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Introduction
INTRODUCTION

A historical review of related literature on self would lead to conclude that 'Self' was more a philosophical constructed and as such, it did not receive much attention from behaviourist and functionalist psychologists. Introspectionists were unable to handle self and as a mentalist construct, it was anathema to behaviourists (Hilgard 1950). Empiricists refused to accept it as a problem of investigation, since it can not be established on the basis of empirically verifiable data.

But psychologists could not ignore the role that conscious self-concept play in determining and predicting human behaviour. It has become essential to construct self-concept as a psychological phenomenon an empirically verifiable data on the basis of adequate measurement and research design. It is further essential to free self-concept from philosophical assumption. This would enable for building up constructs like dimensions of personality and personality traits that confront them. It has become further important after the emergence of a consensus agreement over the role of self as a principle controlling factor, to study the relationship between self-concept and other determinants of personality. Hence psychologists that does not concern itself with the study of self can not justify its existence for the purpose it is meant (Deo 1964).
It can be further added that perception of oneself by himself is a great motivating factor for achieving destinations. Hence self-concept forms the nucleus of personality. The self-concept that one develops through interpersonal relationship bestows a regularity, rigidity and consistency on the behaviour pattern. Self-concept begins to develop from birth onward and through the differentiation process of "me" and not me continuous throughout life.

Development of linguistic abilities, increased contacts with the external world accelerates development of self-Concept. Varied experiences with the environment help in self development. The social context, as such, is the inevitable background against which the self concept emerges and develops. Hall and Lindzey(1957) point out that the concept of self in the contemporary psychology is characterized by the shades of meaning. Firstly, it refers to the self as an object and involves a person's attitudes towards his feelings about perception and evaluation of himself as an object. In its second meaning, it refers to self as a process or self and there by, to the active group of psychological process that govern behaviour and adjustment. Some times person can perceive himself as an object without feeling that he is in control of his behaviour. Instead to him the locus of control may seem to outside his own self "things Just seem to happen to me, it does not seem to be me that is doing things at all."
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James and Seymour (1965) stressed that "one of the major candidates in the field of personality theory is the self-Concept theory of personality organization." Each behaviour of an individual, simple and complex, is influenced by how he sees himself.

If an individual feels he is accepted socially, he will act friendly.

(I) THE SELECTION OF RESEARCH PROBLEM

Research studies, from several areas of behaviour have shown that how self-concept built in early years of life and reinforced by later experiences, influences behaviour and characteristic relations to people and situations, because self-concept is dominant in personality pattern. The measurement of self-concept becomes very essential. If we want to understand and predict his life adjustment and his success and failure, we can not proceed further without knowing this self-concept.

Learning that effect a positive change in one's self-concept is perhaps the most significant learning any of us acquires. For instance, it is not the ability to recognize word symbols as such but the self-perception. "I can read" that is most crucial in influencing a pupils behaviour in subsequent reading situations. The teacher bears a major responsibility for helping students to develop positive self-concepts. Several studies have found positive relationship between self-concept
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and measures of school achievement. The self-concept influences a child's learning in at least two ways. First in order for a child to learn successfully, he must see himself as a learner, as being able to learn. Second, one's Self-structure his organization of personal meaning determines what ideas and facts are relevant for him and hence influence what he will learn.

Self-concept is also closely related with type of personality. Jung proposes to classify all individual into two main groups—Extraverts and Introverts. The extraverts are interested in the world about them. They are sociable, friendly, not easily upset by difficulties. They are men of action rather than reflections. The introverts are described by him as those who are interested in themselves, their own feelings, emotions and reactions. They are highly sensitive and are unable to adjust easily to social situations. They are rather reserved and like to work alone. There are very few people who are purely extraverted or introverted. Most of us have qualities of both these types, in other words, we are ambiverts.

The researcher is more seriously concerned with the present study of self-concept as input, throughput and output in the education of an adolescent. The researcher is also interested in studying it role in interpersonal relations with happiness, values and type of personality.
Though the importance of self-concept and its relation with happiness, values and type of personality is important but it is seen that a little work has been done on this problem in India. Consequently researcher felt justified in carrying out the study with the hope that it would prove and reveal some new important facts in the field of psychology.

Therefore the problem undertaken for the present investigation is entitled as "A study of self-concept and pro-social behaviour of Early Adolescents."

II) DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES INVOLVED

a. Pro-Social Behaviour

Psychologists as a group seem to be more interested in man's short-coming and defects than in his virtues. With a few exceptions they have been more concerned with human feeling-hatred, anxiety defensiveness and rigidity than with personal strenght. In the soical realm we hear more & more about the deterioation of contemporary life, how there is growing apathy an alienation & increasing indiffer-ences to the sufferings and needs of others. Yet this black picture of the human condition can be exaggerated. People are also offen friendly to others, to strangers as well as those they know. At times they even go for out of their way to help some one in trouble.
Reasons why we help others:

Reward from others:

The simplest explanation of why people help others is that they expect to profit in some way in social approval if not in direct material gains. Their good deeds might be appreciated and bring them rewards-attention- friendship or perhaps some favor. Corporate donations to charitable causes are often motivated by the hope of return to good citizenship. Many people who volunteer for social service are also seeking external rewards-companionship, interesting activities and the like on the other side, the helper’s actions are sometimes prompted by fear. They might be punished if they don’t aid those in need they run the risk of disapproval or even scorn ridicule. In some European countries it is even a punishable offense not to help someone under certain specified circumstances (Time December 27, 1971).

Helping Versus Altruism:-

Surely even helpful action isn’t impelled by a desire for some direct gain. Someone is helpful generally speaking. When he benefits another. However we should say he is altruistic only when we’re fairly confident that he rendered the assistance without thinking of the rewards the might obtain from other people. In other words, altruism isn’t controlled by anticipation of return benefits, although these expectations can influence others kinds of helpfulness. But first let’s
consider all forms of aid.

*Reciprocity:*

If we ‘give’ in order to ‘get’ pay in advance, so to speak for benefits we expect in the future, we also pay back for favors already received. This is true for help as well as for economic exchanges. We reciprocate and aid those who thought someone had wanted to help them. Other individual had intended to help them because of a liking for them—and so, in a way, they were flattered and pleased. The other person was nice, someone who cared about them and they wanted to aid him (or her) in return.

**Social Norms and Ideals**

*The reciprocity norms:*

The motives we attribute to our benefactor aren’t the only factors influencing our willingness to pay him back. On many occasions we feel obliged to reciprocate we’ve all seen other expressions of this principle. Every onces in a while people think they should return a favor regardless of how they feel about the persons who aided them.

Some cultures, have a strong version proclaiming that people ought to help those who have helped them. Whereas in other societies the norm is ‘weaker’ maintaing only that a person shouldn’t hurt his benefactors.
Situational and group differences:

According to the Wisconsin experiment, for example, many persons think they have a greater responsibility to return the benefits they received the more freely their benefactor gave these rewards. To make this a bit more concrete, imagine that you are a young executive who has been invited to a party at your boss's house. My guess is that you'll feel a stronger obligation to reciprocate if you believe that your boss has voluntarily invited you (perhaps because he likes you) and hasn't been constrained to invite you by the requirements of his role as an employer. It's the freely given benefits that have to be paid back. In order to investigate the effects of social class differences, Philip Friedman supposedly for a study of supervisory ability. They come from three kinds of social class backgrounds (defined in terms of the father's or guardian's occupation and education) bureaucratic middle-class, entrepreneurial middle class, and working class. When each boy arrived at the laboratory, he was told that he was to write a note to the teenager in the next room explaining how that boy should perform a given task. If he, the subject, earned a good grade, he could win a cash prize, but most of his grade depended on the other person's productivity. Half of the subjects were then led to believe that the other person had worked hard and therefore helped them a great deal. Where as the others were made to think he had not worked hard and thus gave
them little help. The roles were then reversed, and each subject was supposed to be the worker operating under the guidance of a supervisor, either the same individual. They then had to work for their supervisor, believing that his chance of winning a cash prize depended greatly on how much work they turned out in his behalf. At the conclusion of the experimental session the boy filled out questionnaires and their responses were in according with the performance differences.

**The Responsibility Norms:**

We’re not always materialistic and don’t always give in order to get. Sometime we’re altruistic and help others because this seems to be the proper way to act and we want to do the right thing. The undergraduates seemed to be saying there was a social norm maintaining that they ought to work hard and help the person who needed their assistance. Assuming that this was only one manifestation of a fairly pervasive set of ideals calling for socially proper behaviour, we referred to it as a norm of social responsibility. People presumably were reminded of this norm when they learned that someone was dependant upon them, and they ideal to the extent that they had adopted it as a standard of conduct.

**When social norm promote helpfulness:**

The evidences which reviewed so far indicates that many of people believe that they ought to aid those in distress, but it doesn’t
really prove that norms actually make them behave this way. If someone says he was helpful because he thought this was the right thing to do, he could conceivably be trying to put the best possible face on his action: he's offering an after-the-fact explanation that might not be the real reason for his behaviour. When psychologists carried out just this kind of investigation however, they frequently found that moral exhortations didn't have much of an impact on social responsibility (1972). In one study (1973), students at the Princeton Theological Seminary were asked to give a brief talk about the parable of the good a sameritan and, thus, should have become highly conscious of the ideal that we should help our fellow man. When each subject walked to the laboratory where his speech was to be recorded, the passed somebody slumped in a doorway with his eyes closed. Even though the student was presumably thinking how desirable it was to be a good sameritan he was only slightly-but not significantly more likely to aid the stranger in the doorway then were a group of control subjects asked to deliver a talk on another topic. The increased awareness of the social rule in itself evidently hadn't led to greater helpfulness.

**Personal Responsiblity:**

Shalom Schwartz a sociologist at the University of Wisconsin, has suggested what some of the factor affecting the operation of social norms might be. According to his analysis, an individual will be so-
cially responsible and aid those in distress when he.

i) Recognizer that others are confronted by a situation that has serious consequences for them.

ii) Is aware of the social norms that are pertinent to the given situation.

iii) Believes he has a personal responsibility to take action. This last point tells us, in other words, that he must think his own behaviour will have an important bearing on the other's welfare.

When an individual is responsible for others, we can say he knows that they're dependent on him and that his actions will directly determine what happens to them—whether they reach their goals or suffer some unpleasantness for example. This sense of having some control over another's fate can arise in various ways.

i) It may grow out of experiences teaching that one's action can greatly help or hinder others. The people scoring high on schwartz's. Ascription of Responsibility to the self scale presumably learned this.

ii) It may be produced by the positions the individual occupies. His role might place him in charge, giving him control over another's welfare.

iii) The person might believe he has a unique quality or is in a unique position (say, because only he has the means to provide help) so
that he alone or with very few others-can do some thing for those in distress.

These three ways of acquiring a sense of responsibility for others are related and apparently have similar effects.

**Diffusionor Responsibility:**

Schwartz's study indicates how the lowering of diffusion of personal responsibility might affect our willingness to help other if our immediate and direct control over another's welfare frequently prompts us to aid that individual, we might be less inclined to work for someone if we're not in sole charge of his fate.

**Conficting Norms**

Although according to the social responsibility norm we should aid those in need, other ideals can impede helpfulness. For example as noted earlier by the writer that several of kitty Genovese's neighbors claimed they didn't want to intrude into a stranger's private business. We have learned in our society that it isn't nice to stick our noses into a stranger's private life so your intervention might be an inappropriate intrusion into the fallen man's personal affairs. Society also teaches us that we shouldn't become overly emotional but should keep cool and not call undue attention to ourselves. you might therefore feel terribly conspicuous and perhaps even excessively emotional if you ran up to the fallen man. So you hesitate or even do nothing, not because you've
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totally indifferent to the victim’s plight but to some extent at least because you’ve acquired other norms of proper conduct that keep you at distance from strangers.

According to one psychologist, young children are increasingly inclined to aid another youngster in distress as they progress from kindergarten to the second grade, but they become much more hesitant and cautious in the fourth to sixth grades apparently because they are now afraid of acting inappropriately. The older children are more likely to mind their own business, afraid to intrude.

Some Conditions Affecting Helpfulness

Helpfulness like every other social action is greatly affected by the immediate situation. Even if the assistance is rendered because social norms call for helpfulness. Conditions operating at the time can determine if the ideals will come into play and how much influences they will have. In this section we’ll look at some of the factors that can affect the likelihood that help will be given, including the potential helper’s understanding of what is happening the emotion he experiences and the example provided by other helpful or nonhelpful people.

The Other’s Need

The Bystander’s interpretation of the situation:

Latane and Darley emphasized the importance of a person’s interpretation of the situation in their analysis of response to an emergency
before a witness will intervene they suggested he has to (i) notice, the incident (ii) Interpret it as an emergency (iii) decide he has a personal responsibility to act, and (iv) believe he can carry out the required behaviour. Just as we saw earlier a person is unlikely to help unless he realizes something is happening the affects another’s welfare and then thinks the victim is highly dependent on him in particularly for aid.

**Why the dependent person needs help:**

Many onlookers might well feel an initial urge to aid the person in distress on hearing his cry for help or even on learning that he requires assistance, but they don’t always follow through. They may not want to make the effort. May be they can get in trouble. So as we’ve already seen. They may believe they don’t have any person responsibility for him. Or they might decide that he isn’t worthy of their help because it’s his own fault that he is dependent on them.

People clearly react in terms of why someone needs help. If a person is in difficulty because of factors beyond his control his dependence is externally caused-others are often more willing to aid him than if his need results from some inner deficiency-is internally caused.

**Modeling Influence: Example other Provide:**

A person’s need or dependence upon us isn’t the only thing that makes us conscious of our social responsibility. We can be reminded of our society’s ideals in various ways-by exhortations by symbols of
these ideals and especially by the examples other people provide. If we think these reminders apply to us and that we have a personal responsibility to live up to these norms, we’re more act to behave responsibly.

**Prosocial Models:**

People can serve as prosocial models, heightening the likelihood of socially responsible behaviour. One investigation of the impact of television on young children found that 12 episodes of the children’s program ‘Mister Roger’s Neighborhood’ which emphasized cooperation, sharing, the control of aggression and other such positive themes-induced preschoolers from the lower socioeconomic strata to be more co-operative in their interactions with other children. The program taught a lesson which lasted at least through the 6 weeks of observation. They too are often more inclined to do the ‘right thing’ after they see another person act in a responsible fashion. The model’s behaviour in these instances evidently made the viewer more aware of the socially proper action in the given situation and probably also reminded them that they had a personal responsibility to behave that way.

**Model characteristics promoting prosocial behaviour:**

A person’s power, the extent to which he controls other’s rewards and punishments, affected the likelihood that his behavior will imitated. Evidently, the model’s power is more important than his
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nurturance in inducing others to copy his socially responsible behavior. In Grusac's study children who had been trained by a nurturant model were actually relatively unwillingly to share their rewards with others. They apparently thought the warn adult would tolerate their selfishness. A powerful model, on the other hand, did influence school children to practice self denial and donate part of their winnings to a charity.

**Emotional Factors:**

So far, in discussing why a person would help other's been emphasizing the part played by cognitive processes: how the individual understands the situation confronting him. In this regard we have considered some of the ideas that probably occur to the onlooker. Several reports tell us that helpers tend to act fairly quickly and that an onlooker is increasingly less likely to come to the needy person's assistance as time goes by. Apparently a person who learns of someone's need reacts with quick feelings, although this initial emotional response is often also greatly affected by rapid judgements, particularly as to whether the victim's difficulty is his own fault. This first reaction could well provide much of what ever motivation the individual has to give aid along with his belief that he ought to help.

**Empathy for the one in need:**

The rudimentary analysis just sketched out suggests that
individual's emotional reactions often play a major part in determining whether he will help the dependent person.

**Vicarious Experiences:**

On looker's feeling stem in large part from the vicarious experiences of the dependent person's emotions empathize with people in less dangerous or painful situations. We feel some of the discomforts we think those in trouble must be suffering. It we believe that we can do something to alléviate their distress. we're inclined to act, impelled by the hope of reducing their-or-our- unhappiness.

**Empathic reactions and Helpfulness:**

Empathically produced conotions might also motivate us to help people other than those whose experience we vicariously share, Suppose you're a subject in an experiment and watch another student receive electric shocks. Then you empathize with that individual. If you're like the subjects in one study the chances are that soon afterwards you will be especially willing to help someone else avoid getting shocks even though this aid means that you yourself will receive greater punishment. Seeing the first person suffer might sensitize you so that you're now less willing to have someone else endure this discomfort.

**Moral Transgression Guilt and Self Esteem:**

Moral norms make us help others basically because we know we would feel guilty if we didn't adhere to these ideals. Psychiatrists and
psychologists tell us that we also act helpfully at times in order to lessen whatever guilt feeling we already possess. Indeed Freud thought that unconscious guilt was at the root of virtually all morality and impelity and impelled much of "The best behavior of which we are capable.

**Guilt-edged Helpfulness?**

The Transgression aroused guilt feeling which motivated the wrong doers to comply with the request made of them, of course as behavioral scientist have long recognized, transgressors can take any number of routes in attempting to reduce their guilt. They might confess their misdeed deny that they did anything wrong or perhaps minimize their responsibility.

Researchers have found, however, that there is the greatest attempt at self-justification when the individual voluntarily acted contrary to his self-image. This suggests that a person who intentionally departs from his own standards will suffer a greater loss of self-esteem than one who inadvertently does. Behavioral scientist usually say a person feels ashamed when he has publicaly misbehaved, and they speak more cofidently of the individual's 'guilt' when he thinks that only he know he has done wrong. Social behavior is increasingly regulated in our culture by expectations of what others will think instead of by the individual's idea of What he will think of himself.
Other Psychological effects of Transgressions:

Transgression experiments necessarily induced guilt. The experimental manipulation probably had at least two consequences. They caused the wrong-doers to think ill of themselves thereby reducing their self-esteem, or made the subjects feel bad. Experiment indicates that the often quite willing to comply with total strangers request to assist other strangers. Reseatchers suggests that they're also inclined to aid persons in need even when no out-and out request is made.

Restoration of self esteem:

When transgressors give help they are hoping for a reduction in the distress they feel and also for a renewed belief that they are worthy people. Most wrongdoers also want to think better of themselves and render assistance in order improve their shaky self-image.

Mood and Magnanimity

Our mood affects our willingness to aid others. we might be helpful when we’re unhappy in the hope that our behavior will lessen our distress. We’re also particularly inclined to assist persons in need our when we’re happy.

Success, Happiness and Helpfulness:

Beside the evidence all sorts of studies have demonstrated that a favorable mood enhances helpfulness. The good mood doesn’t merely make people more compliant. Many of us are relatively helpful when
we're happy, whether this favorable mood results from a successful experience or from any other pleasant event.

Enhancing one's self-image:

Regarding the effects of a bad mood on a person's willingness to help the findings are somewhat mixed. The failure or whatever else made them unhappy might also have damaged their self concept.

The reluctance to help.

Helping Is often rewarding:

Most persons find that helping other is frequently rewarding. We learn through the course of our lifetime that the assistance we give to those in need can bring various gratifications social approval, a reduction in the guilt stimulated by thoughts of possibly acting improperly heightened self esteem a lessening of the distress we feel in empathizing with those in trouble and the vicarious sharing of other's pleasure at being helped.

Cost of Helping

Some of the costs of helping are fairly obvious. Some of the neighbors might have been afraid of being hurt by the assailant. Or perhaps they believed as all too many city dwellers do these days, that if they become involved in the incident they would them be tied up in court hearings and legal hassles for a long time to come.
Reacting against pressures to help:

There are other reasons why people are unwilling to come to the aid of those in need and one of these deserves special attention. The stronger the insistence the more inclined we are to dig our heels in and resist.

Don't Push too hard:

All sorts of things can exert pressure. Sometimes it's other people's action. High schools student in one study had a fairly private oppotunity to donate the prize they might win in the experiment to a local or phonage. Some of the boys were not pressured. Where as the others were pushed to surrender their prize by having a friends say in their presence that he himself would donate and (in some case) that the subjects really should do the same. Since the students in this experiment knew they couldn't be censured if they refused to donate (that is, they could get away with not giving). They were less likely to contrib-ute their prize the stronger the other's insistence that they give it up.

The victim's need as a source of pressure:

A study shows that college students generally work harder for someone the greater the individual's dependence on them when he is worthy. But if his dependence is improper, they may be greater resis-tance the more he needs help. The greater need for aid imposes stron-ger pressure on others, and this pressure may be resented if the need is
illegitimate.

According to none investigation in which people were asked to donate a bone marrow to a dying woman, the more the emphasis on the woman's plight, the greater the expressed willingness to give bone marrow primarily when there was only a slight chance that the person would actually be called on.

**Overcoming Reactance:**

If we often resent the internal as well as external pressures put on us to aid those in need. You might ask how we can be encouraged to live up to our social ideals and help those requiring assistance.

**b. Self - Concept:**

Self - concept, One of many terms (Self-identity, self-image, self-ideal, perceived self, phenomenal self) relating to self perception. To illustrate this Allport (1965) wrote: Suppose that you are facing a difficult and critical exam. No doubt you are aware of your high pulse rate and of the butter-flies in your stomach (bodily self), also of the significance of the exam in terms of your past and future (self-identity), of your prideful involvement (self-esteem) of what success or failure may mean to your family (self-extension) or your hopes and aspirations (self-image) of your role as solver of problems on the examination (rational agent) and of the relevance whole situation to your long range goals (self-striving).
The idea of self concept originally was proposed by Lecky (1945) and adopted by Rogers (1951) as the key stone of his system of non-directive counselling. This concept is of major importance in education, particularly in the more personal aspects of motivation, level of aspiration and adjustment.

Mead (1934) wrote of the social construction of the self concept which altogether a reflection of the opinions and attitudes communicated by significant others. In the sense, It is argued that society provides a looking glass in which people discover their image or self concept.

Self concept is referred to as the core or centre of gravity of the personality pattern. It is the key-stone of the personality. It gives consistency to the personality. Miller has pointed out that each living system contains an executive or administrative system. He describe 'self' as a decider system which receives information from all parts of the systems and from the environment. When the self concept develops, the individual comes to perceive himself as an active agent in determining his own behaviour.

The individual gradually build up an inner cognitive map or frame of reference which provides him with a meaningful picture of himself and about his world's key elements. According to James (1890) a person's self is the "sum-total of all that he can call his." In recent
decades, what a person can call his" has been spelled out in more
definite and specific terms. It has been referred to as his "attitude
toward self" (Lowe 1961), as an organized configuration of perception
of self" (Pedersen 1965), as "those perceptions, beliefs, feelings, atti-
tudes and values which the individual views as part or characteristics
of himself." Perkins (1958) as the "organization of qualities the indi-
vidual attributes to himself" (Kinch 1968), and as a "System of central
meaning he has about himself and his relation to the world about him."
(Brownfain 1965).

Thus the personality pattern is composed of traits that are
organized and integrated into a pattern in which the concept of self is
the core or centre of gravity. The pattern is founded on the person's
hereditary endowment, which is shaped by environmental experiences
in the home and later outside the home. It is thus possible to control
the environmental forces to ensure the development of a desired per-
sonality pattern or to change a pattern that is likely to lead to poor
personal and social adjustment. The concept of self, the core of the
personality pattern is made up of beliefs and attitude toward self. Ac-
cording to Hurlock (1974) the concept of self has three major compo-
nents; the perceptual, the conceptual and the attitudinal. The percep-
tual component is the image the person has of the appearance of his
body and of the impression he makes on others. It includes the image
he has of the attractiveness and sex appropriateness of his body, the importance of the different parts of his body, such as his muscles, to his behaviour and prestige they give him in the eyes of others the perceptual component is often called the physical self-concept.

The conceptual component is the person's conception of his distinctive characteristics, his abilities and disabilities, his backgrounds and origins and his future. It is often called the psychological self concept "and is composed of such life adjustment qualities as honesty, self confidence, independence, courage and their opposites."

Included in the attitudinal component are the feelings a personal has about himself, his attitudes about his present status and future prospectus, his feelings about his worthiness and his attitudes of self-esteem, self reproach, pride and shame. As the person reaches adulthood, the attitudinal component also includes the beliefs, convictions, values, ideals, aspirations and commitments which make up his philosophy of life.

James (1890) was first to suggest that a person has many "selves". The real self " for example is what a person believes he is, his "ideal self" is the person he aspires to be and his "social self" is what he believes others think of him and how they perceive him. There are four categories of self concept.

*First one is the basic concept* corresponds to James's con-
cept of the "real self" it is the person's concept of what he really is. It includes his perception of his appearance, his recognition of his abilities and disabilities and of his role and status in life, and his values, beliefs and aspirations.

*The second one is the transitory self concept.* This means that a person has a self concept which he holds for a time and then relinquishes. Transitory self concepts may be favourable or unfavourable, depending largely on the situation in which the person finds himself momentarily. They are generally influenced by some passing mood or emotional state or by a recent experience. They are transitory and unstable because they lack the perspective found in the basic self-concept.

*The third one is the social concept* that is based on the way the individual believes other perceive him, depending on their speech and actions. It is usually referred to as a "mirror image" (Bell 1960, Jersild 1952, Kinch 1968, Videbeck 1960). The effect of the social self concept on the behaviour of the individual will depends largely on how important the opinions are most influential in his life at that time. Jersild (1952) has explained: "If a child as accepted, approved, respected, and liked for what he is, he will be help to acquire an attitude of self-acceptance and respect for himself But if the significant people in his life at first his parents and later his teachers,
peers and other persons who wield an influence belittle him, blame him and reject him, the growing child's attitudes towards himself are likely to become unfavourable. As he is judged by others, he will tend to judge himself." Since the young child is most responsive to his mother, his social self-concept is largely based on her opinion of him or what he believes to be her opinion. his social self-concept may be transitory or permanent, depending on the consistency of the mother's treatment of him. In adolescence, the social self concept is derived from the opinions of the peer group as a whole - the "generalized others" (Reeder 1961).

The last and fourth one the ideal self concept that is made up on perceptions of what a person aspires to be and what he believes he ought to be. It may be related to the physical self-image, the psychological self image, or both. It may be realistic in the sense that it is within the reach of the person or it may be so unrealistic that it can never be achieved in real life.

The new born infant's state of consciousness is a "big blooming, buzzing confusion" James (1890). The infant is not aware of himself as a person nor does he differentiate himself from environment. As Allport (1965) has explained, "One thing is quite certain: the young infant if not aware of himself as a self. He does not separate the "me" from the rest of the word. And it is precisely this separation that
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is the pivot of later life. The infants, though presumably conscious lack self-consciousness completely." Gradually because of the sensations he experiences from within his body and from his environment, he begins to differentiate between the two. This is beginning of the long process of developing a concept of self. As Jersild (1965) has written: "The development of self awareness does not occur in all-or-none fashion which would enable us to assume that up to this point the child does not possess it but beyond this point he does. It is more likely that a child perceives different aspects of what he eventually calls himself with varying degrees of clarity at different times. The process of self-discovery is actively going to on at least as long as the child developing or discovering new potentialities and in a healthy person the discovery of self continues as long as he lives."

Different self-concepts develop at different times and in different ways, forming a hierarchy in which the basic self concept is shaped by the person's social experiences in the home. Later self concepts are influenced by those formed earlier. Only when the self-concepts in the hierarchy are integrated can the person be happy and well adjusted. Within the hierarchy are all kinds of self-concept, some of which play a more dominant role in the integration of others.

The various self-concepts develop in accordance with predictable pattern. Physical self concepts develop earlier than psycho-
logical self concepts.. Early social self concepts are developed in the home, with the mother playing a dominant role in their development. Later the environment outside the home and popular stereotypes relating to sex, race and other factors contribute to the foundation laid in the home. The basic self concept develops later than the social and is influenced by the social. Ideal self concept begins to develop in the preschool years, in adolescence they reflect the young person's dissatisfaction with the self. The sources for these concepts come first from the home and later from the larger environment (Hurlock 1974).

Discrepancies between the self-concepts make fusion into a general self-concept difficult and lead to personality maladjustments. Fusion is especially difficult when marked discrepancies exist between the basic and ideal self-concepts or between the basic self-concepts and mirror images. Fusion is less difficult, though serious enough to be recognized and avoided, when discrepancies exist between the physical and psychological self-concepts or between mirror images and ideal self-concepts.

The self concept is relatively stable can a person develop a true sense of identity. Jersild (1952) has pointed out, since the self concept is composed of a person's thoughts and feelings are dynamic, changes are inevitable. Allport (1965) further emphasized the dynamic nature of the self-concept as the "core of our being." He said- "And yet
it is not a constant core. Sometimes the core expands and seems to take
command of all our behaviour and consciousness, some times it seems
to go completely off stage, leaving us with no awareness of self."

There are marked variations in the stability of the self-concept not only in different people but also in the same person at
different times and under different circumstances. Tippett and Sibber
(1965) have reported four types of variations in the stability of the
self-concept.

First, variations of occur in the self-concept over time. The self concept may fluctuate either momentarily or over longer
periods as at puberty on late adolescence. Second, variations may occur
within the different self-image areas, such as ideal and basic. The
physical self-image may very at puberty, but not psychological.
Similarly, when a person goes to work, the work-role image may vary
but not the physical. Third, variations may be found in the self-concept
in different interpersonal situations. A person may see himself
differently in presence of his father, his mother, his teacher, and his
best friend, Fourth, variations occur within the different self-structures.
The ideal self-concept may vary but the real or basic self-concept may
remain stable or vice versa.

c. **Personality:**

For most people, personality is "what makes one individual
different from another". The statements like "Mahatma Gandhi was great personality." "Our history teacher does not possess an impressive personality." And Shyam has no personality at all" are generally heard which speak volumes about individual differences which exist among people. Based on these descriptions, personality seems to refer to an attribute that people possess in varying amounts." Yet personality is not something people possess in large or small quantities, nor is it a concrete thing that is easily observable such as white skin or black hair. Rather, it is what one is a sum total of all his traits and attributes which go to make him unique individual like any one else.

The word personality is derived from persona which originally meant "theatrical mask" worn by dramtis personae (actors) in a play to denote various characters in ancient Greece, Latter, the term used by the Romans. Even though seemingly farfetched this idea was a coin of Gordon Allport's brain and later embodied in more modern personality theories by Carl Jung who considered that 'persona was at the outer edge of the self, a mask worn by the person in response to the demands of social civilization.' It was a role given to the individual by his culture - the part he was expected to play in life in other words, his public personality (image). The notion about personality as something fixed as well as dynamic, inherited as well as acquired, and concrete as well as abstract at the same time has always remained in a
flux. For instance at one stage, personality was conceived of as "the pattern of behaviour in a certain way" at other it comprised simply "intelligence of mind." Allport said, "the term personality refers to both mind-in-particular and the mind-in-general. If we wish to study personality we must be ready to shift our attention rapidly from the particular to the general from the concreate person" might refer to observable dimensions of personality such as the physique and movements the "abstract person" underlines intellectual, mental, spiritual and social qualities (more abstractions) which are generally acquired and developed in order to know and understand a person it would be necessary to take a holistic view of his "being, acting, reacting and interacting" in a particular milieu.

Comparisons, though a natural phenomenon are unnecessary because each individual is a unique being and a model in himself insisting upon three standard yardsticks of evaluating human personality. Kluckholn and Murray opine. "Every man is in certain respect:

(a) like other men (universal norms)

(b) Like some other men (group norms)

(c) Like no other men (idiosyncratic norms)

In what proportion do generality and particularity combine to create a new "unique" individual will continue to remain a
mind boggling puzzle. In social context, to put the matter straight an individual (personality) is a sum total of

(a) what actually he is.
(b) what he considers himself to be.
(c) what he is in the estimation of others.

*Definition of personality:*

Psychologists seem to have no common consensus as far as definition of personality is concerned. Therefore, personality has been defined in a variety of ways. Keeping the interaction of man's biological inheritance with the environment as major consideration, Prince (1925) defined personality as "a sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies and instincts of the individual and dispositions and tendencies, acquired by experience. "John Locke referred to" a thinking intelligent being that has reason and reflection and can consider self as itself. "For Watson-the behaviourist-personality was simply the "sum total of one's behaviour. "With Norman Cannon, personality is "the dynamic organization of interlocking behaviour systems that each of us possesses, as he grows from a biological newborn to a bio-social adult in an environment of other individuals and cultured products. "James (1870) found 'self' (he seldom used the word personality) "consisting of layers viewed from within. In sequence they are the individual self (body, possessions, family, friends etc.)
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social self, spiritual self and pure ego. "Personality" observed Carl Pearson. "Is the effect upon others of a living being's appearance and behaviour so far as they are interpreted as distinctive signs of that being." Eysenck looked at personality as "the more or less stable and enduring organization of person's character, temperament, intellect and physique which determine his unique adjustment to the environment." Allport (1961) believed "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those physical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment."

Guilford (1967) believes that the individual personality, with all its uniqueness, surfaces from out of the individual differences that exist. For him, personality is "an individual's unique pattern of traits." Maddi (1968) finds wider perspective for personality which, he says "is a stable set of characteristics and tendencies that determine those commonalities and differences that have continuity in time and that may or may not be easily understood in terms of the social and biological pressure of immediate situation alone." Dr. S. Radhakrishnan a doyen of oriental philosophy remarked, "Personality is the union of our acts and potentialities, a complex unity of body, mind and spirit. It is the symbol of human integrity of a constant and unique form created in the midst of incessant flux."

A more recent workable definition of personality comes
from Walter Mischel (1986) a noted personality theorist. He says "Personality usually refers to the distinctive patterns of behaviour (including thoughts and emotions) that characterize each individual's adaptation to the situations of his or her life." It may also be defined as "a particular pattern of behaviour and thinking prevailing across time and situations that differentiate one individual from another." (Buskist & Gerbing, 1990). It is interesting that the early psychologists placed greater emphasis on the inherited characteristics (fixed and rigid raw material such as physique, temperament, intelligence etc.), the modern personologists consider "environmental interaction" as a more powerful determinant of personality than hereditary traits. This apart, the three-fold conception of man as body, mind and spirit implies an important truth that man is not a more object, that his spiritual nature is not on the same level as his psychic and corporeal, that his soul and body can participate in a new order of spirit and existence. The dynamic self always inter-acting, adapting adjusting, assimilating and integrating is all that is important in the context of human personality because integration, assessment and organization of certain traits, as Allport (1961) put it takes place only when the individual is in the thick of situations and interacts with the environment. Shaping of a personality is ultimately the result of an increasing struggle between the individual and the environment. Eysenck, therefore believes that
"the unique individual is simply the point of interaction of a number of quantitative variables." While it is easier for the scientist to study commonality and arrive at trustworthy generalization, it is impossible to sit on judgment over individuality because no one for sure can say how various "qualitative variables" interact in each case. No objective yard-stick of science can accurately assess the "uniqueness". Allport (1961) quotes Sherlock Holmes (the hero of detective stories) saying to his friend Watson. "While the individual man is an insoluble puzzle in the aggregate he becomes a mathematical certainty. You can never tell what any one man will do but you can say with percentages remain constant."

The key concepts of most definitions of personality may be summed up as under:-

1. Personality is a dynamic concept. It cannot be restricted to certain inherited traits, tendencies and attributes. The inner core of personality may refer to inherited qualities, characteristic and traits common to all (which exert a constitutes the differences which distinguish one individual from other (s).

2. Individuality is a keynote in the notion of personality. Personality psychology, therefore is "study of individuals their distinctive characteristics and traits and the manner in which they integrate all aspects of their psychological functioning as they
adapt to their environment."

3. The unique personality emerges out of a sustained interaction between the genetic potential and the environmental forces.

4. Various aspects of personality-body, mind, intelligence, spirit, culture, society are highly interactive and completely integrated.

With an essentialist's approach, Allport (1961) concludes Personality is what a person really is regardless of the way other people perceive his qualities or the methods by which we study him. Our perceptions and our methods may be in error, just as an astronomer may fall short in studying the constitution of a star. But the star is still there, a challenging object of study. My definition of course does not deny that a person is variable over time or that his behaviour may change from situation. It say simply that the person has an internal structure and range of characteristics (variables to be sure) but ascertainable and it is the structure that we hope to study.

*Dimensions of personality.*

Personality is an integrated whole with certain concrete and some abstract dimensions. Each dimension has a specific purpose and a significant role to play in the totality of one's being. The maturational changes as a result of chronological growth and the environmental interaction which an individual has through out largely determine the extent to which his personality potential shall be
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developed. Various aspects of personality are not only inter dependent but also so meticulously integrated that what happens in one aspect has its relative effect on other compartments. However, for the sake of convenience and better understanding, Personality is compartmentalized into physique, mind and intellect emotionality and sociability.

Typological View - Point of Personality.

Typology-classifying people according to types on the basis of "shape, size and body-form" has been a practice since ancient times. Hippocrates (400-377 B.C.), the first typologist focused upon the four fluids or "humours" (black bile, yellow bile, blood and phlegm) and classified people according to the predominance of a humour and related characteristics. For example, persons with an excess of black bile were classified as melancholic (depressed and pessimistic); those with an excess of yellow bile were choleric (quick tempered and irritable) those with a predominance of blood were sanguine (cheerful, optimistic), those possessing too much of phlegm were called phlegmatic (slow impassive unresolved). Though the theory was discarded long ago some of its essential elements were retained by the succeeding typologists. Hall (1979) recognized four types of bodies; abdominal, muscular, thoracic (long, slender) and nervous (cephalic). Rostan (1828) published a famous treatise describing three essentially different types of physical constitution: type digestif, type musculaire and type
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cerebral, dominated by digestive, muscular and neural systems. Rostan also hinted at relationship between temperament and body type. Viola differentiated three distinct morphological types which he called microplanchnic (persons with small trunks and relatively long limbs) and macroplanchnic (large and heavy; bodies with relatively long limbs) and normoplanchnic (well proportioned medium muscular frames). These names are merely descriptive. Bean described three extreme variants viz. hypo-ontomorph (literally under-developed or unevolved) has a fat round body short extremities and a relatively enormous preponderance of visceral mass. The neuro-ontomorph has a strong, massive powerful physique with a relatively small forebrain (cerbrum) but a large cerebellum. The hyper ontomorph has a light, linear physique, extremely small visceral mass and relatively large cerebrum with a small cerebellum. Kretchmer whose body classification system found eminence in 1925, revived the Greek terminology and described three types. Pyknic (compact and round), asthentic (slender without strength) and athletic (robust and heavy musculature). Later he added Dysplastic (undifferentiated).

A German philosopher Spranger (1928) published a treatise called Types of Man in which he classified human beings according to six basic interests and values. Theoretic or cognitive (philosophers, scientists, explorers, lovers of knowledge and truth), Aesthetic (lovers
of beauty, arts), Economic (utilitarians, businessmen, merchants, industrialists), Political (statesmen, politicians, diplomats), Religious (saints, mystics, priests, spiritualists) and Social (preachers, social workers, reformers). This apart widely known personality classifications are the introvert and extrovert typology of Carl Jung and Sigmund Freud's oral and anal personalities. Later while explaining dimensions of personality (introversion extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism). Eysenck remarked "Human being differ with respect to the speed with which excitations and inhibitions are produced and speed with which inhibition is dissipated. These differences are properties of the physical structures involved in making stimulus response connections."

Constitutional typology - the study of body-structure and personality became popular in 1940 with the efforts of Sheldon and his associates known as Somato-typing, Sheldon's system of body classification (based on external appearance and body shape) was perhaps the first ever scientific attempt involving empirical data. At the outset approximately four thousand photographs of nude young men were judged with regard to important physical variables. Sheldon recognized three components or characteristics for classification of physique. The terms used were Endomorphy (spherical, round soft). Mesomorphy (cubical, rugged, muscular) and Ectomorphy (linear, (40)
Sheldon rated each component (fat, muscle or bone) on a 7 point scale e.g. 7-1-1 (endomorph), 1-7-1 (mesomorph) and 1-1-7 (ectomorph). The early two-polar classification techniques were discrete where as the distribution of Sheldon's components is continuous and unimodal. With the 7 point scale of rating for each component and also by applying intermediary ratings such as 4.5-5.5-1 etc., observed sheldon, the entire world population could possibly be classified into 343 categories. Sheldon himself has described seventy six somato-types of which fifty are fairly common. Compound terminology is used to describe mixed somato types the dominant type being used as the second term so that an individual who is highly mesomorphic with a strong endo-morphic component, for instance, is identified as endo-mesomorph or in short endomeso. It is believed that sheldon's original purpose was to study the relationship of personality temperament and body measurement. He was seeking an answer to the question whether those who look alike behave alike. In this process, Sheldon rated the subject for temperament which involves emotionally toned aspect of personality, such as joviality, moodiness, tenseness and activity level. Hundred of terms describing temperament were selected and eventually reduced, through statistical procedures to three temperament types i.e. Viscerotonia, Somatotonia and Cerebrotonia. Endomorphy was correspondingly found related to Viscerotonia (love
of comfort, slow reaction, relaxation, love of eating, sociability, complacency, affectionateness etc); Mesomorphy has its relationship with Somatozonia (assertiveness, love of physical adventure, vigour, energeticness, need for exercise, love for dominance, risk-taking and chance, directness of manner, courage, general noisiness, need for action when in trouble etc.); Ectomorphy was related to cerebrotonia (restraint in posture and movement rapid reaction, over tension, anxiety, secretiveness, action-inhibition. thought- introversion, need for loneliness etc.).

In spite of powerful appeal, the constitutional typology became a subject to several objections. For instance the findings seemed to be contaminated because the ratings on the physique and temperament were made by the same researchers, who admitted research-bias. Secondly, temperament is only a limited aspect of personality, even if it does show some relationship to physical characteristics. In fact, somato-typing is not a theory of personality in the real sense of the term. Predictions from constitutitional typology seem little related to person's interests, attitudes and motivation.

*Extraversion Introversion*

Jung distinguishes two major attitudes or orientations of personality the attitude of extraversion and the attitude of introversion. The extraverted attitude orients the person toward the external,
objective world; the introverted attitude orients the person toward the inner subjective world (1921).

These two opposing attitudes are both present in the personality but ordinarily one of them is dominant and conscious while the other is subordinate and unconscious. If the ego is predominantly extraverted in its relation to the world, the personal unconscious will be introverted.

**The Functions**

There are four fundamental psychological function: thinking, feeling, sensing and intuiting. Thinking is ideational and intellectual. By thinking humans try to comprehend the nature of the world and themselves. Feeling is the evaluation function; it is the value of things, whether positive or negative, with reference to the subject. The feeling function gives human their subjective experiences of pleasure and pain, of anger, fear, sorrow, joy and love. Sensing is the perceptual or reality function. It yields concrete facts or representations of the world. Intuition is perception by way of unconscious process and subliminal contents. The intuitive person goes beyond facts, feelings, and ideas in their search for the essence of reality.

The nature of the four functions may be clarified by the following example: Suppose that a person is standing on the rim of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado river. If the feeling function
predominates, she will experience a sense of awe, grandeur, and breathtaking beauty. If she is controlled by the sensation function she will see the Canyon merely as it is or as a photograph might represent it. If the thinking function controls her ego, she will try to understand the Canyon in terms of geological principles and theory. Finally, if the intuitive function prevails the spectator will tend to see the Grand Canyon as a mystery of nature possessing deep significance whose meaning is partially revealed or felt as a mystical experience.

That there are exactly four psychological function, no more and no fewer, "I arrived" Jung writes, "on purely empirical grounds."

Thinking and feeling are called rational functions because they make use of reason judgment abstraction, and generalization. They enable humans to look for lawfulness in the universe. Sensation and intuition are considered to be irrational functions because they are based on the perception of the concrete, particular and accidental.

Although a person has all four functions they are not necessarily equally well developed. Usually one of the four functions is more highly differentiated than the other three and plays a predominant role in consciousness. This is called the superior function. One of the other three functions usually acts in a auxiliary capacity to the superior function. If the superior function is prevented from operating the auxiliary function automatically takes its place.
The least differentiated of the four functions is called the inferior function. It is repressed and unconscious. The inferior function expresses itself in dreams and fantasies. The inferior function also has an auxiliary function associated with it.

If the four functions are placed equidistant from each other on the circumference of a circle, the centre of the circle represents the synthesis of the four fully differentiated functions. In such a synthesis there are no superior or inferior functions and no auxiliaries. They are all of equal strength in the personality. Such a synthesis can only occur when the self has become fully actualized. Since complete actualization of the self is impossible, the synthesis of the four functions represents an ideal goal toward which the personality strives.

*Interactions Among the systems of Personality.*

The various systems and the attitudes and functions that go to make up the total personality interact with each other in three different ways. One system may compensate another system, or two or more systems may unite to form a synthesis.

Compensation may be illustrated by the interaction of the contrasting attitudes of extraversion and introversion. If extraversion is the dominant or superior attitude of the conscious ego then the unconscious will compensate by developing the repressed attitude of introversion. This means that if the extraverted attitude is frustrated in
some way the unconscious inferior attitude of introversion will seize
hold of the personality and exert itself. A period of intense extraverted
behaviour is ordinarily followed by a period of introverted behaviour.
Dreams are also compensatory so that the dreams of a predominantly
extraverted person will have an introverted quality and conversely the
dreams of an introvert will tend to be extraverted.

Compensation also occurs between functions. A person who
stresses thinking and feeling in their conscious mind will be an intuitive
sensation type unconsciously. Likewise the ego and the anima in a man
and the ego and the animus in a woman bear a compensatory
relationship to each other. The normal male ego is masculine while the
anima is feminine and the normal female ego is feminine while the
animus is masculine. In general, all of the contents of the conscious
mind are compensated for by the contents of the unconscious mind.
The Principle of compensation provides for a kind of equilibrium or
balance between contrasting elements that prevents the psyche from
becoming neurotically unbalanced.

Virtually all personality theorists of whatever creed or
persuasion assume that the personality contains polar tendencies that
may come into conflict with one another. Jung is no exception. He
believes that a psychological theory of personality must be founded on
the principle of opposition or conflict because the tensions created by
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conflicting elements are the very essence of life itself. Without tension there would be no energy and consequently no personality.

Opposition exists everywhere in the personality; between the ego and the shadow, between the ego and the personal unconscious, between the persona and the anima or animus, between the persona and the personal unconscious between the collective unconscious and the ego and between the collective unconscious and the persona. Introversion opposes extraversion, thinking opposes feeling and sensation opposes intuition. The ego is like a shuttlecock that is batted back and forth between the outer demands of society and the inner demands of the collective unconscious. As a result of this struggle a persona or mask develops. The persona then finds itself under attack from other archetypes in the collective unconscious. The woman in man that is the anima, invades the male's masculine nature and the animus chips away at the femininity of woman. The contest between the rational and irrational forces of the psyche never ceases. Conflict is a ubiquitous fact of life.

Must personality always be a house divided against itself? Jung believes not. Polar elements not only oppose one another they also attract or seek one another. The situation is analogous to a husband and wife who quarrel with each other yet are held together by the very differences that provoke the disagreements.
Theories of Personality.

7Theory for some is like accepting the mystique of mathematical language simply in order not to appear unsophisticated. For the scientist and clinician however, theory provides a model for working with something diffuse and complex.

Psychoanalytic Theory.

We can think of psychoanalysis as developmental theory where importance is attached to an individual's life history. Development theories do not deny hereditary factors, but rather emphasize personal experience. Though many Freudian ideas are not accepted at this time as a therapeutic method the free association of thoughts, leading to self-knowledge and catharsis is still widely used. Psychoanalytic theory attempts to explain mental phenomena as the dynamic interaction between urging forces or instincts and the counterforces set up by the external environment.

Freud saw the primary force as sexual with the driving energy being what he called the libido, the instinctive pleasure-seeking drive underlying human behaviour. The term sexual, in this context, refers to any type of physically pleasurable activity. The Viennese neurologist arrived at his concept through his awareness of the frequency with which sexual problems seemed to be at the source of emotional trouble. As for personality, Freudian theory divides the
personality structure into the id, the ego and the superego. As the storehouse of the libido, the id is a primitive unconscious, basically irrational and selfish impulse. The ego is the rational aspect of personality which regulates the activities of the id, helping one to maintain social approval and self-esteem. The "conscience" of the individual guarding the ideas of right and wrong which have been learned from childhood. Freud called the superego. Psychoanalytic theory deals with personality development caught up in all its conflicts as we pass through the various stages from infancy to adulthood. As both theory and practice, psychoanalysis has undergone many changes highlighted by such famous names as Adler, Jung, Fromm and Horney. Adler put emphasis on the universal feelings of inferiority and Jung introduced the dimension of introversion-extroversion. Horney brought in emphasis on compliant aggressive and detached types of people. Fromm talked about social character with its many individual variations due to specific parental influences; it was Fromm who spoke of five types of personality with different orientations; receptive, exploitative, hoarding, marketing and productive (1963).

Learning Theory.

Again thinking in terms of growth and dealing with the proposition that personality relates to the principles of learning let us briefly describe learning theory as expounded by Dollard et al. (1939).
Learning theory studies the processes significant to human adjustment particularly the experiences of early childhood. These involve the things that motivate us, the effects of conflict, of punishment and of anxiety. Such theory stresses reward and punishment and the relationships between stimulus and response. Thus an understanding of stimulus conditions is important to an understanding of behaviour. The formation of personality is not rigidly determined by any particular sequence of situations or events; it is not possible to give a step-by-step plan of development. Through feeding, through toilet and cleanliness training and later through his reaction to social situations, the child learns that all does not go smoothly. How the critical problems of infancy and childhood are handled is important to the shaping of personality and must important are those behaviours related to fear and anxiety. We build habits of responding by learning to reduce or to control our drives. We learn to generalize our experiences, becoming shy, hypersensitive, cautious, or showing other general traits. We may even learn to adapt our behaviour to some role we have to play. The once-"liberal" college student may become "conservative" as an executive.

Learning theory evolved out of the experimental psychologist's laboratory using animals as well as people. In contrast psychoanalysis evolved from the disturbed patient, the couch and the
consulting room and it was influenced by the analyses the Freidians
gave to their own inner lives. Whereas learning theory employs learning
principles to account for personality development, psychoanalysis lays
stress on psychosexual development, delving into the emotional history
of the individual.

Type Theories.

In contrast to such developmental theories of personality
there are those that deal with "types" of people, with cognitive ways of
seeing and thinking about the world and with the "traits" of people. Let
us look first at type theory. It seems natural to classify people as though
they came out of some mold (Allport 1961).

From ancient views of personality have come theories of
constitutional typology both stimulating and controversial, but for many
modern-day psychologists oversimplified. Theorists range from those
who say that physique alone determines personality to those who set up
clusters of interrelated psychological traits, each assumed to represent
the same underlying characteristic. Theories based on body type tend
to stress general activity and emotional reactivity. Sheldon (1942)
speaks of the "endomorph," who has a tendency toward roundness and
softness as being fond of food, apprehensive, insecure and a conformist.
The "mesomorph," in whom muscle and bone predominates, is charac-
terized as the adventurous type who can withstand discomfort. The
nonadventurous "ectomorph" is fragile in body build. Controversy about such classifications has stimulated other research and the formation of further theories. For example one study of 10,000 male college freshmen correlating body type and temperament showed virtually no relationship (Hood 1963). Oversimplification in typing people can lead to the dangerous tendency of putting a person into a stereotype which renders all Scots "tight" all Germans "rule-oriented," and all people who do not agree with us as "radical" or "conservative" as the case may be.

Cognitive Theory.

Cognitive theorists propose that the way one sees and thinks about the world is related to what he does. Some behavior characteristics such as authoritarianism or dogmatism can be viewed as a general attitude or ideology influencing personality. (Kelly 1955) has advanced the idea of "personal constructs," where anticipation of events is fundamental to life. Any man who is motivated to make cognitive or understanding sense of the world is a "scientist" of sorts. This allows one to anticipate even predict events. If a man's cognitive system meets certain standards of adequacy he functions well. If the cognitive processes are faulty, he encounters trouble. What we "believe" is important in understanding how we "behave."
Trait Theory.

Each of us, with his own unique structure and background of experiences, develops a set of typical ways of behaving some unique and some like those of other people. This subject can became involved when it comes to description. In the English language alone some 18,000 terms have been complied that serve to distinguish people behaviourally (Allport 1966). One quarter of these terms covers such traits as aggressiveness, sociability and introversion. Another quarter deals with the more transient behaviours the temporary states or moods. Others among these descriptions relate to such evaluative judgments as "insignificant" or worthy." Further terms cover descriptions of physique and capacities.

According to trait personality can be described by its position on a number of scales each of which represents one trait. When we measure people according to trait scales we are measuring common traits, comparing one person with another. On the other hand we have traits unique to each of us; these personal dispositions give us individuality. We may be aggressive like a lot of other people but aggressive in our own way.

Although situations encountered frequently call forth typical responses, traits are usually elicited in social situations. The popular view of personality emphasized its social significance because
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it is related to the art of getting along with people, and psychology affirms this opinion. A personality trait also refers to consistent behaviour rather than to that which is temporary or occasional. Every normal person is aggressive in some situations and submissive in others. His manifestation of this personality trait, however, has a certain degree of constancy. In most situations he will carry out some habitual degree of this response.

*Styles of Behaviour.*

Currently some attention is being given to nonverbal behaviour to individual styles as they are called. One person may smile a great deal and another rarely. Some gesture with a nod of the head. Studies show that people who characteristically smile and use many arm, hand and finger movements are concerned with gaining approval and may tend to use such gestures more than others as part of their style of behaviour. And there are even contitive styles where a person tends to overlook or "level" perceptual differences among objects; here the person sees things in terms of their sameness. In contrast, some people look at things in terms of their differences, a style called "sharpening." Hence, we can theorize that one's way of thinking and perceiving stems, in part, from properties of personality which distinguish one person from another.

*Assessment of Personality*
From the overview of descriptive and explanatory approaches, it is clear that personality is a very complex phenomenon. It encompasses both subjective and objective elements, dimensions and subject matter. Certain aspects of personality are fixed, genetically determined and subject to no modification, other aspects are dynamic, environmentally determined and subject to alteration in relation to time and exigencies. Besides this psychologists are still not in complete agreement over what exactly constitutes personality. This is what makes assessment or measurement of personality a difficult task. While it might be easy to judge the overt actions and activities of an individual, it is almost impossible to delve deep into his behavioural dispositions and unconscious mental processes and accurately assess such psychological abstraction as repression, anxiety, introversion, dominance, self, self-actualisation etc. Yet psychologists have developed a variety of tools and techniques through which they can peep into the structure and dynamics of an individual's personality and have a glimpse of it.

The most effective methods of personality-measurement employed by various psychologists are (1) Behavioural observation (2) Interviews, (3) Paper and Pencil questionnaires, and (4) Projective tests. It may be mentioned that behavioural observation and interview as tools of investigation are largely subjective and beset with
unsurmountable difficulties in terms of judgment generalization, paper-and-pencil questionnaires are objective and can be used on individuals as well as groups. Most paper-and-pencil tests ask subjects to rate as true or false a collection of statements about their thoughts, feelings and behaviour. Some of these questionnaires are designed to measure a very limited range of traits or only a single personality characteristic such as anxiety, self-concept or introversion-extroversion. Others are designed to produce more global measures of personality.

Paper and Pencil Personality Questionnaires

Four widely used paper-and-pencil personality questionnaires. MMPI, CPI, 16PFQ, and EPI- are briefly described below:

Minnesota Multi-phasic Personality Inventory:

Originally designed to help diagnose and classify persons with psychological disorders, the MMPI is today the best known and most widely used objective personality inventory (Hathaway & Kinley, 1942). It has undergone several transformations, alterations and modifications in terms of its contents, processes, and procedures of administration, response-evaluation, and behaviour analysis. In its final version, the MMPI contains 566 statements about behaviour, thoughts, or emotional reactions that subjects rate as "true" of themselves, "false" or "cannot say" (undecided about the truth of the statement). There are ten clinical scales designed to measure such
conditions as depression, social introversion, schizophrenia, paranoia, and psychopathic personality. It also includes four validity scales designed to assess whether subjects have falsified or faked their answers.

Even though MMPI has become a popular diagnostic tool for normal people also, psychologists have found geographical bias in its construction. The original criterion-keyed test (MMPI) has also been questioned for its validity and reliability because the decision-process by which diagnoses of the sample cases were made has not been documented. The questionnaire has been criticized because some of its items particularly those dealing with sex and religion, intrude into the individual's privacy. The excessive length of the MMPI causes at least some subjects to get sloppy in their haste to get the process over with. Although the inventory seems to be a good device for differentiating disturbed and normal people but it lacks the capacity to differentiate reliably within each of these categories; it fails to assess individual differences.

_California Psychological Inventory_.

Authored by Gough (1957-1975) CPI is one of those personality questionnaires that have been standardized on normal population. In format, it resembles MMPI and is based on 5 "normal" personality traits; dominance, sociability, self acceptance, social
presence, self-control, achievement via conformance, achievement via independence, responsibility, intellectual efficiency, flexibility, socialization, femininity, capacity for status, psychological mindedness and tolerance. This apart the CPI also includes three responsebias scales. The inventory was standardized on much larger group than MMPI and care was taken in controlling for factors such as social status, geographical locale and age. The CPI has been cited to have a test-retest reliability of .90 which is very high as compared to that of MMPI (Ross, 1987). In predicting school and job success, leadership, conformity and reactions to stress. CPI has proved to be highly valid instrument.

16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.

Like MMPI the 16 PFQ also received acclaim and popularity in the domain of personality. Raymond Cattell (1965) believed that (1) personality may only be understood when the individual is viewed in given situations; (2) personality traits exist in at least two levels and (3) personality testing should not only be employed to obtain group data, but also using what he termed ap technique, the individual should be assessed repeatedly over time in order to determine trends and patterns in behaviour, feeling and motives. Considering traits to be the building blocks of personality and using factor analyses technique, Cattell identified, 12 primary factors (the result of factorial
technique) and 4 secondary factors (higher level qualities) and finally 
wove them into the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The factors 
are not just unique to the test but instead rest within the context of 
general theory of personality. Each factor listed with its alphabetical 
designation (for example: outgoingness A; intelligence, B; ego-strength, 
C; etc) and brief descriptions of low and high scores (for example, 
score 1-3 on factor B shows low intelligence and score 8-10 high 
intelligence on factor I, it shows tough mindedness and tender-
mindedness respectively so forth and on)

According to the manual of the 16 PFQ the essential 
elements to be considered in evaluating are that (1) the test is embedded 
within the broader fabric or network of general psychological theory: 
(2) in its present form the test rests upon an empirical foundation of 
more than ten factor-analytic investigations across a pool of several 
thousand item; (3) the psychometric properties of the scales (e.g. 
reliabilities, validities etc.) have been explored and reported for a 
variety of samples and conditions and (4) research findings involving 
the test provide the test user with a rich base of criterion evidence in 
industrial, clinical, social and educational psychology. For analysis of 
personality the raw scores derived on each scale are converted into 
sten scores (standard ten) and profiling done. For the purpose of 
comparison, norm tables are available for general adult population and
various other chunks of population (men and women separately).

Eysenck Personality Inventory.

The EPI (latest version called Eysenck Personality Questionnaire) is a modified version of Maudsley Personality Inventory which "sets out to measure two major dimensions of personality, extroversion and neuroticism" (Eysenck, 1959, 1960). The inventory consists of two parallel forms, thus making possible retesting after experimental treatment without interference from memory factors. Apart from Extraversion and Neuroticism Scales, the EPI contains a Lie scale (in EPQ it is called social desirability scale or psychoticism) which may be used to eliminate subjects showing 'desirability response set.'

Direct evidence is available of the validity of the EPI as a descriptive instrument of the behaviour manifestations of personality. For the analysis of data the procedure is very simple because raw scores are not at all converted into any standard scores. The raw scores themselves show the presence or absence of the major dimensions of personality. Norms for general and special chunks of population are available for comparative purposes.

Projective Tests.

While paper-and-pencil questionnaires have the limitation of having closed-ended response patterns, projective tests are marked by open-ended wide latitude of responses in order to enable the
psychologists to tap unconscious thoughts and feelings of the subjects. Because the projective tests do not have obviously correct and socially more or less desirable responses, it is assumed that subjects "project" their own thought or feelings into their responses. This technique derives its substance from the psychoanalytic theory which predicts that people will resort to hidden or inner processes to "project" structure onto ambiguous stimuli. The two most commonly used projective tests are the Rorschach Ink-blot Test and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)

**The Rorschach Ink-Blot Test.**

Constructed by a Swiss psychiatrist Harmin Rorschach the test consists of 10 cards showing ink-blots which are presented to the subject one at a time in a prescribed sequence. The subject is asked to examine each of the blots and say what it looks like or brings to mind. Scoring of the responses is highly complex, involving extensive training in one of the several systems by which the responses are coded, scored and interpreted. However all the various systems agree that the major scoring categories for each response include its location (where the subject focuses attention), its determinants (colour, implied movement, shading, particular form etc.) and its content (human, non-human, animal or object). The response of the subject can be interpreted in a variety of ways. The interpretations are subjective in nature. Even the highly
experienced psychologists using this test do not agree with one another as to how responses be interpreted.

Fingers have been raised on the validity of the Rorschach Ink-blot Test as a diagnostic tool. Most clinical psychologists use this test in conjunction with some other tests and interpret the response in the context of information collected from other sources. As a result it is very difficult to assess the capacity of this instrument by itself to provide valid personality assessments and accurate predictions of behaviour. Despite claims and counter-claims on its effectiveness as a personality assessment tool the test has continued to remain in use copiously.

**The Thematic Apperception Test.**

Developed by Henry Murray the TAT aims to measure the need for achievement and other human motives. Later on it was refined (Mc Clelland 1953) to be an effective psychological instrument. It asks the subjects to make up stories about a series of ambiguous pictures, the idea being that people will project into the stories their own motives, interests and values. Precisely the TAT consists of 30 cards that depict various scenes and one blank card. While recognizable all the pictures are vague and ambiguous: In the standard administration of the test the tester selects 20 cards on the basis of the sex and age of the subject who is then shown the cards one at a time and asked to describe what
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is going on in each scene; what the characters are thinking and feeling, what led up to the portrayed situation and what its outcome will be.

Disclosing the underlying assumptions in developing the T.A.T., Murray (1938) remarked, "The test is based on the well-recognized fact that when a person interprets an ambiguous social situation, he is apt to expose his own personality as much as the phenomenon to which he is attending". Even though formal systems for scoring and interpreting TAT responses are available most clinical psychologists prefer to rely on their own impassionate and subjective assessments. Undoubtedly there are limitations in the total procedure of the TAT, the test seems to have shown sufficiently high validity when used as a research tool under controlled conditions.

Summing up the issue, it would not be inappropriate to say that although a wide range of methods is used to assess personality, none is without limitations. Most psychologists agree that there is scope for refinement in techniques to understand distinctive needs, values and patterns of behaviour that characterize individuals adaptations to the situations of their lives. Life situations are extremely dynamic, so is human interaction with the environment, making personality a difficult proposition to understand and assess in its totality.

d. Socio-economic status

Status refers to one's rank in the social system as perceived by
other members of the society. The concept of social class describes a
group. Status is a psychological notion created by social comparisons.

Every individual measures the status level accorded to him and
strives to maintain it or increase it. It may be impossible to create a
society devoid of status differences. Historical records going back
thousands of years demonstrate that status hierarchies existed in an-
cient China, India and Africa, as well as in the more familiar societies
of Europe and the America.

Writing mostly in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Karl
Marx advanced what is undoubtedly the most influential analysis of
social stratification. He began with the premise that a social
organization’s primary function is to satisfy the basic human needs for
food, clothing, and shelter. To accomplish this end the society must
produce the necessary goods and services, and thus its productive sys-
tem is of fundamental importance. Marx believed that a person’s eco-
nomic condition predisposes him to develop particular social, political
and economic condition predisposes him to develop particular social,
political, and economic attitudes. His role in the productive system
theoretically tends to shape much of his outlook on life. His economic
role could especially cause him to feel alienated.

While Marxists and others highlight the conflict within society,
other theorists, generally labelled as functionalists, emphasize the
conerence and stability of social systems. For the Marxists, high rank comes from control over economic resources, while the functionalists say that the high status individuals satisfy any of a broad spectrum of psychological and social as well as economic needs. In a way, however, the functionalists also emphasize a single type of social differentation. Instead of focusing on economic power, they stress status-honorable prestige. What an individual possesses, the qualities he has, the performance he displays—all determine his esteem in other people's eyes. The person’s position in his culture’s social hierarchy is ultimately a function of his prestige, and his motivation to climb the social ladder is supposedly impelled by a yearning for prestige.

....what human beings as social animals most require to satisfy their ego needs is recognition from others. Beyond a certain point, economic rewards and power are valued, not for themselves but because economic or power positions are symbolic indicators of high status.” -Lipset, S.M. (1968).

However, many people won't obtain the status goals their society has taught them to seek. Various writers have suggested that status frustrations are at the root of much of the juvenile delinquency displayed by working class boys. Although many analysis have viewed the social classes an distinctly different groups of people who have similar occupations, incomes and education levels, the social strata
aren't completely isolated from each other. It may be better to think of social levels or strata than of discrete social classes. People probably think of themselves as being at a certain level in the social order rather than as belonging to a distinct group with common attitudes and beliefs. On the average, a person's occupation is an adequate index of his general social position, and there is wide agreement about the social standing of most occupations.

A person's position in the social order affects the behaviour and feeling of others toward him and his own behaviour and feeling as well. Persons with high social standing are regarded more favourably than those of low social standing. Economic and political attitudes are influenced to some degree by a person's occupational position, as are social attitudes and values. In fact, happiness, mental health, and general satisfaction with one's life are enhanced by having a high status job that calls for some independent thought and initiative and by the consequent economic security and sense of power of such an occupation.

Information on the Socio-Economic Status of subjects in research is one of the most frequently needed source for evaluating dependent variables. The concept of socio-economic status as the social class has been operationally defined in terms of major dimensions namely occupation, income, education and physical and material possessions.
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The symbolic social interactionists (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934) address their theory to the social person, whose "self is a cognitive structure of qualities (traits and attitudes) which develop out of interaction between the organism and stimulus events, mostly other persons." In the course of these interactions, the individual experiences himself not directly but only indirectly from a particular standpoint of other individuals, members of the same social group (Mead, 1934). This sociological theory offers perhaps the most extensive explanation of the relationship between social factors and the development of the self-worth. Self-Esteem, therefore, is considered a social construct which is heavily subscribed on the social environmental contengencies, since it is evolved in terms of social reality (Ziller, 1969).

A person is oriented with favourable or unfavourable attitudes towards himself in the light of the standards which are important to people around him. Individual's success is social status and its accompanying evaluative responses by others of the social group, have a high reward value to the person. This appraisal has a strong personal significance to him that gets bound down into the fabric of his life. Though, children are not by themselves exposed to attain the status which fetches favourable reaction from others, they share the benefits and privileges their parents enjoy in the social class.

Social status is one of the most striking indices of prestige and
success. Persons higher in social hierarchy have more prestigious occupations and higher incomes and tend to live in spacious and luxurious homes located in well laid out localities. These persons are considered more successful in life and they tend to receive material and social benefits that might prompt them to believe that they are generally superior and relatively worthier than others. It is reasonable to expect, therefore, that one's Self-Esteem varies directly with one's social background. Persons from lower social class are exposed to more learning conditions in which the relative inferiority of their physical and social situations may translate into self-feelings of inferiority, worthlessness and sumissiveness, Conversely, the upper class individuals are associated with conditions of occupational and social prestige and power, which help to promote a greater feeling of self-worth, confidence and dominance (Kulwant, 1967; Bieri and Lobeck, 1961).

The high Socio-Economic Status groups exercise a great deal of influence, enjoy certain rights and privileges and are accorded considerable prestige. On the other hand, a large number of deprivations and frustrations can be documented for low Socio-Economic Status groups. This has an influence on self-evaluation of the individual. The individuals from upper Socio-Economic Status groups, by virtue of enjoying greater social prestige and influence tend to evaluate themselves highly. High Socio-Economic Status groups can readily seek satisfac-
tion of various needs and wants. Fulfilment of material needs also contributes to contentment and satisfaction, which might breed feeling of adequacy.

Status refers to the differentiation of prestige and deference among individuals (Mayer and Buckley, 1970; Shils, 1975). Higher status is associated with social position, control over rewards and punishments or knowledge (Lenski, 1966). Lonner (1980) stated that status is a basic dimension in social experience and representation. People with higher status claim such status with displays of anger and disgust aimed at low status others while low status, individuals display sadness and fear (Conway et. al. 1999). People describe lower status individuals as more emotional (Dember, 1993).

III) OBJECTIVE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Following are the objectives of the present study

1. To study significant difference between the self-concept of male and female students.

2. To study the significant difference between the self-concept of high and low socio-economic status students.

3. To study the significant difference between the self-concept of high and low altruism.

4. To study the significant difference between the self-concept of introvert and extrovert type personality students.
5. To study the significant effect of sex (male and female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept.

5.01 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

5.02 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as self-confidence.

5.03 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

5.04 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as sociability.

5.05 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as emotional stability.

5.06 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as mental health.

5.07 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

5.07.1 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality
5.07.2 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

5.07.3 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as placid.

5.07.4 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as responsible.

5.07.5 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as persistence.

5.08 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

6. To study the significant effect of sex (male and female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept.

6.01 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

6.02 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and
socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as self-confidence.

6.03 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

6.04 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as sociability.

6.05 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as emotional stability.

6.06 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as mental health.

6.07 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

6.07.1 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as asendant.

6.07.2 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on tempera-
mental quality as vigorous.

6.07.3 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as placid.

6.07.4 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as responsible.

6.07.5 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as persistence.

6.08 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

7. To study the significant effect of sex (male and female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept.

7.01 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

7.02 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-confidence.

7.03 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and
type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

7.04 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as sociability.
sion) on temperamental quality as placid.

7.07.4 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as responsible.

7.07.5 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as persistence.

7.08 To study the significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

8. To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept.

8.01 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

8.02 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as self-confidence.

8.03 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

8.04 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low)
and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as sociability.

8.05 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as emotional stability.

8.06 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as mental health.

8.07 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

8.07.1 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as asendant.

8.07.2 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

8.07.3 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as placid.

8.07.4 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on tem-
perameptal quality as responsible.

8.07.5 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as persistence.

8.08 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

9. To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept.

9.01 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

9.02 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-confidence.

9.03 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

9.04 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as sociability.

9.05 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low)
and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as emotional stability.

9.06 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as mental health.

9.07 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

9.07.1 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as asendant.

9.07.2 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

9.07.3 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as placid.

9.07.4 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as responsible.

9.07.5 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as...
version) on temperamental quality as persistence.

9.08 To study the significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

10. To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept.

10.01 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

10.02 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-confidence.

10.03 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

10.04 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as sociability.

10.05 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-esteem.
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version) on self-concept as emotional stability.

10.06 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as mental health.

10.07 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

10.07.1 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as asendant.

10.07.2 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

10.07.3 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as placid.

10.07.4 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as
responsible.

10.07.5 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as persistence.

10.08 To study the significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

IV) HYPOTHESIS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Following null hypothesis have been formulated in the light of above objectives:

1. There is no significant difference between the self-concept of male and female students.

2. There is no significant difference between the self-concept of high and low socio-economic status students.

3. There is no significant difference between the self-concept of high and low altruism.

4. There is no significant difference between the self-concept of introvert and extrovert type personality students.

5. There is no significant effect of sex (male and female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept.

5.01 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and
altruism (high and low) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

5.02 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as self-confidence.

5.03 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

5.04 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as sociability.

5.05 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as emotional stability.

5.06 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as mental health.

5.07 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

5.07.1 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as asendant.

5.07.2 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality
as vigorous.

5.07.3 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as placid.

5.07.4 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as responsible.

5.07.5 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on temperamental quality as persistence.

5.08 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and altruism (high and low) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

6. There is no significant effect of sex (male and female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept.

6.01 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

6.02 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as self-confidence.

6.03 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and
socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

6.04 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as sociability.

6.05 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as emotional stability.

6.06 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as mental health.

6.07 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

6.07.1 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as asendant.

6.07.2 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

6.07.3 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on tempera-
mental quality as placid.

6.07.4 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as responsible.

6.07.5 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as persistence.

6.08 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

7. There is no significant effect of sex (male and female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept.

7.01 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

7.02 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-confidence.

7.03 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

7.04 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and
type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as sociability.

7.05 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as emotional stability.

7.06 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as mental health.

7.07 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

7.07.1 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as asendant.

7.07.2 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

7.07.3 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as placid.

7.07.4 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introver-
sion) on temperamental quality as responsible.

7.07.5 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as persistence.

7.08 There is no significant effect of sex (male & female) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

8. There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept.

8.01 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

8.02 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as self-confidence.

8.03 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

8.04 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as sociability.

8.05 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and
socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as emotional stability.

8.06 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as mental health.

8.07 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

8.07.1 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as asendant.

8.07.2 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

8.07.3 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as placid.

8.07.4 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as responsible.

8.07.5 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on temperamental quality as reliable.
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peramental quality as persistence.

8.08 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and socio-economic status (high and low) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

9. There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept.

9.01 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

9.02 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-confidence.

9.03 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

9.04 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as sociability.

9.05 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as emotional stability.

9.06 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and
type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as mental health.

9.07 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental qualities.

9.07.1 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as asendant.

9.07.2 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

9.07.3 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as placid.

9.07.4 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as responsible.

9.07.5 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as persistence.

9.08 There is no significant effect of altruism (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-
concept as feeling of superiority.

10. There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept.

10.01 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as intellectual ability & academic status.

10.02 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as self-confidence.

10.03 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as health & physical appearance.

10.04 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as sociability.

10.05 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as emotional stability.

10.06 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and intro-
version) on self-concept as mental health.

10.07 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as temperamental qualities.

10.07.1 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as ascendant.

10.07.2 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as vigorous.

10.07.3 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as placid.

10.07.4 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as responsible.

10.07.5 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on temperamental quality as...
sion and introversion) on temperamental quality as persistence.

10.08 There is no significant effect of socio-economic status (high and low) and type of personality (extraversion and introversion) on self-concept as feeling of superiority.

V) IMPORTANCE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Psychologists could not ignore the role that conscious self-concept play in determining and predicting human behaviour. It has become essential to construct self-concept as a psychological phenomenon an emirically verifiable data on the basis of adequate measurement and research design. It is further essential to free self-concept from philosophical assumption. This would enable for building up constructs like dimensions of personality and personality traits that confront them. It has become further important after the emergence of a consensus agreement over the role of self as a principle controlling factor. To study the relationship between self-concept and other determinants of personality. Hence psychologists that does not concern itself with the study of self can not justify its existence for the purpose it is meant (Deo 1964).

It can be further added that perception of oneself by himself is a great motivating factor for achieving destinations. Hence self-concept forms the nucleus of personality. The self-concept that
one develops through interpersonal relationship bestows a regularity. Rigidity and consistency on the behaviour pattern. Self-concept begins to develop from birth onward and through the differentiation process of “me” and not me” continuous throughout life.

The self-concept is the highest integrative level of the self-structure and is defined as those most highly differentiated perceptions, beliefs, feeling, attitudes and values which the individual views as part or characteristics of himself. Behaviour tends to be consistent with the self-concept and reflects the individual’s effort to maintain and enhance the self-concept. The students, self-concept appears to be the most important single factor influencing learning performance. The self-concept is such a major factor influencing development and learning. Consequently, the present study is an important attempt to develop a rich and rigorous explanation of self-concept of high school students.