
Analysis of Validity and Reliability of Self-Acceptance Scale Using Rasch Model

Faraz Maulana Gunawan^{1*}, Dodi Suryana¹, Hyunisa Rahmanadia²

¹ Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

² Intercultural Linguistics Department Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary

*Corresponding Author: maulanafaraz@upi.edu

Abstract: The measurement of self-acceptance in previous studies still uses classical methods. A valid and reliable self-acceptance scale will help measure the ability to recognize, accept oneself for uniqueness. This study aims to validate and develop the Self-Acceptance Scale. This study was conducted on 100 high school students in Lembang, West Java Province, which included 58 females and 42 males. Cross-sectional survey research methods and a quantitative methodology were employed in this study. The Rasch Model was utilized for data analysis with the Win steps 3.73 program. The findings indicated that 25 items and four scale alternatives where The Cronbach Alpha value represents the interaction between Person and Item is in the excellent category with a value of 0.56. A person's reliability is in a suitable category with a value of 0.47, which indicates the consistency of respondents' answers. The scale meets the criteria that can be used to measure student self-acceptance.

Keywords: self-acceptance scale, Rasch Model, realibility

INTRODUCTION

Using self-acceptance questionnaires requires proper instrument development and validation (Bergemann, 1988; Lai et al, 2022). The scale in measuring self-acceptance must be valid and reliable to produce instruments that can be used in education. The assessment of self-acceptance, which results in establishing service and learning patterns to improve students' self-ability, will benefit students who are in unstable conditions and do not understand themselves. The concept of self-acceptance is an essential topic in personality research, and measurement techniques have been developed (Crowne et al, 1961; Lu et al, 2022). Many issues regarding positive relationships with other scales are used to assess the construct validity of variables (Durm & Glaze, 2001; Molino et al, 2020). The quality of the instrument must pay attention to the validity and reliability of the items (Harter & Pike, 1984; Sürücü & Maslakci, 2020).

Self-acceptance is generally defined as the ability to accept all parts of the individual self and dare to entirely meet the individual self. Based on instrumentality theory, resourcefulness and capacity for self-acceptance can be seen as the result of an individual's personal goals (Ino-Oka & Matsui, 1977; Nepo et al., 2016). Self-acceptance is a broad construct that should remain stable over time; as the construct of self-acceptance is broad, the scale should only have weak correlations with more particular referents.

Therefore, the self-acceptance scale's behavioral predictions for certain circumstances should be balanced. (Ma & Siu, 2020; Mearns, 1989)

Few research has concentrated on developing self-acceptance instruments. Only one tool, the self-acceptance measurement created by Sheerer and updated by Emanuel M. Berger, was discovered from the search results (Denmark, 1973). Berger's Self-Acceptance instrument was analyzed using classical theory's reliability and validity tests (Berger, 1952). As self-acceptance instruments must be tested using more modern techniques, such as prepackaged software (e.g., spreadsheets), the need to evaluate and choose between multiple viable options increases (Szajna, 1994). This study focuses on developing a self-acceptance measurement tool using Rasch modeling. In this study, the authors developed a self-acceptance scale based on the aspects and dimensions of self-acceptance proposed by Bernard (2013) as follows: 1) Aspects of confidence in accepting everything; 2) Aspects of responding positively to praise and reproach; 3) Aspects of self-benefits in constructive development initiatives; 4) Aspects of action responsibility; 5) Aspects of accepting criticism objectively. These aspects are similar to the aspects described which are as follows: 1) Individuals fully and unconditionally accept themselves; 2) Individuals will introspect on mistakes made; 3) Individuals do not give negative assessments; 4) Individuals are valuable individuals. When these two theories are compared, similarities are found in the aspects of belief, responding to criticism and praise, and responsibility. Since self-acceptance is one of the life skills that people must possess, the author thinks that applying Bernard's theory of self-acceptance will help to reveal self-acceptance in depth.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted using descriptive methods using a cross-sectional survey methodology, and a quantitative approach. Quantitative research is based on testing theories and relationships between two or more variables through statistical analysis and quantifying data (Merriam, 2017). A particular kind of observational study called a cross-sectional survey aims to ascertain the frequency (or level) of certain attributes in a particular population and at one specific time. Cross-sectional surveys provide the benefit of measuring behaviors or attitudes and can deliver data quickly (Creswell, 2012).

Participants

The study involved 100 students, including 58 females and 42 males, from a high school in Lembang, West Java, Indonesia. The following is the data on the research respondents.

Table 1. Participants

	Male	Female	Total
Senior High School 2 Lembang (West Java)	42	58	100
Total	42	58	100

Data was collected in 2022 by distributing questionnaires online through Google Forms. Respondents received an explanation of the research objectives the researcher included in the online form. All respondents filled out the questionnaire voluntarily, and the respondent's data was protected confidentially.

Self-Acceptance Scale

The construct of resilience development refers to the results of the theoretical

study of Michael E. Bernard's theory (2013), which formulates self-acceptance as the ability to recognize oneself as a complex and imperfect individual, accept oneself for all uniqueness, and refrain from criticizing oneself. Based on Bernard's theory (2013), two dimensions impact the ability of self-acceptance, precisely the dimension of self-awareness, to recognize positive and unconditionally respond to unfavorable circumstances. In detail, it is explained as follows: 1) The ability to feel in seeing events favorably is a dimension of self-awareness to recognize a positive character, defined by the following features: a) The aspect of belief is the feeling ability that individuals have in believing and accepting everything given to them in life; b) The aspect of accepting praise and reproach positively is the feeling ability that individuals have in responding to praise and reproach given by others with positive actions and attitudes; c) The aspect of self-excellence is the thinking ability that individuals have in knowing their strengths and can develop them positively. 2) The attributes listed below show the dimension of accepting circumstances, responding well with satisfaction and pride, and continuing to work toward improvement. Those qualities include handling harsh situations while unwaveringly accepting oneself: a) The aspect of responsibility for behavior is the capacity to act in accepting responsibility for one's behavior; b) The ability to feel that people have in receiving criticism honestly and accepting faults without passing judgment on others or themselves is one part of accepting criticism objectively (see table 1). The ability to feel receiving criticism objectively is the ability to accept flaws without passing judgment on oneself or others.

The self-acceptance instrument developed includes 30 statements using a Likert scale with four scale options: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The score details for each level are as follows: Strongly Disagree = 1; Disagree = 2; Agree = 3; Strongly Agree = 4.

Data Analysis Procedure

Psychological attributes were determined using Rasch modeling through the Winsteps Version 3.73 application. Verifying the unidimensionality assumption is the first step in creating a self-acceptance instrument. The unidimensionality analysis was carried out using Output Table 23 Item Dimensionality, Raw Variance explained by measures, and Unexplained Variance values at first to fifth contrast.

Second, knowing each item's difficulty level using Output Table 13 Item Measure Order. Third, knowing whether participants understand the difference in answer choices on a scale of 1, 2, and 3 using data on the Diagnostic Rating Scale presented in Output Table 3.2 Rating Scale. Fourth, determine the fit of the items by using the data in Output Table 10.1 Item Fit Order. If the Model Fits the item, then the item functions generally in measuring academic resilience so that there is no misconception in the individual against the item being studied. Fifth, individual ability (person measure) and individual appropriateness are used to analyze student abilities (person measure). Sixth, analyzing items using the information in Output.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

Results below are the outcomes of the student self-acceptance instrument through the Rasch Model based on unidimensionality, item analysis, rating scale, and instrument analysis.

Unidimensionality

The unidimensionality analysis identified several attributes measured by the instrument.

This analysis uses Output Table 23 in the Winstep 3.33 application to the value of Raw Variance explained by measure and Unexplained Variance in the first to fifth contrast. Measurement of unidimensionality can be proven if the Raw Variance explained by measures $\geq 20\%$ with a note of the general criteria for interpretation, namely, sufficient if 20-40%; good if 40-60%; and excellent if above 60%, and if the Unexplained Variance in first to fifth contrast is less than 15% respectively.

Table 2. Unidimensionality

		-- Empirical --		Modeled
Total raw variance in observations	= 35.03	100.0%		100.0%
Raw variance explained by measures	= 10.03	28.6%		28.8%
Raw variance explained by persons	= 24.1	6.9%		7.0%
Raw Variance explained by items	= 7.6	21.7%		21.9%
Raw unexplained variance (total)	= 25.00	71.4%	100.0%	71.2%
Unexplned variance in 1st contrast	= 3.2	9.2%	12.9%	
Unexplned variance in 2nd contrast	= 2.8	8.1%	11.3%	
Unexplned variance in 3rd contrast	= 2.3	6.7%	9.4%	
Unexplned variance in 4th contrast	= 2.1	6.2%	8.6%	
Unexplned variance in 5th contrast	= 1.7	5.1%	7.2%	

Based on [Table 2](#), Raw Variance explained by measures shows a result of 28.6% and is included in the excellent category. The results of Unexplained Variance in the 1st to 5th contrast respectively show Unexplained Variance in the 1st contrast of 9.2%, Unexplained Variance in the 2nd contrast of 8.1%, Unexplained Variance in the 3rd contrast of 6.7%, Unexplained Variance in the 4th contrast of 6.2%, and Unexplained Variance in the 5th contrast of 5.1%.

Item Analysis

This item analysis includes item difficulty (item measure), item fit and item bias detection.

Item Level of Difficulty

The level of item difficulty can be examined from [Table 3](#), which is known to have an SD (standard deviation) value. Based on [Table 2](#), Raw Variance explained by measures shows a result of 28.6% and is included in the excellent category. The results of Unexplained Variance in the 1st to 5th contrast respectively show Unexplained Variance in the 1st contrast of 9.2%, Unexplained Variance in the 2nd contrast of 8.1%, Unexplained Variance in the 3rd contrast of 6.7%, Unexplained Variance in the 4th contrast of 6.2%, and Unexplained Variance in the 5th contrast of 5.1%.

Item Level of Difficulty

The level of item difficulty can be examined from [Table 3](#), which is known to have an SD (standard deviation) value of 1.45. This SD value, when combined with the average value of logit, then the level of difficulty of items can be grouped into challenging categories (> 1.45), complex categories (0.0 logit 1.45), easy categories (0.0 logit -1.45), and elementary categories (< -1.45). Thus, the score limit for the challenging category is > 1.45 . difficult category 0.0 - 1.45, easy category 0.0 - (-1.45), and elementary category < -1.45 . 1.45. This SD value, when combined with the average value of logit, then the level of difficulty of items can be grouped into challenging categories (> 1.45), complex categories (0.0 logit 1.45), easy categories (0.0 logit -1.45), and elementary categories (< -1.45). Thus, the score limit for the challenging category is > 1.45 . difficult category 0.0 - 1.45, easy category 0.0 - (-1.45), and elementary category < -1.45 .

Table 3. Difficulty Category

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL S.E.	INFIT		OUTFIT		EXACT	MATCH
					MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	OBS %	EXP %
mean	214.1	75.0	50.00	1.70	.99	-.08	1.00	-.04	57.0	53.8
s.d.	28.7	.0	7.69	.14	.28	1.70	.28	1.66	10.3	5.1

Item Conformity Level

In item suitability, the item interprets that the item functions usually to measure self-acceptance so that individuals have no misconceptions about the items studied based on data processing using Winstep in table 10.1, namely item fit order. Based on Winstep table 10.1, item fit order can be examined based on the OUTFIT MNSQ, OUTFIT ZSTD, and POINT MEASURE CORRELATION columns. The criteria for examining the suitability of item fit or item mismatch (misfit), namely the OUTFIT MNSQ value > 0.5 and < 1.5 ; the closer to 1, the better. OUTFIT ZSTD > -2.0 and $< +2.0$, the closer to 0, the better. POINT MEASURE CORRELATION > 0.4 and < 0.85 . Items can be reviewed for fit if they meet at least 1 of these three criteria.

Table 4. The Level of Suitability Item

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL S.E.	INFIT		OUTFIT		EXACT	MATCH
					MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	OBS %	EXP %
mean	214.1	75.0	50.00	1.70	.99	-.08	1.00	-.04	57.0	53.8
s.d.	28.7	.0	7.69	.14	.28	1.70	.28	1.66	10.3	5.1

For the first criterion based on the results of the OUTFIT MNSQ value, seven items meet, namely items 10, 4, 2, 11, 9, 21, 7, 6, 23, 19, 13, 16, 15, 22, 3, 17, 20, 25, 8, 24, 5, 12, 14, and 1. For the second criterion based on the results of the OUTFIT ZSTD value, six items meet, namely items 4, 2, 11, 9, 21, 7, 6, 23, 19, 13, 16, 15, 22, 3, 17, 20, 25, 8, 24, 5, and 12. For the third criterion, based on the results of the POINT MEASURE CORRELATION value, eight items meet, namely items 18, 10, 4, 11, 9, 21, 7, 6, 23, 19, 13, 16, 15, 22, 3, 17, 20, 25, 8, 24, 5, 12, 14, and 1. So, the conclusion is that no items do not fit (misfit).

Rating Scale Diagnostic

This diagnosis is carried out to determine whether participants understand the differences in answer choices on the self-acceptance scale 1, 2, 3, and 4. If the Observed Average and Andrich Threshold values rise in line with the respondents' level, the respondents understand the differences in responses. Table 5 shows the Andrich Threshold value in more detail.

Table 5. Rating Scale Diagnostic

Category	Observed		Obsvd	Sample	INFIT	OUTFIT	Andrich Threshold	Category Measure
Label	Count	%	Avrge	Expect	MNSQ	MNSQ		
1	1	129	-3.85	-5.58	1.16	1.22	NONE	(-26.99)
2	2	392	-.63	.64	.86	.84	-13.59	-10.00
3	3	977	7.05	6.76	.86	.86	-5.37	7.85
4	4	377	11.87	11.93	1.05	1.03	18.96	(30.57)

Table 5 shows suitability and equally increased on a scale of 1, 2, 3, and 4. The results show that the levels on the Self-Acceptance instrument correspond to students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor conditions in real terms.

Instrument Analysis

The detailed instrument analysis can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Instrument Analysis

	Mean	SD	Separation	Reliability	Cronbach Alpha
Person	0,52	3.05	0.94	0,47	0,56
Item	1.57	7.48	4.16	0,95	

The Person measure reflects the overall average of all users of the instrument. The fact that the Person means is higher than the item mean (where the item mean is 0.00 logit) suggests that participant abilities are typically more important than the degree of difficulty of the instrument items.

The Cronbach Alpha number, 0.56, falls into the excellent category and indicates the interaction between the Person and the objects. Additionally, the value of item reliability is 0.95, which indicates the high caliber of the instrument's items, including those in the excellent category, while the value of person reliability is 0.47, which indicates the consistency of respondents' responses, including those in the excellent category.

Table 7. Summary of Person Statistic

	TOTAL SCORE	MODEL			INFIT		OUTFIT	
		COUNT	MEASURE	ERROR	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD
Mean	71.4	25.0	55.67	2.92	1.01	-.21	1.00	-.25
s.d.	5.4	.0	4.49	.14	.57	1.89	.57	1.88
Max.	83.0	25.0	66.53	3.33	3.02	4.93	3.14	5.07
Min.	58.0	25.0	45.24	2.69	.30	-3.42	.29	-3.46
real rmse	3.25	true SD	3.05	separation	.94	person reliability		.47
model rmse	2.92	true SD	3.37	separation	1.15	person reliability		.57
s.e. of person mean = .52								

Table 8. Summary of Item Statistic

	TOTAL SCORE	MODEL			INFIT		OUTFIT	
		COUNT	MEASURE	ERROR	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD
Mean	214.1	75.0	50.00	1.70	.99	-.08	1.00	-.04
s.d.	29.3	.0	7.85	.14	.29	1.73	.28	1.69
Max.	253.0	75.0	67.17	1.95	1.78	3.72	1.76	3.66
Min.	144.0	75.0	38.20	1.50	.57	-2.87	.56	-2.95
real rmse	1.80	true sd	7.48	separation	4.16	item reliability		.95
model rmse	1.70	true sd	7.50	separation	4.41	item reliability		.95
s.e. of person mean = 1.57								

Other data in Tables 7 and 8 that can be used are INFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ, both in the Person and Item tables. Based on the Person table, the average values of INFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ are 1.01 and 1.00, respectively. Meanwhile, based on the Item

table, the average values of INFIT MNSQ and OUTFIT MNSQ are 0.99 and 1.00, respectively. The criteria are that the closer to 1, the better because the ideal value is 1. Thus, the average Person and Item are close to the ideal criteria.

Meanwhile, related to INFIT ZSTD and OUTFIT ZSTD, the average values for Person are -0.21 and -0.25, respectively. In contrast, the INFIT ZSTD and OUTFIT ZSTD values for items are -0.08 and -0.04, respectively. The ZSTD value is 0; the closer to 0, the better. Thus, the quality of the Person and Item is good.

The division or grouping of Persons and Items is the last topic. A student's Self-Acceptance instrument's item sets separation demonstrates how evenly it spreads over the logit ability range. The instrument is better because it can reach people with high to low levels of ability, with more individual separation between them. Item separation, meanwhile, demonstrates how evenly distributed the sample being measured is along a linear scale. The higher the item separation, the better. This index helps characterize the significance of the construct being assessed.

Tables 7 and 8 show that a Person and an object are separated by 0.94 and 4.16, respectively. The quality of the Person and instrument is better the higher the separation value. The formula $H = (4 \times \text{separation}) + 1/3$ allows a more detailed calculation of the separation value. Therefore, a person's separation value is 1.58, rounded to 2, whereas an item's separation value is 5.88, rounded to 6. The research participants have diverse abilities that can be divided into two groups. Meanwhile, the difficulty level of the items spread into six groups ranging from the easiest to the most challenging group.

DISCUSSION

The results of data analysis show that the one-dimensionality test on the self-acceptance instrument is in the excellent category, with the value of Raw Variance explained by measures 28.6%. In comparison, the results of Unexplained Variance in 1st to 5th contrast each showed results of less than 15%. The one-dimensionality test shows that the self-acceptance instrument has been measured clearly and validly. Un dimensionality is the ability of a test item to measure one ability, attribute, construct, or skill. The instrument has described each dimension and aspect of self-acceptance, which includes: 1) One aspect of self-awareness is the capacity to feel, which is characterized by the following traits: a) The aspect of belief is the feeling ability that individuals have in believing and accepting everything given to them in life; b) The aspect of accepting praise and reproach positively is the feeling ability that individuals have in responding to praise and reproach given by others with positive actions and attitudes; c) The aspect of self-excellence is the thinking ability that individuals have in knowing their strengths and can develop them positively. 2) The attributes listed below show the dimension of accepting circumstances, responding well with a sense of satisfaction and pride, and continuing to work toward improvement: a) The aspect of responsibility for behavior is the capacity to act in accepting responsibility for one's behavior; b) The ability to feel that people have in receiving criticism honestly and accepting faults without passing judgment on others or themselves is one part of accepting criticism objectively.

This study's participants were high school students located in Lembang, West Bandung Regency, West Java Province. Positive self-awareness and negative self-evaluation have an impact on one's level of self-acceptance (Bernard, 2013). Other elements influencing self-acceptance include self-acceptance, realistic expectations, the absence of emotional distress, social support, self-concept, parenting, and self-adjustment (Hurlock, 2013). Individuals with positive self-awareness, such as understanding themselves, having a self-concept, and being realistic, can make a person more open and accept what God has destined for his life. This is also in line with Bernard's (2013)

statement that self-awareness is an appreciation of positive characteristics and potential development (personality, cultural characteristics, talents, religion, family).

Item analysis is an analysis of the level of suitability of items and the level of difficulty of items. Based on the results of the item appropriate level analysis, which specifies the item's purpose, whether it functions normally or not, it is known that item numbers 1 to 25 meet at least 1 of the 3 Item Fit criteria. All items usually function, and there are no misfit items. It is known that there are 25 items in the challenging category, namely item numbers 10, 21, 8, 23, 11, 13, 19, 6, 7, 16, 22, 25, 18, 1, 12, 14, 5, 20, 17, 2, 24, 4, 15, and 9.

The analysis results show that participants understand the differences in answer choices in Self-Acceptance scales 1, 2, 3, and 4. Based on the Rating Scale Diagnostic table data, the Andrich Threshold value increases according to the level. Developing a conceptualization of self-acceptance follows the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor developmental stages of early adolescence, which are as follows: 1) In terms of cognition, in the early stages, adolescents are looking for new values and energy and compare normality with peers of the same sex (Jackson et al, 2021); 2) From an affective perspective, early adolescents feel confused and begin to adapt to the changes that occur to them; 3) Adolescents experience rapid physical growth in psychomotor development, enabling early adolescents to carry out heavy and complex activities. However, occasionally, this is not accompanied by competent emotional control. Difficulties in adapting will result in a lack of self-acceptance of all changes that occur to them in the future.

The instrument analysis results show that participants' ability is typically more important than instrument item difficulty. Based on the Person measure value of 0.52, it is more significant than the average item (where the average item is 0.00 logit). According to Oliver and Bennett's (2020) theoretical study findings, the definition of self-acceptance is the ability to view oneself in all the intricacies and dynamics of life with kindness and compassion. Although individuals recognize their limitations and the complexity of life, it does not prevent them from accepting themselves unconditionally (Ellis, 2019). Optimism leads to a healthier life rather than feeling pessimistic and worrying about things out of control.

The interaction between the Person and items is in the excellent category with a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.56. Furthermore, person reliability is in the excellent category with a value of 0.47, which indicates an indicator of the consistency of respondents' answers. Item reliability as an indicator of quality items in the instrument includes an excellent category with a value of 0.95. The average of Person and Item is close to the ideal criteria, and the quality of Person and Item is good.

CONCLUSION

This study validated the development of the Self-Acceptance Instrument. The Cronbach Alpha value shows that the interaction between respondents and items is in the excellent category. Person reliability shows the consistency of respondents' answers in the good category, and item reliability shows the quality of items in the excellent category. All 25 items meet at least 1 of the 3 Item Fit criteria, which indicates that the items usually function and are suitable for measuring student self-acceptance. The development of this Self-Acceptance Instrument is still limited to the number of respondents, which impacts data stability and the number of items that impact student understanding of the instrument. A larger sample size is required for future studies to obtain more pertinent data, and redesigned instrument items must be used to achieve elevated levels of validity and item reliability. Some of the items on this instrument still use general concepts and

contexts, so they are not specific to the intended aspects. The solution for future research is to develop self-acceptance instruments that are more directed at students' affective, cognitive, and psychomotor aspects.

REFERENCE

- Bennett, M. F., Oliver, K. L., Regan, B. M., Bellows, S. T., Schneider, A. L., Rafehi, H., ... & Bahlo, M. (2020). Familial adult myoclonic epilepsy type 1 SAMD12 TTTCA repeat expansion arose 17,000 years ago and is present in Sri Lankan and Indian families. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, 28(7), 973-978. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-020-0606-z>
- Bergemann, N. (1988). Self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others an Afrikaans Version of The Berger Scales. *Tydskr Sielk*, 104-108.
- Berger, E. M. (1952). The Relation between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 778-782. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124638801800306>
- Bernard, M. E., Vernon, A., Terjesen, M., & Kurasaki, R. (2013). Self-Acceptance in the Education and Counseling of Young People. In *Bernard The Strength of Self-Acceptance* (hal. 155-192). New York: Springer.
- Bond, F. W. et al. (2011). Preliminary Psychometric Properties of The Acceptance and Action Questionnaire-II: A Revised Measure of Psychological Inflexibility and Experiential Avoidance. *Behavior Therapy*, 676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2011.03.007>
- Chamberlain, J. M., & Haaga, D. A. (2001). Unconditional Self-Acceptance and Psychological Health. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 163-176.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative (Fourth Edition)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Crowne, D. P., Stephens, M. W., & Kelly, R. (1961). The Validity and Equivalence of Tests of Self-Acceptance. *The Journal of Psychology*, 101-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1961.9916462>
- Denmark, K. L. (1973). Self-Acceptance and Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Extension*, 6-12.
- Durm, M. W., & Glaze, P. E. (2001). Construct Validity for Self-Acceptance and Fear of Negative Evaluation. *Psychological Reports*, 386.
- Ellis, A. (2019). Early theories and practices of rational emotive behavior therapy and how they have been augmented and revised during the last three decades. *Advances in REBT: Theory, practice, research, measurement, prevention and promotion*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93118-0_1
- Fey, W. F. (1955). Acceptance by Others and its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others: A Revaluation. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 274-276. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046876>
- Harter, S., & Pike, R. (1984). The Pictorial Scale of Perceived Competence and Social Acceptance for Young Children. *Child Development*, 1969-1982. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129772>
- Ino-Oka, H., & Matsui, T. (1977). An Extended Use of the Instrumentality Theory of Attitude for Obtaining Self-Acceptance Measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 124-126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.1.124>
- Jackson, E. F., Bussey, K., & Myers, E. (2021). Encouraging gender conformity or sanctioning nonconformity? Felt pressure from parents, peers, and the self. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 50, 613-627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020->

- Lai, J., Zhang, R., Hong, M., & Li, N. (2022). Development and validation of the Nurse's Workplace Mental Health Questionnaire. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 9(4), 521-528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2022.09.004>
- Levin, M. E. et al. (2014). The Acceptance and Action Questionnaire-Stigma (AAQ-S): Developing a Measure of Psychological Flexibility with Stigmatizing Thoughts. *Journal of Contextual Behavior Science*, 21-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2013.11.003>
- Lu, Q., Wang, B., Zhang, R., Wang, J., Sun, F., & Zou, G. (2022). Relationship between emotional intelligence, self-acceptance, and positive coping styles among Chinese psychiatric nurses in Shandong. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 837917. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.837917>
- Ma, Y., & Siu, A. F. Y. (2020). Dispositional mindfulness and mental health in Hong Kong college students: The mediating roles of decentering and self-acceptance. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 72(2), 156-164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12269>
- Mearns, J. (1989). Measuring Self-Acceptance: Expectancy for Success vs Self-Esteem. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 390-397. <https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679>
- Merriam, S. B. (2017). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NCI.0b013e3181edd9b1>
- Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., ... & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during Covid-19 remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 5911. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155911>
- Nepo, M. (2016). *The Self-Acceptance Project*. Colorado: Sounds True. Colorado: Sounds True.
- Omwake, K. T. (1954). The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 443-446. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0058104>
- Sürücü, L., & Maslakci, A. (2020). Validity and reliability in quantitative research. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, 8(3), 2694-2726. <https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i8.1540>
- Szajna, B. (1994). Software Evaluation and Choice: Predictive Validation of the Technology Acceptance Instrument. *MIS Quarterly*, 319-324. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249621>