

Development of Self as a Concept in the University Students

Khalid Rashid^{*}, Muhammad Zafar Iqbal^{**} and Nousheen Khalid^{***}

Abstract

The current study was conducted to explore contributory factor of self concept among the under graduate university students. . BS students of university of education studying in first, second and third years were the population. The sample was selected (70, 70 and 60) in succession of the years. A pilot tested self developed questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire was comprised of 30 items and addressed 14 different dimensions which cause the development of self concept and affect it either way. The questionnaire was distributed to students by the researcher. The data was analyzed through SPSS.

Key words: University students, self concept

* Associate Professor, University of Management and Technology, Lahore

** University of Management and Technology, Lahore

*** Students, University of the Punjab, Lahore

Introduction

Self is a general term encompassing the ways to perceive, think and evaluate one's own personality and its match with the surroundings we normally people live in. First of all Rene Descartes brought the concept of self (Cooley, Mead, James and Dewey, 1930), later on ALL Port (1939) reintroduced self and ego such as self-image, self actualization, self affirmation, phenomenal ego, ego involvement, and ego striving as the experimental positivism (Ian Nicholson, 2003). Self is said to comprise sum of ideas, attitudes, values and commitments (Jerslid, Brook & Brook, 1978). Self is understood in terms of "I" and "Me" I remains operative as an individual where as we represent the group attitude. The element of "Me" can be broken down into; a physical self, a social self, amoral self and a psychological self (Berzonsky, 1981). Major aspects of self include actual/real self, ideal self and self concept (Hamachek, 1971).

There are three major components of self-concept viz. structure, function and quality. Structure encompasses flexibility, congruence and scope where as function stretches over locus of control as regards quality it is envisioned by intellectual competence, physical attractiveness, physical skills, social attractiveness, leadership and moral qualities and sense of humor. There are certain factors that are supposed to affect self concept which may be briefed as; maturity and intelligence (Katz & Zigler, 1967) locus of control (Hamachek, 1978), age, sex, race, religion and socio-economic class are the other factors.

Humanists contributed towards the study of self, Cooley explored the idea of looking glass self, Mead (1927) associated it with social conditions, Sullivan went for inter personal theory of personality, Adler attached self concept with personal life style, Horney related it with the anxieties of life like aspiration for affection, life partner, power, prestige, admiration, independence and perfection. In addition Carl Rogers intends to see a functioning person in terms of consistency in experiences and expectations. Maslow goes for self actualization in the realms of psychological needs, safety needs, esteem needs, belongingness needs. Hamachek (1987) steps forward and points to the fact towards identifying post self concept signs as, strong opinion holder, reflects best judgment, confidence in abilities, self conscious, accepts ideas without getting ruled over and sensitive to social customs. Self concept of women is also found to be driven by physical appearance (Bersheild & Walster, 1974) clothes, names and nick names, intelligence, emotions and cultural patterns, school and college, social status (Mc. Candless & Coop, 1979). As the person passes through the stages of life self concept gets firmer and especially during adolescence period the youth

comes across physical, intellectual, emotional and gender traits development. All these developments lead to seek for awareness, independence, critical thinking, peer acceptance and preparation for the vocation (Mead, 1953).

Education manages for the mental maturity with the need to explore self based on self identity, solid beliefs about the life, empowered to use self and self concept interchangeably (Rogers,1970).

Statement of the Problem

Self concept cultivation is the ultimate intent of the universities. The study is an endeavor to explore the way the universities are coming up to the aspiration of the stakeholders. In line with the intents of the universities this research has been kept focused on the topic, contributive factors towards the development of self concept in the university students of under graduate program.

Objectives of the study

Study has been designed to achieve the following objectives

1. Identify the factors that help develop self concept in the under graduate students of the universities
2. To Explore the factors affecting the self concept of under graduate university students

Research Questions

To keep the research tangible and focused the following questions were developed.

1. What is the level of self concept of the under graduate students of the university?
2. Does age of the students affect their self concept?
3. Is there any effect of class on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
4. Is there any effect of birth order on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
5. Is there any effect of residence on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
6. Is there any effect of grade on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?

7. Is there any effect of monthly income on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
8. Is there any effect of father occupation on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
9. Is there any effect of mother education on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
10. Is there any effect of father education on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
11. Is there any effect of locality on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
12. Is there any effect of mother occupation on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?

Significance of the study

Psychologists believe that self concept is an attribute that help the individual to be optimally functional in the society (Jersild, 1978) where as positive self concept makes the personality (Hamachek, 1971). This study will help the students know their self concept as the personality strength. Teachers will be made aware to design their lectures in line with the students self concepts. The study would also help develop a congenial climate for teaching learning at the university to develop the self concept of the students.

Review of related literature

The term self-concept is a general term used to refer to the way someone thinks about their own self. Baumeister (1999) puts the definition of this term in the following words that self is "the individual's belief about himself or herself, including the person's attributes and who and what the self is". Lewis (1990) understands that the concept of self has two aspects, the existential self *separates one from others in terms of constancy of the self*" (Bee 1992). On the other side in categorical self one puts him or herself into the categories of age, gender, size, skill, hair color, height and favorite things as internal psychological traits. In addition to it Kuhn (1960) could explore that there is something known to be understood as the self-image explaining the term who am I like the physical description, social roles, personal traits and existential statements. Self esteem and self worth are other elaborative factors of self as self esteem which involves the degree of evaluation which may be narrated in terms of high and low self esteem thematic appreciation test is used to measure it. Self esteem is stated to have the affect of four parameters like; reaction of others, comparison with others, social roles and identification (Miller and Ross, 1975). There

is something understood as the ideal self a relationship among ego, self esteem and self image influenced by four factors like; the way others react to us, how we compare ourselves with others, our social roles and the way we identify ourselves with others Michael Argyle (2008). Descriptive Psychology (Ossorio, 1978, 1981, 1985), explains the development of self concept in terms of empirical and logical justifications and therapeutic interventions for altering the self-concept.

The self-concept encounters behavioral possibilities in several ways. The first of which is captured by Charlie Brown as the virtue one considers, for various forms of participation in life. The second limitation imposed by a person's self-concept is to see themselves as a different person than others (Ossorio, 1976; Rogers, 1959) . The third limitation is not the appraisal of one's self rather it is to live in a world. Looking into these well-documented facts it may safely be inferred that self concept poses curious resistance to change (Baumeister, 1995; Ossorio, 1978; Swann, 1992). The crux of the matter lies in the fact that the status takes precedence over fact (Ossorio, 1978, 1998). The problems with the self-concept, originates out of the statuses people assign to them in their young age with their families, peers, school personnel, and others and they carry it with them throughout their lives (Koestner, Zuroff, & Powers, 1991; Swann, 1992) . In "family projection process" (Bowen, 1978), they "typecast" it (Hoffman, 1981). The present concept of self is parsimonious in resistance to change and it ties a wide range of phenomena.

Remedy to the fact is that the therapists in status of dynamic therapy assign a large number of statuses to the persons regarding them as treated, taking him as a person (1) who is acceptable; (2) who makes sense; (3) whose best interests come first in the therapeutic relationship; (4) who is important and significant to the therapist; (5) who already possesses enabling strengths, knowledge, and other resources for solving problems; (6) who, was given a choice between equally realistic but differentially degrading appraisals of him or her, is to be given the benefit of the doubt; and (7) who is an agent (i.e., an individual capable of entertaining behavioral options and selecting from among them, as opposed to a helpless victim of genetic, historical, environmental, or other forces) (Bergner, R., & Staggs, J. 1987).

Zahid (1983) conducted a research and proved that the higher self concept of students cause more cordial relations with their parents. Ahmad (1984) conducted a research on parent child interaction and its relationship with the self concept. He the involvement of parents lead to the development of higher self concept of their children. Kiyani (1986) could reach the conclusion in his study that higher the level of self concept effective would be the study habits. Ahmad (1986) explored the

theory of Meads reach the conclusion that those with high self concept show better academic achievement. Miyamoto and Bush (1986) applying Meads theory and provide out that self concept help shape self definition, responses promote and support self concept. Self concept help others develop specific attitudes. Bilali (1989) conducted a research on parental support and development of self esteem and could reach the conclusion that the two concepts are closely and significantly co-related. Jhangir (1990) conducted a research on relative deprivation and self esteem of female students explored that the two concepts are negatively correlated. Rafiq (1990) conducted research on spontaneous self concepts of Pakistani male and female adolescents and adult. Girls scored higher on the dimensions of nation, religion and academics. Rafi (1990) managed to develop a self-esteem scale which had multidimensional irreparable self esteem in the indigenous context. Ali (2002) conducted a research on finding a relationship between self, self concept and academic achievement of orphan and non orphan students. Research revealed that there is no significant difference on scores of self esteem where as it was significant for the sub scales of dominance and aggression. It may further be added that there was a significant relationship between the constructs for which the study was meant for. Naz (2003) tried to find out the relationship of maternal violence with self esteem of adolescents. No relationship did emerge. Jabeen (2003) managed to find out the relationship between self resiliency and self esteem of adolescents. The results showed positive relationship between the construct with the values higher for the girls than the boys.

Methodology

The study was descriptive and based on the use of survey strategy for the conduct of research.

Method of Study

A five point likert type rating scale was developed which was based on 30 items. The lowest option on the rating scale was strongly disagreed with a value of 1 and strongly agreed with a value of 5. It was pilot tested for the determination of reliability and finalization. A sample comprising students of BS Hons. class at University of education; 70 students from first and second year were taken whereas 60 were selected from third year class.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Table 1

Difference in students self concept on the basis of students age group

Groups	Sum of scores	df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	218.481	3	72.827	.429	.733
Within	33301.114	191	169.904		
Total	33519.595	194			

Table 1 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of students on the basis of age.

Table 2

Difference in students self concept on the basis of students gender

Groups	Sum of scores	Df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	224.469	3	74.824	.440	.723
within	33295.126	196	169.873		
Total	33619.595	199			

Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference in the self concept of students based on gender.

Table 3

Difference in students self concept on the basis of students class level

Groups	Sum of scores	df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	4870.413	2	72.827	429	.733
within	275649.382	197	169.904		
Total	280519.795	199			

Table 3 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of student regarding the students' class levels.

Table 4

Difference in students self concept on the basis of students locale

Groups	Sum of scores	df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	4870.213	2	2435.106	16.744	.000
within	28649.382	197	145.428		
Total	33519.595	199			

Table 4 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding the locale of students.

Table 4.1

I Locale	J Locale	Mean difference (I-J)	Significance
Urban	Semi urban	10.65780	.000
Urban	Rural	9.84524	.001

Table 4.1 shows that students living in urban areas have significantly better self concept as compared to semi-urban and rural students.

Table 5*Difference in students self concept on the basis of their birth order*

Groups	Sum of scores	Df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	7.329	2	3.665	.022	.070
within	3512.266	197	179.113		
Total	3519.595	199			

Table 5 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of students on the basis of their birth order.

Table 6*Difference in students self concept on the basis of their family size*

Groups	Sum of scores	Df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	131.526	2	65.763	.387	.680
within	33296.504	195	169.880		
Total	33427.030	197			

Table 6 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of student regarding their family size.

Table 4.7*Difference in students self concept on the basis of father occupation*

Groups	Sum of scores	Df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	1847.928	2	923.964	5.635	.004
Within	30624.009	187	163.957		
Total	32571.937	189			

Table 7 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding father's occupation.

Table 8*Difference in students self concept on the basis of mother's occupation*

Mother's occupation	N	Mean	SD	Significance (2 tailed)	t	Mean difference
House wife	159	1.0269	12.27597	1.0269	1	12.27597
Working women	41	1.0163	15.50283			

Table 8 shows that there is no significant difference in the self concept of student regarding mother's occupation

Table 9*Difference in students self concept on the basis of father's education*

Groups	Sum of scores	Df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	727.920	6	121.320	.708	.644
Within	32739.737	193	171.412		
Total	33467.67	199			

Table 9 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding their father's education.

Table 10*Difference in students self concept on the basis of mother's education*

Groups	Sum of scores	Df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	933.892	6	155.649	.906	.492
within	32474.598	187	171.823		
Total	33408.490	193			

Table 4.4 reveals that there is significant difference in the self concept of student regarding their mother's education.

Table 11*Difference in students self concept of day scholars and boarders*

F	significance	T	df	Significance (2 tailed)	Mean difference
.307	.580	4.205	198	.000	7.46672

Table 11 reveals that there is significant difference in the self concept of student regarding their residential status.

Table 12*Difference in students self concept on the basis of students earned grades*

Groups	Sum of scores	df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	1683.073	3	561.024	3.469	.017
within	30569.259	188	161.742		
Total	32252.232	191			

Table 12 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding their earned grades.

Table 12.1

I Grades	Jgrades	Mean difference (I-J)	Significance
A	B	8.687	.002
A	B	6.13289	.028

Table 12.1 shows that students with A and A have significantly better self concept as compared to students who earned other grades.

Table 13*Difference in students self concept on the basis of students feelings*

Groups	Sum of scores	df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	552.523	3	184.174	1.090	.355
Within	32960.563	196	169.029		
Total	33513.085	199			

Table 13 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of students regarding their feelings.

Table 14*Difference in students self concept on the basis of students belonging to different income groups*

Groups	Sum of scores	df	Mean square	F	significance
Between	914.037	4	228.509	1.367	.247
within	32605.558	195	176.208		
Total	33519.595	199			

Table 14 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding the income strata students belonged to.

Conclusions

1. The researcher concluded that the difference in students self concept based on the students age.
2. The gender has no significant difference in the development of self-concept.
3. The class does not contribute in self concept.
4. The students living in the urban area were found to have better self concept from the students living in the Sami-urban and rural area.
5. A possibility did exist that the siblings may differ in the self concept in order of their birth order, but nothing tangible could be worked out of the research regarding this dimension.
6. Family size was not found to be intervening in the development of self concept.
7. Father's occupation provides a support in certain aspects and their development but it was found to be contributive pertaining to this factor on the development of self concept where as the effect of mothers occupation was just the contrary.
8. In addition to profession of father, education may also contribute towards the development of self concept among students which stands true for mother and fathers education as per revelation of research.

9. Residential education proves better in the development of self concept in comparison to day scholars.
10. Grades of intellect and same have been endorsed by the research that those with A grade were better in the self concept.
11. Feelings make the people comfortable or distressful those students with better feelings showed better in the self concept.
12. Income makes the functions smooth students belonging to better income families showed better understanding of the self concept rather than the comparatively those belonging to poor groups.

Recommendations

1. Exposure of students to open houses, seminars, workshops, should be a regular feature of the programs enabling the students to socialize understand self and other.
2. The assignment should be given to the students that enable them to follow and defend their own contentions and understanding of their own self.

Bibliography

- Ahmad Naeem. (1986). Effect of Self-Concept on Academic Performance of Intermediate Students. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*, Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Ahmad Shafiq. (1984). Parent child interaction and self concept of the child. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*, Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Ali Anita Ghulam. Youth and national development. (*She*, August, 1997). Karachi.
- Ali Shabnam.(2002). Relationship of self-esteem, self concept and academic achievement in orphan and nonorphan children. *Unpublished Thesis*, National Institute of Psychology. Islamabad: Quaid-i-Azam University.
- Argyle, M. (2008). *Social Encounters: Contributions to Social Interaction*. Aldine Transaction
- Baumeister, R. (1995). Self and identity: An introduction. In A. Tesser (Ed.), *Advanced social psychology* (pp. 50-97). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bergmann, Rose Mary. (2000). Developing a positive self concept. Retrieved November 10, 2012.

- Baumeister, R.F. (Ed.) (1999). *The Self in Social Psychology*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press (Taylor & Francis).
- Beck, A., Rush, A., Shaw, B., & Emery, G. (1979). *Cognitive therapy of depression*. New York: Guilford.
- Beck, A., Rush, A., Shaw, B., & Emery, G. (1979). *Cognitive therapy of depression*. New York: Guilford.
- Beck, A., & Weishaar, M. (1995). Cognitive therapy. In R. Corsini & D. Wedding, (Eds.), *Current psychotherapies* (5th ed., pp. 229-261). Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Bergner, R. (1987). Undoing degradation. *Psychotherapy*, 24, 25-30.
- Bergner, R. (1988). Status dynamic psychotherapy with depressed individuals. *Psychotherapy*, 25, 266-272.
- Bergner, R. (1993). Victims into perpetrators. *Psychotherapy*, 30, 452-462.
- Bergner, R., & Staggs, J. (1987). The positive therapeutic relationship as accreditation. *Psychotherapy*, 24.
- Bergner, R. (1995). *Pathological self-criticism: Assessment and treatment*. New York: Plenum.
- Bergner, R. (1998). Characteristics of an optimal clinical case formulation. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 52, 287-300.
- Bergner, R. (1999). Status enhancement: A further path to therapeutic change. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 53, 201-214. 315-320.
- Berk, Laura, e. (2000). Child development. Ed 5th London: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bersheid, E., Walster, E. (1974). *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Berzonsky, Michael D. (1981). Adolescent development. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Bilali, Bilal Habib. (1989). Impact of parental support on self esteem of their children. *Unpublished Thesis*. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Bowen, M. (1978). Family therapy in clinical practice. New York: Aronson.

- Bright, D. (1988). *Criticism in your life*. New York: Master Media.
www.rce.rutgers.edu/pubs/pdfs/4h/e1448/417-420.pdf
- Campbell, E. Our many versions of the self: Psychology Today. Retrieved November 10,2012. [www.http://mentalhelp.net/psyhelp/chap14/chap14b.html](http://mentalhelp.net/psyhelp/chap14/chap14b.html)
- Coan, Richard W. (1983). Psychology of adjustment. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Denzin, N.K.(1987). Self and Identity: Psychology of adjustment. New York: John Wiley and Sons. [www.http://mentalhelp.net/psyhelp/chap14/chap14b.html](http://mentalhelp.net/psyhelp/chap14/chap14b.html)
- Freud, A. (1966). The ego and the mechanism of defense. *The writings of Anna Freud* (Vol. 2, rev. ed.). New York: International Universities Press. (Originally published, 1936).
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenwald, A. (1992). Unconscious cognition reclaimed. *American Psychologist*, 47, 766-779.
- Haider, M.saeed. (1986). Self- concept and professional commitment of doctor. *Unpublished Thesis*, Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Hamachek, D. (1987). Encounters with the self. New York: Holt Rinehartband Winston.
- Hjelle, A Larry.,& Ziegler, J. Daniel .(1992). Personality theories. 3rded. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Hoffman, L. (1981). Foundations of family therapy. New York: Basic Books.
- Hurlock, Elizabeth, B.(1973). Adolescent development. 4th ed. Japan: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Jabeen, Farah. (2003). Relationship between Ego resiliency and Self Esteem among adolescents. *Unpublished Thesis*, National Institute of Psychology Islamabad: Quaid-i-Azam University.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of Psychology*. New York: Holt.

- Kihlstrom, J., & Klein, S. (1994). The self as a knowledge structure. In R. Wyer & T. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (Second ed., pp. 152-208). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kirsch, N. (1982). Attempted suicide and restrictions in the ability to negotiate personal characteristics. In K. Davis & T. Mitchell (Eds.), *Advances in Descriptive Psychology* (Volume 2, pp. 249-274). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Jerslid, A.T., Brook, J.S., Brook, D.W. (1978). *The psychology of adolescence*. 3rd ed. New York: McMillan Publishing Company.
- Jhangir, Alia. (1990). Relative deprivation and self esteem in female students. *Unpublished Thesis*, Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Kiyani, Manzoorahmad. (1985). Self concept of university students and their study habits. *Unpublished Thesis*. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Koestner, R., Zuroff, D., & Powers, T. (1991). Family origins of adolescent self-criticism and its continuity into adulthood. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 191-197.
- 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.
- Lyoyd, M.A. (1985). *Adolescence*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- McCandless., Boyd, R., & Cooper Richard H. (1979). *Adolescents: Behaviour and development*. 2nd ed. USA. Holt Rinehart & Winston Inc. <http://mentalhelp.net/psyhelp/chap14/chap14b.html>
- Marshall, K. (1993). A bulimic life pattern. In R. Bergner (Ed.), *Studies in psychopathology: The Descriptive Psychology Approach*. Ann Arbor, MI: Descriptive Psychology Press.
- Putman, A. (1990). Organizations. In A. Putman & K. Davis (Eds.), *Advances in Descriptive Psychology*, Vol.5 (pp. 11-46). Ann Arbor, MI: Descriptive Psychology Press.
- Raimy, V. (1975). *Misconceptions of the self*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Raskin, N., & Rogers, C. (1995). Person-centered therapy. In R. Corsini & D. Wedding, (Eds.), *Current psychotherapies* (5th ed., pp. 128-161). Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Snygg, D., & Combs, A. (1949). *Individual behavior*. New York: Harper.
- Wylie, R. (1968). The present status of self theory. In E. Borgatta & D. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of personality theory and research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- 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.
- NazAfsheen. (2003). Perceived domestic violence and its relationship with self-esteem of adolescents. *Unpublished Thesis*. National Institute of Psychology Islamabad: Quaid-i-Azam University.
- Ossorio, P. (1976). *Clinical Topics (LRI Report #11)*. Boulder, CO: Linguistic Research Institute.
- Ossorio, P. (1978). "What Actually Happens". Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Ossorio, P.G. (1981). An outline of Descriptive Psychology for personality theory and clinical application. In K. Davis (Ed.), *Advances in Descriptive Psychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 57-82). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ossorio, P.G. (1985). An overview of Descriptive Psychology. In K. Gergen & K. Davis (Eds.), *Social construction of the person* (pp. 19-40). New York: Springer Verlach.
- Ossorio, P. (1998). *Place*. Ann Arbor, MI: Descriptive Psychology Press. (Originally published, 1982).
- Pfeutz, Paul F. (1961). *Human nature and dialogue in the thought of G.H.Mead and Martin Buber*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Rafai, Fareeda. (1999). Development and validation of a self- esteem scale. Unpublished M.Phil Thesis. National Institute of Psychology Islamabad: Quaid-e-Azam University.
- Rogers, C. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95-103.
- 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.
- Saleem, Ahmad.” Challenges the Youth face”. *The New Daily Lahore*: August 28, 2003
- Shakeel, Usman. “The adjustment problem”. *The New Daily Lahore*: February 16, 2002.
- Steinberg, Lawrence. (1993). *Adolescence*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Steinem, G. (1992). *Revolution from within: A book of self esteem*. Boston: Little Brown and Company. Retrieved on November 10, 2012 from; Stevens, Tom G. (2002).
- Swann, W. (1992). Seeking "truth," finding despair: Some unhappy consequences of a negative self-concept. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, 15-18.