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The relationship between measured self-concept and the drinking patterns of college students was examined by this study. Three groups of male students and three groups of female students were categorized as heavy, moderate-light, or infrequent drinkers-abstainers based upon their descriptions of personal drinking patterns. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was administered to all students, and groups were compared using Total Positive and Self Criticism TSCS subscale scores. No significant sex differences were found using either the Total Positive or Self Criticism subscale scores. It was found that significant differences relative to degree of drinking existed between the groups on the Total Positive self-concept variable. The heavy drinking group differed significantly from the moderate-light drinking and the infrequent drinking-abstaining groups. Significant differences relative to degree of drinking were also indicated using the Self Criticism self-concept variable. Duncan's procedure revealed that the infrequent drinking-abstaining group...
differed significantly from the moderate-light and infrequent drinking-abstaining groups. The results were generally supportive of previous research and suggest the possibility of self-concept being etiologically important in the development of problem drinking. There is an apparent need for further research in this area as demonstrated by the available literature and this study.
Introduction

The widespread consumption of alcoholic beverages spanning culture and race alike has yielded the inevitable alcoholic with his accompanying social, familial, and personal problems. As a result, behavioral researchers have applied themselves to the study of the alcoholic and the nature of his drinking. Some have proposed the existence of an alcoholic personality which serves to identify the alcoholic and distinguish him from other personality patterns (Armstrong & Hoyt, 1963; Brown, 1950; Button, 1956; Hewitt, 1943; Schilder, 1941; Wexberg, 1949). The majority of recent studies, however, fails to support the premise of an alcoholic personality pattern (Allen, 1969; Berg, 1971; Rosen, 1969; Synder, 1957; Vanderpool, 1969).

Research in this area is extremely complex due to the difficulty in determining whether the personality characteristics of the alcoholic were present prior to development of his drinking problem, or developed as a consequence of the drinking. Numerous empirical studies have been completed which explore self-evaluative aspects of the drinking phenomenon. Most of these studies involved the use of hospitalized alcoholics (Berg, 1971; Conner, 1962; Gross, 1971; Rosen, 1960; Vanderpool, 1969; White & Porter, 1966),
Alcoholics Anonymous members (Carroll & Fuller, 1969; Conner, 1962; Mindlin, 1964; White & Porter, 1966), or alcoholics being treated on an outpatient basis (Allen, 1969; Rosen, 1960).

The self-concept as a global facet of personality has been connected with alcoholism in several experimental investigations (Berg, 1971; Gross, 1971; Vanderpool, 1969). Both scientific and clinical examinations have generally agreed that the alcoholic exhibits a less favorable self-image than does the non-alcoholic. Although little has been resolved with regard to the total personality of the alcoholic, much is being done to increase the understanding of the "self" of the alcoholic.

A massive amount of empirical and clinical data has been accumulated concerning the identified alcoholic. However, the drinker who has progressed to the point of becoming acutely aware of his drinking problem or who has been labeled as a problem drinker by society has already been physically and psychologically affected by alcohol. This contributes to the difficulty in determining whether the traits being examined are basic personality traits or at least partly a function of the alcohol abuse. The degree of personality change stemming from alcohol usage might be accurately determined by strictly controlled "before" and "after" assessments. However, the time element and difficulty of maintaining contact with subjects render this
approach largely impractical. As a result, studies attempting to examine the self-perception of the suspected pre-alcoholic have been few in number (Strauss & Bacon, 1953; Williams, 1965). Williams (1965) found that problem drinking college students demonstrated low self-evaluation similar to that of established alcoholics. The possible etiological significance of these findings with regard to alcoholism was discussed but no definitive conclusion was attempted.

It would appear that an investigation of self-concept differences using quantity and frequency of alcohol consumption would be etiologically relevant. By eliminating the primary importance of the problem drinking criteria, it should be possible to examine individuals earlier in the process of becoming alcohol dependent. It should also be possible to minimize the contaminating factor of poor self-concept which results from problem drinking. In this way, a better understanding of the role of poor self-concept in the development of alcoholism may be obtained.
Review of the Literature

The self-concept has been construed by numerous personality theorists as one of the primary determinants of behavior (Combs & Snygg, 1959; Gross & Adler, 1970; Lecky, 1945; Rogers, 1951). One accepted definition of self-concept is "a person's view of himself" (English & English, 1970, p. 486). Self-concept incorporates not only a person's factual knowledge of himself but also his subjective feelings concerning himself. Researchers have in recent years directed their efforts toward the consideration of the self-concept as a broad personality construct (Conner, 1962; Strong & Feder, 1961). It is felt by both theorists and experimenters that a person must develop a clear awareness of his identity (who he is and what he wishes to become) in order that his full potential may be achieved (Coleman, 1972).

Conner (1962) suggested that there exists a hierarchy of "self-concept depletion" extending downward from non-alcoholics through sanitorium patients, Alcoholics Anonymous members, penitentiary prisoners, to Skid Row alcoholics, and jailed alcoholics. He described non-alcoholics as perceiving themselves most favorably while jailed alcoholics were most self-depreciating. Conner strongly advocated the
investigation of self-concept as it relates to alcoholism on the grounds that the "self" is one of the most stable of the broader aspects of personality.

Low self-concept is one aspect of personality which has quite consistently been related to alcoholism either as an etiological factor or as a result of the alcoholic experience (Berg, 1971; Gross, 1971; Vanderpool, 1969). Many researchers have found that alcoholics generally feel inadequate and exhibit a lack of appropriate self-esteem, self-confidence, and self-worth (Allen, 1969; Berg, 1971; Gross & Adler, 1970; Vanderpool, 1969). They have been described as insecure, dependent, immature, and socially alienated (Berg, 1971; Gross & Adler, 1970; Vanderpool, 1969). Alcoholics have long been recognized as frequently feeling physically and/or sexually inadequate and having low tolerance for stress and pressure (Berg, 1971; Gross & Adler, 1970; Vanderpool, 1969). Vanderpool's (1969) study of the self-concept of one-hundred alcoholics yielded results which suggest a more negative self-concept than has been found in the general population. Significant differences on all relevant dimensions of the self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) were in the negative direction with the exception of the Total Variability scale. Allen (1969), in a comparison of earlier studies, found three separate alcoholic groups to exhibit
more maladjusted profiles on the California Personality Inventory than a normative group of college students.

Utilizing the Standard Adjective Q Sort, Berg (1971) found significantly larger Self-Ideal Discrepancy scores among a group of hospitalized alcoholics as compared to a group of social drinkers. The Adjective Check List, used with the same populations, showed that the alcoholic group chose more negative and undesirable adjectives than were endorsed by the control group. The alcoholics also exhibited more extensive feelings of inferiority than did the social drinkers. The significance of Berg's (1971) study was heightened by the fact that he controlled for the personality variable of neuroticism, using the Eysenck Personality Inventory. Yet his results supported the conclusion of numerous other experiments that alcoholics exhibit a poor self-image and suggest that neuroticism does not significantly influence the self-concepts of alcoholics.

In another comparison between hospitalized alcoholics and a non-alcoholic population using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) (Gross & Adler, 1970), further support was obtained for the hypothesis that alcoholics demonstrate lower self-esteem. The study also suggested that the unfavorable self-concepts of alcoholics were broad or global in nature since they differed from the norms on nearly all important dimensions of self-concept. It was proposed by
Gross and Adler that the alcoholic's self-destructive lifestyle can be best explained in terms of his derogatory self-concept.

Using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Rosen (1960) discovered that alcoholics' profiles approximate closely the profiles of psychiatric patients. These findings lend additional support to the premise that the alcoholic views himself unfavorably and suggest that distress may be relatively well established.

Hadley and Hadley (1972), using a self-concept measure developed by P. A. Smith, found a higher self-ideal discrepancy when a group of chronic drunkenness offenders and outpatient rehabilitation clinic alcoholics were compared with a group of college students. In a similar study which controlled for the factor of intelligence, Carroll and Fuller (1969) used the Standard Adjective Q Sort to assess the individual's view of his self-concept and ideal self-concept. The alcoholics again demonstrated a larger self-ideal discrepancy than did non-alcoholics.

Three separate studies by Armstrong and others (Armstrong, Hambacher, & Overby, 1962; Armstrong & Hoyt, 1963; Armstrong & Wertheimer, 1959) using the Leary Interpersonal Checklist, the "Who Are You" test, and the IES Test yielded results showing greater self-ideal discrepancy scores and lower self-concept scores among alcoholic males than among a normative group of males.
The preceding studies generally concluded that alcoholics have a significantly lower measured self-concept than do non-alcoholics. Many studies controlled for the variables of age, race, neuroticism, and education. Females, however, were not adequately represented among the vast majority of studies.

Williams (1965) in his research with college problem drinkers found problem drinking to be positively related to low self-concept, self-criticality, real-ideal self discrepancy, and negatively related to self-acceptance. Using a group of fraternity members, Williams discovered that college problem drinkers endorsed those adjectives of the Adjective Check List which suggest neurosis. The problem drinkers also appeared to make limited use of secondary-relationship terms which consist of "those qualities necessary to the operation of the social structure" (Williams, 1965). As in studies of alcoholics, Williams' college problem drinkers emphasized those terms commonly associated with permissive friendliness. While Williams categorized his subjects as problem and nonproblem drinkers, he failed to consider adequately the possible effects of pre-existing social and/or behavioral problems. These difficulties could have been initially unrelated to their drinking and may have contributed to the development of the
drinking behavior. The questionnaire used in the study tends to emphasize the socially disapproved aspects and negative results of heavy drinking.

Statement of the Problem

Based upon the results of the past studies it is felt that a reasonably clear relationship has been developed between low self-concept and the alcoholic male. Regardless of the population from which the alcoholic was obtained, the self-concept was consistently found to be more negative than that of a control population. Social drinkers, who served as control populations in the majority of the studies, exhibited a much higher degree of self-esteem than did the alcoholics. Total abstainers have not been examined sufficiently for any generalized statement to be made regarding them. Williams' (1965) study of problem drinking college students has limitations in the evaluation of self-concept and college drinking. The problem drinker might be expected to exhibit a low self-concept in the same way that a social drinker experiencing problems might exhibit a low self-concept. Williams did not attempt to sample a representative group of the college population, nor did he deal with the abstainer or the social drinker in college.

The present study will attempt to investigate the self-concepts of college students as related to amount and frequency of drinking. The drinking patterns of college students are held by Williams (1965) to be precursors of a
drinking pattern which will likely persist throughout adulthood. He indicated that while in the majority of cases the pattern will become adaptive, a number of alcoholic patterns will also emerge. It is hoped that the present study will help to increase our understanding of the college drinker and his relationship to the alcoholic.
Method

In an attempt to understand better the nature of the self-concepts of college students in relation to their drinking patterns, students were grouped according to the reported amount of alcohol consumed and frequency of consumption. Comparisons were then made among the different groups relative to their performance on a measure of self-concept.

Subjects

The subject pool consisted of approximately 250 college students who were selected from sophomore, junior, and senior level psychology classes at Western Kentucky University. Subjects were assigned to one of three groups based upon their description of personal drinking patterns. Criteria for the groups were obtained from a complex classification system outlined in the First Special Report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and Health (1971). These criteria classify heavy drinkers as those individuals who "drink nearly every day with five or more per occasion at least once in a while, or about twice weekly with usually five or more per occasion." Moderate drinkers are defined as those who "drink at least once a month, typically several times, but usually with no more than three or four drinks
per occasion." Light drinkers are those who "drink at least once a month, but typically only one or two drinks on a single occasion." Infrequent drinkers are individuals who "drink at least once a year, but less than once a month." The final classification of abstainers are described as those who "drink less than once a year or not at all." For the purposes of this study, the moderate and light drinking categories were combined as were the infrequent drinking category and the abstainer category. This strategy helped simplify the analysis and required fewer subjects. Each group was made up of 20 males and 20 females who were randomly selected from the total number of participating students falling within each classification.

Instruments

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was used to measure each subjects' self-perception. Fitts (1965) discovered that the effects of such demographic variables as sex, age, race, education and intelligence on the scores of this scale are quite negligible. Norms established by Fitts (1965) are "overrepresented in number of college students, white subjects and persons in the 12 to 30 age bracket" (p. 13). It is therefore felt that the normative data are especially appropriate for the purposes of this study.

The TSCS is composed of 100 self-descriptive statements to which the subject responds on a 5 point scale. Forty-five
positive statements and forty-five negative statements make up eight subscales which measure self-esteem. Ten statements are designed to evaluate degree of self-criticism, and are mildly derogatory in nature. Scores were obtained on the Total Positive and Self-Criticism scales for use in the current study. These two scales were chosen because of their relevancy as well as their appropriateness for analysis. The Total Positive scale is held by Fitts (1965) to be the most important single scale on the TSCS. It is a global measure and reflects the overall level of self-concept. The Self Criticism scale consists of 10 items which are mildly derogatory in nature. It was chosen for this study because of its independence from other scales and its usefulness for determining the validity of individual profiles.

Degree of drinking for purposes of grouping was determined by asking each subject to check the appropriate statement on a brief checklist (see Appendix) adapted from the First Special Report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and Health (1971).

Data Gathering Procedure

The drinking checklist and the TSCS were administered to students in several upper level psychology classes at Western Kentucky University. The TSCS was administered first, followed by the drinking checklist. Standard instructions were used for the TSCS. Instructions for the drinking checklist were printed at the top of the page (see Appendix).
Statistical Procedures

The Total Positive self-concept scores and Self-Criticism scores were the dependent variables used in two 2 x 3 fixed model analysis of variance procedures. Male-female sex differences and degree of drinking (heavy, moderate-light, and infrequent-abstainer) were the independent variables used in this study. When significant results were obtained, Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used to determine the specific location of the significance. For all procedures, values which were equal to or less than the .10 level were considered significant.

Hypotheses

This study sought to examine a number of hypotheses associated with self-concept and college drinking.

The null hypotheses associated with the Total Positive self-concept analysis were:

(1) There would be no significant difference between males and females on the Total Positive self-concept variable.

(2) There would be no significant difference among the three groups classified according to degree of drinking on the Total Positive self-concept variable.

(3) There would be no significant difference between the interaction of the male and female groups across the degree of drinking classifications on the Total Positive self-concept variable.
The null hypotheses associated with the Self Criticism analysis were:

(1) There would be no significant difference between males and females on the Self Criticism variable.

(2) There would be no significant difference among the three groups classified according to degree of drinking on the Self Criticism variable.

(3) There would be no significant difference between the interaction of the male and female groups across the degree of drinking classifications on the Self Criticism variable.
Results

Two 2 x 3 fixed model analysis of variance procedures were used to examine the self-concept data in an attempt to ascertain if significant differences were present due to the sex variable and/or the degree of drinking variable. The results of the Total Positive self-concept analyses are presented in Table 1.

The F ratio associated with the sex variable was found to be non-significant at the .10 level and the null hypothesis associated with this effect was accepted. The F ratio associated with the degree of drinking variable was significant at the .10 level and the null hypothesis associated with this effect was rejected. The null hypothesis associated with the interaction of degree of drinking and sex variables was accepted when the F ratio was found to be non-significant at the .10 level.

Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used to determine the location of the significance associated with degree of drinking. The results of Duncan's Multiple Range Test on the Total Positive self-concept data are presented in Table 2.
Table 1

Analysis of Variance

Total Positive Self-Concept and Degree of Drinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147,445.062</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,239.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1,732.800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,732.800</td>
<td>1.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink</td>
<td>6,506.488</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,253.244</td>
<td>2.701*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex &amp; Drink</td>
<td>1,899.055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>949.528</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1,204.427</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .07
Table 2
Duncan's Multiple Range Test
Total Positive Self-Concept and Degree of Drinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heavy (335.38)</th>
<th>Mod.-Light (346.08)</th>
<th>Infreq.-Abst. (353.30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>(335.38)</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod.-Light</td>
<td>(346.08)</td>
<td>10.7*</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infreq.-Abst.</td>
<td>(353.30)</td>
<td>17.92*</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. The means are enclosed in parentheses. Differences between the means are located in the lower left portion of the matrix and the Duncan's least significant ranges are located in the upper right portion.

*p < .10
Duncan's procedure showed that when the Total Positive self-concept mean of heavy drinkers was compared with Total Positive mean of moderate-light drinkers, differences were found to be significant at the .10 level. These findings could be interpreted as showing moderate-light drinkers to have a significantly more positive self-image on a measure of self-concept. When moderate-light drinkers and infrequent drinkers-abstainers were considered, there were no significant differences. These findings suggest that infrequent drinkers-abstainers perceive themselves significantly more positively on a self-concept measure than do those who drink heavily.

The results of the analysis of variance for the Self Criticism scores are summarized in Table 3. The F ratio associated with the sex variable was found to be non-significant at the .10 level and the null hypothesis associated with this effect was accepted. The F ratio associated with the interaction of the degree of drinking and sex variables was non-significant at the .10 level and the null hypothesis associated with this effect was accepted.

Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used to determine the location of the significance associated with degree of drinking. The results of Duncan's Multiple Range Test of the Self Criticism scores and the degree of drinking variable are presented in Table 4.
Table 3
Analysis of Variance
Self Criticism and Drinking Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,823.953</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>32.134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink</td>
<td>251.118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125.559</td>
<td>4.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex &amp; Drink</td>
<td>36.718</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.359</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3,535.285</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>31.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .02
Table 4
Duncan's Multiple Range Test
Self Criticism and Degree of Drinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Infreq.-Abst.</th>
<th>Mod.-Light</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infreq.-Abst.</td>
<td>(33.73)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod.-Light</td>
<td>(36.15)</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>(37.18)</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. The means are enclosed in parentheses. Differences between the means are located in the lower left portion of the matrix and the Duncan's least significant ranges are located in the upper right portion.

\[ *p < .10 \]
Duncan's procedure indicated that when the mean Self Criticism score of infrequent drinkers-abstainers was compared with the mean Self Criticism score of moderate-light drinkers, significant differences were found at the .10 level. This suggests that infrequent drinkers-abstainers tend to express less self criticism on a self-concept measure as compared with moderate-light drinkers. Moderate-light drinkers were compared with heavy drinkers using Self Criticism means and no significant differences were found. The findings suggest that heavy drinkers as well as moderate-light drinkers are more self-critical on a measure of self-concept when compared with infrequent drinkers-abstainers.
Discussion

The results of the present study show that a definitive relationship exists between the self-concept scores and the drinking patterns of the students in the sample population.

Although sex differences were examined, along with degree of drinking and the interaction of sex differences and degree of drinking, only degree of drinking was found to constitute a significant variable. This was found to be true when either Total Positive or Self Criticism scores were used. The lack of significant differences between males and females on either of the two self-concept variables suggested that differences between groups of drinkers were due to factors other than sex. Previous studies using various populations had failed to provide a clear understanding of female drinking as it relates to self-concept. The measured self-concepts of females are felt to be quite comparable to the measured self-concepts of males at different degrees of drinking. This provides support for the inclusion of females and males together in appropriate research and treatment groups.

It was found that self-concept varied consistently with degree of drinking among the students. Heavy drinkers were found to differ significantly from moderate-light and
infrequent drinkers-abstainers on the Total Positive self-concept variable. This suggests that heavy drinkers view themselves less favorably than do those who drink less or not at all. On the Self Criticism self-concept variable significant differences were found between infrequent drinkers-abstainers and the other two groups. Based upon these differences, it appears that heavy drinkers are more self-critical than moderate-light drinkers and infrequent drinkers-abstainers. It should be noted here that a low Total Positive score and a high Self Criticism score are both indicative of an unfavorable self-concept. This is supportive of previous studies of problem drinkers and alcoholics (Berg, 1971; Gross, 1971; Gross & Adler, 1970; Rosen, 1960; Vanderpool, 1969; Williams, 1965), which were indicative of a diminished self-concept among those who drank excessively.

The results of this study were not as markedly significant as those described by previous researchers who used problem drinking as the criterion for inclusion in their populations. A 20 year follow-up study by Fillmore (1974) described problem drinking in youth as the primary precursor of alcoholism in later life. However, since alcoholism is broadly defined as problem drinking, this says little other than that the behavior tended to maintain itself. In this instance, however, significant self-concept differences were found in a pre-alcoholic population whereas
significance has only been found using identified alcoholic or problem drinker populations in the past. This is felt to be very consistent with the concept of a developing alcoholic pattern prior to an individual being identified as an alcoholic or problem drinker. The larger significance levels found in previous studies may have been partially due to the contaminating nature of the problem drinking criteria as well as the self-concept depletion resulting from the drinking behavior.

If poor self-concept is a personality characteristic which is closely related to problem drinking as suggested by Williams (1965), it appears reasonable to consider the possibility that poor self-concept might constitute one of the most basic factors in the early development of alcoholism. It appears reasonable to consider that the measurement of self-esteem might be of primary significance diagnostically and for purposes of prevention and early intervention. It is to be noted that a great deal of further research will be necessary in order to lend credibility to such conjecture.

Limitations of this study include the restricted sample size as well as the bias of the population on which it was based. A more adequate study would need to include a much larger sample selected randomly from the general population. It would be preferable to eliminate problem drinkers from inclusion in the population sample in order to
determine more accurately the self-concept level before one's drinking reaches problem proportions. Further examination of this area of research will hopefully center more upon the etiological significance of self-concept level as well as early drinking behavior in the development of alcoholism. In spite of inherent difficulties, there is a great need for carefully designed longitudinal studies in order to establish clearly the true significance of self-concept level in the genesis of alcoholism.
Appendix
Please check the one statement which most accurately describes your current pattern of alcoholic beverage consumption. Your response will be kept confidential. Please be sure to read all of the statements carefully before making a decision.

___________ I drink at least once a year, but less than once a month.

___________ I drink at least once a month, typically several times, but usually with no more than three or four drinks per occasion.

___________ I drink nearly every day with five or more per occasion at least once in a while.

___________ I drink less than once a year or not at all.

___________ I drink about once weekly with usually five or more per occasion.

___________ I drink at least once a month, but typically only one or two drinks on a single occasion.
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