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Self is hypothetical construct, by construct it means that we cannot use our five senses to prove that it exists, rather it is something that we say exist because we used a unifying principle to account for other things that we can experience with our five senses. Often it is described as, the self is the sum total of what a person already is – Body, behaviour, thoughts & feelings. This description implies that the self is a things but in reality it is not. More precisely the self may be defined as a hypothetical construct referring to the complex set of physical, behavioural, and psychological processes characteristics of the individual.

There are many such hypothetical constructs which were previously used or are being used in psychology. About fifty years before, one such construct was very popular in psychology, it was the hypothetical construct of soul. What soul means is hard for people to explain. Actually, it appears that, soul is simply the name that people give to what they believe is behind all these special qualities, the essence that serves to unify and explain them in the same way about self. It may be stated that it is the name that a person gives to, what he believes is the unifying principle tying together the many aspects of his personality.

In psychology, it is believed that, there are many aspects to the self, of them most obvious is the physical self, the body and all the biological activities going on inside it. Many psychologists tend to identify their selves with their minds, rather than with their bodies. However, they do not realize that when the body is endangered or actually damaged the sense of self become threatened. For example, suppose a person’s leg is amputed, this is related to body, but because of it there will be radical change in the self of the individual.
The second aspect refers to what we might call the self-as-process, the constant flow of our thought, emotions, and behaviour. The self as process includes our total experiencing of the world and the action that we take as a result of this mental experience.

The third aspect of self is more dear to sociologists, it is called social self; it consists of many faces that we show to others as we inact social roles; mother, child, doctor, patient, spouse & so on. People identify these roles very strongly. For example, when the individual is asked, who are you? his first response has to do with his role, the answers to this question are generally as follows I am a teacher, I am a student, I am an electrician or I am Hindu etc.

The fourth aspect of the self relates to the individual’s own personal views of himself. In other words, it is a self concept. Ones self concept is what comes to his mind, when he thinks of ‘him’. Every one of us paint a mental portrait of ones self and though this portrait of ones self may be very unrealistic it is his or her. It has immense influence on his or her thoughts & behaviour.

The fifth aspect of the self is related to the self concept itself. It is called the self ideal that is what you would like be. The self ideal is an extremely important determinant of our behaviour. If some one wants to be a doctor or an engineer then he is likely to act differently than a person whose ideal is to become a national sportsman. Ones self ideal determines his self concept. By measuring ones actual circumstances, against his self ideals, that he forms his self concept, could be understood.

Considering the different aspects of self, it becomes necessary to think about unity and continuity of the self. Admittedly, there is a difference between our social self and our private self. We play different roles in the society. On office or factory we are
employees, in home we are some ones brother, some others father etc., but in our private life we are different from these roles. But here it is necessary to remember that we defined the self as referring to a complex set of processes. The parts of the self are integrated and dependent on one another. If the physical self is damaged, the self concept will suffer. If an individual has low self concept then his thoughts and behaviour are most likely to be troubled. To put it in brief, the units of the self fit together to form a whole. In other words there is unity in the self.

Now let us think of continuity. Needless to mention that human beings behave differently in different situations. Before your seniors you may be docile, with your partner, you may be cooperative, but with your juniors you may be strict and disciplined. It means individual moves from situation to situation, in that case does the self remain the same? Gergen and Taylor (1969) demonstrated that the self concept too may be affected by the situation. They asked fifty officer trainee in the navy to write descriptions of themselves. After a month half of them were told as they would be sent off in two man work teams to solve intricate problems of fleet maneuvers, but their primary goal was to get along with their partners as well as possible. After the assignments had been made, the men were once again asked to describe themselves. Those assigned to the work teams described themselves as more logical, organized and efficient, and those assigned to the leisure teams now described themselves as more relaxed, tolerant and friendly. In short, the formers were better workers than they had a month before and the latters better "pals" than they had before.

The fact that we are capable of acting in different ways and even of seeing ourselves from several different angles does not mean that the self has no continuity. Our everyday experience tells us that people have definite personalities that last for a longer time. Each life have a covenance and continuity that are perceived both by the person and those who know him (Walter Mischel, 1976 p.493). Thus, our behaviour may vary but these variations simply reflect the complexity & flexibility of the self. However, it must be remembered that though the self has unity and some continuity it is
not fixed because it is a set of processes, not a finished product. Existential psychologists rightly pointed out that we are all gradually becoming, that is, we are constantly in a state of change. Our bodies grow and deteriorate, we learn new things and forget old things. Good experiences enhance our self concept and bad experiences deflate it. These changes constitute our adjustment, this is the process of directing our future self. The process of directing consist of three steps.

The first step in the process of directing the future self is to analyse the present self. Analysis is an act of studying something by examining its essential features and to relation to one another. Through the process of analysing we break the self down into specific feelings and specific behaviours. Secondly, we make attempts to discover how these elements of the self connect with each other and what are their causes.

The second step refers to objectivity. When we are proceeding to analyse ourselves we try to be as scientific as possible, for a scientific approach, the most important requirement is objectivity. However, while analysing the self it is not easy to be objective and our analysis is likely to be influenced by our feelings and desire. There are a number of unpleasant truths which we do not like to accept and we try to defend ourselves from ourselves.

The third step and the final step is the goal. The goal of our self analysis must be to understand ourselves by creating a framework within which we can organize our experiences of ourselves, that is, we must try to perceive the structure of our experience how that experience gave rise to that feelings. At first the experience is chaotic. Gradually, the confusion begins to disappear, once you learn the skills.

In case of self and self concept also, when you learn what causes what in your personal life, confusion will gradually give way to confidence. In other words we have
to develop insight. Insight replaces confusion with confidence and also fosters personal growth. Hence, insight is a major goal of almost every form of psychotherapy.

Psychologists have suggested procedure for self analysis which incorporates description, objects of description, methods of description and even functional analysis. However, while writing your self description you should follow three basic rules, they are simplicity, objectivity, and specificity.

Self Concept:-

It was already stated earlier, that the self concept is your own personal view of yourself. It is a mental self portrait and it has three dimensions.

The first dimension of the self concept is what we know about ourselves; generally, we select a list of traits that describe us, in addition to them we consider our age, sex, nationality, ethnic background, profession and so forth. Thus, a person’s self concept may be based on the following fundamentals, twenty five years old, male Indian citizen, studying engineering etc. These basic facts put the individual in a social group, such as age group, ethnic group, professional group and so on. Further the groups are labeled on the basis of affiliation such as follower of Congress, BJP, Shivsena, etc. Some time the classification is on the basis of religion, socio-economic status etc. In comparing ourselves to members of our groups, we label ourselves in terms of qualities we categories ourselves relative to others as spontaneous or restrained, generous or selfish, calm or hot tempered. The qualities that we ascribe to ourselves are in no way permanent, we can change our behaviour or we can change the group to which we compare ourselves. The important thing to remember with regards to the knowledge dimension of the self concept is that this information is rather shifty and subjective. Even information that seems totally fixed may be either highlighted or played down in our self concept.
The second dimension of self concept refers to expectations we have, a set of notions as to what we are also we have, another set of notions as to what we could be (Rogers 1959), in short, we have expectations for ourselves. These expectations constitute the ideal self. It is separate from the self concept. However, the expectations that constitute the ideal self, are also an essential components of the self concept. The ideal self differs considerably from individual to individual. Whatever our expectations or goals they constitute the power that propels us into the future and guides our action as we do.

The third dimension of the self concept is our evaluation of ourselves. We stand in judgment over ourselves, every day measuring what we are against the I could be or the I should be. The I could be referred to expectations for ourselves, and the I should be referred to our standard for ourselves. The resulting measurement is called our self esteem.

Regarding self concept, it is said that, self concept can be negative or it can be positive, our own view of ourselves probably falls somewhere between the negative and positive end. When a person develops a negative self concept, he knows very little about himself. There appears to be two characteristic types of negative self concept, in one, the persons view of himself is markedly disorganized, that is, he has no sense of stable and integrated self. This condition is common among adolescents whose self concept often become temporarily disorganized in making the transition from the role of child to the role of adult (Erikson 1968).

The second type of negative self concept is almost the exact opposite of the first type, here the self concept is too stable and too organised, this is a kind of rigid self concept. In both types of negative self concept, new information about the self is bound to cause anxiety. In other words, the self concept ideally must be both organised and
broad. The person with disorganised and narrow self concept simply has no mental categories to which he can relate conflicting information about himself (Sullivan, 1953).

If you place a high value on the virtue of humility, then you might assume that a truly positive self concept is rather dangerous quantity. The basis of the positive self concept is not so much admiration of the self, as it is acceptance of the self. The person with a positive self concept can understand and accept a great deal of disparate information about himself.

For example, the person can think I have no intention of committing adultery but there are times, when I wish I could, because the person can mentally absorb all this information, none of it possess a threat. The positive self concept is large enough to accommodate the entire range of the persons mental experience, his evaluation of himself is positive, he is able to accept himself for what he is, however, this does not mean that he never disappoint himself or that he fails to recognize his faults as faults. He feels no need to apologize for his existence. The love of oneself is a prerequisite for loving others. The person with positive self concept sets goal that are appropriate and realistic. There is every possibility that like every one else he may fantasize periodically, about being Bill Gates, but the objectives that he actually set for himself are realistic. There is substantial likelyhood of his achieving them. At the same time they are worthy enough so that achieving will be just cause for self praise.

The individual with positive self concept develops ideas about life, and decide how he should approach the world. Life to him is a process of discovery. He accepts it to interest him, surprise him, and reward him. As a result, he acts with courage and spontaneity and treats other people with warmths and respect. It must be remembered that the positive self concept, like the negative, is part of a circular relationship.
The self concept is an extremely important aspect of the self, it is capable of making your existence happy or miserable. It is necessary to study from where this powerful belief comes from and how does it grow.

Self concept is a topic interesting from two points of view. Social psychologists study the process through which individuals form and change their beliefs about themselves. Psychotherapists are concerned with the relationship between the nature of an individual's belief about himself and his adjustment; and in change in self concepts concomitant with psychotherapy.

The concept of self or selves has a definite socio-cultural reference: in other words, the interaction of the individual and socio-cultural environment is the antecedent of self concept. The individual's personality is organized around the concept of self, and this organization is hierarchical. In the family - group environment the most basic concept of self (primary concept) is acquired, and in other group environments outside the home other concepts of self (secondary concepts) are acquired. The origin and structure of the self have been presented in detail by Allport, (1943); Murphy, (1947); and Sarbin, (1952). An excellent brief account of the stages of development of self has been presented by Sarbin and Allen (1975).

The "foci" of cognitive organization, empirical selves, result from past experiences (see Sarbin, 1952). The first focus, the somatic self, arises from experiences that take place in the first few weeks of life. This initial cognitive structure is the basis for later differentiation of the self from non-self, but at this period the infant's own body is not differentiated from the external world. The primary differentiation made by the organism at this time is between the qualities of tension and quiescence. Later, in the maturational sequence, a second focus of self is organized around the receptor and effector process. At this time the self is quite undifferentiated. Beginning at about sixth month of age a third focus of development can be identified, the primitive construed self.
At this level of development of self the child begins to recognize differences between objects instrumental in tension reduction. With further maturation and additional social experience, the child can associate gestures with things and with persons.

Cognitive structure at the fourth stage, the introjecting - extrojecting self, sets the stage for development of the “socius”. At this stage during the fourth quarter of the first year, the child participates in play and other ‘pretend’ activities, and words are differentiated and limited.

During the fifth focus of development, the social self differentiates persons in terms of social roles. The child begins to show some skill in taking the role of the other at this stage and through language ability can assign qualities to the self (good, bad, stupid etc.).

In fine, then self refers to a cognitive organization of qualities. These qualities reflect the participation of the various empirical ‘selves’. The qualities of the self may be assessed by use of ‘I’ statements.

The brief account of the development of self does suggest that self is the product of the environmental factors.

Experience is a critical factor in development of psychological functions as well as in complex cognitive processes. Several studies have been reported demonstrating the varying amounts and types of experimental impoverishment or deprivation on psychological process (e.g. Bruner, 1961; Denberg, 1970; Jensen, 1968; Skeels, 1966; White, 1971, etc.).
The effects of severe deprivation on children parallel the effects recorded in several of the studies of laboratory animals (e.g. Reissman, 1962; Woodgush, 1963; Zubek, 1969 etc.). Findings of these studies on animals and on human demonstrate that deprivation may have pervasive unfavourable effects in adaptive (or intellectual) social and emotional spheres.

Skeels *et al.* (1998) demonstrated the effects of severe deprivation; and more pointedly the long term effects of deprivation were reported by Skeels in a further study. The findings of this study suggest that a planned programme of intervention with an enriched environment might have almost incalculable value for children who are born into poverty and condition of maternal, social and cultural deprivation. It also influences a person’s perception of who and what he is. It also casts doubt on the fatalistic theories of those who claim that a person’s fate is decreed in the first two years of life (see Skeels, 1966).

As was found by Skeels, environment can change a person’s perception of who and what he is, there is no doubt that the self concept of the individual can be influenced by the experiences gained through social and cultural environment, because self concept in one or the other way is one’s attitude towards oneself.

Kenneth and Mamie Clark conducted studies during 1930s and 1940s. The findings showed that Black children had self degrading attitudes (cf. H.E. Fitzgerald and J.P. McKinney, 1977, pp.202). According to Kenneth and Mamie Clark, to a large extent, every individual’s future is determined by the circumstances of his or her birth. Boys and girls born in to royalty become kings and queens, while youngsters born into slavery become slaves. Today for instance academic racists argue that Blacks are born less intelligent than Whites, and in so doing they apply a cruel assault on the Black child’s self concept. In large part a child’s image of himself and his future is a reflection of his socio-economic and ethnic background. Clearly, the future of a child living in the
slums will differ vastly from that of his peer in suburbia (Kenneth and Mamie Clark, Op. Cit.).

A crucial and controversial problem studied in psychology is that of intelligence. It is very difficult to determine what is more important in the development of intelligence: the nature or the nurture. Darwin stimulated a thought by arousing interest in the problems of heredity and mental inheritance, which was upheld by Galton (Galton, 1869). Inspite of disagreement about the inheritance of “intelligence” Galton’s work had preserved its importance for half a century. But faith in the immutability of intelligence dwindled during 1920-1930. Advent of intelligence tests popularized the common opinion that general ability must be thought of as operating within the culture. Since then there is no dearth of studies supporting either of these views (Carmichael, 1940; Cole and Bruce, 1966; Erloumeyer Kimling and Jarvic, 1963; Hebb, 1949; Jennings, 1930; Kuo, 1930; Mosley, 1925; Newman, Freeman and Holzinger, 1937; Padilla, 1935; Piaget, 1952; Searle, 1949; Tryon, 1940 etc.).

Concerning the relationship between social deprivation and intelligence in the current researches two hypotheses are prominent. The first hypothesis known as environmental disadvantage hypothesis assumes that individual differences in intelligence are predominantly attributable to heredity, although environmental factors can play some role (Jensen, 1969). According to Jensen (1969) hereditary differences account for 80% of the difference in IQ scores among middle class Whites and expects that these estimates would be equally high in other ethnic groups.

The second approach known as genotype distribution hypothesis is well in accord with what Kenneth and Mamie Clark called academic racist views. In a study Scarr - Salpatek (1971) revealed that advantaged and disadvantaged children differ primarily in what proportion of variance in aptitude scores can be attributed to environmental sources. They inferred that in lower class population, the heritability values were lower.
(56% to 60%) than they were for middle class sample or those reported by Jensen. Hunt (1973) in one of his studies inferred that heredity is a prime factor in such differences, but this need not imply fixed traits or a pre-determined course of development.

Experiences necessary for intellectual development are well explained in detail by Piaget (1970), and there is ample empirical evidence supporting the effects of environmental change (Klineberg, 1950; Tuddenham, 1948; Wheeler, 1942 etc; see Scottish Council for Research in Education Report, 1952).

Development of Self Concept:

At birth the individual doesn’t have a self concept, he doesn’t have a knowledge of himself. There are no expectations for himself, and of course no evaluation of himself. The reality is that the individual, at birth, has no awareness of himself as separate from his environment. The child do not know whether the thing he is holding is his foot or his toy and he doesn’t care also. The child experiences physical sensation - warmth, cold, pleasure, pain, but he doesn’t have the idea that these sensations resulted from the interaction of two independent factors, he and his environment.

The child has good reason to be ignorant of his independent status since, he is utterly dependent on others for the fulfillment of his needs, however this state of fusion with the environment do not last for long, slowly the child begins to differentiate between the me and the not me. Gradually he discovers that it was his thumb which he was sucking as the sense of self consolidates, the child begins to form an idea of the relationship between the me and the not me. The child learns that, the not me the world includes people, creatures who unlike the lamp do things for you and respond to the things you do. The child learns to place great importance on human beings especially parents since they fulfill or fail to fulfill the child’s most urgent needs, on this foundation the child begins to construct his self concept. It is based on the discovery of his physical
self as separate from the environment and the discovery of the importance of other people.

In the beginning the notions are vague. The experiences with physical pleasure or pain gradually get condensed. Though these early notions are vague they form the conceptual anchor for one's views about himself. If the individual is treated with warmth and affection his conceptual anchor probably consisted of positive feeling towards himself, but if he has experienced coldness and rejection, then the foundation of his future self rejection is laid (Cooper Smith, 1967). The greatest spurt of progress in the development of one's self concept takes place when he begins to use language. This takes place at the age of about one year. When the child learns to think in terms of words, he begins to see relationship among things and consequently make generalization. In the beginning the generalization is simple as I am good, I am small, I can dress myself and so forth. At this point the picture of the child which he perceive is an extremely rough sketch. However, the young child's vague self concept determines the nature of the future self concept. A child who consider himself unlovable tries to take to heart a rejection by nursery school teacher, since her judgment of him matches what he already believes about himself. Whereas a child who thinks of himself as lovable tend to ignore rejecting teacher since the information she is giving him does not fit into his mental picture of himself. As the child grows his self concept solidifies and become more resistant to serious change, this is perhaps one of the reason why Freud (1959) claimed that a lifetime of behavior is fairly well established by the age of six. The self concept of course continues developing throughout life, but it tends to develop along the lines established in early childhood.

**Sources of information for the Self Concept:**

To some degree we learn simply from ourselves. Our bodies teach that we are separate from the world, they also teach our relations to the world. When the child finds it difficult to reach cupboard, the child learns that he is a small creature. When he learns
to dress himself he thinks he is a capable person. Later on the major source of information for the self concept is our interaction with other people. An important proposition in this regard was put forth by Charles Cooley (1922). He introduced the notion of the looking glass self. According to Cooley we use other people as mirror to study as who we are. We imagine how we appear to other and how they judge us and this inferred appearance and judgment becomes our picture of ourselves.

There are certain special types of defence mechanism which shape the development of self concept. For example, through an intellectualization the person hides unacceptable feelings behind a smoke screen of fancy intellectual analysis and thereby avoids the pain of confronting these feelings head on.

Unlike intellectualization, denial is a rather uncomplicated defence, the person simply denies whatever it is that is threatening his self concept. The threat may be a memory, a feeling, or an actual fact.

Often, the individual make use of sublimation. In fact, sublimation is truly constructive. According to Freud (1930) civilization itself was the result of century of collective sublimation. These defence mechanisms affect the self concept. The defence mechanism are to some degree useful adaptive technique, we all resort to them, and according to Freud (1936) we have to resort to them in order to adjust to the demands made over us by reality and by our own consciences. Defence mechanisms can also prevent us from looking at ourselves realistically. In fact defence mechanisms are stop-gap measures, when we use them we are using our finger to stop a dam in the dour, but we have many fingers so we make use of different mechanisms.

Parents play important role in shaping the development of self concept. The infant depends on his parents for his food, shelter, and comfort and of course, for his survival. Obviously, the importance that the parent assure in the child's eyes cannot be
overestimated and because of their god like important what the parents communicated to the child has better staying power than any other information he receive throughout his life. Our parents are instrumental in establishing our expectation they provide us with a constant flow of information about ourselves. Most important is that our parents teach us how to evaluate ourselves. Researchers have found that even in adult life, people still tend to evaluate themselves as they feel their parents evaluate them (Jourard & Remy, 1955).

Next to the parent, the child’s peer group influences the self concept to a greater extent. After getting love from the parents the child needs the approval of the other children of his block or his class-room, if this approval is not secured the self concept is most likely to suffer. The child carves out a particular role in his peer group, this role has a profounding impact on his view of himself. By enhancing his role he reinforces his vision of himself as a leader or a goody goody boy.

Young children do not place much value on the accident of their birth, but their society does place value on such a facts. This value is eventually communicated to the child and incorporated into the self concept. In India the caste system definitely influences the development of self concept. The practice is still predominant, in cities as well as in rural areas. The child learns to perceive himself through the perspective of caste in which he was born, apparently in cities caste system seem to be not so prevalent, but in actual practice and behaviour it still persists.

The child who is born in lower caste feels inferior and it is almost certain that his expectations and achievements are stunted as a result. On the other hand, a child born in upper caste views himself as superior and accordingly develops motivation to fulfill the expectations and achievements. In cities and urban areas the picture is changing gradually, but the change is due, not to the children but to the society or caste, like our parents and our society tells us how to define ourselves.
Learning is another factor which influences development of self concept. Learning may be defined as a relatively permanent psychological change that occur in us as a consequence of experience (Hilgard, and Bower, 1966). Through the experience of falling in the bath tub and getting his nose full of water a child may learn to fear the water. The same principle may operate in the learning of the self concept. A fat child through the experience of listening to his classmate poke fun at his body learns that being fat is bad and therefore, that he is bad. In the learning of the self concept there are three important factors they are namely association, consequences and motivation.

In 17\textsuperscript{th} century, John Locke pointed out that we tend to think via association, these associations are learnt connections between different things. This process of thinking and valuing via associations is basic to the formation of the self concept. However, the most important association we ever make in terms of the future self concept takes place long before we are ever aware of such cultural stereotypes. One of the most crucial steps in the development of the self concept is the infants learning to value his parents as very special feature of his environment. In fact it occurs because the child comes to associate his parent with the physical gratifications that they give him such as food and physical contact. On this background it is clear that learning through association is a basic cause of our condition as social creatures and it be a well known fact that social interaction is largely responsible for teaching us our self concept.

For most of us virtue has seldom its own reward, we take the action that we take, because in the past these actions have been rewarded. The actions in the past have been punished, we avoid them; in other words, we associate the action with consequence. Learning via consequences is largely responsible for creating our standards for ourselves and consequently our self evaluation, for example if a child comes home with excellent report card, he is praised, and all love is given to him by the family members so the child learns the value placed on academic achievement. However, in case of academic failure the child is scolded. For every mistake the child is scolded, then there is a every likelyhood that the child may grow up to be a perfectionist about his own behaviour; in
other words, the standards against which we evaluate ourselves are simply the rewards and punishment of yester year.

Learning involves motivation. Motivation is the state of arousal that we experience while working towards a goal, the more value we attach towards reward, the more likely we are to engage in whatever action will produce the reward. In early childhood we learn to do the things which are approved by our parents. In fact, what we learn depends to a large degree on what is motivating us. Some of the psychologists have suggested that certain types of motivation are particularly powerful in the learning of the self concept. One such motivation is curiosity. Children try to explore everything that are within their reach, they spend many hours seeking out information about themselves and their world. The information they receive, as a result of their activity, has a profound effect. The other two motives which are helpful in the learning of the self-concept are the desire to achieve, and the desire for self esteem. In case of children and also adults problems in learning means the problems in the self concept.

Our environment and the people who inhabit it gives us feedback about ourselves, this feedback is eventually organized into a self concept. Sometimes there is insufficient feedback, the parentless children or the children whose parents are not interested in them do not get appropriate feedback, as a result these children are most likely to develop negative self concept (Cooper Smith, 1967). It has been argued that women have lower expectations for themselves than males.

Often teachers give much more attention and feedback to boys than to girls (Serbin and O'Leary, 1975). The result is, boys are more motivated to achieve than the girls. In our culture also, through society and through parents the boys are more motivated to achieve, also they are better instructed in how to do so. In the growth of self concept the quantity and quality of feedback seem to be an important factor, however, there should be a consistency in the feedback. Many parents tend to ignore
their children's misbehaviour and only and only when it is unbearable to them, they react with fury (Cooper Smith, 1967). In such cases the child never learn to discriminate between proper and improper behaviour, he simply behaves as he wishes. There is an another type of distractive feedback, here the parents through their disapproval impress upon the child that some part of experience is completely unacceptable. Regarding such unacceptable behaviours the parents do not provide appropriate information about the unacceptable behaviours as a result they are never assimilated into the self concept of the child. Such behaviour remain there as threats to the self concept rather than as accepted and manageable components of the self (Rogers, 1951).

Festinger (1957) through his theory of cognitive consistency and cognitive dissonance claimed that, one of the most powerful motive in human life was the drive for cognitive consistency. Cognitive consistency is the experience of having our beliefs fit comfortable with our another and of having reality fit comfortably with our beliefs; when two cognitions conflict with one another, the individual experiences the opposite of cognitive consistency, a state of mental discomfort called cognitive dissonance. In such cases the individual makes an attempt to resolve the dissonance by twisting one cognition to conform with the other (Festinger, 1957). According to Festinger, the individual will automatically resort to distortion in order to resist a challenge to what he already believe, this principle is one of the central keys to the development of the self concept. The subjects who had scored high on self esteem test tended to attribute their success to internal factors and tended to explain their failure has the result of external factor. The low self esteem subjects tended to explain their failures as failure of ability and their successes as the results of chance (Fitch, 1970).

The low self esteem subjects instead of giving themselves credit for their success choose an explanation consistent with their derogatory view of themselves. Often it appears that people with negative self concept crave the acceptance and approval of the others, but when they get it they distrust it, because it contradicts their expectation. It is but creation of cognitive dissonance.
Masculinity & Femininity

It is fairly recognized and accepted that a human is essentially a bisexual animal. On a physiological level, the male secretes both male and female sex hormones, as does the female. On the Psychological level, masculine and feminine characteristics are found in both sexes. Homosexuality is just one of the conditions, but perhaps the most striking one, that has given rise to the conception of human bisexuality.

Jung ascribes the feminine side of man’s personality and the masculine side of woman’s personality of archetypes. The feminine archetype in man is called the anima, the masculine archetype in woman is called the animus (Jung, 1945, 1945b). These archetypes, although they may be conditioned by the sex chromosomes and the sex glands, are the products of the racial experiences of man with woman and woman with man. In other words, by living with woman throughout the ages man has become feminized, by living with man, woman has become masculinized.

The distinction between masculinity and femininity is an essential element in most cultures. Gender is the primary social category and the basis of social classification and of social relationships. We grow up, become aware that the basic polarity is both antithetical and symbiotic. Recent research has demonstrated that the gender dichotomy is related to many other dichotomies in symbolic classification in western culture; for example, active-passive, instrumental-expressive, nature-culture, internal-external, analytic-intuitive, and agency-communion (Glennon, 1979). Children acquire knowledge of the cultural stereotypes of gender very early; they also learn gender is associated with anxiety and that there are different evaluations of masculine and feminine (Villian, 1976).

Stereotypical social classifications serve a number of psychological functions; they reduce complexity, they provide convenient definitions of “in” and “out” groups
and they provide simple models for emulation and for self definition. Stereotypes can also serve to defuse threat. Clifton, McGrath and Wick (1976), for example, found that the general stereotype of woman was sub-divided, particularly by men, into four categories, which they labeled “housewife”, “bunny”, “careerwoman” and “athlete”. The first two of these categories included different aspects of the general “feminine” predominantly “masculine” characteristics.

Activity and general competence seem to be incompatible with feminity. If females succeed, observer’s and agents tend to put the success down to luck or extra effort, whereas male success is due to ability (Feldman-Summers and Kiesler, 1974). When females fail, it is from lack of ability, when males do, it is from bad luck or laziness.

Recently our understanding of the traditional symbolic male-female duality has been enlarged by the development of various concepts of androgyny. Within psychology, there are two distinct formulations of androgyny.

The first is integrative. It focuses on the ways in which the sexes are more alike than they are different, e.g. the research of Bem (1974) and others. They devised sex role scales which broke with the traditional measures which polarised masculinity and femininity. Their scales measure masculinity and femininity separately. So an individual may be identified as “sex-types” (high on one and low on the other), “androgynous” (high on both) or “undifferentiated” (low on both). It had already been suggested that a balance of masculine and feminine characteristics was desirable and indeed it emerges from studies using Bem’s Scale that the androgynous person is mentally and physically healthier and more adaptable (Williams, 1979).

The second conception of androgyny is dualistic and dialectical. It recognizes that there are important gender differences, in the sense that there are definable
“masculine” and “feminine” styles of thought, behaviour and social interaction. The main problem is seen to be the under valuation of the feminine and the failure to acknowledge it, as a valid alternative to the currently dominant masculine principle. This model seeks to identify what is specific about the feminine, and about the “masculine” pole of the various other dichotomies, Gilligan (1977), for example, has found that there is a distinctively female way of thinking about moral and personal dilemmas, whereas males focus on issues of rights and justice, female are oriented to the interpersonal and relational. Several studies have specifically addressed Baken’s distinction between agency (individual orientation, focus on the self and self expansion) and communion (orientation to others, seeking the self as part of a social whole (Baken, 1966), this distinction which matches the masculine-feminine duality.

There is considerable overlap between these two notions of androgyny and in practice the distinction is not always sharp. The aim of both is to provide a more balance and accurate model of the person. The difference is in their implications for research and policy. The first conception implicitly assumes that a patriarchal society exaggerates and fosters gender differences, and that pointing out their social origins will ameliorate their potentially disastrous effects, clearly an aspect of the nature-nurture debate. The second conception recognizes the reality of gender differences and aims for a re-evaluation of the feminine, rather than for transcendence of masculinity and femininity. An understanding of the origin of gender differences is less important for this approach. What is at issue is the dynamic relationship between masculinity and femininity within society (in both practical and symbolic forms) and within the individual.

Sex-role orientation refers to the degree to which one incorporates into one’s self identity the traits associated with gender. Some of the characteristics and labels associated with the “masculine” and “feminine” principles are listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Principle</th>
<th>Feminine Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agency</td>
<td>- Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instrumental</td>
<td>- Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impersonal</td>
<td>- Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initiation</td>
<td>- Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal</td>
<td>- External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inner-directed</td>
<td>- Other-directed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The traditional view of sex-role orientation holds that masculinity and femininity are opposite sides of the same dimension. An individual who is highly feminine, in this view, is by definition low in masculinity. Indeed, as Constantinople (1973) pointed out, measures of masculinity and femininity have traditionally exploited this view, taking the measurement of one to be the opposite of the other. This traditional view has recently come into serious question. Masculinity and Femininity are separate personality attributes that can vary independently of one another (Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Because masculine and feminine attributes are actually two separate dimensions, it is possible to measure them separately. One instrument used to measure them is the Sex-Role Inventory (Bem, 1974).

Several terms have been proposed for the “masculine” and “feminine” principles. Masculinity and femininity are rather like a yin and yang of personality, essential elements both present to some degree in each human being. The “masculine” principle includes such elements as individualism, selfishness, alienation, denial mastery and
autonomy. It is highly instrumental orientation. The "feminine" principle includes elements of community, mystery, affirmation of feeling, participation and other-directedness. It is an interpersonal orientation (Brown & Marks, 1969).

Sex Role and Self Concept:

The sex of a person is determined at the moment of conception, although there is no apparent physiological difference between males and females for about the first six weeks. Male and female cells must unite for new life to begin, but only a woman can bear a child and only a woman can nurse it with milk after it is born. But does biology also determine sex-linked behaviour? If sex-linked behaviour were biologically inherited, we would expect males and females to enact pretty much the same roles in all societies. But they do not. Anthropological evidences indicate that it is human society rather than human biology, that determines the roles that males and females will play. A child learns sex roles from a variety of sources. In the early years, its parents are the most important influence. A baby boy is dressed differently than a baby girl.

From birth, the male child, like a female, is weak and dependent and cries easily. But he is trained to reject these "feminine" traits and become strong, independent and self-restrained. Though a boy's closest early contacts are with his bother, "he must resist being tied to her apron strings". This negative approach to male sex role development pressures them into "macho behaviour. They act as tough guys, aggressive and competitive. They do not show weaknesses or emotions. Female children on the other hand have a better chance for healthy emotional development. A little girl is not punished for being dependent nor is she discouraged from expressing emotions. The presence of her mother provides her with a model whose behaviour she can imitate. But all is not entirely smooth for the girl child. Prohibitions hem her in and discourage her from being independent. She is steered away from activities that teach competition and achievement.
All these result in the development of different self concept among the "masculine" dominated and "feminine" dominated individuals. Among the boys there are several who are docile, dependent and emotional, while among the girls many are found assertive, aggressive and independent. Probably the sex role they developed might have resulted in formation of such characteristics.

Sex role typing affects personality through the effect it has on the self concept. When children see themselves favourably through the treatment they receive from others, especially those who are most important to them, it will have a favourable effect on the self concept and, as such, lead to good personal and social adjustments. The reverse will be true if the self concept is unfavourable owing to unfavourable treatment from others. Children who are judged as sex appropriate, it has been reported, make better personal and social adjustments, then those who are judged as sex inappropriate. The former are favourably judged by the social group and the latter unfavourably judged (Hartley, 1969; Inselberg and Burke, 1973).

The effect of sex role typing is especially hazardous to personal and social adjustments when it conforms to the traditional sex-role stereotype. In the case of boys, it leads to an unwarranted feeling of superiority - a superiority complex based on the belief that all who are male are automatically superior to all who are female. In girls it leads to an unwarranted feeling of inferiority - an inferiority complex based on the traditional belief that all females are inferior to all males regardless of abilities and achievements. In neither case do children see themselves realistically. The wider the gap between their real selves and their idealized selves, the greater the chance that maladjustments will develop. Traditional sex role typing almost always leads to sex-cleavages. When they develop, the effects on personality are similar to those that result from discrimination due to racial, religious or other differences (Bohan, 1973; Gordon and Hall, 1974).
Ego Strength and Self Concept:

In personality “ego” and “self” are more or less similar in meaning and nature. It was Freud, who introduced the three basic imaginary concepts in psychoanalytic theory, however, later on the concept of ego became inseparable part of most of the personality theories and propositions. Freud’s anatomy of personality is built around the concepts of id, ego, and superego. Each of these aspects of personality is related to the other two both genetically and functionally. The id is the primary aspect of personality of which little is known. It is, in Freud’s own words, “a chaos a cauldron of seething excitement” (Freud, 1933).

The ego is “that part of the id which has been modified by its proximity to the external world, and the influences the latter has on it, and which serves the purpose of receiving stimuli and protecting the organism from them, like the cortical layer with which a particle of living substance surrounds itself”. Freud further characterized the ego-id relationship as one in which the ego represents external reality to the id, at the same time effecting a compromise between the blind, chaotic striving of the id and the superior forces and demands of the environment. If the id were not so protected it would be destroyed. The essential mechanism by means of which the ego accomplishes its protective function is through the “reality test”. Specifically, the ego, after observing the external world, searches its own perceptions in order to determine whether traces of internal impulses have crept in and thus distorted the memory picture. In this way the ego “dethrones” the pleasure principle in favour of the reality principle, which in long run “promises greater security and greater success.

The ego is a logical, ordered aspect of personality as it needs must be if it is to function effectively in dealing with reality. It is this latter aspect of the ego which Freud believes chiefly distinguishes it from the id. The organizational, critical and
synthesizing ability of the ego makes possible a life of reason despite the fundamentally animalistic nature of man. However, it must be emphasized that the ego’s power is derived entirely from the id and that its ultimate goal is to try insofar as possible to meet the demands of the id by compromising with reality. Consequently, the ego is in the position of an executive whose powers have been delegated to him from below. He must try to run the organization in such a way as to maximize both owner and customer satisfaction. In its attempts to mediate between the pressures of the environment on the one hand, and the demands of the superego and id on the other hand, the ego develops defense mechanisms which are essentially modes of behaviour that serve to relieve ego tensions.

For smooth sailing ego must be strong enough to keep proper control on the demands of id, as well as that of superego. Ego-strength, thus, influences the development of one’s self and personality. When the ego strength is poor, the individual finds it difficult to control the demands of id, which generally result in maladjustment and development of poor self concept. Due to poor ego strength when it is not possible to fulfill the demands of superego or to keep appropriate control over them, the individual is likely to develop distorted self concept. Hence, it is necessary to develop sufficient ego strength to form better self concept and a balanced personality. It is because of the three main aspects of personality, it is only the ‘ego’ which functions through the reality principle, is a logical and ordered aspect of personality. The superego is that aspect of personality which makes possible the processes of self observation and what is commonly called conscience. The self observation function of the ego is a necessary prerequisite to the critical and judicial aspect of the superego. In other words, the individual must first be able to stand apart from himself before he can serve as his own critic. For developing “actual self concept”, as well as “ideal self concept”, all these are necessary. Role of ego strength is, thus, unquestionable in the development of self.
Intellectual Capacities and Self Concepts:

How well the individual lives up to the social expectations has a marked effect on his self concepts. Wylie reviewed several studies showing strong relationship between adjustment and self concept. (Wylie, 1968, pp. 777-783). Intelligence provides to a person with the capacity to meet and solve the problems that adjustment to life requires. As the intellectual capacities develop the person constantly alters his awareness of the world and his perceptions of people, of situations and of himself. This is the direct effect of intellectual capacities. Indirectly, intellectual capacities influence the judgments other people make of the person. Their judgments affect his self judgments because they determine what role the social group will permit him to play and how it will treat him. Thus, adjustments are influenced both directly and indirectly by the level of the individual’s intellectual capacities and so also self concept.

All people follow much the same pattern of intellectual development, the rate of development and decline varies sharply. There are individual differences and even in the same person physical and mental traits develop at different rates, reach maturity at different ages and then start to decline at different ages and at different rates (Bayley, 1968; Gessell et al, 1956 etc.). Irregularities in rate of growth both physically and mentally are not uncommon when development is far ahead of physical development, the many adjustment problems that the person must face will have a profound effect on his self concept.

How a person uses his inherited intellectual capacities determines the quality of his adjustments. And the quality of his adjustments affect his self concept (Bayley, 1968).

This brief introduction regarding the history, nature and development, types of and factors influencing the self-concept makes it clear that self concept is a multifaceted phenomenon.
Theoretical views about self:

There are nearly as many views of self as there are self psychologists, however, the common element in all definitions of self is the character of self as an organizer that imposes a consistency of some order of behaviour.

Two fundamentally different approaches were identified by William James (1890) of which the first one regards self as a knower, or has an executive function; and the other regards self as an object of what is known. James saw no value to the self as knower for understanding behaviour and felt that, it should be banished to the realm of philosophy. The self as an object of knowledge he identified as consisting of whatever the individual views as belonging to himself, which includes a material self, a social self and a spiritual self. James apparently viewed the self as having a unity as well as being intimately associated with emotions as medicated through self esteem.

Cooley (1902) defined the self as, “that which is designated in common speech by the pronouns of first person singular ‘I’, ‘me’, ‘my’, ‘mine’ and ‘myself’. He noted that, what is labelled as self produces stronger emotions than what is labelled feelings that the self can be identified. Cooley’s “looking glass self” refers to an individual perceiving himself in a way that others perceive him.

According to Freud (1905) personality is made up of three major systems: the id, the ego and the superego. Each of the systems has its own functions, properties, components, operating principles, dynamics and mechanisms. However, id, ego, and superego interact so closely with each other that it is more or less impossible to disentangle their effects and assess their relative contributions to human behaviour. The ego is treated as equivalent to the concept of self, in Freud’s opinion behaviour is the product of the interaction among id, ego and superego.

Self, according to Jung (1923) is the midpoint of personality. All the other systems are constellated around self. The function of the self is to hold the other systems
together and provide the personality with unity, equilibrium and stability. Jung called self as the goal of life, for which people strive constantly but rarely reach to it. Like archetypes, the self motivates human behaviour and causes one to reach for wholeness specially through the avenues provided by religion.

"Creative self" was introduced by Adler (1972). The doctrine of creative self asserts that humans make their own personalities; they construct them out of raw material of heredity and experience. The creative self gives meaning to life; it creates the goal as well as means to goal. It is the active principle of human life.

George Mead (1934) expanded Cooley's concept of "looking glass self". He noted that the self arises in social interaction at an outgrowth of the individual's concern about how others react to him. In order to anticipate other peoples' reaction so that he can behave accordingly, the individual learns to perceive the world as they do. By incorporating estimates of how the "generalized others" would respond to certain actions, the individual acquires a source of internal regulation that serves to guide and stabilize his behaviour in the absence of external pressures. Mead believes that there are as many selves as there are social roles.

Allport (1937) believed that the structure and dynamics of personality are same. All the self or ego functions be called as appropriate function of the personality. Allport identified seven aspects in the development of the proprium or self-hood. They are bodily sense, self identity, ego-enhancement, ego extension, rational process, self image and appropriate striving. These seven aspects; rational thinking, cognitive style, and the function of knowing are all true and vital portions of personality and they have in common a phenomenal warmth and a sense of importance. Together, they might be said to comprise the "proprium".

The only motive that organism possesses, according to Goldstein (1940) is the self actualization. Goldstein believes that drives such as hunger, sex, power, achievement and curiosity are merely manifestations of the sovereign purpose of life,
that is to actualize oneself. Self actualization is the creative trend of human nature. It is the organic principle by which the organism becomes more fully developed and more complete. In other words, self actualization or self realization means fulfillment of needs.

Humans are capable of developing ideas about themselves as organisms because many of their organic processes become conscious. The sum total of these conceptions constitutes the symbolic self (Angyal, 1941). However, the symbolic self is not always a reliable representation of the organism that what a person thinks about himself or herself rarely yields a true picture of reality. Lecky defined personality as an “organization of values that are consistent with one another”. The self concept is the nucleus of the personality. The organization of the personality is considered to be dynamic as it involves a continuous assimilation of new ideas and rejection or modification of old ideas. The self concept, as the nucleus of personality plays a key role in determining what concepts are acceptable for assimilation into the overall personality organization.

A systematic theory of self was proposed by Rogers (1951). He defined the self, “as an organized fluid, but consistent conceptual pattern of perceptions of characteristics and relationships of the ‘I’ or the ‘me’ together with values attached to those concepts.” He stated that the self concept includes only those characteristics of an individual that he is aware of an over which he believes exercises control. There is a basic need to maintain and enhance the self. Threat to the organization of self concept produces anxiety. Rogers’ views have obviously a great deal in common with those of Lecky (1945) and Snygg and Coombs (1949).

**Aim of Study:**

In the study four dependent variables were used. Also, Ss were selected from two different cities Mumbai and Aurangabad. The aim of the study was to examine the effect of sex, intelligence, sex role and ego strength on the development of physical,
intellectual, social, moral, emotional and aesthetic self concepts. Also, to examine the differences in the self concepts of the Ss for Aurangabad and Mumbai.

**Objectives of study:**

As guidelines the following objectives were framed.

1. To examine the effect of sex on the development of physical self concept.
2. To study the influence of sex on the development of intellectual self concept.
3. To search the sex differences with regards to social self concept.
4. To measure the effect of sex on the development of moral self concept.
5. To find out sex differences, if any, in the emotional self concept.
6. To explore sex differences, in the development of aesthetic self concept.
7. To study the effect of intellectual ability on the development of physical self concept.
8. To examine the influence of intellectual ability on the development of intellectual self concept.
9. To search the differences in the social self concept of high IQ and low IQ Ss.
10. To find out the impact of intellectual ability on the development of moral self concept.
11. To explore the effect of intellectual ability on the development of emotional self concept.
12. To measure the effect of intellectual ability on the development of aesthetic self concept.
13. To understand the extent to which sex role influences the development of physical self concept.
14. To study the impact of sex role on the development of intellectual self concepts.
15. To examine the influence of sex role on the development of social self concept.
16. To find out the effect of sex role on the development of moral self concept.
17. To explore the effect of sex on the development of emotional self concept.
18. To find out the effect of sex role on the development of aesthetic self concept.
19. To search the extent to which ego strength influences the development of physical self concept.
20. To study the impact of ego strength on the development of intellectual self concept.
21. To examine the impact of ego strength on the development of social self concept.
22. To measure the effect of ego strength on the development of moral self concept.
23. To find out the influence of ego strength on the development of emotional self concept.
24. To study the effect of ego strength on the development of aesthetic self concept.
25. To find out whether the Ss from Auranganad differ significantly from the Ss from Mumbai on six different types of self concepts namely, physical, intellectual, social, moral and aesthetic.

**Hypotheses Tested In The Study:**

Following hypotheses were tested in the study. Males have significantly poor physical self concept than the females. The Ss having HIQ develop significantly better physical self concept than the Ss with LIQ.

1. The Ss having predominance of femininity develop significantly better physical self concept than having predominance of muscularity.
2. Those who have high ego strength have significantly better physical self concept than those having low ego strength.
3. Social self concept of female Ss is significantly better than that of the male Ss.
4. The Ss having HIQ develop significantly better social self concept than the Ss who have LIQ.
5. Social self concept of the Ss having predominance of femininity have is significantly superior to that of those having predominance of masculinity.
6. The Ss with high ego strength develop significantly better social self concept than those having low self concept.
7. There is no significant sex difference with regards to intellectual self concept.
8. Intellectual self concept of the HIQ Ss is significantly better than of the LIQ Ss.
9. Sex role is not related to the development of intellectual self concept; the Ss having predominance of femininity and those having predominance of masculinity develop more or less similar intellectual self concept.

10. The Ss with high ego strength develop significantly better intellectual self concept than the Ss with low ego strength.

11. Moral self concept of female Ss is significantly better than that of male Ss.

12. Intelligence is closely related to the development of moral self concept.

13. Those having HIQ have significantly better moral self concept than those having LIQ.

14. The Ss with predominance of femininity develop significantly better moral self concept than those having predominance of masculinity.

15. Moral self concept of the Ss having high ego strength is significantly better than those having low ego. Strength.

16. Females develop significantly better emotional self concept than the males.

17. Emotional self concept of the Ss with HIQ is significantly better than that of the Ss with LIQ.

18. The Ss having predominance of femininity have significantly better emotional self concept than those having predominance of masculinity.

19. Emotional self concept of the Ss having high ego strength is significantly better than that of those having low ego strength.

20. Aesthetic self concept of females is significantly better than that of the males.

21. The HIQ Ss develop significantly better aesthetic self concept than the LIQ Ss.

22. The Ss having predominance of femininity develop significantly better aesthetic self concept than those having predominance of masculinity.

23. Aesthetic self concept of the Ss with high ego strength is significantly better than that of those having low ego strength.

Culture is an important factor which influences the development of different self concept. In present study, it was hypothesized that the Ss born and brought up in Mumbai develop significantly better all the six different self concepts than the Ss who were born and brought up in Aurangabad.