



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

TITLE: CORRELATION BETWEEN SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN
WOLKITIE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY FOR PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN PSYCHOLOGY.

BY: ENATFENTA ZELALEM

SUBMITTED TO :DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

MAY,2023

WOLKITIE, ETHIOPIA

ADVISOR NAME. MR. ESRAEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE	7
1. Introduction	7
1.1. Background of the Study	7
1.2. Statement of the Problem	9
1.3. Research Question	10
1.4. Objectives of the study	10
1.4.1. General Objective	10
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	10
The specific objectives of this study are to:	10
1.5. Significance of the Study	11
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	11
1.7. Limitation of the Study	11
1.8. Operational Definition of Basic Terms	12
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
2.1. Self-esteem Issues	13
2.2. The Concept and Meaning of Self-esteem	14
2.3. Types of Self-esteem	15
2.4. The Importance of Self-esteem	15
2.5. The Relationship between Self-esteem and Social Interaction	16
2.6. The Concept of Social Interaction	17
2.6.1. Types of Social Interaction	18
2.6.2. The Importance of Social Interaction	18
2.6.3. The Concept of Relationship	19
2.6.4. Friendship Formation	19
2.6.5. Group Process and Interacting with Others	20
2.6.6. Interaction System of Peer Group	20
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	22
3.1. Research Design	22
3.2. Population	22
3.3. Sample and Sampling Technique	22
3.3.1. Sampling Technique	22
3.3.2. Sample Size	22

3.4. Data Collection procedure and Tools of Data Collection	24
3.4.1. Data Collection procedure	24
3.4.2. Data Collection Tools	24
3.5. Instrument of data analysis	25
3.6. Ethical Consideration	25
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION	26
4.1. Introduction	26
4.2. Biographical Data	26
4.3. Analysis of Quantitative Data	27
4.3.1. Social Interactions among Students of Wolkitie University	27
4.3.2. Self-esteem Data Presentation	29
4.3.3. Correlations among dimensions of social interaction and self-esteems of respondents	30
4.3.4. Difference in Gender on Self-esteem, and Social Interactions.....	31
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION(S)	33
5.1. Summary of Findings	33
5.2. DISCUSSION	34
5.2.1. Correlation among Self-esteem and Social Interactions	34
5.2.2. Gender difference on Self-esteem and Social Interaction	36
5.3. CONCLUSION	36
5.4. RECOMMENDATION(S)	36
References	37

List of Tables and Figures

<i>TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE SIZE AND TARGET POPULATION STRATIFIED ACROSS DEPARTMENTS.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>TABLE 2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF THE RESPONDENTS.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>TABLE 3: RESPONSES ON SOCIAL INTERACTION EXPERIENCES OF STUDENTS.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>TABLE 4: RESPONSES TO ITEMS OF STUDENT'S SELF-ESTEEM INDICATORS.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>TABLE 5: CORRELATION AMONG SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTION DIMENSIONS.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>TABLE 6: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GENDER ON SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS.....</i>	<i>31</i>

AKNOWLEDGEMENT

First I would like to thank God to your name for what you have done in God for his support and giving the health and strength to complete this research paper and I would like to extend my hurtful thanks to my uncle Atalel kassa your giving financial and moral support.

Second, I would like to express my deep gratitude and appreciation to my adviser Mr . Esrael for his personal commitment to give the invaluable advise and comments that encourage me to take my step in the progress of this paper.

Finally I would like to express my heart full thanks to all the 2015 E.C graduates of psychology department, you are always in my conscious mind.

Abstract

The main objective of the study was to assess the relationship between self-esteem and social interaction in students of Wolkitie University. A correlational design that involves only quantitative method was employed to examine the existing correlations among self-esteem types and corresponding social interactions of students. A stratified random sampling technique was employed to select samples from the target population (third year and four year students in four departments of Business and Economics faculty). Consequently, data was collected from 78(m=46,f=32) students through questionnaire and analysed by Pearson's product-moment correlation formula using SPSS. Besides, an independent t-test was also employed to test existence of significant difference between gender on the existing self-esteem to social interaction relationships. The major findings of the study showed that, though the correlations of self-esteem to social interactions are insignificant, relatively students with high self-esteem have stronger informational($r= 0.148$) and emotional ($r=0.107$) types of social interactions unlike those with low self-esteem who had negative social interactions($r=0.291$). The result also revealed that there is no significant difference between being male or female(gender) on the purported self-esteem to social interaction relationships(see, table6,p.29). Based on the findings, the conclusions are drawn and recommendations are forwarded

Key Terms: *self-esteem, social interaction, correlation, informational, emotional or trusted social interaction, negative social interaction*

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

The study for understanding human behavior has been in action since long. Human behavior, as a product of individual's interaction with the social environment, is affected by personal and contextual factors (Bandura, 1986). This proposal focuses on investigating the relationship between student's self-esteem and social interaction and also tries to address whether the state of student's self-esteem hinders/facilitates his/her social interaction that is assumed to be a background for effective communication, learning and working collaboratively during their stay for study in this university. Thus, this proposal constitutes background, statement of the problem, objectives, significance, operational definition of terms, limitation, delimitation, and methodology of the study. Besides, the schedule or plan for conducting this research project is included at the end of this proposal.

1.1. Background of the Study

Individual's state of self-esteem (lower or higher) affects their social interaction and quality of relationship. Researchers argue that there is a significant relationship between self-esteem and social interaction (Thomas & Patterson, 1991). It is asserted that positive and genuine self-esteem of individuals make those around them feel good, connected and comfortable despite low self-esteem of individuals does the opposite.

Social interaction is a social exchange between two or more individuals (Durkheim, 2002). It is a dynamic phenomenon expressed by action versus reaction scenarios among/between partners in a social context as part of relationship. Social interaction provides emotional, instrumental and informational support and can be a source satisfaction and fulfillment (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

However, operationalizing and measuring social interaction is elusive due to the fact that different scholars associate dimensional views to it. For example, Kalish (2001) reviewing the works of few (Fiore, Becker, & Coppel, 1983; Revenson, Schiaffino, Majerovitz, & Gibofsky, 1991; Rivera et al., 1991; Rotenberg & Hamel, 1988) provided service-based concrete (tangible), cognitive guidance, socializing, emotional support, and self-disclosure types of social interactions. Each type of interaction has specific purpose to address. Service-based concrete (tangible) interaction is applied during service provision using structures (e.g., learning and teaching, assignments, projects, meetings, sport games, meal programs and so on); Cognitive guidance interaction (called advice or informational support) occurs during dissemination of information on a topic that is unclear or upsetting; socializing interaction (also called intimate interaction) refers to interactions with the purpose of sharing potentially enjoyable situations (e.g., sharing a meal, taking a walk, playing a game); emotional support interaction refers to interactions performed for sense of being heard and cared about (e.g., listening, reflecting,

reporting concern); **and** Self-disclosure interaction refers to interactions that require availing non-judgmental comfortable environment to reveal private information, feelings, and thoughts (e.g., discussing dissatisfaction, secrets, illness and others).

Yet, Rook (1994) and others reported that many of the above mentioned types of interactions are not significantly different in their impact on individuals and hence they may be categorized more efficiently into only three theoretically distinct categories: emotional, instrumental, and informational interactions.

Moreover, students in the university as member of the community appear to have different social interactions. They also make interactions via their telephones with friends, parents, and relatives outside of the compound. Thus, their scope of social interaction is broad. But several researchers limit their scope to specific contexts. With this regard, social interaction of students in a university is situated to the university context and may include mainly, the instrumental/tangible, informational, emotional and socializing aspects of social interactions.

Self-esteem is the evaluative aspects of the self-concept that corresponds to an overall view of the self as worthy or unworthy (Lazarus, 1991). Self-esteem is a product of social relationship or social interaction. Moreover, relationships are resources that prevent one from stress and are instruments for both cooperative and problem solving (Hartup, 2007). Hence, self-esteem (SE) is a crucial part of adaptation to social relationships; it serves as a gauge or socio-meter to monitor people level of belongingness or social inclusion (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). It is considered as the best means to reach self-compatibility that helps face failure as well as difficult, different and new social situations.

Therefore, the level of self-esteem affects psychological security of the individual and raises social anxiety and vice versa. If the individual has a low level of self-esteem, he/she will deal negatively with social situations. It also increases the individual's impulsiveness in dealing and interacting within the community. In case of failure, the individual refuses social communication and loses the feeling of enjoying the accompaniment of others (Murad, 2019). As a result, peer rejection, academic failure and receiving limited social support are consequences of such relationships (Coie et al., 1993). These problems are expected to be experienced by university students due to various stressors they are entangled with. These negative social relationships will force individuals to higher level of psychological depression that will be associated to social anxiety experience, fear, and uneasiness in social performance and interactional situations (Alansari, 2004; Muammariyah, 2009). In addition, Hope, Chavous, Jagers, and Sellers (2013) revealed that high self-esteem of individuals plays essential roles for them to achieve self-compatibility, positive psychological stability, and academic achievement.

In the university or outside communities, the question of does having more close friends boost one's self-esteem, or does having high self-esteem influence the quality of one's friendships(social interaction)has been researched for several years though results were rarely inconsistent(Harris,2019).

However, recently a meta-analysis of more than two decades of research involving more than 47,000 participants and research papers published between 1992 and 2016, published by the American Psychological Association, reported to have answered questions. The questions were whether, to what extent,and at what ages a person's social relationships influence his or her self-esteem development, and vice versa. The findings of this meta-analysis research not only answered the questions but also cleared the previous inconsistencies of some research findings(Harris,2019). The findings reveal that *positive social relationships, social support and social acceptance* shape the development of self-esteem in people over time across ages 4 to 76. It is also found that a positive self-esteem of individuals help to create good social relationships and interactions. But the analysis requested further study especially on whether this effect is cumulative across life span starting in childhood at family level or situated to a specific conditions,whether certain relationships types become particularly important at certain ages or not.

But this meta-analysis was performed on papers from only western countries and Russia(30 samples from the United States, four from Switzerland, three from Germany, two each from Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Greece, Russia and Sweden) so that the findings are not representative to Ethiopian situations.Yet, it is reasonable to investigate how much student's social interactions in the wolkitieuniversity affects his/her self-esteem and viceversa by examining self-esteem and social relationships of students in the context.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Researchers and psychologists suggested that the state of one's self-esteem indicates the nature of one's social relationships and helps also to monitor psychological health and detect and manage social rejection. In this view, self-esteem is a socio-metric tool used to identify which activities, relationships, and behaviors do trigger negative emotions, and signs of social exclusion(Leary &Baumeister, 2000).

Social rejection occurs when an individual deliberately excluded from social relationship or social interaction for no other practical reasons. Such exclusions can be either active by bullying, teasing or ridiculing or passive by ignoring. Gradually, internalizing rejectionas subjective experience, the recipient may adhere to it without active presence of rejection and may develop low self-esteem and isolation. This may hurt not only his/her personality development but also educational achievement in several ways. Consequently, peer rejection, academic failure and receiving limited social support are consequences of such relationships (Coie et al., 1993).

These problems are expected to be experienced by Wolkitie University students due to various stressors they face daily in the social context. These negative social relationships will force individuals to higher level of psychological depression that will be associated to social anxiety experience, fear, and uneasiness in social performance and interactional situations (Alansari, 2004; Muammariyah, 2009).

In addition, Hope, Chavous, Jagers, and Sellers (2013) revealed that high self-esteem of individuals plays essential roles for them to achieve self-compatibility, positive psychological stability, and academic achievement. It is evident that several Wolkitie University students leave the university per semester not only for academic but also for psychological and social relationship failures. Thus, the researcher is initiated to closely investigate how far self-esteem and social interactions are related for student's in Wolkitie University and explain the role of stressors that inhibit social interactions indirectly affect student's self-esteem and vice-versa. This will help strengthen the effort exerted to improving university teaching and learning.

Hence, in this study student's self-esteem will be investigated by the assessment of student's *social relationship*, *social support* and *social acceptance* (Harris, 2019) using self-esteem questionnaire (Rosenberg, 1965). And student's social interaction will be examined based on the assessment of *instrumental/tangible*, *informational*, *emotional* and *socializing* dimensions of social interactions (Kalish, 2001; Rook, 1994). And thus, at the end of the study, the researcher intends to answer the following questions:

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTION

1. Is there any relationship between students' self-esteem and their social interaction in Wolkitie University?
2. Is there any gender difference in students' self-esteem and their social interaction in Wolkitie University?
3. What psychological mechanisms are then needed to improve students' self-esteems and social interactions in Wolkitie University?

1.4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.4.1. GENERAL OBJECTIVE

- The general objective of this study is assessment of the relationship between students' self-esteem and their social interaction among Wolkitie university students.

1.4.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of this study are to:

- Examine the relationship between self-esteem and social interaction of students using correlational analysis statistic.

- Investigate if there is statistically significant gender difference on students' self-esteem and social interaction.
- Provide psychological strategies useful to improve students' self-esteem and social interaction from literature focused on gaps identified by correlational analysis.

1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The researcher's findings is expected to have the following significances.

- ❖ It may help to increase student's self-esteem development and provide means to improve student-student, student-teacher, and student-social workers relationships of the campus community.
- ❖ It may promote the awareness and knowledge of those students as well as another concerned individual in the campus to examine about their self-esteem and social interaction.
- ❖ It may motivate other researchers for the issue and can be used as resource for further study on issues relevant to self-esteem and social interaction

1.6. DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The areal scope of this study is Wolkitie University located in the Southern part of Ethiopia. The study involves mainly students of college of Business and Economics enrolled in either of the four departments of the college.

Theoretically, the two broad concepts: self-esteem and social interaction are limited to *social relationship*, *social support* and *social acceptance* (Harris, 2019) dimensions of self-esteem and *instrumental/tangible*, *informational*, *emotional* and *socializing* dimensions of social interaction (Kalish, 2001; Rook, 1994).

1.7. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

- This research was conducted on Wolkitie University on respondents taken from specific departments so that its findings may not bear generalization
- Furthermore, due to material and time insufficiency, the researcher could not consider all the student population of the university as target population. Therefore, the findings of this study may not be even generalizable to the university level. Besides, only one college is taken as target population and selected purposively. And only third and fourth students are taken as respondents for this study due to the fact that first and second year students are not accessible easily. Moreover, the sample size is further adapted to manageable size of 90% confidence of true (10% of sampling error) of the calculated sample size due to anticipated time and resource scarcity.

1.8. OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF BASIC TERMS

- Self-esteem: is operationalized as having a healthy view of yourself, a quiet sense of self-worth, and a positive outlook. It is being able to see all your abilities and weaknesses together, accepting them, and setting realistic goals (Canadian Association Mental Health, 2013). It will be measured by adopting the Melhem (2012) or Rosenbergs' (1965)self-esteem standard scale and items.
- Social-interaction: it refers a dynamic changing sequence of social actions of students and a social exchange between two or more students in the campus setting.
- Relationship: refers to a particular type of connection between two or entities or phenomena and a binding usually continuous association between students where in one has influence on feelings or actions of the other students.
- Social-rejection: refers to occurs when the students are deliberately excluded from a social relationship of social interaction for social rather that practical reasons.
- Peer-rejection: **it** refers to a powerful force in one's life especially when the students being rejected is also ridiculed, harassed or bullied.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. SELF-ESTEEM ISSUES

Self-esteem is the amount of self-respect or self-worth that a person has for him or herself. Peoples are often described as having either self-esteem, meaning they think very well of themselves and their abilities or low self-esteem meaning they are filled with doubts and criticisms about them and their abilities. Peoples with low self-esteem may experience many problems in their lives (Ribinson, 1995). According to Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2001), however the term low self-esteem is only a popular description of the way of a person thinks or feel about him or herself it not an official diagnosis of mental health problems. Nevertheless many mental health care professionals agree that health self-esteem is important to many aspects of a person's life. People with low self-esteem with often of themselves in very critical ways such I am not good enough, I am a failure or I never amount to anything. And with this thoughts come painful feelings such as sadness, anger and anxiety, fear and worthless. Peoples with low self-esteem may to make decisions, because they doubt that they will be successful. They also find it harder to make friends, because they are shy or they do not think other people will like them. In addition people with low self-esteem frequently stay away from situations which they might be judged so they avoid chances or trying new thinks especially when other peoples are around.

Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2001), in comparison, people with higher self-esteem often report having happier and satisfying lives. They more confident about their abilities to cope with problems and take on new challenges, and more likely to approach new peoples to make friends.

In some studies high self-esteem often acts as a protective factor for may peoples helping them more effectively with common stressor in life. But despite these potential benefits, many health care professionals still disagree about the costs and benefits of helping peoples increase their self-esteem does more harm than good or that it encourage and level of self-esteem. Some researchers claim that encouraging peoples to become more narcissistic and raise their self-esteem does more harm than good

that encourages people become impulsive. However for people who recognize that their lives are suffering because of their critical, judgmental thoughts, about themselves, increasing self-esteem even just a little can have many lasting benefits (Hilal, 2008).

2.2. THE CONCEPT AND MEANING OF SELF-ESTEEM

In psychology and self-esteem reflects a person's over all subjective emotional evolution of his or her own worth. It is a judgment of one as well as attitude to the self.

Self-esteem is the evaluative aspects of the self-concept that corresponding to an overall view of the as worthy or unworthy (Lazarus,1991).Thus academic self-esteem is an attitude about the and related to personal beliefs about skills, abilities, social relationships and future outcomes. It is important to distinguished self-esteem from the general term self-concepts, because the two terms are often used to interchangeably. Self-concept refers to the whole cognitive beliefs that have about themselves. It is everything that known about the self, and includes things such as name, race, likes, dislikes, beliefs, value and appearance descriptions such height and weight(Campbell,1996).

By contrast academic self-esteem is the emotional response that people experience as contemplate and evaluate different things about in the academic social life. Although self-esteem is related to the self-concept it is possible for people believe objectively positive things such as acknowledging skills in academic, athletics or arts, but continue not really like themselves.

Conversely, it is possible for people to like themselves and therefore hold high self-esteem in spite of their having any objective indicators that support such positive self views.Although influenced by the contents of the self-concept, self-esteem is not the same things(Tilaye,2006).

Self-esteem encompasses beliefs about one self,(for example,"I am competent", "I am worthy"),as well as emotional state such as triumph, despair, pride and shame. Mc Donald ,Saltman and Leary(2003),defined it by saying "the self-concept is what think about the self as in how we feel about it, Self-esteem an attractive a social psychological construct because researchers have conceptualized Italia as an influential predictor of certain outcomes such as an academic achievement ,satisfaction in marriage and relationships and criminal behavior.

According to Leary and Baumeister(2000),self-esteem is possessing title self-regard can lead people to become depressed to fall short their potential or to tolerate abusive situations and relationships. Too much self-love on other hand results in an off putting sense of entitlement and an inability to learn from failures

2.3. TYPES OF SELF-ESTEEM

In psychological findings in the field of self-esteem and the definition of self-esteem can basically be boiled down in to one of three standard ways these are : competence based ,worthiness based and competence worthiness combined(Coopersmith,1998).What this then gives us four categories we can put ourselves in to:

First, low self-esteem: it indicates a person who has a poor belief in both self-worth and competence. They basically have constant feelings of insecurity, are very cautious, timid, have poor initiative, avoid conflict and suffer with a lot of anxiety and depression.

Second, high self-esteem is demonstrated with one who has good beliefs in this competence and worth. They generally feel good about themselves are open to new experiences, feel accepted and are pleasant to be around. They have a high competence level, which means they the skill set to succeed in life and show good mental health, happiness, and secure in their own identify.

Third, worthiness based Self-esteem is revealed when an individual that fits in to this type of self-esteem realizes how others view him/her and they view themselves. They make up for perceived lack of competence by denying short-comings minimizing failures and surroundings themselves with people who accept them.

Fourth, competence based self-esteem- in individuals' measure how they feel about themselves by their achievements and success.They compensate for their lack of worth by exaggerating the importance of thei successes(Dedikdes& Brewer,2001).

2.4. THE IMPORTANCE OF SELF-ESTEEM

The importance of a healthy self-esteem for foundation of our existence can not be underestimated.Our self-esteem is important because it has an impact on our life and choices.Our self-value is the sources of our mental health.Self-esteem is idea that we have about ourselves.It how valuable and important we think. How we respect ourselves as a person(Bednar,Wells and Peter,1995).

Self-esteem is important because of :We believe we are worthy of happiness,we feel worthy of ourselves.Is the first step in believing in us,it builds self-confidence. If we do not respect our self do we think others will ?.Our self-esteem has a profound effect on thinking,emotions happiness,desire,values and goals.We can still feel respect and be proud even if we make a mistake.We have a sense of control and direction and approach problems with different.Allows we to make correct choices and take actions,goals and desires.We can challenges easily and criticism.

We consider our self a valuable person and we live for a reason. It gives the clarity to recognize our qualities, strong faith in our self and know that we loveable and capable.It is an integral part personal happiness,fulfilling relationships and achievement of of desires. It allows us to be in control of our own live and able do what we want is the source of our mental health that is why self-esteem is important(Hilal,2008).

2.5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

Self-esteem is related to so many positive behavior and life outcomes of social -interaction. People with high self-esteem are less susceptible to social, pressure, have fewer inter-personal problems, are happier with their life, interact at high and more persistent level socially and capable of forming satisfying self-esteem are more prone to psychological problems such as anxiety, depression and to physical illness, to poor social relationships with others and social -interactively. It is very important aspects of well-being,happiness,adjustment and social-interaction.So building self-esteem is a key to happiness and success (Harter,1988).

According to Thomas and Patterson (1991), there was a significant relationship between self-esteem and social-interaction. The correlation links between low self-esteem and social -interaction problems have other possible interpretations. Psychologists approved that there is a strong correlation between self-esteem and social-interaction. To mean that those who have high scale highest level of socially and those who have high self-esteem scale poor social -interaction.

In generally, high self-esteem helps an individual to view themselves as an active and capable person to promote changes through efforts and set higher goals which causing learning,thinking,and socially interacting a new things.A research has also documented that high self-esteem plays an important role in social –interaction,social and personal responsibility.Those who have higher social-interaction tend to

more feel confident in contrast those who have lack of confidence in themselves interact less (Redenback,1999).

2.6.THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

Social interaction is a dynamic changing and reactions due to actions by interaction partners.Social - interactions can be differentiated in to accidental,repeated,regular and regulated.A social -interaction is a social exchange between two or more individuals(Durkheim,2002).These interactions form the basis for social structure therefore are a key object of basic social inquiry and analysis.Social interactions can be studied between groups of two or dyads three or triads larger social groups Social structures and cultures are founded up on interactions.

By interacting with one other people design,rules,institutions and systematic witch in which they seek live.Symbols are used to communicate the expectations of a given society to new to it either children or outsiders.Through this broad this schema of social development ones sees how social interaction is lies at its care.The empirical study of study social -interaction is one of the subjects of micro-sociology which concerns the the nature of every day human social interactions agency on a small scale(Marx,2002).

Methods include symbolic interactionism and ethno-methodology as well as later academic subdivisions and studies like psycho-social studies conservational analysis and human computer interaction.With symbolic interactionism reality is seen as social developed interaction with others.It argues that both individuals and society can notseparated far from each other for two reasons.One being that they are both created through social-interaction.The second reason is they cannot be understood in terms with out the others.

Ethno-methodology an offshoot of symbolic interactionism which questions how peoples interactions can be created the illusion of a shared social order despite not understand each other fully and having different perspectives. Social group is a collection of human or animals that share certain characteristics interact witch one another accept expectations and obligations as member of the group and share a common identity.

Social -interaction is a social exchange between two or more individuals.Dyad is a pair of things standing in particular relation: dyadic relation.For example any conversation,bet it a lengthy

conversation between intimate friends or casual chatter around the office water cooler, is a social-interactions can also be non verbal like eye contact made between two people(Weber,2002).

2.6.1. TYPES OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

According to Brehm, Saul and Steven(1999),there are basically four types of social -interactions.

First accidental : is not planned and not repeated for instances asking a stranger directions.Second repeated : not planned bound to happen time to time. Third regular: not planned but very common,likely to raise questions when missed for instances meeting a doorman every work day in our work place.Fourth regulated: planned and regulated by customs or law will definitely raised from question when missed for instances, interaction in a workplace.

2.6.2. THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

Social-interaction and social -support are one of the most important factors in predicting the physical health and well-being of everyone,ranging from childhood through older adults.Although social -interaction is a complex and that it vital to human health both physically and mentally(Shaw,1971).Many people find it hard to open their hearts and share their feelings and problems.

However, social -interaction where people can express their feelings and share their problems with people have a beneficial outcome on human health. Good social-support and social -interaction might also help coping with stress and major life changes like divorce, redundancy, moving house etc..It proved that lonely people more often suffer from cardiovascular problems stress and depression.

According to Brehm, Saul and Steven(1999),can also argued social -interaction can have a negative influence on human health.It happens especially if the main reference group has an ant-social behavior such as drug taking, alcohol using. In case social-interaction has a devastating outcome on mental health and physical health and it is necessary to help the person to break up this kind of relation and positive social-support or either professional help.

It highly appearing that our health is in some ways strongly dependent on other people. Social -interaction and social -support have a positive influence on human beings'physical and mental health. It lowers occurrence of stress,depression,anxiety and highly affects our endocrine-immune system. So that the end we can say people need people.

2.6.3. THE CONCEPT OF RELATIONSHIP

Relationship refers to a particular types of connection between two or more entities or phenomenon. A binding usually continuous association between individuals where in one has some an influence on feelings or action of the others that means for example marriage is one a common type of relationship. Also a relationship refers to aggregation of interrelations that endure over time which forms the bases for reciprocal inter personal expectations. Relationships are resources that prevent one from stress and are instruments for both cooperative and problem solving (Hartup,2007).

Keeping relationship with others is a common phenomenon for a person. This in fact is a need that distress in type at each stage of life for students particularly those reached in the higher education feel fact the friendship is more important that relationship with parents and sibling (Duncan,1993).

In life there is hardly anything as difficult as going it alone, having someone to learn one can make even the bitterest of life tolerable. A research can suggest that relationships are a vital to our health as a good nutrition regular exercises. So human relationships have an incredible complexity and variety which psychologists have a just began to fathom (Brown,1988).

2.6.4. FRIENDSHIP FORMATION

According to Baumeister and Leary (1995) people need to belong satisfied by regular interactions with in relationship that are characterized by stability and effective concern supporting that the social-meter should most active instable close relationships.

However, much of the experimental research supporting socio-meter theory was done by manipulating acceptance of rejection by previously unknown strangers supporting that the socio-meter is monitoring social inclusion in less close relationship example with acquaintances. Address this current study address this issue by investigating people relations to social interactions with their closet family member and closet friend as compared to less close family member and friends.

Research reveals that friendship formation is a complex process in which a of factors must coverage first environment must bring to two people in to contact with one other. Second the situation must be right for a friendship formation developed example both must be at appoint in life where they have the time and the resources to devoted to a new relationship. In additions we test the association between social-

interaction and self-esteem within a romantic relationship. This is important because it is apparently unclear whether there exists a unitary socio-metric that discriminates all social relationships or a collection of various closely interconnected domain and relationship specific socio-meters that are each attuned to some what different context (Kirkpatrick and Ellis,2001).

Relationships are very important and improved to people. Which can be partially explained by the relation that family members are generally related. So, investments that are well-associated with fitness benefits. Friendship can be very important for social and emotional supporting, establishing and maintaining social connections (Hartup and Steven,1997).

2.6.5. GROUP PROCESS AND INTERACTING WITH OTHERS

Influentially as they can be collectives are only minimal, social people are in the same place at the same time working on a common event, but they do not engaged in extensive interaction with each other. This section to examine social influence and interacting among members are more direct and meaningful. At a fundamental level people may have an innate need to belong to groups stemming from evolutionary pressures that increasing peoples chance of survival, groups and reproduction when in groups in isolation (Baumeister and Leary,1995).

A group is two or more person who are interacting with another in such a manner that each influences and is influenced by each other person (Shaw,1971).

For a collection of people to be defined as a group the members must interact with one other, be socially attracted to each other, share goal or objectives and have shared identify which distinguishes them from group. The social mixing of a sports club is termed "social cohesion" and group with formal goals who are normally successful a group for a example the eight rowers in a boat race is referred to as " task cohesion" (Brown,1988)

2.6.6. INTERACTION SYSTEM OF PEER GROUP

Hartup (2007) has been the most influential theorist in study of adolescents' friendship. He argued that friends are important in shaping the development of children and adolescents, such as the need for secure attachment, playful companionship social acceptance, intimacy and social relation.

Friends provide adolescents with a familiar partner someone who is usually to spend time with the and join in collaborative activities for increasing, interesting and information. Adolescents to maintain an

impression of themselves as competent attractive, trust relations with others. Adolescents have strong desire to be accepted by their peers. Peers are very important influence in adolescents.

Compare to people in their forties and fifties adolescents view themselves as being independent, realistic more ideas healthy sexual and better friendship. Friendship and peer group help adolescents and young adults to make the transition from dependent to independent (Duncan, 1993)

CHAPTER THREE:RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design of this study is correlational research design that uses quantitative research method and quantitative measurements such as frequency or number. This design and method are selected based on the research purpose,that is, to assess the relationship between students' self-esteem and their social interactions using statistical means in the Wolkitie university situations.

3.2. POPULATION

The population of this study is the Wolkitie University student community. However, the target population is students of college of Business and Economics. This college constitutes four departments: Economics, Management, Accounting and finance, and Marketing. I choose business and economics college and its students to be my respondents with the my assumptions that they relatively lack exposure to social interaction(perhaps, I may be judgmental) with outside and campus situations due to the nature of their courses unlike sociology, psychology and social science students who have one way or another better social engagement activities initiated by their courses. Thus, the target population amounts totally 663(male=416, female=247).

3.3. SAMPLE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

3.3.1. Sampling Technique

Sampling technique plays significant role in making unbiased data collection using questionnaire. This can happen when respondents have equal chance of being selected as a member of the research sample. There are several probabilistic sampling strategies used for quantitative studies. One of them is the stratified sampling strategy or technique. Thus, I employ stratified sampling technique to select sample members from the target population. To do so, strata will be identified and for this study student's department, academic year and gender will be used as clear strata to select members of the sample.

Besides, only fourth and third year students will be selected to fill the questionnaire. This may make the research finding biased but first and second year student are not accessible for several reasons

3.3.2 Sample Size

Depending the size of the population, and hence the target population, sample size differs. It also varies according to disciplines. But for social science studies, Taro Yemane(1967) has provided a formula that helps to determine sample size. The formula is described as $n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$, Where: n- represents the sample size; N-represents population size under study; e-represents the margin error taking sample. It is often given by $e=0.05$ or 0.1).

Therefore, the sample size , that is, the total number of respondents will be calculated based on this formula. That is $n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$, where in this case, the total population of the business and economics department, $N=663$, $e=0.05$. Substituting the values for N and e gives, $n = \frac{663}{1 + 663(0.05)^2} = 249$. Therefore, the sample size of this study taken from the target population is 249(male=156,female=93). However, due to the available time and work load I may face in the second semester during data collection, I decided to make the sampling error to be 0.1 or the confidence of interval to be 90% where in this case the correctness of the data obtained from the appropriate respondent is only 90%. Thus, the calculation of sampling size for $e=.1 = \pm 10\%$ is 87. This is chosen to be appropriate for this study as the study is a social science research and the researcher is a novice. All the results of necessary calculations performed on each stratum are displayed in table I below. Thus, the total size of respondents for this research will be only 87(m=55,female=32) and their distribution across four departments is also displayed in the table below.

TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE SIZE AND TARGET POPULATION STRATIFIED ACROSS DEPARTMENTS

R	Department	Target population				At 90% of CI, sample size calculated using Yamane's (1967)		
		M	F	Total	Year	M	F	T
1	Marketing	61	47	108	3	8	6	14
		22	23	45	4	3	3	6
2	Management	58	51	109	3	8	7	15
		41	28	69	4	5	4	9
3	Accounting & finance	72	42	114	3	9	6	15
		52	21	73	4	7	3	10
4	Economics	76	26	102	3	10	3	13
		34	9	43	4	4	1	5

Total	416	247	663	4	55	32	87
--------------	-----	-----	-----	---	----	----	----

Finally, after having the list of names of students in each department, those student who are going to be members of the sample of the study will be selected by using lottery method. Consequently, their names will be listed in a note book and kept secret until the time of data collection approaches.

3.3. Data Collection procedure and Tools of Data Collection

3.4.1. Data Collection procedure

Data was collected once from members of the sample based on the schedule or plan. Friends from my department and college of business and economics will be oriented how to distribute and collect questionnaire to students whose names are in the list before assigning them for the task. Data collection from those respondents will be done in short time possible but in time when are relatively free from engaging tasks so as to increase rate of return of questionnaire papers.

3.4.2. Data Collection Tools

The main tool of data collection was questionnaire. The questionnaire was adapted from already in use items available in the literature. Especially, those developed by Rosenberg (1965) or Melhem (2012) was adapted and in use for measuring self-esteem of students. Similarly, social interaction measurement tools were adapted from that of Social Interaction Questionnaire(SIQ) of Kalish(2001) or others by searching from the literature.

After adapting the questionnaire items, data for pilot test was collected and analysed to check reliability and validity of the instrument or tool of data collection using Cronbatch alpha correlation coefficient. The cumulative cronbach alpha for internationally used self-esteem measurement tools was 0.67($\alpha=0.67$). Thus, the items seemed to have relatively medium internal consistency. As the items are adopted from the literature that is frequently pilot tested and valued, this value is relatively low. But this decrement might have come from small sample size of the pilot test, which was only about 20 respondents for the cases.

Similarly, the items for social interaction were adapted from that of Kalish(2001). After they are pilot tested, the cumulative cronbach alpha value is found to be 0.78($\alpha=0.78$). The internal consistencies of this items is relatively better.

3.5. Instrument of data analysis

To analyze the data collected about the relationship between students' self-esteem and their social interaction, SPSS(Software Package for Social Scientists)was used. More specifically, the Pearson Product Moment correlation formula has been in use to calculate the correlation between major variables. Furthermore independent t-test was applied to identify existence of difference between gender across respondents.

3.6. Ethical Consideration

The study has been done based on the following ethical consideration:

- ❖ The researcher asks willingness of the any relevant stakes and respondents before engaging them on the task..
- ❖ Privacy of the respondents were kept in to consideration during data collection.
- ❖ The purpose and objective of the study was clearly stated and given to the respondent.
- ❖ Confidentiality is still and will be kept and protected.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The major purpose of this research was assessment of correlation among types of students' self-esteems(low and high) and their respective types of social interactions(i.e., informational, emotional, and socializing of Kalish(2001) and Rook(1994) or student's *social relationship*, *social support*, and *social acceptance* Harris(2019)) among Wolkitie university students. More specifically the study was committed to answer the following questions:

- Is there any relationship between students' self-esteem and their social interaction in Wolkitie University?
- Is there any gender difference in students' self-esteem and their social interaction in Wolkitie University? And
- What psychological mechanisms are then needed to improve students' self-esteems and social interactions in Wolkitie University?

Thus, this chapter presents the data analysis and presentation of results that suggest possible answers about questions of this research. As the research design is correlational, a quantitative data analysis techniques are in place. Applying the statistics tables, charts, and graphs will be used to display using means, standard deviation and variance measures.

In the first section of this chapter the biographical data of the sample of respondents are given. Following this, the respondents' responses are displayed using frequency and correlation tables. After data is displayed with tables based on subtitles, the summary of findings, discussion, and recommendation follow.

4.2. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

The sample size of this study was calculated to be 87(m=55, f=32). Using stratified simple random sampling technique, respondents of this study were identified. Besides, 87 questionnaire papers were distributed to respondents in four colleges of Wolkitie University. Only 9 questionnaire papers were not returned. That is, the rate of return is 89.65%. The following table 1 shows distribution of biographical data of this study.

TABLE 2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF THE RESPONDENTS

	Department	Sex of the Respondent	Year		Total
			3rd	4 th	
1	Marketing	Male	6	3	9
		Female	6	5	11
		Total	12	8	20
2	Management	Male	7	4	11
		Female	7	4	11
		Total	14	8	22
3	Economics	Male	9	4	13
		Female	2	1	3
		Total	11	5	16
4	Accounting and Finance	Male	6	7	13
		Female	4	3	7
		Total	10	10	20
5	Total	Male	28	18	46
		Female	19	13	32
		Total	47	31	78

As displayed in table1, the data constituted the responses of 46 male and 32 male students of third and fourth year. Only five from accounting and finance, two from management, and two from marketing totally 9 questionnaire papers were not returned for analysis.

4.3. ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

4.3.1. SOCIAL INTERACTIONS AMONG STUDENTS OF WOLKITIE UNIVERSITY

Amongst types of social interactions, the interactions related to informational, emotional, and socializing type(Kalish, 2001) and Rook(1994) or that of *social relationship*, *social support*, and *social acceptance* Harris(2019) are dominantly experienced by most inquirers. The respondents’ response with this regard is given by the following table2.

TABLE 3: RESPONSES ON SOCIAL INTERACTION EXPERIENCES OF STUDENTS

No	Items	Often	Regularly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
1	Received help during travel, work or while taking a walk in the university	4 (5.1%)	11 (14.1%)	37 (47.4%)	20 (25.6%)	6 (7.7%)	78
2	Received good ideas that reduced my worries from someone in the university	4 (5.1%)	19 (24.4%)	37 (47.4%)	13 (16.7%)	5 (6.4%)	78
3	Got information that kept me less anxious from someone in the University	8 (10.3%)	8 (10.3%)	28 (35.9%)	22 (28.2%)	12 (15.4%)	78
4	Received advice to adjust myself to my daily activities in the university	7 (9%)	13 (16.7%)	22 (28.2%)	25 (32.1%)	11 (14.4%)	78
5	Received encouragement on my becoming better from someone in the university	8 (10.4%)	15 (19.5%)	20 (26%)	22 (28.6%)	12 (15.6%)	77
6	Received help on my personal care activities (hygienic, packing materials, etc.,).	8 (10.3%)	8 (10.3%)	12 (15.4%)	25 (32.1%)	25 (32.1%)	78
7	Received help on my daily learning and social activities in the university	6 (7.7%)	18 (23.1%)	19 (24.4%)	23 (29.5%)	12 (15.4%)	78
8	Got someone who listened to my feelings in the university	9 (11.7%)	10 (13%)	32 (41.6%)	18 (23.4%)	8 (10.4%)	77
9	Got someone who made me feel comfortable with the way I looked	7 (9.2%)	13 (17.1%)	27 (35.5%)	17 (22.4%)	12 (15.8%)	76
10	Got someone who made me doubt dependability on others in the university	7 (9.1%)	10 (13%)	12 (15.6%)	23 (29.9%)	25 (32.5%)	77
11	Got someone who made me worried or upset in the university	12 (15.4%)	10 (12.8%)	21 (26.9%)	23 (29.5%)	12 (15.4%)	78
12	Got someone who gave me upsetting information in the university	10 (13%)	17 (22.1%)	19 (24.7%)	20 (26%)	11 (14.3%)	77
13	Got someone who provided me with unwanted advice about my daily activities	6 (7.8%)	10 (13%)	16 (20.8%)	24 (31.2%)	21 (27.3%)	77
14	Met someone who discouraged me on what I did	5 (6.4%)	15 (19.2%)	22 (28.2%)	19 (24.4%)	17 (21.8%)	78
15	Met someone who was unable to share feeling with me	11 (14.1%)	12 (15.4%)	23 (29.5%)	22 (28.2%)	10 (12.8%)	78
	Total	112	189	347	316	199	1163

From table2 here, respondents indicate that almost informational social interactions are available at about regular basis by the fact that when responsesthe items of informational interaction, i.e., item1,2,3, and 4 above scale ‘sometimes ‘ are summed up, they lie between 53.9 % and 77.2%. This is indicating that almost above 53.9% respondents have experienced social interactions that are mainly informational and supportive. It also shows that quit a number of respondents did not have good deal of participation to informational social interactions.

Similarly, the sum of responses of respondents for items 5 to 9 except item6 at scales levels termed as ‘often’, ‘regularly’, and ‘sometimes’ lies between 54% and 67%. That is, majority of respondents (at

least 54% of them) believe that they experienced social interaction that involves emotional engagement and trusted relationship occasionally (frequency between sometimes and often).

The table also displays that respondents replied existence of negative social interactions that cause personal upset (55.1%), provide upsetting information (59.1%), and hinder sharing feelings (58.4%). But other respondents also replied that there are no as such deepened social interactions that lead to closer care and support of one another (64.2%), discourage individuals directly (46.2%), and feel doubtful or suspicious to interact with others (62.4%).

4.3.2. SELF-ESTEEM DATA PRESENTATION

Assessment of the status of students' self-esteem has been the focus of this research. Student's self-esteem plays significant role in shaping his/her interactions, emotional engagement, and healthy relationship with members of the community. It has also high contribution to student's holistic development and particularly competence, academic achievement and success (Dedikdes & Brewer, 2001). The data collected from respondents in the Wolkitie University about the issues is displayed in the table 3 below as follows.

TABLE 4: RESPONSES TO ITEMS OF STUDENT'S SELF-ESTEEM INDICATORS

No	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others	27 (34.6%)	27 (34.6%)	17 (21.8%)	7 (9%)	78
2	I feel that I have a number of good qualities	26 (33.3%)	30 (38.5%)	15 (19.2%)	7 (9%)	78
3	All in all, I feel that I am a failure	19 (24.4%)	7 (9%)	20 (25.6%)	32 (41%)	78
4	I am able to do things as well as most other people	26 (33.3%)	29 (37.2%)	14 (17.9%)	9 (11.5%)	78
5	I feel I do not have much to be proud of	14 (17.9%)	14 (17.9%)	34 (43.6%)	16 (20.5%)	78
6	I take a positive attitude towards me	29 (37.2%)	28 (35.9%)	18 (23.1%)	3 (3.8%)	78
7	On the whole I am satisfied with myself	20 (25.6%)	30 (38.5%)	21 (26.9%)	7 (9.0%)	78
8	I wish I could have more respect for myself	17 (21.8%)	38 (48.7%)	14 (17.9%)	9 (11.5%)	78
9	I certainly feel useless at times	15 (19.2%)	12 (15.4%)	26 (33.3%)	25 (32.1%)	78
10	At times, I think I am no good at all	17	10	20	31	78

Table3 here displays that majorities of respondents believed that they have positive self-esteem expressed by their response. The responded that they have equal personal worth like others(79.2%), a number of good qualities(71,8%), Positive self-attitude(73.1%), self-satisfaction(62.1%) and ability that makes them able (70.5%).

On the opposite extreme of these respondents, a number of respondents have lower self-esteem. They replied that they feel rather a failure (66.6%), less proud of the self (64.1%), useless (65.4%), and at times no good at all (65.3%). This is indicating that respondents of this research in this study context have experienced either type of self-esteem options: low self-esteem or high self-esteem spirit.

4.3.3. CORRELATIONS AMONG DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL INTERACTION AND SELF-ESTEEMS OF RESPONDENTS

The major objective of this study was to assess whether the student’s self-esteem beliefs are associated to their social interactions in the university. The student’s self-esteem dimensions are identified to be low self-esteem and high self-esteem holding the extremes. Similarly social interaction dimensions are considered to be informational social interaction, emotional (trusted and engaged) social interaction, negative social interaction. The correlation among them with Pearson’s correlation formulae is displayed in the table4 below.

TABLE 5: CORRELATION AMONG SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTION DIMENSIONS

Correlations				
		Informational and support interaction	Emotionally engaged positive social interaction	Negative social interaction
Informational and support social interaction	Pearson Correlation	1	.684**	-.316**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.005
	N	78	78	78
Emotionally engaged positive social interaction	Pearson Correlation	.684**	1	-.216
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.057
	N	78	78	78
Negative social interaction	Pearson Correlation	-.316**	-.216	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.057	
	N	78	78	78
Students with high esteem	Pearson Correlation	.148	.107	-.190
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.197	.351	.095
	N	78	78	78
Having lowself-esteem	Pearson Correlation	-.089	-.024	.219
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.440	.837	.054

	N	78	78	78
--	---	----	----	----

As can be in table4, the types of social interactions prevailing in study context seem to have related to one another instead of becoming exclusive from one another. As correlational values indicated some of the social interactions have either positive or negative correlations to each other. Some of those correlated do have significant effect on the other unlike others which have insignificant correlations.

It can be observed here from the data that respondents who have experienced trusted and emotionally engaged interactions have also significant share for practices of informational and supportive social interactions($r=0.684, \alpha=0.000, N=78$). Similarly, those respondents having negative social interaction practices have significant negative correlation with those who have good informational and supportive social interactions ($r=-0.316, \alpha=0.005, N=78$).

However, the correlation of respondents' self-esteem to their corresponding type of social interactions are found to be weak and insignificant. For instance, respondents who rated themselves to have high self-esteem have correlation with **informational and support**($r=0.148$), **emotional and engaged**($r=0.107$), and **negative** ($r=-0.190$) types of social interaction practices. Besides, the data in table 4, shows that those respondents who rated themselves to experience low self-esteem have relatively strong correlation to negative social interactions($r=0.219$) but weak negative effect on other types of social interactions.

4.3.4. DIFFERENCE IN GENDER ON SELF-ESTEEM, AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

It appears that males and female students have different interactions based on their self-esteems. Examining whether there is significant difference gender wide on the suggested constructs in the practices of students in Wolkitie University. The data analyzed based on t-test is given in the following table5.

TABLE 6: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GENDER ON SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

Dimensions of self-esteem and social interaction		T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference
1	Informational and support social interaction	.006	76	.995	.004	.668
2	Negative social interaction	.043	76	.966	.053	1.244
3	Emotionally engaged positive social interaction	-.375	76	.709	-.380	1.015
4	Students with high self-esteem	.864	76	.390	.772	.893

5	Students with low self-esteem	-.923	76	.359	-.885	.958
---	-------------------------------	-------	----	------	-------	------

The analyzed data as displayed in table 5 here shows that there is no significant difference between sexes in their self-esteem and social interaction experiences. As can be observed in the table, the significant level of each dimension namely, respondents' informational and supportive($t=0.006, df=76, \alpha=0.995$), emotional and engaged ($t=0.043, df=76, \alpha=0.966$), negative tendency($t=0.-.375, df=76, \alpha=0.709$), high self-esteem ($t=0.864, df=76, \alpha=0.390$), and low self-esteem($t=0.-.923, df=76, \alpha=0.359$) experiences. Here the significance level of each variable, that is , α -value is greater than $p=0.05$ and this makes the difference between sexes insignificant.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION(S)

5.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The major purpose of this research was assessment of correlation among types of students' self-esteems(low and high) and their respective types of social interactions(i.e., informational, emotional, and socializing of Kalish(2001) and Rook(1994) or student's *social relationship*, *social support*, and *social acceptance* Harris(2019)) among Wolkitie university students. More specifically the study was committed to answer the following questions:

- Is there any relationship between students' self-esteem and their social interaction in Wolkitie University?
- Is there any gender difference in students' self-esteem and their social interaction in Wolkitie University? And
- What psychological mechanisms are then needed to improve students' self-esteems and social interactions in Wolkitie University?

After the thorough analysis of collected data using the SPSS, then major results are screened. As the social interactions are measured using rating scales that use frequency of actions or activities (often, regularly, sometimes, rarely and never), the findings are expressed by averaging frequency of actions. Thus, the sum of responses of 'sometime', 'regularly' and ' often' is equated to 'occasional' activity and those below this frequency is regarded as 'never'. Hence, findings are stated with such considerations as follows:

- Respondents ranging from 53.9%to 77.2% replied that they occasionally experienced informational and supportive types of social interactionsduring their stay in the Wolkitie University.
- Majority of respondents (54% to 67%) have replied to have experienced have trusted and emotionally engaged type of social interaction at occasions.

- A number of respondents replied to have experienced negative social interactions that cause personal upset (55.1%), provision of upsetting information (59.1%), and hinder sharing of feelings (58.4%).
- More than 70% of respondents replied to have positive and high self-esteem about their own self. Unlike a number of respondents who believed to have low self-esteem expressed by their feeling failure (66.6%), less proud of the self (64.1%), useless (65.4%), and no good at all (65.3%).
- Respondents who replied to have experienced **trusted** and **emotionally engaged** type of social interaction have also significant interaction in **informational** and **supportive** types of social interaction ($r=0.684, \alpha=0.000, N=78$).
- Similarly, those respondents who believed to have experienced negative social interactions negatively affect informational and supportive social interactions going on in the university ($r=-0.316, \alpha=0.005, N=78$).
- The correlation between respondents' self-esteem and the types of corresponding social interaction are found weak and insignificant. That is, respondents who rated themselves to have high self-esteem have weak correlation with **informational and support** ($r=0.148$), **emotional and engaged** ($r=0.107$), and **negative** ($r=-0.190$) types of social interaction practices. Whereas, those respondents who rated themselves to experience low self-esteem have relatively strong correlation to negative social interactions ($r=0.219$) and weak negative effect on other types of social interactions.
- There is no significant difference between sexes in types of self-esteems and social interactions experienced by the respondents in the university so far.

5.2. DISCUSSION

5.2.1. CORRELATION AMONG SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

The findings of the data analysis show that there are stronger and significant relationships among types of social interactions than their self-esteem and social interaction relationships. For example, the data shows that more than 54% respondents have informational and supportive types of social interaction. Similarly more than 53% of respondents have trusted and emotionally engaged social interaction but more than 55% of them reported to have experienced negative types of social interactions. Besides, there

is significant correlation between informational and supportive and trusted and emotionally engaged social interaction types ($r=0.684, \alpha=0.000, N=78$). This is implying that those students who have good experience of informational and supportive social interaction in the university have also significant social practice in establishing trusted and emotionally engaged type of social interaction. That is, there are a number of students in the university who are informative, helpful, supportive, and trusted to the students or community members of the university.

As a matter of fact, the data analysis also provided that more than 55% of respondents experienced significant negative social interaction practices in their stay in the university ($r=-0.316, \alpha=0.005, N=78$). This is indicating that a number of students in the campus have gone through poor management of relationships with friends or anyone around. This may have come from poor attitude to their communications, provocative tendencies, and fixated annoyances. Literature shows that the types of social interactions can have a negative or a positive influence on human health (Brehm, Saul & Steven, 1999). So, individuals need to be satisfied with their regular social interactions to ensure stability, health, and success (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). But negative social interactions are prone to psychological problems that lead to serious mental and physical health deterioration (Kalish, 2017).

On the other hand, revealed that the findings of this study showed that there is weak positive correlations between respondents who believed to have high self-esteem and positive social interactions mainly with that of the informational and emotional aspects. But this finding is a bit different from other findings that reported to have got strong and significant correlations in similar other areas (Redenback, 1999). This weak and insignificant correlation found here in this study may be due to the small sample size and lack of focus from the side of respondents while filling the questionnaire items. Similarly, those respondents who believe to have low self-esteem have relatively strong positive correlation with those who are experiencing negative social interactions ($r=0.291$) though not significant. This finding somehow supports previous findings that reveal individuals with low self-esteem interact less but if they are pushed further they interact (Redenback, 1999). Thus, findings of this research and similar others are implying that establishing conditions that enhance positive social interaction are helpful not only for informational or socializing, emotional, and acceptance types of social interactions but also for coping with stress and major life changes. And this could be facilitated by helping students build positive self-esteem about their own self and their performance in the university.

5.2.2. GENDER DIFFERENCE ON SELF-ESTEEM AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

In this study gender was considered to have a differential effect on respondents' self-esteem beliefs and social interactions. For several influential background variables, the sex roles are found different and somehow significant in some areas of practice. The study anticipated to have differences across the two sexes on the status of self-esteem and social interaction activities. But findings showed that there is no significant gender difference in the status of self-esteem and social interaction activities of the respondents. This is implying several propositions. Some of which may be that the university of Wolkitie has paved an equivalent and equitable feasible conditions for both female and male students. Or the data sample size here also affected the result of the study to this extent.

5.3. CONCLUSION

Students in Wolkitie University have experienced atleastan informational, emotional, and negative types of social interactions and high and low types of self-esteem perceptions with no significant difference between sexes. Those students with high self-esteem beliefs appeared to have informational and emotional types of social interactions whereas those with low self-esteem beliefs are likely to be engaged in negative type of social interactions.

5.4. RECOMMENDATION(S)

As a result of analysis, summary, discussion and interpretation of the data of this research, the researcher recommends the following for respective bodies.

- The institutional guidance and counseling body together with others relevant needs to organize continuous training programs for students of any year level that is pertinent to improve their social, self-understanding, self-esteem, and communication skills and knowledge. Especially, students with sort of stress that might emerge from low performance, student background and others need to have immediate psychosocial support and focus.
- University lectures, psychologists, social workers, and student administration need to orchestrate their effort to help students build their positive self-esteems in line with facilitating students' academics.

REFERENCES

- Alansari, B. M. (2004). Anxiety among young people in some Arab countries: A comparative cultural study. *Association of Egyptian Psychologists, Cairo, Psychological Studies*, 14(3)
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Baumeister, R.F., & Leary, M.R.(1995) The Need to Belong Desire for Interperson Attachments As a Fundamental Human Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117,479-529
- Coie, J.D., Watt, N., F., West, S., G., Howkins, J., D., Asarnow, J., R., Markman, H., J., Ramey, S., L., Shure, M., B., Long, B.(1993). The science of prevention. A conceptual framework and some directions for a national research program. DOI: 10.1037//0003-066x.48.10.1013
- Harris, M., A.(2019): The Link Between Self-Esteem and Social Relationships: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, published online Sept. 26, 2019.
- Hartup, W. W.(2007) Critical Issues & Theoretical Viewpoints In H.K. Rubin, W.M. Bukows & B. Low Sen (Eds) *Handbook of Peer Interactions Relationship & Groups* (Pp-3-19), New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hope, E., Chavous, T., Jagers, R., & Sellers, R. (2013). Connecting self-esteem and achievement: Diversity in academic identification and dis-identification patterns among black college students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(5), 1122-1151. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213500333>
- Kalish, K., D.(2001). Psychometric properties of the Social Interactions Questionnaire (SIQ) in an older adult sample. Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports.
- Lazarus, R.S(1991) *Developmental Understanding : Emotion & Adaptation*. New York Oxford University Press.
- Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R.F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: sociometer theory .In M. P. Zanna(Ed.), *Advances in experimental social Psychology: Vol, 32* (pp. 1-62). San Diego: Academic press.

- Melhem, S. M. (2012). Effect of eating disorders, social anxiety, obsessive-compulsive disorder and self-esteem on body image satisfaction among adolescents in Jordan. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, Banha University*, 23(90), 1-32
- Muammariyah, B. (2009). Social anxiety: Emotional situations, prevalence ratios, gender and age differences. *Journal of the Arab Psychological Network*, 21-22, 135-149
- Murad,O.,S.(2019).Social Anxiety in Relation to Self-Esteem among University Students in Jordan. *International Education Studies*; Vol. 13, No. 2; 2020. Canadian Center of Science and Education
- Rook, K. S. (1997). Positive and negative social exchanges: Weighing their effects in later life. *Journals of Gerontology*, 52B, S167-S169.
- Rosenberg , M .(1965).Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton.University Press
- Thomas,K.& Patterson, G.R(1991)Inmor& Beyond Woman &Identify.Adolescence Identity Formation : New Burry York CA :Sage.