

The mean of Group A for the Self-acceptance Inventory is below the midpoint of that scale, indicating the possibility of this group being slightly skewed in the direction of non-acceptance of the self. The standard deviation was relatively small, indicating that the group was fairly homogenous in this respect. The cross-validation sample (Group B) showed a mean equal to the midpoint of the scale and a slightly larger standard deviation.

From Table 2 it can be seen that the mean score of Group A subjects falls slightly above the midpoint of the Rigidity Scale. The mean score of Group B approaches the midpoint more closely, and the standard deviations indicate that there is little difference in variability between the two groups.

Group A showed a mean somewhat below the midpoint of the Social Extraversion-Introversion Scale, while the mean of Group B was somewhat above the midpoint. Bendig (1962), however, reported an even higher mean of 17.21 for his group.

From the mean of the A Group on the Emotionality Scale, it is clear that this group had a strong tendency towards emotional lability and neuroticism (as measured by this scale). The mean score of 21.0 is considerably higher than the score of 14.60 reported by Bendig (1962) for a somewhat comparable group of American students. Group B was less extreme in this
respect. Bendig (1962) reported a standard deviation of 6.92 for his group, indicating that the present groups were perhaps slightly more selected on this variable.

The mean score of Group A on the Dominance Scale fell close to the mean, but the tendency can be noticed for the mean of Group B to be slightly skewed in the direction of greater dominance. The standard deviations of both groups was relatively small and showed little difference in variability.

Both groups obtained scores above the midpoint of the Ego-strength Scale. Barron (1955) reported a mean of 52.7 for his improved patient group and a mean of 29.1 for his unimproved patient group.

The means on the Socio-economic Status Scale are slightly above the midpoint of the scale, but quite close to the mean of 17.46 reported by Gough (1956).

The means for the Psychological Control Scale are almost on the midpoint of the scale. Luft (1957) used a method of weighted answering for his adult group, so that comparisons cannot be made. The boys in his study showed a mean of 31.34 and a standard deviation of 6.4.

Group A obtained quite a low mean score on the Concealed Figures Test and although Group B showed a mean almost 20 points higher, both groups obtained means well below that of Pemberton's (cf. Thurstone and Jeffrey, n.d.) mixed group of male and female subjects ($\bar{X} = 100.67$). Her group also showed a larger standard deviation.

On the Quality Scale, the present groups appear to have achieved slightly lower mean scores than Strümpfer's (1953) group. He used the sum of ratings
### Table 3

Comparisons of Means and Variances of Groups A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.642</td>
<td>1.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Rigidity</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Extraversion-Introversion</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.536</td>
<td>1.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.401</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego-strength</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.505</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.453</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.962</td>
<td>1.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Figures</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.682</td>
<td>1.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>1.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image Disturbance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a significant at the .01 level.
by two judges, which raised the maximum obtainable score to 28; the mean of his group was 15.59.

Marked differences were found between the means of the two groups and the midpoints of the Body Image Disturbance Scale. The small standard deviations indicate that there was little variation on this measure in the two groups. Strümpfer (1963) used the sum of ratings by two judges on this scale in his study of Draw-a-Person protocols by students. When the means of the present groups are doubled for purposes of comparison, they are still lower than the mean of his group (13.20).

Small differences in means were noticed between the two groups on the academic achievement measure. Group A tended to score slightly below the midpoint and the B Group above it. Little difference was noted in the standard deviations.

The means and variances of Group A and B were tested for significance of differences by means of the \( t \) and \( F \) tests. These results are shown in Table 3. The \( t \) value was significant at the .01 level in the case of the Emotionality Scale and the Concealed Figures Test. No other \( t \) or \( F \) values reached significance.

C. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SCORES OF SELF-ACCEPTANCE INVENTORY AND OTHER MEASURES

Table 4 shows the correlations coefficients for the relation of the Self-acceptance Inventory to the various other measures of personality functioning. Five of these eleven coefficients were significant at the .001 level, two were significant at the .01 level, and one was significant at the .05 level. In the
Table 4

Correlations between Self-acceptance Inventory and other Measures in Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>r's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality Rigidity</td>
<td>- .64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Extraversion-Introversion</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego-strength</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image Disturbance</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  significant at .05 level
b  significant at .01 level
c  significant at .001 level
following discussion these coefficients will be considered in a descending order according to their sizes.

The highest correlation was found between the Personality Rigidity Scale and the Self-acceptance Inventory. As predicted, it was a relatively high negative correlation. When the square of the correlation coefficient (expressed as a percentage) is taken to indicate the amount of common or overlapping variance between the two scales (Cronbach, 1960), the Self-acceptance Inventory can be said to have 41 per cent of its variance on a factor also measured by the Rigidity Scale. The results of research mentioned in Chapter I have shown self-acceptance to be associated with good adjustment. Since rigidity is generally considered a measure of maladjustment, the dynamics of this relationship is clear. An impressionistic scanning of the contents of the Rigidity Scale supports the contention that the rigid person (as described by his scale) makes use of maladaptive modes of reaction in the face of threat. Rehfisch (1958a) concluded from such a content analysis that his scale includes items indicative of anxiety and constriction in social situations; need for a stable, orderly, predictable environment; perseverative tendencies; slowness in coming to a decision (compulsive doubting); conservatism and conventionality; self-doubt and sensitivity to negative criticism; misanthropy and parsimony; and empathic concern with work and study. The test and scale correlates of the Rigidity Scale indicated "a tendency for high scorers . . . as contrasted to lows, to be: a, socially introverted and lacking in social presence (defined as poise, spontaneity and self-confidence); b, submissive and low in leadership qualities; c, anxious and self-
disparaging; and d, unoriginal and relatively deficient in cognitive and motivational factors associated with intellectual competence and achievement." (Rehfisch, 1958b, p. 374)

The relationship between the Emotionality Scale and the Self-acceptance Inventory was negative and moderately high. The Emotionality Scale is a relatively new measure and very little has been published about it. It provides a factorially pure measure of a second-order personality dimension (identified among correlated first order factors) and gives an indication of neurotic emotional instability and anxiety. In the factor analytic process of its construction "somatic" items referring to physical symptoms such as nausea, sweating, headaches etc., were eliminated as well as an "introversion" component which contaminates other anxiety and neuroticism inventories. The Self-acceptance Inventory and the Emotionality Scale had 28 per cent of their variance in Group A of the present study on a factor measured by both of them. Since the Emotionality Scale is a pure measure of emotionality, it can be concluded that more than a quarter of the variance of the Self-acceptance Inventory can be explained in terms of this factor. The self-acceptant person can thus be described as relatively free from anxiety and emotional instability.

A moderately high positive correlation was obtained between the Socio-economic Status Scale and the Self-acceptance Inventory. This scale does not measure actual socio-economic status but rather the personality characteristics of persons of high and low social status. Inspection of the items of the scale lead the author
to suggest that they fall into five general groups: literary-esthetic attitudes; social poise, security, confidence in self and others; denial of fears and anxieties; 'broadminded', 'emancipated' and 'frank' attitudes toward moral, religious and sexual matters; and positive, dogmatic and self-righteous opinions" (Gough, 1956, p. 194). The implication of good adjustment is quite obvious here, and the finding that 25 percent of the variance of the Self-acceptance Inventory can be explained in such terms as the above, is not surprising. In discussing the above categories, Gough referred to the "apparent paradox of urbane, liberated attitudes coadunated with a sort of pompous and rigid dogmatic" (1956, pp. 192-193). His suggestion is: "Such contradictions in the status folkways may underlie the inconsistent behaviour which high-status persons often display in regard to social and political affairs" (p. 193). The relatively high correlation obtained in the present study seems to imply that to some extent, this kind of behaviour, with similar attitudinal background, would be characteristic of the self-acceptant person too.

The correlation between the Dominance Scale and the Self-acceptance Inventory indicated that about 23 percent of the variance on these two measures could be explained in terms of a factor common to both of them. A subjective analysis of the item content of the Dominance Scale lead the authors (Gough, McClosky and Meehl, 1951) to suggest that the factor implied by the largest number of items appeared to be one of poise and self-assurance. "The dominant personality maintains a high level of self-confidence, does not seem to be plagued by self-doubt or equivocations, and therefore
appears freer to behave in an unencumbered and straightforward manner. The impression given is one of resoluteness and vigorous optimism" (p. 216). Other aspects mentioned are resourcefulness and efficiency; perseverance, or even doggedness; a dutiful sense of morality; an unyieldingness in the area of goals and values; and a rather deep-seated seriousness which "does not imply solemnity or pomposity, but would appear to reflect a basic acceptance of self and a consequent disinclination to treat fundamental needs, satisfactions, and dissatisfactions in a light or trivial manner " (p. 217).

These descriptions clearly point to aspects of personality functioning which the Self-acceptance Inventory also purports to measure. High scores on the Dominance Scale are also indicative of leadership potential and social responsibility, characteristics which can - on the basis of the demonstrated correlation - also be assumed to characterize, within limits, the person scoring high on the Self-acceptance Inventory.

The last of the correlations significant at the .001 level was found between the Social Extraversion-Introversion Scale and the Self-acceptance Inventory. Bendig(1962) constructed this scale to provide a factorially pure measure of a second-order factor bearing the same name as the scale. Since this is the case, the Self-acceptance Inventory can be said to have about 19 per cent of its variance on this factor. The person scoring high on self-acceptance can, therefore, also be described in such terms as cycloid, sociable, out-going, and friendly.

The Ego-strength Scale showed a low, but still quite significant (.01 level) correlation with the
Self-acceptance Inventory. About 13 per cent of the variance on these two measures could be assumed to overlap. The characteristics to which Barron (1953) refers collectively as "ego-strength" include physiological stability and good health, a strong sense of reality, feelings of personal adequacy and vitality, permissive morality, lack of ethnic prejudice, emotional outgoingsness and spontaneity, and intelligence. Taken together, these can perhaps be seen as "inner resources" in the face of threat.

The Psychological Control Scale also showed a correlation, significant at the .01 level, with the Self-acceptance Inventory. Less than 10 per cent of the variance on these scales could be explained in terms of overlapping variance. Luft considered high scores on his scale to be "indicative of constriction, orderliness, conformity, intolerance of ambiguity, and a tendency to deny feelings. Low control scores were considered indicative of impulsiveness, greater expressiveness, and fluidity of feelings, more tolerance for ambiguity and less inhibition generally" (1957, mimeographed report, p. 20).

He was of the opinion that the largest proportion of the population consists of persons showing relatively moderate degrees of control, i.e. persons falling between the two extremes. The implication is, at least to some extent, that persons showing either extreme would be maladjusted. On the basis of the findings discussed earlier in this section, one would suspect that the person showing a low degree of self-acceptance could fall at either of the extremes of psychological control. This raises the possibility of a curvilinear relationship between these two scales, in which case a product-moment correlation coefficient would give an underestimation of the relation-
ship between them.

The last significant (.05 level) correlation coefficient was the negative one between the Body Image Disturbance Scale and the Self-acceptance Inventory. The correlation is so low that less than six per cent of the variance on these measures can be considered to be common to both of them. There is thus a slight indication that a person scoring high on self-acceptance has a clear body image, and that he could use this image of his own body as a point of reference in determining his relation to the objective reality. Strümpfer (1963) found low scores on the Body Image Disturbance Scale to be associated with good adjustment as measured by the Social, Emotional and Total scores on the Bell Adjustment Inventory, as well as the Part II (psychological maladjustment) and Total Scores of McFarland and Seitz's Psycho-somatic Inventory.

As can be seen from Table 4, the correlations of the Self-acceptance Inventory with the Concealed Figures Test, the D.A.F. Quality Scale, and academic achievement were non-significant.

In those instances where significant correlation coefficients had been found in Group A, cross-validation was carried out on Group B. These findings are shown in Table 5. Just three of these correlations, viz. those with the Dominance Scale (.01 level) the Ego-strength Scale and the Psychological Control Scale (both at the .05 level) remained significant in the cross-validation sample. The relationship between scores on the Self-acceptance Scale and those characteristics purportedly measured by these three scales can thus be accepted with a high degree of confidence. However, since the cross-validation sample
Table 5

Correlations between Self-acceptance Inventory and other Measures in Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality Rigidity</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Extraversion-Introversion</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>.65⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego-strength</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>.29⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Control</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image Disturbancea</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a
n = 19; in all other instances n = 20.

b
significant at the .05 level

c
significant at .01 level
was excessively small, the non-significant correlation with the remaining scales cannot be accepted as conclusive proof of non-existent relationships. Results obtained on small groups are, in most instances, not as statistically reliable as statistics obtained from large groups of subjects. The smaller the group, the greater the influence which change has in the direction of the results obtained. Cross-validation on a sample of at least twice the size of the present one would have been highly desirable.

D. INTERCORRELATIONS OF VARIOUS PERSONALITY MEASURES

When the contents of the various personality measures that were found to be significantly correlated with scores on the Self-Acceptance Inventory are considered, it is obvious that there must be some degree of overlap among them. For this reason, it was necessary to calculate the intercorrelations of these measures. Table 6 shows the correlation coefficients that were obtained. For the sake of convenience these measures are listed in Table 6 in the same sequence as in the previous section on their correlations with the Self-acceptance Inventory. Actually the best solution to this problem would have been a factor analysis of the matrix of correlation coefficients provided by Tables 4 and 5, to determine the smallest number of dimensions that are present among these intercorrelated measures.

A group of measures that all showed significant correlations with one another are the Personality Rigidity, Emotionality, Social Extraversion-Introversion and Ego-strength scales. On the basis of the
Table 6.

Intercorrelations of Various Personality Measures in Group A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.57&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.39&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.40&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.58&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.33&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.54&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.44&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.55&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The personality measures were assigned numbers as follows: Personality Rigidity (1), Extraversion-Introversion (2), Emotionality (3), Dominance (4), Ego-strength (5), Socio-economic Status (6), Psychological Control (7), and Body Image Disturbance (8).)

<sup>a</sup> significant at .05 level
<sup>b</sup> significant at .01 level
<sup>c</sup> significant at .001 level.
descriptions of content mentioned in the previous section, these correlations could perhaps be related to the fact that these scales provide, in varying degrees, measures of the presence or absence of anxiety; feelings of self-doubt as opposed to feelings of personal adequacy; and attitudes variously described as "constriction in social situations", being sociable, out-going and cycloid, as well as emotional outgoingness and spontaneity.

Another possible group of measures can be thought of as related to the Socio-economic Status, Dominance, Social Extraversion-introversion, Ego-strength, and Body Image Disturbance scales. In the descriptions of the contents of the inventory scales terms indicating similar tendencies occur, e.g. social poise, sociability and emotional outgoingness; confidence in self and other, and feelings of personal adequacy; as well as terms descriptive of moral attitudes. The relation of the body image measure to these is rather obscure.

Other groupings could probably also be made. The important point in this connection, however, is that in interpreting the correlations between the Self-acceptance Inventory and the Self-acceptance Inventory, some degree of cautiousness should be exercised, since the latter cannot all be considered as measures of independent aspects.

In the cross-validation sample, the correlations of the Dominance Scale with the Ego-strength Scale and the Psychological Control Scale were, respectively, .27 and .02. The Ego-strength and Psychological Control scales correlated .26 with each other. None of these coefficients reached
significance. These were the only scales which showed significant correlations with the Self-acceptance Inventory in this sample.
SUMMARY

The concepts of "self" and "self-acceptance" were discussed, as well as the relationships previously demonstrated between self-acceptance and various personality characteristics. In the present study, a forced-choice self-acceptance inventory was employed and its relationships with various other personality measures were studied. These included scales measuring personality rigidity, emotionality, the personality characteristics related to socio-economic status, dominance, social extraversion-introversion, ego-strength and psychological control. Two Draw-a-Person Test scales measuring quality of drawing and body image disturbance, as well as academic achievement, were also included as variables. The literature on these measures was reviewed briefly.

The subjects were two groups of respectively, 72 and 20 female students in a first year Psychology course. The main study was carried out on the larger group, while the smaller group was used for cross-validation. Due to the smallness of this sample, the cross-validation study was inconclusive.

The reliabilities of the various measures were found to be high enough for the purposes of group studies like the one undertaken here.

The self-acceptance scores showed significant positive correlations with the measures of socio-economic status, dominance, extraversion, ego-strength, and psychological control. Significant negative correlations were obtained with the scores on personality rigidity, emotionality, and body image disturbance. On the basis of these correlations, the intercorrelations of the various personality
measures, and consideration of the item-content common to the various scales, a person scoring high on the self-acceptance inventory can be described as free from anxiety and neurotic emotional instability, as extraverted, friendly, sociable, out-going, and spontaneous (not constricted) in social situations; as showing confidence in himself and others, and experiencing feelings of personal adequacy and security; as somewhat dominant (not domineering) and high in leadership qualities; as being progressive (rather than conservative and conventional) but also serious, perseverant and unyielding in matters of goals and values.
OPSMANDING

Die begrippe „self“ en „self-aanvaarding“ is bespreek, asook die verwantskappe wat tevore tussen self-aanvaarding en ander persoonlikheidskenmerke aangetoon is. In die huidige ondersoek is gebruik gemaak van a gediworgkeuse selfaanvaardingsinventarise, en die verwantskappe daarvan met verskeie ander persoonlikheidsmaatstawwe is bestudeer. Hierby is skale ingesluit wat die volgende gemeet het: persoonlikheidsrigiditeit, emosionalitiit, die persoonlikheidskenmerke wat met sosiale status verband hou, dominasie, sosiale ekstroversie - introversie, ego-sterkte en psigiese beheer. Twee persoonstekeningskale wat tekeningkwaliteit en liggaamsbeeldversteuring meet, is as veranderlikes ingesluit, en ook verder akademiese prestasie. 'n Kort oorsig van die literatuur omtrent hierdie maatstawwe is gegee.

Die proefpersone was twee groepe van, respektiewelik, 72 en 20 vroulike studente in 'n eerstejaarskursus in Sielkunde. Die hoofondersoek is op die groot groep uitgevoer, terwyl die klein groep vir kruisvalidering gebruik is. A.g.v. die kleinheid van lgn. steekproef, was die kruisvalideringsondersoek nie afdoenlike nie.

Die betroubaarhede van die verschillende maatstawwe was hoog genoeg vir die doeleindes van groepsondersoekinge soos die huidige.

Die selfaanvaardingatellings het beduidende positiewe korrelasies getoon met die maatstawwe van sosiale status, dominansie, ekstroversie, ego-sterkte en psigiese beheer. Beduidende negatiewe korrelasies is gevind met die tellings vir persoonlikheids-
rigiditeit, emosionaliteit, en liggamsbeeldversteuring.

Op grond van hierdie korrelasies, die interkorrelasies van die verskillende persoonlikheidsmaatstawwe en oorweging van die iteminhoud wat die verskillende skale met mekaar in gemeen het, kan 'n persoon wat 'n hoe telling op die self-aanvaardingsinventaris behaal het, beskryf word as vry van angs en neurotiese onstabiliteit; as ekstrovert, vriendelik, gesellig, na- buite-lewend en spontaan (nie ingeperk) in sosiale situasies; as iemand met vertroue in homself en andere, en met gewoelens van persoonlike toereikendheid en sekeriteit; as tot 'n mate dominant (nie baasaspelerig) en sterk t.o.v. leierskapskamperke; as synde progressief (eerder as konservatief en konvensioneel), maar ook ernstig, volhardend en standvastig m.b.t. sake wat met oogmerke en waardes te doen het.
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S.A. - INVENTARIS
(Vorm V)

Aanwysings

Hierdie boekie bevat 'n reeks bewerings wat in pare saam gegroep is. Lees elke paar deur en be- sluit watter een van die twee die meeste op jou van toepassing is, of waarmee jy die meeste saamstem. Merk jou keuse op die los antwoordblad. Moenie in hierdie boekie merke maak nie.

As jy meen dat die A-deel van 'n paar die meeste op jou van toepassing is of dat jy die meeste daarmee saamstem, maak die spásie onder A swart, bv.

A B
1. A  O

As jy meen dat die B-deel van 'n paar die meeste op jou van toepassing is, maak die spásie onder B swart, bv.

A B
2.  O  A

Maak seker dat die nommer van jou antwoord altyd ooreenstem met die nommer van die paar waarmee jy be- sig is.

Kies in alle gevalle een van die twee bewerings, al moet jy ook soms raal. Werk vinnig en gee jou eerste indruk. Jou antwoorde sal absoluut konfidensiële behandel word en sal sleks vir navorsingsdoeleindes ge- bruik word.
1. A. Ek luister graag na simfoniekonserte oor die radio.
   Ek is daarteen gekant om aan bedelaars geld te gee.

2. A. As ek vanjaar moet druip sal ek, afgesien van geldelike oorwegings sterk twyfel of ek verder behoort te studeer.
   E. Ek hou daarvan om tuin te maak en in die grond te werskaf.

3. A. Ek geniet omtrent netso 'n goeie mate van gesondheid as die meeste van my vriende.
   B. Ek voel dat ek weldeglik kan bydra tot die geluk van andere.

4. A. Kinders behoort al die belangrike feite omtrent geslagsake geleer te word.
   B. Ek glo dat vrouens netseveel geslagstelike vryheid as mans behoort te hê.

5. A. Ek meen dat die meeste mense op maniere wat effens onregverdig is, sal optree as dit tot hulle voordeel is, eerder as om hulleself te benadeel.
   B. In die tyd en omstandighede waarin ons lewe kan 'n jong mens nooit te veel leer nie.

6. A. Politiek is so 'n ingewikkelde saak dat die gewone mens nie 'n die standpunt omtrent sake kan hê nie.
   B. Al verstaan ek dit nie altyd nie, het ek tog 'n hoë waardering vir kuns.

7. A. Wanneer seker hoe danig van 'n ander persoon in my teenwoordigheid geprys word, wens ek altyd dat ek hulle self besit.
   B. As iemand my sou vra wat ek die graagste in die lewe wil hê, sou ek sê om net tevrede te wees met wat ek is en het, en ni altyd te hunker na die ding wat buite my bereik is nie.

8. A. Daar is 'n doel vir myself in die lewe.
   B. Op skool het die meeste onderwysers my eerlik en regverdig behandeld.

9. A. Ek hou daarvan om te lees en te studeer oor dinge waarmee ek besig is.
   B. As 'n mens die saak goed ondersoek, vind jy dat agter byna elke groot man 'n vrou (moeder of aggenoot) gestaan het wat bereid was om op te offer.

10. A. Ons sou baie beter gedagtes dink as ons woorde soos „waarskynlik”, „ongeveer” en „miskien” weglaat.
    B. Soms besef ek my gebreke so terdeë dat ek myself minag.
11. A. In die ou dae was die meeste ouers te streng en outokraties in die opvoeding van hulle kinders.
B. Ek stap maklik alleen 'n kamer binne waar ander mense bymekaar is en al aan die gesels is.

12. A. As 'n predikant gelykydig beroepes na twee gemeentes ontvang, behoort hy die een aan te neem wat vir hom die gunstigste is.
B. Een van die moeilikste dinge van volwasse te wees is om klaar te wees met die dinge van 'n kind.

13. A. Ky ouers het my gewoonlik my eie besluite laat neem.
B. Ek wens soms ek hoef nie verantwoordelikheid vir my lewe te aanvaar nie.

14. A. Wannende ek teespoed ondervind, herwin ek gou weer my vertroue in my vermoe om probleme op te los.
B. Ek is 'n taamlike vinnige leser.

15. A. As ek 'n kunstenaar was, sou ek graag bloome geteken hê.
B. As 'n mens jou persoonlikheid met min moeite kon verander, sou ek definitief 'n hele paar trekke verander hê.

16. A. As ek een van 'n tweeling was en ons albei dieselfde persoon liefgekry, sou ek uit liefde vir my broër/suster, voorgegee het dat ek nie die persoon so baie lief het nie.
B. Kritiek op myself hinder my, selfs al is dit geregverdig en kan ek daarby baat.

17. A. Ek moet erken dat ek bang voel as ek na 'n vreemde plek moet trek.
B. Een ding waarvan ek nie las ondervind nie, is om te onthou waar ek goed gebêre het.

18. A. As 'n perd of 'n ander trek nie trek nie, behoort hy geelaan te word.
B. Wanneer iemand my kritiseer, ontstel dit my nie.

19. A. Een van my moeilikhede is dat ek soms meer dinge onderneem as wat ek werlik kan behartig.
B. Ek voel by tye baie nutteloos.

20. A. Dis goed om op die ou paal te wandel, solank 'n mens net nie op hulle doodgaan nie.
B. Ek probeer gewoonlik om uit moeilikhede te bly, al beteken dit ook dikwels dat ek my gevoelens en oortuigings sodoende vir myself moet hou.
21. A. In politieke sake moet 'n mens jouself meestal laat lei deur die gesamentlike mening van al die mense wat saamgesnoer is in 'n party.

B. As ek te veel kleingseld uitgekeer word, vestig ek altyd die aandag van die klerk daarop.

22. A. Ek moet erken dat dit my sou hinder om 'n wurm aan 'n vishoek te sit.

B. Ek gee nie graag uitdrukking aan my gevoelens nie, omdat 'n mens te maklik op die manier 'n gek van jouself kan maak.

23. A. Ek is geneig om in verskeie stokperdies gelyk belang te stel, eerder as om myself oor 'n land tydperk met een besig te hou.

B. Dit het al gebeur dat wanneer ek volgens my eie oortuigings gehandel het, ek later gevoel het of ek daarvoor verskoning behoort te vra.

24. A. Ek dink dikwels: "Ek wens ek was 'n kind."

B. Ek kan die koers van my lewe bepaal en ek wil dit ook doen.

25. A. Eén rede waarom ek nie in die Staatsdiens sal wil werk nie, is dat senioriteit daar 'n te belangrike rol speel by bevorderings.

B. My eie oplossings vir probleme is gewoonlik waardeloos of minstens nie so suksesvol nie.

26. A. Ek moet erken dat ek dikwels voel dat ek nie die verantwoordelikhede van die beroep waarvoor ek besig is om myself te bekwaam, sal kan dra nie.

B. As ek 'n moeder was, sou ek my eie behoeftes as naas naby net so belangrik as die behoeftes van my kinders beskou, omdat 'n moeder ook regte en voorregte het.

27. A. Ek verlang dikwels terug na die erlede omdat dit bekend is teenoor die toekoms wat so onbekend en onekker is.

B. Ek weet dat 'n mens daarmee respek van andere afdwинг, maar ek erken nie maklik as ek 'n fout gemaak het nie.

28. A. Ek het soms al gevoel dat die lekker in die lewe nie opweeg teen die swaar nie.

B. As ek 'n medikus was, sou ek graag in brein-sjirurgie wou gespesialiseer het.

29. A. Ek is jammer om dit te moet erken, maar ek gee nie veel om vir wetenskaplike leesstof nie.

B. Ander se besittings is didwels vir my aantrekliker as my eie, alhoewel al is myne van die selfde waarde of nog beter.
30. A. Ek lees graag boeke oor geskiedenis o' historiese romanse.
   B. Dit lyk of ek meer dikwels as ander mense dinge doen waaroor ek later jammer is.

31. A. As ek eendag getrou is, wil ek my huweliklike lewe intrig net soos my ouers sin.
   B. As ek 'n vreemdeling ontmoet, dink ek dikwels hy is beter as ek.

32. A. Om kritiek te voorkom, probeer ek gewoonlik doen wat van my verwag word.
   B. As die afstand nie te ver is nie, stap ek liever as om te ry.

33. A. Ek is 'n baie kielerige mens.
   B. Ek voel angstig as ek in vreemde situasies kom.

34. A. Wanneer ek 'n 'n groep verkeer, het ek al die tyd die gevoel dat hulle op my swakpunte sal hamer, en daarom tree ek nie op die voorgrond nie.
   B. As ek 'n predikant was, sou ek graag kategismuspreke gelewer het.

35. A. Ek dink ek kan saamstem met die bewering: "Die stem van die volk is die stem van God."
   B. Ek kwel my nou nog oor mislukkings van die verlede.

36. A. Ek wens selde dat ek idees en opvattinge gehad het wat meer algemeen voorkom as die wat ek wel besit.
   B. Ek het al by tye gedink dat dit beter wou wees as ek liever dood is.

37. A. Dit lyk of ek nie omgee wat van my word nie.
   B. Dit is 'n voorreg om te lewe in hierdie tydperk van die geskiedenis waarin soveel dinge gebeur.

38. A. Ek wens ek behoort nie so te reageer nie, maar as ander mense my kritiseer nadat ek my bes gedoen het, kwel dit my baie en veroordeel ek myself naderhand.
   B. Ek probeer altyd gawe grappe en anekdotes onthou; sodat ek hulle kan oorvertel.

39. A. Skurwe grappe maak my verleë.
   B. Ek wens dat ek myself altyd kon sien soos ander my sien, sodat ek my optrede dienoooreenkomstig kon wysig.
40. A. Ek sal graag altyd werk wil doen wat redelik goed deur my ouers en ander mense wat naby my staan, begryp en aanvaar word, anders sal ek hulle morele steun dikwels moet ontbeer.
   B. As ek 'n kunstenaar was, sou ek graag kinders geteken het.

41. A. Ek voel dikwels spyt oor my haastige optrede wanneer ek my humeur verloor het.
   B. Ek dink selde oor hoe ek lyk en watter indruk ek op mense maak.

42. A. Ek dink ek sal daarvan hou om 'n sleepoffisier te wees.
   B. Soos die meeste mense, bekommer ek my daaroor wanneer andere ongunstig teenoor my optree of my veroordeel.

43. A. Vrouens behoort dieselfde salaris as mans betaal te word as hulle dieselfde werk doen.
   B. Ek voel skuldig elke keer wat ek tyd of geld vir ontspanning bestee omdat ek voel dat ek dit nie verdien nie.

44. A. Ek verkies om die advies van ander mense oor belangrike sake te volg, dan voel ek nie so sleg as dit verkeerd loop nie.
   B. Ek is nie baie bang vir insekte, paddas, ens. nie.

45. A. Ek besit die elenskappe om van my 'n sosiaal aanvaarbare persoon te maak.
   B. Ek voel soms baie jammer daaroor, maar daar is oopgiets waarin ek nie anders kan as om van my ouers te verskil nie.