Self-esteem is a popular and important construct in the social sciences and in everyday life. The State of California has actually established a “Commission on Self-Esteem,” presumably to devise and implement policies to increase feelings of self-worth among its citizens. Most Americans believe intuitively that “poor” or “low” self-esteem is undesirable, and indeed research links low self-esteem with loneliness (Peplau & Perlman, 1982), depression (Shaver & Brennan, this volume, Chap. 6), social anxiety (Leary, 1983), and alienation (Johnson, 1973).

The popular notion of self-esteem is straightforward. According to the dictionary definition, “To esteem a thing is to prize it, to set a high mental valuation upon it; when applied to persons, esteem carries also the warmer interest of approval, cordiality, and affection” (Williams, 1979, p. 309). In common parlance, then, self-esteem is the extent to which one prizes, values, approves, or likes oneself.

In the social sciences, self-esteem is a hypothetical construct that is quantified, for example, as the sum of evaluations across salient attributes of one’s self or personality. It is the overall affective evaluation of one’s own worth, value, or importance. This conception underlies the assumption that measuring attitudes toward, or evaluations of, one’s self reflects a person’s self-esteem. The concept of self-esteem goes by a variety of names (e.g., self-worth, self-regard, self-respect, self-acceptance) all of which are compatible with the dictionary definition of “esteem” ascribed to the self.

Regardless of the exact definition or label one chooses to employ, self-esteem is usually thought to be the evaluative component of a broader representation of self, the self-concept, the latter being a more inclusive construct than self-esteem, one that contains cognitive and behavioral components as well as affective ones. As a result, cognitions about the self (contained in the self-concept) may or may not influence self-esteem. For example, believing that one is a terrible singer may be a part of one’s self-concept but may not bear any relation to one’s feelings of self-worth. Feeling mildly or severely depressed because one cannot sing, however, is a matter of self-esteem, as is the behavioral consequence of jumping off the roof of an 18-story building to end one’s humiliation over this deficiency.

According to current models of affect and attitudes (e.g., Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1984; Weiner, 1986), appraisals or judgments (e.g., “I’m attractive/unattractive,” “intelligent/unintelligent,” “hardworking/lazy”) underlie positive or negative feelings about the self. To the extent that such evaluations cover a relatively broad spectrum of personal attributes, self-esteem is an appropriate label. Over time, consistency in such judgments results in a relatively stable affective appraisal that is readily accessible to the individual
because of the salience of the self in everyday life. Narrower constructs such as self-confidence or body-esteem refer to narrower self-domains. Thus, self-esteem is more global than the evaluation of a specific attribute (e.g., height or academic ability) or a circumscribed set of related attributes (e.g., one’s body or intelligence).

There is widespread acceptance of the psychological importance of self-esteem. Further, it is widely assumed that self-esteem is traitlike, thus self-esteem levels are consistent over time within individuals. Self-esteem is nearly as ubiquitous a construct as intelligence, but there is less agreement about how to measure it. Both self-esteem and intelligence are everyday trait concepts that psychologists attempt to quantify, and both are defined as much in terms of their measurement and correlates as in terms of well-developed theory. In fact “self-esteem has been related to almost every variable at one time or another” (Crandall, 1973, p. 45). This includes personality correlates such as happiness (Freedman, 1978) and shyness (Jones & Briggs, 1984); cognitive correlates such as self-serving attributional bias (Tennen & Herzberger, 1987); behavioral correlates such as task effort and persistence (Felson, 1984; McFarlin, Baumeister, & Blascovich, 1984); and clinical correlates such as depression (Tennen & Herzberger, 1987) and coping ability (S. E. Taylor, 1983).

Key Issues

Conceptual and methodological problems combine to make valid measurement of self-esteem difficult. Conceptual confusion is created by the fact that self-esteem, like other important concepts, is used in ordinary language and academic psychology concurrently (e.g., Blascovich & Ginsburg, 1978). Thus implicit, common-language notions of self-esteem are sometimes substituted for more precise, explicit, scientific definitions, creating the illusion of a universally accepted, well-defined, phenomenological entity (Wells & Marwell, 1976). The relatively recent call for a “standardized” measure of self-esteem (Greenwald, 1986), based on the assumption that a single measure would accommodate all needs, has only added to the confusion.

Although there is little dispute that global self-esteem involves self-evaluation, different hypothetical self-evaluation processes have been proposed (Wells & Marwell, 1976). Minimally, self-esteem is described simply as an attitude, the evaluative component of self-concept (Gergen, 1965; Rosenberg, 1965). More recent research (e.g., Fleming & Courtney, 1984; Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976) has expanded this description to include “facets” of self-esteem, detailing in hierarchical fashion the more specific self-evaluational components and subcomponents that contribute to global self-esteem (e.g., math ability contributes to academic self-concept).

At a conceptually more complex level, self-esteem is thought to result from perceived discrepancies between actual and ideal self (Cohen, 1959). At an even more complex level, self-esteem is regarded as one’s attitude toward the discrepancy between the actual and ideal self (Wells & Marwell, 1976).

Other writers concentrate less on the nature of the construct than on the adaptive and self-protective functions of self-esteem (Becker, 1973, 1975; Mossman & Ziller, 1968). For example, high self-esteem is hypothesized to protect the individual against environmental stressors (Ziller, Hagey, Smith, & Long, 1969) or even against the “terror” of facing mortality (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986). Each of these approaches has important implications for strategies of self-esteem measurement.

Given the ultimately subjective nature of self-esteem, it has been measured almost exclusively by self-report. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive of a behavioral or physiological measure that would tap self-esteem directly. Considering the different theoretical
approaches to the self-esteem construct as well as the vast number of studies in which self-esteem has been measured, it is not surprising that different measurement approaches have evolved. The relative merits of direct and indirect self-report measures have been debated (see Crandall, 1973). Some favor direct, face-valid questionnaires using items that are scored more or less additively (Levy, 1956; Wylie, 1961) while others favor more indirect measures using complexly scored questionnaires, using, for example, self–ideal discrepancy scores (Bills, Vance, & McLean, 1951; Miskimins & Braucht, 1971). Researchers apparently prefer the former. The use of simple self-report measures has increased dramatically while the use of more complex measures has declined. Self-esteem is typically measured in adults and adolescents by dichotomous or Likert-type responses to a number of questionnaire items, which are summed or scored to produce a self-esteem index. We are persuaded that the direct, self-report route is the most pragmatic.

Another issue concerns measurement specificity. For example, some (e.g., Rosenberg, 1965) argue that global self-evaluations hold the most predictive promise, while others (Marsh, Smith, & Barnes, 1983; Shavelson et al., 1976) argue that more specific measures (i.e., based on facets of the self) are best. We do not take a stand regarding the specificity issue. Rather, we recommend that researchers choose a measure according to the level of specificity that seems theoretically justifiable and empirically sensitive. Thus five of the scales reviewed are general or global measures of self-esteem (e.g., the Rosenberg Scale and the Texas Social Behavior Inventory), while the remainder measure specific facets of self-esteem (e.g., the revised Janis and Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale) or are specialized for children (Piers–Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale and the Self-Perception Profile for Children).

Self-esteem is best employed as a predictor or intervening (i.e., mediating or moderating) person variable, lending itself to correlational and other nonexperimental research designs. Like other person factors (e.g., intelligence, Type A behavior), self-esteem cannot be manipulated in a truly experimental manner, although participants in experiments can be chosen on the basis of self-esteem scores (e.g., Crocker, Thompson, McGraw, & Ingerman, 1987; Janis & Field, 1959; McFarlin & Blascovich, 1981). Since global self-esteem is a relatively stable characteristic, especially in adults, meaningful changes are difficult to detect when global self-esteem is employed as a dependent variable in an experiment. For example, experimentally manipulated success or failure experiences are unlikely to have any measurable impact when assessed against a lifetime of self-evaluative experiences. This inability to influence self-esteem in controlled settings creates a problem for researchers interested in testing variables hypothesized to influence levels of self-esteem or in evaluating interventions designed to raise self-esteem. Designing experiments to influence self-esteem in the laboratory, given that therapists and counselors have difficulty influencing the self-esteem of clients after years of rigorous interventions, presents a daunting challenge to researchers.

One approach to overcoming the problem of using self-esteem as a dependent variable is to focus on self-evaluations of very specific and/or novel attributes. For example, self-evaluations of one’s ability to perform a certain arcane laboratory task might prove useful as a dependent measure in experiments because individual participants are unlikely to have a prior history of evaluating this specific ability. Of course, the rationale for such a procedure is based on theoretical associations between self-evaluations of specific attributes and overall self-esteem. Another strategy is to focus on threats to self-esteem. For example, differences in affective, cognitive, or even psychophysiological reactions to information that is consistent or inconsistent with subjects’ established beliefs might prove useful to the extent that defending oneself against challenges to such beliefs is central to self-esteem.

Another methodological problem in assessment stems from the social desirability of
high self-esteem. It is more socially desirable to present oneself as high rather than low in self-esteem and to respond to face-valid scale items accordingly, thereby inflating self-esteem scores. Demo (1985) has suggested decreasing the social desirability of self-esteem items by measuring "presented self-esteem" through the ratings of observers, which can then be used to complement an individual's self-ratings or "experienced self-esteem." In his study, Demo compared Rosenberg's (1965) and Coopersmith's (1967) traditional self-report measures of self-esteem with nontraditional "other-report" measures, either from ratings made by "peers" (acquaintances) or trained "observers." The peer measures were ratings completed by peers who had ongoing relationships with the individual in question, and the ratings by trained observers were completed following interactions with that individual. The convergence of these other-report measures with self-reports suggests considerable validity. Few researchers, however, have access to the specialized peer and observer populations that Demo did.

Presumably, verbal and nonverbal behaviors presented by individuals to peers and trained observers are less subject to social desirability effects than their responses to self-report scale items. However, these other-reports may be more susceptible than self-reports to another confounding factor in self-esteem assessment: the possible functional utility of attempting to exhibit high levels of self-esteem. Appearing high in self-esteem can be used defensively (consciously or unconsciously) against threats to the self such as failure or social rejection (Schneider & Turkat, 1975). Such defensive reactions may increase exhibited levels of self-esteem, thereby artifactually inflating other-report as well as self-report measures (Paulhus, 1986).

**Locating and Selecting Measures**

The initial set of self-esteem scales identified for review was based on the authors' knowledge, on inquiries to colleagues, and on the earlier chapter by Crandall (1973). These sources were supplemented and checked by an on-line query of title and abstract information in the psycINFO® computerized database. This database contains relevant information for all articles published since 1967 in over 1300 journals, as well as dissertations and monographs.

Query of the terms "self-esteem" and "self-concept" yielded over 30,000 separate references! This not only indicated the popularity of these constructs but ruled out even a cursory review of abstracts. The search was then limited to the following major journals: American Psychologist, Developmental Psychology, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Journal of Personality, Journal of Personality Assessment, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Journal of Research in Personality, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Psychological Bulletin, and Psychological Review. Still, over 15,000 references remained. The search was then limited to the following terms: "concurrent validity," "construct validity," "face validity," "test item analysis," "test item content," "test reliability," "factor analysis," and "multitrait-multimethod matrix." This reduced the search to 306 documents that were likely to include original articles using or describing newly developed scales. Careful reading of the resulting abstracts verified this assumption. The 40 scales listed and footnoted in Table 1 were identified using this procedure. The Social Science Citation Index was used to gauge the frequency with which each scale had been used (see Table 1). The resulting frequencies were then divided by the number of years since publication to arrive at the yearly frequency figures in Table 1.

There is neither a firm body of evidence nor a convincing definitional rationale to
### Table 1
Various Self-Esteem and Self-Concept Scales Listed in Order of Number of Citations Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency/Year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Self-Esteem (Rosenberg, 1965)</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967)</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Self-Concept (Roid &amp; Fitts, 1988)</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers–Harris Self-Concept (Piers, 1984)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Barron Ego-Strength (Barron, 1953)</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis and Field Feelings of Inadequacy (Janis &amp; Field, 1959; Eagly, 1967; Fleming &amp; Courtney, 1984)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Orientation Inventory (Shoström, 1966)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Helmreich &amp; Stapp, 1974)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body-Cathexis (Secord &amp; Jourard, 1953)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rosenberg–Simmons Self-Esteem (Rosenberg &amp; Simmonds, 1972)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger Self-Acceptance (Berger, 1952)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*McFarland and Ross Self-Esteem (McFarland &amp; Ross, 1982)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ziller Social Self-Esteem (Ziller, Hagey, Smith, &amp; Long, 1969)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ III (Marsh, Smith, &amp; Barnes, 1983)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Adjustment and Values (Bills, Vance, &amp; McLean, 1951)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler–Haigh Q-sort (Butler &amp; Haigh, 1954)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Self-Perception Inventories (Soares &amp; Soares, 1970)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Valuation Triads (Gergen, 1965)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective Check List (Gough &amp; Heilbrun, 1965)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5117</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Pictorial Scale of Self-Concept (Harter, 1985), Body-Esteem Scale (Franzoi & Shields, 1984), Self-Concept Stability (Brownfain, 1952), The 20-Statements (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954), Duncan Personality Integration (Duncan, 1966), Phillips Self-Acceptance (Phillips, 1951), Miskimin’s Self-Goal-Other Discrepancy Scale (Miskimin & Braucht, 1971), Measure of Self-Consistency (Gergen & Morse, 1967), Sherwood Self-Concept Inventory (Sherwood, 1962), Inferred Self-Concept Scale (McDaniel, 1970), Unconscious Self-Esteem (Beloff & Beloff, 1959), Joseph Preschool Self-Concept (Joseph, 1979), Thomas-Zander Ego-Strength (Zander & Thomas, 1960), and Self-Report Inventory (Bown, 1961) all had percentage of total values of less than one and are thus not listed above. An asterisk indicates that an estimate may be inflated due to non-scale-related citations.

Justify many of the “self-esteem” measures that exist. The subset of scales that we selected for review are based on the criteria of our limited outreach efforts, on popularity (i.e., frequency of use), judgments of promise, and need in the field. Certain less popular measures were included because of the needs they fill, while certain popular measures were included even when we were less enthusiastic about their value as measures of global self-esteem than as measures of related constructs.
Measures Reviewed Here

Our review of self-esteem scales is organized primarily by target population. Five scales that were developed for use with adolescents and adults are considered first, followed by two scales developed for use with children. Finally, a subset of five scales dealing with narrower or related constructs is considered.

Adolescent—Adult Scales

The first grouping includes the following five scales for adolescents and adults.

1. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965)
3. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (1967)
4. Texas Social Behavior Inventory (1974)
5. Ziller Social Self-Esteem Scale (1969)

Few scale developers distinguish measures intended for adolescents from those intended for adults. This is not surprising given that most research subjects are college students in one of, or straddling, these two age categories.

As is evident from Table 1, Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-esteem Scale (SES) is the most popular measure of global self-esteem. Indeed, it is the standard with which developers of other measures usually seek convergence. Rosenberg’s definition of self-esteem as a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward oneself (Rosenberg, 1965, p. 15), while unidimensional, is strikingly face valid. The fact that the scale contains only 10 Likert-type items contributes to ease of administration, scoring, and interpretation. The measure’s relatively high internal consistency and test–retest reliability undoubtedly contribute to its popularity. Possible susceptibility to social desirability effects has not dampened its use, probably because of similar problems with other scales. Although originally developed for use with adolescents, the SES is also used widely with adults. A subsequent adaptation of the scale for children by Rosenberg and Simmons (1972) does not enjoy similar popularity, probably because its administration requires an in-person interview.

The original Janis–Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale (FIS) (1959) assessed self-esteem in a negative fashion. Its 23 items tapped the strength of such negative feelings as personal worthlessness, social anxiety, and self-consciousness. Eagly’s major revision (1967) reduced the number of scale items to 20 and created a balance between negative and positive items, thereby eliminating possible acquiescence or response set problems inherent in the negatively framed original version. In an attempt to use the scale to measure self-esteem in a multidimensional fashion, Fleming and Watts (1980) and Fleming and Courtney (1984) have further revised the FIS, by adding five and eight items, respectively. These revisions are in line with the “hierarchical facet” approach to self-esteem (Shavelson et al., 1976), and produce measures of five primary factors hypothesized to be subordinate to self-esteem: social confidence, academic ability, emotionality, physical appearance, and ability.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) (1967), second to the Rosenberg SES in popularity, was developed originally for use with children and has been modified for use with adults (Ryden, 1978). Although Coopersmith (1975) reduced the original 50-item version to 25 items in an attempt to assess self-regard unidimensionally, various factor analyses of SEI data have revealed as many as 10 factors (e.g., Ahmed, Valliant, & Swindle, 1985; Gibbs & Norwich, 1985). While none of these factors were related directly to self-esteem, the overall scale has correlated as high as .55 with the Rosenberg
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SES, .72 with the Janis–Field FIS, and .77 with the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Demo, 1985; Van Tuinen & Ramanaiah, 1979).

The Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) (Helmreich, Stapp, & Ervin, 1974) was developed to assess feelings of self-worth in terms of interpersonal interaction in the four domains of social confidence, dominance, social competence, and relations to authority figures. Although it is not as global a measure of self-esteem as others, it is likely that “social” self-esteem is usually an important determinant of overall self-esteem. One distinctive advantage of the TSBI is that it has two equivalent 16-item forms (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974), both of which correlate highly (.97) with the original 32-item form and with the other short form (.87). Thus two separate assessments can be made (e.g., test–retest, or pre- and post-test) with relatively little concern over the sensitization effects that affect other measures.

Ziller, Hagey, Smith, and Long’s (1969) Social Self-Esteem (SSE) measure is also based on an assumption of the paramount importance of self-worth in interpersonal situations. The SSE uses a geometric format in which the location of paper and pencil representations of the self in relation to the location of representations of others is the ultimate quantifying criterion of self-esteem (as described in the scale section). To the extent that unconscious processes guide such representations, the assessment of self-esteem is not as subject as usual to social desirability or bias effects. While its psychometric record is not strong, it is included here for its novel and experimental approach to measuring self-esteem.

The Self-Esteem Scale
(Rosenberg, 1965)

Variable

This scale was originally designed to measure adolescents' global feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance.

Description

The 10 items that make up the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES) were designed to optimize ease of administration, economy of time, unidimensionality, and face validity. Self-Esteem Scale items require the respondent to report feelings about the self directly. Although originally designed as a Guttman-type scale, the SES is typically scored using a four-point response format (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree) resulting in a scale range of 10–40 with higher scores representing higher self-esteem. Some authors, however, have adopted more familiar Likert-style response formats employing 5- or 7-point scales resulting in broader ranges of SES scores.

Several studies have demonstrated that a unidimensional factor structure underlies the SES (e.g., Hensley, 1977; Simpson & Boyal, 1975), while others have identified two highly correlated factors, with the additional factor reflecting negatively worded questions (Dobson, Goudy, Keith, & Powers, 1979; Hensley & Roberts, 1976; Kaplan & Pokorny, 1969).

Sample

The original sample was a group of 5024 high school juniors and seniors from 10 randomly selected New York State high schools.
Reliability

*Internal Consistency*

Dobson *et al.* (1979) obtained a Cronbach α of .77 for their sample, while Fleming and Courtney (1984) reported a Cronbach α of .88.

*Test–Retest*


*Validity*

*Convergent*

The SES is associated with many self-esteem-related constructs. For example, Lorr and Wunderlich (1986) reported a correlation of .65 between SES scores and confidence and .39 between SES scores and popularity. Reynolds (1988) found a correlation of .38 between SES scores and overall academic self-concept with correlations between SES scores and specific facets of academic self-concept ranging from .18 to .40. The Rosenberg measure correlated .72 with the Lerner Self-Esteem Scale, .24 with “beeper” self-reports of self-esteem (a series of self-esteem measurements requested at quasirandom times over an extended period of time), and .27 with peer ratings for an adolescent sample (Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981).

Fleming and Courtney (1984) demonstrated negative relationships between the SES and several concepts associated with low self-regard. For example, SES scores correlated −.64 with anxiety, −.54 with depression, and −.43 with anomie. In addition, these authors reported that SES scores correlated .78 with general self-regard, .51 with social confidence, .35 with school abilities, .42 with physical appearance, and .66 with scores on a revised Janis and Field scale. Finally, Demo (1985) found SES scores correlated .55 with scores on the Coopersmith SEI and .32 with peer ratings of self-esteem. Correlations with social desirability range from .10 (Reynolds, 1988) to .33 (Fleming & Courtney, 1984).

*Discriminant*

Considerable discriminant validity has also been demonstrated for the SES. Reynolds found no significant correlations between SES scores and grade point averages (.10), locus of control (−.04), Scholastic Aptitude Test verbal (−.06) and quantitative (.10) scores. Fleming and Courtney found no significant correlations between SES scores and gender (.10), age (.13), work experience (.07), marital status (.17), birth order (.02), grade point average (.01), or vocabulary (−.04).

*Location*
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Results and Comments

The Rosenberg SES has enjoyed widespread use and utility as a unidimensional measure of self-esteem. In fact, the SES is the standard against which new measures are evaluated. Its ease of administration, scoring, and brevity underlie our recommendation for the use of the SES as a straightforward estimate of positive or negative feelings about the self. Researchers interested in a more dimensionalized or faceted view of the self are advised to examine other scales reviewed in this chapter.

The Rosenberg, however, is not completely trouble-free. For example, the items may be susceptible to socially desirable responding. In addition, scale score distributions among college students tend to be negatively skewed so that even tripartite splits of the distribution produce "low" self-esteem groups that have relatively high self-esteem in an absolute sense. Alleviating this concern somewhat, however, is the argument that an individual who fails to endorse SES items at least moderately is probably clinically depressed.

In addition to the standard 10-item scale, a 6-item version (based on the original scale) is available for use with younger than high-school age populations (Rosenberg & Simmons, 1972). This scale is administered by interview and was designed to be applicable for both black and white children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Esteem Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10. At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Feelings of Inadequacy Scale
(Janis & Field, 1959)

Variable

This scale was originally developed to quantify a person's feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, self-consciousness, and social anxiety.
The Janis and Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale (FIS) was originally part of a larger instrument devised to assess individual differences in persuasibility (Janis & Field, 1959). The feelings of inadequacy subscale was intended to measure self-esteem, primarily by asking respondents to indicate how bad they feel about themselves. The original 23 FIS items appraise perceived social anxiety, self-consciousness, and feelings of personal worthlessness. Respondents indicate the extent of their agreement with each of the 23 statements, using five response alternatives: very, fairly, slightly, not very, and not at all. Item scores vary from 0 to 4 for a possible FIS range of 0 to 92, with low scores indicating high feelings of inadequacy (low self-esteem), and high scores reflecting high self-esteem.

The FIS has undergone several revisions. Eagly’s (1967) was the first, balancing the scale for acquiescence response set (all items had been negatively worded) and discarding poor items, thereby reducing the scale to 20 items. Many of the new items pertained to success and social competence.

A second revision (Fleming & Watts, 1980) factored the scale in accordance with Shavelson et al.’s (1976) hierarchical facet model of self-esteem. Five items were added to the scale (four pertaining to school abilities and one to assertiveness) producing three subscales: social confidence, school abilities, and self-regard. In addition, response alternatives were changed to 7-point Likert format. The scale was revised once again to approximate the Shavelson et al. model (Fleming & Courtney, 1984) better. Eight items were added for a total of 33, producing two additional subscales: physical appearance and physical ability. In addition to the five subscales, factor analysis of the latest scale revision reveals a global self-esteem factor justifying an overall self-esteem score.

Sample

The original Janis and Field (1959) questionnaire was based on a sample of 184 male and female high school juniors. The Eagly (1967) version was based on samples of 33 and 160 male and female college students. The Fleming and Watts (1980) and Fleming and Courtney (1984) versions are both based on college student samples of 106 and 259 (males and females), respectively.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Janis and Field (1959) reported a split-half reliability coefficient of .83 and a Spearman–Brown coefficient of .91 for their 23-item version. Eagly (1967) presented split-half reliabilities of .72 and .88 for her 20-item version. Cronbach $\alpha$ is .90 for the Fleming and Watts (1980) version and .92 for the Fleming and Courtney (1984) version with Cronbach $\alpha$ values ranging from .77 to .88 for the five subscales.

Test–Retest

No test–retest data were encountered.

Validity

Convergent

found a correlation of .82 between the Eagly revision of the FIS and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The Eagly version correlated .84 with the Berger Self-Acceptance Scale (Eagly, 1969). Fleming and Watts’s version was related to locus of control (−.30), with high self-esteem individuals more internal (Fleming & Watts, 1980). The Fleming and Courtney version correlated −.62 with anxiety, −.48 with depression, and −.38 with anomie (Fleming & Courtney, 1984). This version is also moderately correlated with social desirability (.22).

**Discriminant**

Hamilton (1971) found low correlations between the FIS and self-ratings of dominance and open-mindedness. Fleming and Watts (1980) found no correlation between their total self-esteem score and verbal intelligence (.06), self-report of grade point average (.12), birth order (.12), number of siblings (.08), and empathic fantasy (−.07). In addition, this version was unrelated to social desirability, correlating .06 with the Marlowe–Crowne scale.

**Location**

Although the Fleming and Courtney (1984) FIS scale revision items are presented below, the original FIS and subsequent revisions are readily available.¹


**Results and Comments**

The extensive revisions of the FIS have produced a reliable and seemingly valid measure of both facet and global self-esteem. The Fleming and Courtney (1984) version is recommended. Factor structures and validity coefficients attest to the scale’s appropriateness. Used for subscale scores or total scores, the questionnaire should produce an adequate estimation of an individual’s level of self-esteem according to either a global or a facet conceptualization.

---

¹J. S. Fleming reports that a new version of the instrument called the PASCI (Personal and Academic Self-Concept Inventory) is now available. The PASCI has six self-concept scales (Self-Regard, Social Acceptance, Verbal Ability, Math Ability, Physical Appearance, and Physical Ability), as well as a Social Anxiety scale. These scales are briefer than the previous version, with only five items each. Results of confirmatory factor analysis, reliability analysis, and correlations with some related scales for convergent and discriminant validity are available in “The Personal and Academic Self-Concept Inventory: Factor Structure and Gender Differences in High School and College Samples,” by J. S. Fleming and D. J. Whalen, 1989 (available from the first author).
Feelings of Inadequacy Scale  
(revised Janis and Field)

*1. How often do you feel inferior to most of the people you know?  
I I I I I I I I I
NEVER ALWAYS

*2. Do you ever think that you are a worthless individual?  
3. How confident do you feel that someday the people you know will look up to you and respect you?  
*4. Do you ever feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether you are a worthwhile person?  
*5. How often do you dislike yourself?  
6. In general, how confident do you feel about your abilities?  
*7. How often do you have the feeling that there is nothing you can do well?  
*8. How much do you worry about how well you get along with other people?  
*9. How often do you worry about criticisms that might be made of your work by your teacher or employer?  
*10. Do you ever feel afraid or anxious when you are going into a room by yourself where other people have already gathered and are talking?  
*11. How often do you feel self-conscious?  
*12. How much do you worry about whether other people will regard you as a success or failure in your job or in school?  
*13. When in a group of people, do you have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about?  
*14. When you make an embarrassing mistake or have done something that makes you look foolish, how long does it take you to get over it?  
*15. Do you often feel uncomfortable meeting new people?  
*16. How often do you worry about whether other people like to be with you?  
*17. How often are you troubled with shyness?  
*18. When you think that some of the people you meet might have an unfavorable opinion of you, how concerned or worried do you feel about it?  
*19. How often do you feel worried or bothered about what other people think about you?  
*20. When you have to read an essay and understand it for a class assignment, how worried or concerned do you feel about it?  
*21. When you have to write an argument to convince your teacher, who may disagree with your ideas, how concerned or worried do you feel about it?
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*22. How often do you have trouble expressing your ideas when you try to put them into writing as an assignment?

*23. How often do you have trouble understanding things you read for class assignments?

*24. How often do you imagine that you have less scholastic ability than your classmates?

25. In turning in a major assignment such as a term paper, how often do you feel you did an excellent job on it?

*26. Compared with classmates, how often do you feel you must study more than they do to get the same grades?

*27. Have you ever felt ashamed of your physique or figure?

*28. Do you often feel that most of your friends or peers are more physically attractive than yourself?

*29. Do you often wish or fantasize that you were better looking?

*30. Have you ever been concerned or worried about your ability to attract members of the opposite sex?

31. How confident are you that others see you as being physically appealing?

*32. Have you ever thought of yourself as physically uncoordinated?

*33. Have you ever felt inferior to most other people in athletic ability?

*34. When involved in sports requiring physical coordination, are you often concerned that you will not do well?

*35. Have you ever thought that you lacked the ability to be a good dancer or do well at recreational activities involving coordination?

*36. When trying to do well at a sport and you know other people are watching, how rattled or flustered do you get?

Note: *, Reverse-scored item. **, Labels of scale anchors vary as appropriate to specific items.

The Self-Esteem Inventory
(Coopersmith, 1967)

Variable

This scale measures evaluative attitudes across several domains pertaining to the self.

Description

The Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) was originally designed for use with children. Items were drawn from work by Rogers and Dymond (1954) and from original research by Coopersmith. Five psychologists classified these items as reflecting high or low self-esteem. Of all possible items, 50 were selected on the basis of face validity. These items were designed to measure self-regard in four specific areas: peers, parents, school, and personal interests. Each item is a declarative, self-descriptive statement worded in the first
person. Subjects are instructed to respond to each question by stating whether the statement is “like me” or “unlike me.” One point is assigned for each item connoting high self-esteem that the respondent identifies as “like me” as well as for each item connoting low self-esteem that is identified as “unlike me.” Thus SEI scores can range from 0 to 50.

In subsequent work, Coopersmith (1975) created Form B of the SEI by selecting the 25 items with the highest item-total correlations. This version was assumed to measure positive self-regard unidimensionally. In addition, others have modified the scale for use with adult samples (see Ryden, 1978). Authors continue to use both the 50- and 25-item versions. Factor analyses of both versions have proved troublesome. Kokenes (1978) found nine factors in the full 50-item version, while Gibbs and Norwich (1985) found 10 factors in their own 25-item version. Perhaps the most stable factors were obtained by Ahmed et al. (1985), who found Form B of the Coopersmith scale to have four interpretable factors: view of life, family relations, tolerance and confusion, and sociability. It should be noted that none of these analyses has produced factors that correspond to a priori theoretical constructs.

Sample

The original sample consisted of 87 fifth and sixth grade boys and girls; a second sample consisted of 1748 children attending public schools in Connecticut (Coopersmith, 1967).

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Using the 50-item version, J. B. Taylor and Reitz (1968) reported a split-half reliability of .90. Van Tuinen and Ramanaiah (1979) reported a Cronbach $\alpha$ of .83 for the 25-item version (Form B). Ahmed et al. (1985) obtained an $\alpha$ of .75 for the same version.

Test–Retest

Coopersmith reported test–retest correlations of .88 for a 5-week period and .70 over 3 years. Ryden (1978) reported test–retest correlations ranging from .78 to .80 for his shortened version over periods ranging from 6 to 58 weeks. Byrne (1983) obtained test–retest correlations on a general self subscale of .62 over a 1-week period.

Validity

Convergent

Demo (1985) found the 25-item version to correlate .44 with “beeper” self-reports of self-esteem, .55 with the Rosenberg Scale, .41 with peer ratings, .33 with observer Q-sorts of self-esteem, and .50 with a self-esteem interview. Correlations of .58 with social self-esteem, .75 with the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, .72 with the Janis–Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, .58 with simple ratings of global self-esteem, and .47 with simple ratings of social self-esteem have been demonstrated (Van Tuinen & Ramanaiah, 1979). Finally, Byrne (1983) obtained correlations ranging from .58 to .60 with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Correlations with social desirability have reached .44 (Ryden, 1978).
Discriminant validity has also been shown with the SEI. For example, the SEI was unrelated to several measures of need for order or routine (Van Tuinen & Ramanaiah, 1979). Also, the scale was unrelated to the Eysenck Personality Inventory Lie Scale (Ahmed et al., 1985). Finally, Gibbs and Norwich (1985) found no relationship between their version of the SEI and verbal IQ or reading age.

Location


Results and Comments

There are several problems with the SEI. First, as is true of many global self-esteem instruments, the scale is negatively skewed; that is, most people score above the mean (Coopersmith, 1967). In addition, there is a high correlation with social desirability. These findings suggest that influences other than self-esteem contribute to SEI scores. The response format (like me, unlike me) is limiting and may contribute to socially desirable responding and range restriction. The most critical problem, however, has been the lack of a stable factor structure. The scale and subsequent revisions were originally intended to be unidimensional, but data have indicated multidimensionality. Solutions of 4, 9, and 10 factors have resulted in no stable interpretable pattern. This, in combination with the lack of face validity of many items, detracts from the value of the SEI.

Self-Esteem Inventory

Please mark each statement in the following way:

If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check in the column "Like Me."

If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check in the column "Unlike Me."

There are no right or wrong answers.

1. I spend a lot of time daydreaming.

   Like Me  
   
   Unlike Me  

2. I'm pretty sure of myself.

3. I often wish I were someone else.

4. I'm easy to like.

5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.

6. I never worry about anything.

7. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.
8. I wish I were younger.
9. There are lots of things about myself I’d change if I could.
10. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.
11. I’m a lot of fun to be with.
12. I get upset easily at home.
13. I always do the right thing.
14. I’m proud of my school work.
15. Someone always has to tell me what to do.
16. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.
17. I’m often sorry for the things I do.
18. I’m popular with kids my own age.
19. My parents usually consider my feelings.
20. I’m never unhappy.
21. I’m doing the best work that I can.
22. I give in very easily.
23. I can usually take care of myself.
24. I’m pretty happy.
25. I would rather play with children younger than me.
26. My parents expect too much of me.
27. I like everyone I know.
28. I like to be called on in class.
29. I understand myself.
30. It’s pretty tough to be me.
31. Things are all mixed up in my life.
32. Kids usually follow my ideas.
33. No one pays much attention to me at home.
34. I never get scolded.
35. I’m not doing as well in school as I’d like to.
36. I can make up my mind and stick to it.
37. I really don’t like being a boy/girl.
38. I have a low opinion of myself.
39. I don’t like to be with other people.
40. There are many times when I’d like to leave home.
41. I’m never shy.
42. I often feel upset in school.
43. I often feel ashamed of myself.
44. I’m not as nice looking as most people.
45. If I have something to say, I usually say it.
46. Kids pick on me very often.
47. My parents understand me.
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48. I always tell the truth.
49. My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.
*50. I don't care what happens to me.
*51. I'm a failure.
*52. I get upset easily when I'm scolded.
*53. Most people are better liked than I am.
*54. I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.
55. I always know what to say to people.
*56. I often get discouraged in school.
57. Things usually don't bother me.
*58. I can't be depended on.

Note: *, Reverse-scored item.

Texas Social Behavior Inventory
(Helmreich, Stapp, & Ervin, 1974)

Variable

This scale is intended to be an objective measure of an individual's feelings of self-worth or social competence, constructs that are not distinguished conceptually or empirically.

Description

The original Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) consisted of 32 items selected from a larger pool on the basis of factor and item analyses. Shortly after the creation of the original scale, Helmreich and Stapp (1974) revised the scale to create two parallel 16-item forms. This split was based on the desire for rapid administration and for use in studies attempting to change self-esteem. The criteria for assignment to one of the forms were equivalence of part-whole correlations, equivalence of means between forms and between sexes, equivalence of score distributions, and parallel factor structures. Owing to their equivalence, the two scales correlate .97 with the full 32-item version and .87 with each other. Most researchers using the TSBI have employed one of the short forms.

Factor analyses of 32-item TSBI responses produce one large factor and four conceptually coherent correlated factors: confidence, dominance, social competence, and social withdrawal or relation to authority figures (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). Items are straightforward, addressing degree of self-confidence in groups of people, fear of speaking to strangers, and security in social situations. Subjects are instructed to respond to statements using a five-point Likert-type format (not at all characteristic of me, not very, slightly, fairly, very much characteristic of me). Individual items are keyed from 0 to 4, and scores on the scale range from 0 to 64 with higher scores indicating higher self-esteem.

Sample

The original 32-item version was based on a sample of more than 1000 college students.
Reliability

Internal Consistency

Alternate-form reliability of the total 32-item scale is .89 (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). McIntire and Levine (1984) reported a Cronbach α of .92 for the full 32-item version.

Test–Retest

No test–retest correlations were encountered.

Validity

Convergent

Sadowski, Woodward, Davis, and Elsbury (1983) found the TSBI to be significantly related to locus of control. For both males and females high self-esteem was positively associated with internality. Helmreich and Stapp (1974) reported that TSBI scores were correlated .81 with masculinity for males and .83 for females, and .42 with femininity for males and .44 for females. McIntire and Levine (1984) reported that the TSBI correlated .25 with the Ghiselli Self-Assurance Scale, .76 with performance self-esteem, .40 with academic self-esteem, .25 with athletic self-esteem, .39 with academic social self-esteem, and .23 with athletic social self-esteem. The TSBI correlated .26 (McIntire & Levine, 1984) and .32 (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) with the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

Discriminant

Helmreich and Stapp (1974) found no relationship between the TSBI and intelligence as measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test, although it was predictive of academic and other honors.

Location


Results and Comments

The most troubling aspect of the TSBI is its focus: Does it measure self-esteem or social skill? While these two constructs are certainly related, they are still very distinct concepts in social psychological research. The scale authors treat the concepts as conceptually and empirically equivalent. Positive response bias is a potential problem, because only 5 of 16 questions on form A and 4 of 16 on form B are worded negatively. The remainder are positively worded.

We would expect this scale to correlate positively with measures tapping social skill and self-confidence. Given that high self-esteem is socially desirable, the modest correlations with social desirability are not unreasonable and are typical of self-esteem scales in general. In summary, the scale is a short, simple, and easy-to-use measure of self-esteem,
particularly in social situations or environments. The TSBI is probably best used as a measure of social self-esteem.

### Texas Social Behavior Inventory

**Form A**

*1. I am not likely to speak to people until they speak to me.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL CHARACTERISTIC OF ME</th>
<th>NOT SLIGHTLY FAIRLY CHARACTERISTIC OF ME</th>
<th>VERY MUCH CHARACTERISTIC OF ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I would describe myself as self-confident.
3. I feel confident of my appearance.
4. I am a good mixer.
5. When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right things to say.
*6. When in a group of people, I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.*
7. When I am in disagreement with other people, my opinion usually prevails.
8. I would describe myself as one who attempts to master situations.
9. Other people look up to me.
10. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.
11. I make a point of looking other people in the eye.
*12. I cannot seem to get others to notice me.*
13. I would rather not have very much responsibility for other people.
*15. I would describe myself as indecisive.*
16. I have no doubts about my social competence.

**Form B**

*1. I would describe myself as socially unskilled.*

*2. I frequently find it difficult to defend my point of view when confronted with the opinions of others.*
3. I would be willing to describe myself as a pretty “strong” personality.
4. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things.
5. I usually expect to succeed in the things I do.
Social Self-Esteem
(Ziller, Hagey, Smith, & Long, 1969)

Variable

The Social Self-Esteem Scale (SSE) is based on the premise that self-esteem maintains the self under conditions of strain, such as the processing of new self-relevant information.

Description

The SSE was developed to assess self-esteem as it evolves from social interaction and exchange. High self-esteem is considered a self-protective mechanism and is said to insulate the individual from environmental strain (such as the processing of new information about the self) through selective consideration of relevant social elements. Self-esteem is viewed largely as a result of self-evaluation or social comparison processes stemming from social contexts.

The SSE is based on the assumption that individuals find it expedient to order and structure the surrounding environment. According to the SSE developers, empirical evidence demonstrates that individuals tend to order things from left to right. In addition, individuals assign more importance to things placed at the extreme left. For each "item" respondents are instructed to place representations of themselves and five significant others (e.g., "someone you know who is happy") arbitrarily in one of six circles arranged in a row. There are six different groups of significant others within which the self must be placed. A self-esteem score is derived by measuring the self’s position relative to others. The farther left the self is placed, the greater the individual’s inferred self-worth. The scale can also be scored as a function of how far left the self is placed relative to the most desirable other. If scored simply as a function of left-sided placement, the possible range of scores is 0–36, with higher scores indicating greater self-esteem.

6. I feel comfortable approaching someone in a position of authority over me.
7. I enjoy being around other people, and seek out social encounters frequently.
8. I feel confident of my social behavior.
9. I feel I can confidently approach and deal with anyone I meet.
10. I would describe myself as happy.
11. I enjoy being in front of large audiences.
12. When I meet a stranger, I often think that he is better than I am.
13. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers.
14. People seem naturally to turn to me when decisions have to be made.
15. I feel secure in social situations.
16. I like to exert my influence over other people.

Note: *, Reverse-scored item.
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Sample

Various samples were used by Ziller et al. (1969) ranging from college students to politicians and in size from 41 to 321.

Reliability

*Internal Consistency*

Split-half reliability estimates are reported by Ziller et al. (1969) ranging from .80 to .85.

*Test–Retest*

Test–retest correlation for 86 sixth and seventh grade students (unspecified time interval) was .54 (Ziller et al., 1969). No test–retest data on adult subjects were encountered.

Validity

*Convergent*

The SSE has not correlated very highly with other measures of self-esteem. Ziller et al. (1969) reported nonsignificant correlations with the Coopersmith SEI, Bills Index of Adjustment and Values and Diggory’s Self-Evaluations of .04, −.14, and .21, respectively. Zirkel and Gable (1977) obtained nonsignificant correlations of .03 with the SEI, .03 with the Primary Self-Concept Scale, −.03 with the Behavioral Rating Form, and −.11 with the Teacher Rating Form.

Some predictive validity has been shown for the SSE. Ziller et al. (1969) demonstrated that the scale differentiated winning from losing political candidates, sociometric stars from sociometric isolates in a grade school population, mental health status of one clinical population from another (e.g., acutely depressed from psychotic), psychiatric patients from normals, frequent and consistent contributors to psychiatric treatment group interaction from less frequent and consistent contributors, and subjects of higher versus lower socioeconomic status. The scale has also been used (in combination with a semantic differential measure of self-esteem) as a measure of “defensiveness,” operationalized as a discrepancy between one’s conscious and unconscious self-evaluations (Mann, 1981). Defensiveness was subsequently related to delinquent behavior of adolescents.

*Discriminant*

No studies of discriminant validity were encountered, although the low correlations with more conventional self-esteem measures might be interpreted as evidence for discrimination.

Location


Results and Comments

The format of the SSE is interesting but not immune to criticism. Problems suggested by Carlson (1970) include the failure of the scale to distinguish between the source and level
of self-esteem; sex bias, making it questionable for females; and cultural bias. Additionally, the left-to-right tendency is not universally evident in subjects, and the order of significant others on the questionnaire can affect subjects' placement of them on the scale (Froehle & Zerface, 1971). Mann (1980) has investigated some of these problems and concluded that while the placement of significant others may bias responses, there are no effects of developmental stage or gender of respondent.

Because of the consistent lack of convergence with conventional measures, it is clear that this scale does not measure what has traditionally been thought of as self-esteem. Unconscious self-evaluation is certainly an interesting possibility. Thus, the instrument might be more useful as a tool for measuring true or actual self-esteem rather than defensive or presented self-esteem. More research along these lines is needed.

**Social Self-Esteem**

Sets of six circles are accompanied by lists of six “people.”

```
  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●
```

The six sets of social objects included in the adult form of the instrument are:

a) doctor, father, a friend, a nurse, yourself, someone you know who is unsuccessful;

b) doctor, father, friend, politician, yourself, an employer;

c) someone you know who is a good athlete, someone you know who is popular, someone you know who is funny, someone who knows a great deal, yourself, someone you know who is unhappy;

d) an actor, your brother or someone who is most like a brother, your best friend, yourself, a salesman, a politically active person;

e) someone you know who is cruel, a judge, a housewife, a policeman, yourself, your sister or someone who is most like a sister.

Note: Social Self-Esteem (Ziller et al., 1969). Copyright 1969 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted here with permission. Because the scale is now being distributed commercially, Dr. Ziller requests that researchers contact him (Dept. of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, 32601) and the publisher (American Psychological Association) for permission to use the scale.

Children

Assessment of self-esteem in children, especially young children, presents some obvious measurement problems. Scale language must be relatively simple and scale responses must also be unsophisticated. Hence traditional Likert-type instruments are not used in the two scales reviewed here:


The Piers–Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale (CSCS) (Piers, 1984) was designed to assess self-attitudes based on an evaluation of one’s behavior and attributes. The target
504.0x738.0
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population includes children and adolescents aged 8–18. A total or global self-esteem score is computed, as well as six subscale scores for behavior, abilities, intelligence, physical appearance, anxiety, and happiness. Response bias and inconsistency indexes are also available. Social desirability is thought not to be problematic for younger age populations because of the presumably unsocialized nature of children in this regard. However, this assumption may hold less well for adolescents.

Harter (1985) has developed the Self-Perception Profile for Children (SPPC), a promising scale designed for use with elementary school children. Overlapping versions are available for use with kindergarten-age children and children in first or second grade. The SPPC assesses global self-worth as well as five major domains: scholastic competence, social acceptance, athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavior conduct. The format of the SPPC appears well-chosen for young children. Pairs of pictures depicting skills and activities are presented to respondents. In each pair, one picture illustrates the skill or activity being performed well or optimally and the other picture suboptimally (i.e., negatively). The child chooses which one is most like him or her and how true a representation it is (i.e., “sort of true” or “really true”).

**Piers—Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale**

(*Piers, 1984*)

**Variable**

This instrument is designed to measure children's and adolescent's self-concepts, defined by Piers as “a relatively stable set of self-attitudes reflecting both a description and an evaluation of one's own behavior and attributes” (1984, p. 1). Contrary to broader uses elsewhere, the term “self-concept” here is synonymous with self-esteem or self-regard.

**Description**

The Piers—Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (CSCS) is an 80-statement self-report inventory. Statements are worded primarily in the first person and children are instructed to respond “yes” or “no” to indicate whether or not each statement is self-descriptive. Approximately half the items are high self-esteem statements and half are low. Total CSCS scores range from 0 to 80 with higher scores indicating greater self-esteem.

In addition to yielding a total score, the CSCS also produces six factor analytically derived clusters or subscales: behavior, intellectual and school status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity, and happiness and satisfaction. The clusters demonstrate substantial overlap and many items contribute to more than one cluster.

The scale is designed for use with children and adolescents aged 8–18. It is self-administered, but the user may find it desirable to read the items aloud to younger children. Administration time is less than 30 minutes. A computerized version is also available that, in addition to yielding the scores listed above, also produces two validity indexes. A response bias index estimates the amount of response bias present in a score, and an inconsistency index examines the extent to which redundant questions were answered in opposing directions.
Sample

The original sample consisted of 1183 children aged 4–12 from a Pennsylvania school system. No consistent gender or age differences were found.

Reliability

*Internal Consistency*

Piers (1984) lists reliability coefficients (e.g., α, Spearman–Brown, and Kuder–Richardson 20) from nine samples ranging from .88 to .92.

*Test–Retest*

A summary of test–retest data was also presented by Piers (1984). Test–retest reliability was .72 for a 4-month period for the 95-item version. Three- to 4-week test–retest coefficients on the 80-item version ranged from .80 to .96 (Querry, 1970).

Validity

*Convergent*

Correlations as high as .54 with teacher ratings of self-concept have been demonstrated (Piers, 1984). Correlations with peer ratings have also been consistent, ranging from .26 to .49 (Piers, 1969). Correlations with other self-esteem measures have also been relatively consistent. The CSCS correlated .51 with the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale for males and .61 for females (Yonker, Blixt, & Dinero, 1974). Correlations with the Bills Index of Adjustment and Values were .40 for females and .42 for males (Yonker et al., 1974). Correlations were .85 with the Coopersmith Inventory (Schauer, 1975) and .67 with the Personal Attribute Inventory for Children (Parish & Taylor, 1978). Correlations with social desirability have also been high, ranging from .25 to .45 (Millen, 1966).

The CSCS also has been related to several concepts believed to be negatively related to self-esteem. Cox (1966) reported correlations of −.64 between the CSCS and “big problems” and −.48 between the CSCS and “health problems.” Correlations between the CSCS and the Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale ranged from −.54 to −.69 (Millen, 1966).

*Discriminant*

No discriminant validity data were encountered.

Location

The scale is copyrighted and available through Western Psychological Services, 12031 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90025.

Results and Comments

Because of potential problems with response bias and socially desirable responding, the CSCS is better suited to children than adolescents. When used with younger groups the
scale appears to exhibit acceptable reliability and validity. Shorter versions, while not encountered in the literature we reviewed, may represent an improvement.

### Piers–Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale

2. I am well behaved in school. (Behavior)

| YES | NO |

16. I have good ideas. (Intellectual and School Status)
54. I am good-looking. (Physical Appearance and Attributes)
*74. I am often afraid. (Anxiety)
51. I have many friends. (Popularity)
2. I am a happy person. (Happiness and Satisfaction)

Note: Because of the commercial nature of this scale, only sample items can be reproduced here. *, Reverse-scored item.

### Self-Perception Profile for Children

*(Harter, 1985)*

**Variable**

This scale measures several aspects of children’s self-concept that are related primarily to competence and acceptance.

**Description**

Because of the rather dramatic change in skills that connote competence and acceptance at different ages (Harter & Pike, 1983), there are two versions of the 24-item Self-Perception Profile for Children (SPPC), one for kindergarteners, and one for first and second graders. The SPPC assesses five domains (scholastic competence, social acceptance, athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct) as well as global self-worth. Harter advises that the global self-worth scores of children under 8 years of age be interpreted with caution, since younger children are less able to make abstract judgments. The two versions share 12 common core items, but each version has 12 unique items.

The SPPC utilizes a unique format consisting of pairs of pictures, one presenting a positive behavioral depiction and the other a negative depiction. For example, one picture shows a child bouncing a ball, while the other shows the child dropping the ball. The pictorial format is appropriate for young children because it engages their interest and attention and makes it possible for them to portray their skills and activities concretely. For each pair of pictures, the child is asked to decide which is most like him or her. Next, the child is asked whether this is “sort of true” or “really true” for him or her. Thus the child is requested to make both an evaluative and an extent-of-agreement judgment.

Each of the six subscales is based on six items. Items are scored from one to four with
the most positive answers receiving a four (positive picture, really true) and negative responses receiving a one (negative picture, really true). Domain scores can range from 6 to 24, while total scores range from 36 to 144. In both cases, higher scores indicate a more positive self-concept.

Sample

Four standardization samples were employed, encompassing a total of 1553 third through eighth grade boys and girls.

Reliability

*Internal Consistency*

Cronbach $\alpha$ values for each subscale are provided by Harter (1985). All are generally high, ranging from .71 to .85 across four samples.

*Test–Retest*

No test–retest correlations were encountered.

*Validity*

*Convergent*

Factor analyses have confirmed the a priori domains of self-concept (Harter, 1985). Some convergent evidence comes from unpublished data reported by S. Harter and R. G. Pike (personal communication, November 20, 1988) in which 96% of first and second grade children were readily able to give specific reasons why they felt competent or not and why they felt accepted or not. Also, a correlation of .42 was reportedly obtained between perceived competence and preferred level of difficulty in puzzle tasks.

*Discriminant*

No discriminant validity data were encountered.

Location

The scales are available from Dr. Susan Harter at the Psychology Department, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80208-0204.

Results and Comments

While most work using the SPPC has been performed by Harter and her colleagues, the scale is promising as a stable and useful instrument for assessing children’s self-concept. The format is engaging for children and should hold their interest for the time necessary to complete the scale. Providing versions that are age-specific is an added advantage. One potential (and as yet untested) problem is susceptibility to socially desirable responding. Additional work is necessary to establish the validity of the instrument.

Harter and her colleagues are creating instruments with similar formats for older children, adolescents, and adults using words rather than pictures. The entire set of instruments may prove useful for developmental studies.
Self-Perception Profile for Children

This girl is pretty good at puzzles. Are you:
- Really good at puzzles
- Pretty good

This girl isn't very good at puzzles. Are you:
- Not very good at puzzles
- Sort of good

This boy isn't very good at numbers. Are you:
- Not too good at numbers
- Sort of good

This boy is pretty good at numbers. Are you:
- Pretty good
- Really good at numbers
Related Constructs

In many cases, researchers may be interested in constructs that, while related to self-esteem, are either defined more broadly or more narrowly. Here we consider two measures of the more general construct of self concept and two measures of more specific constructs.

8. Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (1965/1988)
10. Shrauger Personal Evaluation Inventory (1990)

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSC), originally introduced by Fitts (1965) and recently revised by Roid and Fitts (1988), was developed to assess an individual's identity, behaviors, and satisfaction comprehensively across many domains. Indeed, 29 scores can be derived for each respondent. Presumably, satisfaction scores in these various domains can be construed as specific self-esteem measures. Although the TSC has been used as a research instrument, its major value may lie in clinical applications, allowing therapists to focus on specific attributes underlying pathologically low or high self-esteem.

The Self-Description Questionnaires (SDQ) were also developed in an attempt to measure self-concept multidimensionally. Marsh and his colleagues developed distinct versions for children (the SDQ-I) (Marsh, Smith, & Barnes, 1983), adolescents (the SDQ-II) (Marsh, Parker, & Barnes, 1984), and late adolescents or adults (the SDQ-III) (Marsh, & O’Neill, 1984). Each is based on the assessment of varying numbers of factors assumed to underlie self-concept in each age group.

Shrauger’s Personal Evaluation Inventory (PEI) (1990) focuses on self-confidence, arguably an important evaluative component contributing to global self-esteem. The PEI is based on a multidimensional approach to self-confidence encompassing academic ability, athletics, physical appearance, romantic relationships, social interactions, and speaking with people. Clearly, this instrument is more appropriate for use with late adolescents and young adults than with other age groups.

The Body-Esteem Scale (BES) (Franzoi & Shields, 1984) is based on a revision of the widely used Body-Cathexis Scale of Secord and Jourard (1953). Unlike the earlier uni-dimensional scale, the BES is based on gender-specific multidimensional factor structures including physical attractiveness, concern about weight, and physical condition for males and attitudes toward sexual attractiveness, concern about weight, and physical condition for females. To the extent that physical appearance is an important underlying component of self-esteem, as argued by Berscheid and Walster (1978) and Hatfield and Sprecher (1985), measures like the BES tap an important component of self-esteem.

**Tennessee Self-Concept Scale**
*(Roid & Fitts, 1988)*

**Variable**

This scale is based on a multidimensional view of the self-concept derived primarily from a clinical perspective and emphasizes both general and specific factors.

**Description**

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) was designed to be simple, widely applicable, and multidimensional. It is intended for use with individuals aged 12 and above. The scale
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consists of 100 self-descriptive, self-administered statements, the vast majority of which are phrased in the first person. Respondents are instructed to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement. Response alternatives are completely false, mostly false, partly true and partly false, mostly true, completely true. Items are scored from one to five, and total scale scores can range from 100 to 500, with higher scores indicating a more positive self-concept.

Roid and Fitts (1988) reported that 29 major scores are calculable from the measure, but users have relied primarily on total score and five categorical scores: physical self, moral–ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. Three additional measures can be computed for each of these categories: identity (how the individual describes his or her basic identity within each category), self-satisfaction (how satisfied the individual is with perceived self-image within each category), and behavior. The result is a $3 \times 5$ matrix of categories by item types. Other scales address self-criticism, true–false ratio, conflict, variability in response, defensive posture, general maladjustment, psychosis, personality disorder, neurosis, personality integration, deviant signs, and time score, in addition to others.

Sample

The original sample consisted of 626 participants from various parts of the United States. The group ranged in age from 12 to 68 and contained an approximate balance of females and males, blacks and whites, representatives of all social, economic, and intellectual levels, and educational levels from sixth grade to doctoral level. Normative scores on all subscales are available in Roid and Fitts (1988).

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Split-half reliability has been estimated to be .91 (Nunnely, 1968). Roid and Fitts (1988) reported several $\alpha$ coefficients for total score that range from .89 to .94. Subscale coefficients were slightly lower.

Test–Retest

Fitts (1965) reported test–retest reliability coefficients based on 60 college students (2-week interval) ranging from .60 to .92 for total score. Roid and Fitts (1988) presented test–retest data on 472 respondents over a median interval of 6 weeks. Their test–retest coefficients ranged from .62 to .94 (total score).

Validity

Convergent

The TSCS has correlated .80 with the Piers–Harris Self-Concept Scale (Roid & Fitts, 1988). Fitts (1965) found total score to correlate .64 with a measure of positive feelings. The scale correlates .53 with the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire extraversion measure (Roid & Fitts, 1988). Van Tuinen and Ramanaiyah (1979) provide the best evidence of convergence with other measures. They found that the TSCS total scale correlated .75 with the Coopersmith inventory, .45 with social self-esteem, and .65 with the Janis and Field questionnaire. In addition, correlations of .62 and .42 were found for simple
self-ratings of global and social self-esteem, respectively. Finally, Fitts (1965) found the scale to be highly negatively correlated (−.70) with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale.

**Discriminant**

Evidence of discriminant validity is provided by Fitts (1965), who found the scale to be uncorrelated with authoritarianism (California F-scale). Hall (1964) showed no relationship between the TSCS and agreement response set. Sundby (1962) found the scale unrelated to conformity. Roid and Fitts (1988) provide evidence for the discriminative power of the TSCS in terms of correlations with scales composing the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The TSCS failed to correlate with most measures including deference, order, exhibition, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression.

**Location**

The TSCS is copyrighted and available through Western Psychological Services, 12031 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90025.

**Results and Comments**

A comprehensive analysis of the TSCS by Marsh and Richards (1988) demonstrated consistent validational support for only the family, social, and physical subscales. Although the scale purports to measure many aspects of self-concept, its popularity (see Table 1) is due to its use as a general measure of self-esteem.

### Tennessee Self-Concept Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Moral</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a healthy body.</td>
<td>1    2   3   4   5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I have a lot of self-control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. I am a member of a happy family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. I am as sociable as I want to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Because of the commercial nature of the scale, only sample items can be reproduced here.

### Self-Description Questionnaire

*(Marsh, Smith, & Barnes, 1983)*

**Variable**

This instrument is designed to measure the self-concept and is derived from a hierarchical facet model of a dimensionalized self.
Description

The facet model incorporates a generalized sense of self, more specific facets or domain self-concepts, and even more specific skills and abilities. In short, specific skills and abilities contribute to facet selves, which in turn contribute to a generalized sense of self. The Self-Description Questionnaire (SDQ) was designed to measure the self-concept of children of less than adolescent age. Seven conceptual and factor analytically supported facets from two domains (academic and nonacademic) are measured. These domains are physical abilities, appearance, relationship with peers, relationship with parents, reading, mathematics, and (other) school subjects.

The scale consists of 66 items selected from an original pool of 100 items. The nonacademic subscales each contain eight positively worded and one negatively worded item. The academic scales each contain 10 parallel items, five of which are cognitive in content and five affective in content. Each contains four positively worded items and one negatively worded item. Most questions are worded in the first person, and subjects are instructed to respond to each item on a five-point response scale (true, mostly true, sometimes true, sometimes false, mostly false, and false). Items are scored in the direction of higher self-esteem, and total score can range from 66 to 330.

Sample

The scale is based on a sample of 654 male and female students attending one of six coeducational public schools in Sydney, Australia. The students were primarily in fifth or sixth grade and ranged in age from 9.5 to 13 years.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Marsh, Smith, and Barnes (1983) report Cronbach α values for the seven subscales ranging from .80 to .92.

Test–Retest

Six-month subscale test–retest coefficients have ranged from .27 to .74 with most in the .50–.70 range (Marsh, Smith, & Barnes, 1983).

Validity

Convergent

Several factor analyses have confirmed the presence of seven factors within the scale (Marsh & Hocevar, 1983; Marsh, Barnes, & Hocevar, 1985; Marsh, Relich, & Smith, 1983) with all items loading on their expected factor. Evidence of convergence with related constructs is based on several data sets and includes correlations with physical abilities, .30–.53; appearance, .07–.31; relations with peers, .22–.58; mathematics .33–.74; all school subjects .22–.65.

Discriminant

No discriminant validity data were encountered.
The scale is copyrighted and available through the Psychological Corporation, 555 Academic Court, San Antonio, Texas 78204-2498. Only paraphrased sample items can be reproduced here.


Results and Comments

The SDQ appears to be an adequate and comprehensive measure of the multidimensional aspects of self-concept. It is susceptible, however, to response bias and socially desirable responding. Its length and specificity limit its utility as a measure of overall self-evaluation (global self-esteem). In general we recommend this scale for researchers interested in specific aspects of self-concept, but not for those interested in global self-esteem.

Also available but not reviewed in this chapter are the Self-Description Questionnaire II (SDQ II) for use with adolescent samples and the Self-Description Questionnaire III (SDQ III) for use with late adolescent and adult samples. The SDQ II contains 122 items measuring 11 subscales including general self, mathematics, verbal, general school, physical abilities, physical appearance, relations with same-sex peers, relations with opposite-sex peers, relations with parents, honesty, and emotional stability. The SDQ III contains 13 scales, each represented by 10 or 12 items. The subscales are mathematics, verbal, general academic, problem solving and creativity, physical abilities, physical appearance, relations with same-sex peers, relations with opposite-sex peers, relations with parents, religion or spirituality, honesty or reliability, emotional stability or security, and general self-concept. Both the SDQ II and the SDQ III are balanced to avoid response set and have acceptable reliability and factor structures.

---

**Self-Description Questionnaire**

1. I am good at sports:

   - TRUE
   - MOSTLY TRUE
   - SOMETIMES TRUE, SOMETIMES FALSE
   - MOSTLY FALSE
   - FALSE

   I. Physical Abilities
   I am a good athlete.
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II. Appearance
   I am good looking.

III. Relationships with Peers
   I make friends easily.

IV. Relationship with Parents
   I get along well with my parents.

V. Reading
   I look forward to reading.

VI. Mathematics
   I am interested in maths.

VII. School Subjects
   I like all school subjects.

Note: Because of the commercial nature of this scale, only sample items can be reproduced here.

Personal Evaluation Inventory
(Shrauger, 1990)

Variable

This scale measures self-confidence, an aspect of self-evaluation defined as a person's sense of his or her own competence or skill and perceived capability to deal effectively with various situations.

Description

The Personal Evaluation Inventory (PEI) was designed to serve as a measure of self-evaluation that would not be as global as existing measures such as the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. In development, an open-response format was employed to determine the most relevant self-confidence domains. The six most frequently mentioned dimensions were then chosen as subscales. These included academic performance, athletics, physical appearance, romantic relationships, social interactions, and speaking with people. In addition to these subscales, others were developed to assess general confidence level and mood state which might effect confidence judgments.

Item selection was based on four criteria: high item–subscale correlations; low correlations with other subscales; low correlations with the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale; and balance between positively and negatively worded items within each subscale. All subscales contain seven items except for the athletics subscale, which contains five items. Thus, there are a total of 54 items, each scored from one to four with a
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possible range of total scores of 54–216, with higher scores indicating higher self-confidence.

Sample

The scale was developed on a sample of 211 college students.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Cronbach α values for the subscales range from .74 to .89 for females and from .67 to .86 for males.

Test–Retest

Test–retest correlations of subscales after a 1-month interval ranged from .53 to .89 for women and from .25 to .90 for men. Total scale score correlations for the same interval were .80 for women and .93 for men.

Validity

Convergent

Evidence of convergence is displayed in a series of correlations reported by S. Shrauger (1990). The total PEI correlated .58 with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, .59 with the Janis–Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale (Eagly, 1967 version), and .53 with optimism. In general, the subscales displayed patterns similar to total scale with the exception of the athletic subscale, which displayed no evidence of convergence (i.e., correlations reaching significance). Finally, Shrauger reports that scores on the PEI are related to peer ratings, task choice, and rejection of negative information about the self. Confidence scores were significantly related negatively to negative affect (−.43), to hopelessness (−.49), and to repressive tendencies (−.63).

Discriminant

Factor analytic results reported by Shrauger (1990) confirm the presence of six hypothesized factors accounting for 48% of the variance, with only two of 200 nontarget loadings greater than .3. The PEI appears to be free of socially desirable response set, does not correlate significantly with social desirability scales including the Marlowe–Crowne and the College Social Desirability Index (Shrauger & Sparrell, 1988). In addition, confidence scores were unrelated to socioeconomic level, religious affiliation, and degree of religious involvement.

Location

The scale is not yet published, but information can be obtained by writing Dr. Sidney Shrauger, Psychology Department, Park Hall, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York 14260.
Results and Comments

Although more validation studies are needed, the PEI is a promising measure of the self-confidence aspect of self-concept. The scale appears to be free of traditional scale limitations such as methodological artifact and response set, but there are still two problems. One is the scale’s focus on domains within the college experience. Several subscales would be inappropriate for other settings such as work. A second problem is the utility of the athletic subscale. While it is clearly an independent factor, its applicability seems limited to domains such as sport psychology.

**Personal Evaluation Inventory**

Below are listed a number of statements that reflect common feelings, attitudes, and behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and think about whether you agree or disagree that it applies to you. Try to respond honestly and accurately, but it is not necessary to spend much time deliberating about each item. Think about how the item applies to you during the last two months unless some other time period is specified. Indicate your degree of agreement with each statement as follows:

1. I am a good mixer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>MAINLY AGREE</td>
<td>MAINLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2. Several times in the last few days I have gotten down on myself.

*3. It bothers me that I am not better looking.

4. I have no difficulty maintaining a satisfying romantic relationship.

5. I am happier right now than I have been in weeks.

6. I am pleased with my physical appearance.

*7. I sometimes avoid taking part in ball games and informal sports activities because I don’t think I am good enough at them.

*8. Talking in front of a group makes me uncomfortable.

*9. I would like to know more people, but I am reluctant to go out and meet them.

10. Athletics is an area in which I excel.

11. Academic performance is an area in which I can show my competence and be recognized for my achievement.

12. I am better looking than the average person.

*13. I dread the thought of getting up and talking in public.

14. When I think about playing most sports I am enthusiastic and eager rather than apprehensive and anxious.

*15. I often feel unsure of myself even in situations I have successfully dealt with in the past.
16. I frequently wonder whether I have the intellectual ability to achieve successfully my vocational and academic goals.

17. I am a better athlete than most people of my age and sex.

18. I lack some important capabilities that may keep me from being successful.

19. When I have to talk before a group of people I usually feel assured that I can express myself effectively and clearly.

20. I am fortunate to be as good looking as I am.

21. I have recognized that I am not as good a student as most of the people I am competing with.

22. I have been more critical of myself in the last few days than I usually am.

23. Being poor at sports is an important weakness of mine.

24. For me meeting new people is an enjoyable experience that I look forward to.

25. Much of the time I don't feel as competent as many of the people around me.

26. I almost never feel uncomfortable at parties or other social gatherings.

27. I have fewer doubts about my abilities than most people.

28. I have more trouble establishing a romantic relationship than most people do.

29. I am more uncertain about my abilities today than I usually am.

30. It bothers me that I don't measure up to others intellectually.

31. When things are going poorly, I am usually confident that I can successfully deal with them.

32. I am more concerned than most people about my ability to speak in public.

33. I have more confidence in myself than most people I know.

34. I feel apprehensive or unsure when I think about going on dates.

35. Most people would probably consider me physically unattractive.

36. When I take a new course I am usually sure that I will end up in the top 25% of the class.

37. I am as capable as most people at speaking before a group.

38. When I go to social gatherings I frequently feel awkward and ill at ease.

39. Usually I have a better love life than most people seem to.

40. I have sometimes avoided taking classes or doing other things because they would require my making presentations before a group.

41. When I have to come through on important tests or other academic assignments I know that I can do it.

42. I am better at meeting new people than most people seem to be.

43. I feel more confident about myself today than I usually do.

44. At times I have avoided someone with whom I might have a romantic relationship because I felt too apprehensive around them.
### The Body-Esteem Scale
*(Franzoi & Shields, 1984)*

**Variable**

This scale is designed to measure a specific aspect of self-concept that is presumably importantly related to self-esteem: how one feels about his or her body and appearance.

**Description**

The Body-Esteem Scale (BES) (Franzoi & Shields, 1984) is a revision of Secord and Jourard’s (1953) Body-Cathexis Scale. Body-cathexis is defined as “the degree of feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the various parts or processes of the body” (Secord & Jourard, 1953, p. 343). The Body-Cathexis Scale required respondents to rate 40 body parts and functions on a 5-point scale. Items were summed and divided by 40 to produce a total score ranging from one to five. Higher scores indicated greater body cathexis (i.e., greater satisfaction with one’s body).

Based on their identification of three gender-specific factors in the Body-Cathexis Scale, Franzoi and Shields (1984) included three gender-specific subscales in the BES: physical attractiveness, upper body strength, and physical condition for men, and sexual attractiveness, weight concern, and physical condition for women. Carpenteri and Cheek (1985) confirmed this factor structure. The 32 BES items are scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (have strong negative feelings) to 5 (have strong positive feelings). Likert scores are summed across all items to yield a total score, and across subsets of items to produce subscale scores. Total scores range from 32 to 160, with higher scores indicating greater esteem for one’s body. Subscale score ranges are consistent with the number of subscale items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I wish I could change my physical appearance.</td>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I am less concerned than most people about speaking in public.</td>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Right now I am feeling more optimistic and positive than usual.</td>
<td>Upper body strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Attracting a desirable boyfriend or girlfriend has never been a problem for me.</td>
<td>Physical condition for men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>If I were more confident about myself, my life would be better.</td>
<td>Sexual attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I seek out activities that are intellectually challenging because I know I can do them better than most people.</td>
<td>Weight concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I can get plenty of dates without any difficulty.</td>
<td>Physical condition for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I don’t feel as comfortable in groups as most people seem to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I am less sure of myself today than I usually am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I would be a lot more successful in dating if I were better looking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *, Reverse-scored item.*
Sample

The BES was developed using two samples, the first consisting of 366 females and 257 males, the second 301 females and 182 males. All were undergraduate students attending the University of California at Davis.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

The Body-Esteem Scale has shown adequate internal consistency with subscale $\alpha$ values ranging from .78 to .87 (Franzoi & Shields, 1984).

Test–Retest

No test–retest data were encountered for the BES. However, Balogun (1986) reported a 2-week test–retest correlation of .89 for the Body-Cathexis Scale from which the BES was derived.

Validity

Convergent

BES subscales are moderately correlated with overall self-esteem (Rosenberg SES, 1965), with $r$s ranging from .19 to .51 (Franzoi & Shields, 1984). Franzoi and Herzog (1986) reported BES subscale correlations of .21–.40 with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. In addition, they reported subscale correlations ranging from .08 to .27 with attractiveness, .24–.28 with body-consciousness, and .21–.63 with body-competence. In addition, the weight subscale was found to distinguish between people suffering from anorexia nervosa and a “normal” control group (Franzoi & Shields, 1984).

Discriminant

Although Franzoi and Shields (1984) and Franzoi and Herzog (1987) reported data supporting discriminant validity among the subscales, no data describing relationships between the BES scale and other variables were found.

Location


Results and Comments

The extent of socially desirable response bias in the BES has not been determined. On the basis of scale content we expect social desirability to contribute moderately to scale
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scores. Much of our support for the BES is based on validity data for its predecessor, the Body-Cathexis Scale. We recommend the use of the Body-Esteem Scale instead of the earlier Body-Cathexis Scale because of its rationale and stable factor structure.

The Body-Esteem Scale

All items are scored on the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAVE</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>FEELINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female

Sexual attractiveness: body scent, nose, lips, ears, chin, chest or breasts, appearance of eyes, cheeks/cheekbones, sex drive, sex organs, sex activities, body hair, face

Weight concern: appetite, waist, thighs, body build, buttocks, hips, legs, figure or physique, appearance of stomach, weight

Physical stamina: physical stamina, reflexes, muscular strength, energy level, biceps, physical coordination, agility, health, physical condition

Male

Physical attractiveness: nose, lips, ears, chin, buttocks, appearance of eyes, cheeks/cheekbones, hips, feet, sex organs, face

Upper body strength: muscular strength, biceps, body build, physical coordination, width of shoulders, arms, chest or breasts, figure or physique, sex drive

Physical condition: appetite, physical stamina, reflexes, waist, energy level, thighs, physical coordination, agility, figure or physique, appearance of stomach, health, physical condition, weight

Future Research Directions

During the review of self-esteem scales for possible inclusion in this chapter, several general problems became apparent. First, few if any measures are free from the conceptual and methodological criticisms raised by Wylie (1974) and Crandall (1973). Apparently, the perfect measure does not exist. The more serious of the methodological inadequacies contributed to our decision to review relatively few measures.

Second, since three very popular scales together account for 50% of the measurement-related citations in the literature during the last two decades (see Table 1), one might be tempted to conclude that self-esteem is only what the Rosenberg, Coopersmith, or Tennessee scales measure. However, as our review implies, these particular scales are not always appropriate measures of self-esteem. On the one hand, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale is often much broader in scope and technically more complex than is necessary for
self-esteem assessment. On the other hand, there is often a need for more specific self-evaluations than the global measures of self-esteem provided by the Rosenberg or Coopersmith scale.

Third, since self-esteem is a hypothetical construct, validation is mainly limited to convergence with other similar variables and constructs (and divergence from dissimilar ones) or to face validity. Thus, acceptance of a measure depends to a great extent on the acceptance of both the conceptual criteria or definition of self-esteem underlying the measure and the consonance of scale items with the definition.

Attempting to validate self-esteem measures against specified behaviors is problematic not only because a large set of representative behaviors is difficult to identify and measure, but also because such a procedure introduces circularity into the logic of the validation process. Is it the construct (i.e., self-esteem) or the behavior that is being validated? If one assumes the former, then the validity of the behavior must be established instead of the construct. Such validation would probably still rest on face or concept validity.

Finally, too little attention has been paid to possible group, subcultural, and cultural biases in self-esteem assessment. The typical scale has been developed primarily to assess self-esteem in white adolescents and young adults. Thus, the counterintuitive finding that blacks score much higher than whites on Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale items (Johnston, Bachman, & O'Malley, 1986) may be reliable and consistent with certain theoretical explanations, such as high self-esteem serving a self-protective function for members of stigmatized groups (Crocker & Major, 1989), or may result from possible subcultural biases in the SES.

Certainly, even currently acceptable scales can be improved psychometrically, especially by periodic collection of validational, reliability, and normative data. However, development of new measures of global self-esteem or new measures of specific self-evaluations related to self-esteem is probably unnecessary unless advances in theory warrant them.

One promising example is the work of Luhtanen and Crocker (1990), who are currently validating a scale to measure the self-esteem or self-worth that individuals accrue from the groups to which they belong voluntarily (e.g., a work group) or involuntarily (e.g., a race or gender group). Unlike the “social” self-esteem scales described above, which assess self-esteem as a function of the individual’s relative or comparative worth in interpersonal situations, Luhtanen and Crocker’s Collective Self-Esteem Scale assesses self-esteem as a function of worth ascribed to and internalized by the individual via group membership. This scale assesses membership esteem (i.e., an individual’s worthiness as a group member), private collective self-esteem (i.e., an individual’s judgments of how his or her social group is perceived), public collective self-esteem (i.e., an individual’s judgments of how outsiders perceive his or her social groups), and identity (i.e., the importance to the individual of membership in social groups).

Another area in which work remains to be done, but one without a promising solution in sight, concerns the defensive or health-maintaining nature of self-esteem (Cohen, 1954; Greenberg et al., 1986; Schneider & Turkat, 1975; Taylor & Brown, 1988). If there is such a thing as core self-esteem that is independent of defensive distortions, then it is necessary to develop self-esteem measures that are not subject to self-presentation and self-enhancement effects such as defensive agreement with socially desirable scale items. Alternatively, if one postulates that defensive or self-enhancing biases are critical to the nature and development of self, then self-presentation and self-enhancement biases are important components of the self-esteem construct and must be measured (see Chapter 2, this volume).
One way out of this apparent conflict might be a two-factor approach to self-esteem measurement in which both self-evaluation and self-protection tendencies or traits are assessed. Individuals could be assessed as high, moderate, or low on each dimension and the relative strength of the associations between either or both factors and criterion variables could be pursued. In this way, the relative contributions of "core" self-esteem and "functional" or "defensive" self-esteem could be determined. Although we are working on such a measurement approach, its development is still in its infancy.

Bibliography


4. Measures of Self-Esteem


4. Measures of Self-Esteem


