

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-3-1999

A validity study for the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2

Kelly R. Fleming
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fleming, Kelly R., "A validity study for the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2" (1999). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1800.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1800>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

A VALIDITY STUDY FOR THE ADOLESCENT AND ADULT
SELF-CONCEPT RETROSPECTIVE SCALE AND THE
TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE:2

by
Kelly R. Fleming

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
Spring, 1999

Approved by

Professor

Date Approved 5/3/99

ABSTRACT

Kelly R. Fleming

A Validity Study for the Adolescent and Adult
Self-Concept Retrospective Scale and the
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2

1999

Dr. John Klanderman and Dr. Roberta Dihoff
Master of Arts Degree in School Psychology

The purpose of this study was to investigate the validity of the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale (AASRS) by comparing it to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2 (TSCS: 2) on a population consisting of fifty-nine college students ranging in age from 18 to 20. The study also examined whether there is a significant correlation between male and female adolescents with regard to self-concept.

Two trained examiners administered the AASRS and the TSCS:2. One examiner administered the AASRS and the other administered the TSCS:2. All fifty-nine students were tested on both tests over a two-week period.

A Pearson Correlation produced supportive and relevant data suggesting that there is a relationship between the AASRS and the TSCS: 2. The relationship between gender and self-concept went unsupported.

MINI ABSTRACT

Kelly R. Fleming

A Validity Study for the Adolescent and Adult
Self-Concept Retrospective Scale and the
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2

1999

Dr. John Klanderman and Dr. Roberta Dihoff
Master of Arts Degree in School Psychology

This study investigated the validity of the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale by comparing it to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2 and examined the significance of gender and self-concept. A relationship between the AASRS and the TSCS: 2 was found. A relationship between gender and self-concept was not found.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Jack Joseph for the opportunity to work with the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale.

I would especially like to thank Jill Fredricks for her assistance with administering the surveys and for her patience and understanding throughout the completion of this thesis. I couldn't have done it without her.

Thanks to James Yanek for his computer assistance and for his patience, support and guidance, which helped keep me sane throughout this project.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Dr. John Klanderman and Dr. Roberta Dihoff for their continued supervision throughout the process.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff at the graduate office for allowing me to work on my thesis during my assistantship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE	1
THE PROBLEM	1
NEED	1
PURPOSE	2
HYPOTHESIS	2
THEORY	2
DEFINITION OF TERMS	3
ASSUMPTIONS	4
LIMITATIONS	4
OVERVIEW	4
CHAPTER II	5
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
HISTORICAL ROOTS OF SELF-CONCEPT	5
SELF-CONCEPT, ADOLESCENCE AND GENDER	9
THE IMPORTANCE OF VALIDITY	14
SUMMARY	15
CHAPTER THREE	16
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	16
SAMPLE	16
MEASURES	16
DESIGN	17
TESTABLE HYPOTHESIS	17
ANALYSIS	18
SUMMARY	18

CHAPTER FOUR	19
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	19
Table 4.1	20
Table 4.2	21
Table 4.3	22
CHAPTER FIVE	23
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	23
SUMMARY	23
CONCLUSIONS.....	23
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	23
REFERENCES	25
APPENDIX A - Demographic Sheet	27
APPENDIX B - Feedback Sheet	29

List of Tables

TABLE 4.1	20
TABLE 4.2	21
TABLE 4.3	22

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

NEED

Self- concept is the way an individual perceives himself, his behaviors, how others view him, and the feelings of personal worth and satisfaction that are attached to these perceptions (Joseph, 1979). Many researchers have focused on measuring self- concept with a variety of tests. One in particular, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale has been used in many settings (Bishop, Walling and Walker, 1997). It is utilized to measure a multidimensional construct of self-concept (Gellen and Hoffman, 1984).

The Joseph Self-Concept Scale For Young Children (JSSYC) is an individually administered scale designed to assess the self-concept levels of children ages seven years and older. Revisions of this scale are being introduced to focus on other various populations.

When new ways of testing are introduced, it is important for them to be valid. Tests should measure what they purport to measure. In this study, the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale (AASRS), a revision of the JSSYC, is compared to the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to correlate the revision's global self-concept scores for an adult/late adolescent population.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to investigate the validity of the AASRS by comparing it to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale on a population consisting of 59 college students, ages 18 – 20.

HYPOTHESIS

1. The AASRS is a valid measure of self-concept in college students when compared to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.
2. Comparisons of the AASRS and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale will investigate whether there are gender differences in self-concept.

THEORY

There is a plethora of information concerning self-concept. History has shown that although there are varying perspectives of self-concept, it is of great importance and in need of investigation. Early philosophers equated the self with the soul (Hattie, 1992). Cooley brought about the idea of self-concept as the “looking-glass self.” The 19th century brought more thoughts on the concept of self with William James and his argument that “the consciousness of self involved a stream of thought and that each thought can remember that which went before” (Hattie, 1992). He was one of the first psychologists to concentrate extensively of the concept of self. Freud was concerned with the id, ego and superego, while more recently, psychologists such as Skinner and Allport see self-concept as an agent (Hattie, 1992).

Erikson’s theory of psychosocial development addressed the self-concept as related to the adolescence stage. This is the stage where the question, “Who am I” is addressed. According to Carver and Scheier (1996), “To emerge from adolescence with a strong sense of identity requires that the self-concept evolve in two ways” (p. 308). You

must consolidate the self-conceptions formed during the previous psychosocial stages, merging them in a way that feels right, then this integrated self-view must be integrated with the conception of you that others hold. Erikson sees acquiring the sense of self as a major life task (Carver & Scheier, 1996).

Many measures of self-concept have also been developed throughout history. It is important that there be a way to test self-concept with tools that are valid. The validity of a measurement is important when it is being used to help make an assessment of a person. Attempts to define and measure self-concept have been hampered partly by the lack of instrument equivalency in operational definition of the hypothesized constructs (Moran, Michael, & Dembo, 1978). Using the well-known TSCS in comparison to the AASRS will hopefully offer validity.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. **AASRS:** The Adult and Adolescent Self-Concept Retrospective Scale
2. **JPPSST:** The Joseph Pre School and Primary Self-Concept Screening Test
3. **JSSYC:** The Joseph Self-Concept Scale For Young Children (JSSYC)
4. **TSCS:2:** Tennessee Self-Concept Scale
5. **Adolescents:** The young adult population surveyed between the ages of 18 and 20.
6. **Self-Concept:** The way an individual perceives himself, his behaviors, how others view him, and the feelings of personal worth and satisfaction that are attached to these perception (Joseph, 1979).

ASSUMPTIONS

It is to be assumed that the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale is a valid and reliable measure. It is also to be expected that the responses to the measurements are honest and objective.

LIMITATIONS

The student populations were from college students, ages 18 – 20, living on a particular college campus, in one specific residence hall and therefore may not be representative of all late adolescents.

OVERVIEW

In Chapter 2, a review of the literature on self-concept and gender differences will be presented. The pertinent information concerning the TSCS and the AASRS is reviewed. In Chapter 3, the design of the study will be presented and Chapter 4 will be an analysis of the results.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The topic of self-concept is very broad and can become overwhelming with its many variations. The historical roots of self-concept will be addressed first, in order to offer background information on some of the many theories that have evolved throughout time. Following the historical background, some research will be presented on the topics of self-concept in relation to adolescence and gender differences. Finally, the importance of validating self-concept measures will be discussed.

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF SELF-CONCEPT

Cooley: “The Looking-Glass Self”

Cooley believed that the feeling state is produced by the belief that one has control over events, or by cognitive discrimination, such as in noting that one’s own body is different from other people’s bodies (Epstein, 1973). Cooley brought about the concept of the “looking-glass self.” This concept refers to an individual’s perceiving themselves in the way that others perceive them (Epstein, 1973). According to Harter (1996), Cooley theorized that significant others constituted a social mirror into which individuals would look to detect their opinions toward themselves. Cooley contended that what becomes the self is what we imagine that others think of our appearance and character for example. Cooley argued that personal pronouns such as “I” seem to have no uniform meaning, but they, plus “self,” are names we learn (Hattie, 1992).

They are “a peculiarly central, vigorous and well-knit portion of the mind, not separate from the rest but gradually merging into it, and yet having a certain practical distinctness, so that a man generally shows clearly enough by his language and behavior what his “I” is as distinguished from thoughts he does not appropriate.” (Hattie, 1992, p.182)

There are three components of his “self-idea:” (1) the imagination of our appearance to the other person, (2) the imagination of that person’s judgement of that appearance, and (3) a type of self-feeling, for example, pride or shame (Harter, 1996). Harter (1996) continued with the idea that what paved the way for a more developmental perspective on how the attitudes of others are incorporated into the self was Cooley’s idea that the internalization of others’ opinions about the self was a critical element.

William James: “Me = A Stream of Consciousness of All That I Call Mine”

According to Epstein (1973), William James was one of the first psychologists to have written extensively on the self. He identified the fundamentally different approaches. One approach regards the self as a knower, and the other regards the self as an object of what is known (Epstein, 1973). Epstein (1973) continues with the thought that James saw no value to the self as a knower for understanding behavior and felt that it should really be looked at by philosophers. James was thought to believe that all aspects of the self are able to bring about feelings of a greater self-esteem and well-being, or lowered self-esteem and unhappiness (Epstein, 1973).

Hattie (1992) felt that James did not look at consciousness as a “thing.” James felt that the main causes of self-feeling are one’s actual successes or failures and the actual good or bad position one holds in life (Hattie, 1992). “For James, the I was the

knower, in contrast to the Me, which represented an empirical aggregate of things objectively know about the self” (Harter, 1996, p.1).

According to Harter (1996), James further developed the idea of the Me-self. The Me-self as defined by James as “the sum total of all a person can call his or her own” (Harter, 1996, p.2). Three major constituents of the “sum total” were (1) the material self, (2) the social self, and (3) the spiritual self (Harter, 1996). James developed a hierarchical structure that he thought was common across individuals. At the bottom of the hierarchy is the material self, the social self occupies the next position, and the spiritual self occupies the highest tier (Harter, 1996). According to Harter (1996), James paved the way for future models in which the self is viewed as multidimensional and hierarchical” (p. 2).

Mead: “If The ‘I’ Speaks The ‘Me’ Hears”

According to Hattie (1992), Mead claimed that the individual self is individual only because of its relation to others. The individual learns to perceive the world as they do. Epstein (1973), explained that Mead noted that the self-concept arises as an outgrowth of the individual’s concern about how others react to him in social interaction. “There are as many selves as there are social roles” (Epstein, 1973, p. 406).

“An individual may become the object of his or her actions” (Hattie, 1992, p. 18). According to Hattie (1992), aside from mutual social identity, which Mead called the “me,” there are the active and spontaneous aspects of the individual, which he called the “I.” Mead contended that the “I” acts upon the “me,” and therefore upon the socialization process itself. According to Hattie (1992), Mead claimed that we have an innate drive for self-enhancement, and superiority.

Harter (1996) states that, "In Mead, we see an even greater insistence on the role of social interaction, particularly through the use of language" (p. 4).

Allport: "The Concept of Proprium"

Allport used the term "proprium" as opposed to the term "self." According to Epstein (1973) "the "proprium" is defined by Allport as consisting of those aspects of the individual which is regarded as of central importance, and which contributes to a sense of inward unity, according to" (p. 406) . According to Hattie (1992), Allport suggested we call "all aspects of personality that make for inward unity" the proprium.

Allport distinguished that the proprium has the following eight attributes: (1) awareness of a bodily self, (2) a sense of continuity over time, (3) ego enhancement, or a need for self-esteem, (4) ego extension, or the identification of the self beyond the borders of the body, (5) rational process, or the synthesis of inner needs with outer reality, (6) self-image, or the person's perception, and evaluation of himself as an object of knowledge, (7) the self as knower, or as executive agent, and (8) "proprie striving," or the motivation to increase rather than decrease tension, and to expand awareness and seek out challenges (Epstein, 1973).

Rogers: "Need to Maintain and Enhance the Self"

According to Epstein (1973), Rogers defined the self as "an organized, fluid, but consistent conceptual pattern of perceptions of characteristics and relationships of the 'I' or the 'me,' together with values attached to these concepts" (p. 406). "The self is an awareness of being, and includes only those characteristics that individuals are aware of and over which they believe they can exercise control" (Hattie, p. 34).

Rogers also felt that anxiety is experienced by any threat to the organization of the self-concept (Epstein, 1973). According to Epstein (1973), Rogers claimed that the highest goal of any individual is to become himself or herself.

Coopersmith

According to Hattie (1992), Coopersmith felt that the amount of respectful, accepting, and concerned treatment we receive from others is critical. Self-concept provides a mental set that prepares a person to respond according to expectations of success, acceptance and personal strength (Hattie, 1992).

According to Harter (1996), the four dimensions of self evaluation proposed by Coopersmith are: “(1) competence (success in meeting achievement demand(s), (2) virtue (adherence to moral and ethical standard(s), (3) power (the ability to control and influence others), and (4) significance (the acceptance, attention, and affection of other(s)” (p. 11).

SELF-CONCEPT, ADOLESCENCE AND GENDER

The adolescence stage of Erikson’s theory of psychosocial development begins with the changes in puberty and lasts until approximately age 20 (Carver & Scheier, 1996). “To emerge from adolescence with a strong sense of identity requires that the self-concept evolve in two ways” (Carver & Scheier, 1996, p. 308). The two ways are by consolidating the self-conceptions that were acquired in the other psychosocial stages, making them fit in a sensible manner and by integrating the self-view with the conceptions of you that others have (Carver & Scheier, 1996).

Simmons (1987) argues that changes in both self-concept and psychological distress can be a result of dramatic change in the environment during adolescence. It was

also found that women do not have as positive a self-image, as do men during the transition to college (Alfeld-Liro & Sigelman, 1998). Women were also found to have more trouble adapting and tend to experience more stress (Alfeld-Liro & Sigelman, 1998).

Rubin (1988) reported that Blos (1979) warns that narcissistic character disorder can result from a prolonged adolescence. Rubin randomly selected 24 freshmen and group administered a battery of psychological procedures consisting of Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS; Fitts, 1965), Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), a life experiences questionnaire (LEQ), and a daily happiness survey in order to look at the phenomena of turmoil and narcissism on college campuses.

The results showed that the freshmen were pretty much happy and displayed average self-concept scores (Rubin, 1988). There was an assumption that the new situation of being at college and the stressors that are experienced could have caused the subjects to be defensive with their responses (Rubin, 1988). Rubin's overall conclusion was that, "Perhaps this group of subjects supports Bandura's 1964 contention that normal, healthy adolescents from stable homes will not show great turmoil" (p. 590).

According to Hattie (1992), "There has been much conjecture as to the basis of the differences between male and female self-concepts" (p. 176). Hattie (1992) continues to offer that not only are women in the minority, but that they also have more role conflict, tend to be more socially and financially dependent and are often seen by society as inferior. There was also a reference to the fact that Marsh (1989b) found a pattern of

gender differences that favored males for math and physical self-concept and females for verbal and social self-concept (Hattie, 1992).

A study by Sharpley and Hattie examined cross-cultural and sex differences (Sharpley & Hattie, 1983). 101 men and 101 women, between the ages of 23 to 54, from a part-time undergraduate psychology course at a University in Australia were chosen randomly (Sharpley & Hattie, 1983). The subjects were administered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Significant differences were found between the men and the women ($X^2(20) = 66.12, p < .00$) (Sharpley & Hattie, 1983). It was determined that the males scored higher on Personal self, Psychosis, Personality Integration, Self Criticism, Neurosis, Defensive Positive and True/False ratio, and lower on Conflict scores (Sharpley & Hattie, 1983). The females scored higher on Personality Disorder, Row Variability, Moral/Ethical self and Social self (Sharpley & Hattie, 1983).

Alfeld-Liro and Sigelman (1998) investigated sex differences in adaptation to college with a concentration on real and ideal self-concept. 287 students, 128 males and 159 females responded to a repeated survey (Alfeld-Liro & Sigelman, 1998). The average age was 18 and the majority of the subjects were Caucasian.

Responses to the Sherwood Self-Identity Questionnaire were analyzed and the results showed that real self-concept changed over the period of time from summer orientation and second semester of freshmen year for the male participants, ($F(1,127) = 15.48, p < .001$), (Alfeld-Liro & Sigelman, 1998). There was no significant difference in the females.

Alfeld-Liro and Sigelman (1998), suggest further research on the topic of sex differences in self-concept during the transition to college in order to ensure equal opportunities for both genders to grow and change and succeed in college.

College is a time when setting goals for the future and forming an “ideal self” are key developmental tasks, when adolescents leave familiar people and settings and adjust to new ones, and when changes in well-being and perceptions of self may be expected (Alfeld-Liro & Sigelman, 1998, p. 219)

Long, Ziller, and Henderson (1968), investigated developmental changes in the self-concept of adolescents. It was hypothesized that the adolescent’s view of self with regard to others would vary and influence the way he/she acts now, versus how the individual views the future. It was also thought that there would be variability in the person and their social environments (Long, Ziller & Henderson, 1968).

The subjects worked in test booklets, selecting symbols and arranging them according to how he or she represents him or herself in relation to others. This Self-Social Symbols Tasks test provides measures of esteem, dependency, power, centrality, complexity, individuation, and identification (Long, Ziller & Henderson, 1968).

The results in regard for sex differences, showed that, “the sex by grade interaction for dependency was significant ($p = .05$)—girls, as compared with boys, had lower scores in junior high and higher scores in senior high” (Long, Ziller & Henderson, 1968, p. 218). The authors continued with the results showing that boys were found to identify more with their fathers than the girls did (boys 59%, girls 49%; $\chi^2 = 4.6$; $p = .05$).

Crain (1996), stated that, “for gender, the largest and most consistently found difference is the divergence between boys’ and girls’ perceptions of their physical ability self-concept” (p. 414). A study conducted by Sonstroem and Potts (1996) looked at life adjustment correlates of physical self-concepts using 119 female and 126 male university students (Sonstroem & Potts, 1996). The subjects were given the Physical Self-Perception Scale (PSPP) which assesses a self-concept domain of physical self-worth. It also addresses four specific subdomains: perceived sport competence, physical condition, attractive body, and strength (Sonstroem & Potts, 1996). They were also administered the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale as a measure of self-esteem.

The results showed that males scored significantly higher on the self-deceptive enhancement ($P < 0.01$) and all five physical self-concept scales ($P < 0.001$ including strength, $P < 0.01$) (Sonstroem & Potts, 1996). The authors also found that females scored significantly higher on impression management ($P < 0.001$). Overall, it was determined, according to Sonstroem and Potts (1996), that, “the study’s three significant interactions revealed that inverse relationships between Sport and negative affect, depression, and health complaints were significantly larger for males as opposed to females” (p. 624). These findings help support the importance of self-concepts (Sonstroem & Potts, 1996).

Aries, Olver, Blount, Christaldi, Fredman, & Lee (1998) recruited 78 students, 38 males and 40 females, from a variety of extracurricular groups. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 23 years and were given pagers and self-report forms for one week (Aries, Olver, Blount, Christaldi, Fredman, & Lee, 1998). The subjects were told to fill out the forms as soon as possible after receiving an electronic signal. The forms were collected

each day. A Social Identity Form was also completed that elicited background information on each participant (Aries, Olver, Blount, Christaldi, Fredman, & Lee, 1998).

According to Aries, Olver, Blount, Christaldi, Fredman, & Lee (1998), signals were sent out to the subjects at certain times during the day. Upon receiving a signal, the participants recorded on the form the date, the time of the signal, the time of completion of the form, their location, their primary and secondary activities, other people present, and the number of other people present. (Aries, Olver, Blount, Christaldi, Fredman, & Lee, 1998). Each subject upon receiving the signal also reported Racial and gender composition.

There were no significant differences between males and females in relationship to gender and self-definition, but all subjects are more aware of gender when they were in the gender minority (Aries, Olver, Blount, Christaldi, Fredman, & Lee, 1998).

THE IMPORTANCE OF VALIDITY

According to Wylie (1989), “a few instruments had been used in a good many studies and had been subjected to some of the relevant psychometric technologies such as item analysis, factor analysis, and controls for response set” (p. I). Messick (1980) argued that, “tests should be evaluated in terms of their measurement properties” (p. 1012).

Hattie (1992), states that, “validity is the most important quality of measurement” (p. 149). Reynolds (1988), states that, “validation is an ongoing dynamic process” (p. 238).

Hattie (1992) discusses three types of validation: relationships to other instruments, dimensionality, and differences between known groups. Validation that looks at relationships to other instruments is the idea that tests of self-concept are expected to have high correlations with other tests of self-concept and lower correlations

with tests that measure things other than self-concept (Hattie, 1992). Dimensionality is used to assess the underlying constructs of the various self-concept measures (Hattie, 1992). Finally, the known-groups method was said to be used to compare groups that were theoretically expected to be different on the construct measured (Hattie, 1992).

There are two major forms of validity according to Joseph (1979), construct and criterion-related. Joseph (1979) defines construct validity as referring to “the development of evidence which supports an instrument’s claim that it is really measuring the given trait that it purports to measure” (p. 57). Criterion-related validity, according to Joseph (1979), is “demonstrated by correlating test scores to performance on some external criterion measure” (p. 57). Hattie (1992) expresses a concern that there are very few validity studies on the measures that are being introduced for self-concept.

SUMMARY

Self-concept is a very broad topic that has been debated throughout history. Differences in self-concept have been found with regard to age and gender and many various measurements of self-concept have been developed. The purpose of this study is to examine self-concept with relation to gender and adolescence, while validating a revision of a previously used measure of self-concept in early childhood.

CHAPTER THREE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

SAMPLE

Twelve male and forty-seven female adolescents residing in an on-campus residence hall at Rowan University served as the subjects for this study. Rowan University is a state university, in the rural town of Glassboro, New Jersey. This sample ranged in age from 18 to 20 years of age. Seventeen of the subjects were 18, twenty-four were 19, and sixteen were 20. Fifty-three of the subjects described themselves as Caucasian, while the others were divided into other ethnic backgrounds; two African Americans, one Asian American and three Hispanic Americans.

MEASURES

This study tests the validity of the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale (AASRS), a revision of the Joseph Self-Concept Scale for Young Children as compared with the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2. (TSCS:2). The AASRS consists of thirty self-concept situation items and asks that each subject respond to the stimulus as though they were seven years old. The thirty items also include four Distortion Index items which were constructed to detect socially desirable responding-faking good, defensiveness, and/or repressive patterns (Joseph, 1979). Test materials include record forms and bound sets of boy and girl stimulus cards. Each age edition also offers a set of boy and girl minority cards that feature only darker skin and hair shading. It was at the discretion of the examiner to decide whether or not to utilize the minority cards.

The adult form of the TSCS:2 consisting of 82 items was used for this study. The TSCS:2 consists of self-descriptive statements that allow the subjects to portray his or her own self-picture using five response categories (Fitts & Warren, 1996). Test materials for the TSCS:2 include record forms and was administered individually, although it can be given to a group.

DESIGN

Two trained examiners administered the AASRS and the TSCS:2. One examiner administered the AASRS and the other administered the TSCS:2. All fifty-nine students were tested on both tests over a two-week period. Thirty-five subjects were administered the AASRS immediately followed by the TSCS:2. The other twenty-four subjects were administered the TSCS:2 immediately followed by the AASRS. The counterbalancing was to minimize the effects of administration order.

Data will be analyzed to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the AASRS and the TSCS:2 and also to examine if there is a significant correlation between male and female adolescents with regard to self-concept. This is a descriptive study.

TESTABLE HYPOTHESIS

Null hypothesis₁: A difference will be found in self-concept as measured by the AASRS compared to the TSCS:2.

Alternative hypothesis₁: There will be no difference in self-concept as measured by the AASRS compared to the TSCS:2.

Null hypothesis₂: No difference will be found in self-concept between males and females as measured by the AASRS and the TSCS:2.

Alternative hypothesis₂: A difference will be found in self-concept between males and females as measured by the AASRS and the TSCS:2.

ANALYSIS

A Pearson Correlation using $\rho = .05$ will be utilized to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the AASRS and the TSCS:2 and also to examine if there is a significant relationship between male and female adolescents with regard to self-concept. This is a descriptive, validity study.

SUMMARY

The Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale is being compared to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2 in order to investigate validity. Gender differences are also being examined. Fifty-nine Rowan University students served as subjects for this study and a Pearson Correlation will be utilized in this descriptive study.

CHAPTER FOUR ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the validity of the Adolescent and Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale (AASRS) by comparing it to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: 2 (TSCS:2) on a population consisting of fifty-nine college students ranging in age from 18 to 20. The study also examined whether there was a significant correlation between male and female adolescents with regard to self-concept.

A table of the means and standard deviations for the AASRS and the TSCS:2 scores can be found in Table 4.1. This was done to get an overall look at the variance of scores between the two tests.

As shown in Table 4.2, a Pearson Correlation resulted in a correlation coefficient of .398 which, at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) proves to be significant; therefore the null hypothesis was not supported by this data regarding validity.

As shown in Table 4.3, when comparing self-concept and gender the correlation was less positive. On a two-tailed test at the 0.01 level, the critical value was not found to be significant. The value was not within the critical range at the 0.01 or 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis was supported by this data regarding gender.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	44.7966	6.8927	59
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	284.8136	27.4606	59

Table 4.2

Correlations

		Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2
Pearson Correlation	Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	1.000	.398**
	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	.398**	1.000
Sig. (2-tailed)	Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale		.002
	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	.002	
N	Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	59	59
	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	59	59

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.3

Correlations

		Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	Gender
Pearson Correlation	Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	1.000	.398**	.096
	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	.398**	1.000	.003
	Gender	.096	.003	1.000
Sig. (2-tailed)	Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	.	.002	.470
	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	.002	.	.984
	Gender	.470	.984	.
N	Adolescent & Adult Self-Concept Retrospective Scale	59	59	59
	Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:2	59	59	59
	Gender	59	59	59

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER FIVE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the validity of the AASRS by comparing it to the TSCS:2 on a population consisting of fifty-nine college students ranging in age from 18 to 20. The study also examined whether there was a significant correlation between male and female adolescents with regard to self-concept.

Two trained examiners administered the AASRS and the TSCS:2. One examiner administered the AASRS and the other administered the TSCS:2. All fifty-nine students were tested on both tests over a two-week period.

The study was successful in producing supportive and relevant data about the relationship between the AASRS and the TSCS:2. The relationship between gender and self-concept went unsupported.

CONCLUSIONS

Results indicated that the AASRS is an acceptable measure of self-concept for this population. The lack of relationship between gender and self-concept may have been due to the inequality in gender representation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

When new ways of testing are introduced, it is important for them to be valid. Tests should measure what they purport to measure, therefore validity studies are very important and need to continue. For future research, the researcher suggests using a larger

sample of subjects. It is also recommended that one should use subjects from a variety of sources in order to have a more representative sample.

REFERENCES

- Alfeld-Liro, C., & Sigelman, C.K. (1998). Sex differences in self-concept and symptoms of depression during the transition to college. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, *27*, 219-245.
- Aries, E., Olver, R.R., Blount, K., Christaldi, K., Fredman, S., & Lee. (1998). Race and gender as components of the working self-concept. The Journal of Social Psychology, *138*, (3), 277-291.
- Bishop, S.L., Walling, D.P., & Walker, B.A. (1997). The emperor's clothes: assessing the validity of scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, *57*, (1), 150-163.
- Blos, P. (1979). The adolescent passage. New York: International Universities Press.
- Epstein, S. (1973). The self-concept revisited. American Psychologist, *28*, 404-416.
- Gellen, M.I., & Hoffman, R.A. (1984). Analysis of the subscales of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, *17*, (2), 51-55.
- Harter, S. (1996). Historical roots of contemporary issues involving self-concept. In Bracken, B.A. (Editor), The Handbook of Self-Concept. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hattie, J. (1992). Self-Concept. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Joseph, J. (1979). Joseph Preschool and Primary Self-Concept Screening Test, Wood Dale, IL: Stoelting.
- Long, B.H., Ziller, R.C., & Henderson, E.H. (1968). Developmental changes in the self-concept during adolescence. School Review, *76*, 210-230.
- Marsh, H.W., (1989). Age and gender effects in physical self-concepts for adolescent elite athletes and nonathletes: A multicohort-multioccasion design. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, *20*, (3), 237-259.
- Messick, S. (1980). Test validity and the ethics of assessment. American Psychologist, *35*, (11), 1012-1027.

- Moran, M., Michael, W.B., & Dembo, M.H. (1978). The factorial validity of three frequently employed self-report measures of self-concept. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 38, 547—563.
- Reynolds, W.M. (1988). Measurement of academic self-concept in college students. Journal of Personality Assessment, 52, (2), 223-240.
- Rubin, S. (1988). College freshmen: turmoil or maturity? Adolescence, 23, 585-591.
- Sharpley, C., & Hattie, J. (1983). Cross-cultural and sex differences on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: A challenge to Fitts' original data. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39, (5), 717-721.
- Simmons, R. (1987). Social transition and adolescent development. New Direction Child Development, 37, 33-61.
- Sonstroem, R.J., & Potts, S.A. (1996). Life adjustment correlates of physical self-concepts. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 28, (5), 619-625.
- Wylie, R.C. (1989) Measures of Self-Concept. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC SHEET

Researcher: Kelly R. Fleming

Subject #: _____

Demographic Sheet

Instructions: Please circle the answer that applies to you or fill in the appropriate answer.

1) What is your gender? Male Female

2) What is your age? _____

3) What is your race?

African American Asian American Hispanic Native American

Caucasian Other _____

4) What is your current college status?

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Other _____

5) What is the level of education obtained by your mother and/or father?

APPENDIX B
FEEDBACK SHEET

FEEDBACK SHEET

Self-concept is the way an individual perceives himself, his behaviors, how others view him, and the feeling of personal worth and satisfaction that are attached to these perceptions (Joseph, 1979). Self-concept is a very broad topic that has been debated throughout history, but despite the varying perspectives, it is of great importance and in need of investigation.

Differences in self-concept have been found with regard to age and gender and many various measurements of self-concept have been developed. It is important that there be a way to test self-concept with tools that are valid, or measure what they purport to measure.

The main objective of this study is to examine self-concept with relation to gender and adolescence, while validating a revision of a previously used measure of self-concept in early childhood.

For information regarding individual or overall results, please contact me at **234-9398**, or via email at flem6995@rowan.edu. Thank you for taking part in this study.

Kelly R. Fleming
Graduate Student