



12-1-1971

## The Relationship of the Self-Concept and the Reflected Ideal Self to Various Components of Friendship

Dennis L. Johnson

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Johnson, Dennis L., "The Relationship of the Self-Concept and the Reflected Ideal Self to Various Components of Friendship" (1971). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3499.  
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3499>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SELF-CONCEPT AND  
THE REFLECTED IDEAL SELF TO VARIOUS  
COMPONENTS OF FRIENDSHIP

by

Dennis L. Johnson

Bachelor of Science, Washington State University 1970

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty  
of the  
University of North Dakota  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

December  
1971

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SELF-CONCEPT AND  
THE REFLECTED IDEAL SELF TO VARIOUS  
COMPONENTS OF FRIENDSHIP

Dennis L. Johnson, Master of Arts

The University of North Dakota, 1971

Faculty Advisor: Professor Paul H. Wright

This investigation was designed to examine some of the relationships between self-concepts, evaluation by others, and friendship. It was hypothesized that a person who is seen by a second person similarly to the way the first person would like to see himself will be more likely to form friendships with the second person, and more likely to see him as ego supportive than when such similarity does not exist. It was also predicted that people who see themselves as being quite different from the way they would like to be (unfavorable self-concepts) will be more likely to be involved in relationships characterized by strain and discord than will people who see themselves as being similar to the way they would like to be (favorable self-concepts).

The subjects reported for the experiment in same-sex pairs who were acquainted. Each partner completed the IAV which measures the subject's real and ideal selves, and was modified in this experiment to measure also the concepts of their partners. They also described their partners in terms of the ADF.

The subjects were divided into high and low groups on two kinds of discrepancy scores computed from the IAV. The first of these, the reflected ideal discrepancy was defined as the differ-

ence between a subject's ideal self and his partner's description of him. The self-concept discrepancy was defined as the difference between the way a subject says he sees himself and the way he says he would like to see himself.

The first hypothesis was supported with respect to VID, but not with respect to ESV. That is, the low reflected ideal discrepancy subjects assigned significantly higher VID, but not ESV, scores to their partners than did the high reflected ideal discrepancy subjects.

All results for the second hypothesis were negative. No significant relationships were found between the size of a subject's self-concept discrepancy; and the DTM assigned to his partner, the DTM he was assigned by his partner, or the DTM he assigned his partner plus the DTM his partner assigned to him.

This thesis submitted by Dennis L. Johnson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Paul H. Wright  
(Chairman)

Alice J. Clark

John O. Nee

Dennis L. Johnson  
Dean of the Graduate School

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation for the generous assistance and support that Dr. Paul Wright, my committee chairman, has given through all stages of the work on this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. John Noll and Dr. Alice Clark for the help they have given me.

My wife, Bette, also deserves a special note of thanks for her patience and cooperation in this project and throughout my academic career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	5
Review of the Literature	
Statement of the Problem	
III. METHOD . . . . .	25
Instruments	
Procedure	
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	30
Treatment of the Data	
Test of Hypothesis	
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	39
Reflected Ideals and Attraction	
Self-Concepts and DTM	
Conclusions	
VI. SUMMARY . . . . .	44
APPENDIX A . . . . .	46
APPENDIX B . . . . .	49
REFERENCES . . . . .	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean VID Scores for High Versus Low Reflected Ideal Subjects . . . . .	33
2. Mean ESV Scores Assigned by High Versus Low Reflected Ideal Subjects . . . . .	34
3. Mean DTM Scores Assigned by High Versus Low Self-Concept Subjects . . . . .	35
4. Mean DTM Scores Assigned to High Versus Low Self-Concept Persons . . . . .	36
5. DTM Assigned by <u>S</u> plus DTM Assigned to <u>S</u> for High Versus Low Self-Concept <u>S</u> 's . . . . .	38



## ABSTRACT

This investigation was designed to examine some of the relationships between self-concepts, evaluations by others, and friendship. It was hypothesized that a person who is seen by a second person similarly to the way the first person would like to see himself will be more likely to form friendships with the second person, and more likely to see him as ego supportive than when such similarity does not exist. It was also predicted that people who see themselves as being quite different from the way they would like to be (unfavorable self-concepts) will be more likely to be involved in relationships characterized by strain and discord than will people who see themselves as being similar to the way they would like to be (favorable self-concepts).

The subjects reported for the experiment in same-sex pairs who were acquainted. Each partner completed the IAV which measures the subject's real and ideal selves, and was modified in this experiment to measure also the concepts of their partners. They also described their partners in terms of the ADF.

The subjects were divided into high and low groups on two kinds of discrepancy scores computed from the IAV. The first of these, the reflected ideal discrepancy was defined as the difference between a subject's ideal self and his partner's description of him. The self-concept discrepancy was defined as the difference between the way a subject says he sees himself and the way he says he would like to see himself.

The first hypothesis was supported with respect to VID, but not with respect to ESV. That is, the low reflected ideal discrepancy subjects assigned significantly higher VID, but not ESV, scores to their partners than did the high reflected ideal discrepancy subjects.

All results for the second hypothesis were negative. No significant relationships were found between the size of a subject's self-concept discrepancy; and the DTM assigned to his partner, the DTM he was assigned by his partner, or the DTM he assigned his partner plus the DTM his partner assigned to him.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The question of why certain persons become friends while others do not has been one of considerable interest to social psychologists. A number of theoretical efforts in the broader area of interpersonal attraction have attempted to provide an answer to this question. Among the best known of these are the need complementarity and need similarity hypotheses. The need complementarity hypothesis is that people will be attracted to people whose needs are in some way opposite to their own. Winch (1955) proposed two types of complementarity that may lead to attraction. He suggested that similar intensities on opposite needs or differing intensities on the same need may lead to attraction. An apparently opposite view has been espoused by Izard (1960a). He has argued that similarity of needs or personality characteristics are usually a prerequisite of attraction.

A balance theory has been proposed by Heider (1958) as an explanation of interpersonal attraction. This theory assumes that people seek "a harmonious state, one in which the entities comprising the situation and the feelings about them fit together without stress" (Heider, 1958, p. 180). Perceived similarity to another person should then produce liking. Heider's balance theory has been expanded by Newcomb (1961). In this system, the attrac-

tion of A to B depends on the similarity of A's attitude toward X. Conversely, his own attitude and his perception of B's attitude are influenced by the degree to which he is attracted to B. When there is attraction, reciprocal reward occurs.

In recent years the concept of "self" has come to claim considerable interest in psychology. The most enthusiastic proponent of self theory has been Carl Rogers. For him, the self is "an organized, fluid but consistent perceptual pattern of perceptions and relationships of the 'I' or the 'me,' together with values attached to those concepts" (Rogers, 1951, p. 408). Thus this concept includes the idea of the self as an individual who is known to himself and of his evaluation of that self.

Rogers' theory of personality incorporates a phenomenological viewpoint. He asserts that every individual is the center of a private world of experience which is for the individual "reality." He further states that "the best vantage point for understanding behavior is from the vantage point of the individual himself" (1951, p. 494). He says that the self-concept "is available to awareness, though not necessarily in awareness" (Rogers, 1959, p. 200). Consistent with these views, the self-concept is operationally defined in terms of an internal frame of reference or the person's view of himself. The self-concept is operationally defined in terms of the discrepancy between the person's real self and his ideal self. The real self is the way he would like to be. The smaller the discrepancy between these two, the more favorable is the self-concept.

According to Rogers (1951), when a person perceives and accepts all of his experiences and organizes them into a consistent self-system, he will be more understanding and accepting of other persons. That is, a person who accepts himself is seen as more likely to accept others. Thus, his relations with other persons will be expected to improve if his self-concept improves. It is argued that a person who is threatened by an inconsistency in his own behavior, may be overly sensitive to certain aspects of the behavior of other persons. Such a person views experience defensively as threats, and has difficulty understanding other people because he is preoccupied with protecting himself against threats.

Some studies have specifically studied relationships between self-concepts and interpersonal attraction. One group of studies has looked at relationships between the favorableness of a person's self and the favorableness of his ratings of people in general, or of specific other persons. Other studies have looked at the relationship between the favorableness of a person's self-concept and how often he is chosen sociometrically by other members of a group to which he belongs. Still other studies have compared the self-concepts of friends to those of non-friends or of disliked persons.

Wright (1969) alleged that studies of interpersonal attraction have often overemphasized the antecedents of attraction while paying relatively less attention to the components and types of attraction itself. He further states that the types of criteria used to measure attraction are not very appropriate if one wishes to focus on some specific kind of dyadic relationship such as

same-sex friendships. These comments seem quite appropriate to research on self-concept and interpersonal attraction.

A device for measuring same-sex friendships on several dimensions has been developed by Wright (1969). This model consists of a criterion variable, voluntary interdependence, and a measure of difficulty in maintaining the relationship, as well as three possible benefits or rewards of a friendship. These benefits are ego support value, stimulation value, and utility value. It is felt that the use of this model should lead to a better understanding of the relationship between self-concepts and friendship.

## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### Review of the Literature

##### Propinquity

In the study of interpersonal attraction several hypotheses have been tested with varying results. Probably the most obvious of these is that of propinquity. People are most likely to become attracted to those with whom they have the greatest opportunity to interact. For example, it has been reported (Byrne, 1961a) that in college classrooms students were more likely to become friends with those whose assigned seats were near their own than with other members of the class. Such proximity is obviously necessary for attraction to occur. Propinquity, of course, does not insure that attraction will occur. Festinger (1953) reports that in the housing project where residents felt they were forced to live together residents were not attracted to their neighbors. Thus, as is noted by Lott and Lott (1965, p. 261), contact is "a necessary but not sufficient condition for attraction." Other frequently postulated correlates of interpersonal attraction include need complementarity, personality similarity, and similarity of attitudes and values.

### Need Complementarity and Need Similarity

The need complementarity hypothesis has argued that, in general, people will be attracted to those whose need patterns complement or are in some ways opposite to their own. The evidence for this view has come from studies with married couples on certain need characteristics. Kerckhoff and Davis (1962) found that need complementarity was important for seriously attached couples who had been going together for at least eighteen months, but not for those who had been together for a shorter period of time. Reilly, Commins, and Stefic (1960) found no evidence of need complementarity or mutual need satisfactions in pairs of same-sex friends. Newlyweds and couples married ten years or more were compared with randomly paired newlyweds by Murnstein (1961). With the couples who had been married a long time, similarity was a better explanation than complementarity. For the newlyweds there was no evidence of either similarity or complementarity. Levinger (1964) has been critical of the theory of complementary needs because no criteria are specified for predicting on which needs complementarity will occur. At best, the results on the need complementarity hypothesis seem to be ambiguous.

Though the findings have probably been more congruent with the personality similarity hypothesis than with the complementarity hypothesis, the findings are still somewhat inconsistent. Izard (1960a) found among high school students that pairs of same-sex friends were more similar on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) than were random pairs. In another study Izard (1960b) gave the EPPS to freshman college girls and



interviewed them six weeks later. In this study he found that similarity was an antecedent of attraction, but he failed to replicate this finding with college seniors (Izard, 1963). He suggested that his failure to replicate was due to the fact that the more mature seniors did not need to see their personality characteristics reflected in their friends. In a study in which subjects rated both themselves and a friend on needs, Secord and Backman (1964) found evidence for both actual and perceived similarity.

#### Similarity of Attitudes and Values

The evidence that friends are similar in attitudes and values is fairly strong and consistent. Newcomb (1961) studied two groups of students, all initially strangers, who lived together for a sixteen week period during which they responded to a number of questionnaires. Over this period of time there was a tendency for attractions to form between those who were similar. Byrne (1961b) had college students complete a questionnaire and indicate the issues that were the most and the least important to them. Later they were given a completed questionnaire which they were told was filled out by another student. These questionnaires were either in complete agreement or complete disagreement with the subjects' own responses, in agreement on important and disagreement on unimportant attitudes, or in agreement on unimportant and disagreement on important attitudes. The subjects then indicated how much they liked the person who had filled out the questionnaire and how much they would like working with that person. The results indicated that strangers with similar attitudes are liked

better than those with dissimilar attitudes. Also, a stranger with similar attitudes on important issues is seen as more desirable in some respects, than one with similar attitudes on unimportant issues.

Certain kinds of attitudes are probably important to everyone. Self-referring attitudes would seem to be among these. Few attitudes would be expected to be more important to a person than attitudes about himself. Thus, if agreement on important attitudes stimulates interpersonal attraction, agreements on attitudes toward aspects of the people involved should be of special interest.

#### Self-Concept Theory

For Rogers (1951), the most favorable adjustment occurs when the individual is able to organize and assimilate all of his experience into a consistent self-concept. Thus the person feels that he is in control of himself and becomes more spontaneous and less self-conscious. The individual then finds it easier to understand and accept others. This happens because the person who denies part of his experience must guard himself against threats and views the behavior of others defensively. "Thus in interpersonal relations, words or behaviors are experienced and perceived as threatening which were not so intended" (Rogers, 1951, p. 520). When the person is able to accept and integrate his experiences into a consistent self-system, this source of defensiveness disappears. So other people can be accepted for what they are with no need to defend against or attack them.

### Self-Concept and Acceptance of Others

Rogers (1951) has contended that the degree to which a person accepts other people will be related to the degree to which he accepts himself. The following studies have tested this assertion. In general, the results have supported the suggestion of a positive relationship between self-concept and regard for others. Two general methods have been used to measure self-concepts. Discrepancy devices include Q sorts and a number of questionnaires and rating scales with which the person indicates how he is and how he would like to be in terms of each of these items. His self-concept is then operationally defined as the sum of the differences between how he says he is and how he says he would like to be for all of the items. Direct measures of self-concept include questionnaires and ratings scales which ask directly how satisfied a person is with a number of aspects of himself.

In a therapy situation, Rudikoff (1954) reported that as the self-concept improved during therapy so did the concept of the "ordinary person." Both were closer to the ideal-concept after therapy than in the initial testing.

In a study by Zukerman, Baer, and Monaskin (1956), normal subjects and mental patients made ratings on a personality scale for themselves, their ideals, their mothers, their fathers, and people in general. For normals they found a significant correlation between self-acceptance and acceptance of father, mother, and people in general. For the mental patients they found significant correlations between self-acceptance and acceptance of one's

father and people in general. In each case, acceptance was measured by a comparison of the subject's self-perceived real with his ideal self.

Suiin (1961) had 82 male high school seniors do Q sorts using several Q-sort decks. One of these decks was made up of items that an earlier standardization group had deemed applicable to the self. The subjects sorted this deck according to their concepts of their real and their ideal selves. A second deck was made up of items earlier deemed appropriate for description of one's father. This deck was sorted by the subjects for their concepts of their real fathers and their ideal fathers. Likewise, a third deck consisted of items earlier deemed appropriate for a male teacher. With this deck, the subjects described a male teacher and an ideal male teacher. Then acceptance scores were computed in each case for fathers, selves, and male teachers by finding the discrepancies between the appropriate real and ideal sorts. Pearson product moment correlations of .32 ( $p < .005$ ) between father acceptance and teacher acceptance and .25 ( $p < .02$ ) between teacher acceptance and self-acceptance were found.

In one study (Omwake, 1954) both self-acceptance and acceptance of others were measured by three different instruments. Eight of nine possible correlations between acceptance of self and acceptance of others were significant. In general, however, correlations based on two instruments were lower than those where the self-acceptance and other acceptance scores were from the same instrument. The two lowest correlations involved the instrument which differed most in format from the other two. These findings

were interpreted as supporting the idea that response sets may inflate correlations between self-acceptance and other acceptance scores when both are measured with the same instrument.

One of the rare negative findings in this area was reported by Zimmer (1956). He had airmen rate themselves on eight evaluative scales. They rated a harmonious and an annoying peer on the same scales. In general, the correlations were low and insignificant. Also, no differences were found between correlations of self with harmonious peers and of self with annoying peers.

#### Self-Concept and Acceptance by Others

It has been suggested that a favorable self-concept will not only lead to better acceptance of others but generally to a better ability to get along with others. It has also been suggested that acceptance by others will increase the favorability of the self-concept. These suggestions have resulted in a number of studies relating favorability of self-concept to acceptance by others. Some, but far from all, of the findings have shown the predicted relationship.

Turner and Vanderlippe (1958) had a large number of college students do self and ideal Q sorts. They then found the 25 students with the highest and the 25 students with the lowest self-ideal discrepancies. Then they went into the dorms of each of these 50 students and had these students plus the 9 students with the closest rooms fill out 11 sociometric scales. They found that the subjects in the low self-ideal discrepancy group were rated higher on all 11 sociometric scales and significantly higher on 8 of them.

Coopersmith (1959) had children in fifth- and eighth-grade classrooms fill out a self-esteem inventory. They were also asked to name their three best friends. The researcher found a partial correlation coefficient of  $+0.29$  ( $p < .01$ ) between a discrepancy self-esteem score and frequency of sociometric choice when school achievement was held constant.

In a study with fourth-, sixth-, and eighth-grade children, Reese (1961) found significant curvilinear relationships between a rating scale self-concept measure and acceptance of others and acceptance by others. On the basis of self-concept scores, subjects were divided into three groups. The moderate group was highest on both acceptance of others and acceptance by others as determined from sociometric ratings. On acceptance by others each group was significantly different from the other two, with the moderate group most accepted, the low group least accepted, and the high group intermediate. No significant difference, however, was found between a discrepancy self-concept measure and the sociometric measures.

A clearly negative finding has been reported by McIntyre (1952). He had male college students in a dormitory fill out a questionnaire for acceptance of self and acceptance of others using a direct measure of self-acceptance. He also had three men make sociometric choices. He found a significant correlation ( $.46$ ) between acceptance of self and acceptance of others. However, he failed to find any relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance by others as measured by sociometric choices. He also failed to find any significant relationship between acceptance of others and acceptance by others.

In a similar study of freshman medical students Fey (1955) found a significant relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others, but no significant relationship between either of these and acceptance by others. He used a direct measure of self-acceptance. He did, however, find a significant negative correlation ( $r = -.27$ ,  $p < .05$ ) between the acceptance of self score minus the acceptance of others score, and the acceptance by others. Thus, those subjects whose self-acceptance relative to their acceptance of others was high tended to be rejected by others.

In a later study, Williams (1962) attempted to replicate Fey's study. He administered Fey's questionnaire to 74 members of two fraternities. He also found a significant positive relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others and failed to find any significant relationship between either of these and acceptance of others. However, he failed to replicate Fey's finding of a significant negative relationship between acceptance of self minus acceptance of others, and acceptance by others.

Some researchers have looked at changes in the self-concept in relation to interpersonal interaction. Manis (1955) had college men in a dormitory fill out a bipolar rating scale for their real selves, their ideals, and for seven other men at two different times six weeks apart. They also filled out sociometric questionnaires at each testing. He found that a subject's self-perception and a friend's perception of him became more similar over time. He also found a greater increase over time between an individual's self-concept and his friend's impressions of him

than between an individual's self-concept and a non-friend's perception of him.

Kipnis (1961) also used students in dormitories and used rating scales like those used by Manis. The rating scales were filled out for the person himself and for seven students living near him. Each student also filled out sociometric choices for ten situations. All evaluations were done twice with a six week period between tests. From the sociometric information a "best friend" and a "least liked roommate" were found for each subject. In this study, friends were generally seen as more similar to the self than were non-friends. Self-evaluations tended to change more when the friend was unlike the self and they tended to change in such a way as to reduce differences between the two friends. If the friend was seen more favorably than the self, then the self-concept became more favorable. When a friend was seen less favorably than the self, self-concepts became less favorable.

#### Self-Concepts and Friendship

Several studies have compared self-concepts of friends, a person's self-concept to his perception of his friend's self-concept, and a person's ideal self-concept to his perception of his friend's self-concept. In general, people seem to perceive themselves as having self-concepts more like their friends than their non-friends, but there is little evidence for greater actual similarity in friends' self-concepts. Also, friends are perceived to be more similar to a person's ideal self-concept than are non-friends!

Fiedler, Warrington, and Blaisdell (1952) had 26 fraternity men do four Q sorts. They did a real self sort and an ideal self



sort as well as sorting the cards the way they thought the group member they liked best would sort them and the way they thought the member they liked least would sort them. They found that subjects perceived those fellow members they liked best to be more similar to themselves than those they liked least. They also found that subjects perceive fellow members they like best to be more similar to their ideal self than those they like least. They failed to find more actual similarity in self-descriptions or in ideal self-descriptions to those they like than to those they do not like.

Lundy, Kathovsky, Cromwell, and Shoemaker (1955) had college students fill out a personality description blank describing themselves, their ideal selves, and their best and least liked fellow students of the same-sex. They found that negative sociometric choices tended to be similar to the self on items on which there was a self-ideal discrepancy. In contrast positive choices were more often similar to the self on items on which there was a self-ideal congruence. Positive sociometric choices were perceived as more similar to the self than were negative sociometric choices. Further they found that the greater a person's self-ideal congruence, the greater was the agreement between his self-descriptions and descriptions of his positive sociometric choices.

Thompson and Nishimura (1952) had eight pairs of same-sex friends rate 100 personality traits on a 9-point scale according to the Q-technique. He rated these on how significant the trait was to his own personality, his ideal personality, his friend's personality, and the personality of an acquaintance who was not

a close friend. Correlations were found for several combinations of sorts and mean correlations were computed across subjects. The resulting mean correlations were:

1. Subject's ideal with his evaluation of his friend	.67
2. Subject's ideal with his friend's ideal	.62
3. Subject's ideal with his friend's evaluation of him	.55
4. Subject's ideal with subject's self	.48
5. Subject's self with his evaluation of his friend	.47
6. Subject's self with his friend's evaluation of him	.38
7. Subject's self with his friend's self	.29
8. Subject's ideal with his evaluation of a non-friend	.06

McKenna, Hofstaetter, and O'Connell (1956) had 90 female college students do Q sorts for their real self, ideal self, and for their concepts of their first and second best friends. This study differed from that of Thompson and Nishimura in that the friends were not involved. They found that, in general, the personality pictures of friends resemble a subject's ideal self-concept more than her real self-concept. However, when self-ideal congruence is very high, friends' personality pictures may be perceived as more similar to the real than the ideal self. As the self-ideal congruence rises, so does the self-friend congruence.

#### Congruency Theory

Secord and Backman (1961) have argued that the locus of interpersonal behavioral stabilities lies in the interaction process rather than in the personality structures of the participants. They theorized that such behavioral stabilities are a function of the interpersonal matrix which is made up of a person's self-concept,

his interpretation of elements of his behavior associated with relevant aspects of his self-concept, and his perception of related aspects of the person with whom he is interacting. These writers postulated that interpersonal behavior is characterized by a striving for congruence among these items. They suggested several processes that may contribute to congruency: these included selective interaction with others, selective evaluation of others, selectively attending to congruent behaviors in others, evoking congruent responses from others, misperceiving others, misinterpreting his own behavior, and misinterpreting his own behavior, and selectively matching his own behavior with his perceptions of others.

Some predictions from this congruency theory were tested in a study using 31 girls living in a sorority house (Backman and Secord, 1962). Each girl was asked to rate herself, each of the other girls, and herself as she thought each of the other girls would rate her. They were also asked to indicate their frequencies of interaction with each of the girls. The results showed that the more a subject liked another person, the more she distorted the other girls' presumed perception of her in the direction of congruency. It was also found that the more a girl interacted with another, the more she perceived the other girl as having a congruent perception of her.

In another study (Doherty and Secord, 1971), roommates who requested a roommate change for the next semester were compared to those who did not. Girls in pairs that did not request a change showed more similarity between her self-rating and her rating of how she was seen by her roommate, between her self-rating and her

roommate's rating of her, and between her rating of how she was seen by her roommate and her roommate's rating of her than those who desired new roommates. The questionnaires were given again the next semester. More similarity or congruence was found on all three measures for those pairs that had stayed together than for new pairs of roommates.

#### Self-Concept and Hypothetical Persons

Griffitt (1969) used a questionnaire which the subjects first filled out for their real and ideal selves. Later, they were given a questionnaire which was already filled out and they were asked to rate the person who had filled it out. When the similarity of the hypothetical stranger's self to the subject's ideal was held constant, subjects were more attracted to strangers whose self-concepts were similar to their own. When the similarity of the hypothetical stranger's self to the subject's self-description was held constant, subjects were more attracted to a stranger whose self-description was similar to their own ideal self-descriptions. Total similarity was found to be more important than similarity to the real or to the ideal self alone.

Neuringer and Wandke (1966) administered the self-description portion of Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values to a large number of college students. They then chose the 16 members of each sex with the highest and lowest "self-concepts" according to this scale. They then showed these subjects a graphic rating scale and told them to imagine that they had a friend with the indicated degree of friendship. Then they were told to imagine how they would feel

about this friend if he committed a given act. Five of these acts were good (e.g., donate blood to a dying man) and five were bad (e.g., take candy from your little brother). The subjects were asked to indicate on a graphic rating scale how great a degree of friendship they would have for the person after he committed each of these acts. They found that high self-concept subjects changed their evaluations more when confronted with disruptive information. The authors interpreted this as suggesting that persons with high self-concepts are more susceptible to interpersonal conflicts. It is to be noted that their measure of "self-concept" was not a discrepancy measure of self-concept and was not considered to be a direct measure of self-concept by the authors of the scale they used. Also, this use of hypothetical persons in hypothetical situations seems to be rather far removed from real life situations.

#### The Friendship Model

Wright (1968, 1969) has recently objected to some aspects of social psychological studies of interpersonal attraction. One criticism he had made is that these studies have been too global. They have not described the variable believed to foster attraction specifically enough and they have attempted to look at attraction abstractly while ignoring the particular situation in which the attraction occurs. Thus, such studies do little to specify the conditions that will enhance a particular kind of attraction such as same-sex friendship. A related criticism is that such studies seem to assume that everyone looks for the same thing in their interpersonal relationships. Instead, Wright (1968) argues that different people may be looking for quite different things in their

interpersonal relationships. Striking inconsistencies in results with similar methods have led him to question the methods themselves. Among the questionable methods is "treating attraction conceptually as if it were the dependent variable but operationally (analytically) as if it were the independent variable" (Wright, 1968, p. 127). This results in a relatively gross treatment of attraction which may result in over generalizing resulting relationships. Another methodological objection is the frequent use of dyadic indices which are difficult to interpret.

Such considerations as those listed above have prompted Wright to develop his own friendship model and a corresponding measuring device. He notes that the previously used criteria of attraction are not especially well suited for focusing on particular types of attraction and that for these a "more stable criterion seems to be indicated" (Wright, 1969, p. 297). The resulting friendship model provides a more refined criteria of measurement. This approach focuses specifically upon already established same-sex pairs of friends.

The model provides for a description of friendship on several dimensions. The most basic variable to this approach is voluntary interdependence (VID) which serves as a criterion for friendship. People are friends to the extent that they voluntarily make aspects of their lives dependent on the other person. VID is seen as a measure of "the degree to which the plans, activities, and decisions of the acquaintances are contingent upon those of the other when both members of the pair are free to exercise a certain amount of choice" (Wright, 1969, p. 297). Thus, the friends

would be expected to choose to spend time together. This, rather than ability to communicate, liking or feeling comfortable with each other, is felt to be the basic fact of friendship.

Wright (1969) emphatically denies that all friendships can be expected to run smoothly and effortlessly all of the time. Rather, he suggests, and his research corroborates, the idea that within a given level of friendship, there can be considerable variation on a difficulty-to-maintain (DTM) variable. DTM is a separate dimension relatively independent of VID. The level of DTM in a relationship is an indication of the degree to which it "is marked by misunderstandings, arguments, and hard-to-resolve disagreements, and to the degree that the partners have to spend time clarifying communications, soothing ruffled feelings, and exercising restraint to keep the relationship intact" (Wright, 1969, p. 298). The variables affecting DTM may well be different from those attributing to friendship itself.

The idea that different people find different satisfactions in a friendship is implicit in the model. Also, the same person may find different satisfactions in different friendships. The model considers three rewards or benefits a person may obtain in a friendship. One such benefit, stimulation value (SV), refers to the extent to which a person "sees another as interesting and imaginative, capable of introducing the subject to new ideas and activities and capable of leading him into an expansion and elaboration of his present knowledge and outlook" (Wright, 1969, p. 299). Another benefit, utility value (UV), is "the degree to which the subject sees another person as cooperative, helpful, and in general,

willing to use his time and resources to help the subject to meet his own personal goals and needs" (Wright, 1969, p. 299). The final benefit, ego support value (ESV), "refers to the degree to which the subject sees another person as encouraging, supportive, non-threatening, and, in general, capable of helping the subject feel more comfortable and maintain an impression of himself as a competent, worthwhile person" (Wright, 1969, p. 299). These are considered to be the rewards of a friendship. They may serve to mediate factors within the individual such as personality variables.

#### Statement of the Problem

There is some evidence that people see their friends as being similar to their own ideal selves. Further, there is evidence that friends are seen as closer to a person's ideal self than to his real self (McKenna, et al., 1956). In the study by Thompson and Nishimura (1952), the three highest Q-sort correlations involved the subject's ideal self. These were the subject's ideal with his evaluation of his friend, the subject's ideal with his friend's ideal, and the subject's ideal with his friend's evaluation of him. Such previous results seem to indicate that a person's ideal self may be an important factor in the friendships a person forms.

If a person has a favorable self-concept, he is evaluating himself positively on most aspects. Thus, if such a person is seen as he sees himself, he is, in general, also seen as he would like to see himself. Such people would be expected to have friends who see them as they see themselves. This follows from balance theory, where the attitude X is some aspect of one of the people. A person with an unfavorable self-concept, however, is generally eval-



uating himself negatively. If such a person is seen by someone else as he sees himself, he is seen as different from the way he would like to see himself. Such people would be expected to have friends who see them differently from the way they see themselves. This prediction would also follow from balance theory.

Whether a person has a favorable or an unfavorable self-concept, it is predicted that being seen as he would like to be seen would be a reinforcing situation which a person would like to continue. It is further expected that people whose perception of a person is similar to that person's ideal self will be seen by that person as ego supportive. Thus, it is hypothesized that as the discrepancy between a person's ideal self and the way he is seen by another decreases, the VID and ESV that the first person assigns to a second will decrease.

The research evidence available seems to affirm the idea that people who have favorable self-concepts generally tend to see other people more favorably than do those with unfavorable self-concepts. Whether people who have favorable self-concepts are also seen more favorably by other people is somewhat less clear. The evidence relating to this proposal tends to support it, though some exceptions have been reported. Thus, we have evidence that people with favorable self-concepts see others more favorably and are seen more favorably by others than are those with less favorable self-concepts.

These findings, however, tell us nothing about what goes on within the friendships of high and low self-concept people. It seems reasonable to believe that although both types of people have

friends, the friendships formed by these two types of people may differ in some ways. One possible type of difference is that there would be less tension and discord in friendships of low self-concept people. The writings of some self-concept theorists (e.g., Rogers, 1951) seem to suggest that people with favorable self-concepts would be easier to get along with and have generally smoother relationships with other people.

The second hypothesis to be tested in this study is that as the people with unfavorable self-concepts will tend to be in relationships characterized by more DTM than people with favorable self-concepts. Specifically, it is predicted that compared to people with favorable self-concepts, people with unfavorable self-concepts will assign a higher degree of DTM to their relationships and will have a higher degree of DTM assigned to their friendly relationships by their partners in these relationships. Further, it is predicted that the total DTM in a relationship will increase as a function of the sum of the self-ideal discrepancies of the participants.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

The subjects of this study were pairs of same-sex acquaintances. In each case at least one member of the pair was enrolled in an undergraduate psychology class in which participation in research was a course requirement. Both members of some pairs were enrolled in such classes. In such cases, both of them received course credit for participation. The members of these pairs came to the experiment together. They were each asked to fill out two questionnaires. One was a friendship scale. The other was a self-concept scale.

#### Instruments

##### Index of Adjustment and Values

The Index of Adjustment and Values was developed by Bills, Vance, and McLean (1951) as an operational definition of Rogers' conception of self-concept. This scale is made up of 49 adjectives which the subject is asked to rate on several scales. In column I, the subject responds to each of the 49 words in the sentence "I am a(an) \_\_\_\_\_ person" with a number 1 through 5. The number 1 indicates seldom, 2 indicates occasionally, 3 indicates about half of the time, 4 indicates a good deal of the time, 5 indicates most of the time. In column II, he is asked simply, "How do you feel about being this way?" He again marks a 5-point scale from 1 indi-

cating "very much dislike" to 5 indicating "very much like." In column III, the subject responds to the sentence, "I would like to be a(an) \_\_\_\_\_ person," with the number 1 though 5 having the same meaning as in column I. A fourth column is sometimes added in which the subject is asked how often people in general or people in a given reference group are like these adjectives. The IAV provides a measure of self-concept in terms of summed discrepancies between column I and III. In addition, column II may be used as a direct measure of self-satisfaction or self-concept.

In the development of this scale, 124 trait names were selected from Allport's list of 17,953 traits. Those chosen were selected because the developers felt that they were typical of traits frequently mentioned in client centered therapy. The 49 items which showed the greatest test-retest reliability on pretesting were chosen for the final form.

Much more information is available on the norms, reliability, and validity of this instrument than on any other measure of self-concept included in a comprehensive survey of self-concept measures conducted by Wylie (1961). The split-half reliability for 100 students on self-description (column I) was .53 while the test-retest after six weeks was .90. The split-half reliability for self-concept (column I - column III) was .87 in a group of 100 college students and .88 in another group of 237 college students. The test-retest reliability was .88 for self-concept (column I - column III) after six weeks with 175 of the original 237 students (Bills, Vance, and McLean, 1951).

In this study, a somewhat modified version of the IAV was used. Columns I and III of the original IAV were used as columns I and II of the modified version. Self-concept then was measured in the usual way as the sum of the absolute differences of the responses to the items in these two columns. Column II of the original scale was not used here because a second measure of self-concept was deemed unnecessary. The discrepancy measure of self-concept was chosen for two reasons. In the literature on the subject the use of discrepancy type measures predominates and it was deemed undesirable to go against this tradition in view of the lack of any demonstrated superiority of direct measures. Further, the use of the discrepancy measure resulted in a simpler questionnaire. Column III in this version was a modification of the question asked in column IV of the original IAV. Here the subject responded to the statement, "My partner in this experiment is a(an) \_\_\_\_\_ person," with a number 1 through 5 with the numbers having the same meaning as in column I.

#### Acquaintance Description Form

The Acquaintance Description Form (ADF) is the companion methodological approach to Wright's (1969) model of friendship. It is a person perception questionnaire which measures the level of each of Wright's friendship components that a person associates with a given acquaintance, the Target Person (TP). These components include voluntary interdependence (VID), the friendship variable; ego support value (ESV); stimulation value (SV); utility value (UV); and the difficult-to-maintain variable (DTM).

The ADF is made up of 60, five choice, multiple choice items. It has a scale for each of the 5 friendship components plus a general favorability (GF) scale, which is used to correct the "halo effect." The subjects respond by circling a numbered or lettered alternative. These responses are scored from 0 to 4. The scores for appropriate items are summed to give a raw score for each of the 6 scales. The GF scale is made up of 10 non-specific but favorable items. It is an estimate of the subject's tendency to make an undifferentiated favorable response to his TP. The raw scores are then changed by the amount that they are estimated to have been effected by general favorability.

Wright (1971) found that the test-retest reliabilities for the ADF scales after six weeks for 59 female and 103 male college students. The resulting reliability coefficients were generally high, but higher for raw scores than for corrected scores and higher for females than males. The raw scores reliabilities ranged from .85 (ESV) to .92 (VID) for males and from .88 (DTM) to .97 (VID and GF) for females. The reliabilities of the corrected scores ranged from .67 (ESV) to .79 (UV) for the males and from .72 (ESV) to .90 (SV) for the females.

#### Procedure

A total of 208 subjects participated in the experiment. They reported in same-sex pairs who were acquainted with each other. No criteria of the intensity or duration of the acquaintance was used. There were 30 male pairs and 74 females pairs. Both members of the pair were given the IAV and the ADF. They were told to fill out the IAV first, then the ADF.

The scoring of the IAV involved two parts. First, each subject's self-concept was found. This was the sum of the absolute differences between the responses to the items of column I and II of the modified IAV form. For the second part of the scoring, the questionnaires were treated in pairs. Again, the sum of the absolute differences between two sets of ratings were found. This time the differences were between the subject's ideal self-description (column II) and his partner's description of him. The median discrepancy of each of these types was found for members of each sex. For each type of discrepancy the subjects were divided into two groups, above the median and below the median.

The ADF scores for the appropriate scales were found. Using the GF score, standard corrections were made for the scores on the DTM and ESV scales. These scores and the VID scores then related to the discrepancy scores and the levels of discrepancy for the IAV.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Treatment of the Data

##### Discrepancy Scores

The IAV forms were scored to give two different discrepancy scores. The first of these discrepancies involves the difference between a person's real or perceived self and his ideal self. This discrepancy was computed by taking the absolute difference between a subject's response to column I (his real self) and his response to column II (his ideal self) for each of the 49 items on the IAV. These 49 differences are then added to give a discrepancy score. Because this discrepancy is used as an index of the favorableness of a person's self-concept it will be referred to as a self-concept discrepancy score.

To compute the second discrepancy used in this study, it was necessary to compare the IAV forms of both members of a pair. This discrepancy involves the degree to which a person's ideal self is reflected in his partner's description of him. It was computed by taking the absolute difference between a person's response to column II (ideal self) for each stimulus word and his partner's column III (partner description) response to the same word. The discrepancy score was then computed by summing these



differences for each word. Because this discrepancy is a measure of the degree to which a person's ideal is reflected in his partner's description of him, it will be referred to as a reflected ideal discrepancy. Although the responses of the two subjects contribute equally to this score, it will, for sake of convenience, be referred to as the reflected ideal discrepancy of the subject whose ideal self response is involved.

After these discrepancies were computed for each of the subjects, they were divided into high and low groups with respect to both of the discrepancies. The median was used as a dividing point. Because the distributions of these discrepancies were both positively skewed, scores falling at the median were considered part of the low group. The high group was thus made up of scores above the median and the low groups of scores at or below the median.

#### Tests of Significance

Because previous findings regarding sex differences in attraction have been reported, all data were analyzed separately for males and females. The VID and ESV scores assigned by S's were computed for S's in the high and low reflected ideal discrepancy groups. Also, the mean scores for DTM assigned by an S, DTM assigned to an S, and DTM assigned by an S plus DTM assigned to an S were computed for S's in the high and low self-concept discrepancy groups. The differences between these means for high and low groups were tested for statistical significance with t tests.

In addition to this comparison of high and low discrepancy groups, a correlational analysis was done. This analysis was done in addition to the previous one because it seemed likely to give a more precise indication of the relationships being studied and that it might detect differences obscured on the t tests by possible poor choices of cutting scores. Correlation coefficients were computed between the self-concept discrepancy scores and each of the three DTM scores: DTM assigned to S, DTM assigned by S, and DTM assigned to S plus DTM assigned by S. Correlation coefficients were also computed separately between the reflected ideal discrepancy scores and VID and ESV scores assigned by an S.

#### Test of Hypothesis

Results will be presented first regarding the hypothesis that the perception of a person by a friend will be similar to that person's ideal self. Then results will be presented to evaluate the hypothesis that friendships in which the participants have unfavorable self-concepts will be difficult to maintain.

#### Congruence of TP with S's Ideal Self

The first hypothesis predicted that a person who is described by an acquaintance similarly to the way the first person says he would like to see himself will tend to assign that acquaintance higher VID and ESV scores than when such similarity does not exist.

Table 1 presents the VID mean and standard deviations for the high and low reflected ideal groups of males and females. For the males it can be seen that as predicted the low reflected ideal discrepancy group had a higher mean VID score than the high dis-

crepancy group. The difference between these means is significant at the .05 level. The product moment correlation coefficient between the reflected ideal discrepancy and the VID a man assigned to his friend was  $-.152$ .

TABLE 1  
MEAN VID SCORES FOR HIGH VERSUS  
LOW REFLECTED IDEAL SUBJECTS

		N	Mean	Standard deviation	<u>t</u>
Males	high	26	22.346	7.022	1.752*
	low	34	25.882	8.330	
Females	high	71	26.775	6.632	1.888*
	low	77	28.663	5.483	

\* $p < .05$  (one-tailed test)

For females, the differences in mean VID scores were also in the predicted direction and significant at the .05 level. The correlation between a woman's reflected ideal self and the VID score she assigned her friend was  $-.104$ .

The first hypothesis also predicted that persons who describe an acquaintance similarly to that acquaintance's ideal self would be assigned a higher ESV score than in cases where such similarity

does not exist. The results pertaining to this hypothesis are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
MEAN ESV SCORES ASSIGNED BY HIGH VERSUS  
LOW REFLECTED IDEAL SUBJECTS

		N	Mean	Standard deviation	<u>t</u>
Males	high	26	18.923	4.269	1.074
	low	34	20.030	3.303	
Females	high	71	21.380	4.244	0.399
	low	77	21.623	2.934	

For the male subjects, the differences were in the predicted direction. This difference, however, was not significant. The correlation between the reflected ideal discrepancy and the ESV scores assigned by a man was  $-.160$ .

For the female subjects, the ESV means of the high and low reflected ideal groups were virtually identical. The correlation between this discrepancy and the VID score assigned was  $-.055$ .

#### Agreement of Real and Ideal Selves and DTM

The second major hypothesis predicted that person with unfavorable self-concepts are more likely to be involved in high

DTM relationships than are those with more favorable self-concepts. This hypothesis predicted that subjects in the high self-concept discrepancy group would tend to assign higher DTM scores to their partners than would those in the low self-concept discrepancy group. Table 3 presents the results needed to evaluate this hypothesis for males and females.

TABLE 3  
MEAN DTM SCORES ASSIGNED BY HIGH VERSUS  
LOW SELF-CONCEPT SUBJECTS

		N	Mean	Standard deviation	<u>t</u>
Males	high	26	22.462	5.085	1.066
	low	34	21.118	7.364	
Females	high	72	21.569	5.219	.795
	low	76	20.863	5.437	

It can be seen that as predicted the high discrepancy males assigned a higher mean DTM to their partners than did the low discrepancy males. This difference was not significant. The correlation between the self-concept discrepancy and the DTM assigned by the subject was +.126.

For the females the results were also in the predicted direction but not significant. The mean DTM in the high self-concept discrepancy group was higher than that in the low self-concept discrepancy group. The correlation between the self-concept discrepancy and the DTM assigned by female subjects was  $+0.074$ .

It was also predicted that subjects with high self-concept discrepancies would have higher DTM scores assigned to them by their partners than would low discrepancy persons. The results relevant for the evaluation of this prediction are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
MEAN DTM SCORES ASSIGNED TO HIGH VERSUS  
LOW SELF-CONCEPT PERSONS

		N	Mean	Standard deviation	<u>t</u>
Males	high	26	21.518	6.136	0.192
	low	34	21.706	6.745	
Females	high	72	21.541	5.592	0.774
	low	76	20.882	5.094	

For the males this difference was neither significant nor in the predicted direction. The members of the high self-concept

discrepancy group had a lower mean DTM score assigned to them by their partners than did the members of the low discrepancy group. However, the correlation between the size of a subject's self-concept discrepancy and the DTM assigned to him was  $+.084$ .

For the female group, differences were in the predicted direction but not significant. The members of the high discrepancy female group had a higher mean DTM assigned to them than did the members of the low discrepancy group. The correlation between the size of the women's self-concept discrepancies and the DTM assigned to them by their partners was  $-.017$ .

Finally, it was predicted that subjects having high self-concept discrepancies would tend to be in pairs where the DTM assigned by them to their partners plus the DTM assigned to them by their partners would be higher than for subjects having low discrepancies. The results for this prediction are shown in Table 5.

For the males, the differences were in the predicted direction but not significant. The high discrepancy group had a higher mean DTM assigned to them plus DTM assigned by them than did the low discrepancy group. The correlation between the self-concept discrepancy and the total DTM for the pair was  $+.095$ .

For the females the results were also in the predicted direction but not significant. Females in the high discrepancy group had higher means on DTM assigned by them plus DTM assigned to them than did the low discrepancy group. The correlation between self-concept discrepancies and DTM for the pair was  $+.059$  for the females.

TABLE 5

DTM ASSIGNED BY S PLUS DTM ASSIGNED TO S  
 FOR HIGH VERSUS LOW SELF-CONCEPT S'S

		N	Mean	Standard deviation	<u>t</u>
Males	high	26	44.038	9.796	.529
	low	34	43.441	12.701	
Females	high	72	42.917	9.263	.945
	low	76	41.474	9.173	



## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to investigate the relationships between a second person's evaluation of a first person and certain indications of friendship of the first person for the second. Specifically, an inverse relationship was predicted between the size of the discrepancy between the way a first person would like to see himself and the way he actually is seen by a second (reflected ideal discrepancy), and the degree to which the first person is voluntarily interdependent with the second and finds him to be ego supportive. A second part of the study investigated the relationship between the discrepancy between a person's real and ideal selves (self-concept discrepancy) and the degree of tension and discord in his friendly relations.

#### Reflected Ideals and Attraction

It was found that a person whose ideal self is similar to a person's evaluation of him will have a high level of friendship (VID) for the other than in cases where this similarity is lacking. This is in support of the hypothesis for reflected ideal discrepancies and is true for both males and females.

No evidence was found to support the hypothesis that a person who is seen by another similarly to the way the first would

like to see himself, will find the second person to be ego supportive. That is, no significant differences were found between ESV scores assigned by members of the high and low reflected ideal discrepancy groups.

These two findings together tell us that people show a greater willingness to continue to interact with persons who see them as they would like to be seen but do not necessarily find such people to be highly ego supportive. This lead to the question of what, if not a desire for ego support, is responsible for the greater desire for continued interaction in the low, than the high, reflected ideal discrepancy situation. A completely adequate answer to this question is not apparent.

One possible explanation for the present findings lies in the nature of correlational, as opposed to experimental, research. In research, such as this study, which is basically correlational in nature, any interpretation regarding the direction of influence or causation must be highly tentative in nature. Thus, it is possible that high VID is a determinant rather than a result of a low reflected ideal discrepancy. It may be that as people interact they find out each other's ideals and tend to see other people as generally living up to the ideals they express. Thus as interaction (VID) goes up, the reflected ideal discrepancy would be expected to go down. This could, of course, go on independently of any expected relationship between ESV and reflected ideal discrepancy.

The details of the relationship between reflected ideals and friendship are at this time unspecified. Two possible ways

of further delineating the nature of this relationship are suggested. Experimental studies which vary the reflected ideals and use friendship as the dependent variable should be useful. Longitudinal studies in which reflected ideal scores and friendship scores are obtained at various times should also provide insight into this relationship.

#### Self-Concepts and DTM

No relationships were found between self-concept discrepancies and measures of DTM. High and low self-concept discrepancy S's did not differ significantly in the DTM they assigned to their partners in the study, in the DTM their partners assigned them, or in the sum of these two DTM scores.

The predictions of self-concept theories such as Rogers' (1951, 1959) are somewhat vague in the area of interpersonal relationship. From these theories predictions have been made that people with more favorable self-concepts would be more accepting of others and more accepted by others than those with less favorable self-concepts, and that friends will have similar self-concepts. These predictions have been generally confirmed. The present study, however, interpreted such theoretical statements as suggesting that people with unfavorable self-concepts would be more difficult to get along with and likely to be involved in relationships characterized by high strain and discord.

It is emphasized that the present results do not necessarily contradict previous findings that people with unfavorable self-concepts are more likely to reject and be rejected by others. Wright (1969) has reported that the DTM variable measured by the ADF is rela-

tively independent of friendship. Thus, it seems possible to resolve this study with previous research by saying that people with unfavorable self-concepts are less accepting of others and less accepted by others in general, but that they seem to form relationships about as free of strain and discord as those of people with more favorable self-concepts. Perhaps people with unfavorable self-concepts form fairly harmonious relationships but fewer of them than do people with favorable self-concepts.

### Conclusions

The present study provides some support for the idea that friendship between two people is a function of the extent to which one of these people sees the other as being similar to his ideal self. This hypothesis was supported for the friendship variable (VID) but not for ESV. While people are more likely to desire continued interaction with those who see them as they would like to be seen they are not any more likely to find such people ego supportive. It is thus evident that it is not because of increased ego supportiveness that a person likes those who see him as being as he wants to be. No other reason for this relationship is readily apparent. The possibility that friendship affects reflected ideals rather than the opposite must also be considered since this was a correlational study. The present study also failed to find any relationship between favorableness of self-concept and the difficulty-to-maintain variable. Persons with unfavorable self-concepts are no more likely to be involved in relationships characterized by tension and discord than are those with favorable self-concepts. Whatever adverse effects an unfavorable self-concept may have on

a person's self-concept, it will not necessarily prevent him from forming relatively smooth, tension-free relationships.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

This investigation was designed to examine some of the relationships between self-concepts, evaluation by others, and friendship. It was hypothesized that a person who is seen by a second person similarly to the way the first person would like to see himself will be more likely to form friendships with the second person, and more likely to see him as ego supportive than when such similarity does not exist. It was also predicted that people who see themselves as being quite different from the way they would like to be (unfavorable self-concepts) will be more likely to be involved in relationships characterized by strain and discord than will people who see themselves as being similar to the way they would like to be (favorable self-concepts).

The subjects reported for the experiment in same-sex pairs who were acquainted. Each partner completed the IAV which measures the subject's real and ideal selves, and was modified in this experiment to measure also the concepts of their partners. They also described their partners in terms of the ADF.

The subjects were divided into high and low groups on two kinds of discrepancy scores computed from the IAV. The first of these, the reflected ideal discrepancy was defined as the difference between a subject's ideal self and his partner's description of him. The self-concept discrepancy was defined as the differ-

ence between the way a subject says he sees himself and the way he says he would like to see himself.

The first hypothesis was supported with respect to VID, but not with respect to ESV. That is, the low reflected ideal discrepancy subjects assigned significantly higher VID, but not ESV, scores to their partners than did the high reflected ideal discrepancy subjects.

All results for the second hypothesis were negative. No significant relationships were found between the size of a subject's self-concept discrepancy; and the DTM assigned to his partner, the DTM he was assigned by his partner, or the DTM he assigned his partner plus the DTM his partner assigned to him.

## INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

In column 1 below, use each of the words in this sentence, "I am a(an) \_\_\_\_\_ person." Indicate how much of the time this statement is like you. The number 1 indicates seldom, 2 indicates occasionally, 3 indicates about half of the time, 4 indicates a good deal of the time, 5 indicates most of the time.

In column 2, use each of the words in the sentence, "I would like to be a(an) \_\_\_\_\_ person." Use the numbers 1 through 5 as indicated above.

In column 3, use each of the words in the sentence, "My partner in this experiment is a(an) \_\_\_\_\_ person." Again use the numbers 1 through 5 as indicated.

	<u>Col. 1</u>	<u>Col. 2</u>	<u>Col. 3</u>
1. Acceptable	_____	_____	_____
2. Accurate	_____	_____	_____
3. Alert	_____	_____	_____
4. Ambitious	_____	_____	_____
5. Annoying	_____	_____	_____
6. Busy	_____	_____	_____
7. Calm	_____	_____	_____
8. Charming	_____	_____	_____
9. Clever	_____	_____	_____
10. Competent	_____	_____	_____
11. Confident	_____	_____	_____
12. Considerate	_____	_____	_____
13. Cruel	_____	_____	_____
14. Democratic	_____	_____	_____
15. Dependable	_____	_____	_____
16. Economical	_____	_____	_____
17. Efficient	_____	_____	_____
18. Fearful	_____	_____	_____
19. Friendly	_____	_____	_____
20. Fashionable	_____	_____	_____



	<u>Col. 1</u>	<u>Col. 2</u>	<u>Col. 3</u>
21. Helpful	_____	_____	_____
22. Intellectual	_____	_____	_____
23. Kind	_____	_____	_____
24. Logical	_____	_____	_____
25. Meddlesome	_____	_____	_____
26. Merry	_____	_____	_____
27. Mature	_____	_____	_____
28. Nervous	_____	_____	_____
29. Normal	_____	_____	_____
30. Optimistic	_____	_____	_____
31. Poised	_____	_____	_____
32. Purposeful	_____	_____	_____
33. Reasonable	_____	_____	_____
34. Reckless	_____	_____	_____
35. Responsible	_____	_____	_____
36. Sarcastic	_____	_____	_____
37. Sincere	_____	_____	_____
38. Stable	_____	_____	_____
39. Studious	_____	_____	_____
40. Successful	_____	_____	_____
41. Stubborn	_____	_____	_____
42. Tactful	_____	_____	_____
43. Teachable	_____	_____	_____
44. Useful	_____	_____	_____
45. Worthy	_____	_____	_____
46. Broad-minded	_____	_____	_____
47. Businesslike	_____	_____	_____
48. Competitive	_____	_____	_____
49. Fault-finding	_____	_____	_____

## ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

## Statements

This form lists some situations about your reactions to an acquaintance called the Target Person (TP). Please indicate your reaction to each statement on the special answer sheet you have been given. Perhaps some of the situations described have never come in your relationship with TP. If this happens, try your best to imagine what things would be like if the situation did come up.

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.
3. TP's ways of dealing with people make him (or her) rather difficult to get along with.
4. TP has a lot of respect for my ideas and opinions.
5. TP is a conscientious person.
6. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact him (her) just for the sake of keeping touch.
7. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
8. If I were looking for a job, I could count on TP to try his best to help me find one.
9. I can count on TP's being very easy to get along with, even when we disagree about something.
10. If I have an argument or disagreement with someone, I can count on TP to stand behind me and give me support when he thinks I am in the right.
11. TP is fair and open-minded.
12. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that TP and I could work at the same place.
13. TP is the kind of conversationalist who can make me clarify and expand my own ideas and beliefs.
14. TP is willing to use his skills and abilities to help me reach my own personal goals.

15. I can count on having to be extra patient with TP to keep from giving up on him (her) as a friend.
16. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying too much about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate or just plain silly.
17. TP is emotionally steady and even-tempered.
18. If TP and I could arrange our class or work schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.
19. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it wasn't for him (her).
20. TP is a good, sympathetic listener when I have some personal problem I want to talk over with someone.
21. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."
22. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.
23. TP is a hard-working person.
24. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him (her).
25. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinion, TP introduces viewpoints that help me to see things in a new light.
26. I can count on TP to be a good contact person in helping me to meet worthwhile people and make social connections.
27. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics he considers controversial or touchy.
28. TP has confidence in my advice and opinions about practical matters and personal problems.
29. TP is very well-mannered person.
30. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.
31. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.

32. If I have some more or less serious difference with a friend or acquaintance, TP is a good person for acting as a go-between in helping me to smooth out the difficulty.
33. I have a hard time really understanding some of TP's actions and comments.
34. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.
35. TP is an intellectually well-rounded person.
36. If I had no particular plans for a free evening and TP contacted me suggesting some activity I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with him (her).
37. TP has a way of making ideas and topics that I usually consider useless and boring seem worthwhile and interesting.
38. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
39. I can count on TP's acting tense or upset with me without my knowing what I've done to bother him (her).
40. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.
41. TP is a tactful person.
42. TP is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if he were in some sort of difficulty.
43. TP can come up with good, challenging questions and ideas.
44. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if he is not directly involved.
45. I can count on TP's being willing to listen to my explanations in a patient and understanding way when I've done something to rub him (her) the wrong way.
46. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP listens and reacts as if my thoughts and ideas make a lot of sense.
47. TP is generous.
48. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

49. TP is the kind of person from whom I can learn a lot just by listening to him talk or watching him work on problems.
50. I can count on TP to be willing to loan me personal belongings (for example, his books, car, typewriter, tennis racket) if I need them to go somewhere or get something done.
51. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.
52. TP considers me a good person to have around when he needs someone to talk things over with.
53. TP is a thoughtful person.
54. I try to get interested in the activities that TP enjoys, even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.
55. TP is the kind of person who is on the lookout for new, interesting and challenging things to do.
56. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.
57. I can count on TP to misunderstand me and take my actions and comments the wrong way.
58. I can count on TP to come up with really valuable advice when I need help with practical problems or predicaments.
59. TP is a helpful, cooperative person.
60. If TP and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and he (she) had to postpone his (her) trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

REFERENCES

#### REFERENCES

- Backman, C. W., & Secord, P. F. Liking, selective interaction, and misperception in congruent interpersonal relations. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 321-335.
- Bills, R. E., Vance, E. L., & McLean, O. S. An index of adjustment and values. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 257-261.
- Byrne, D. The influence of propinquity and opportunities for interaction on classroom relationships. Human Relationships, 1961a, 14, 63-70.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961b, 62, 713-715.
- Coopersmith, S. A method for determining types of self-esteem. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 87-94.
- Crandall, V. J., & Bellugi, U. Some relationships of interpersonal and intrapersonal conceptualizations to personal-social adjustment. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 224-232.
- Doherty, E. G., & Secord, P. F. Change of roommate and interpersonal congruency. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1971, 2, 70-75.
- Festinger, L. Group attraction and membership. In D. Cartwright and A. Kander (Eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1953, 92-101.
- Fey, W. F. Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others: A reevaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 274-276.
- Feidler, F. E., Warrington, W. G., & Blaisdell, F. J. Unconscious Attitudes as correlates of sociometric choice in a social group. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 790-796.
- Griffitt, W. B. Personality similarity and self-concept as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 78, 137-146.
- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960a, 61, 47-51.
- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity, positive effect, and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960b, 61, 484-485.
- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity and friendship: A follow-up study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 598-600.
- Kerckhoff, A., & Davis, K. A. Value consensus and need complementarity in need selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.
- Kipnis, D. M. Changes in self-concepts in relation to perceptions of others. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 449-465.
- Levinger, G. Note on need complementarity in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 61, 153-157.
- Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-309.
- Lundy, R. M., Kathovsky, W., Cromwell, R. L., & Shoemaker, D. J. Self acceptability and descriptions of sociometric choices. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 260-262.
- McIntyre, C. J. Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance by self and others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 624-625.
- McKenna, H., Hofstaetter, P. R., & O'Connell, E. J. The concepts of the ideal self and of the friend. Journal of Personality, 1956, 24, 262-271.
- Manis, M. Social interaction and the self-concept. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 362-370.
- Murnstein, B. L. The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle-aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 194-197.
- Newcomb, T. M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961.
- Neuringer, C., & Wandke, L. W. Interpersonal conflicts in persons of high self-concept and low self-concept. Journal of Social Psychology, 1966, 68(2), 313-322.
- Omwake, K. T. The relation between acceptance of self and acceptance of others shown by three personality inventories. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 443-446.



- Reese, H. W. Relationships between self-acceptance and sociometric choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 472-474.
- Reilly, M. Ste. A., Commins, W. D., & Stefic, E. C. The complementarity of personality needs in friendship choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 292-294.
- Rogers, C. R. Client Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A Study of a Science. Study I. Conceptual and Systematic. Vol. 3. Formulations of the Person and the Social Context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, 184-256.
- Rudikoff, E. C. A comparative study of the changes in the concepts of the self, the ordinary person and the ideal in eight cases. In Rogers and Dyamond (Eds.), Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Personality theory and the problem of stability and change in individual behavior: An interpersonal approach. Psychological Review, 1961, 68, 21-32.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Interpersonal congruency, perceived similarity, and friendship. Sociometry, 1964, 27, 115-127.
- Suiin, R. M. The relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance of others: A learning theory analysis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 37-42.
- Thompson, W. R., & Nishumura, R. Some determinants of friendship. Journal of Personality, 1952, 20, 305-314.
- Turner, R. H., & Vanderlippe, R. H. Self-ideal congruence as an index of adjustment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 202-206.
- Williams, J. E. Acceptance by others and its relationship to acceptance of self and others: A repeat of Fey's study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 438-442.
- Winch, R. F. The theory of complementary needs in mate selection: A test of one kind of complementariness. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 52-56.

- Wright, P. H. Need similarity, need complementarity and the place of personality in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1968, 3, 126-135.
- Wright, P. H. A model and a technique for studies of friendship. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 295-309.
- Wright, P. H., & Crawford, A. C. Agreement and friendship: A close look and some second thoughts. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1971, 2, 52-69.
- Wylie, R. C. The Self-Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Zimmer, H. Self-acceptance and its relation to conflict. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 447-449.
- Zukerman, M., Baer M., & Monaskin, I. Acceptance of self, parents and people in patients and normals. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1956, 12, 327-331.