

## A study on the relationship between College Students' self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship

Ximiao Tang<sup>1</sup>, Huanhuan BU<sup>1</sup>, Jinyan Luo<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Department of Psychology, School of Public Administration, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Canton, China

<sup>2</sup> College of Art, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Canton

\* Corresponding author

**Abstract:** In order to explore the current situation, differences and relationship between self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship of college students, 240 college students from 8 universities in Guangzhou University City were selected as the research objects. Self-evaluation Scale and interpersonal relationship scale were used to measure. The results show that: (1) the self-evaluation of college students is in the middle level, the interpersonal relationship problems are common among college students, 49.3% of them have certain problems, 47.3% of them have serious problems. (2) There is no difference in gender, grade and consumption level in self-evaluation. But the self-evaluation of mature self in freshmen and juniors, self-acceptance in sophomores, social self and achievement self in senior group, and mature self-evaluation in consumption group less than 1000 yuan are significantly higher than those in other grades. (3) There is no difference in gender, grade and consumption level in interpersonal relationship of college students. But it is significantly higher in female group's communication distress and freshman and sophomore's conversation distress. (4) There is no significant correlation between self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship. The results of the study provide data basis for the management of college students, and enrich the theory of self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship.

**Key words:** college students, interpersonal relationship, self-evaluation, mental health

### I. Introduction

The Third International Health Assembly believes that mental health refers to the development of one's state of mind to the best within the range of physical, intellectual and emotional incompatibility with the mental health of others. Its standard is that the body, intelligence and emotion are very harmonious; they can adapt to the environment, be humble to each other in interpersonal relations; have a sense of happiness; in work and occupation, they can give full play to their ability and lead an efficient life [1]. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines health as not only the absence of mental illness, but also the ability to adapt the environment, have a perfect personality, and exert personal potential to achieve the best state.

College Students' mental health is a long-standing topic. On the one hand, because of the particularity of the research object, especially the new characteristics of the post-90s college students in the period of social transformation, they have good moral outlook and are prone to double standards. They have serious personal utilitarianism, high dependence on the Internet, and biased mental cognition and harmonious social environment

[2]. On the other hand, with the change of time, the group will show different behavior patterns and emotional tendencies. There are also many researches and discussions on College Students' mental health. The research shows that one of the main factors affecting mental health is interpersonal relationship. Therefore, this study attempts to explore the relationship between interpersonal relationship and self-evaluation of college students.

#### 1.1 Definition and measurement of self-evaluation

In the Great Dictionary of psychology, self-evaluation is defined as a component of self-consciousness, an individual's evaluation of one aspect or the whole of one's own physiological, psychological and social characteristics and behaviors is a part of self-consciousness. Self evaluation includes three aspects: physiological self-evaluation, psychological self-evaluation and social psychological evaluation, which respectively refers to the evaluation of one's physical condition (appearance, body shape, physical ability, etc.), psychological state (personality, ability, emotion, etc.), and social attribute (interpersonal role, social status, etc.)<sup>[3]</sup>.

There are two ways to measure self-evaluation: one is open question and answer, in which participants describe themselves, and then encode the description. This method is easy to operate but is not widely used because of its subjective factors; the other is the scale method, which calculates the scores of subjects' different scales to calculate their self-evaluation, including personal evaluation questionnaire (PEI), Tennessee self-concept scale (TSCS), college students' Self-concept Questionnaire and so on. The scale method is widely used, and its reliability and validity are satisfactory in practice<sup>[4]</sup>.

#### 1.2 Definition and measurement of interpersonal relationship

As a special term, "interpersonal relationship" was first proposed by the American Association of personnel management and based on Hawthorne's experiment, Professor E. Mayo of Harvard University founded it in 1933, also known as the theory of population relationship, emphasizing the importance of people in the production process<sup>[5]</sup>.

Through literature review, this paper finds that the definition of interpersonal relationship at home and abroad has the following characteristics, with individuals and groups as the main body, interpersonal communication as the media, and psychological relationship as the core. To sum up, combined with the research object, this paper believes that college students' interpersonal relationship should be a relatively stable psychological relationship gradually developed in the daily life between individual and group.

#### Social measurement

Social measurement is developed from the social measurement test proposed by American psychologist Moerno, J.L., which is mainly used to explain the interpersonal interaction mode within the group. Its basic assumption is that there is informal organization within the group. The basic operation of social measurement method is that the subjects ask questions from the main test, and the subjects choose other members. The positive choice represents acceptance and appreciation, while the negative choice indicates negation and exclusion, thus reflecting people's feelings of favoritism or antipathy, so as to analyze their different psychological distances<sup>[6]</sup>.

However, social measurement can only express people's likes and dislikes in terms of emotions, but can not reflect the motivation of choice and the psychological mechanism of making choices in interpersonal relationships.

#### Reference measurement

Based on the shortcomings of social measurement, the Soviet psychologist Petrovsky proposed a new method to measure interpersonal relationship, namely reference measurement. The specific operation is that on the basis of mutual evaluation of the former, members can freely view other people's evaluation of themselves, which makes it easier to determine the "central person" who plays a role in the group.

However, this method is easy to be affected by power factors, resulting in distortion of results, and is not suitable for the groups of poor independence and more people's interaction <sup>[7]</sup>.

Bales measurement

This measurement method was proposed by American psychologist Bales, R.F., who believed that as long as we can observe the whole process of human interaction, we can measure the basic nature of interpersonal relationships in groups. The advantage of this measurement method is that it can be used not only for small group internal measurement, but also for cross-cultural measurement. However, the formation of this measurement method is based on the experimental environment rather than the actual environment, so the external validity is not ideal <sup>[8]</sup>.

## II. Methods

### 2.1 Subjects

A total of 292 subjects were tested and 255 effective subjects were obtained. The effective rate was 87.3%. Among them, 86 were freshmen, 75 were sophomores, 50 were juniors and 44 were seniors. There are 140 boys and 115 girls, with a total of 255.

### 2.2 Research tools

#### 2.2.1 Self evaluation measurement tool

Self concept scale was developed by Liu Tianyue. The scale is based on the self-concept structure of college students proposed by Zheng Yong and Huang Xiting, with reference to Zheng Yong's College Students' Self-concept Questionnaire, Tennessee self-concept scale and self-concept scale of WJZ psychological test and statistics software developed by Wang Jianzhong. There are 23 items, each item is scored from 1 to 5 points. It is divided into 9 dimensions: communicative self, friendly self, faithful self, appearance self, academic self, ambition self, family self, mature self and self-contained self. Through the test analysis, the alpha coefficient of the scale is 0.716, and the reliability coefficient of the retest is 0.785. The structural validity of the scale is verified by examining the correlation between each dimension score and the sub questionnaire score and the total score of the questionnaire, which shows that the scale has good reliability and validity.

#### 2.2.2 Interpersonal relationship measurement tools

The comprehensive interpersonal relationship scale was compiled by Zheng RI Chang. The scale is composed of 28 questions, each of which answers "yes" or "no". It is divided into four dimensions: conversational distress, communicative distress, interpersonal distress and heterosexual obsession, each dimension corresponds to 7 questions. The scores of 0-2 in each dimension indicated that the subjects performed well in the project, and the scores of 3-5 indicated that the subjects had certain problems in the project, and the scores of 6 and above indicated that the problems were serious. The total score of the scale is 0-8, which indicates that there is less trouble with friends; the score between 9 and 14 indicates that there is a certain degree of trouble in communication with friends; the score of 15-28 points indicates that there are serious problems in communication with friends, and there may be some psychological barriers. A large number of studies have shown that the scale has good reliability and validity.

#### 2.2.3 Data analysis

Spss19.0 is mainly used for data input, processing and analysis.

### III. Results

#### 3.1 The current situation and differences of College Students' self-evaluation

##### 3.1.1 General situation of self-evaluation

It can be seen from table 3-1 that college students show similar characteristics in several dimensions of self-evaluation. The social self, achievement self, mature self and self acceptance are slightly higher than the middle level, and the integrity self, appearance self and ambition self are in the middle level, while the friendly self and family self are lower than the medium level.

Table 3-1 General situation of self-evaluation

	<i>N</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Social self	150	1.00	5.00	3.33	1.15
Friendly self	150	1.00	4.00	2.63	0.77
Integrity self	150	1.00	4.00	3.19	0.55
Appearance self	150	2.00	4.00	3.25	0.55
Achievement self	150	2.00	5.00	3.37	0.54
Ambition self	150	1.00	5.00	3.26	1.24
Family self	150	2.00	4.00	2.52	0.53
Mature self	150	3.00	5.00	3.67	0.77
Self acceptance	150	1.00	5.00	3.73	1.20
Self evaluation	150	2.00	4.00	3.11	0.35
<i>N</i>	150				

Note: \* means significant at the level of 0.05, \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.01, and \* \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.001

##### 3.1.2 Self evaluation differences

In order to explore whether there are significant differences in the dimensions of College Students' self-evaluation, this paper will control the variables such as gender, grade and monthly average income to test their differences.

###### (1) Gender differences of college students' self-evaluation

It can be seen from Table 3-2 that the self-evaluation of men is significantly different,  $P < 0.5$ ; in the female group, the T value of self-acceptance dimension is 2.261,  $P < 0.5$ .

Table 3-2 Gender differences in college students' self-evaluation

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Male					
Social self	3.39	1.09	1.49	138	0.14
Friendly self	2.61	0.80	0.13	138	0.89
Integrity self	3.19	0.57	-0.57	138	0.57
Appearance self	3.30	0.56	0.39	138	0.70
Achievement self	3.34	0.52	-0.34	138	0.74
Ambition self	3.0964	1.21590	.868	138	0.39
Family self	2.5181	.52641	-1.033	138	0.30

	Mature self	3.7229	.81620	.940	138	0.34
	Self acceptance	3.7349	1.23055	.883	138	0.38
	Self evaluation	3.1205	.36283	2.261	137	.025*
Female	Social self	3.2537	1.22280	1.139	113	0.26
	Friendly self	2.6418	.73240	1.594	113	0.11
	Integrity self	3.1791	.52006	-.742	113	0.46
	Appearance self	3.1940	.52912	-1.451	113	0.15
	Achievement self	3.4030	.55212	-.122	113	0.90
	Ambition self	3.4627	1.25925	.528	113	0.60
	Family self	2.5224	.53252	-.622	113	0.54
	Mature self	3.6119	.71679	-.099	113	0.92
	Self acceptance	3.7313	1.17528	2.261	113	.026*
	Self evaluation	3.0896	.33626	1.017	113	.31

Note: \* means significant at the level of 0.05, \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.01, and \* \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.001

## (2) Grade differences of College Students' self-evaluation

It can be seen from table 3-3 that the score of mature self of freshmen is higher. Sophomores scored higher in self-acceptance. Third year students have higher scores of mature self. Among the dimensions of self-evaluation of senior students, there are significant differences between social self and achievement self.

Table 3-3 Grade differences of College Students' self-evaluation

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Fresh men	Social self	3.44	1.17	0.44	84	0.66
	Friendly self	2.60	0.76	0.52	84	0.60
	Integrity self	3.13	0.51	-0.62	84	0.54
	Appearance self	3.38	0.49	-1.71	84	0.09
	Achievement self	3.40	0.53	0.36	84	0.72
	Ambition self	3.22	1.29	0.82	84	0.41
	Family self	2.55	0.50	-0.31	84	0.75
	Mature self	3.82	0.84	2.30	78	0.02*
	Self acceptance	3.46	1.33	0.87	84	0.39
	Self evaluation	3.09	0.35	0.78	84	0.44
Sopho more	Social self	3.21	1.19	1.89	73	0.06
	Friendly self	2.53	0.74	1.41	73	0.16
	Integrity self	3.19	0.66	0.22	73	0.83
	Appearance self	3.12	0.59	0.18	73	0.86
	Achievement self	3.35	0.53	-.90	73	0.37
	Ambition self	3.05	1.25	-.89	73	0.38

	Family self	2.49	0.55	-.60	73	0.55
	Mature self	3.60	0.69	0.26	73	0.79
	Self acceptance	3.79	1.10	2.10	57	0.04
	Self evaluation	3.09	0.37	2.37	73	0.02*
Junior	Social self	3.45	1.15	.87	48	0.39
	Friendly self	2.86	0.79	1.10	48	0.28
	Integrity self	3.24	0.51	-0.89	48	0.38
	Appearance self	3.31	0.47	0.50	48	0.62
	Achievement self	3.71	0.49	2.137	48	0.04
	Ambition self	3.48	1.12	1.49	48	0.14
	Family self	2.52	0.57	-.04	48	0.97
	Mature self	3.55	0.74	-2.19	48	0.03*
	Self acceptance	3.79	1.21	0.78	48	0.44
	Self evaluation	3.17	0.38	1.13	48	.26
Senior	Social self	3.73	1.06	2.10	42	.05*
	Friendly self	2.57	0.79	-0.81	42	0.43
	Integrity self	3.26	0.45	-0.52	42	0.61
	Appearance self	3.13	0.63	-0.66	42	0.52
	Achievement self	4.12	0.59	3.47	42	0.00*
	Ambition self	3.48	1.27	1.02	42	0.32
	Family self	2.52	0.51	-1.40	42	0.17
	Mature self	3.61	0.78	0.67	38	0.51
	Self acceptance	4.22	0.90	1.09	42	0.28
	Self evaluation	3.09	0.29	-0.09	42	0.93

Note: \* means significant at the level of 0.05, \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.01, and \* \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.001

### (3) The different consumption level of College Students' self-evaluation

It can be seen from table 3-4 that under the group of less than 1000 RMB, the T value of mature self dimension is 3.304, and the corresponding significance value is 0.001. There are significant differences in the groups. Specifically, the students under the group of less than 1000 yuan have a higher score of mature self.

Table 3-4 Consumption level differences of College Students' self-evaluation

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Below 1000 yuan	Social self	3.42	1.21	1.38	77	0.17
	Friendly self	2.70	0.68	0.70	77	0.49
	Integrity self	3.12	0.56	-0.43	77	0.67
	Appearance self	3.28	0.57	-1.10	77	0.28
	Achievement	3.36	0.56	-0.15	77	0.88

self						
Ambition self	3.26	1.26	0.92	77	0.36	
Family self	2.60	0.57	0.38	77	0.71	
Mature self	3.76	0.85	3.30	77	0.00*	
Self acceptance	3.48	1.27	1.34	77	0.18	
Self evaluation	3.10	0.36	2.17	76.04	0.03*	

Note: \* means significant at the level of 0.05, \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.01, and \* \* \* indicates that it is significant at the level of 0.001

### 3.2 The current situation and differences of College Students' interpersonal relationship

#### 3.2.1 General situation of interpersonal relationship

From table 3-5, it can be seen that there are less problems in college students' interpersonal relationship, accounting for 3.3%; there are more problems, accounting for 49.3%; there are also a considerable proportion of serious problems, accounting for 47.3%. Each dimension showed similar characteristics, the proportion of certain troubles was large, and the proportion of less and serious disturbances was relatively small.

Table 3-5 Distribution of interpersonal distress (N=255)

dependent variable	Less trouble		A certain degree of trouble		Serious trouble	
	Number of people	Percentage (%)	Number of people	Percentage (%)	Number of people	Percentage (%)
Trouble talking	16	10.7	120	80.0	14	9.3
Trouble to make friends	14	9.3	122	81.3	14	9.3
Trouble in dealing with people	12	8.0	126	84.0	12	8.0
Heterosexual obsession	10	6.7	126	84.0	14	9.3
Interpersonal problems	5	3.3	74	49.3	71	47.3

#### 3.2.2 Research on interpersonal differences

In the same way, we control the variables such as gender, grade and monthly average income, and test their differences to study whether there are significant differences in the dimensions of college students' self-evaluation.

##### (1) Gender differences in college students' interpersonal relationship

It can be seen from table 3-6 that the T value of communication distress of female group is 2.151, which indicates that there are differences among female groups in communication distress.

Table 3-6 Gender differences of College Students' interpersonal relationship

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Male	Trouble talking	3.46	1.29	.074	101	.94
	Trouble to make friends	3.72	1.34	0.39	138	0.70
	Trouble in dealing with people	3.66	1.54	0.83	138	0.41
	Heterosexual obsession	3.53	1.40	0.09	138	0.93
	Interpersonal problems	14.37	2.73	0.60	99	.55
Female	Trouble talking	3.46	1.44	-1.90	113	.06
	Trouble to make friends	3.25	1.35	-2.15	113	.013*
	Trouble in dealing with people	3.42	1.48	-0.23	113	0.82
	Heterosexual obsession	3.43	1.34	-0.40	113	0.69
	Interpersonal problems	13.70	3.51	-1.77	113	0.08

(2) Grade differences in interpersonal relationship among College Students

According to table 3-7, the corresponding significance T values of conversation distress in each dimension about interpersonal relationship are 0.018 and 0.011 respectively, indicating that there are significant differences between freshmen and sophomores in this dimension.

Table 3-7 Grade differences of interpersonal relationship among College Students

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Freshmen	Trouble talking	3.88	1.51	2.80	84	0.02
	Trouble to make friends	3.73	1.56	-0.14	84	0.89
	Trouble in dealing with people	3.44	1.52	-0.04	84	0.97
	Heterosexual obsession	3.27	1.51	-1.16	84	0.25
	Interpersonal problems	13.82	3.54	-0.88	84	0.38
Sophomore	Trouble talking	3.90	1.28	2.83	73	.011*
	Trouble to make friends	3.67	1.34	-0.53	73	0.60



Trouble in dealing with people	3.72	1.47	-0.19	73	0.85
Heterosexual obsession	3.84	1.31	-0.13	73	0.90
Interpersonal problems	14.53	3.00	-0.81	73	0.42

(3) The difference of consumption level of College Students' interpersonal relationship

According to the results of data, no matter what kind of consumption level grouping, there is no significant difference in interpersonal relationship between inside and outside the province.

**3.3 Correlation analysis of College Students' self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship**

It can be seen from table 3-9 that college students' self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship do not show correlation in general, and there is a correlation between self-evaluation's Integrity self and interpersonal relationship of interpersonal communication distress.

Table 3-9 Correlation coefficients between college students' self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship

	Communication		Trouble in dealing with people	Heterosexual obsession	Total score of interpersonal distress
	Trouble talking	ation trouble			
Social self	-0.05	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.02
Friendly self	-0.03	-0.07	-0.02	-0.05	-0.07
Integrity self	0.05	-0.13	-0.04	-0.02	-0.05
Appearance self	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.00	0.09
Achievement self	0.05	-0.02	-0.07	-0.00	-0.02
Ambition self	-0.07	0.07	0.02	-0.02	0.00
Family self	0.07	-0.05	-0.02	0.05	0.03
Mature self	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.10	0.10
Self acceptance	0.03	-0.06	-0.03	-0.06	-0.05
Total score of self evaluation	0.03	-0.03	0.02	0.00	0.01

**IV. Discussions**

**4.1 Difference analysis of college students' self-evaluation**

(1) The overall situation's analysis of self-evaluation

From each dimension, the social self, achievement self, mature self and self acceptance are slightly higher than the medium level, which is more consistent with the process of college students gradually breaking away from the identity of students and becoming social people. The level of friendly self is lower than the medium level, which may be due to the influence of utilitarian social environment, and it deserves attention.

(2) Analysis of gender differences in self evaluation

On the whole, there is no significant difference in the self-evaluation of college students in terms of gender,

which indicates that both male and female groups have similar characteristics in self-evaluation on the same gender.

(3) Analysis of grade differences in self evaluation

On the whole, there is no significant difference in the self-evaluation of college students in different grades, which shows that there are similar characteristics in the self-evaluation of college students in different grades.

In the dimension of maturity, freshmen and juniors have higher scores of mature self, which is directly related to the progress of college students in their learning and life in recent years. However, due to the higher starting point of groups in Guangdong Province, the self-evaluation of maturity dimension does not change much over time. In the senior group, the self-evaluation of social self and achievement self is higher. Compared with other grades, the senior group has more contact with the society, which shows that they still have certain advantages in working and living in similar social environment.

(4) Analysis on the difference of self evaluation consumption

On the whole, there is no significant difference in the self-evaluation of college students under different consumption levels, which indicates that college students also have similar characteristics in self-evaluation at different consumption levels.

Under the group of less than 1000 yuan, college students scored higher in the mature self dimension. The reason for this phenomenon may be that the family background of the low consumption group is generally in the middle and lower class, and they are exposed to the hardships of life earlier. Especially, the rapid development and change in Guangdong, the social contrast is more obvious, which makes the student groups have a deeper understanding of this point.

#### **4.2 Analysis of interpersonal differences among college students**

(1) The overall situation's analysis of interpersonal relationship

On the whole, most college students have some problems in interpersonal relationship, which is related to the rapid development of modernization in Guangdong Province. Under the fierce social competition, there will inevitably be such problems. Only a small number of groups can balance the development and change of themselves and the environment.

In each dimension, college students show similar characteristics, with certain troubles in the majority, and less and more troubles in the minority, which shows that in interpersonal relationship, the distribution of college students' group problems is unbalanced, and the situation between individuals is different, and the difference is obvious.

(2) Analysis of gender differences in interpersonal relationship

Generally speaking, gender can not be the influencing factor of the students in and outside the province in terms of interpersonal relationship, that is to say, the characteristics of college students with the same gender are similar.

In the female group, the communication distress is significantly higher than that of the male group, which is related to the unique psychological characteristics of the female group. At the same time, the communication barrier caused by the difference of thinking mode and language has a greater impact on the female group than the male group.

(3) Analysis of grade differences in interpersonal relationship

In general, the influence of grade difference in interpersonal relationship is not obvious, that is to say, the same grade students also have similar characteristics in interpersonal relationship. Specifically, from all dimensions, under the group of freshmen and sophomores, the problem of college students' conversation is

relatively high, while the difference between them gradually disappears after they become juniors or seniors. This is due to the fact that the group of foreign students has just entered the campus and can't integrate the local environment and do as the Romans do when they go to school, especially in the aspect of communication. With time going by, the group of foreign students can do better. In order to adapt to the local environment, the differences between them and the students in the province will be reduced or even disappeared.

#### (4) Analysis on the difference of interpersonal relationship consumption

In different consumption levels, college students do not show significant differences, which show that in terms of interpersonal relationship, consumption level can not be the influencing factor of group differences between inside and outside the province.

### **4.3 Correlation analysis of self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship**

According to the results of the analysis, the study found that except for the negative correlation between the self-evaluation of integrity self and the communication distress in interpersonal communication, there is almost no correlation between self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship among college students, which is contrary to the existing research results. On the one hand, the reason for this result may be that the sample is relatively scattered, on the other hand, the application of self-concept scale is still worth exploring, it may not have considerable regional universality.

## **V. Conclusion**

Based on the results of data analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (1) In self-evaluation, there is no significant difference between male and female students. In grade and consumption level, college students do not show significant differences, but there are significant differences in mature self-esteem of freshmen and juniors, self-acceptance of sophomores, social self and achievement self of senior group, and mature self of less than 1000 yuan consumption group.
- (2) In interpersonal relationship, 3.3% of college students have less trouble, 49.3% have some degree of trouble, and 47.3% have serious trouble.
- (3) In interpersonal relationship, there are no significant differences in gender, grade and consumption level among college students, but there are significant differences in communication distress of female group and conversation distress of freshmen and sophomores.
- (4) There was no significant correlation between self-evaluation and interpersonal relationship.

## **Reference**

- [1] Wang Bin. Definition, standard and evaluation of mental health (review) [A]. *Physical research and health promotion papers* [C]: 2006:6
- [2] Li Chen. Research on optimizing the quality structure of College Counselors Based on the new characteristics of post-90s college students [D]. *Southwest Jiaotong University*, 2012
- [3] Zhang Liya. Research on the compensation effect of self-evaluation in social comparison of college students [D]. *Southwest University*, 2010
- [4] Hu Ying. Influence of time comparison and regulatory focus on College Students' self-evaluation [D]. *Sichuan Normal University*, 2017

- [5] ZhengQuanquan, Yu Guoliang. Interpersonal psychology [M].*Beijing: People's education press*, 1999.p5-21
  
- [6] Cheng Xi. Introduction to social measurement [J].*Psychological development and education*, 1991 (01): 31-36
  
- [7] Li Ningning. Comparative analysis of two measurement methods of interpersonal relationship -- social measurement and reference measurement [J].*Sociological research*, 1987 (02): 81-86
  
- [8] Plateau. A study on the relationship among interpersonal relationship, self-worth and sense of life significance of college students [D].*Shenyang Normal University*, 2012