Self Concept in Relation to the Personality – An Overview

N. Srividya

International School of Business & Media
Kolkata

Abstract: *Self-Concept is the basic level thinking of a person about himself and his surroundings. When a child is born, he/she cannot think upto one year. From fifth month onwards, he starts recognizing the people and the surroundings. By the time he/she turns one year, he can understand the feelings and the emotions of his parents and other family members in the house. His thinking process would start slowly and it evolves fully by the time he reaches three or four years. It takes time upto ten to twelve years to fully form a personality of the person.*

This paper tries to analyse the self-concept and the formation of personality of the person with the help of research. A sample of 468 comprising across all types of individuals is selected randomly and a questionnaire is framed and circulated taking into consideration a few parameters in connection with the self-concept and the corporate work environment. Suitable hypotheses are framed basing on the objectives of the study and are tested with data analytical tools. Findings and suggestions are drawn along with the limitations and further scope of the study.

Keywords: *Self Concept, Personality, Self-confidence, Locus of control*

Introduction

Self-concept means how someone thinks about, evaluates or perceives himself. In short, to be aware of oneself is to have a concept of oneself. According to Baumeister (1999) 'The individual's belief about himself or herself, including the person's attributes is known as Self-concept'.

Lewis (1990) finds there are two aspects in the development of self-concept.

• Existential Self

• Categorical Self

Existential Self

This talks about the being of a human being and his opinions about himself. Here the child starts to think about himself as an individual and tries to learn things by observation and imitation of his parents. This may happen around three years of age.

Categorical Self

After realising that the child is an individual called 'I', he tries to attribute few characteristics to himself such as 'I'm a boy, I'm 5 years old, etc.'.

This stage may start around 5 or 6 years of age. In the beginning, the children start framing their own attributes to themselves. But as they keep on observing their parents or peers or friends or siblings, their own ideas may get changed or altered dsepending on what they learn day by day from others.

They keep on evaluating and comparing their own propositions with others or themselves and reframe or alter the original ones. This cycling process continues.

Review of Literature

Various researchers have contributed towards this topic in several aspects. Few glimpses of research are as follows.

T Aruna Bharathi, Sreedevi Pettugani (2018) "A Study on the Self-Concept of Adolescents"[1]

This paper studies the self-concept of adolescents in twin cities of Hyderabad in Telangana state. It is observed that most of the adolescents have above average levels of self-concept. Few

parameters such as Temperament, Intellectual, Physical, and Social are considered for the study.

Weissman, A. N., & Beck, A. T. "The Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale". [2] (1980)

Here Cognitive View of Emotions is discussed in relation to Depression. Cognitive Triad is mentioned with the Concept of Schemas. Dysfunctional Attitude Scale is constructed and validated. Three other scales namely Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), Profile of Mood States (PMS) and Story Completion Test (SCT) are also studied and administered.

It is found that there is more diversity amongst high school students than depressed adults. Dysfunctional thinking is prominent only in few high school students.

James, I. A., & Barton, S. "Changing core beliefs with the continuum technique. Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy"[3] (2004)

This paper talks about Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT). Cognitive Behaviour Therapy consisting of eliciting, evaluating and changing core beliefs whether they are constructive or destructive. This paper offers a set of practical guidelines for the continuum technique for evaluating, targeting and changing core beliefs of the patients. The planning, management, and interpersonal skills are also highlighted in creating contexts.

It is found that lasting cognitive change is difficult to attain but with the help of continuum technique, comparatively a change that can exist for a little longer can be achieved.

Dobson, K. S. "Cognitive Therapy"[4], Washington, DC: APA Books. (2012)

This book takes a historical approach for the cognitive therapy. It also gives an outline to the cognitive therapeutic model with central tenets. This elaborates the therapy's process and studies the maladaptive schemas, automatic thoughts and cognitive distortions. This book overviews the evidence base and their strategies in addition to the collaborative empiricism. This book also suggests the future directions in the field of therapy.

Dobson, D., & Dobson, K. S. "Evidence-based practice of cognitive-behavioral therapy". [5] (2009).

This book is written by well qualified psychologists on the process of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. This book is evidence based on theoretical applications and concepts. This book provides clear description of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy in clinical research with empirical literature. This book is helpful in training the individuals in CBT disorders. This book deals with basic skills and case formulation in assessing and modifying the core beliefs and schemas.

De Oliveira, I. R., Powell, V. B., Wenzel, A., Caldas, M., Seixas, C., Almeida, C., et al. "Efficacy of the Trial-Based Thought Record: A new cognitive therapy strategy designed to change core beliefs in social phobia"[6] (2011)

This paper deals with Social Anxiety Disorder (SAD) and the impairment in functioning. A new and novel approach called Trial Based Thought Record (TBTR) in restructuring the core beliefs. This paper also talks about general psychiatric distress and the Conventional Cognitive Therapy (CCT). The TBTR (Trial Based Thought Record) is proved to be more efficient than the CCT (Conventional Cognitive Therapy) in reducing SAD (Social Anxiety Disorder).

As observed, most of the research is on the personality and the core beliefs. This paper mainly focusses on the self-concept and how it emerges into personality.

Research Method

Statement of the Problem

The problem for the research is that to find out whether there is any connection between the self-concept and the educational qualification of the person. As it is quite difficult to quantify self-concept, a few parameters are identified and considered for the research purpose.

They are as follows:

- Locus of control
- Self Confidence
- Need for Affiliation

- Need of Achievement

- Trusting Other People

- Attitude towards efficiency

- Risk-Taking Nature

- Self-Image portrait

Objectives & Scope of the Study

This paper tries to analyse the various parameters and their relation with education or learning of the person.

- To identify the major aspects of Self-concept.

- To study whether any impact is there on the parameters of the self-concept of a person due to his education

This research can be applied to all types of employees in corporates as the sample for this study comprises of all types of people across all the ages.

Sample and Sampling Size: 468 Random sampling

Population All types of people from all parts of India and covering all ages and educational backgrounds

Data Collection Method: Questionnaire.

A questionnaire was made with the above mentioned parameters of self-concept and it is circulated to various people with different ages and education levels.

Hypotheses

Various hypotheses are framed basing on the objectives of the study and they are tested with suitable data analysis techniques. The types of test can be categorized as follows.

- Basing on educational qualification

- Basing on overall level on self concept

- Basing on educational qualification

Ho 1: There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Locus of Control** of respondents.

Ho 2: There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Self Confidence** of respondents.

Ho 3: There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Trust towards People** of respondents.

Ho 4: There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Attitude** of respondents.

Ho 5: There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Risk Taking Nature** of respondents.

Ho 6: There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Image** of respondents.

Ho 7: There is no significant difference between **Qualification** and **Total Self Concept** of respondents

Tools Adopted: Descriptive Analysis, Charts, Group Statistics, t-test, Correlation.

Analysis of Data: The whole data is analysed using t-tests. For t-tests, the educational qualification is grouped further in two ways; Post Graduation (PG) and below Post Graduation (UG).

T-tests are conducted at the level of 0.05 significant level for all the parameters as shown in the hypotheses. All those hypotheses are tested individually.

Limitations

- The results hold good only for this research and the study. It cannot be generalised to all.

- The research is purely based on the data collected through the questionnaire.

- As the topic itself is highly subjective and also mostly deals with dispositions about one's self, the respondents might have given their opinions highly subjectively. Even while filling the questionnaire, they might have felt highly hesitant or scared to reveal their actual dispositions or thoughts about themselves, how much would the data be kept highly confidential and are meant only for research purpose and nothing else.

- The research holds good only for the dispositions of the respondents given. Neither can it be generalised to all the self-

dispositions of the respondents nor to all the people in general.

Scope for Further Research

The research can further be extended to how perception changes with self-concept parameters considered and thereby the personality. Even another research can be conducted how this self-concept affects the value system.

Applied Value of the Research

This research can be applied in medical field to correct the self-concept and the personality. In management also, self concept is important in career planning, career mapping, goal setting, etc.

Data Analysis

Before proceeding further to analyse the data, first the Validity and Reliability test is done.

For both the scales, Item Validity and Estimation of Reliability are considered and checked.

Item Validity

For item analysis, Internal Criterion Method was followed to select both suitable components and related items that correlate the most with total scores. Accordingly, for testing the consistency of the items of the selected domains, as well as for total scale, correlations were computed for the following three different sets of scores for each of the tests.

- 'Individual item score – Individual enquiry area score'.
- 'Individual enquiry area's score – Total score of all test items'.
- 'Individual item score – Total score of all items'.

Considering the correlation values (values above 0.40) the relevant items and selected components were retained for each of the final scales. The results of the correlation analysis of respective scale have been presented in the following tables

Consolidated Picture of Item Validity Measures of Core Beliefs and Who Am I (Self) Scales on the Basis of Data Collected from respondents (N = 468)

(Footnotes)

S. No.	Name of Enquiry Areas (Core Beliefs Scale)	Correlational Values (r)		
		Individual Enquiry Area – Individual Item Score	Individual Item score – Item Total Score	Enquiry Area – Total Score
1.	Locus of Control	0.673 – 0.755	0.023 - 0.499	0.458
2.	Self Confidence	0.329 – 0.655	0.069 – 0.338	0.238
3.	Need for Affiliation	0.251 - 0.435	0.064 – 0.354	0.198
4.	Need for Achievement	0.544 - 0.883	0.054 – 0.241	0.179
5.	Trust towards Others	0.552 - 0.825	0.026 – 0.372	0.455
6.	Attitude towards Efficiency	0.65 - 0.793	0.303 – 0.533	0.593
7.	Risk Taking Nature	0.396 – 0.736	0.031 – 0.411	0.400
8.	Image	0.234 - 0.642	0.009 – 0.256	0.342

The individual item scores which have the value less than 0.4 are removed. Those are as follows Defeat sense under Self Confidence, Important to please others under Need for Affiliation, Achieve ok under Image, criticism, reason for traditions, change mind, upset dignity, disagreements from Who Am I (Self Concept) are deleted due to their low value.

Again the values for Individual item scores are calculated and the correlation tests for Individual item score and Item total score are calculated.

Again here, the enquiry areas with low values have been removed and the values are recalculated. The removed enquiry areas are need for affiliation and need for achievement.

Further the correlation test for enquiry area and total score is calculated.

The revised values are as follows.

Table 5.2: Revised Values of Item Validity Measures of Core Beliefs and Who Am I (Self) Scales on the Basis of Data Collected from respondents (N = 468)

Sl No.	Name of Enquiry Areas (Core Beliefs Scale)	Correlational Values (r)		
		Individual Enquiry Area – Individual Item Score	Individual Item score – Item Total Score	Enquiry Area – Total Score
1.	Locus of Control	0.673 – 0.725	0.057 - 0.562	0.458
2.	Self Confidence	0.629 – 0.755	0.369 – 0.628	0.368
3.	Need for Affiliation	0.4 - 0.495		0.198
4.	Need for Achievement	0.544 - 0.723		0.179
5.	Trust towards Others	0.552 - 0.835	0.264 – 0.486	0.515
6.	Attitude towards Efficiency	0.65 - 0.793	0.303 – 0.393	0.604
7.	Risk Taking	0.496 – 0.746	0.031 – 0.463	0.400
8.	Image	0.584 - 0.772	0.329 – 0.516	0.432

Table 5.3 Consolidated Profile of the Validity Measures of the Scales

Results of the correlation analysis for item validity measures indicated that the total items of each of the scales along with their respective subscales for individual enquiry areas (8 for Core Beliefs, 1 for Who Am I) had good amount of content validity.

Name of the Scale	No. of Enquiry Areas	No of Items	Range of Correlation Values / Validity Measures			
			Individual Enquiry Area – Individual item score	Individual Item score – Item Total Score	Enquiry Area – Total Score	Inter Enquiry Areas Correlation (d)
Core Beliefs	6	17	0.459 - 0.897	0.421 - 0.692	0.376 - 0.695	-0.007 - 0.486

In order to identify the nature of the Construct Validity of two scales, an attempt had been made to test the inter–enquiry areas correlation for all the two adopted scales. The result of such correlation analysis of the scales was presented in the following tables.

Table 5.4: The Inter-Components Correlation Matrix for Core Beliefs Scale on the Basis of Data Collected from Respondents (N = 468)

Correlation	AvgLocus of Control	AvgSelf Confidence	AvgTrust towards	Avg Attitude towards people	Avg Risk taking Efficiency	Avg Self Image Nature
AvgLocus of Control	1	0.237	0.39	0.129	0.119	-0.117
AvgSelf Confidence	0.237	1	0.333	0.067	0.15	0.45
AvgTrust towards people	0.39	0.333	1	-0.34	-0.007	0.48
AvgAttitude towards Efficiency	0.129	0.067	-0.34	1	0.162	0.213
AvgRisk taking Nature	0.119	0.15	-0.007	0.162	1	0.352
Avg Self Image	-0.117	0.45	0.48	0.213	0.352	1

Again, the results of inter enquiry area correlation matrix indicated that in each of the two scales any change of values or loading in individual enquiry areas will affect the respective scales which was an indication of the trends of unidimensionality of the set of domains for each of the scales. Further, positive and significant inter enquiry areas correlation, Individual Item score – Total score of all test item score correlation, as well as Individual Item score – Individual component enquiry area score correlation affirmed that the two scales (adopted) had subsequently sound in factorial validity.

b) Estimation of Reliability

The responses of each scales were processed for estimation of reliability through SPSS version 16 and presented in Table 5.5

Table 5.5: The Reliability Values of the Four Scales

Scales	Reliability Values (r)		
	Split half	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Spearman Brown**
Core Beliefs	1.034	0.623	0.358

N. B. All the above mentioned reliability values were significant at 0.01 level.

The computed coefficients of correlation were found highly significant – relative of high reliability of each of the two scales.

For the Core Beliefs scale, reliabilitytest resultsare Split Half 1.034, Cronbach's Alpha is 0.623 and Spearman Brown is 0.358 respectively.

Validity values are as follows.

Individual Enquiry Area – Individual item score is 0.459 - 0.897

Individual Item score – Item Total Score is 0.421 - 0.692

Enquiry Area – Total Score is 0.376 - 0.695

Inter Enquiry Areas Correlation is -0.007 - 0.486

Apart from this a separate scale is considered for checking the personality called Who Am I (developed by Michael Lynn & C.R. Snyder, 2002) (the knowledge about themselves or their own personality characteristics). The reliability of the scale Split Half 0.576,Cronbach's Alphais 0.613 and Spearman Brown is 0.579 respectively.

Validity values are as follows.

Individual Enquiry Area – Individual item score is 0.535 - 0.793

Individual Item score – Item Total Score is 0.575 - 0.794

Enquiry Area – Total Score is 1.000

Testing the Hypotheses

After drawing the charts for the various parameters on the variation of the different educational qualification, t-tests are conducted to find whether there is any significant difference between the said groups. For this, total sample is divided into two groups with education less than (Post Graduation) and more than PG (Post Graduation).

t-tests are conducted to find whether there is any significant difference between the age groups. For this, total sample is divided into two groups with age less than 30 and more than 30 years. It is also observed that, though the number of samples in the age group below 30 is different from the number of samples and the variance in the age group more than 30, the variance is similar to each other. Hence, Equal Variance t-Test should be conducted.

$$t\text{-Value} = \frac{Mean_1 - Mean_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1-1)Var_1^2 + (n_2-1)Var_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}} * \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^1} + \frac{1}{n^2}}}$$

$Mean_1$ and $Mean_2$ are the average values of each sample sets

n_1 and n_2 are the number of records in each sample sets

Degrees of Freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2$

Var_1 and Var_2 are the variances of each sample sets

n_1 and n_2 are the number of records in each sample sets

The results of these tests are as follows.

Hypothesis:

Ho 1: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification and parameters of Locus of Control of the Respondents.

Table 4.13 Group Statistics between Educational Qualification and the Average of Locus of Control of the Respondents

Group Statistics					
	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Avg of Locus of Control	>=PG	180	3.5000	0.697	0.052
	<PG	288	3.2396	0.907	0.053

$Var_1 = SD_1{}^2 = (0.907)^2 = 0.823$ and $Var_2 = SD_2{}^2 = (0.697)^2 = 0.486$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation

The mean value for the respondents with higher qualification is high. It can be interpreted that the locus of control may increase with the Educational Qualification.

As observed in the charts above, each Educational Qualification group has different locus of control and the same is reiterated here.

Table 4.14 t-Test for Independent Samples (Educational Qualification below PG and above PG) for the parameters of Locus of Control of the Respondents

		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Avg of Locus of Control	Equal variances assumed	3.291	0.001	0.260	0.079	0.105	0.416

Interpretation:

Result of t-test (3.291) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the locus of control due to variation of Educational Qualification group (less than PG and greater than PG). Hence we can infer that locus of control increases with the increases of the Educational Qualification.

Hypothesis:

Ho 2: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification and Self Confidence of Respondents.

Table 4.15 Group Statistics between Educational Qualification and the Average of Self Confidence of the Respondents

Group Statistics					
	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Avg of Self Confidence	>=PG	180	3.444	0.816	0.061
	<PG	288	3.166	0.734	0.043

$Var_1 = SD_1^2 = (0.734)^2 = 0.539$ and $Var_2 = SD_2^2 = (0.816)^2 = 0.666$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation:

The self-confidence for the respondents higher Educational Qualification is higher than that of the respondents with less Educational Qualification.

Table 4.16 t-Test for Independent Samples (Educational Qualification below PG and above PG) for the Average of Self Confidence of the Respondents

		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Avg of Self Confidence	Equal variances assumed	3.814	0.000	0.278	0.073	0.135	0.421

Interpretation

Result of t-test (3.814) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the self-confidence due to variation of Educational Qualification group (below PG and above PG). Hence we can infer that self-confidence increases with the increases of the Educational Qualification.

Hypothesis

Ho 3: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification and Trust towards People of respondents.

Table 4.17 Group Statistics between Educational Qualification and the Average of Trust towards People of the Respondents

Group Statistics					
	Educational Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Avg of Trust	>= PG	180	3.183	0.763	0.057
	< PG	288	3.719	0.676	0.039

$Var_1 = SD_1^2 = (0.676)^2 = 0.457$ and $Var_2 = SD_2^2 = (0.763)^2 = 0.582$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation

The mean value for the respondents with less **Educational Qualification is** higher than that of the respondents with higher **Educational Qualification**. It can be interpreted that the respondents less **Educational Qualification** have more trust towards people.

Table 4.18 t-Test for Independent Samples (Educational Qualification below PG and above PG for the Average of Trust towards People of the Respondents

		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Avg of Trust	Equal variances assumed	-7.932	0.000	-0.535	0.067	-0.668	-0.403

Interpretation:

Result of t-test (7.932) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the Trust towards People due to variation of Educational Qualification group (below PG and above PG).

Hence we can infer that Trust towards People increases with the decreases of the Educational Qualification.

Hypothesis:

Ho 4: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification and Attitude of Respondents towards efficiency.

Table 4.19 Group Statistics between Educational Qualification and the Average of Attitude of the Respondents towards Efficiency

Group Statistics					
	Educational Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Avg of Attitude towards Efficiency	>=PG	180	3.867	0.666	0.049
	<PG	288	3.885	0.689	0.041

$Var_1 = SD_1^2 = (0.689)^2 = 0.475$ and $Var_2 = SD_2^2 = (0.666)^2 = 0.444$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation

The mean value for the respondents with **Educational Qualification below PG** is greater than that of the respondents with **Educational Qualification above PG**. It can be said that the respondents with **Educational Qualification above PG** are to be more competent, efficient and generous. However, respondents with higher qualification tend to be less perfect than their counterparts.

Table 4.20 t-Test for Independent Samples (Educational Qualification below PG and above PG) for the Average of Attitude of the Respondents towards Efficiency

		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Avg of Attitude towards Efficiency	Equal variances assumed	-0.290	0.772	-0.019	0.065	-0.146	0.108

Interpretation

Result of t-test (-0.290) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the Attitude towards Efficiency due to variation of Educational Qualification group (below PG and above PG). Hence, we can infer that Attitude increases with the decreases of the Educational Qualification.

Hypothesis:

Ho 5: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification and Risk Taking Nature of Respondents.

Table 4.21 Group Statistics between Educational Qualification and the Average of Risk Taking Nature of the Respondents

Group Statistics					
	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Avg of Risk Taking Nature	>=PG	180	3.3167	0.514	0.038
	PG	288	3.5417	0.478	0.028

$Var_1 = SD_1{}^2 = (0.478)^2 = 0.228$ and $Var_2 = SD_2{}^2 = (0.514)^2 = 0.264$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation

The mean value for respondents with less **Educational Qualification is more** for risk taking nature which can be meant that they are willing to take risks in life or job.

Table 4.22 t-Test for Independent Samples (Educational Qualification below PG and above PG) for the Average of Risk Taking of the Respondents

		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Avg of Risk Taking Nature	Equal variances assumed	-0.290	0.772	-0.019	0.065	-0.146	0.108

Interpretation:

Result of t-test (-4.815) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the Trust towards people due to variation of Educational Qualification group (below PG and above PG).

Hence we can infer that Risk Taking Nature increases with the decreases of the age.

Hypothesis:

Ho 6: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification and Self Image of Respondents.

Table 4.23 Group Statistics between Educational Qualification and the Average of Self Image of the Respondents

Group Statistics					
	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Avg of Image	>= PG	180	3.44	0.654	0.049
	< PG	288	3.486	0.570	0.034

$Var_1 = SD_1{}^2 = (0.570)^2 = 0.325$ and $Var_2 = SD_2{}^2 = (0.654)^2 = 0.428$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation

The respondents with high **Educational Qualification** feel that they cannot face the outside world as they are and feel that if they do so, people would not accept them.

Table 4.24 t-Test for Independent Samples (Educational Qualification below PG and above PG) for the Average of Image of the Respondents

		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Avg of Image	Equal variances assumed	-0.727	0.468	-0.042	0.057	-0.154	0.071

Interpretation

Result of t-test (-0.727) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the Image towards people due to variation of Educational Qualification group (below PG and above PG).

Hence we can infer that Image towards people increases with the decreases of the Educational Qualification.

Hypothesis

Ho 7: There is no significant difference between Qualification and Total Self Concept of Respondents

Table 4.27 Group Statistics between Qualification and the parameters of Total Self Concept of the Respondents

Group Statistics					
	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Score Self Concept	>= PG	180	76.133	7.758	0.578
	< PG	288	77.500	8.529	0.503

$Var_1 = SD_1^2 = (8.529)^2 = 72.744$ and $Var_2 = SD_2^2 = (7.758)^2 = 60.187$

$n_1 = 288$ and $n_2 = 180$ and the degree of freedom = $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 466$.

Interpretation

The respondents with less **Educational Qualification** would know more about themselves than their counterparts.

Table 4.28 t-Test for Independent Samples (Qualification below PG and above PG) for the Total Self Concept of the Respondents

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Total Score Self Concept	Equal variances assumed	-1.745	466	0.082	-1.367	0.783	-2.906	0.172

Interpretation

Result of t-test (-1.745) is significant at 0.01 level. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference for the Self Concept due to variation of Qualification group (below PG and above PG). Hence we can infer that Self Concept increases with the increase of the Qualification.

Findings, Suggestions and Conclusion

All the hypotheses with the inferences can be tabulated as follows.

Table 5.2 The Overview of the Hypotheses with respect to Educational Qualification of the Respondents

Sl. No	Hypothesis	Accepted /Rejected	Interpretation
1	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Locus of Control** of Respondents.	Rejected	The respondents with high qualification have higher locus of control than that of the respondents with high qualification.
2	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Self Confidence** of Respondents.	Rejected	The self-confidence for the respondents with higher qualification is higher than that of the respondents with high qualification.
3	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Trust towards people** of Respondents.	Rejected	The respondents with less qualification have more trust towards people.

Sl. No	Hypothesis	Accepted /Rejected	Interpretation
4	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Attitude of Respondents towards Efficiency.**	Rejected	The respondents with less qualification are to be more competent, perfect, efficient and generous.
5	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Risk Taking Nature of Respondents.**	Rejected	The respondents with less qualification are willing to take risks in life.
6	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification and Image of Respondents.**	Rejected	The respondents with less qualification feel that they can face the outside world as they are and feel that if they do so, people would accept them.

Table 5.3 The Overview of the Hypotheses with respect to Total Score of Self Concept

Sl. No	Hypothesis	Accepted /Rejected	Interpretation
1.	There is no significant difference between **Educational Qualification** and **Total Self Concept** of Respondents	Rejected	The respondents with less Educational Qualification would know more about themselves than their counterparts.

Suggestions

It is found that with higher education, a person can better understand about himself. His attitude towards life, self-awareness would also get enhanced due to higher education and with experience as well.

Hence, for the better self-awareness and to know the self, a person should get educated to certain level and he should have a certain age at least to analyse things and to conclude.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that a person with good self-awareness has a fair idea about his Self. His self-awareness increases with the education or experience in life. Over a period of time, this self-concept only become the stepping stones of the personality. To modify or to correct the personality of person, it is necessary to know his self-concept.

References

McLeod, S. A. (2008). Self-Concept. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/self-concept.htmlBottom of Form

Argyle, M. (2008). Social encounters: *Contributions to social interaction.* Aldine Transaction

Baumeister, R. F. (Ed.) (1999). *The self in social psychology*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press (Taylor & Francis).

Bee, H. L. (1992). *The developing child.* London: HarperCollins.

Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Kuhn, M. H. (1960). Self-attitudes by age, sex and professional training. *Sociological Quarterly*, 1, 39-56.

Lewis, M. (1990). Self-knowledge and social development in early life. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality* (pp. 277-300). New York: Guilford.

Miller, D. T., & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction? *Psychological Bulletin,* 82, 213–225

Morse, S. J. &Gergen, K. J. (1970). Social comparison, self-consistency and the concept of self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 148-156.

Rogers, C. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In (ed.) S. Koch,*Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 3: Formulations of the person and the social context.* New York: McGraw Hill.