

CHAPTER 2

SELF-EVALUATION AS A COMPONENT OF PERSONALITY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

There is a close relationship among self-concept, self-evaluation and personality. What one thinks of oneself (self-concept) and how one will evaluate oneself (self-evaluation) will determine one's personality. Self-evaluation is a central and continuing part of daily life. Self-evaluation is always a process and not just an event (Suls & Wills 1991:106). The act of self-evaluation is carried out with a greater or lesser degree of awareness in the different life situations in which a person finds himself/herself. Usually people want to evaluate themselves positively (Suls & Wills 1991:116).

The greatest job of a human soul is to have a high or positive opinion of oneself (Rosenberg, Schooler & Schoenbach 1989:1006). This research is centralised around the self and it is therefore imperative to put the self under the spotlight. The term "self" can be defined as a person's continuous interpretation and organisation of his/her experiences in respect of his/her physical characteristics, and his/her psychological and social attributes (Jordaan & Jordaan 1989:683-684).

As people we do not live in a vacuum. Therefore, we cannot live in isolation from each other. Therefore we have interdependent relationships with others. This is true not only of adults but also of adolescents. In evaluating themselves, adolescents have to take into consideration other adolescents' opinions because these will affect their own self-evaluation. This research will mainly try to portray the adolescent's self-evaluation where self-as-instrument is stressed. Through a more objective self-evaluation, an adolescent may assess whether his/her life will be a success or a failure in life in general.

Before adolescents may be in a position to evaluate themselves, they must first be able to value themselves. They should be aware of their present state of affairs, whether they regard themselves as valuable or not. When an adolescent realises that he/she has a certain weakness, such adolescent will

have a good reason to struggle and strive to improve himself/herself. Self-evaluation is therefore, linked to a person's introspection and retrospection.

2.2 THE CONCEPT OF "PERSONALITY"

For the man in the street, personality can be described in one of two ways, namely on the basis of a particular characteristic of an individual, for example a friendly personality or a bullying nature or on the basis of certain social skills a person may possess, for example a strong personality. In every language, personality is described in various ways, and it is therefore of great importance to analyse these different ways to avoid possible confusion. In this study, personality will mean the totality of all the physical, psychological and spiritual characteristics which determine the behaviour of an individual (Meyer et al 1994:8). Personality refers to whatever is making a person who he/she is, in other words, that which allows us to make assumptions about a certain person's behaviour.

Different authors have different definitions of personality. Sometimes the same authors will have different definitions of personality. There is no single version of the definition of the term "personality" which is acceptable to everyone (Möller 1995:4). At times, personality definitions are not only different but also contradictory (Leaves, Jeysenck & Martin 1989:7). Based on a consistent pattern of research findings eg. by Eysenck (Heaven, Mak, Barry & Ciarrochi 2002:453), it is a well established fact that personality factors are linked to academic performance. This means that personality factors play a greater role in predicting attitudes to school.

The study of personality development has usually focused on personality traits. The aim of the traits approach is to identify personality traits, that is patterns of thoughts, behaviour differences among individuals. According to Hart, Hofmann, Edelstein & Keller (1997:195), traits emerge in the course of development and influence the life course.

In his survey in , Gordon Allport collected as many as 50 different definitions of personality. Taking into account that more than sixty years have passed since then, there are most probably even more definitions of personality today. This should give us an idea that "personality" is a complex concept for which there is no simple definition or explanation.

Personality cannot be understood apart from its social setting; self and world are correlates, each understandable only in terms of the other (Vrey 1990:20-21). Society provides a world for the person, without which personality would be meaningless. This natural interrelationship between objects, between people and between people and nature serves to stress how important it is to study relationships.

The word “personality” in English is derived from the Latin word *persona*. Originally it denoted the masks worn by theatrical players in ancient Greek dramas (Strack & Lorr 1994:80). Later the term was used to encompass the actor’s role. Thus the initial conception of personality was that of a superficial image that an individual adopted in playing life roles, a “public personality” that people displayed to those around them. Today we hear people talking about Rodney having “a lot of personality” or Ruth having a “great personality”.

Here are some examples of definitions of personality generally found in literature. The following authors, arranged from the earliest to the most recent, define personality as follows:

- That which makes it possible to predict what a person will do in a given situation (Cattell 1965:5).
- The relatively permanent patterns of repetitive interpersonal situations, which characterises a person’s life (Sullivan 1953:111).
- The more or less stable and permanent organisation of a person’s character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determines his unique adaptation to the environment (Eysenck 1970:2).
- The sum total of the ways in which man characteristically reacts to and interacts with others (Ferguson 1970:2).
- A combination of all relatively stable dimensions by means of which a person can be evaluated (Byrne 1974:26).
- The characteristic behaviour pattern (including thought and emotion) typifying each person’s adaptation to the circumstances of his life (Mischel 1976:2).
- The most adequate conceptualisation of a person’s behaviour in all its detail (Mischel 1993:5).

From the above, it is evident that personality is an essential hypothetical construct for explaining the organisation and integration of behaviour and the differences between people (Möller 1995:5).

The definitions of personality are diverse, but they also seem to have the following three things in common:

- Personality refers to the characteristic structure, thoughts, emotions and behavioural pattern, which make every human being unique.
- Personality helps man to adjust to his unique, everyday life and circumstances.
- Personality refers to the dynamic nature of man, which includes a person's tendency to react fairly consistently in a variety of situations over time.

The psychology of personality is mainly concerned with understanding the total person and it aims to lead authors to the following questions:

- In which ways are people similar?
- In which ways do people differ?
- How does personality function?
- How does personality develop?
- Can personality be changed?
- Is personality determined by environmental factors?
- Why does a person behave the way he/she does?
- How does individuality arise?

There are many more questions to which the psychology of personality is striving to find answers, but the main question still remains: What is personality?

Psychologists often use personality and behaviour interchangeably, and according to Mischel (1996:4), this causes big confusion. Personality is an abstraction about behaviour, whereas behaviour consists of observable events.

2.3 DISCUSSION OF PERSONALITY

Of all the problems that have confronted human beings since the beginning of recorded history, perhaps the most significant has been the riddle of their own nature. Countless attempts have been made to answer the question, “What sort of creatures are we?” What complicates the problem even further, is that human beings come in many shapes and sizes and behave in exceedingly complex ways. Of the several billion people who are presently inhabiting the earth, no two individuals are exactly alike. The vast differences among them have made it difficult, if not impossible, to identify what they have in common as members of the human race (Hjelle & Ziegler 1992:1).

Today the problem is more pressing than ever, since most of the world’s ills, for example exploding population figures, global unrest, ecological pollution, racial prejudice and poverty, are brought about by the behaviour of people. It will therefore not be an exaggeration to say that the quality of human life in the future, indeed our very survival, may depend upon increased understanding of human nature. According to Conger (1991:55), adolescents and adults with a strong sense of their own identity see themselves as separate, distant individuals. The very word “individual”, as a synonym for “person”, implies a need to perceive oneself as somehow separate from others, no matter how much one may share with them.

There is no single definition of personality which can sufficiently describe this concept without touching its related concepts. Concepts such as I, self, self-esteem, self-concept and self-evaluation are simply indispensable in any description of personality. Therefore, the concepts mentioned above will be discussed in the following sections.

2.3.1 Identity and personality

According to Vrey (1990: 44-45) to be a child is to be somebody, to form a self-identity, to have satisfactory answers to the question “Who am I”? Self-identity is incongruent with an integrated whole made up of:

- a person’s conceptions of himself/herself
- the stability and continuity of the attributes by which a person knows himself/herself
- the agreement between a person’s self-conceptions and the conceptions held of him/her by he/she esteem

In other words, identity does not derive only from the role one has in a particular situation, but also from one’s sense of membership in social units of various kinds. One is located or identified by one’s religion, ethnic group, social class, college or university, state, town, neighbourhood and a variety of other social characteristics as well as by one’s situated role.

2.3.2 I and personality

Vrey (1990:13) says that the “I” can be described as an individual’s spiritual dimension which exists only in so far as it is integrated with other dimensions of personality. An interaction takes place between the I and the self.

2.3.3 Self and personality

The self is the core of a personality, and the initiator of various constellations of actions and functions. This understanding of my self or my own identity always includes an evaluation on the basis of subjective norms, and gives rise to my self-concept.

There are three aspects of the self which will be considered here. These are the three aspects of being in the world and they are as follows:

- The *Umwelt*, which literally means “world around” and can be understood to mean self vis-à-vis the environment
- the *Mitwelt*, which literally means “with world” that is the world in relation to others
- and finally we have the *Eigenwelt*, or the “own world”, which simply means, the sense of relationship with one’s self (Hobfoll 1988:162).

We have noted thus far that concepts such as I, self-esteem, self-concept and self-evaluation, cannot be separated; they can only be identified. These concepts form the core of personality. Vrey (1990:47) concludes that a child’s self-concept is the core of his/her personality.

2.4 PERSONALITY THEORIES

Personality has also been viewed as an individual’s most striking or dominant characteristics, for example shy personality or aggressive personality. If human behaviour were fully understood, there would be no need for personality theories. Such theories actually represent elaborate speculations or hypotheses about why people behave the way they do. They have both descriptive and predictive functions in psychology. A personality theory is descriptive in that it serves to organise human behaviour systematically so as to render it intelligible. A good personality theory therefore, provides a meaningful context within which human behaviour can be consistently described and interpreted. A theory should not only describe past and present events but also predict future ones. The second function of a personality theory is therefore to provide a basis for the prediction of events and outcomes that have not yet occurred (Hjelle & Ziegler 1992:1-7).

Personality embodies a unity, consistency, and integration of traits. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that there is an overall principle that unifies traits, attitudes, values, motives and experiences. The problem of identifying and describing the nature of personality integration requires an all-inclusive construct such as the self, ego, or style of life. In less scientific days, people called it a soul. But all these terms have accumulated too many connotations and semantic ambiguities. Allport introduces a new term, the “proprium” (Hjelle & Ziegler 1992:293-294).

In his personality theory, Allport conceives of the proprium as including all aspects of personality which contribute to a sense of inward unity; as marking the consistency associated with an individual's traits, intentions, and long-range goals. He does not regard it as separate from a person as a whole. The following propiate functions of personality are presented in order of their sequential appearance in the growing child:

- the sense of bodily self
- the sense of self-identity
- the sense of self-esteem or pride
- the sense of self-extension
- the self-image
- the sense of self as a rational coper
- propiate striving

The different personality theories will be discussed next, starting from the earliest theories to the most recent theories. In this study, personality theories will be divided or grouped into the following four classes:

- the depth psychological approach
- the learning theory approach
- the dimensional approach
- the humanistic approach

A historical overview of each approach, a brief discussion thereof and theories on personalities related to each approach will be discussed hereunder.

2.4.1 The depth psychology approach

The view of the depth psychology approach is that behaviour is determined by forces within a person of which he/she is mostly unaware (Meyer et al 1994:13). In depth psychology the emphasis is on

“deep, unconscious aspects of the personality”. Man’s nature is dual in itself: there is conscious functioning on the one hand and unconscious functioning, on the other. According to Berg (Meyer et al 1994:33), the fundamental hypothesis of depth psychology is that man’s inner, subjective consciousness consists of layers that differ as to their depth. The layer at the surface of the consciousness deals with conscious matters, while the deeper layers deal with unconscious matters.

In its development, three rivalling schools of thought have emerged. By 1915, there were Freud’s Psychoanalysis, Adler’s Individual Psychology and Jung’s Analytical Psychology. Meyer et al (1994:36) state that each of the above persons had their own theoretical framework concerning human functioning and the human personality. Except for the three schools of thought already mentioned, further development took place and more schools of thought developed within the depth psychology, some of which are discussed below.

2.4.1.1 *Freud’s psychoanalytical theory*

According to Meyer et al (1994:41), apart from the fact that Freud’s theory is considered to be the first personality theory, it is also regarded as the most comprehensive of all the theories on human functioning. Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) is regarded as the father of psychoanalysis. He developed his theory over a period of 47 years. Freud observed that many patients behaved according to drives and experiences of which they were not consciously aware. He thus concluded that the unconscious played a major role in shaping behaviour.

At first, Freud tried to explain human behaviour by distinguishing three levels of consciousness in the psyche, namely the conscious, the preconscious and the unconscious. In the course of time he created further structural concepts in explaining man’s complex psychological functioning. The new concepts were the id (at the core), the ego (tester of reality) and the superego (high court in pursuit of perfection). Pervin & John(2001:80) contend that the id represents the biological side of personality. It is the source of the instincts, which motivates all behaviour.

Petri (1996:135) has it that the ego strives towards satisfying the instincts of the id, but this is done according to the reality principle. The ego distinguishes between the internal mind and external reality. The ego controls behaviour that bridges the gap between mental images and the outside world. For example, if someone is thirsty, the ego directs such a person to look for and to drink real water. The ego, which is the realistic dimension of the personality, helps to suppress or even block the satisfaction of the id-instincts. The ego is that aspect of personality, which has to do with conscious perceptual functions such as realistic thought and decision making. According to Feist (1994:40) the superego strives towards moral perfection. The structure of personality according to Freud is illustrated in figure 2.1 below.

FIGURE 2. 1: STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY ACCORDING TO FREUD

Source: Möller (1995:33).

It should be noted, however, that the id, the ego and the superego should not be seen as three separate concepts or entities, each on its own and each having control over the personality of an individual in its own way. A person does not have the id, the ego and the superego separately. The three are merely concepts which describe qualities of the personality. The three concepts are identified for study purposes, but they should not be separated. Though Freud was a great man in the field of personality theory, some of his theories were heavily criticised. Some of his notable students, for example Jung and Adler, even broke away from his theories to found their own schools. Freud was criticised because he did not use the experimental methods of science. Criticism was also levelled at him for overemphasising the part the sex urge played in an individual. Criticism against the Freudian theory of personality can be summarised as follows: (*The world book Encyclopaedia* 1982:456-457).

- Infantile sexuality was overemphasised.
- Early personality formation was overemphasised.
- Failed to consider adult personality changes.
- Overemphasised unconsciousness.
- Artificial division of personality.

2.4.1.2 Jung's analytical theory

Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) described his own approach as analytical psychology. This theory is universally regarded as highly complex, possibly because Jung, in his endeavour to understand the psychological functioning of man, drew information from a wide spectrum of disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, theology, biology, physics, history, anthropology, chemistry, archaeology, literature and mythology. According to Meyer et al (1994: 76), Jung's theory is so complex that it appears to be optimistic and pessimistic at the same time.

Jung described the total personality as the psyche. He identified the three primary interdependent systems of the psyche as follows:

- the ego
- the personal unconscious
- the collective unconscious

At first, Jung believed that the ego is a conscious dimension of personality but, as Feist (1994:163) puts it, he later accepted that a larger part of the ego is unconscious. In Jung's view, there are opposing factors in all people. There is nobody who is only good or only bad, or purely male or purely female, because one part will always dominate on the conscious level while the other will dominate on the unconscious level. For example, the unconscious part of the mind of a male person contains female personal drives and experiences of which that individual is not aware. The same will be true of the unconscious part of the mind of a female person, it will contain male personal drives and experiences of which an individual is not aware. The person then strives to bring these opposing forces within himself/herself to a harmonious unity, a self. The self is the centre of personality. Jung defined selfhood as a balance between the opposing forces of personality, including both unconscious and conscious materials.

Jung differed from Freud, even though they were both following a depth psychology approach. Part of Jung's theory was a rejection of Freud's theory: Jung did not accept Freud's mechanistic view of man, which regarded the individual as a product of a suppressed sexual past. Jung also rejected Freud's theory of libido, which overemphasised sexuality. Freud placed far too much importance on sexual instincts in human behaviour, but Jung de-emphasised sexuality. He thought that many other factors, besides sex, stimulated human behaviour (Möller 1995:71).

2.4.1.3 *Adler's individual psychology*

The personality theory of Alfred Adler (1870-1937) was mainly influenced by his medical background and Freud's theory of psychoanalysis. As time went by, Adler gradually began formulating an

independent viewpoint, and he chose to name his theory the “Individual Psychology”. Though it is not clear why Adler chose this name for his theory, Meyer et al (1994:99) suggest that it was believed that an individual himself/herself had the ability to decide on his/her life goals and then adjusted his/her life accordingly. Adler therefore maintains that psychology should focus on the study of the individual rather than on formulating the general laws governing human behaviour.

As far as Adler is concerned, healthy personality development means a growing ability to deal successfully with the following three life tasks (Möller 1995:89-95):

- the life goal is an individual’s own unique view of the success for which he/she strives
- life style is the unique way in which an individual organises and mobilises all the aspects of his/her personality
- social interest is the criterion used to see whether success has been achieved or not

To deal adequately with the three life tasks a formation of a realistic view of life, self-confidence, a formation of social interests and trust in others are required. In his theory, Adler views an individual as someone who is addressed by life itself, and in life, each individual is faced with the following three problems:

- labour
- friendship or social responsibility
- love between man and woman

Adler has built his personality theory around the more or less successful way in which an individual is able to solve the three problems named above . In conclusion, Feist (1994:152) stated that Adler’s personality theory leaves much to be desired or is just hard to follow because Möller (1995:100) contends that there is a great need for further research on Alfred Adler’s personality theory, namely the individual psychology.

2.4.1.4 *The socially-oriented psychoanalytical theory*

The emerging of disciplines such as sociology and anthropology towards the end of the nineteenth century had an impact on the psychological thinking of the time. A person was no longer seen purely as an individual, but as a social being. The emphasis was placed on the role of social and cultural factors in the development of personality. Though this theory recognised the importance of the unconscious, it placed more attention on the consciousness and its manifestation in a concept of the self.

The views of the following three theoreticians will be examined next:

- Karen Horney (1885-1952)
- Erich Fromm (1900-1980)
- Harry Stack Sullivan (1892-1949)

(a) *Karen Horney*

Horney accepted only part of Freud's work, namely the important role played by the unconsciousness. However, she did not see it as the most important aspect of human functioning. She made a distinction between the following:

- an idealised self
- an actual self
- a real self

An idealised self is caused by a feeling of inferiority, and this feeling of inferiority causes anxiety. The actual self is often rejected, as it does not meet the demands of the ideal self. The real self is a force which prompts an individual in the direction of growth and self-fulfilment (Meyer et al 1994:119). Karen Horney identifies two needs that are basic to the unfolding of personality:

- the need for security
- the need for satisfaction

Horney also states that human personality can change, irrespective of age. According to her, the change stops only when death steps in.

(b) *Erick Fromm*

To a large extent, Fromm's view was basically influenced by the theories of Freud and Karl Marx. His psychoanalytical approach was centred around the relationship between the individual and society. According to Fromm, an individual struggles to retain his worth and freedom in spite of society's pressure to conform (Meyer et al 1994:125).

Fromm rejects Freud's division of the personality into structural elements of the id, the ego and the superego, but he agreed with Freud on the question of the consciousness and unconsciousness. Regarding the concept of identity, Fromm states that man is the only animal who is able to say "I" and who is aware of himself as a separate entity.

(c) *Harry Stack Sullivan*

Sullivan is regarded as the first American who developed a significant personality theory within the psychoanalytical tradition. To an extent he was also influenced by Freud's theory, but just like Fromm and Horney, could not accept Freud's libido theory. Sullivan highlights the way in which interpersonal factors influence personality development. Sullivan considers personality as a hypothetical construct, which can be observed only as it finds expression in interpersonal relationships.

He pays less attention to structural components like id, ego and superego and pays more attention to the dynamic nature and development of personality. Sullivan identifies the following three personality components:

- dynamism
- personification
- self-system

Meyer et al (1994:138) state that Sullivan has paid attention to two aspects of the development of personality, namely:

- cognitive experiential modes
- developmental stages (fixed stages) or epochs

Sullivan is well-known for the fact that he focuses on the cognitive development that underlies personality development.

2.4.1.5 *Erickson's ego psychological theory*

Eric Erickson (1902-1980) wrote his work within a Freudian framework. There are therefore similarities but also differences between Freud's views and those of Erickson. While Freud argues that personality development is determined by certain biological processes during the first five years and is completed at about six years, Erickson argues that man's development consists of progressive and life-long evaluation of the individual's innate potential.

Freud draws a clear distinction between the id, ego and superego, but Erickson does not offer such a clear distinction: according to Meyer et al (1994:150), Freud distinguishes between the individual and the environment, but Erickson describes the individual and the environment as being intertwined.

Erickson agrees with the existence of the id, ego and superego, but he mainly stressed the ego. In his book, Erickson (1971:218) defines the ego as that aspect of the personality which makes co-ordinated and planned functioning possible. Erickson argues further that the ego develops throughout life and is governed by a genetically determined ground plan (the epigenetic principle).

Erickson regards the striving for identity as man's basic motive. According to him, personality development takes place in eight stages. These stages rank from birth to old age. Each stage is characterised by what he calls developmental crisis. Hereunder the eight stages are listed below and, next to each stage, its development crisis is given. The stages are as follows:

- Infancy: trust vs. distrust
- early childhood: autonomy vs. doubt
- play age: initiative vs. guilt
- school age: industry vs. inferiority
- adolescence: identity vs. confusion
- early adulthood: intimacy vs. isolation
- adulthood: generativity vs. stagnation
- maturity: integrity vs. despair

The stages given above can also be illustrated in table 2.1 below.

TABLE 2.1: EIGHT STAGES OF PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

Oral sensory	Trust vs. Mistrust							
Muscular-anal		Autonomy vs. Shame, Doubt						
Locomotor-genital			Initiative vs. Inferiority					
Latency				Industry vs. Inferiority				
Puberty and adolescence					Identity vs. Role Diffusion			
Young adulthood						Intimacy vs. Isolation		
Adulthood							Generativity vs. Stagnation	
Maturity								Integrity vs. Disgust, Despair

Source: Ferguson (1970:13).

2.4.2 The learning theory approach

The theorists in this field regard learning and environment as the most important factors in the development of personality. Meyer et al (1994:169) state that the learning theories of personality have developed from behaviourism, which is regarded as one of the great schools of psychology. Behaviourists base their views on positivism and regard behaviour as consisting of two basic elements, namely stimuli and responses.

Behaviourism emphasises experimental methods and focuses on variables that are observable and measurable. Behaviourists avoid anything subjective, internal and unavailable, that is anything mental.

The personality theories discussed below will mainly concentrate on the observable aspects of the learning process, or as Möller (1995:108) puts it, that which can be studied experimentally. Though more theorists will be mentioned in the said discussion, the following will enjoy more attention:

- Skinner (extreme behaviourism)
- Dollard (drive reduction theory)
- Bandura (social learning theory)

2.4.2.1 *Skinner's extreme behaviourism*

The personality theory of BARRHUS Frederic Skinner (1904-) is mainly based on the extreme behaviourism of Watson. According to Meyer et al (1994:181), the theorists of behaviourism define behaviour as a lawful result of environmental factors. There is no (or little) reference to internal factors such as motives, drives, needs and emotions. The use of terms such as emotions is regarded as unscientific because such concepts cannot be studied objectively.

The behaviourists are basically interested in behaviour and principles of learning and not in personality per se. Möller (1995:108) contends that the behaviourists seldom use the term "personality". Personality implies something inside a person. Behaviourists want to work with externally observable behaviour, that which can be studied experimentally. The view of Skinner is that all behaviour, being simple or complex, is learnt. The behaviourists contend that the personality of the individual consists of

the behaviour he or she has learnt (Meyer et al 1994:108). As far as Skinner is concerned, psychology should study behaviour and nothing more or nothing less.

Whilst Skinner recognises several forms of learning, he stresses the type of conditioning he calls operant conditioning (Hergenhalm & Olson 2001:77).

Skinner is adamant that the development of the individual will be determined by environmental factors. Therefore people can take decisions to improve their own environment in ways that will encourage maximum development. Here follows a summary of Skinner's basic assumptions (Möller 1995:107-109):

- all behaviour should be according to scientific laws
- behaviour can be predicted
- behaviour is governed by environmental factors
- behaviour can be controlled by changing and manipulating environmental factors

2.4.2.2 *Dollard's drive reduction theory*

John Dollard (1900-1980) worked hand in hand with Neal Elgar Miller. They were strongly influenced by Pavlov, Hull and Thorndike. Dollard regards learning as the result of drive reduction (Meyer et al 1994:203).

Dollard is mainly interested in explaining how an individual acquires behaviour. He never speculates about the internal structure of personality. The central structural concept in his theory is that of habit. A habit is a relationship or connection between a stimulus and a response. The stimulus [S] leads to a response [R], thus [S-R]. Any form of behaviour occurring fairly regular, according to Dollard, is described as habit.

In Dollard's view, a baby is born with a simple set of habits, for example blinking and sucking reflexes, but adults possess a large number of learnt drives, such as the drive for money.

2.4.2.3 *Albert Bandura*

Albert Bandura (1925-) is generally regarded as the most important representative of the social learning theory (Meyer et al 1994:221). According to Pervin & John (2001:440), a number of behaviourists, including Bandura and Walters, strongly argue that people can learn new complex behaviour patterns only through the observation of others, or by initiation or social learning. The social learning theory is based on the following assumptions:

- Behaviour is influenced by the environment.
- The environment and personal characteristics affect each other and a person's behaviour.
- Individuals learn what to expect through their own experience and through their social group.
- Individuals learn through imitating the behaviour of others.
- Individuals learn through reinforcements and rewards they receive as a result of their behaviour.

Unlike other behaviourists, Bandura places considerable emphasis on mental processes. Bandura also depends on detailed observation. The standard procedure in experimental method is to manipulate one variable, and then measure its effects on another. This leads to a personality theory which states that one's environment causes one's behaviour.

Bandura agrees that environment causes behaviour, but goes on to say that behaviour "causes" environment as well. He names this concept reciprocal determinism. Bandura states further that personality is an interaction among the following three things:

- the environment
- behaviour
- a person's psychological processes

Though Bandura has developed his personality theory on the basis of behaviourism, his social learning theory is a mixture of various approaches to psychology. Whilst he agrees that reinforcement is essential for human behaviour, he does not agree that it is the only one (Hergenhalm & Olson 2001:319).

2.4.3 The dimensional approach

The view of dimensional theorists is that a person has many different behavioural tendencies. They all agree that the most appropriate descriptive dimensions must be found in order to depict a person accurately. Just like the depth psychologists and the learning theorists, the dimensional theorists differ among themselves on aspects such as the nature of the basic dimensions and the methods to be used in discovering these dimensions (Halverson, Kohstamm & Martin 1994:69-70; Meyer et al 1994:243; Mischel 1996:2-11).

Three groups will be discussed below. The first will be the constitutional topologists who hold a view that physical build must be the point of departure. The next group is of the opinion that personality consists of stratified layers. The third group, the factor analysts, uses a variety of psychological methods for measuring personality traits. This group also uses a statistical method, namely factor analysis, to discover the dimensional pattern of the characteristics measured. The following theorists will be discussed here (each representing a group, as explained above):

- Sheldon (physical structure)
- Murray (stratified layers)
- Cattell (factor analysis)

2.4.3.1 *Sheldon's constitutional typology*

William Herbert Sheldon (1899-1977) is of the opinion that there is a close connection between the individual's physical structure and his/her personality (Meyer et al 1994:243). In other words, according to him, there is a positive relationship between the physical appearance and the inner person. As an individual is from the outside, so he/she will also be from the inside. There are many assumptions about people with certain physical traits, for example the following:

- The belief that redheads are quick-tempered.
- The belief that tall, thin people are withdrawn and intellectual.

- The belief that plump people are cheerful and friendly.

The above beliefs sound rather ridiculous, but as early as the days of Shakespeare, people believed that there was a positive correlation between physical traits and personality. Sheldon's view points to the same direction. He argues that there is a positive correlation between certain stable physical traits and certain relatively stable personality traits. This he calls temperament. Sheldon's approach consists of the following steps:

- identification of the basic physical components
- identification of the basic components of personality
- establishing a relationship between physique and personality

Sheldon and his co-workers have come to the conclusion that the human physique comprises three basic components, namely: endomorphy (compact), mesomorphy (normal, average) and ectomorphy (tall, thin). Their argument is that each of these physical human components corresponds with a personality type. According to Sheldon, the body is an essential precondition for behaviour (Meyer et al 1994:262). Sheldon aims at exposing the connection between the external form of the body and behaviour. Sheldon never bothers to explain how the personality functions, but he mainly concentrates on the components of physique and temperament. These days, the attention has shifted to the internal aspects of the body, for example the nervous system, and it is hoped that this will lead to the formulation of a more comprehensive constitutional personality theory, better than that of Sheldon.

2.4.3.2 Murray's need theory

Henry Murray (1893-) bases his theory on the assumption that personality consists of stratified layers and that behaviour is determined by motives pertaining to these layers. Murray, a medical doctor, a psychological researcher, medical researcher and psychotherapist, does not have a straightforward personality theory. The influence of the diversity of his different occupations is clearly reflected in his personality theory. Murray aligns himself with the following (Maddi 1989:60-65):

- He recognises the influence of physiological factors.
- He tries to connect abstract notions to the physiological basis of behaviour.
- He acknowledges the influence of unconscious factors.
- He makes use of psychoanalytical concepts.
- He acknowledges the pressure of social factors.
- He recognises an individual's powers of imagination.

From the above explanation, it is evident that Murray's theory covers a broad and wide area. He attempts to develop an inclusive system for psychology as a whole and therefore uses many concepts. Murray is well-known for the following concepts which he often uses: need, press and thema. The fact that Murray uses a vast number of concepts makes his personality theory complex compared to other personality theories.

2.4.3.3 *Cattell's factor-analysis model of personality*

According to Kline (1993:22), factor analysis is a statistical technique central to the psychometrics of personality. The factor analytical approach rests on the assumption that the basic structure of anything can be discovered by collecting a large number of measurements and analysing them by means of statistical techniques referred to as factor analysis (Butcher & Spielberger 1995:4). Cattell's views will be discussed below. Raymond B. Cattell (1905-), just like other factor theorists, regards personality attributes as the basic elements of personality. Möller (1995:285) contends that Cattell, Eysenck and Guilford have regarded traits as the basic building blocks of personality. Cattell defines personality traits as constructs that have been developed according to rules of factor analytical method and are based on empirical observation. A factor theory of personality is made up of a set of postulates concerning personality, based on the results of factor analysis. From factor analysis emerge factors that are regarded by factor analysts as representative of natural elements of personality, namely personality traits. Allport and Odbert have found approximately 18 000 terms referring to traits in the English dictionary. Allport estimates that about 5 000 of these qualify as definite trait names (Möller 1995:285). A brief description of steps used in factor analysis follows:

- The correlation coefficient of each of these scores is calculated.
- By using a computer, the intercorrelations are manipulated by means of a process of rotation.
- The factor loading of each variable is calculated.
- An attempt is made to ascribe psychological meaning to the factor concerned.

After a long period of doing research, Cattell finally differentiated a group of 16 original traits. Cattell's well-known 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire is based on these factors (Matthews & Deary 1998:20). The 16 original traits are given in table 2.2 below.

TABLE 2.2: THE 16 ORIGINAL TRAITS BY CATTELL

LOW SCORE	FACTOR	HIGH SCORE
reserved	A	outgoing
less intelligent	B	more intelligent
emotionally unstable	C	emotionally stable
submissive	E	self-assertive
sober	F	carefree
expedient	G	conscientious
shy	H	venturesome
tough-minded	I	tender-minded
trusting	L	suspicious
practical	M	imaginative
forthright	N	shrewd
placid	O	apprehensive
conservative	Q1	experimenting
group dependent	Q2	self-sufficient
casual	Q3	socially controlled
relaxed	Q4	tense

Source: Möller (1995:286).

Cattell's theory maintains that the behaviour of a particular individual in a given situation will depend on his/her stylistic and temperament traits and attitudes (sentiments and motivational components) which are relevant to the situation. This will include variables such as his/her mood and his/her role in a given situation. This may differ from time to time and from situation to situation. It is within this framework that personality functions (Meyer et al 1994:308). In conclusion, it can be stated that Cattell has tried to develop a method for the comparison of personality structures across groups.

2.4.4 The humanistic approach

The humanistic approach accommodates a number of different views. The humanists recognise the gaps or shortcomings in the psychoanalytic and behaviouristic approaches. In an attempt to fill these gaps, the humanists are offering different solutions. They are trying to include and explain all aspects of a person in their theories. They mainly differ with regard to identifying the overall goal of a person's life. The theories of the following humanistic theorists will be discussed:

- Allport (holistic theory)
- Maslow (self-actualising theory)
- Rogers (self-concept theory)
- Kelly (cognitive theory)
- Frankl (existential theory)

2.4.4.1 *Allport's holistic theory*

Gordon Allport (1897-1967) can also be grouped under the trait theorists but, because of his humanistic ideas, Allport will be grouped together with other humanists. According to Möller (1995:261), Allport defines personality as "the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought". Allport uses the term psychophysical to emphasise the unity of personality. Personality is neither exclusively physical nor exclusively psychological. Both the physical and the psychological function form a unity in which personality is represented. This view includes many perspectives in its definition and description of

personality; it does not absolutise only one perspective. Therefore it is referred to as holistic (Barnett & Zucker 1990:34-35).

Allport is adamant that the psychological functions as well as the physical functions (psychophysical systems) form the basis of personality. Though Allport said and did many things, he is primarily known for the following views of personality (Meyer et al 1994:330-347):

- No two people will react to a situations in the same way (even if they are identical twins).
- Personality is a universal thing, although it only occurs in individual forms.
- Owing to growth and maturation, personality changes.
- Personality is something that exists.
- There is discontinuity between the personalities of a child and an adult.
- Personality is neither inherent nor learnt.
- Personality develops throughout one's life by means of learning.

Unlike Freud, Allport's personality theory is based on the research conducted on "normal" people. According to Allport's theory, the result of optimal personality development is a mature adult personality. Attributes of the mature adult personality together with brief explanations in brackets are listed below:

- extension of the sense of self (not egocentric)
- warm relatedness to others (love for family, friends and others)
- self-acceptance (accepts the self as a person)
- realistic perception of reality
- unifying philosophy of life (the mature adult personality has his own philosophy of life)

Allport uses the Gestalt school's model of the personality. This model consists of concentric circles or layers, commonly known as the onion model. According to this model, the more important something is to an individual, the more appropriate it is. The concentric arrangement of a psychophysical system according to Allport is set out below in figure 2.2

FIGURE 2.2: CONCENTRIC ARRANGEMENT OF A PSYCHOPHYSICAL SYSTEM

Source: Meyer et al (1994:337) Adapted from Allport (1961:141).

Allport emphasises behaviour and seems to ignore the influence of environment. Despite its shortcomings, Allport's view should still be judged a valuable contribution to personality theories.

2.4.4.2 *Maslow's self-actualisation theory*

Abraham Harold Maslow (1908-1970) believes that a person is essentially a good and worthy being. His view differs from the psychoanalytical school which stresses the unconscious as well as from the behaviourists who stress environmental influences. Maslow is therefore regarded as the founder of the “third force” (Meyer et al 1994:357).

Maslow emphasises human potential and the possibility of a more successful life. He is of the opinion that to learn something about man’s potential one should study the handful of people who have succeeded in fulfilling their potential. He refers to such people as self-actualisers. Maslow wants to understand why they are exceptional. He does not believe that man will achieve success through luck alone. Maslow bases his views on the hierarchy of needs (Petri 1996:319-321). He gives the following example:

If a person is hungry and thirsty, he will start by drinking water first, then eat food. But if a person is very thirsty and hungry and someone puts a choke hold on him/her and he/she cannot breathe, that person will definitely struggle so that he/she can breathe first, then drink water and then eat food. In view of this example, Maslow regards sex as less powerful than any of the needs mentioned above. He argues that no one has ever died because he/she did not get sex. Beyond the need of air, water, food and sex, Maslow lays out five broader layers or hierarchies:

- physiological needs
- the need for safety and security
- the need for love and belonging
- the need for esteem
- the need to actualise the self

Maslow groups the five needs listed above into two general categories, namely deficiency motives and growth motives. The first four levels of the need hierarchy from physiological needs upwards fall under deficiency motive and the need for actualisation is put apart from deficiency needs, as shown in figure 2.3 below (Möller 1995:201-206).

FIGURE 2.3: TWO GENERAL CATEGORIES OF NEEDS BY MASLOW

Source: Möller (1995:203), modified.

The hierarchy of needs explained above will now be briefly discussed.

1. The physiological needs. These include the need for air, water, food, et cetera. Also included are the needs to be active, to avoid pain, to rest, to sleep and so on. Maslow regards the above-mentioned needs as individual needs.
2. The safety and security needs. If the physiological needs are averagely satisfied, the second layer of needs will have to be satisfied. Once a person has food and water to drink, he/she will need a home, a secure job and may even want to plan for retirement.
3. The love and belonging needs. When the physical needs and the safety and security needs are taken care of, the third layer of needs will become important. A person begins to feel the need for a friend, a spouse, offspring and a sense of wanting to be with others, for example by becoming a member of a church (Meyer et al 1994:361).
4. The esteem needs. Next in the line of needs is the need for self-esteem. Maslow identifies two types of esteem needs, namely the lower esteem needs, for example the need for status, fame and glory, and the higher esteem needs, for example the need for self-respect.
5. The need for self-actualisation. The last level of needs is slightly different from the rest. Maslow calls this level growth motivation, in contrast to deficit motivation. He also calls this level the being needs or the B-needs, in contrast to the deficit needs or D-needs. He also refers to this level as self-actualisation.

The self-actualisation needs involve the desire to fulfil potential, that is, to be all that one can be or becoming all that one can be or becoming all one is capable of becoming, making full use of one's abilities, talents and potential - in other words, becoming the person one may possibly aspire to be.

The levels of personality development can be depicted as a ladder which an individual can ascend and descend. The self-actualising person will be able to move up to the highest step of the ladder, while the other people will be somewhere on the lower level of the ladder. Figure 2.4 shows the hierarchy of needs depicted in the form of a ladder.

**FIGURE 2.4: THE HIERARCHY OF NEEDS DEPICTED IN THE FORM OF A
LADDER**

Source: Meyer et al (1994:359).

As mentioned earlier, many people will be found on the lower steps of the ladder and only a handful of people like Thomas Jefferson, Mahatma Gandhi and Abraham Lincoln, to mention but a few, will reach the top of the ladder, the self-actualisation level.

2.4.4.3 *Rogers' self-concept theory*

Carl Rogers (1902-1987) rejects the psychoanalytical view that man is motivated by biological energy. He also rejects the behaviourist's view that behaviour is a product of conditioning. According to Rogers, man is constantly striving to actualise himself and to achieve greater maturity (Möller 1995:215).

Rogers contends it that the environment plays a role merely as a facilitator. The environment may also play an inhibiting role. He stresses the role of each person's subjective experience of his/her world and especially how self-concept determines behaviour. Rogers believes that the purpose of life is to become that self which one truly is (Petri1996:316). Man has an intrinsic compulsion to strive towards the actualisation of all his/her potential. In his theory, Rogers stresses the importance of a person's subjective experience of himself/herself, the self-concept, and its influence on personality.

In Rogers' view, the structure of personality comprises three things:

- The organism. This term is used to refer to an individual with all his/her physical and psychological functions. An individual's behaviour is determined by his/her specific subjective perception of his/her world and the meaning he/she attaches to it.
- The phenomenal field. This constitutes the second structural element of the theory. It is the totality of an individual's experiences and includes both his/her perception of external objects and events and his/her awareness of experiences related to himself/herself.
- The self-concept. This is the third important structural element. It refers to a person's view of himself/herself (Möller 1995:215-216). Self-concept refers to the picture a person has of himself/herself and the value he/she attaches to himself/herself - in other words, how a person sees and judges himself/herself in the area of talents, motives, goals, appearance, ability, ideals,

and social interactions and relationships. The ideal self is the self-concept an individual would most like to have. The structure of personality as proposed by Rogers may be illustrated by a diagram as shown in figure 2.5 below.

FIGURE 2.5: THE STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS OF ROGERS' THEORY

Source: Meyer et al (1994:379).

Concerning the dynamics of personality, Rogers pays attention to the concept of congruity. Congruent functioning refers to a situation where an individual's self-concept corresponds with his/her potential, while incongruous functioning refers to a situation where an individual's self-concept does not correspond with his/her potential. Whilst the actualising tendency is regarded as being the overriding motive, the need for positive regard is also a very strong motive and may hinder the actualisation

process when the quest for appreciation by others is in conflict with an individual's actualisation potential. Congruence is the ideal in which the organism is open to and conscious of all his/her experiences and can incorporate them into the self-concept. Meyer et al (1994:381) conclude that a congruent person sees himself/herself as he/she really is and has a self-concept that corresponds with his/her actual potential.

In short, it may be said that true symbolisation of experiences leads to congruence whilst denial of experiences leads to incongruity, and thus to a false self-concept. The concepts "congruence" and "incongruence" may be shown in diagram form, as depicted in figures 2. 6 and 2. 7.

FIGURE 2.6: A DIAGRAM REPRESENTING A STATE OF CONGRUITY

Source: Meyer et al (1994:381).

FIGURE 2.7: A DIAGRAM REPRESENTING A STATE OF INCONGRUITY

Source: Meyer et al (1994:381).

Rogers further states that an individual is functioning ideally when his/her self-concept is congruent with his/her needs and feelings. In conclusion, it should be remembered that Rogers' personality theory is based on the assumption that man (or organism) is basically good and that he strives for fulfilment of his/her self-concept and his experiences.

2.4.4.4 *Kelly's cognitive theory*

George Kelly (1905-1967) has developed an entirely different personality theory. His theory is different from any other personality theory because in his unusual model, Kelly describes man or an individual as a scientist. Kelly observes that each person is constantly trying to predict, control and understand events in his environment (Meyer et al 1994:399; Möller 1995:139). Kelly realises that psychologists regard themselves as scientists striving to understand, interpret and control the behaviour of their subjects. What the psychologists often do not realise is that their subjects are also trying to understand, interpret, predict and control their lives and environment just like themselves (the psychologists).

In his approach, Kelly places the emphasis on cognition in personality development (Mussen, Conger, Kagan & Huston 1990:301). Cognition includes the process involved in thinking, problem solving and predicting events in the environment. People think about what is happening to them and are trying to and construct theories about what is going on, in an attempt to satisfy the drive to making sense of things. If a husband who was supposed to arrive home at 19:00 does not arrive at that time, his wife may start thinking that perhaps he has been delayed at work, or he is having a breakdown, or he has gone to the shops before coming home, or even worse he might have had an accident. One thing is certain, she will start thinking about different possibilities.

Just like a scientist, human beings create their own ways of seeing the world in which they live; the world does not create ways of seeing for them. Human beings build constructs and also try out these constructs. Like any scientific hypothesis, the constructs we establish should also have predictive power. Kelly states that we all develop a set of personal constructs which we use to make sense of the world and the people in it. The constructs are bipolar, that is, they have two ends. They may also be referred to as dichotomous and will differ from one person to another. Kelly therefore recognises the fact that people are different, not only because they may differ in the events they are seeking to anticipate, but also because there are different approaches to anticipation of the same events. As such, Kelly's psychology can be referred to as the psychology of individual differences. People may consist of sensitive/unfeeling, honest/dishonest individuals and so on.

2.4.4.5 *Frankl's existential theory*

Viktor Emil Frankl (1905-1997) is regarded as the father of logotherapy (from the Greek word *logos*, meaning study, word, spirit, God, or meaning). It is this last aspect that Frankl focuses on. Logotherapy postulates a voice to meaning. Frankl views man as consisting of a body (*soma* in Latin), psyche and spirit (Möller 1995:243; Meyer et al 1994:423).

Frankl argues that the physical, psychological and social aspects of human life are natural aspects of existence and hardly distinguish human beings from animals. He goes on to say that man is primarily a spiritual being who has freedom and responsibility. It is this existential view of the human being that forms the basis of Frankl's view and description of personality.

Unlike animals, the human being is not only shaped by the forces of heredity and environment; the human being is a person, and this implies that he/she has the freedom to be responsible. Responsibility is a quality unique to human beings. Unlike animals, the human beings is a body-psyche-spirit unit and is a spiritual-psychological being. Spiritual aspects form a person's existential core and this spiritual core of existence enables him/her to function as an integrated unit. According to Möller (1995:243), "the spiritual core, and only the spiritual core, constitutes unity and wholeness in the person". The structure of personality, according to Frankl, can be illustrated schematically as in figure 2.8.

FIGURE 2.8: FRANKL'S VIEW OF THE STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY

Source: Möller (1995:244).

As shown in figure 2.8 above, the cylindrical shape indicates that a person is made up of physical, psychological and spiritual aspects. Frankl combines the vertical hierarchies, that is, the unconscious, preconscious and conscious, with the concentric layers or circles, that is, the somatic, psychological and spiritual. As shown above, the spiritual aspect is in the centre; it is the core.

The human being has freedom of choice. He/she is not forced to behave in a particular way. But because of his/her free will, he may also be held responsible for his/her choices and has to bear the consequences of his/her choices himself/herself. This freedom of choice represents the spiritual dimension and, as Frankl puts it, it is actually what makes a human being to be human (Meyer et al 1994:432).

The concept of logotherapy literally means therapy through meaning. The view of man underlying the theory of Frankl is based on the following three fundamental premises:

- The human being has a free will.
- His/her basic motive is the will to meaning.
- There is actually meaning in life.

As stated above, the spiritual dimension is of special interest to Frankl. He stresses the spiritual dimension for the following reasons:

- On a spiritual level, human beings have responsibility.
- A human being's behaviour is goal- and value-oriented.
- On a spiritual level, human beings have freedom of will.
- A human being is a being searching for meaning.
- A human being is open towards himself/herself.
- The spiritual dimension is the core of personality.

Frankl argues that human beings develop themselves from the spiritual dimension, forming their own personality through their choices and decisions. He further contends that genetic composition and

environmental influences do not shape an individual's personality that much but rather the individual himself/herself. The personality of an individual is formed by his/her unique responses to the demands of his/her environment and the important persons in his/her life.

In Frankl's view, the core or essence of an individual's personality is already present at birth, although his/her personality (that is, the behaviour whereby a person is recognised) will develop throughout his/her life span. Only at the end of his/her life is a person fully actualised. Personality is continually in a process of becoming, and a person himself/herself is the force behind what he/she becomes.

2.5 SELF-EVALUATION AS COMPONENT OF PERSONALITY

Van den Aardweg & Van den Aardweg (1988:206) state that self-evaluation follows on self-analysis and leads to a positive or negative self-concept. Self-evaluation is usually arrived at by aligning or comparing oneself with peers or admired others.

It is not possible to discuss self-evaluation in isolation. The link, relationships and interrelated terms must also be mentioned. These terms can only be identified and be defined as entities but they can never be separated. The following terms, namely self-concept, self-esteem, self-attitudes, self-regard, self-worth, self-awareness, self-evaluation, self-identity, self-description and self-consciousness can be identified but should not be separated. The differences between these terms appear to be only grammatical in nature. It is not possible to put a clear divide between them.

As children grow older, they begin to act independently; gradually they become aware of others evaluating them, for instance by saying "Good boy/girl", or "No, don't do that". Thus, their behaviour is being judged according to certain rules and standards. These rules and standards must be learned and understood before an individual is capable of self-evaluation. As children gradually learn these criteria, each of them will develop a self-concept, and this concept will reflect the attitudes of others. Berns (1993:44) concludes that a self-concept develops when the attitudes and expectations of others with whom one interacts are incorporated into one's personality, making it possible to regulate one's behaviour accordingly.

The concept of self-evaluation, forms of self-evaluation, self-concept, self-analysis, formation and change of self-evaluation and consequences of self-evaluation will be discussed now. Practically every part of research and every conception that has to do with the self treat the human being as a self-evaluator. The starting assumption, generally implicit, is that everyone is at almost any time ready to make some kind of evaluative or judgmental statement. Schwarzer (1986:165) concludes that when a person starts evaluating the self, he/she will see almost exclusively only two things:

- good-bad dimensions
- has-the-trait versus does-not-have-the trait dimension

One simple relation may assert that an individual's overall level of self-evaluation is a weighted average of his/her task - specific performance expectations of various tasks in which he/she engages. Giving such a relation of specific task expectation to self-evaluation would be analogous to the relation between self-evaluation and self-concept. The former is part of, and consequently a partial determinant, of the latter. In both cases, the latter term is more general, but normally it is used with less precision than the former. People who speak of self-concept differ more widely in what they mean by that term than do people speaking of self-evaluation. People who speak of self-evaluation have more dissimilar ideas in mind than do people speaking of self-expectations (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:41).

According to Diggory (1966:417), self-evaluation, by juxtaposition of the definitions of self and value, simply means that the object being evaluated is part, aspect, or product, of the very organism that does the evaluation. It is possible then to evaluate a previous evaluation. Roughly speaking, when we change our evaluation of something we will also change our behaviour towards it. We may be more resistant to changing self-evaluations than to changing our evaluation of other people.

Vrey (1990:47) states that self-evaluation is a basic component of self-perception. For the person himself/herself, it is made reality. This is how he/she sees himself/herself. Self-perceptions form the basis of self-esteem which, for the majority of people, is the most crucial question of all. The primary source of self-esteem is the esteem of others. The researchers in the field of self-evaluation all agree that, in some sense, the individual prefers a high evaluation to a low self-evaluation and will take steps to

maximise his/her level of self-evaluation (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:130). Jordaan & Jordaan (1989:683) have the following to say about self-evaluation: “Self is analysed in accordance with the principle that every person forms a self-image on basis of self-knowledge acquired through the act of self-evaluation”. They go on to state that this act of self-evaluation is carried out with a greater or lesser degree of awareness in various life contexts, and that it lends to a person’s self-image a dynamic, developing character.

The belief is prevalent in social psychology that individuals are seeking to maximise their self-evaluation. Positive self-images are said to be pleasing to an individual, and it is frequently assumed that people will consciously direct their activities to obtain the highest possible self-evaluation in a given situation.

Webster & Sobieszek (1974:132) conclude that self-maximisation clearly is a central issue for any theory of self-evaluation. Almost the same conclusion is drawn by Diggory (1966:426) when he states that, throughout the experiment, the subject whose general initial level of self-evaluation was high, made probability of success P(s) that were well above those made by the subject who participated in the experiment with a self-evaluation that was generally low. It lends support to the contention that a connection exists between our estimate of the power of our abilities and the level of our self-evaluations.

2.5.1 Forms of self-evaluation

Authors and researchers have identified an average of three forms of self-evaluation. People continuously interpret and organise their experiences into the following three categories (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:130-132):

- physical characteristics (their appearance)
- psychological attributes (their abilities, plans and needs)
- social attributes (how friendly, shy, withdrawn they are in their interaction with other people)

The above-mentioned explanation is also maintained by Jordaan & Jordaan (1989:684). They state that the act of self-evaluation takes on different forms which are mutually inclusive. They distinguish at least

three forms of self-evaluation. These three forms will not be elaborated in this research; they are merely listed below.

- symbolic interaction
- self-reflection
- observation of own behaviour

2.5.2 Self-analysis and self-concept

Taking into account that self-evaluation follows on self-analysis and leads to a positive or negative self-concept (Van den Aardweg & Van den Aardweg 1988:206), the researcher thought it wise to have a brief look at both self-analysis and self-concept.

2.5.2.1 *Self-analysis*

Van den Aardweg & Van den Aardweg (1988:205) define self-analysis as a process where the individual looks at himself, not as a totality, but at his various aspects. Self-analysis leads to self-evaluation and a positive or negative self-concept. Self-analysis involves reflecting an individual's statements and serving as a model for him/her to admire.

Maddi (1989:672) states that, with regard to self-analysis, little confrontation takes place. This is because self-analysis is subjective. As an individual looks at himself/herself, he/she will possibly see himself/herself in a positive way. When individuals look at themselves, they would probably want to see their good selves.

2.5.2.2 *Self-concept*

According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1988:84), self-concept includes three mutually dependent components, namely identity, action and self-esteem. They further state that the self-concept has been termed the *Eigenwelt*: "Eigenwelt is the self in relation to itself or the self knowing itself". The

self-concept becomes the focal point of relationships. No child can truly become adult without a definite, clear self-concept (Vrey 1990:84) .

Self-concept is seen as a composite image of what we think we are, of what we think we can achieve, of what we think others think of us and of what we would like to be. It seems to be an evaluative picture which each person develops in his/her daily life within his/her psychological environment. Therefore, each person carries along with him/her his/her self-concept throughout his/her life's journey. Every normal human being, adolescents included, has a self-concept. It is not possible to live without one. One's self-concept can either be positive or negative, but it is never neutral. The self-concept forms the core of personality (Vrey 1990:47).

Relationship with the self is a most crucial factor in a person's achievement. Even if circumstances are not ideal, when a person believes in himself/herself, achievement is still possible. But for a person with low self-concept, chances of achieving high scores or rising above circumstances are very poor.

In conclusion, Webster & Sobieszek (1974:7) state that self-concept, that is, who an individual thinks he/she is, and the unique traits he/she believes himself/herself to possess, is at the core of virtually all issues regarding people.

2.5.3 Formation and change of self-evaluation

According to Hicks, Hicks, Powell & Simonton (1996:55), self-evaluation skills are a key to the future of each one of us. Each of us must internalise evaluation options and be able to manipulate criteria appropriate for different settings.

Webster & Sobieszek (1974:20-21) state that, turning to the issue of formation, ability and change, we find that the self is a function of others' opinion. Since the self depends on the opinions of others, it seems reasonable to suppose that individuals perceiving others' ranking of themselves as inaccurate would be less certain, perhaps also less stable, in their self-rankings. Research findings have proven that

the effect of others in changing the self-concept is inversely related to the accuracy of perception, or to the certainty of the original self-evaluation.

Change in one area of self-evaluation apparently generalises into other areas. This result can be expected from the conception of overall self-evaluation as being composed of specific task evaluations. Research findings have shown the effect of frequency of evaluation to be directly related to the amount of change induced in the self-evaluation (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:24).

After their investigation on self-evaluation, Snygg and Combs (Diggory 1966:27) came to the following conclusions:

- When self-evaluation and social evaluation are equal, a subject will be realistic and his/her goals and behaviour will be constant with the culture and with his/her own possibilities.
- When self-evaluation is lower than social evaluation, a person will have strong interests, will be gratified by the results of his/her own behaviour and will be encouraged by social reaction to continue his/her efforts, modestly and unassuming, until self-evaluation and social evaluation have achieved the parity of the case above.
- When self-evaluation is above social evaluation, the behaviour of others is threatening to the organism of phenomenal self, so an individual will become defensive and set high goals to prove that his/her self-evaluation is justified (Diggory 1966:107).

Although the self seems to be sensitive to changes in the evaluations received from others, it is not infinitely flexible, nor is it constantly changing to be in perfect agreement with every modification in evaluations. In other words, a semipermanent structure seems to arise from the evaluations received, and the type of structure that arises partly determines the effect of subsequent opinions. Thus it is possible to talk of two individuals, one who possesses a high self-evaluation as a result of having received a large number of positive evaluations, and another who possesses a low self-evaluation as a result of having received a large number of negative evaluations (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:29).

2.5.4 Consequences of self-evaluation

Erez & Judge (2001:1270) believed that self-evaluations concept may provide some needed integration, both in personality psychology and perhaps, in the relations of these traits to work outcomes such as motivation and job performance.

In 1966, Jones investigated the effects of either positive or negative evaluations of performances of individuals whose ability had previously been rated by the experimenter as being either higher or low (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:25). Some of the findings are as follows:

- Subjects receiving a high proportion of positive evaluations from others reveal a higher proportion of positive evaluations, than those receiving a lower proportion of positive evaluations from others.
- Subjects who have been told they are making good contributions to the case problem are more likely to offer comments in the future.

In conclusion, research conducted by Jones(as cited by Webster & Sobieszek 1974:25) indicates the following findings:

- An individual who receives many positive evaluations regarding a particular task is more likely to attempt future performances than an individual who receives many negative evaluations. It suggests that one consequence of a high self-evaluation may be increased willingness to perform in the future and, by extension, that a consequence of a low self-evaluation may be a decreased willingness to perform.
- A second consequence of a high self-evaluation that have appeared in several studies is a greater willingness to rank oneself within a group (Webster & Sobieszek 1974:29).

2.5.5 Self-evaluation and self-concept

As we have already seen from the definitions and discussions so far, self-evaluative and self-reinforcing functions occupy a central position in the social-learning theory. In addition to giving humans a capacity for self-direction, self-evaluation serves as a basis for feelings of satisfaction and worth. Specifically the

extent to which individuals experience both satisfaction and dissatisfaction is determined not only by their achievements but also by the standards against which their achievements are judged. Therefore, objectively identical accomplishments may let one person feel highly fulfilled, but leave another quite disappointed, because of differing evaluative standards.

After a lengthy explanation, Hjelle & Ziegler (1992:256) conclude that negative self-concepts reflect a history of negative self-evaluation, that is, a tendency to devalue oneself. Conversely, a positive self-concept reflects an enduring disposition to engage in positive self-evaluation, that is, a tendency to judge oneself favourably.

What one thinks of oneself (self-concept) will determine one's personality. How one evaluates oneself (self-evaluation) will also determine one's personality. Self-concept, as well as self-evaluation, lies at the core of personality. We possibly cannot talk about self-concept without implying self-evaluation, and we cannot talk about self-evaluation without implying self-concept either.

2.6 CONCLUSION

From the discussions above, it has been evident that self-evaluation, which follows on self-analysis, leads to a positive or negative self-concept. It is a known fact that, for a person with a low self-concept, chances of achieving high scores or rising above circumstances are remote. It has also been established that a positive relationship exists between self-concept and achievement.

We have come to realise that no two people are completely alike. Therefore, no two people will react identically to the same psychological situation or stimulus, even if they were Siamese twins. Human behaviour has never been fully understood, and therefore there is still a need for personality theories. It has been noted that there are many personality theories, ranging from the depth psychology approach to the humanistic approach. Except that the personality theories are different, they are at times even opposing one another. It has also been established that some personality theories are not theories in the true sense of the word, they may be classified as philosophical systems.

