

Conceiving or Misconceiving the Self: Issues in Adolescent Self-Esteem

By: Ritch C. Savin-Williams and [David H. Demo](#)

Savin-Williams, Ritch C., and David H. Demo. (1983). Conceiving or misconceiving the self: Issues in adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 3, 121-140. DOI: DOI: 10.1177/027243168331009

Made available courtesy of SAGE Publications: <http://www.sagepublications.com/>

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from SAGE Publications. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document.*****

Article:

An individual cannot touch, smell, taste, hear, or see self-esteem. The self is not a "natural" phenomenon and is thus not accessible to the same kinds of scientific inquiry and measurement as are natural psychological constructs that are observable (e.g., human motor behavior). Self-esteem is nonsensical—cannot be measured through sensory data collection—and hence imaginary (Berlow, personal communication); as a result, an individual's self-esteem must be inferred, either by an individual's report of his/her sense of self (experienced self) or by others reporting the individual's self-esteem (presented self). But the social science community has too readily accepted an individual's personal self-report of self-esteem as natural fact. The guiding, and unquestioned assumption has been that the individual alone has access to the self. Who are we as outsiders to question this source of data? Few self-esteem researchers have used "others" to infer self-esteem—and thus they have relatively little knowledge of the validity of their self-report data (Wells & Marwell, 1976).

This paper questions the validity of past studies of adolescent self-esteem that rely solely on a single, one point in time self-report instrument. Wylie (1974) has acknowledged that the vast majority of published research on self-esteem relies on measures of the experienced self, seemingly oblivious to theoretical concerns of a multi-dimensional approach to the self that includes measurement of the presented self. The distinction between the experienced and the presented self is not one that we invented. It was made by William James (1890) a century ago and was later elaborated by sociologists C. H. Cooley (1902) and G. H. Mead (1934). In response to these issues, we began a longitudinal study of adolescent self-esteem six years ago, funded by the Spencer Foundation of Chicago. Three conceptual questions were addressed with empirical data:

- (1) Is self-esteem a unitary concept or it is more useful to conceptualize it as a construct with various dimensions?
- (2) What contextual and transsituational factors have an impact on self-esteem level and stability during the adolescent years?
- (3) Using the self-concept as a basis of assessment, is the nature of adolescence one of storm and stress or of stability?

In the pages to follow we will illustrate possible answers to these questions by providing examples from our study.

MULTI-MEASURES

It is an exceptional study when more than one measure is used to assess the self construct (Wells & Marwell, 1976). Issues of measurement procedures are seldom addressed in published research; psychologists and sociologists are far more interested in substantive problems, e.g. what predicts self-esteem level or what does self-esteem predict, than they are in problems of measurement (Shavelson, Hubner & Stanton, 1976). Yet, issues of measurement are prior and of more importance. If various research measures are used and they converge in their findings, then a comparison of studies becomes feasible and construction of a nomological network is possible (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Shavelson et al., 1976). Then, one can test whether different measures are assessing the same phenomenon or, if not, different aspects of the same phenomenon. Meaningful research cannot be addressed until this point is achieved.

In the empirical literature, however, there are far too many instruments and far too few studies which use more than one instrument to assess self-esteem (Wylie, 1974). The relatively few multi-measure studies do not employ more than one method nor do they present an altogether consistent validity picture. An earlier study (Demo & Savin-Williams, 1983) obtained correlations between .36 and .44 among three experienced self-instruments—Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, Marolla Looking-Glass Self-Esteem Scale and Waetjen-Liddle Learner's Self Concept Scale—with a sample of fifth through eighth grade students in seven Midwestern Catholic parochial schools. Wylie's (1974) extensive review found that intercorrelations among self-esteem instruments range from zero to .81, with an average of .40. She concluded:

Factor-analytic studies of instruments purporting to measure "overall" self-esteem, self-acceptance, etc., lead us to believe that either there is no such measurable dimension as overall self-esteem, or at least some of the scales purporting to measure this construct are doing a poor job of it (p. 101).

Given these methodological shortcomings we opted in our longitudinal study to use several instruments with a relatively small number of adolescent participants to assess the convergence of self-esteem measures. Table 1 (modified from Savin-Williams and Demo, in press) presents the years when various measures of self-esteem were administered. Each of these seven measures are described below.

Presented Self

Although this dimension has been proposed as an important component of the self (most notably with Goffman, 1956), a recent review of the literature (Wells & Marwell, 1976) indicated that the construct had not been empirically verified. The presented self is that dimension which an individual verbally and non-verbally reveals to the social world. Measurement relies on others making behavioral or personality assessments. Three measures of the presented self were employed to assess what others judge the self-esteem of an individual to be.

1. Behavioral observations. A behavior checklist was constructed by Savin-Williams (Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981) consisting of 20 behavioral descriptions. Ten items measure high self-esteem (e.g., faces others when speaking, expresses opinions) and 10 behaviors measure low self-esteem (e.g., glances around to monitor others, gives excuses for failure). Interobserver reliabilities (times when two observer-adolescent pairs were together) and an independent validity check of the 20 behaviors are presented in Appendix A and discussed in Savin-Williams & Jaquish (1981). The behavior checklists were completed by "youth companions," college undergraduate students who met weekly for one semester with their same-sex adolescent. The pair spent several hours together each week, engaged in whatever activities they chose, such as eating pizza, ice skating, biking and talking about their lives. After each occasion together the observer completed a behavior checklist. Each checklist produced a self-esteem score by subtracting the number of low self-esteem behaviors from the number of high self-esteem behaviors, and then dividing by 10. The resultant proportion scores (range = -1.00 to +1.00) from the checklists were summed and the mean of these scores provided the behavioral self-esteem level for that individual.

2. Peer ratings. Each adolescent rated all other peers in the study on a number of traits (e.g., athletic ability, attractiveness), including self-esteem. In individual sessions a college-age interviewer read the list of names in random order to each rater and asked the rater to select a number from one (low self-esteem) to five (high self-esteem) that reflected his/her opinion of the ratee's self-esteem. A peer-based self-esteem score was obtained for each participant by computing the mean of all ratings given to that individual by other youths in the study.

3. Q-sort. Each youth companion assessed the personality characteristics of his or her adolescent using the 100 card Q-Sort (Block, 1961) at the conclusion of the semester spent together. This sorting was then correlated with a template for a prototypical ideal self-esteem adolescent. This template was formed by three self-esteem researchers (Savin-Williams, Demo, Jaquish) with inter-judge reliability between .69, and .78.

TABLE 1
Number of Adolescents Participating in Each Measure for Each Year

Year	OBS	Peers	Q-sort	RSI	SEI	Intw	Beeper
Seventh	40	*	*	*	*	*	37
Eighth	39	35	*	*	*	*	35
Ninth	43	54	34	41	41	*	51
Tenth	29	35	24	35	35	34	29

*Measure was not given that year

Experienced Self

This dimension has a longer research tradition than the presented self and represents the self as evaluated by the individual. The experienced self, "me" (Mead, 1934), is the basis for the vast majority of research on the self-concept (Wells & Marwell, 1976). It was assessed using two traditional self-report measures and a new interview instrument.

1. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE). The RSE (Rosenberg, 1979) is a 10- item Likert-format scale consisting of sentences such as, "I take a positive attitude toward myself." Respondents indicate the degree (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) to which each statement reflects their own self-attitudes. It was administered in individual sessions during the spring semester.

2. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI). The SEI (Coopersmith, 1967) consists of 54 items (e.g., "I'm easy to like"), to which individuals indicate whether it is "like me" or "not like me." It too was given during individual sessions in the spring.

3. Interviews. Wylie (1974) and Wells and Marwell (1976) maintain that interviews are rarely used in self-esteem measurement (except in clinical settings), so little is known about their utility or validity. Each adolescent was asked a series of 20 questions (Appendix B); 14 measure self-esteem and 6 measure dominance. The self-esteem questions were constructed specifically for this study while the dominance questions were adapted from a sub-scale of the California Psychological Inventory designed to measure that trait. The interview method employed here shares many features with self-reports since the participants make their own self-descriptive judgments, but the method is also distinct in that a one-to-one social situation exists during the interview.

Self-Feelings

A new, innovative self-report, repeated response measure was developed to assess adolescent self-feelings. This method is a modification of a technique developed by Csikzentmihalyi and his colleagues at the University of Chicago (Csikzentmihalyi, Larson, & Prescott, 1977; Larson & Csikzentmihalyi, 1978). The objective is to assess an individual's self-feelings in naturalistic settings, removing a respondent from experimental, laboratory situations (Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981).

For one week per year each of the adolescents carried a "beeper," a paging device frequently used by physicians and others who depend on remote contact. On a random schedule during pre- and post-school times (7 a.m.-8 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 10 p.m.) the paging device "beeped" three to four times daily. Since the school would not allow the devices to be carried on the premises, during the school hours the participants responded (as if their beeper had sounded) at four previously determined times (which varied for each adolescent). On weekends and days off from school a different schedule was followed-six to eight random beeps between the hours of 10 a.m. and 10 p.m.

At such times the adolescent indicated on a pre-printed beep sheet (Appendix C) the physical location, major activity, thoughts, others present, and perception of time passing (see Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981). There are 40 words (20 positive and 20 negative words) on the backside of the sheet and the adolescent circled as many words as he/she felt about the self when beeped. A self-feeling score was derived for each occasion by subtracting the number of negative self-feeling words (e.g., insecure, sluggish, unloved) from the number of

positive self-feeling words (e.g., happy, free, loved), then dividing this quantity by the total number of words selected (possible range = -1.00 to +1.00). A participant's self-feeling score was the mean of these scores computed across all settings. The adolescents responded to the beep signal at an average rate of 81 percent.

Results. Table 2 (modified from Savin-Williams & Demo, in press) presents the correlations between each of the seven measures given to the adolescents during the four years. Not all instruments assess self-esteem in an identical fashion. For example, in the ninth grade the behavioral observations correlated with the Q-Sort at .61 (p. 001), but with the Rosenberg at .18 (NS). We next considered whether there was a pattern to these correlations by examining the type of method used. It is here that we consider the issue of global self-esteem in regard to dimensions and contextual variations.

MULTI-METHOD

Every data gathering technique has its specific bias (Webb, 1970; Wells & Marwell, 1976). Since method variance is usually greater than person variance, "single method research usually tells us more about social science's methodological artifacts than anything else" (Shweder, 1979a; p. 259). Thus, "... to the extent that self-esteem measurement relies upon a single measurement form-orthodox verbal self-ratings-it will be inadequate" (Wells & Marwell, 1976; p. 144). Since most published self-esteem research relies on one measure and thus one method, it is not unreasonable to question seriously the value of such studies.

The most popular (frequent) method of assessing an individual's self-esteem is to ask him/her. This seems simple enough, that is, straight-forward and obvious. These self-report instruments—and there are many of them—are usually given on one occasion and in a group setting, thus facilitating ease in administration and data analysis (large N).

TABLE 2
Correlations Among Six Measures of Self-Esteem,
Seventh Grade through Tenth Grade

	OBS 7	OBS 8	OBS 9	OBS 10	BEEP 7	BEEP 8	BEEP 9	BEEP 10	PEER 8	PEER 9	PEER 10	Q-SORT 9	Q-SORT 10	ROSY 9	ROSY 10	COOP 9	COOP 10
OBS 7	—																
OBS 8	.15	—															
OBS 9	.35	.31	—														
OBS 10	.14	.40+	.43+	—													
BEEP 7	.17	.13	.48*	.39	—												
BEEP 8	.13	.02	-.15	-.29	.55**	—											
BEEP 9	.20	.02	-.25	-.13	.36+	.39+	—										
BEEP 10	.51+	.12	-.04	-.19	.48+	.36	.81**	—									
PEER 8	.28	.21	-.05	.03	-.04	-.14	.14	.47+	—								
PEER 9	.34+	.26	.39*	.10	.01	.01	.12	.18	.26	—							
PEER 10	.33	.42+	.40+	.10	.01	.01	.05	.19	.71**	.87**	—						
Q-SORT 9	.26	.33	.61**	.52+	.25	-.02	-.28	.03	.36	.38+	.30	—					
Q-SORT 10	.62+	.30	.36	.54*	.58+	-.02	.23	.35	.16	.42+	.42+	.44+	—				
ROSY 9	.35	.33	.15	.36	-.02	-.19	.20	.23	.07	.32+	.31+	.18	.46+	—			
ROSY 10	.44+	.34	.14	.11	.31	.29	.30+	.37+	.37	.33+	.43*	.09	.45+	.59**	—		
COOP 9	.42+	.14	.18	.04	.16	.21	.44*	.43+	.19	.41*	.33+	.33+	.43+	.55**	.38	—	
COOP 10	.51+	.18	.26	.13	.10	.21	.34+	.47*	.51*	.46*	.56**	.42+	.63**	.46*	.65**	.66**	—

Note: Correlations are based on different Ns (pair-wise deletions) as result of procedures explained in the text, so correlations based on larger Ns are more likely to be significant.

+ p .05
* p .01
** p .001

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965, 1979) and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967) are the most frequently administered self-report, one-shot measures. Yet, is the information they provide self-esteem?

Rosenberg (1965; p. 5) defines self-esteem as "the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval." Similarly, Coopersmith (1967) views self-esteem as a judgment of self-worthiness. These definitions assume that self-esteem is accessible to the individual (experienced) and that it is global (an attitude "customarily maintains") and not context dependent. These assumptions are questionable.

Dimensions of Self-Esteem

It is perhaps not possible for all individuals to adequately reflect and then accurately report on a paper-and-pencil exercise their self-evaluation. Even considering those individuals for whom this may be possible, at what age and under what conditions? An individual's awareness level, unconscious defenses, current emotional state or moods, and need to appear socially desirable may unduly influence reporting self-evaluation (Hamlyn, 1977; Mischel, 1977; Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981). It is, therefore, not unreasonable to question whether an adolescent is capable and willing to perceive his/her personality independent of situational factors (Jones & Nisbet, 1972). Yet, this issue is avoided or ignored in every major study of adolescent self-esteem.

Mischel (1977) offers an alternative methodological technique:

The future of personality measurement will be brighter if we can move beyond our favorite pencil-and-paper and laboratory measures to include direct observation as well as unobtrusive nonreactive measures to study lives where they are really lived and not merely where the researcher finds it convenient to look at them (p.248).

Mischel's position, which we have adopted in our longitudinal study, is that self-evaluation is not only a private, subjective experience but is also accessible to measurement by external behavior. How one behaves in naturalistic settings conveys to others one's self-esteem. These behaviors may be used by independent or by "significant" others in the individual's interpersonal or social world, inferences which a researcher can use to assess the self-esteem level of the individual.

These behaviorally inferred measures may not, however, capture the processual, enduring aspects of self-esteem. Others only experience an individual's interpersonal behavior during a sample of his/her daily life (Demo, in preparation). A second problem with using the presented self as a measure of self-esteem is that this aspect of the self may only be a "front," a self shown to others to hide how one really feels about oneself. This impression management may distort the perspective of others.

If, however, both methods, assessing the experienced self and the presented self, purport to measure self-esteem, then they should correlate highly with each other. Studies which have employed both methods (Combs, Soper, & Courson, 1963; Hamilton, 1971; Parker, 1966; Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981), however, report negligible correlations between ratings made by self and ratings made by others. This suggests, as Wells & Marwell (1976) concluded in their conceptualization and methodological review of the self-esteem literature, that the two methods assess different aspects of the self.

We refer to the experienced and presented selves as dimensions of the self-esteem construct. Traditional self-report methods assess the experienced self dimension while ratings and observations made by others assess the presented self dimension. In addition, the beeper method measures a third dimension of the self: self-feelings. While this may not be an all-inclusive list, it does provide a broader view of the evaluative aspect of the self. These dimensions probably have elements of other psychological phenomena embedded within them: social desirability, social competence, and mood state.

Using the LISREL Program for analysis, an earlier study (Demo, in preparation) demonstrated that these dimensions are separate but interacting, overlapping components of adolescent self-esteem. A simple

unidimensional conceptualization of global self-esteem will not suffice if one is to adequately understand and investigate the complexities of self-conception. For example, while the sexes are significantly different on the self-feeling dimension (boys' mean = .28; girls' mean = .02; $t=3.75$, $p < .001$; Jaquish & Savin-Williams, 1981), no such sex difference was noted when the presented self was assessed (Savin-Williams & Demo, 1983).

Context-Dependent Self-Esteem

A second assumption made by traditional self-esteem research is that one maintains a global self-evaluation. Yet, much recent personality research (e.g., Bem, 1972; Shweder, 1975, 1979a, 1979b; Mischel, 1968) questions the notion of "global traits." Does how one feels about the self depend to some or even to a large degree on where one is, whom one is with, or what one is doing? Burke (1980) describes the self-image as undergoing modifications as one moves from one social context to another. These "snapshots" represent a processual perspective of the self, changing by time and situation.

A third perspective, in addition to global and situation-specific self-esteem is one which views an individual as having a "baseline" level of self-esteem from which situational fluctuations emerge. Self-esteem is thus global in the sense that the individual summarizes or derives a baseline self-image by considering the self over a number of situations and situationally determinant in that snapshots of the self vary by the context that the individual is in at a particular moment.

Until the paging device instrument no one had devised a method of assessing self-esteem that was sensitive to situational fluctuations. The "beeper" is an ideal repeated measure instrument since it assesses self-feelings over time and in various naturalistic settings.

In sum, our analysis (Savin-Williams & Demo, in press) for the seventh through tenth grade data indicated three different styles of self-evaluation:

- (1) Stable (global): those adolescents who varied little from one moment to the next on how they felt about themselves (11 % to 41 % of the sample).
- (2) Baseline: one self-feeling score was statistically independent of the next, fluctuating only slightly from an overall mean or baseline (56% to 82% of the sample).
- (3) Oscillating (context-dependent): those adolescents who varied significantly from one moment to the next with one self-feeling score predicting that the next would be in the opposite direction (3% to 16% of the sample).

Although our analyses (Savin-Williams and Demo, 1983) revealed no significant contextual variations in self-feeling, a more detailed examination reveals moments when adolescent self-feelings tend to be high or low. For example, Monday morning was a time of low self-feeling; so was time spent at school. On the other hand, when engaged in active leisure (e.g. sports) with same-sex peers after school, self-feeling levels were uniformly high. Far better predictors of self-feeling were trans-situational characteristics, i.e., enduring characteristics of the individual. The middle class male who is the oldest child in the family, relatively late in pubertal maturation, and with a baseline style of self-feelings was most apt to report a high level of self-evaluation. Thus, the self-feelings of adolescents are more influenced by enduring personal characteristics than they are by features of the immediate context. Our findings lend support to the view of human nature espoused by Epstein (1979): human behavior and personality are consistent across time and situations.

We are uncertain as to the stability of these styles for the individual through his/her life course. Are they "routes" through the life course or only through adolescence? Offer and Offer (1975) suggest that the routes that they found in their longitudinal study of adolescents—continuous growth, surgent growth, tumultuous growth—are life long characteristics of the individual.

LONGITUDINAL

Only recently have longitudinal research designs been incorporated in the study of adolescent conceptions of the self. These studies include youth in Chicago (Petersen, 1981), Milwaukee (Simmons, Blyth, Van Cleave, &

Bush, 1979; Blyth, Simmons, & Bush, 1978), Syracuse-area (Dusek & Flaherty, 1981), Ithaca, New York (Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981; Savin-Williams & Demo, 1983 and in press), and a national sample (Bachman & O'Malley, 1977; Bachman, O'Malley, & Johnston, 1978).

A longitudinal approach is necessary if the question is one of developmental change and stability. It is not uncommon to view adolescence as a time of disturbance of the self-concept (Erikson, 1959; Rosenberg, 1979); thus, the issue of developmental stability would appear to be an important one. Is self-esteem a stable characteristic of an individual or are there variations over time in the evaluation which an individual makes in regard to the self? If there is a period of crisis or disruption during the adolescent years then it should be reflected in one's level of self-esteem during the teenage years.

Although the traditional, theoretical view of adolescence is one of instability and stress the empirical evidence presents a divergent view (Coleman, 1977). Dusek and Flaherty (1981) found no significant change in self-concept level from 11 to 18 years. Self-concept did not develop in a discontinuous manner but in a predictable, stable manner. Bachman, O'Malley and Johnston (1978) reported stability of self-esteem scores from middle adolescence through the young adult years. There was an absence of sudden or dramatic changes in self-regard; scores gradually increased over the eight year period of time the individuals were followed. Wylie (1979), after an extensive review of the empirical literature, concluded that there was no clear linkage between self-esteem and chronological age from the years 6 to 50.

Our research confirms these findings. In the autumn of 1977 we selected every third name from a list of junior high students at a local school (7-9 grades). They graduate from high school this spring, 1983 (see Savin-Williams & Demo, 1983 and in press for more detailed information of the study). Data from the first four years have been analyzed and on all measures and for all methods, self-esteem level did not vary significantly from one year to the next.

Presented Self

The behavioral observation scores from one year to another (see Table 2 for all correlation scores) may be interpreted as "stability coefficients." There was little stability in presented self-esteem from seventh to eighth grade, moderate stability from eighth to ninth grade, and significant stability from the eighth and ninth grades to the tenth grade.

The peer ratings indicate stability from eighth to tenth grade. Correlations between eighth and tenth grade ratings (.71) and between ninth and tenth grade ratings (.87) are significant at the .001 level.

The Q-sort measure was given during the ninth and tenth grade. Scores for the two years correlated significantly, adding further evidence of stability of presented self-esteem during adolescence.

Experienced Self

The correlation between the ninth and tenth grade RSE scores was .59 (p .001). SEI scores corroborate the RSE patterns in experienced self-esteem. The correlation of .66 (p .001) between SEI scores for the ninth and tenth grade sample points to stability in self-esteem among our adolescents.

Self-Feelings

In most instances the adolescents remained in the same self-feeling group from one year to the next. This was most clearly the case from seventh to eighth grade (65 percent of those with beeper scores in both years) and from ninth to tenth grade (66%). However, slightly over one-half (52%) of the eighth grade adolescents changed groups by the time the ninth grade data were collected.

Stability of self-feelings is further documented in the year-to-year correlations for the beeper data (Table 3). The correlations indicate that self-feelings is a stable component of the self among our adolescents.

The stability coefficients present a consistent picture for the three dimensions of the self: feelings about the self, the presented self, and the experienced self are all stable components of the self-concept during the adolescent years. That is, our data support the notion of stability of individual differences in the self-concept (adolescents ranked essentially the same from one year to the next). These findings confirm earlier empirical studies of adolescent stability but also extend the research data beyond the experienced self to include other dimensions of the self.

CONCLUSION

After reviewing self-esteem research and analyzing the data from our longitudinal study, we believe that for an accurate portrait of adolescent self-esteem it is necessary to conduct research that is longitudinal and that employs a diversity of measures and methods. This methodological approach is mandatory if our conceptualization of the self construct is multi-dimensional. Unless we as researchers move away from the single, one-shot, self-report measures, self-esteem as a meaningful construct will fall prey to being a relatively transient psychological predictor with low explanatory power as an independent variable and an irrelevant dependent variable (a "who-cares" construct).

We identified three dimensions of self-evaluation—experienced self, presented self, and self feelings—and three styles of adolescent self-evaluation—stable, baseline and oscillating. Self-feelings are apparently both global and context-dependent. The largest number of our adolescents had a baseline of self-evaluation from which fluctuations rose and fell mildly, most likely dependent on features of the context.

Future studies need to explore the interplay of these three dimensions. Are there additional components of the self-esteem construct? Do the dimensions overlap more with increasing age? Does one more than the others predict adjustment, happiness, earning power, or other personal and social characteristics?

Other questions which should be addressed center on the stability issue. Will self-esteem remain stable through high school graduation? Are the three styles routes for an individual through the life course? How are the three styles reflected in other aspects of the individual's life (e.g. marriage, academic record, physical health)?

And, finally, can we re-define context in terms that will significantly predict self-esteem level? Perhaps it is not so much where one is, whom one is with, or what one is doing (the descriptive approach) but the meaning or function that the situation has for the individual which is most apt to predict self-esteem level. If so, then is self-esteem only predictable through an in-depth clinical examination of individual differences? Or, will self-esteem be most predictable when one knows certain features of individuals, such as age, sex, family size, social class, etc.

Our major concern, however, is that despite 1500 articles on adolescent self-esteem published since 1967, we know relatively little of its correlates, determinants, or predictors. The majority of research presents a view of self-esteem that is

TABLE 3
Self-Feelings Score Correlations,
Ns, and Significance Levels for Four Years

Grade	Grade			
	Seventh	Eighth	Ninth	Tenth
Seventh	—	.55 p=.001	.36 p=.03	.48 p=.04
Eighth	N=28	—	.39 p=.02	.36 p=.08
Ninth	N=28	N=30	—	.81 p=.000
Tenth	N=15	N=16	N=28	—

too limited to be of much consequence either for developing a theory of adolescence or for those concerned with adolescent development. The conceptualization and methodological stances advocated in this paper will, we hope, benefit both researchers and practitioners for youth.

REFERENCES

- Bachman, J. G. & O'Malley, P. M. Self-esteem in young men: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of educational and occupational attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1977,35,365-380.
- Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M. & Johnston, J. Adolescence to adulthood: Change and stability in the lives of young men. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1978.
- Bem, D. J. Constructing cross-situational consistencies in behavior: Some thoughts on Alker's critique of Mischel. *Journal of Personality* , 1972,40, 17-26.
- Block, J. The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research. Springfield, IL: Thomas, 1961.
- Blyth, D. A., Simmons, R. G. & Bush, D. The transition into early adolescence: A longitudinal comparison of youth in two educational contexts. *Sociology of Education*, 1978,51,149-162.
- Burke, P. J. The self: Measurement requirements from an interactionist perspective. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 1980,43, 18-29.
- California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1964.
- Coleman, J. C. Current contradictions in adolescent theory. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 1977,7, 1-11.
- Combs, A. W., Soper, D. W., and Courson, C. C. The measurement of self concept and self report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1963,23,493-500.
- Cooley, C. H. Human nature and the social order. New York: Scribner, 1902.
- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1955,52,281-302.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Larson, R. & Prescott, S. The ecology of adolescent activity and experience. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 1977,6,281-294.
- Demo, D. H. The measurement of self-esteem: Refining our methods. In preparation.
- Demo, D. H., & Savin-Williams, R. C. Early adolescent self-esteem as a function of social class: Rosenberg and Pearlin revisited. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1983.
- Dusek, J. B. and Flaherty, J. F. The development of the self-concept during the adolescent years. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1981,46 (4, Serial No. 191).
- Epstein, S. The stability of behavior I: On predicting most of the people much of the time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1979,37,1097-1126.
- Erikson, E. H. Identity and the life cycle. *Psychological Issues* , 1959, I, Issue 1.
- Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 1956.
- Hamilton, D. L. A comparative study of five methods of assessing self-esteem, dominance, and dogmatism. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1971,31, 441-452.
- Hamlyn, D. W. Self-knowledge. In T. Mischel (Ed.), *The self: Psychological and philosophical issues*. Totowa, NJ: Towman & Littlefield, 1977.
- James, W. Principles of psychology. New York: Holt, 1890.
- Jaquish, G. A. & Savin-Williams, R. C. Biological and ecological factors in the expression of adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* , 1981,10,473-486.
- Jones, E. E., & Nisbet, R. E. The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E. E. Jones et al. (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Larson, R. and Csikszentmihalyi, M. Experiential correlates of solitude in adolescence. *Journal of Personality* , 1978,46,677-693.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Mischel, W. Towards a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 1973,80,252-283.
- Mischel, W. On the future of personality measurement. *American Psychologist*, 1977,32, 246-254.

Offer, D. & Offer, J. B. From teenage to young manhood: A psychological study. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Parker, J. The relationship of self report to inferred self concept. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1966,26,691-700.

Petersen, A. C. The development of self-concept in adolescence. In M. D. Lynch, A. Norem-Heibeisen and K. Gergen (Eds.), *The self-concept*. New York: Balinger Press, 1981.

Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rosenberg, M. *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Savin-Williams, R. C. & Demo, D. H. Situational and trans-situational determinants of adolescent self-feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1983, 44, 832-841.

Savin-Williams, R. C. & Demo, D. H. Developmental change and stability in adolescent self-concept. *Developmental Psychology*, In press.

Savin-Williams, R. C. and Jaquish, G. A. The assessment of adolescent self-esteem: A comparison of methods. *Journal of Personality* , 1981,49,324-335.

Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., and Stanton, G. C. Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 1976, 46, 407-441.

Shweder, R. A. How relevant is an individual differences theory of personality? *Journal of Personality*, 1975,43,455-484.

Shweder, R. A. Rethinking culture and personality theory, Part I. *Ethos*, 1979, 7, 255-278(a)

Shweder, R. A. Rethinking culture and personality theory, Part II. *Ethos*, 1979, 7, 279-308(b)

Simmons, R. G., Blyth, D. A., VanCleave, E. F., & Bush, D. M. Entry into early adolescence: The impact of school structure, puberty, and early dating on self-esteem. *American Sociological Review*, 1979,44,948-967.

Webb, E. J. Unconventionality, triangulation, and inference. In N. K. Denzin (Ed.), *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wells, L. E., and Marwell, G. *Self-esteem: Its conceptualization and measurement*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.

Wylie, R. C. *The self-concept: A review of methodological considerations and measuring instruments*. (Rev. edition) Volume II. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Wylie, R. C. *The self-concept*. Vol. II: Theory and research on selected topics. (Rev. ed.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

APPENDIX A
Behaviors Contained on the Behavior Checklist: Reliability Coefficients and
Adolescents' Agreement with Study's Assumptions

<i>Positive Indicators</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>%^a</i>
1. Gives others directives or commands	.71	83**
2. Voice quality is appropriate for situation	.59	90**
3. Expresses opinions	.59	95**
4. Sits with others during social activities	.64	95**
5. Works cooperatively in a group	.64	93**
6. Faces others when speaking or being spoken to	.66	100**
7. Maintains eye contact during conversation	.58	95**
8. Initiates friendly contact with others	.63	95**
9. Maintains comfortable space between self and others	.56	93**
10. Little hesitation in speech, speaks fluently	.63	93**
 <i>Negative Indicators</i>		
1. Puts down others by teasing, name calling or gossiping	.65	83**
2. Gestures are dramatic or out of context	.91	63+
3. Inappropriate touching or avoids physical contact	.94	100**
4. Gives excuses for failures	.88	83**
5. Glances around to monitor others	.62	85**
6. Brags excessively about achievements, skills, appearance	.90	60+
7. Verbally puts self down; self depreciation	.88	100**
8. Speaks too loudly, abruptly or in a dogmatic tone	.81	70*
9. Does not express views or opinions, especially when asked	.85	93**
10. Assumes a submissive stance	.85	95**

^aPercent of the 40 adolescents who agreed with the study's assumptions concerning which behaviors measured high self-esteem and which ones measured low self-esteem

*p .01 according to the binomial probability distribution with *p* set at .50

**p .001

+p .15

APPENDIX B
Self-Esteem & Dominance Interview
(Demo-Savin-Williams)

Instructions: Ask the questions in the order given below. Once you elicit an open-ended response, circle the appropriate answer. If the response does not correspond to the choices available, choose the two or three that best reflect the interviewee's response and read the choices. *One* and only one answer must be circled.

Questions:

1. How does it feel to be 14?
 - (5) really good
 - (4) good
 - (3) OK
 - (2) bad
 - (1) really bad
2. Do you think your life so far has been a success or a failure?
 - (5) quite a success
 - (4) a success
 - (3) neither/both
 - (2) a failure
 - (1) quite a failure
3. Do you like yourself? How much?
 - (5) yes, very much
 - (4) yes, pretty much
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not very much
 - (1) no, not at all
4. Do you think you're a leader?
 - (5) yes, very much so
 - (4) yes, pretty much so
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not really
 - (1) no, not at all
5. Overall, do you like the way other people treat you?
 - (5) yes, very much
 - (4) yes, pretty much
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not really
 - (1) no, not at all

6. If you could change thing(s) about yourself, how many would you change?
 - (5) nothing
 - (4) a couple/few things
 - (3) some things
 - (2) several things
 - (1) everything
7. Do you enjoy having authority over other people?
 - (5) yes, very much
 - (4) yes, pretty much
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not very much
 - (1) no, not at all
8. How often do you feel really good?
 - (5) always
 - (4) frequently
 - (3) sometimes
 - (2) almost never
 - (1) never
9. Do you feel down, or depressed very much?
 - (5) never
 - (4) almost never
 - (3) sometimes
 - (2) frequently
 - (1) always
10. Do you enjoy planning things and deciding what each person in a group should do?
 - (5) yes, very much so
 - (4) yes, pretty much so
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not really
 - (1) no, not at all
11. Given the normal everyday situations that you are in, in how many do you feel good about yourself?
 - (5) feel good in any situation
 - (4) feel good in most situations
 - (3) feel good in some situations, bad in others
 - (2) feel good in few situations
 - (1) feel good in no situations
12. Would you say people your age like you?
 - (5) very much
 - (4) pretty much
 - (3) some do, some don't
 - (2) not very much
 - (1) not at all

13. Is it easy for people to win arguments with you?
 - (5) no, definitely not
 - (4) no, not really
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) yes, usually so
 - (1) yes, always
14. Can your friends depend on you?
 - (5) always
 - (4) frequently
 - (3) sometimes
 - (2) almost never
 - (1) never
15. Do you feel like an important person in the school?
 - (5) very much so
 - (4) pretty much so
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not really
 - (1) no, not at all
16. Do you have a natural talent (comes easily) for influencing people?
 - (5) yes, very much so
 - (4) yes, pretty much so
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not really
 - (1) no, not at all
17. Do you think you can meet the challenges ahead of you?
 - (5) yes, indeed
 - (4) probably, I think so
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) probably not
 - (1) definitely not
18. Do you speak up when you have something to say in school?
 - (5) always
 - (4) frequently
 - (3) sometimes
 - (2) almost never
 - (1) never
19. Do you like to give orders (instructions) and get things moving?
 - (5) yes, very much
 - (4) yes, pretty much so
 - (3) yes and no
 - (2) no, not really
 - (1) no, not at all

20. Given most days and most situations, how would you describe your feelings about yourself? (Read all possible responses to the interviewee.)
- (5) feel really good about self
 - (4) feel good
 - (3) feel OK
 - (2) feel bad
 - (1) feel really bad

APPENDIX C
Beep Sheet

Date: _____ Time: _____ am/pm

AS YOU WERE BEEPED . . .

Where were you?

What things were you doing?

What were you thinking about?

Wish you were doing something else? What?

Who were you with? Give the number, age, sex, and relationship (parents, sister, friend, acquaintance, stranger, etc.) of those present.

Time is passing (circle appropriate dot):

Fast 0 o . . o 0 Slow

How would you describe yourself at the moment beeped? Circle as many words below as are appropriate.

inhibited	happy	skilled	left behind
clear	relaxed	productive	exposed
consistent	free	unloved	fussy
tense	sluggish	useless	loved
confident	lonely	growing	bored
unprepared	powerful	overwhelmed	unsure
belonging	empty	affectionate	on time
weak	ashamed	depressed	in control
safe	proud	needed	conforming
spontaneous	secure	frustrated	manipulated

Other feelings about yourself: