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Abstract

The current study was conducted to explore contributory factor of self concept among the undergraduate university students. BS students of university of education studying in first, second and third years were the population. The sample was selected (70, 70 and 60) in succession of the years. A pilot tested self developed questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire was comprised of 30 items and addressed 14 different dimensions which cause the development of self concept and affect it either way. The questionnaire was distributed to students by the researcher. The data was analyzed through SPSS.
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Development of Self as a Concept in the University Students

Introduction

Self is a general term encompassing the ways to perceive, think and evaluate one’s own personality and its match with the surroundings we normally people live in. First of all Rene Descartes brought the concept of self (Cooley, Mead, James and Dewey, 1930), later on ALL Port (1939) reintroduced self and ego such as self-image, self actualization, self affirmation, phenomenal ego, ego involvement, and ego striving as the experimental positivism (Ian Nicholson, 2003). Self is said to comprise sum of ideas, attitudes, values and commitments (Jerslid, Brook & Brook, 1978). Self is understood in terms of “I” and “Me” I remains operative as an individual whereas we represent the group attitude. The element of “Me” can be broken down into; a physical self, a social self, amoral self and a psychological self (Berzonsky, 1981). Major aspects of self include actual/real self, ideal self and self concept (Hamachek, 1971).

There are three major components of self-concept viz. structure, function and quality. Structure encompasses flexibility, congruence and scope where as function stretches over locus of control as regards quality it is envisioned by intellectual competence, physical attractiveness, physical skills, social attractiveness, leadership and moral qualities and sense of humor. There are certain factors that are supposed to affect self concept which may be briefed as; maturity and intelligence (Katz & Zigler, 1967) locus of control (Hamachek, 1978), age, sex, race, religion and socio-economic class are the other factors.

Humanists contributed towards the study of self, Cooley explored the idea of looking glass self, Mead (1927) associated it with social conditions, Sullivan went for interpersonal theory of personality, Adlar attached self concept with personal life style, Horney related it with the anxieties of life like aspiration for affection, life partner, power, prestige, admiration, independence and perfection. In addition Carl Rogers intends to see a functioning person in terms of consistency in experiences and expectations. Maslow goes for self actualization in the realms of psychological needs, safety needs, esteem needs, belongingness needs. Hamachek (1987) steps forward and points to the fact towards identifying post self concept signs as, strong opinion holder, reflects best judgment, confidence in abilities, self conscious, accepts ideas without getting ruled over and sensitive to social customs. Self concept of women is also found to be driven by physical appearance (Bersheild & Walster, 1974) clothes, names and nick names, intelligence, emotions and cultural patterns, school and college, social status (Mc. Candless & Coop, 1979). As the person passes through the stages of life self concept gets firmer and especially during adolescence period the youth...
comes across physical, intellectual, emotional and gender traits development. All these developments lead to seek for awareness, independence, critical thinking, peer acceptance and preparation for the vocation (Mead, 1953).

Education manages for the mental maturity with the need to explore self based on self identity, solid beliefs about the life, empowered to use self and self concept interchangeably (Rogers, 1970).

**Statement of the Problem**

Self concept cultivation is the ultimate intent of the universities. The study is an endeavor to explore the way the universities are coming up to the aspiration of the stakeholders. In line with the intents of the universities this research has been kept focused on the topic, contributive factors towards the development of self concept in the university students of under graduate program.

**Objectives of the study**

Study has been designed to achieve the following objectives

1. Identify the factors that help develop self concept in the under graduate students of the universities
2. To Explore the factors affecting the self concept of under graduate university students

**Research Questions**

To keep the research tangible and focused the following questions were developed.

1. What is the level of self concept of the under graduate students of the university?
2. Does age of the students affect their self concept?
3. Is there any effect of class on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
4. Is there any effect of birth order on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
5. Is there any effect of residence on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
6. Is there any effect of grade on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
7. Is there any effect of monthly income on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
8. Is there any effect of father occupation on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
9. Is there any effect of mother education on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
10. Is there any effect of father education on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
11. Is there any effect of locality on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?
12. Is there any effect of mother occupation on the self concept of under graduate students of the university?

Significance of the study

Psychologists believe that self concept is an attribute that help the individual to be optimally functional in the society (Jersild, 1978) where as positive self concept makes the personality (Hamachek, 1971). This study will help the students know their self concept as the personality strength. Teachers will be made aware to design their lectures in line with the students self concepts. The study would also help develop a congenial climate for teaching learning at the university to develop the self concept of the students.

Review of related literature

The term self-concept is a general term used to refer to the way someone thinks about their own self. Baumeister (1999) puts the definition of this term in the following words that self is "the individual's belief about himself or herself, including the person's attributes and who and what the self is". Lewis (1990) understands that the concept of self has two aspects, the existential self separates one from others in terms of constancy of the self” (Bee 1992). On the other side in categorical self one puts him or herself into the categories of age, gender, size, skill, hair color, height and favorite things as internal psychological traits. In addition to it Kuhn (1960) could explore that there is something known to be understood as the self-image explaining the term who am I like the physical description, social roles, personal traits and existential statements. Self esteem and self worth are other elaborative factors of self as self esteem which involves the degree of evaluation which may be narrated in terms of high and low self esteem thematic appreciation test is used to measure it. Self esteem is stated to have the affect of four parameters like; reaction of others, comparison with others, social roles and identification (Miller and Ross, 1975). There
is something understood as the ideal self a relationship among ego, self esteem and self image influenced by four factors like; the way others react to us, how we compare ourselves with others, our social roles and the way we identify ourselves with others (Argyle, 2008). Descriptive Psychology (Ossorio, 1978, 1981, 1985), explains the development of self concept in terms of empirical and logical justifications and therapeutic interventions for altering the self-concept.

The self-concept encounters behavioral possibilities in several ways. The first of which is captured by Charlie Brown as the virtue one considers, for various forms of participation in life. The second limitation imposed by a person's self-concept is to see themselves as a different person than others (Ossorio, 1976; Rogers, 1959). The third limitation is not the appraisal of one's self rather it is to live in a world. Looking into these well-documented facts it may safely be inferred that self concept poses curious resistance to change (Baumeister, 1995; Ossorio, 1978; Swann, 1992). The crux of the matter lies in the fact that the status takes precedence over fact (Ossorio, 1978, 1998). The problems with the self-concept, originates out of the statuses people assign to them in their young age with their families, peers, school personnel, and others and they carry it with them throughout their lives (Koestner, Zuroff, & Powers, 1991; Swann, 1992). In "family projection process" (Bowen, 1978), they “typecast” it (Hoffman, 1981). The present concept of self is parsimonious in resistance to change and it ties a wide range of phenomena.

Remedy to the fact is that the therapists in status of dynamic therapy assign a large number of statuses to the persons regarding them as treated, taking him as a person (1) who is acceptable; (2) who makes sense; (3) whose best interests come first in the therapeutic relationship; (4) who is important and significant to the therapist; (5) who already possesses enabling strengths, knowledge, and other resources for solving problems; (6) who, was given a choice between equally realistic but differentially degrading appraisals of him or her, is to be given the benefit of the doubt; and (7) who is an agent (i.e., an individual capable of entertaining behavioral options and selecting from among them, as opposed to a helpless victim of genetic, historical, environmental, or other forces) (Bergner, R., & Staggs, J. 1987).

Zahid (1983) conducted a research and proved that the higher self concept of students cause more cordial relations with their parents. Ahmad (1984) conducted a research on parent child interaction and its relationship with the self concept. He the involvement of parents lead to the development of higher self concept of their children. Kiyani (1986) could reach the conclusion in his study that higher the level of self concept effective would be the study habits. Ahmad (1986) explored the
theory of Meads reach the conclusion that those with high self concept show better academic achievement. Miyamoto and Bush (1986) applying Meads theory and provide out that self concept help shape self definition, responses promote and support self concept. Self concept help others develop specific attitudes. Bilali (1989) conducted a research on parental support and development of self esteem and could reach the conclusion that the two concepts are closely and significantly co-related. Jhangir (1990) conducted a research on relative deprivation and self esteem of female students explored that the two concepts are negatively correlated. Rafiq (1990) conducted research on spontaneous self concepts of Pakistani male and female adolescents and adult. Girls scored higher on the dimensions of nation, religion and academics. Rafi (1990) managed to develop a self-esteem scale which had multidimensional irreparable self esteem in the indigenous context. Ali (2002) conducted a research on finding a relationship between self, self concept and academic achievement of orphan and non orphan students. Research revealed that there is no significant difference on scores of self esteem where as it was significant for the sub scales of dominance and aggression. It may further be added that there was a significant relationship between the constructs for which the study was meant for. Naz (2003) tried to find out the relationship of maternal violence with self esteem of adolescents. No relationship did emerge. Jabeen (2003) managed to find out the relationship between self resiliency and self esteem of adolescents. The results showed positive relationship between the construct with the values higher for the girls than the boys.

Methodology

The study was descriptive and based on the use of survey strategy for the conduct of research.

Method of Study

A five point likert type rating scale was developed which was based on 30 items. The lowest option on the rating scale was strongly disagreed with a value of 1 and strongly agreed with a value of 5. It was pilot tested for the determination of reliability and finalization. A sample comprising students of BS Hons. class at University of education; 70 students from first and second year were taken whereas 60 were selected from third year class.
Data Presentation and Analysis

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>218.481</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.827</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>33301.114</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>169.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33519.595</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of students on the basis of age.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>224.469</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74.824</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td>33295.126</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>169.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33619.595</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference in the self concept of students based on gender.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4870.413</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.827</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td>275649.382</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>169.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280519.795</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of student regarding the students’ class levels.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4870.213</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2435.106</td>
<td>16.744</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td>28649.382</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>145.428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33519.595</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding the locale of students.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Locale</th>
<th>J Locale</th>
<th>Mean difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Semi urban</td>
<td>10.65780</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9.84524</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that students living in urban areas have significantly better self concept as compared to semi-urban and rural students.
Table 5
Difference in students self concept on the basis of their birth order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7.329</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.665</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td>3512.266</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>179.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3519.595</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of students on the basis of their birth order.

Table 6
Difference in students self concept on the basis of their family size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>131.526</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.763</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td>33296.504</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>169.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33427.030</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 reveals that there is no significant difference in the self concept of student regarding their family size.

Table 4.7
Difference in students self concept on the basis of father occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1847.928</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>923.964</td>
<td>5.635</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>30624.009</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>163.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32571.937</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding father's occupation.

Table 8
Difference in students self concept on the basis of mother's occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significance (2 tailed)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House wife</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.0269</td>
<td>12.27597</td>
<td>1.0269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.27597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working women</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0163</td>
<td>15.50283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that there is no significant difference in the self concept of student regarding mother's occupation.
Table 9

*Difference in students self concept on the basis of father’s education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>727.920</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121.320</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>32739.737</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>171.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33467.67</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of students regarding their father’s education.

Table 10

*Difference in students self concept on the basis of mother’s education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>933.892</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>155.649</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>32474.598</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>171.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33408.490</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of students regarding their mother’s education.

Table 11

*Difference in students self concept of day scholars and boarders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance (2 tailed)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>7.46672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of students regarding their residential status.

Table 12

*Difference in students self concept on the basis of students earned grades*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1683.073</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>561.024</td>
<td>3.469</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>30569.259</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>161.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32252.232</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of students regarding their earned grades.

Table 12.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Mean difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B</td>
<td>8.687</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B</td>
<td>6.13289</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.1 shows that students with A and A have significantly better self concept as compared to students who earned other grades.
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>552.523</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184.174</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>32960.563</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>169.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33513.085</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of students regarding their feelings.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sum of scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>914.037</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>228.509</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>32605.558</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>176.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33519.595</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 reveals that there is a significant difference in the self concept of student regarding the income strata students belonged to.

Conclusions

1. The researcher concluded that the difference in students self concept based on the students age.
2. The gender has no significant difference in the development of self-concept.
3. The class does not contribute in self concept.
4. The students living in the urban area were found to have better self concept from the students living in the Sami-urban and rural area.
5. A possibility did exist that the siblings may differ in the self concept in order of their birth order, but nothing tangible could be worked out of the research regarding this dimension.
6. Family size was not found to be intervening in the development of self concept.
7. Father’s occupation provides a support in certain aspects and their development but it was found to be contributive pertaining to this factor on the development of self concept where as the effect of mothers occupation was just the contrary.
8. In addition to profession of father, education may also contribute towards the development of self concept among students which stands true for mother and fathers education as per revelation of research.
9. Residential education proves better in the development of self concept in comparison to day scholars.
10. Grades of intellect and same have been endorsed by the research that those with A grade were better in the self concept.
11. Feelings make the people comfortable or distressful those students with better feelings showed better in the self concept.
12. Income makes the functions smooth students belonging to better income families showed better understanding of the self concept rather than the comparatively those belonging to poor groups.

Recommendations

1. Exposure of students to open houses, seminars, workshops, beshould be a regular feature of the programs enabling the students to socialize understand self and other.
2. The assignment should be given to the students that enable them to follow and defend their own contentions and understanding of their own self.
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