



M. A. Akşit Koleksiyonundan



Göç edince, önce kendimizde uyumsal değişim yaşamalıyız

*First changing must be at ourselves, adaptation, at migration performing**

*M Arif AKŞİT***

**Değişim kendimizden başlamalıdır, başkasına söylenen inandırıcılıktan yoksun olmamalıdır.*

*** Prof. Dr. Çocuk Sağlığı ve Hastalıkları, Neonatoloji Bilim Dalı, Pediatri Genetik*

İnsanlar denize girmek isterse, buna göre giysi değiştirmeli, mayo giymelidir. Ayrıca havlu ve plaj terliği, güneşlik ve şapka gibi ek kıyafet üstü donanımlı olmalıdırlar. Bir nevi göç boyutu olup, buna uygun yapılanma, donanım gereklidir. Değişimi yaşamalıyız.

Her ortamda ayrı bir ben ve benlik olmalıdır. Bu duruma ve şartlara göre değişmelidir. Bu benliğin değişimi değil, farklı ortamda aynı kişi ama uygulama ve yaklaşımları değişmektedir.

Çarşı ve pazarda sizi tanıyan olmayabilir ama nezaket ve insanlık boyutu ile yapılan karşılık olarak hürmetli olması beklenir. Farklı yere göç, sevgi ve insanlığı beraberinizde götürmenize mani olamaz.

Sevgi, her boyutun temelidir, göçte çok yararınıza olacaktır. Tanımadıkları bir kişi karşılarında, farklı yerden geldiği de belli, nasıl davranılacaktır? Bireyler, Almanca ve Fransızca konuşanlar birlikte, tatil yerinde, temel anlaşmayı İngilizce yapmaktadırlar.

Merhaba, Hello, ötesinde, bir etkileşim yaşamak ve yaşatmak için ne yaparsınız? Bahçeden çiçek kopardım, sadece kadınlara verdim, sıfatlarınızı sunuyorum, bunu ben değil, tüm erkekler adına yapıyorum dedim. İkinci aşama, fotoğraf düz çekilmez, her birey birbirinin kolunu tutmalı, temas etmeli, bir sevgi halkası oluşturmalı dedim. Her biri ile kendi lisanından konuştum. Sanki yaptıklarım ile, kimi zaman Berlin’de oldum, Londra ve Paris’ten konuşmalar ile birçok yere aynı ortamda göç etmiş oldum. Bu çok etkiledi, çünkü kendileri de sanki orada olduklarını sandırlar.

Kendi ülkelerinden uzak ama bir anda kendi ülkelerinde gibi hissettiler.

Kardeşlik, hepimiz aynı mitokondriyal DNA/RNA ile kardeşiz diyerek, amaç bütünleşme idi, onlarda bildikleri kelimeler ile Türkçe konuşmaya başladılar. Ortak, gerekçe ve dayanak öne çıkmakta, sevgi temelinde insanlık öne çıkmaktadır. *Birimiz hepimiz, hepimiz birimiz içindir, nerede olursak olalım, nereden göç etmiş isek de sevgi ve insanlıkta olmayan yerde işimiz olamaz* dedik ve ortak onayladık.

Özet

Göç edince, önce kendimizde uyumsal değişim yaşamalıyız

Amaç: İnsanlar soğukta elbise giyerek uyum sağlamaya çalışırlar. Aynı değişik yapıda da bireyler, kendilerini irdeleme, değerlendirme ile yaklaşım yapmalıdırlar.

Dayanaklar/Kaynaklar: Kişinin kendisini irdelemesi, değerlendirmesi açısından referanslar temelinde yaklaşım yapılmaktadır. İngilizce sunulması, tümünden orijinal olarak okunması ve bilgi edinilmesi amaçlıdır. Yorumlardan okuyanları etkilememek amacı taşımaktadır.

Giriş: İlk planda değişim kendimizde olmalıdır. Bunun için kendimizi tanımak, gelişim boyutu ile irdelemek ve gelişimi yapma için kapasite öne çıkmaktadır. Kültürel değişim, bir kalıbın değil, bireyin haklarda ileri ve özel özgün olmasını sağlama olmalıdır.

Genel Yaklaşım: Birey Hakkı, Civil Liberties gibi yaklaşımlar ile, kişinin kendi benliği temelinde, rıza ve sorumlu olarak değişim olması önemlidir.

Başlıca boyutlar: İnsan hür ve bağımsız olması ile, tüm kurum ve kuruluşlardan hakları korumalı ve gözetilmelidir. Talep bile olmadan hakları sağlanmalıdır.

Yaklaşım: Değişim temel ise, eğitim bir yöntemdir ama kişinin kendi benliğine uygun olmalı ve onu gelişimini ve değişimini sağlamalıdır.

Sonuç ve Yorum: Gelişim insanın kendisinde olandır ve bu amaçla farkındalık önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kendisinin farkında olan kişi, göçte benliğini kaybetmez

Outline

First changing must be at ourselves, adaptation, at migration performing

AIM: We can survive, by adaptation of the conditions. For awareness, being evaluated yourself and the condition so by knowing who we are.

Grounding Aspects: From the references, the self-fact is under evaluation. They are given in English, for direct understanding, not mis-understanding by translation, as taken the information.

Introduction: First, we ourselves under the differentiation, progression. By self-evaluation, self-enhancement, and self-assessment, we can verify ourselves as self-verification.

General Considerations: Consent is at ourselves, thus we need advices and information, so responsibility belongs to us. This is civil liberties factor.

Proceeding: Justice must save and care the rights, even form Governmental and institutional factors, even spontaneously not by demand.

Notions: If the progression is on reality, education must be on the individual factors, by wishes and upon capacities.

Conclusion: Progression is at ourselves, so starting from us.

Key Words: If perceive yourself, not lost at migration

Giriş

Şarap üreticileri olarak Rektör olarak ziyaret ettiler. Kendilerinin kaliteli şarap üretmelerine karşılık, herhangi bir madalya alamadıkları, büyük firmalarının kapıştığını belirttiler. Yapabileceğimi sordum. Bir şarapçılık festivali düzenlenmesi, bilim insanları ile gerçek jüri olarak bulunması ve madalya vermesini istediklerini belirttiler. Niye dayandıkları söyleyince,

tadılma konusunda farkları bildiğimi, aynı zamanda gerçekten eşit davranacağıma inandıklarını söylediler. Tadarak rakı tiplerin bilirim ama içmem diye ekledim. Şarap konusunda bilgim yok dedim. Bir değerlendirme formu varmış, ona göre not verilecek dediler. Peki eğer hata saptarsam ne yaparım, tahmininiz nedir? Derhal müdahale eder, olayları sonlandırırınız dediler. Kontrol sizde, başkanlık sizde, güvendiğiniz kişiler de yönetici olacak, biz karışmayacağız, sadece maliyeti karşılayacağız dediler.

İlk defa geldiğimde Bekilli de Yüksekokul değil, Eğitim Fakültesi bir bölümünü, Fen Bilimleri Bölümünü açmak istedim. Beni çağırdılar, Hukuk Danışmanım Bekillili idi, bir sınavdan geçeceğimizi söyledi. Gittik, ince belli çay bardaklarına yarısına kadar şarap doldurulmuş, bunu tadım dediler. İlk, bu kız şarabı dedim. Nereden anladın, sulu olan üzümlerde, ilk planda ağırlığı az olanlardan ezilir, bu alkolü düşük, günlük içimlidir dedim. Daha sonra kilolu olanlar ezer, bu şaraptır. En son merdane ile sıkılır, bu da alkolü yüksek bir içecek olur dedim. İkincisi için de bu fermente olmaya ihtiyacı var dedim. Nedeni şekeri tam bitmemiş, sek olmamış dedim. Tepsiyi çekin denildi, 4 tane özel şarap geldi. İçtim, işte bunlar şarap dedim. Özelliği dediler, 5 yıldan fazla olmuş, özel fiçılarda dinlenmiş ama, 9-10 yıl olursa top olur dedim. Bu olguyu hatırlattılar bana.

Gıda Mühendisliği Bölümü vardı, onlara danıştım, ama onların işe karıştırmama kararımı da söyledim. Dışarda kalacaklardı, çünkü hiç şarap tatmamışlardı.

Toplantı önce, sabah, öğretim üyelerine bir sınav yapalım mı dediler, bir form dağıttılar, 16 parametrelili ve 4 haneli idi, verilen şarapları değerlendirin denildi. Benim de katılmamı istediler. Gerekece sonra söylendi, iki jüri üyesi gelmemiş, seçim için yapmışlar. Biri ben, en yüksek puan alan, bir de Rektör Yardımcısı imiş. Göreme 'li doğal dedim. Kendime şaştım. Bunun üzerine, ikimiz ayrı oturduk ama karar aldık, verilen değer bakarak, bizim üst ilk 5 içine almadığımız olursa itiraz edecektik. Bunu da biliyorlardı. 177 katılan içinde uyguladık. Markalara bakılmasını da jüri gereği olarak engelledik, sadece numara olarak verildi.

Ayrıca bir panel ve önemli bir ziraat geleceği konusunda bir vurgu yaptık.

Bunları neden belirttik? Bir iş yapacak isen, bir jüri üyesi olacaksan, önce kendini değiştireceksin. Kendin bilmez isen, sana eğitim vermenin anlamı olmaz. Sen bir bilirsen, eğitim alabileceksen onlar katkıda bulunurlar.

Bekilli şaraphanelerini açtılar, bize 2 saat bilgi verdiler, numunelerden de tadarak boyutu kavramaya çalıştık. Bunu temel olarak öğrendik; şaraba güzel veya çirkin denilmez, doğanın bir fermentasyon ürünüdür, neden, gerekece söylenmeli olduğunu kavradık.

Bu bana Yurtdışında bir irdelemem nedeni ile, tüm lokanta sıra oldu saygılarını sundu, başkası patronu gelerek servis otosunun kapını açmıştı. Kendisi İtalyan imiş, şaraba saygı duyana ben de saygı duyarım dedi.

Sonuç, ben şarap hakkında bilgim sınırlıdır, bir uzman, ben 20 yıldır mesleğim tadımcılık ama ben de bilmiyorum, bir araya gelip konuşalım dedi. Konuşma bir saate yakın sürdü.

Kendini nasıl değerlendirirsin?

Kendimizi nasıl değerlendiririz, bir değerlendirme yap, bilene sun, o mükemmel derse, bir hata vardır, ama tenkit ederse iyidir derim.

Mükemmellik iynin düşmanıdır. Hiçbir şey mükemmel değil, devamlı gelişim ve değişime ihtiyacı vardır.

20 yıl mesleği tadımcı olan kişinin, benden öneriler istedi, sundum ve çok mutlu oldu. Bilmeyen ama ilgi duyanın katkısı daha önemlidir dedi. Söylediğim, kişiler şarabı farklı şekilde algırlarlar. Hz. İsa kanı değil, askıda durumca, akciğerde toplanan seröz sıvıdır, bir kargı ile delinmiş, alınmış, pnömotoraks ile daha çok eziyet çekmesi istenmemiş dedim. Gerçi haça gerilen onu ihbar eden, son yemekte yanında olan mürididir diye ekledim.

Yıllarca bir emek ürünüdür, Kapadokya'da geliştirilmiş, taş havuzlarda dinlendirilmiş, yegâne gıda olmuştur dedim. Her insan farklı olduğu gibi, her şarap şişe olarak da farklıdır. Kişiler etikete değil, şarabı içerek irdelenmeli, tadına varmalı, tatmalı, içmemeli dedim. Şişeyi bitirmek isteyen şarap alınmalı dedim, şaraba yazık diye ekledim. Getirdiği örnekler üzerine karşılıklı yorum yaptık.

Not ben şarap konusunu bilmem, ama öğrenmek isterim, tadarım ama içmem.

Self-evaluation motives, Wikipedia¹

Self-evaluation is the process by which the self-concept is socially negotiated and modified. It is a scientific and cultural truism that self-evaluation is motivated. Motives influence the ways in which people select self-relevant information, gauge its veracity, draw inferences about themselves, and make plans for the future. Empirically-oriented psychologists have identified and investigated Three cardinal self-evaluation motives (or self-motives) relevant to the development, maintenance, and modification of self-views. These are [self-enhancement](#), [self-assessment](#) and [self-verification](#).

Yorum

İnsanın kendisini irdelemesi, belirli pencere bakışında olursa objektif olamaz.

Objektiflikte kime göredir. Bu açıdan bireysel yaklaşım yerine Etik ilkeler temelinde bakmak daha iyi olacaktır. Etik temelde 4 ana başlıkta toplanır, önemli olanları, ilkinde genel uzmanlar tarafından oluşturulan doğru nedir ve bu durumda doğru yaklaşım nedir tanımlamasıdır ki bu teorik oluşmaktadır. Uygulama bize yönelik olarak, biz doğru yaklaşım olarak, kendimiz ne yapmalıyız olmaktadır.

Hekimlikte bir acil yaklaşım yönlendirmesi, ABC vardır, bu uygulamada bireye adapte olmalı, sonuçta da elde edilenler irdelenmelidir.

Başlıca 3 boyut öne çıkmaktadır.

- 1) Kendinizi nasıl geliştirir, ilerletir, yönlendirirsiniz,
- 2) Kendinizi tanımlamak, beceriler ile oluşturmak,
- 3) Kendinizin yaptıklarını irdelemek olmaktadır. Prensip, buna göre plan ve uygulama olmalıdır.

Bu konular aşağıda irdelenmektedir.

- 1) Kendinizi nasıl geliştirir, ilerletir, yönlendirirsiniz,

Bireyler kendi benliklerini devamlılığı için ilerleme, gelişmeyi bir motivasyon olarak görmektedirler.

Kendisinde pozitif olanlar çok, negatif olan nadir diye düşünüyorsa, başkasını kritize ederler. Tersine ise karşıdakini yüceltirler, bu şekilde de bir nevi onu ulaşılamaz yapar ve mukayese olanağı olmaz.

Kültürel açıdan da farklı yaklaşımlar gözlenmektedir.

Birçok açıdan ele alınabilmektedir.

Çeşitli basamaklardan söz edilebilir.

- 1) Gözlemsel etkisi: Motivasyon için pozitif olanları dikkate almak ile olmaktadır.
 - 2) Devam eden, içinde bulunulan durum: Eylem sırasında motivasyon yapmak durumu denilebilir.
 - 3) Kişilik özellikleri: Durumuna göre davranma da bir motivasyon olmaktadır.
 - 4) Altta ki motivasyon: Stratejik ve sosyal karşılaştırma ile kendisini üstün tanımlama imkânı yaratabilmektedir.
- Kendine güveni yüksek olanlarda, kendisini bir koruma altına da almaktadır.

Self-Enhancement

Self-enhancement, Wikipedia²

Self-enhancement is a type of [motivation](#) that works to make people feel good about themselves and to maintain [self-esteem](#).^[1] This motive becomes especially prominent in situations of threat, failure or blows to one's self-esteem.^{[2][3][4]} Self-enhancement involves a preference for positive over negative self-views.^[5] It is one of the three [self-evaluation motives](#) along with [self-assessment](#) (the drive for an accurate self-concept) and [self-verification](#) (the drive for a self-concept congruent with one's identity). Self-evaluation motives drive the process of self-regulation, that is, how people control and direct their own actions.

There are a variety of strategies that people can use to enhance their sense of personal worth. For example, they can downplay skills that they lack or they can criticise others to seem better by comparison. These strategies are successful, in that people tend to think of themselves as having more positive qualities and fewer negative qualities than others.^[6] Although self-enhancement is seen in people with low self-esteem as well as with high self-esteem, these two groups tend to use different strategies. People who already have high esteem enhance their self-concept directly, by processing new information in a biased way. People with low self-esteem use more indirect strategies, for example by avoiding situations in which their negative qualities will be noticeable.^[7]

There are controversies over whether or not self-enhancement is beneficial to the individual, and over whether self-enhancement is culturally universal or specific to Western individualism.

Levels[...]

Self-enhancement can occur in many different situations and under many different guises. The general motive of self-enhancement can have many differing underlying explanations, each of which becomes more or less dominant depending on the situation.

The explanations of the self-enhancement motive can occur in different combinations. Self-enhancement can occur as an underlying motive or personality trait without occurring as an observed effect.

Levels of self-enhancement: The four levels of self-enhancement manifestation as defined by Sedikides & Gregg (2008) ^[5]	
Observed effect	Self-enhancement at the level of an observed effect describes the product of the motive. For example, self-enhancement can produce inflated self-ratings (positive illusions). Such ratings would be self-enhancement manifested as an observed effect. It is an observable instance of the motive.
Ongoing process	Self-enhancement at the level of an ongoing process describes the actual operation of the motive. For example, self-enhancement can result in attributing favourable outcomes to the self and unfavorable outcomes to others (self-serving attribution bias). The actual act of attributing such ratings would be self-enhancement manifested as an ongoing process. It is the motive in operation.
Personality trait	Self-enhancement at the level of a personality trait describes habitual or inadvertent self-enhancement. For example, self-enhancement can cause situations to be created to ease the pain of failure (self-handicapping). The fabrication of such situations or excuses frequently and without awareness would be self-enhancement manifested as a personality trait. It is the repetitive inclination to demonstrate the motive.
Underlying motive	Self-enhancement at the level of an underlying motive describes the conscious desire to self-enhance. For example, self-enhancement can cause the comparison of the self to a worse other, making the self seem greater in comparison (strategic social comparisons). The act of comparing intentionally to achieve superiority would be self-enhancement manifested as an underlying motive. It is the genuine desire to see the self as superior.

Both the extent and the type of self-enhancement vary across a number of dimensions.^[5]

Self-advancement vs. self-protection[...]

Self-enhancement can occur by either self-advancing or self-protecting, that is either by enhancing the positivity of one's self-concept, or by reducing the negativity of one's self-concept.^[8] Self-protection appears to be the stronger of the two motives, given that avoiding negativity is of greater importance than encouraging positivity.^[9] However, as with all motivations, there are differences between individuals. For example, people with higher self-esteem appear to favour self-advancement, whereas people with lower self-esteem tend to self-protect.^[10] This highlights the role of risk: to not defend oneself against negativity in favour of self-promotion offers the potential for losses, whereas whilst one may not gain outright from self-protection, one does not incur the negativity either. People high in self-esteem tend to be greater risk takers and therefore opt for the more risky strategy of self-advancement, whereas those low in self-esteem and risk-taking hedge their bets with self-protection.^[11]

Public vs. private[...]

Self-enhancement can occur in private or in public.^[12] Public self-enhancement is obvious positive self-presentation,^[13] whereas private self enhancement is unnoticeable except to the individual.^[14] The presence of other people i.e. in public self-enhancement, can either augment or inhibit self-enhancement.^{[15][16]} Whilst self-enhancement may not always take place in public it is nevertheless still influenced by the social world, for example via social comparisons.^[17]

Central vs. peripheral[...]

Potential areas of self-enhancement differ in terms how important, or central, they are to a person.^[18] Self-enhancement tends to occur more in the domains that are the most important to a person, and less in more peripheral, less important domains.^{[19][20]}

Candid vs. tactical[...]

Self-enhancement can occur either candidly or tactically.^[21] Candid self-enhancement serves the purpose of immediate gratification whereas tactical self-enhancement can result in potentially larger benefits from delayed gratification.

Tactical self-enhancement is often preferred over candid self-enhancement as overt self-enhancement is socially displeasing for those around it.^[22] [Narcissism](#) is an exemplification of extreme candid self-enhancement.^[23]

Types[...]

Self-enhancement does not just occur at random. Its incidence is often highly systematic and can occur in any number of ways in order to achieve its goal of inflating perceptions of the self. Importantly, we are typically unaware that we are self-enhancing. Awareness of self-enhancing processes would highlight the facade we are trying to create, revealing that the self we perceive is in fact an enhanced version of our actual self.

Self-serving attribution bias[...]

Self-enhancement can also affect the causal explanations people generate for social outcomes. People have a tendency to exhibit a self-serving attribution bias, that is to attribute positive outcomes to one's internal disposition but negative outcomes to factors beyond one's control e.g. others, chance or circumstance.^[24] In short, people claim cr... for their successes but deny responsibilities for their failures. The self-serving attribution bias is very robust, occurring in public as well as in private,^{[25][26]} even when a premium is placed on honesty.^[27] People most commonly manifest a self-serving bias when they explain the origin or events in which they personally had a hand or a stake.^{[28][29]}

Explanations for moral transgressions follow similar self-serving patterns,^{[30][31]} as do explanations for group behaviour.^[32] The [ultimate attribution error](#)^[32] is the tendency to regard negative acts by one's out-group and positive acts by one's in-group as essential to their nature i.e. attributable to their internal disposition and not a product of external factors. This may reflect the operation of the self-serving bias refracted through social identification.^{[33][34]}

Selectivity[...]

Selective memory[...]

Selectivity within information processing	
Selective attention	People typically avoid attending to negative, unflattering information at encoding, ^{[35][36]} therefore its initial recognition is impaired. Selective attention manifests itself in the form of an overt behaviour via selective exposure.
Selective exposure	People selectively expose themselves to information that justifies important prior decisions they have made. ^[37] This holds true so long as the information appears to be valid and the decision that was made was done so freely and is irreversible. ^[38]
Selective recall	At retrieval people bring to mind a highly biased collection of memories. Selective recall occurs for behaviours that exemplify desirable personality traits, ^[39] harmonious interpersonal relationships ^[40] or even health enhancing habits. Affect associated with unpleasant memories also fades faster than affect associated with pleasant memories. ^[41]

People sometimes self-enhance by selectively remembering their strengths rather than weaknesses. This pattern of selective forgetting has been described as [mnemonic neglect](#). Mnemonic neglect may reflect biases in the processing of information at either encoding, retrieval or retention.

- Biases at encoding occur via selective attention and selective exposure.
- Biases at retrieval and retention occur via selective recall.

The role of mnemonic neglect can be emphasized or reduced by the characteristics of a certain behaviour or trait. For example, after receiving false feedback pertaining to a variety of behaviours, participants recalled more positive behaviours than negative ones, but only when the behaviours exemplified central not peripheral traits and only when feedback pertained to the self and not to others.^[36] Similar findings emerge when the to-be-recalled information is personality traits,^[42] relationship promoting or undermining behaviours,^[43] frequencies of social acts,^[44] and autobiographical memories.^[45]

Selective acceptance and refutation[...]

Selective acceptance involves taking as fact self-flattering or ego-enhancing information with little regard for its validity. Selective refutation involves searching for plausible theories that enable criticism to be discarded. A good example of selective acceptance and refutation in action would be: Selective acceptance is the act of accepting as valid an examination on which one has performed well without consideration of alternatives, whereas selective refutation would be mindfully searching for reasons to reject as invalid an examination on which one has performed poorly.^{[46][47]}

Concordant with selective acceptance and refutation is the observation that people hold a more critical attitude towards blame placed upon them, but a more lenient attitude to praise that they receive.^{[48][49]} People will strongly contest uncongenial information but readily accept at without question congenial information^{[50][51]}

Strategies[...]

Strategic social comparisons[...]

The social nature of the world we live in means that self-evaluation cannot take place in an absolute nature – comparison to other social beings is inevitable. Many social comparisons occur automatically as a consequence of circumstance, for example within an exam sitting social comparisons of intellect may occur to those sitting the same exam. However, the strength of the self-enhancement motive can cause the subjective exploitation of scenarios in order to give a more favourable outcome to the self in comparisons between the self and others. Such involuntary social comparisons prompt self-regulatory strategies.

Self-esteem moderates the beneficial, evaluative consequences of comparisons to both inferior and superior others. People with higher self-esteem are more optimistic about both evading the failures and misfortunes of their inferiors and about securing the successes and good fortunes of their superiors.^[52]

Upward social comparisons[...]

An upwards social comparison involves comparing oneself to an individual perceived to be superior to or better than oneself. Upwards social comparison towards someone felt to be similar to oneself can induce self-enhancement through assimilation of the self and other's characteristics,^[53] however this only occurs when:

- The gap between the self and the comparison target is not too large;^[54]
- The skill or success being compared is attainable;^[55]
- The comparison target is perceived as a competitor.^[56]

Where assimilation does not occur as a result of a social comparison, contrast can instead occur which can lead to upwards social comparisons providing inspiration.^[57]

Downward social comparisons[...]

Even though upwards social comparisons are the most common social comparisons,^{[58][59]} people do sometimes make downwards social comparisons. Downwards social comparisons involve comparing oneself to an individual perceived to be inferior to or less skilled than the self. Downwards social comparisons serve as a form of ego-defence whereby the ego is inflated due to the sense of superiority gained from such downwards social comparisons.^{[60][61]}

Lateral social comparisons[...]

Lateral social comparisons, comparisons against those perceived as equal to the self, can also be self-enhancing. Comparisons with members of one's in-group can lead to protective against low self-esteem, especially when the in-group are disadvantaged.^[62]

Self-evaluation maintenance theory[...]

Self-enhancement waxes and wanes as a function of one's ability level in the context of interpersonal relationships, and this, in turn influences interpersonal attitudes and behaviours. Three factors influence the self-evaluations people make:^[63]

- *Closeness of a relationship:* comparison of one's own performance with that of another is more likely to occur, and when it does is more consequential when others are close rather than distant.
- *Personal relevance of a particular ability:* when the domain is not relevant to oneself reflection will occur and when the domain is relevant comparison will occur.
 - *Reflection:* one will undergo self-enhancement (pride) when the other does well, but self-derogation (shame) when the other does poorly.
 - *Comparison:* one will undergo self-derogation (humiliation) if others perform well, but self-enhancement (triumph) if the other performs poorly.
- Level of performance in that ability domain.

People adopt a variety of coping strategies to deal with the pressures of self-evaluation:

- Choose friends and partners who excel, but not in the same domains as they do;^[64]
- Withhold information that is likely to improve the performance of others of personally relevant domains;^[65]
- Alter the relevance of performance domains by changing their self-concept, thus moderating the impact of the reflection and comparison processes;^[66]
- Broaden or narrow the gap between the oneself and others, even by deliberately altering the difficulty of domain-relevant tasks.^[67]

Strategic construal[...]

The concepts that people use to understand themselves and their social world are relatively vague.^[68] Consequently, when making social comparisons or estimations people can easily and subtly shift their construal of the meaning of those concepts in order to self-enhance. Strategic construal's typically increase following negative feedback.^[69] Numerous examples of strategic construal's exist, a small selection include:

- People's interpretation of what counts as a virtue or talent is biased in favour of the attributes they possess, and of what counts as a vice or deficiency in favour of attributes they lack.^[70]
- People rate personality feedback and scientific research as less credible if it implies they are susceptible to disease.^{[48][71]}
- Lazy people perceive the rest of the world as reasonably fit and healthy, whereas frequent exercisers see their athleticism as a single, unique attribute.^[72]
- Low achievers in a particular area are likely to perceive the successes of high achievers as exceptional, thereby lessening the shame of their own inability.^[73]
- People think harder about any discouraging test results they receive, will spend longer thinking about them, are more inclined to have them confirmed and are significantly more skeptical of them.^[50] People do not react the same way to test results received by others however.^[74]
- When research tarnishes the reputation of groups with which people identify, they search for a statistical weakness of that research.^[75]
- Strategic construal's can also be more subtle. People make self-aggrandizing interpretations not only of their own attributes, but also of others in order to appear greater by comparison.

Strategic construal's appear to operate around one's [self-esteem](#). After either positive or negative feedback people with high self-esteem alter their perceptions of others, typically varying their perceptions of others ability and performance in a self-enhancing direction.^[76] Those with low self-esteem however do not. Self-esteem level appears to moderate the use of strategic construal's. As well as operating as a function of self-esteem level, strategic construal's also appear to protect self-esteem levels. For example, members of minority groups who perform poorly in academic settings due to negative cultural attitudes towards them, subsequently disengage psychologically from, and disidentify with academic pursuits in general. Whilst buffering their self-esteem level they jeopardize their future socioeconomic prospects.^[77]

Strategic construal's also influence the degree to which categories are believed to characterize other people. There is a general tendency to assume that others share one's own characteristics.^[78] Nevertheless, people reliably overestimate the prevalence of their shortcomings e.g. show enhanced false consensus effect, and underestimate the prevalence of their strengths e.g. show a contrary false uniqueness effect.^[79] People perceive their flaws as relatively commonplace but their skills as unique.

Behavioural self-handicapping[...]

Behavioural self-handicapping is the act of erecting obstacles in the path of task success in order to reduce the evaluative implications that can be drawn from task performance.^[80] This permits self-enhancement to occur in two ways:^[81]

- In the case of failure, self-handicapping can protect self-esteem by attributing failure to obstacles that one has erected – *discounting*.
- In the case of success, self-handicapping can promote self-esteem by attributing success to oneself despite the obstacles one has erected – *augmenting*.

People low in self-esteem opt for discounting as a self-protective route to avoid being perceived as incompetent, whereas people high in self-esteem preferentially select augmenting as a method of self-promotion to enhance their perceived competence.^{[10][82]} Self-handicapping, whilst predominantly a behaviour that occurs in private performance^[83] is magnified in public situations.^[84] However, self-handicapping is highly risky in social situations. If found out, those who use it face the negative evaluation and criticism of others.^[85]

Factors promoting behavioural self-handicapping	
Task familiarity	Uncertainty over ability to obtain a positive outcome due to experience of limited control over a similar task. ^[86]
Task complexity	Holding a very fixed, concrete theory of the complexity of a task. ^[87]

Insecurity	Uncertainty over ability to obtain a positive outcome due to generally insecure sense of self. ^[86]
Belief	Holding the belief that improvement is physically possible.
Importance	A task or evaluation has to be important to the self in order for self-handicapping to occur.
Feedback	Negative feedback makes self-handicapping more probable as it allows any damage to the ego to be rectified. ^[88]
Neuroticism	High neuroticism promotes discounting. ^[89]
Conscientiousness	Low conscientiousness can increase the tendency to self-handicap. ^[89]

Regardless of the causes of self-handicapping the self-defeating end result remains the same – the integrity and quality of a task outcome or evaluation is compromised in order that the meaning of that outcome appears more agreeable. Behavioural self-handicapping is a good demonstration of active self-deception.^[90]

Whilst task performance is important to people, they do sometimes act in ways so as to paradoxically impair task performance,^[80] either to protect against the shame of performing poorly by creating a convenient excuse (discounting), or to enhance themselves by succeeding despite adversity by creating grounds for conceit (augmenting).^[82] Furthermore, self-handicapping can have unintentional adverse consequences. Whilst allowing the maintenance of positive self-views^[91] self-handicapping has the cost of impairing objective performance.^[92] Students who report frequent use self-handicapping strategies underperform relative to their aptitude, with poor examination preparation mediating the effect.^[93]

Ultimately, those who readily prepare themselves for the possibility of poor task performance beforehand use the strategy of discounting less.^[94]

Outcomes[...]

The effect of self-enhancement strategies is shown in the tendency of people to see themselves as having more positive qualities and a more positive future outlook than others.^[6]

Self-enhancing triad[...]

People generally hold unrealistically positive views about themselves. Such flattering views can often be neatly categorised within what has become known as the Triad of Positive Illusions.^[95] The three illusions in question are above-average effect,^[96] illusions of control,^[97] and unrealistic optimism.^[98] These illusions can be replicated across many situations and are highly resistant to revision. Rather ironically, when informed of the existence of such illusions, people generally consider themselves to be less prone to them than others.^[99]

Above-average effect[...]

The better-than-average-effect is the most common demonstration of an above-average effect. It is a highly robust effect, as evidenced by the fact that even when the criteria on which the self and others are judged are identical the self is still perceived more favorably.^[96] Things close to the self also take on the perceived superiority of the above-average effect. People value both their close relationships^{[100][101]} and their personal possessions^[102] above those of others. However, where an outcome is perceived as highly skilled, people often err on the side of caution and display a [worse-than-average effect](#). The majority of people would rate themselves as below average in unicycling ability, for example.

1) Above-Average Effect, 2) Unrealistic Optimism, 3) Illusion of Control: The three related divisions of the self-enhancing triad

The illusory nature of the above-average effect comes from the fact that not everyone can be above-average – otherwise the average would not be the average! The majority of people rating themselves as being better than the majority of people does not quite seem plausible, and in some situations is 100% impossible. Where a distribution is symmetrical i.e. mean = median = mode, it is statistically impossible for the majority of people to be above average, as whichever of the three averages is taken, all are equal to the 50th percentile.^[103] In a non-symmetrical distribution i.e. mean < median < mode or mode < median < mean, it is statistically impossible for the majority of people to be above average when the average is taken to be the median, as the median represents the 50th percentile, or the midpoint of the data.^[103] However, in a non-symmetrical distribution where the average is taken to be either the mean or the mode, the above-average effect can be statistically plausible. In some situations, the majority of people can be above-average.

People show self-enhancement in the form of the above-average effect in many different ways. It is typical for people to profess to be above-average at a task yielding positive or desirable outcomes, and below average at a task yielding negative or undesirable outcomes.

Some of the wide variety of documented examples of the above-average effect include observations that:

- Most university students regard themselves as well above the 50th percentile in exhibiting social grace, athletic prowess and leadership abilities.^{[104][105][106]}
- Even 12th percentile achievers in domains such as grammar and logic consider themselves to be of 62nd percentile achievement.^[107]
- 94% of university professors believe their teaching ability to be above average.^[108]

- University students in the UK and the US regard themselves as above average drivers.^[109] Even drivers hospitalized after causing accidents persist in believing they are no worse than regular drivers.^[110]
- Even when informed about the above average effect people rate themselves as less susceptible to such biases than others.^[111]

Illusions of control[...]

People overestimate the level of control they have over outcomes and contingencies,^[112] seeing their actions as influential even when they are in fact inconsequential.^[113] Also, people stand by their apparent conviction that they can influence the outcomes of inherently random systems for example lotteries, especially when such systems possess features typically associated with skill-based tasks. Even when a degree of contingency does exist between actions and outcomes, people still reliably overestimate the strength of that contingency.^[113]

Unrealistic optimism[...]

People typically believe that their life will hold a greater number of positive experiences and fewer negative experiences than the lives of similar others.^{[98][114][115]} They have the same unrealistic optimism, but to a lesser degree, for others who are closely linked, such as romantic partners and close personal friends.^[116]

Unrealistic optimism is apparent in people's behaviours and beliefs across many different situations. People can both overestimate their ability to predict the future,^[117] and underestimate how long it will take them to complete a variety of tasks.^[118] People also overestimate the accuracy of their social predictions,^[119] and interpret probability adverbs to award higher values for personal positive outcomes and lower values for personal negative outcomes.^[120] Smokers, rather alarmingly, underestimate their risk of cancer relative to both non-smokers and even in comparison with fellow smokers.^[121]

Benefits and costs to the individual[...]

There is controversy over whether self-enhancement is adaptive or maladaptive.^{[122][123]} A single operationalisation of self-enhancement can be influenced by a variety of motives and thus can be coordinated with both positive and negative outcomes.^[124] Those who misperceive their performance (self-enhancers and self-effacers) tend to have a lower academic achievement, lower subsequent performance. These results appear to be culturally universal.^[125] Surely, it's a false assumption to relate self enhancement to depression.

- If self-enhancement is taken to mean rendering more positive judgments of oneself than of others then outcomes are frequently favourable.^{[126][127]}
- If self-enhancement is taken to mean the rendering of more positive judgements of oneself than others render then outcomes are often untoward.^{[128][129]}

Which definition is better at measuring self-enhancement has been disputed, as rating oneself more positively than one rates others is not seen as self-enhancement by some researchers.^[130]

In some studies, self-enhancement has been shown to have strong positive links with good mental health^[131] and in others with bad mental health.^[128] Self-enhancing can also have social costs. Whilst promoting resilience amongst survivors of the [September 11th terrorist attacks](#), those who self-enhanced were rated as having decreased social adaptation and honesty by friends and family.^[132]

Constraints[...]

Plausibility[...]

Self-enhancement thrives upon the vagueness or ambiguity of evidence. Where criteria are rigidly defined, self-enhancement typically reduces. For example, the above-average effect decreases as clarity and definition of the defined trait increases.^[133] The easier it is to verify a behaviour or trait, the less that trait will be subject to self-enhancement. The plausibility of a trait or characteristic given real world evidence moderates the degree to which the self-enhancement of that trait occurs. Selectively recalling instances of desirable traits is moderated by one's actual standing on those traits in reality.^[39]

When plausibility reduces the impact of self-enhancement, undesirable evidence often has to be accepted, albeit reluctantly. This typically occurs when all possible interpretations of the evidence in question have been made.^[75] The reason for this unwilling acceptance is to maintain effective social functioning, where unqualified self-aggrandizement would otherwise prevent it.^[134] People will continue to self-enhance so long as they think they can get away with it.^{[135][136]}

The constraint of plausibility on self enhancement exists because self-enhancing biases cannot be exploited. Self-enhancement works only under the assumption of rationality – to admit to self-enhancing totally undermines any conclusions one can draw and any possibility of believing its facade, since according to legit rational processes it functions as a genuinely verifiable and accrued improvement.^[137]

Mood[...]

Both positive and negative moods can reduce the presence of the self-enhancement motive. The effects of mood on self-enhancement can be explained by a negative mood making the use self-enhancing tactics harder, and a positive mood making their use less necessary in the first place.

The onset of a positive mood can make people more receptive to negative diagnostic feedback. Past successes are reviewed with expectation of receiving such positive feedback, presumably to buffer their mood.^[138]

Depression has quite a well-evidenced link with a decrease in the motive to self-enhance. Depressives are less able to self-enhance in response to negative feedback than non-depressive controls.^{[139][140]} Having a depressive disposition decreases the discrepancy between one's own estimates of one's virtues and the estimates of a neutral observer, namely by increasing modesty.^{[141][142]} Illusions of control are moderated by melancholy.^[143] However, whilst the self-ratings of depressives are more in line with those of neutral observers than the self-ratings of normal, the self-ratings of normal are more in line with those of friends and family than the self-ratings of depressives.^[141]

Social context and relationships[...]

The presence of the motive to self-enhance is dependent on many social situations, and the relationships shared with the people in them. Many different materializations of self-enhancement can occur depending on such social contexts:

- The self-enhancement motive is weaker during interactions with close and significant others.
- When friends (or previous strangers whose intimacy levels have been enhanced) cooperate on a task, they do not exhibit a self-serving attribution bias.
 - Casual acquaintances and true strangers however do exhibit a self-serving attribution bias.^[135]
 - Where no self-serving bias is exhibited in a relationship, a betrayal of trust in the relationship will reinstate the self-serving bias. This corresponds to findings that relationship satisfaction is inversely correlated with the betrayal of trust.^[144]
- Both mutual liking and expectation of reciprocity appear to mediate graciousness in the presence of others.^[145]
- Whilst people have a tendency to self-present boastfully in front of strangers, this inclination disappears in the presence of friends.^[136]
- Others close to the self are generally more highly evaluated than more distant others.^[146]

Culture[...]

Psychological functioning is moderated by the influence of culture.^{[147][148][149]} There is much evidence to support a culture-specific view of self-enhancement.

Westerners typically...	Easterners typically...
Priorities intra-dependence	priorities interdependence
Place greater importance on individualistic values	Place greater importance on collectivistic values
Have more inflated ratings of their own merits	Have less inflated ratings of their own merits ^[150]
Emphasise internal attributes	Emphasise relational attributes ^[151]
Show self-enhancement that overshadows self-criticism	Show self-criticism that overshadows self-enhancement ^[151]
Give spontaneously more positive self-descriptions	Give spontaneously more negative self-descriptions ^[152]
Make fewer self-deprecatory social comparisons	Make more self-deprecatory social comparisons ^[153]
Hold more unrealistically optimistic views of the future	Hold fewer unrealistically optimistic views of the future ^[154]
Display a self-serving attributional bias	Do not display a self-serving attributional bias ^[155]
Show a weak desire to self-improve via self-criticism	Show a strong desire to self-improve via self-criticism ^[156]
Are eager to conclude better performance than a classmate	Are reluctant to conclude better performance than a classmate ^[157]
Reflexively discount negative feedback	Readily acknowledge negative feedback ^[158]
Persist more after initial success	Persist more after initial failure ^[159]
Consider tasks in which they succeed to be most diagnostic	Consider tasks in which they fail to be most diagnostic ^[159]
Self-enhance on the majority of personality dimensions	Self-enhance only on some personality dimensions ^[160]
Self-enhance on individualistic attributes	Self-enhance on collectivist attributes ^{[20][161]}

Self-enhancement appears to be a phenomenon largely limited to Western cultures, where social ties are looser than in the East. This is concordant with empirical evidence highlighting relationship closeness as a constraint on self-enhancement.^[162] The [self-improvement](#) motive, as an aspiration towards a possible self-^[163] may also moderate a variety of psychological processes in both independent and interdependent cultures.^[164]

There are nevertheless signs that self-enhancement is not completely absent in interdependent cultures. Chinese schoolchildren rate themselves highly on the dimension of competence,^[165] and Taiwanese employees rate

themselves more favorably than their employers do,^[166] both of which show self-enhancing tendencies in Eastern cultures.

One possible explanation for the observed differences in self-enhancement between cultures is that they may occur through differences in how candidly or tactically the motive to self-enhance is acted upon, and not due to variations in the strength of motive.^[21] Alternatively, self-enhancement may be represented only in terms of the characteristics that are deemed important by individuals as they strive to fulfil their culturally prescribed roles.

The issue over whether self-enhancement is universal or specific to Western cultures has been contested within modern literature by two researchers — Constantine Sedikides and [Steven Heine](#). Sedikides argues that self-enhancement is universal, and that different cultures self-enhance in domains important in their culture. Heine on the other hand describes self-enhancement as a predominantly Western motive.^{[20][167][168][169][170][171][172]}

Other motives[...]

It is an exaggeration to say that self-enhancement is the dominant [self-evaluation motive](#). Many controversies exist regarding the distinction between the self-evaluation motives, and there are situations in which motives besides self-enhancement assume priority.

1. The [self-assessment](#) motive is often contrasted with the self-enhancement motive due to the relative adaptiveness of each approach within social interactions.
2. The [self-verification](#) motive is often challenged by supporters of the self-enhancement as being unfeasible as it often appears implausible.
3. The [self-improvement](#) motive is often taken to be the physical manifestation of the self-enhancement motive i.e., the act of attaining desired positive self-views.

Where the truth about oneself worsens or varies it gradually becomes less feasible to satisfy all motives simultaneously.

In an attempt to compare the self-evaluation motives (excluding self-improvement) a self-reflection task was employed. Participants were asked to choose the question they would most likely ask themselves in order to determine whether they possessed a certain [personality](#) trait. On the whole, people self-enhanced more than they self-assessed or self-verified. People chose higher diagnostic questions concerning central, positive traits than central, negative ones, and answered yes more often to central, positive than negative questions. Also, people self-verified more than the self-assessed, and chose more questions overall concerning relatively certain central traits than relatively uncertain peripheral traits.^[173]

Other factors[...]

- [Cognitive load](#): Where people are in situations of great cognitive load, the tendency to self-enhance increases, almost as if instinctive. People are quicker to agree with possessing positive traits and slower to reject having negative traits.^{[174][175]}
- [Modifiability](#): Where a trait or characteristic is seen as unchangeable people are more self-enhancing versus perceiving the trait to be modifiable.^[176]
- [Diagnostic](#): Where a trait or characteristic is seen as highly diagnostic people are less likely to self-enhance, for fear of being caught out in the process of an erroneous attempt at self enhancement as neurosis.^{[135][136]}

Yorum

İnsanın kendi benliği ve varlığını oluşturan bir motivasyon boyutunda olduğu ve bu açıdan kendisini tanımlaması öne alınmalıdır.

Kendisine verdiği değer ötesinde, gerçek boyutu olarak, yaratılan, eylemleri ile sevgi ve insanlığın çeşitli boyutunu oluşturma bir amacı, gayesi olmalıdır.

İnsan bugün vardır, yarın ise geleceğe bırakacaktır, ki bırakacağı önemlidir ve buna göre yetiştirilmeli, eğitilmelidir.

- Basamakları, 1) Etkileşimi gözlemek,
2) Eylem, boyutu oluşturmak,
3) Kişilik özellikleri,
4) Uygulanan motivasyon ve yapılanlar olmaktadır.

Ne olursa olsun değil, sevgi ve insanlıkta olmadıkça yapılmaması daha önemlidir.

İnsanlar kendilerini yüce görebilirler, bu durumda toplumda dışlanma gözlenebilir. Birey sadece kendisi değil, sevgi ve insanlık içinde olması, paylaşması ve iyilikler, güzellikler yaratması ile kendini bulabilir.

Hepimizin gönlünde sevgi vardır, bunun farkında olunmalıdır.

Ortak akıl, toplum görüşü boyut içinde olan kişi, benliğini yitirebilir, bir robot gibi olabilir. Bu açıdan etik boyut irdelemeli, rıza ve sorumluluk kendisinde olduğuna algılamalıdır.

İster babası, ailesi bir zorlama içinde olsun, ama yine sevgi ve insanlık dışında ise uymamalıdır.

Karşı çıkma ve mücadele değil, kendisi ile uyumlu olmalı ve bu etik ilkelerde kalmalıdır.

Gönülde sevgi ve insanlık var iken, benlik tam tersi benim için diyerek, zorlama ve dikta içinde olabilmektedir.

Bu açıdan gönül akıl ile bütünleşerek insanlıkta olmalıdır.

Yaklaşımlar, birey bir kendi arzusu ile başkasına zarar olsa bile, zorlama olsa bile yapması, onun etik dışı olmasına neden olacaktır.

Yaklaşımlar tesadüfi olsa bile kabul görülmez. Mutlaka akıl ve gönül sorumlu tutulur. Çünkü vaz geçmeli ve telafi etmelidir.

İnsanlar hata yapabilir ama, mutlaka af, özür ve tazmin etmesi de beklenir.

İnsanlar kendilerini ortaya çıkarmak için bazı yaklaşımlarda bulunurlar.

Bu yaklaşımlar, menfaat için ise, sevgi ve insanlık boyutunda eksiklik ise an azından ayıplanır.

Gaye, amaç ve güdü bu açıdan öne çıkarılmaktadır.

Yaklaşımların genel değil, amaca yönelik, selektif olması beklenir.

Seçici dikkat, seçici olarak ortaya konuluş ve seçici uygulama önemlidir.

İnsanlık yaklaşımında tek yönlü değil, çoklu yaklaşım önemlidir. Sadece kadın ve çocuk değil, tüm bireyler önemsenmelidir.

Silah çekenler olsa bile, önce uyarı, havaya ateş ve sonra yaralama yönünde yaklaşım gerekir. Pişman olan ve teslim olanın etkisi daha önemlidir, daha geniş savaşma motivasyonunu kırıcı olmaktadır.

İnsanlar bir yaklaşım yaparken belirli bir hedefi, stratejisi olur.

Bu amaçla hedef, 1) Çok büyük ve yapılamaz seçilmemeli, 2) Kişisel kabiliyet olarak yapılabilir olmalı, 3) Rakip, rekabet gibi ele alınmalıdır.

Önemli olan başarmak değil, başlamak bile %75 başarmak anlamındadır.

Birey kendisinin tanımlanması açısından; 1) Konu ile ilgisi, iletişimi olmalıdır,

2) Kabiliyeti, kapasitesi olmalıdır, a) Kendisine güveni, b) Toplum içinde yapabilecek kişi olduğunu algılamalıdır,

3) Daha önce yaklaşımları da bir yaptıkları ile bir örnek ve kapasitesini göstermektedir. Devamlı değişim olduğu için, bir bilgilenme ve gelişim içinde olunmalıdır.

Sonuçta, amaç, sevgi ve insanlı üzere çalışmak, eser ve değer üretmek olmalıdır.

İnsanlar kendi isteklerine göre yapılanma istemeleri ile, 1) Kendi açıklarını kapatma amacıyla olur, dışardan evin temizliği için eleman alırlar,

2) Hastalanmamak için bazı işleri başkalarına yaptırırlar,

3) Tembellik nedeni ile hazıra konmak isterler,

4) Kendileri için utanç kaynağı olarak düşündükleri, bahçelerine bakmaz, bahçıvan tutarlar,

5) Stratejik zaman ve zayıflık yaratmasın diye, başkalarından yararlanırlar,
 6) Kendileri yapsa bile daha iyi yapandan ürün alırlar, yemek getirtirler.
 Tümünde dikkat edilen daha rahat ve daha iyisi, güzelini almak boyutu olup, mutlu olmak hedefleri olmaktadır.

Olayı irdelerken başarı ve başarısızlık ötesinde yapılmalıdır. 1) Yapılana karşı duyulan benimseme boyutu,

- 2) Karmaşık değil, çözülebilir olması önemlidir,
- 3) Güvenli olmalı, hastalık veya yaralanma oluşturmamalıdır,
- 4) İnanmalı, dayanmalı, yapabilirim demeli, kendi görüşüne de ters olmamalıdır,
- 5) Yaparken huzursuz olmamalı, benimsemelidir,
- 6) Yapılan işin bilincine varmalıdır.

Anlamsız, faydasız olduğunu görünce, vaz geçmek bir nevi başarı olacaktır denilebilir.

Gerçeğe dayanmayan olumlu görüşler insanı farklı yöne, yanlış yola sokabilmektedir.

Yaklaşımlarda Doğu ve Batı kültürel yaklaşımlar diye ayırmıştır. Gerçekte ise kültürel ayırım, a) Göçebe, b) Tarım, c) Endüstri, d) Yüksek Teknoloji ve e) Birey Hakkı boyutu ile oluşmaktadır. Burada ayırım ise başlıca Tarım ve Endüstri ayırımı yapmaktadır.

Batı...	Doğu...
Öncelik kendi güvenliği	Öncelik toplum bağımlılığı
Bireysel kendi değerlerine kıymet ver	Toplum olarak yerleşim önemli
Kendi değerlendirmen öne çıkmalı	Kendisinden önce toplumdur
İç duygularına önem ver	İlişkilere önem verir
Kendi değerlendirmeni öne çıkar	Kritik olmaya kendisinden önce gelir
Kendi tanımlanmana doğal pozitif bak	Kendisinde negatif yorum sıktır
Sosyal karşılaştırmada, kendine yüklenme	Kendi depresyonu sosyal olarak fazladır
Gelecek için hayal kur	Gelecek için umut dolu olması azıdır.
Kendini öne çıkaran davranışta bulun	Kendini öne çıkaran yaklaşım yapma
Kendini kritik etmeyi öne çıkarma	Kendini tenkit ederek, gelişime çalış
Sınıfta öne geçmeye çalış	Sınıfta iyi öğrenci ol
Negatif değerlendirmeyi bırak	İbretlik için geri dönüş almalsın
İlk başarıdan sonra devam et	Başlarken başarısızlığa hazır ol
Başarı üzerine çalış	Tanı koymadan, başarısızlığı bekle
Kendini geliştirmeye bak	Kişisel üzere gelişime çalış
Kendini tanımlama bireysel olmalıdır	Kolektif çalışmada bireysel katkısı olur

Tüm bu irdelemeler Tarım Kültürü ile Endüstri Kültürü farkı olup, Doğu ve Batı teknolojik farklı olduğu için yaklaşımlar uymaktadır.

Kişisel değerlendirme ve irdelemeyi gelişim üzere oluşturmak, bireysel bakışa bağlıdır. Gelişim istemeyene yaptırılamaz.

Kendini tanımlama diploma ötesinde, objektif olmalı ama kendisine katkısı bulunmalıdır.

Gelişim kişi talebi ile olur. Eğitim bunun sonucudur, isterse çalışılır, zorla çalışmada akla fikirler girmesi beklenmemelidir. Ezberleyebilir ama akılı yatmaz.

Zihinsel yük, objektif olmakta, değişim, uyum ve uyarılma da zeka ürünüdür ve ayrıca tanımlama, tanı koymak da somut veri, kanıta dayalı olursa yararlı olur, değişim olanağı sağlanabilir.

Her yapılan bir iş, insana motivasyon kazandırmalıdır. 1) Sosyal açıdan önere olmalı, 2) Kendini tanımlamasında önemlidir, 3) Kendi gelişimi açısından örnek olmaktadır. Gelişim ve değişim açısından her yapılan bir tecrübe ve bir beceri kazanma işlevidir.

Diğer faktörler: 1) Bilinç durumu: birçok istediği olabilir ama bilinç bunu dengelemelidir. Şeker hastası olan kişi tatlıyı sevebilir ama bunu hesaplı yemelidir.

2) Uyarılma yeteneği: kendisine zarar olmayacak şekilde, benliğini de yok etmeyen ortak bir çözüm bulmalıdır.

3) Tanımlama yapmalıdır, tehdidin boyutu önemlidir.

Birçok kişi kavgadan kaçmak ister, olay dayak yemek değil, zorbalık, bedensel mücadeleye girmemek isteğidir. Bu amaçla sıklıkla karşıdakini polis ve suçlu olacağı şeklinde korkutmak en akılcı olmaktadır.

The [self-enhancement](#) motive is the motive to improve the [positivity](#) of one's [self-concept](#), and to protect the [self](#) from negative information (we search for positivity and avoid [negativity](#)). This motive influences people's self-evaluations.^[1]

For instance, people process information important to the self in a selective manner, focusing on information that has favourable implications to the self and discarding information with unfavorable implications. People also choose to compare themselves socially to others so as to be placed in a favourable position.^[2] By doing this, people seek to boost the (self-evaluated) positivity of themselves or to decrease its negativity, hence increasing their levels of [self-esteem](#) with the aim of having others see them as more socially desirable.^[3]

Yorum

Kendini geliştirme olumlu yönde olmalıdır. Negatif olanlar ibret olarak ele alınmalı, yapılmaması da bir ders niteliğinde olarak, faydalanılır.

Self-Assessment[...]

Self-assessment, Wikipedia³

In [social psychology](#), **self-assessment** is the process of looking at oneself in order to assess aspects that are important to one's [identity](#). It is one of the motives that drive self-evaluation, along with [self-verification](#) and [self-enhancement](#). Sedikides (1993) suggests that the self-assessment motive will prompt people to seek information to confirm their uncertain self-concept rather than their certain self-concept and at the same time people use self-assessment to enhance their certainty of their own [self-knowledge](#).^{[1][2]} However, the self-assessment motive could be seen as quite different from the other two [self-evaluation motives](#). Unlike the other two motives, through self-assessment people are interested in the accuracy of their current self view, rather than improving their self-view. This makes self-assessment the only self-evaluative motive that may cause a person's [self-esteem](#) to be damaged.

Functions

If through self-assessing there is a possibility that a person's self-concept, or self-esteem is going to be damaged why would this be a motive of self-evaluation, surely it would be better to only self-verify and self-enhance and not to risk damaging self-esteem? Trope in a 1986 paper suggests that self-assessment is a way in which self-esteem can be enhanced in the future. For example, self-assessment may mean that in the short-term self-assessment may cause harm to a person's self-concept through realising that they may not have achieved as highly as they may like; however in the long term this may mean that they work harder in order to achieve greater things in the future, and as a result their self-esteem would be enhanced further than where it had been before self-assessment.^[3]

Within the self-evaluation motives however there are some interesting interactions. Self-assessment is found a lot of the time to be associated with [self-enhancement](#) as the two motives seem to contradict each other with opposing

aims; whereas the motive to self-assess sees it as important to ensure that the self-concept is accurate the motive to self-enhance sees it as important to boost the self-concept in order to protect it from any negative feedback.

Research

In 1993, [Constantine Sedikides](#) performed an experiment investigating the roles of each of the self-evaluation motives, investigated if one was stronger and held more weight than others and tried to draw out specifically the self-assessment and self-verification motives.^[1] The first experiment conducted the results showed that when choosing what questions they wanted to be asked they were more likely to request those that would verify their self-concept rather than assess it. This finding supports the idea that certain traits are more central to a person's self-concept, however shows little support for the self-assessment motive. When considering the interaction between how strong and how central certain traits are to a person's self-concept Sedikides again found evidence in support of the self-verification and self-enhancement motives, though again none for the self-assessment motive.^[1]

The second experiment conducted by Sedikides (1993) investigated the possibility that the ability for greater reflection than experiment one may show greater levels of self-assessment in the participants. However the results of this experiment showed that though through some analysis there was evidence of some self-verification there was no real evidence pointing towards self-assessment and all the results supported self-enhancement. The third experiment again tried to draw out evidence for self-verification and self-assessment and though, as with experiment two, there was some evidence to support the self-verification motive most of the results pointed towards the self-enhancement method and not self-assessment.^[1]

In experiment four Sedikides suggests that the reason past experiments have not supported self-assessment is because participants reflect more on the central traits than peripheral traits, which are generally ones that are assessed so as to be able to improve at the same time as not harming the self-concept too much. This experiment therefore looked at whether this was true and whether it was the central traits that were being looked at in this study rather than peripheral. The results showed exactly what Sedikides expected, though because of this the results of the other parts of the experiment gave support to the self-enhancement motive rather than self-assessment of self-verification.^[1]

The fifth experiment carried out by Sedikides suggests that in the past experiments the possibility of self-assessing was less likely than self-verification or self-enhancement as the participants would not have been objective in their self-evaluation. For this experiment therefore the experimental group were asked to approach their reflections in an objective way, as if they were approaching their self-concept as a scientist, bringing each of their traits under scrutiny. Results of this study showed that those subjects who were asked to be objective in their assessment strove more for accuracy than those not asked to be specifically objective. The authors then conducted one final experiment looking at the validation of self-enhancement when reflecting on the self.^[1]

Sedikides and Strube (1997)^[2] reviewed past research into the self-assessment motive and looked at whether participants would be more attracted to tasks that were high or low in accuracy about their characteristics, whether they would choose to take part in tasks that were more or less accurate and if they would prefer to create highly or less accurate tasks. This review showed that people are more attracted to taking part in tasks that are more accurate about them than those that are less accurate^[4] and would prefer to take part in higher accuracy tests.^[5] However, when only being asked if they would like to take part in high or low accuracy tasks does not give a complete accurate view of self-assessment; if there is no threat of actually taking part in the tasks the participants may not be as honest as if they actually had to take part. Brown^[5] therefore showed that self-assessment is can be seen when participants are asked to actually take part in tasks that will be high in their accuracy or low in their accuracy of a person's characteristics. This research found that participants were more likely to choose to take part in tasks that were higher in accuracy about their characteristics. The last area of self-assessment Sedikides and Strube^[2] reviewed was whether participants would want to construct highly or less accurate tasks and if participants would be more persistent or more likely to succeed if they were taking part in highly or less accurate tasks. The review showed that participants would prefer to make highly accurate tasks which measured their abilities; however they will be more persistent in tasks which are lower in accuracy.^[6] The review also showed though that participants were more likely to succeed on tasks that they were told were high in accuracy.^[7] It is suggested that this is because when completing tasks that are highly accurate about a person's characteristics there is more to gain from succeeding in a task as it will therefore give more information about the person's characteristics than if it was low in accuracy.

Though self-assessment is one of the self-evaluation motives it could be suggested that it may not be the most popular one. Self-enhancement was displayed in each of the experiments conducted by Sedikides^[1] and self-assessment, and even self-verification to an extent was only displayed when it was teased out. This is not to say that self-assessment is not a self-evaluation motive, however most of the experiments conducted by Sedikides^[1] ended up with the participants reflecting on central traits rather than peripheral traits. This is unsurprising as they are the most important traits to a person's self-concept, however it is not therefore surprising that these are the traits that are enhanced rather than assessed as if someone assessed their central traits and found fault it would be more of an issue than finding a fault with a peripheral trait. The fifth experiment carried out by Sedikides^[1] shows that self-assessment does exist and is one of the self-evaluation motives; if people didn't self-assess then even in this experiment there would have been no difference between the reflections of those asked to be objective and those who were not. Self-assessment is a difficult motive to assess, as discovered by Sedikides^[1] but it is important to self-evaluation as it means that people are able to realize ways in which to improve themselves.

Yorum

Kendini değerlendirme, üstün, orta veya alt katmanda görme boyutu ile değişmektedir. Örneğin çocuklar yaptıkları resimleri fotoğrafik görüntü olarak irdelerler ve kötü derler. Halbuki bu gerçek değildir. Özel ve özgün olması ile bir değişimi yaşamalıdır. Sosyal psikoloji, insanın kendi bakışına göre yaklaşım yaptığını tanımlamaktadır.

İnsanın kendisini niçin değerlendirmektedir? Bir sosyal ve başkası açısından mı olmaktadır, yoksa kendi gelişimi için ni yapmaktadır?

Sınavlarda başarılı olmak için çalışmak ile ezberlemek farklı olmakta, bu açıdan algılama, kavrama olmadan bilgi sahibi olmak başarı için yeterli olmamaktadır.

Değerlendirme nasıl yapılmalı konusunda araştırmalar vardır ama temel olan bireyin kendisi, kendi algısı olacağı da unutulmamalıdır. Veriyi irdeleyecek kişi kendisi olacaktır. Başarısız olan kişi, ilk önce hocayı suçlayabilir.

The *self-assessment motive* is based on the assumption that people want to have an accurate and objective evaluation of the self.^[3] To achieve this goal, they work so as to reduce any uncertainty about their abilities or [personality traits](#).^[4] [Feedback](#) is sought to increase the accuracy and objectivity of previously formed self-conceptions. This is regardless of whether the new information confirms or challenges the previously existing self-conceptions.^[1]

Yorum

Kendini değerlendirme de net, objektif olması ne kadar beklenebilir?

Geri dönüşlerde anlamlı olmaya bilir.

Self-Verification[...]

Self-verification theory, Wikipedia⁴

Self-verification is a [social psychological](#) theory that asserts people want to be known and understood by others according to their firmly held [beliefs](#) and [feelings](#) about themselves,^[1] that is *self-views* (including [self-concepts](#) and [self-esteem](#)). It is one of the motives that drive [self-evaluation](#), along with [self-enhancement](#) and [self-assessment](#).

Because chronic self-concepts and self-esteem play an important role in understanding the world, providing a sense of coherence, and guiding action, people become motivated to maintain them through self-verification. Such strivings provide stability to people's lives, making their experiences more coherent, orderly, and comprehensible than they would be otherwise. Self-verification processes are also adaptive for groups, groups of diverse backgrounds, and the larger society, in that they make people predictable to one another thus serve to facilitate social interaction.^[2] To this end, people engage in a variety of activities that are designed to obtain self-verifying information.

Developed by [William Swann](#) (1981), the theory grew out of earlier writings which held that people form self-views so that they can understand and predict the responses of others and know how to act toward them.^[3]

Difference between positive and negative self-views[...]

There are individual differences in people's views of themselves. Among people with *positive self-views*, the desire for self-verification works together with another important motive, the desire for positive evaluations or "[self-enhancement](#)".^[4] For example, those who view themselves as "insightful" will find that their motives for both self-verification and self-enhancement encourage them to seek evidence that other people recognize their insightfulness. In contrast, people with *negative self-views* will find that the desire for self-verification and self-enhancement are competing. Consider people who see themselves as disorganized. Whereas their desire for self-enhancement will compel them to seek evidence that others perceive them as organized, their desire for self-verification will compel such individuals to seek evidence that others perceive them as disorganized. Self-verification strivings tend to prevail over self-enhancement strivings when people are certain of the self-concept^[5] and when they have extremely depressive self-views.^[6]

Self-verification strivings may have undesirable consequences for people with negative self-views ([depressed](#) people and those who suffer from low [self-esteem](#)). For example, self-verification strivings may cause people with negative

self-views to [gravitate](#) toward partners who mistreat them, undermine their feelings of [self-worth](#), or even abuse them. And if people with negative self-views seek [therapy](#), returning home to a self-verifying partner may undo the progress that was made there.^[7] Finally, in the workplace, the feelings of worthlessness that plague people with low self-esteem may foster feelings of ambivalence about receiving fair treatment, feelings that may undercut their propensity to insist that they get what they deserve from their employers (see: [workplace bullying](#)).^[8] These findings and related ones point to the importance of efforts to improve the self-views of those who suffer from low self-esteem and depression.^[9]

Effects on behavior[...]

In one series of studies, researchers asked participants with positive and negative self-views whether they would prefer to interact with evaluators who had favorable or unfavorable impressions of them. The results showed that those with positive self-views preferred favorable partners and those with negative self-views preferred unfavorable partners. The latter finding revealed that self-verification strivings may sometimes trump positivity strivings.^[10]

Self-verification motives operate for different dimensions of the self-concept and in many different situations. Men and women are equally inclined to display this tendency, and it does not matter whether the self-views refer to characteristics that are relatively *immutable* (e.g., intelligence) or *changeable* (e.g., diligence), or whether the self-views happen to be *highly specific* (e.g., athletic) or *global* (e.g., low self-esteem, worthlessness). Furthermore, when people chose negative partners over positive ones, it is not merely in an effort to avoid interacting with positive evaluators (that is, out of a concern that they might disappoint such positive evaluators). Rather, people chose self-verifying, negative partners even when the alternative is participating in a different experiment.^[11] Finally, recent work has shown that people work to verify self-views associated with group memberships.^[12] For example, women seek evaluations that confirm their belief that they possess qualities associated with being a woman.

Self-verification theory suggests that people may begin to shape others' evaluations of them before they even begin interacting with them. They may, for example, display identity cues (see: [impression management](#)). The most effective identity cues enable people to signal who they are to potential interaction partners.

- Physical appearance, such as clothes, body posture, demeanor.^[13] For example, the low self-esteem person who evokes reactions that confirm her negative self-views by slumping her shoulders and keeping her eyes fixed on the ground.
- Other cues, such as the car someone buys, the house they live in, the way they decorate their living environment. For example, an [SUV](#) evokes reactions that confirm a person's positive self-view.

Self-verification strivings may also influence the social contexts that people enter into and remain in. People reject those who provide social feedback that does not confirm their self-views, such as married people with negative self-views who reject spouses who see them positively and vice versa. College roommates behave in a similar manner.^{[14][15]} People are more inclined to [divorce](#) partners who perceived them too favorably.^[16] In each of these instances, people gravitated toward relationships that provided them with evaluations that confirmed their self-views and fled from those that did not.

When people fail to gain self-verifying reactions through the display of identity cue or through choosing self-verifying social environments, they may still acquire such evaluations by systematically evoking confirming reactions. For example, depressed people behave in negative ways toward their roommates, thus causing these roommates to reject them.^[17]

Self-verification theory predicts that when people interact with others, there is a general tendency for them to bring others to see them as they see themselves. This tendency is especially pronounced when they start out believing that the other person has misconstrued them, apparently because people compensate by working especially hard to bring others to confirm their self-views.^[18] People will even stop working on tasks to which they have been assigned if they sense that their performance is eliciting non-verifying feedback.^[19]

Role of confirmation bias[...]

Self-verification theory predicts that people's self-views will cause them to see the world as more supportive of these self-views than it really is. That is, individuals process information in a [biased](#) manner. These biases may be conscious and deliberate, but are probably more commonly done effortlessly and non-consciously. Through the creative use of these processes, people may dramatically increase their chances of attaining self-verification. There are at least three relevant aspects of information processing in self-verification:

1. [Attention](#): People will attend to evaluations that are self-confirming while ignoring non-confirming evaluations.^[18]
2. [Memory retrieval](#): self-views bias memory recall to favor self-confirming material over non-confirming elements.^[20]
3. [Interpretation of information](#): people tend to interpret information in ways that reinforce their self-views.^[21]

These distinct forms of self-verification may often be implemented sequentially. For example, in one scenario, people may first strive to locate partners who verify one or more self-views. If this fails, they may redouble their efforts to elicit verification for the self-view in question or strive to elicit verification for a different self-view. Failing this, they may strive to "see" more self-verification than actually exists. And, if this strategy is also ineffective, they may withdraw from the relationship, either psychologically or in actuality.^[citation needed]

Related processes[...]

Preference for novelty[...]

People seem to prefer modest levels of novelty; they want to experience phenomena that are unfamiliar enough to be interesting, but not so unfamiliar as to be frightening or too familiar as to be boring.^[22]

The implications of people's preference for novelty for [human relationships](#) are not straightforward and obvious. Evidence that people desire novelty comes primarily from studies of people's reactions to [art objects](#) and the like. This is different when it concerns human beings and social relationships because people can shift attention away from already familiar novel objects, while doing so in human relationships is difficult or not possible. But novel art objects are very different from people. If a piece of art becomes overly stimulating, we can simply shift our attention elsewhere. This is not a viable option should our spouse suddenly begin treating us as if we were someone else, for such treatment would pose serious questions about the integrity of people's [belief systems](#). Consequently, people probably balance competing desires for predictability and novelty by indulging the desire for novelty within contexts in which surprises are not threatening (e.g., [leisure activities](#)), while seeking coherence and predictability in contexts in which surprises could be costly—such as in the context of enduring relationships.^[23]

Tension with self-enhancement[...]

People's self-verification strivings are apt to be most influential when the relevant [identities](#) and behaviors matter to them. Thus, for example, the self-view should be firmly held, the relationship should be enduring, and the behavior itself should be consequential. When these conditions are not met, people will be relatively unconcerned with preserving their self-views and they will instead indulge their desire for self-enhancement. In addition, self-reported emotional reactions favor self-enhancement while more thoughtful processes favor self-verification.^[24]

But if people with firmly held negative self-views seek self-verification, this does not mean that they are masochistic or have no desire to be loved. In fact, even people with very low self-esteem want to be loved.^[25] What sets people with negative self-views apart is their ambivalence about the evaluations they receive. Just as positive evaluations foster joy and warmth initially, these feelings are later chilled by incredulity. And although negative evaluations may foster sadness that the "truth" could not be kinder, it will at least reassure them that they know themselves. Happily, people with negative self-views are the exception rather than the rule. That is, on the balance, most people tend to view themselves positively. Although this imbalance is adaptive for society at large, it poses a challenge to researchers interested in studying self-verification. That is, for theorists interested in determining if behavior is driven by self-verification or positivity strivings, participants with positive self-views will reveal nothing because both motives compel them to seek positive evaluations. If researchers want to learn if people prefer verification or positivity in a giving setting, they must study people with negative self-views.^[26]

Self-concept change[...]

Although self-verification strivings tend to stabilize people's self-views, changes in self-views may still occur. Probably the most common source of change is set in motion when the [social environment](#) recognizes a significant change in a person's age (e.g., when adolescents become adults), [status](#) (e.g., when students become teachers), or [social role](#) (e.g., when someone is convicted of a crime). Suddenly, the community may change the way that it treats the person. Eventually the target of such treatment will bring his or her self-view into accord with the new treatment.^[27]

Alternatively, people may themselves conclude that a given self-view is dysfunctional or obsolete and take steps to change it. Consider, for example, a woman who decides that her negative self-views have led her to tolerate abusive relationship partners. When she realizes that such partners are making her miserable, she may seek therapy. In the hands of a skilled therapist, she may develop more favorable self-views which, in turn, steer her toward more positive relationship partners with whom she may cultivate healthier relationships. Alternatively, when a woman who is uncertain about her negative self-concept enters a relationship with a partner who is certain that she deserves to view herself more positively, that woman will tend to improve the self-concept.^[28]

Criticism[...]

Critics have argued that self-verification processes are relatively rare, manifesting themselves only among people with terribly negative self-views. In support of this viewpoint, critics cite hundreds of studies indicating that people prefer, seek and value positive evaluations more than negative ones. Such skeptical assessments overlook three important points. First, because most people have relatively positive self-views,^[29] evidence of a preference for positive evaluations in unselected samples may in reality reflect a preference for evaluations that are self-verifying, because for such individuals self-verification and positivity strivings are indistinguishable. No number of studies of participants with positive self-views can determine whether self-verification or self-enhancement strivings are more common. Second, self-verification strivings are not limited to people with globally negative self-views; even people with high self-esteem seek negative evaluations about their flaws.^[30] Finally, even people with positive self-views appear to be uncomfortable with overly positive evaluations. For example, people with moderately positive self-views withdraw from spouses who evaluate them in an exceptionally positive manner.^[31]

Other critics have suggested that when people with negative self-views seek unfavorable evaluations, they do so as a means of avoiding truly negative evaluations or for purposes of self-improvement, with the idea being that this will enable them to obtain positive evaluations down the road. Tests of this idea have failed to support it. For example, just as people with negative self-views choose self-verifying, negative evaluators even when the alternative is being in another experiment, they choose to be in another experiment rather than interact with someone who

evaluates them positively.^[11] Also, people with negative self-views are most intimate with spouses who evaluate them negatively, despite the fact that these spouses are relatively unlikely to enable them to improve themselves.^[32] Finally, in a study of people's thought processes as they chose interaction partners,^[33] people with negative self-views indicated that they chose negative evaluators because such partners seemed likely to confirm their self-views (an epistemic consideration) and interact smoothly with them (a pragmatic consideration); self-improvement was rarely mentioned.

Yorum

Kendini tanımlamak bir bakıma sosyal psikologlar olsa bile, kişi kendisine toz kondurmayabilir. Aynı zamanda kendini irdelemeye yetkisini sorgular.

Bir bakıma Dünyayı tanıma, kendini tanıma, irdeleme, yorum ile de bağlantılıdır.

İnsan kendisi hakkına olumlu ve olumsuz görüşleri olabilir. Olumlular tekrar etmek, olumsuzlar ise, ibret olarak ders alma ile ilintili olmalı, hepsinden de mutluluğu yakalamalıdır.

Sevgisizlik ve insanlık dışı olanlar için dışlanmalı, başka yola sapmalıdır.

İnsanlar etkilemek için kıyafet seçimi öne çıkmaktadır. Resmi kıyafet insanların yaklaşmasını zorlaştırabilir, bu açıdan davranış ile kıyafet uymayabilmektedir.

Bazı kişiler en pahalı araba ile giderler, bu zengin oldukları, yazdığı çeklerin geçerli olduğu, olacağı anlamını da taşıyabilir.

Doğramacı, arabası orta sınıf ve çarpışma kat sayısı en iyi olan ve şoför ile gitmesi ile, bunu izleyen sermayedarlar, soru sormadan, zaten bildikleri için, Hacettepe yapılması için kredi vermişlerdir. Kısaca güven insanın kullandıkları ile ilintili olmaktadır.

İnsanın tanımlanmasında öne çıkanlar: 1) Dikkat, konuya verdiği önem ve yaklaşım ile, 2) Bu konuda çalışmaları, hafızasında geçmişindeki yaptıkları ile 3) Mülakatta tutunduğu durum olmaktadır.

Mülakat, bilgi sorgusu olmamalı, sadece kişi CV ve tanımlamaya uyması açısından öne çıkmalıdır.

Her kişinin kendisine göre bir usulü vardır, bir yaklaşımı vardır. Bu özel ve özgündür. Burada öne çıkan sevgi ve insanlık boyutu olmaktadır.

Menfaat olması ile kişisel yaklaşım boyutu çekişmemeli, birbirini tamamlamalıdır.

Sınavlarda yüksek stres faktörü vardır. Bu kişinin başarısını da etkilemektedir.

Kendisinden emin, güven duyması, konu ile ilgisi, çalışması, kendisine dayanma boyutu ile alakalıdır. Başka yerde çalışırım güveni duymalıdır.

Zamanla kişilerin duygu ve düşünceleri değişebilir.

Tıp Fakültesine girerken uzmanlık farklı düşünülebilir, serviste çalışması ile birisin bağlanması ve bu yolda yürümesi ile değişim yaşanabilir.

Dahiliye uzmanı olmak isterken, Pediatri ve Yenidoğan istenilmesi, doğrudan yapılan yaklaşım, başarı ve canlandırma ile elde edilen yeni yaşama döndürme boyutu olmuştur. Dahiliye de yapılan canlandırma başarılı olup olmaması ötesinde, bir yenidoğanda yaşam kazanması mukayese bile edilemez olduğu görülmüştür.

Tüm bunlara karşın kişilerin kendilerini irdelemesi nadirdir. Bir bakıma yapmak istemezler, sadece arzularını yerine gelmesine bakabilirler.

Sınavda başarılı olamadım yerine, hoca beni bıraktı demek, insanı daha tatmin edici olabilmektedir.

The *self-verification motive* asserts that what motivates people to engage in the self-evaluation process is the desire to verify their pre-existing self-conceptions,^[4] maintaining consistency between their previously formed self-conceptions and any new information that could be important to the self (feedback)^[3] By doing this, people get the sense of control and predictability in the social world.^{[1][5]}

Conditions[...]

Self-Enhancement[...]

The *self-enhancement motive* states that people want to see themselves favorably. It follows that people should choose tasks with a positive *valence*, regardless of *task diagnostic* (this motive is more active in presence of tasks high in diagnostic of success than in presence of tasks high in diagnostic of failure).^[2] Tasks that disclose a failure and negative feedback are considered less important than tasks with an outcome of success or positive feedback. As a result, the former are processed faster and more thoroughly, and remembered better than the latter.^[3]

Each *motive* originated a different type of reaction (cognitive, affective or behavioural). The self-enhancement motive creates both affective and cognitive responses. Affective responses result in negative feedback leading to less positive affect than positive affect. This is moderated by trait modifiability, in the sense that we can find the former event to be especially true for unmodifiable traits. On the other hand, cognitive responses lead to favourable feedback being judged as more accurate, but only in the case of modifiable traits.^[1]

Self-Assessment[...]

The *self-assessment motive* postulates that people want to have an accurate view of their abilities and *personality traits*. Hence, when evaluating the self-people tend to preferably choose tasks that are high in *diagnostic* (people want to find out about their uncertain self-conceptions). This is found even when the diagnosis leads to a disclosure of failure (i.e., regardless of task valence).

The responses generated by the self-assessment motive are behavioural responses, which becomes evident by the fact that people choose to receive feedback on their performance (they prefer tasks for which feedback is available, opposed to tasks with unavailable feedback). This pattern is emphasized when the trait is considered to be modifiable.^[1]

Self-Verification[...]

The *self-verification motive* asserts that people want to verify their previously existing beliefs about the self. No preference regarding the task valence is apparent. Regarding task diagnosticity, people seek knowledge about their certain self-conceptions to a greater extent than they do for their uncertain self-conceptions.^[6]

Cognitive responses guide the self-verification motive partially depending on their previously formed self-concept. That is, when a certain trait is present, positive feedback regarding this trait is judged to be more accurate than unfavourable feedback; but when in the presence of the alternative trait, there isn't any difference in the judgement of the feedback accuracy. However, this pattern is conditional on perceived trait modifiability.^[1]

The self-verification motive resulted in cognitive responses to traits considered to be unmodifiable, but not to traits considered modifiable. In the former, positive feedback is considered more accurate than negative feedback, when in the presence of the trait. On the other hand, negative feedback is viewed as more accurate than positive feedback in the presence of the alternative trait.^[1]

Yorum

İnsan bir boyutta ilerleme için, kendi isteği ile yapmasında, önce bilgi edinmesi, daha sonra güdüsü ve isteğine bakılması beklenir.

Kendini tanımlama, irdeleme ve yaklaşımların gelişim üzere olmasına çalışması bir hedef olarak çizilen boyuttur.

Kendisinin daha iyi olması, daha toplum tarafından onore edilmesi, daha tercih edilen olması arzusunu gerçekleştirmek için ilerleme yapmasıdır.

Motivasyonu bu açıdan öne çıkmaktadır.

Kendisini irdeleme konusu da kişilik ile ilgilidir. Yüceltebildiği gibi düşürebilir ki, ikisi de gerçek olmayabilir.

Kendi yorumlaması da amacına göre değişmektedir. Objektif olanlar bile kabul görmeyebilir. Sınavda soruları bilmemesi, hocalar geçirmek istemedikleri için sordular denilebilmektedir.

Sonuç

Başarı başlama ile alakalıdır.

Başlama bir plan, proje ve imkân meselesidir, elbet. Ama birey önce yapacaklarına inanmalı, yaratılacak olanların oluşması da bir varlığın etkileşimi ile olacaktır.

Bu sonuca gelmekte, benim aleyhimde çalışanlara teşekkürüm vardır. Rektöre bir yerde, benim aleyhimde söylenenler oldu. Bunu duyan arkadaşım bana geldi. Kendini müdafaa et dedi. Hayır, yönetici algılsa olur, bir gelişim ve bir ünite kazanması lehine olur, algılamalıdır dedim.

Onların katkısı ile, olayı daha geniş anlatma olanağı da bulmuş oldum.

Yaşayan prematüreler, ailelerin şükranları da en önemli katkısı olmuştur.

Hicret etmek bir zorunlu yaklaşımdır

Kuran Peygamber değil, resul demekte, anlam olarak habercidir. Peki niye hicret etmiştir?

Öldürmek istedikleri için Medine'ye göçmüştür.

Mekke aristokrat ve belirli bir sülalenin yönetiminde, bu Peygamber sülalesi. Ebu Lehep çok memnun oluyor, ölürse bize miras kalacak deniliyor.

Hicrete neden olan boyut: Zenginlik, bol para verilmek isteniyor, hoca ol ve Mekke Amiri olması isteniyor. *Bana tüm Dünyanın zenginlerini verseniz, hâkim kılsanız bile, ben tebliğden vaz geçmem, ben de sizden birisiyim* demesidir.

Öldürelim bu miras bize kalsın yaklaşımı oluyor. Kısaca tüm boyutlarda zenginlik ve emir olmaktan hicret ediyor.

Kaynaklar

- 1) Self-evaluation motives, Wikipedia
- 2) Self-enhancement, Wikipedia
- 3) Self-assessment, Wikipedia
- 4) Self-verification theory, Wikipedia