



A Study of the Self-Concept of College Principal

DR. ASHA CHAUDHARY
Assistant Professor,
Sarvajanik Education College,
Mehsana, Gujarat (India)

Abstract:

Self-concept (also called self-construction, self-identity or self-perspective) is a multi-dimensional construct that refers to an individual's perception of "self" in relation to any number of characteristics, such as academics (and non academics), gender roles and sexuality, racial identity, and many others. Each of these characteristics is a research domain (i.e. Academic Self-Concept) within the larger spectrum of self-concept although no characteristics exist in isolation as one's self-concept is a collection of beliefs about oneself. While closely related with self-concept clarity (which "refers to the extent to which self-knowledge is clearly and confidently defined, internally consistent, and temporally stable"), it presupposes but is distinguishable from self-awareness, which is simply an individual's awareness of their self. It is also more general than self-esteem, which is a function of the purely evaluative element of the self-concept. The self-concept is an internal model which comprises self-assessments. Features assessed include but are not limited to: personality, skills and abilities, occupation(s) and hobbies, physical characteristics, etc. For example, the statement "I am lazy" is a self-assessment that contributes to the self-concept. However, the statement "I am tired" would not be part of someone's self-concept, since being tired is a temporary state and a more objective judgment. A person's self-concept may change with time as reassessment occurs, which in extreme cases can lead to identity crises.

Another model of self-concept contains three parts: self-esteem, stability, and self-efficacy. Self-esteem is the "evaluative" component it is where one makes judgments about his or her self-worth. Stability refers to the organization and continuity of one's self-concept. Is it constantly in flux? Can singular, relatively trivial events drastically affect your self-esteem? The third element, self-efficacy, is best explained as self-confidence. It is specifically connected with one's abilities, unlike self-esteem. In this study the researcher studied about the interrelationship of self-concept of College Principals through certain variables.

Keywords: *Personality, Self Concept, Self-Presentation*

1. Introduction

Pragmatic View of Self : The self is a complex process of gaining self awareness. We develop a concept of who we are through our interactions with others. This view is expressed in pragmatic philosophy in the works of William James and George Herbert Mead, among others. **Dramatism and Self-Presentation :** We construct roles that we perform in the everyday drama of life and shape the image we choose to convey to others. **The Humanistic view of Self:** Drawing on perspectives of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers, this view of self emphasizes individual growth toward self-actualization.

Postmodern Self: Our sense of self is a relational view that is defined and negotiated in relational communities.," Self-Esteem Esteem is the need to affirm self worth and gain confidence in interacting with others. This focus also draws on humanistic psychology.

2. Assessment of Self- Concept

There are even individual differences in the ability to form a self concept. Jane Loevinger[1966] has proposed that there is a measurable dimension of personality related to the ability to conceptualize one Self to assume distance from oneself, and to describe oneself precisely, and that this variable it self is dependent upon age, intelligence, education and socio economic status.

3. Definition of terms

Your self is your basic personality or nature, considered especially in term of what you are really like as a person or what you are really like at a particular time in your life.

A concept is an idea or abstract principle which relates to particular subject or to particular view of that subject. Here, self-concept means what believe he\she (College principal) for himself.

4. Objectives of the Study

1. To study interrelationship among Rural and Urban area for Self-Concept of College Principal.
2. To study interrelationship among Woman and Man for Self-Concept of College Principal.
3. To study interrelationship among High and Low Self-Concept of College Principal for Job-Satisfaction.
4. To study interrelationship among Branch of Arts,Commerce and Science for Self-Concept of College Principal.

5. Variables of the Study

5.1 Independent Variables

- a) Urban and Rural [Area]
- b) Woman and Man [Sex]
- c) Job-Satisfaction-High&Low [Level]
- d) Arts ,Commerce and Science [Branch]

5.2 Dependent Variable

- a) Self-Concept of College Principal

6. Hypothesis

- [i] There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Rural and Urban area.
- [ii] There is no significance difference between the mean of self- concept of College Woman Principal and Man principal.
- [iii] There is no significance difference between the mean of high self-concept of Job-Satisfaction of College Principal and low self-concept of Job- Satisfaction of College principal.
- [iv] There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Arts and Commerce.
- [v] There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Arts and Science.
- [vi] There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Commerce and Science.

7. Tools used for this Study

For the collection of data of study, the following tools were adapted by the researcher.

* Job-Satisfaction Questionnaire: This is tool developed by Dr.N.T. Chauhan.

* Self-Concept Scale: This is tool developed by Dr. Bina Shah

8. Sample of the Study

For the collection of the data following demographic sample were adapted by the researcher.

Table-1 Variables

Variable	Sub variable	No.	Total
Area [A] A1	Rural A1	30	120
	Urban A2	90	
Sex [B]	Woman B1	8	120
	Man B2	112	
Level [C]	High Self-Concept's [J. S.] C1	80	120
	Low Self-Concept's [J. S.] C2	40	
Branch [D]	Arts D1	40	120
	Commerce D2	40	
	Science D3	40	

9. Research Procedure

The investigator has seen the problem in education management and in specially College Principal because in Principal have important role of learning process. The investigator has selected the sample from the Gujarat state's colleges principal. The investigator has get data by questionnaire and scale. The investigator has calculated the data as per research design and statistical method and technique. The investigator has tested all the null hypotheses and noted the conclusions.

10. Analysis of the data

Values of central tendency, dispersion and its error of Self concept of College Principal and variables such as [A] Area; [B] Sex [C] Level [D] Branches.

Table - 3

Variable	Area		Sex		Level		Branches		
	Urban (1)	Rural (2)	Woman (3)	Man (4)	High S.C. Of J.S. (5)	Low S.C. Of J.S. (6)	Arts (7)	Commerce (8)	Science (9)
M	196.83	191.76	190.5	194.54	308.91	304.27	194.75	193.85	193.83
Std	21.95	2.48	16.51	23.63	33.92	38.36	19.12	26.68	25.02
Q	32	34	15.5	32	30	24	28.5	38	36
SK	-0.46	-0.76	-0.03	-0.31	-2.64	-3.77	-0.25	-0.61	1.67
Ku	0.20	0.93	1.30	1.12	17.46	20.66	-0.56	0.031	5.71
Er.Std.	4	2.47	15.83	23.62	3.77	5.99	3.02	14.21	3.96
Er.sk	0.43	0.25	0.75	0.23	0.27	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37
Er.ku	0.53	0.50	1.48	0.45	0.53	0.72	0.73	0.73	0.73

- Table no. 3 & Colummu no. 1-2 Indicates that the mean of self concept of College Principal of urban and rural äreä are 196.83 and 191.76. It indicates skewness value -0.46 and -0.76 also kurtosis value 0.20 and 0.93. So that, it can be said that the mean of Urban äreä is high. Also it can be said that the value of skeweness are minus and the kurtosis of urban is leptokurtosis but rural-kurto-sis is platy.
- Table no. 3 & Colummu no. 3-4 indicates that the mean of self concept of College Principal for woman and man 190.54 and 194.54. So that, it can be said that the mean of man is high . It indicates skevvnness value -0.03 and -0.31 and kurtosis value 1.30 and 1.12. So . Also it can be said that the value of skeweness is minus and the kurtosis of woman is leptokurtosis, butthe kurtosis is platy for man.
- Table no. 3 & Colummu no. 5-6 indicates that the mean of self concept of principal's job satisfaction 308.91 and 304.27. So that, it can be said that the mean of high-self concept of principal's job satisfaction is high . It indicates skewness value are -2.64 and -3.77 and kurtosis value are 17.46 and 20,66. Also it can be said that the both value of skeweness are minus and the both kurtosis are platy kurtosis.
- Table no. 3 & Colummu no. 7, 8, 9 indicates that the mean of self concept of Principal of arts, commerce and science are 194.75,193.85 and 193.83. So that, it can be said that the mean of self concept of Principal of arts is high . It indicates skewness value -0.25 , -0.61 and 1.67. also kurtosis value are -0.56,0.03. and 5.71. Also it can be said that the value of skeweness of arts& commerce are minus but science is plus also the kurtosis of arts & science are platy kurtosis but commerce is leptokurtosis.

11. Testing of Hypotheses

1. There is no significance difference between the mean of high self-concept of Job-Satisfaction and low self-concept of Job-Satisfaction of College principal.
2. There is no significance difference betvveen the mean of self-concept College Principal of Arts and Commerce.
3. There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept College Principal of Arts and Science.
4. There is no significance difference betvveen the mean of self-concept College Principal of Commerce and Science.

Table-4

Sr. No.	Hypotheses	Df	Value f	Value P	Significae	Acceptance of Hypotheses
1	There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Rural and Urban area	28	4.88	0.11	yes	no
2	There is no significance difference between the mean of self- concept of College Woman Principal and Man principal	7	41.80	0.12	yes	no

Sr. No.	Hypotheses	Df	Value f	Value P	Significae	Acceptance of Hypotheses
3	There is no significance difference between the mean of high self-concept of Job-Satisfaction of College Principal and low self-concept of Job- Satisfaction of College principal	33	6.20	0.01	yes	no
4	There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Arts and Commerce	27	0.40	0.98	no	yes
5	There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Arts and Science	27	0.53	0.91	no	yes
6	There is no significance difference between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Commerce and Science	27	1.72	0.23	yes	no

1. Findings

1. The significant difference has been shown between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of rural and urban area.
2. The significanc difference has been shown between the mean of self-concept of College woman Principal and man piincipal.
3. The significanc difference has been shown significance difference between the mean of high self-concept of Job-Satisfaction of College Principal and low self-concept of Job-Satisfaction of College principal.
4. No significanc difference has been shown between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Arts and Commerce.
5. There is no significance difference has been shown between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Arts and Science.
6. The significance difference has been shown between the mean of self-concept of College Principal of Commerce and Science.

References

1. Aries, Elizabeth, et al. "Race and gender as components of the working self-concept." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 138.3 (1998): 277+.
2. Bong, M., & Clark, R. E. (1999). Comparison between self-concept and self-efficacy in academic motivation research. *Educational Psychologist*, 34(3), 139-153.
3. Byrne, B. M. (1984). The general/academic self-concept nomological network: A review of construct validation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 427-456.

4. Byrne, B. M., & Worth Gavin, D. A. (1996). The Shavelson model revisited: Testing for the structure of academic self-concept across pre-, early, and late adolescents. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 215-228.
5. Hoffman, Rose Marie, John A. Hattie, and L. DiAnne Borders. "Personal definitions of masculinity and femininity as an aspect of gender self-concept." *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development* 44.1 (2005): 66+.
6. Hoffman, Rose Marie. "Conceptualizing heterosexual identity development: issues and challenges." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 82.3 (2004): 375+.
7. Leflot, G., Onghena, P., & Colpin, H. (2010). Teacher-Child Interactions: Relations with children's self-concept in second grade. *Infant and Child Development*, 19(4). 385-405.
8. Shavelson, R. J., & Bolus, R. (1982). Self-concept: The interplay of theory and methods. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 3-17.
9. Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. (1976). Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 407-441.
10. Wade, Jay C. "Male reference group identity dependence: a theory of male identity." *The Counseling Psychologist* 26.3 (1998): 349+.
11. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-concept>