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The self-concepts of 232 fourth and fifth grade students in nine classroom groups were measured by use of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI). Each student completed the SEI, and the classroom teacher for each student completed the SEI for the students who were the subjects of the study. The subjects were from a medium-sized urban school district and from a lower or middle class socioeconomic background.

Data from the administration of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory are reported as five separate scores: (a) general concept, (b) social-self-peers, (c) home-parents, (d) school-academic, and (e) total concept.

Data for the subjects were aggregated and t tests were used to test eight research questions posed for this study. The major tests were for differences in self-esteem as reported by male students when compared to female students and differences in self-concept as perceived by the students when their perceptions were compared to teacher perceptions. An alpha level of .05 was used as the level of statistical significance.

The findings of this study are similar to findings reported in research studies reviewed in the design of this study. Female
students had higher self-concepts than male students in two areas—school-academic and total concept—while no significant differences were found in other areas. Teachers' perceptions of student self-concept were higher than the self-concept reported by students. Differences in teacher ratings and student ratings were statistically significant. The only exception was school-academic self-concept of female students.

The findings of this study failed to support the assumption made in the study that teacher perceptions of student self-concept would be statistically similar to student self ratings of self-concept.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Self-esteem theory postulates that individuals have a need for positive self-esteem which is satisfied by the approval they receive from others and is frustrated by disapproval. Theories about self-esteem assume that the individual has a need to enhance self-evaluation and to increase, maintain, or confirm feelings of worth, effectiveness, and self-satisfaction (Jones, 1973; Samuels, 1977). These feelings may be manifested with respect to a particular aspect of self-evaluation or to global feelings. Individuals respond favorably to positive evaluation of self, which is assumed to satisfy esteem needs, and to respond unfavorably to negative evaluations of self, which would frustrate the esteem needs. Therefore, low self-esteem people would respond more favorably to negative evaluations as compared to high self-esteem individuals. This is based on the assumption that low self-esteem people have greater need for esteem approval of others and are more frustrated by disapproval of others than are high self-esteem people (Samuels, 1977, p. 65).

If self-esteem needs are met, the low self-esteem person will respond to others. If teachers can provide experiences to enhance self-esteem for those children who lack positive self-esteem, the children will respond and presumably grow toward more positive
self-feelings (Samuels, 1977). Evidence has been presented that self-development is open to positive change over time. There exists a dynamic process of cognitive-affective integration and differentiation of meaning of self over time (Horrocks & Jackson, 1972; Sprigle, 1980).

The global self-concept which a child has developed before exposure to the formal school program forms the foundation for future self-concept development. What occurs during the elementary school years, and particularly through the primary grades, may add to or damage this foundation, exerting lasting effects on the child. The home and the school are the two primary influences in development of the child's self-concept (Felker, 1974; Horrocks & Jackson, 1972; Thomas, 1973).

While studying self-esteem in children, McCandless (1967) observed that parents set the stage, and the play is acted out with peers and bosses. The elementary school child is very vulnerable according to Hamachek (1975). The child is very impressionable and believes, with few exceptions, the feedback received from peers and adults. The elementary child accepts these evaluations made by teachers and parents without questioning or understanding them. Hamachek concluded that feedback concerning one's performance during the elementary school years is likely to have a greater influence than it would have in later years. This feedback is readily absorbed into a developing self-system which is still developing, incomplete, and more open to input and change. The elementary child's self-system is immature.
Children do not have a good framework from which to judge other person's evaluation of them. The young child may not be able to distinguish between negative reactions to his products or performance and negative reactions to him as a person. The young are less able to understand or process negative feedback (Samuels, 1977).

Research findings have been consistent in showing a relationship between self-concept and academic achievement; positive self-concept is related to high achievement and low self-concept is related to poor achievement (Brookover, Shailer, & Paterson, 1964; Coopersmith, 1967; Lecky, 1945; Shaw & Alves, 1963; Walsh, 1956).

The role of the school in self-esteem development, with teachers as the main agents, is crucial (Stanwyck, 1972). Stanwyck concluded that schools do not always enhance self-esteem; he described elementary school children as having difficulty in maintaining positive self-concepts after they enter the school situation (p. 83).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the difference between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of these children. The male and female reported self-concepts were examined for any differences. The children's self-concepts and the teachers' perceptions of the children were recorded on a self-esteem instrument. The target population was fourth and fifth grade students in a medium sized urban school district.
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Rationale of the Research

Positive self-esteem can motivate an individual toward new experiences and interactions with others with the expectancy of success. The fear of failure or the perceived probability of success is related to self-esteem, since low-esteem may be symptomatic of both fear of failure tendencies and perceived low probability of success in a valued domain. The fear of failure oriented person would be afraid of competition and evaluation, because failure would be painful to the individual (Antes & Antes, 1976).

Compared to children with adequate self-esteem, the child with low self-esteem will be less confident, will approach each new task cautiously, and will be less likely to be persistent in meeting academic demands. Consequently, the child is less likely to receive rewards and self-confidence may be lowered even further. Lack of self-confidence often is associated with anxiety, which can lead, in turn, to further failure (Epps, 1970).

Effective people perceive themselves as being "okay" (Palomares & Ball, 1974). In other words, they have a healthy degree of self-esteem and a feeling of mastery, or self-confidence. They try new challenges and do not strongly fear failures. These two human qualities, positive self-concept and effective behavior, interact and reinforce each other as an individual's personality develops and matures.

Characteristics of an effective human being are (a) striving towards a sense of identity and authenticity, (b) increasing degrees
of responsibility and independence, (c) having the ability to reason and solve problems, (d) being able to communicate effectively with others, (e) showing concern for others, (f) being motivated towards self-growth, and (g) being enthusiastic about living. These characteristics of the effective human being reinforce the importance of positive self-esteem (Koepke, 1976).

Self-concept is a dynamic circular force in human lives. People who are important to individuals influence what the individuals think of themselves; their everyday experiences suggest whether they are competent or incompetent, good or bad, worthy or unworthy. They receive information and attitudes from all sides at once, as if they were in the center of an arena (Felker, 1974).

The elementary school experience is important in the process of becoming a self-actualizing person; however, it may become a frightening, frustrating, and anxiety producing experience for a young child. As children grow and develop they learn and interact with the external world, and also within the self. Both areas are important for cognitive growth, personal happiness, and public behavior. If cognitive skills are emphasized and affective growth ignored, the child may be subjected to a highly competitive "weeding" process that can seriously erode the child's feelings of personal adequacy. If affective growth is emphasized and cognitive growth neglected, the child may fail to develop levels of knowledge and skill requisite for future development or performance. In either case the child can be exposed to unnecessary frustrations and anxieties. Institutions interested in enhancing human potential should be concerned about
facilitating continual growth in both cognition and affect (Landry, 1974).

Positive self-esteem development during the elementary school years may be more difficult for boys than girls. Teachers may be more accepting and warm toward those students who are industrious, respectful, friendly, and able to adjust readily to the demands of the classroom. For this reason, the boisterous and assertive qualities for which a boy has been positively reinforced as a preschooler may be the cause of negative feedback as he enters the elementary school. Boys often find the adjustment to school difficult and, compared to girls, are probably subjected to more negative feedback in the classroom concerning their personal qualities and behavior (Hetherington & Ross, 1975).

Researchers have identified teachers as "significant others" in the development of school age children. Therefore, a measure of teacher perceptions of a child's self-esteem, as well as the child's reported self-esteem, might provide further insight into the role of self-esteem in academic achievement. Identification of the child's self-esteem and the teacher's perception of the child's self-esteem might facilitate the development of ways to develop positive self-esteem in children. Observing whether there is a difference in self-esteem between boys and girls in elementary school might lead to efforts to create curriculum and instruction innovations designed to meet the specific interests of individuals.
Questions

In order to examine the differences of a child's reported self-concept and the teacher's reported conception of the child, and to examine the differences in boys' and girls' reported self-concept, the following questions were developed:

1. What differences, if any, exist between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the children in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school-academic?

2. What differences, if any, exist between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the children on the basis of total self-concept on a self-esteem inventory?

3. What differences, if any, exist between the females' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the females in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school-academic?

4. What differences, if any, exist between the females' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the females on the basis of total self-concept on a self-esteem inventory?

5. What differences, if any, exist between the males' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the males in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school-academic?
6. What differences, if any, exist between the males' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the males on the basis of total self-concept on a self-esteem inventory?

7. What differences, if any, exist between females' reported self-concept and males' reported self-concept in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school academic?

8. What differences, if any, exist between females' reported self-concept and males' reported self-concept on the basis of total self-concept scores on a self-esteem inventory?

Assumptions

The following assumptions underlie the study:

1. Every child forms a self-image.

2. The children included in the sample were capable mentally and physically of understanding and responding to the instrument.

3. If accurate assessment is made of children's self-concept, specific affective learning objectives can be identified and methods systematically developed to enhance self-concept.

Definition of Terms

Affective growth: "Pertaining to or resulting from emotions or feelings rather than from thoughts" (American Heritage Dictionary, 1975, p. 21). "Pertaining to affect, feelings, or affection" (English & English, 1958, p. 15).
Children's reported self-concept: Self-concept statements which a child confirms or denies on the Coopersmith (1967) Self-Esteem Inventory.

Cognitive: "A generic term for any process whereby an organism becomes aware of or obtains knowledge of an object" (English & English, 1958, p. 92). "The mental process or faculty by which knowledge is acquired" (American Heritage Dictionary, 1975, p. 259).

Self: "An abstraction that an individual develops about the attributes, capacities, objects, and activities which he or she possesses and pursues. This abstraction is represented by the symbol 'me' which is a person's idea of himself or herself to himself or herself" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 20).

Self-concept: "The sum total of the view which an individual has of himself is unique and to varying degrees is different from the view that anyone else has about him or her" (Felker, 1974, p. 12).

An organized configuration of perceptions of the self, which are admissible to awareness. The self-concept is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities, the precepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment, the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects, and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence (Borgatta & Lambert, 1968, p. 116).

Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI): A self-report instrument designed and tested for reliability and validity by Coopersmith. The instrument is reported fully in The Antecedents of Self-Esteem by Coopersmith (1967).
Teacher's reported perception of children: The teacher conceptualizes statements the children will confirm or deny on the Self-Esteem Inventory and marks the instrument accordingly.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are as follows:

Temporal limitation: The self is subject to change; therefore, the self-concept of each subject reported in this study is the concept of that particular individual at the moment the individual was tested.

Geographical limitation: This investigation was confined to a study of fourth and fifth grade children enrolled in four elementary schools in an urban school district. The schools were chosen to represent a cross-section of the school population of this system. Cultural differences may have some influence on the results.

Methodological limitation: The study of the self-concept of elementary school children imposes limitations when the components are measured by paper and pencil test.

Summary

According to self-esteem theory, individuals have a need for positive self-esteem, which is satisfied by the approval they receive from others and is frustrated by their disapproval (Coopersmith, 1967; Felker, 1974; Samuels, 1977). Evidence has been given supporting the idea that the home and school are the two primary influences in influencing the child's self-concept (Felker, 1974; Thomas, 1973).
Therefore, the major thrust of this study was to examine the differences in students' reported self-concept and the reported perception of their teacher. The difference in male and female reported self-concept was also examined.

In Chapter II the related literature is reviewed. The most pertinent research in the area of self-esteem is examined. Details of the research procedures used to select the samples, select the instrument, collect the data, and analyze the data are found in Chapter III. Analysis and interpretation of the test data collected as a result of administering to the students the Coopersmith (1967) Self-Esteem Inventory are in Chapter IV. In Chapter V there is a summary of the investigations, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
The idea of self-esteem is not a new one. Self-esteem has been described by Samuels (1977) as the evaluative sector of the self-concept. Individuals who have high esteem respect and consider themselves worthy. If self-esteem is low, individuals lack respect for themselves and believe they are incapable, insignificant, unsuccessful, and unworthy (Coopersmith, 1967). According to Bibring (1953), self-esteem is:

(a) the wish to be worthy, to be loved, to be appreciated, not to be inferior or unworthy; (b) the wish to be strong, superior, great, secure, not to be weak and insecure; and (c) the wish to be good, to be loving, not to be aggressive, hateful, and destructive. (p. 34)

Self-esteem is related to successful functioning in learning and in later adjustments to life. Parents and teachers should be extremely sensitive to the attitudes they express toward children. Children should be referred to with warmth, appreciation, encouragement, and confidence rather than with criticism and disappointment (Symonds, 1951). The fact that concepts of self are reflections of the attitudes expressed toward a person by others indicates the power that parents and teachers have in determining the kinds of selves children will develop.
Definition and Interpretation

Before examining research findings about self-esteem, the meaning of the words should be examined. According to Coopersmith (1967), self-esteem (self-concept) refers to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to self. Self-esteem expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself or herself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. Self-esteem is a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes individuals hold toward themselves and is a subjective experience which the individuals convey to others by verbal reports and other overt expressive behavior. Children reach certain conclusions about what sort of person they are, or more precisely they develop certain vague hunches from the way other people behave toward them. As time goes on these hunches fit together fairly well because some are frequently reinforced by experiences, and others get little reemphasis and fall away. People are motivated, throughout life, by the desire to behave in a manner consistent with the symbolic role they have accepted as "myself" (Gellerman, 1963).

Relationship Between Self-Concept and Achievement

Lecky (1945), one of the first investigators to relate self-esteem to school achievement, found that some children made the same number of spelling errors on each page regardless of the varying difficulties of the words; he concluded that their responses were due
to how they perceived they could spell rather than their actual spelling ability. In an investigation conducted by Brookover et al. (1964), a sample of 1,050 seventh-grade students was studied and a significant relationship between self-esteem of ability and grade point average, even when measured intelligence was controlled, was noted.

Two groups of middle-class, bright boys in elementary school classrooms—one a high achieving group, the other a low achieving group—were compared by Walsh (1956). Subjects used boy dolls to express feelings. Walsh found that low achievers consistently portrayed the boy dolls as being restricted in actions. They were unable to express their feelings appropriately; and they felt criticized, rejected, or isolated. The teachers agreed with the results of the experiments in 90% of the cases.

Reading, an achievement area that is a significant skill essential for success, has been found to be correlated with self-esteem in many studies. A study of Spanish speaking elementary school children found that self-esteem was positively related to verbal skills in both English and Spanish (Green & Zirkel, 1971). Considering how important reading achievement is in school performance, Wattenberg and Clifford (1964) said that self-concept is a better prediction of reading achievement than ability measures. This positive relationship between reading achievement and self-esteem is found in both white and black populations and in groups with learning problems of a serious nature (Caplin, 1969; Gorlow, Butler, & Guthrie, 1963).
Children who have high self-esteem often show independence and outspokenness, while low self-esteem children are often more conforming and passive. High esteem children may be more difficult to work with in an educational setting than low esteem children who are more overtly submissive. Individuals with high self-esteem feel capable of coping with adversity and competent enough to achieve success; individuals with low self-esteem feel helpless, vulnerable, and inadequate (Coopersmith, 1967).

The successful student sees himself as self-confident, self-accepting, and having a positive concept. Purkey (1970) found that high achievers rated themselves higher on personal competence, academic, and social competence than did low achievers. Also noted was that once a child formed a negative self-image of himself or herself as a learner, it was very difficult for a teacher or any instructor to modify that self-concept. The prevention of that negative self-concept as a learner is important.

A considerable proportion of what students learn is dependent on their decision to learn. These decisions are dependent on their conceptions of what is appropriate for self and what they think they are able to learn. The students' conception of self are acquired in interactions with others in their social systems. Self-esteem of ability is a "threshold" variable. This means that a self-concept of ability is only a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for achievement—for example, if a person does not think he or she is able to learn an activity he or she will not organize his or her activities to learn; however, if he or she thinks he or she can
learn, he or she may still choose not to learn and to direct his or her attention elsewhere. Self-concept accounts for a significant portion of achievement independent of measured intelligence; socioeconomic status; educational aspirations; and the expectations of family, friends, and teachers. In this study it was found that a significant proportion of students with high self-concepts of ability achieved at a relatively lower level (approximately 50%); practically none of the students with low self-concepts of ability achieved at a high level (Brookover & Erickson, 1969).

A concern of Samuels (1977) was that most studies were done after the beginning of the kindergarten experience. Therefore, it is difficult to determine which is cause and which is effect, since failure in school could develop negative self-esteem instead of the reverse. A few studies of beginning kindergarten children have evaluated the effect of early childhood self-esteem on learning. In a study relating self-esteem to school readiness in a group of lower-class black children, aged 3.9 to 4.9, Flynn (1974) found that self-concept accounted for a significant percentage of achievement variance for both sexes. Ozehosky and Clark (1971) reported that the self-esteem of a sample of 100 children was related to achievement in kindergarten, not only as measured on self-esteem tests but also as reported by teachers judging the children's self-estees. Beginning children's self-esteem in the competence and self-worth dimensions as well as their intelligence was measured by Wattenberg and Clifford (1964). Two and a half years later these same subjects' progress in reading was determined and their self-esteem measures were repeated.
The measured self-esteem at the kindergarten level was predictive of reading achievement 2.5 years later, but was not significantly related to mental test scores.

In 1967, Irwin studied the self-reports of students and reported significant relationships between reported self-esteem and academic achievements. He reported that a positive conception of one's self as a person is more important than striving to get ahead or enthusiasm for study and going to school. A positive self-concept is a central factor when considering scholastic performance.

How the Successful Student Views Self

A number of studies have verified that the successful student is one who is likely to see himself or herself in positive ways. In an investigation of factors of achievement of students, Gowan (1960) found that achievers are characterized by self-confidence, self-acceptance, and a positive self-concept. After completing a study of intermediate grade students, Farls (1967) reported that high achieving boys and girls reported higher self-concepts in general than low achieving boys and girls. Davidson and Greenberg (1967) investigated successful learners among lower-class children and the correlates of school achievement within this group on three different distinct aspects of the self—personal competence, academic competence, and social competence; the high achievers rated themselves significantly better than low achievers.

Three projects (1962-1968) completed by Brookover, LePere, Hamachek, Thomas, and Erickson (1965) represented continuous phases
of a 6-year study of the relation of the self-concept of academic ability to school achievement among students in one school class while in the 7th through 12th grades. Among their findings were that the reported self-concept of ability is significantly related to achievement among both boys and girls, this relationship persists even when intelligence is factored out, that achievement in school is limited by the student's concept of his ability and that self-concept of ability is a better prediction of success in school than is overall self-concept. The investigation also found that students who report low self-concepts rarely perform at an above-average level; a significant proportion of those who profess high self-concepts of ability do not perform at comparable levels. This led Brookover et al. (1965) to hypothesize that confidence in one's academic ability is a necessary but not sufficient, factor in determining scholastic success.

Describing the successful students would seem to show that they have a high opinion of themselves and are more optimistic about their future performance. They have confidence in their general ability and in their ability as a student. Information from numerous studies supports the belief that successful students can generally be characterized as having positive self-concepts and tending to excel in feelings of worth as individuals (Wojcik, 1974).

How the Unsuccessful Student Views Self

Students who think of themselves in a negative way and learn to attach negative terms to themselves are likely to have a difficult
time viewing any experience as being good or positive. The self-concept is a filtering and coloring mechanism in human experience. If it is negative, everything which is seen in the work takes on a negative hue. The development of the self-concept is going on when other learning experiences seem to be in the foreground. As children learn language they are learning a set of words which provide the pool from which they can choose words to apply to themselves. If they learn only negative words, they will use them on themselves and others (Felker, 1974).

Several studies have been conducted concerning the unsuccessful student. Most of these studies have focused on the "underachiever." The underachiever is described as the student whose classroom performance tends to be below his or her demonstrated aptitudes as measured by mental ability tests. This is the student who has the ability to succeed in school but who, because of nonintellectual factors, does not perform up to expectations (Durr & Schwartz, 1964). Shaw and Alves (1963) noted that underachievers have a more negative self-concept than achievers and demonstrate less mature behavior than achieving peers. A study of underachievers (Goldberg, 1960) in school in Grades 9 through 12 was done using a list of characteristics and abilities called "How I am." The underachiever was found to perceive himself or herself as less able to fulfill required tasks, less eager, less eager to learn, less confident, and less ambitious. Investigating differences between achieving and underachieving elementary school children, Durr and Schwartz (1964) reported that underachievers were more withdrawn and tend to lack self-reliance, a sense
of personal worth, and a feeling of belonging. They also reported finding behavioral immaturity and feelings of inadequacy.

Effect of Teachers on Child's Self-Concept

The early years of a child's life, both at home and in school, are seen as the most important and influential in the development of the child's self-concept. How children are treated by significant persons in their lives and the successes and failures that they encounter all participate in the development of their notion of identity and worth (Ausuble, 1952).

Davidson and Lang (1960) concluded from their study of elementary children that the teacher's feelings of acceptance and approval are communicated to the child and perceived by him or her as positive appraisals. They reported that it is likely that these appraisals encourage the children to seek further teacher approval by achieving well and behaving in a manner acceptable to their teacher. Children who achieve well and behave satisfactorily are bound to please their teacher. The teacher in turn communicates positive feelings towards the children, thus reinforcing their desire to be good students. To ascertain which of these variables serves as the primary determiner is difficult. They seem to reinforce each other (Davidson & Lang, 1960). The implication is that it is essential for teachers to communicate positive feelings to their children and thus not only strengthen their positive self-appraisals but also stimulate their growth academically as well as interpersonally. A study done by Spaulding (1954) found that there was a significant relationship
between an elementary student's positive self-concept as reported and the degree to which teachers are calm, accepting, supporting, and facilitative, and a negative relationship between a student's self-concept and teachers who are threatening, grim, and sarcastic.

A teacher's classroom interactions are critically consequential. In his or her classroom interaction, a teacher not only teaches a child how he or she should perceive himself or herself, but a teacher may also teach an entire class how they should perceive the child in question (Davidson & Lang, 1960).

There are theories indicating that if individuals think well of themselves, they are likely to think well of others. Teachers' attitudes (Combs & Soper, 1963) towards themselves may be more important than their techniques, practices, or materials. A study by Aspy (1969) supports the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the level of teacher self-concept and the cognitive growth of the students. The study pointed up the need for assessing teachers by other than intellective indices. Teachers must possess positive and realistic attitudes toward self if they are to be able to reach out, to like and respect their students (Purkey, 1970). In 1954, Omwake studied a group of male and female adults and concluded that persons who reject themselves tend to maintain low opinions of others.

According to Samuels (1977), the self-fulfilling prophecy is based on the assumption that children will behave as others expect them to behave. Since behavior reflects self-feelings, the self-fulfilling prophecy is a description of how our self-concept is affected by significant others. That is, individuals see themselves
and act as others treat them and expect them to act.

Teachers were told that an experimental group of children actually chosen at random were "spurters" in a study done by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). The children so designated were compared to a control group not so labeled and were found to show higher achievement at the end of the year. In reality there was no difference between the two groups at the beginning of the experiment. Thorndike (1969) questioned the adequacy of the data gathering and data analysis and the appropriateness of the conclusions based on the study. He said that it might have been correct to conclude that a self-fulfilling prophecy existed but the study did not substantiate it.

A study of first grade children by Brophy and Good (1970) found that teachers were more likely to stay with high achieving children than with low expected achievement children after they failed to answer an initial question, give a clue, or ask another question. They tended to call on someone else when the low achieving child failed to answer. Differences in teacher feedback were also reported. Teachers failed to give feedback more often to low achievement children than high achievement students, and high achievement children were more likely to be praised and less likely to be criticized. Rowe (1969) gave evidence that teachers waited significantly longer for a response after questioning a high achieving student than a low achieving one. When teachers are trained to increase the waiting time, the students in low groups were found to speak up more often—sometimes enough to change the teacher's expectations.
The self-fulfilling prophecy is not supported in all research. Fleming and Auttomen (1971) reported that there was no correlation between teachers' expectations and students' academic performance. They stated that in studies where experimenters persuaded the teachers that children had certain potential (which may not have been based on reality and where teacher differences were not controlled), the self-fulfilling prophecy was not supported. The teachers had to believe the experimenter's information was accurate.

A number of psychologists have reported that children see themselves as they are seen by the "significant" people in their lives. During the earliest years these are mother and father. When the children go to school, the teachers with whom they come in contact may be included. Walsh (1956) said that if a teacher is to help children not have distorted images of themselves the teacher must first be "significant" to the children. This implies a relationship and if it is to be a helpful, satisfying relationship, the teacher must be able to see the children as adequate persons and show them that. Moustakos's (1966) survey showed that most teachers want to meet the student on a significant level, and most teachers want to feel they make a difference.

The Sears Self-Concept Inventory was used by Sears and Sherman (1964) to measure 10 areas of concern in self-concept for fifth and sixth graders. These areas were physical ability, mental ability, social relations with the same and opposite sex, work habits, social virtues, happy qualities, and school subjects. In all of these areas of self-concept, the child's ability, how he or she perceives his or
her ability, and how significant others perceived his or her ability were found to be important. The teacher-child relationship was significant in how a child perceived himself or herself. Teacher approval and reward was related to self-esteem development, and the interaction between the teacher personality and child personality was important. Sears (1970) also reported that the reputation the children held in the teacher's eyes provided an indirect measure of the environmental condition that they met in school. The environmental conditions included the people with whom the children interacted. The teacher's behavior towards the children also affected the peers' reactions to them. These peer perceptions of the children influenced the way they were treated by them.

A basic assumption of the theory of the self-concept is that individuals behave according to their beliefs. Teachers' beliefs about themselves and their students are crucial factors in determining their effectiveness in the classroom. Evidence indicates that the teachers' attitudes toward themselves and others are as important, if not more so, than his or her techniques, practices, and materials (Wojcik, 1974).

The theories of self-esteem have been reexamined and challenged by Lerner (1985). She stated:

Sigmund Freud gave vivid descriptions of the long struggle of each human individual to move beyond the exclusive self love of childhood and develop into a fully functioning adult, capable of loving others, and of doing productive work. The heart of the struggle as Freud described it, was to get out from under the seductive domination of the pleasure principle, accepting the reality principle instead, and acting in accord with it. (p. 13).
This is interpreted by Lerner (1985) to suggest that learning to reject the impulse to seek immediate gratification—focusing only on what feels good now—is a key step in this process. What feels good now is success, instant and effortless, in a fantasy world where the self is omnipotent, and all things exist to serve self. Living in this fantasy world is pleasant and very enhancing to self-esteem, but Freud (cited in Lerner, 1985) believed that children who did not move out of it could not be successful in love or in work. To be successful in the real world, Freud thought that every person had to struggle to break out of the shell of self-absorption into which they were born. Lerner concluded that the Self-Esteem-Now theory of educational development has failed to produce excellence in schools and may even have retarded its development.

Self-Concept Development of Boys and Girls

Investigators have given varied reports on the development of male versus female self-concept development in relationship to the teacher. Davidson and Lang (1960) reported that girls perceived their teachers' feelings toward them more favorably than did the boys. In a study Brophy and Good (1973) said that they observed differences in the treatment of boys and girls due to student behavioral differences rather than the negative attitudes of female teachers toward boys. They concluded that boys receive more praise, more criticism, and more contacts with teachers. Eron and Huesman (1980) commented that girls, very early in life, learn that physical aggression is an undesirable behavior for girls; and so they acquire other
behaviors more suitable to expectations for girls. They discovered in their study done with fourth, sixth, and eighth grade youngsters that while girls endorsed increasingly with age the effectiveness of passive behavior in problem solving, boys increasingly disapproved of such behavior in problem solving.

Forty female primary school teachers' feelings about aggressive and dependent children were examined by Levitin and Chananie (1972). These teachers judged the aggressive boy and the dependent girl as being typical. Dependent behavior rates significantly more approval than aggressive behavior, regardless of the child's sex. The achieving girl was significantly preferred over the achieving boy.

In a study of 72 boys and 60 girls in first grade, McNeil (1964) discovered that boys received more negative admonition than girls, were given less opportunity to read, and were identified as having no motivation for reading. Boys who were negatively rated and received little opportunity to read dropped in their reading rank; however, these boys were not inferior to the girls after auto instructional procedures and they were given equal praise and attention that the girls received.

Some studies show the girls to be at just as much of a disadvantage as are boys. An investigation by Sears and Feldman (1966) showed that girls are rewarded for conforming behavior or ignored. In their study of 240 student teachers, it was reported that they perceived most positively the rigid, conforming girl; second, the rigid conforming boy; third, the dependent girl; followed by the male of the same personality. The lowest rating was given to the
independent, assertive girl. Therefore, the independent, assertive girl would probably be in trouble with some teachers.

Some female teachers have total disdain for impulse ridden little boys. They try to repress them, which is understandable, since it is difficult to integrate these boys into the entire class. Some boys experience this repression as rejection of their masculine strivings. To escape their feelings of helplessness and deprivation, they exaggerate their behavior, seeking the approval and reassurance of the only audience that understands and shares their feelings—other little boys. A war between teacher and the little boys develops. What is at stake? Their very masculinity (Miles, 1981)!

A study done by Brophy and Good (1973) showed that male teachers have precisely the same patterns of interactions with male and female students that have been observed in studies involving only or almost primarily female teachers. Male teachers gave no evidence of greater sympathy or favoritism towards boys and the overall results indicated that, at least above the preschool level, the sex differences found in previous studies involving only female teachers cannot be attributed to a tendency of these teachers to favor girls over boys.

Most of the studies comparing boys' and girls' self-esteem in school have concluded that girls' concepts are higher than boys. Using a self-rating scale, Williams and Stith (1974) presented evidence that girls' self-concepts were better than boys' on various personality variables. Using 12-year-old students of varying socioeconomic, intelligence, and achievement backgrounds, Sweely (1970) found that girls had significantly better self-concept than did boys.
Purkey (1970) concluded that sex differences do to some extent influence the relationship between the self-concept and achievement, primarily in the areas of underachievement. Male underachievers tend to have more negative self-concepts than female underachievers. Children in Grades 1-6 were tested by Fein, O'Neill, Frank, and Velet (1975) and it was found that the male self-esteem was greater than the female self-esteem only among the older children. Using the Piers-Harris self-concept scale, Reed and Felker (1974) found boys and girls in Grades 3 through 6 differed both in ideal and actual self-concepts. No significant sex differences in their measurement of self-concept was found in the study of White and Howard (1973).

The Effect of the Home on the Child’s Self-Concept

Children's earliest meaningful experiences are in the home, their parents' role in their self-concept development cannot be overemphasized. Freud (cited in Antes & Antes, 1976) emphasized fear of the father and parental training (including punishment and rewards) as important factors in self-concept development. Many theorists feel that parents greatly influence a child's self-concept through the evaluations they make of him or her and communicate to the child through rewards, punishments, behaviors, and expressed or unexpressed attitudes. The child then incorporates these evaluations into his own self-structure. This theory is called the mirror theory (Antes & Antes, 1976).

The scores of 84 sixth grade girls and 75 sixth grade boys on five measures of self-concept and one measure of masculinity-
femininity with reports their mothers had made 7 years earlier when the children were in kindergarten concerning child practices in the home at that time were compared by Sears (1970). The conclusion of this study was that higher self-concepts for both boys and girls resulted from warmth on the part of both parents. No sex differences were found related to which parent had greater influence.

An investigation which followed 85 normal boys from preadolescence to early adulthood was done by Coopersmith (1967). He found many similar relationships between family factors and self-concept. Boys of high esteem had close warm relationships with their parents who were interested in the boys' welfare, problems, concerns, and friends. The parents of children of high self-esteem were less permissive than those of low self-esteem children. High self-esteem children had set limits, but were given much freedom within those limits. Their parents set high standards of behavior and enforced them consistently, but were less punitive than parents of boys with low self-concept. The parents of the high self-concept group were more likely to use reward rather than punishment or withdrawal of love and were viewed as fair disciplinarians by their children.

A study involving an experiment working with parents, a counselor, and an "expert" from the university was done by Brookover et al. (1965). Working with parents, the researchers tried to enhance the academic expectations and evaluations parents had for their children. The experiment with the counselors was designed to have the counselors communicate high evaluation of academic ability to the students. The third experiment had an expert from the university
provide the students with direct information that they were able and should achieve at higher levels than they were presently achieving. The parent experiment was successful in making positive changes in the self-concepts of the students and increasing achievement. The parents changed to more positive attitudes towards their children's teachers, the role of the school, and an acceptance of their own role in affecting self-conceptions and achievements of their children. Improved academic performance did not continue when the parental "treatment" was discontinued. Plus, neither the counselor or expert experiments to change children's self-concept was successful. The counselor and the expert communicating positive evaluations of the student in a formal manner was not a successful strategy to enhance self-concept of ability or increase academic achievement.

All personality theorists who are concerned with the constructs involving the self accord great importance to the parent-child inter­action in the development of the self-concept. This notion follows from such general ideas as these: (a) The self-concept is a learned constellation of perceptions, cognitions, and values. (b) An impor­tant part of this learning comes from observing the reactions one gets from other persons. (c) The parents are the persons who are present earliest and most consistently. For this reason, and because of the child's dependence on them and his or her affection for them, the parents have a unique opportunity to reinforce selectively the child's learning (Wylie, 1967).
Peers assume a progressively important role in shaping the child's self-concept as the child proceeds through the grades. By the preadolescent years, the importance of adults has diminished. Parents, adult relatives, and teachers have all played an important role in making a child what he is, but as the youth moves toward increasing independence from adults, his peer group assumes increasingly greater importance to him (Antes & Antes, 1976).

In a study of 42 five-year-olds at the Fels Institute, Heathers (1955) observed that socially competent children engaged more in social play, were more assertive, and sought attention or approval from children more than from adults. Studying 95 black lower-class children a year after school entrance, Henderson and Long (1971) found by comparing the children's self-social-concepts, behavior ratings by teachers, and reading behavior of the children, that the children in the first grade who were reading had a mature independence, while the nonreaders were overdependent and those who were not promoted were socially withdrawn. Richmond and White (1971), studying fifth and sixth grade students, found that children with positive self-concepts were more likely to enjoy high peer status than were low self-concept students. This difference transcended race and social class. Teigland (1966), in a study of fifth grade students, found that the achievers were better adjusted and chosen more often by their peers in work and play situations. Hovland, Jones, and Kelley (1953) found that individuals low in self-esteem were more
persuasible and more conforming than those with a high level of self-esteem. They concluded that the compliance manifested by those of low self-esteem might be defensive behavior that aimed to please everyone. If the low-esteem individuals were lacking in personal adequacy, they might have an exceptionally strong need for approval. This need for approval could inhibit growth in the intellectual and creative capacities of the individual.

The research seems to indicate that children who feel good about themselves tend to be adjusted socially and to be accepted by peers. This social acceptance increases the self-concept. A vicious cycle develops. As children succeed with their peers, they feel better about themselves and continue interacting with the peers. Children who are worried about failing because of past experiences of failure, don't get involved in a group and the more of a failure they perceive themselves to be, the more inadequate they feel and the less they get involved (Samuels, 1977).

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a review of related research regarding the relationship of student's self-concept and the teacher's concept of the child. Research has provided many clues for educators and parents alike as to how they might better provide for children to develop healthy, positive self-concepts.

The studies reported on are in the categories of:

1. Relationship between self-concept and achievement.
2. How the successful student views self.
3. How the unsuccessful student views self.
5. Difference in boy and girl self-concept in school.
7. Effect of self-esteem on peer relationships.

Evidence shows that individuals' self-esteem affects their performance and behavior. Also people significant or important to another person influence that person's concept of self. The self-concept remains a stable, not easily modified, entity which warrants continued investigation by researchers in an effort to understand the relationship between the affective and cognitive factors in learning.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The study attempted to determine differences, if any, between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' perception of the child and the difference, if any, in boys' and girls' reported self-concept. Included is information on the selection of the sample and the research instrument. Statistical information about the reliability and validity of the instrument chosen is also presented. The remainder of the chapter is comprised of procedures for the collection and treatment of data.

Population

The sample for the research was drawn from a population of nine classes of boys and girls and their teachers. Five fourth-grade classes and four fifth-grade classes containing 232 boys and girls made up the student population. Nine teachers responded to 232 instruments for the students and the 232 completed by the students made a total of 464 instruments used in the study.

The class groups are in three different buildings in the same school district. Two fourth and one fifth in one building, two fourth and two fifth in the second building, and one fourth and one fifth in the third building. These schools were chosen because the buildings are included in what is called a cluster by the school
The population encompassed in the area is quite homogeneous in socioeconomic make up, within the range from low-middle to middle class.

Table 1 shows the student sample for the research and Table 2 shows the teacher samples.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Instrument

A number of research instruments were examined and evaluated. Listed below is a description and evaluation of each test:

**Behavioral Academic Self-Esteem**

Behavioral Academic Self-Esteem (BASE) (Coopersmith & Gilberts, 1982) consists of 16 third-person declarative statements such as "This child is willing to undertake new tasks" and "This child readily expresses opinion," that are responded to by teachers who have observed a child's classroom behaviors for a minimum of 5-6 weeks on a daily basis. Teachers rate how frequently a child behaves in a particular way, using a five-category scale which varies from never to always. BASE measures inferred self-esteem rather than the more traditional approach of measuring self-esteem based on the respondents' self-reports.

**Reliability and Validity**

Internal consistency coefficients are based on correlations of individual items with the total score 2 transformation correlation .61. Intercorrelations of factor scores with the total score range from .17 to .94 with means of .83 for boys and .84 for girls. Interrater reliability was computed on 216 students and reported as .71. Test-retest reliability coefficients are not reported. The validity of the BASE ratings was determined by correlating the ratings with scores from the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. Total scores
from the two tests consistently correlated about .50 in Grades 2 through 6.

**Evaluation**

The Behavioral Academic Self-Esteem instrument was not chosen. The instrument is recommended by Schunk (1984) for low-esteem students and should be used in research to chart improvement over time or to compare experimental groups.

**The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept**

The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (Piers & Harris, 1969) is a self-report inventory consisting of 80 first-person declarative statements. The test is intended for use with children in Grades 4 through 12 and can be administered either individually or in a group. Presentation format is a four-page booklet with statements on one side of the page and yes or no on the other side. The response requirement is that the child circle either yes, indicating that the statement describes the way he or she feels about himself or herself, or no, indicating that the statement does not describe the way he or she feels about himself or herself.

**Reliability and Validity**

Test-retest reliabilities ranged from .42 to .96 with a mean of .73. Studies investigating internal consistency yielded coefficients ranging from .88 to .93 on the total scale. Moderate relationships were reported with other measures of self-concept, and relationships
with personality and behavior measures were generally in the direction expected. Intercorrelations between cluster scales ranging from .21 to .59 were obtained, indicating a moderate degree of relation.

Evaluation

The Piers-Harris instrument was judged to be too lengthy and complicated for the intended population.

Bledsoe Self-Concept Scale

The Bledsoe Self-Concept Scale (Bledsoe, 1964) consists of 30 descriptive adjectives. Respondents are asked to check on a 3-point scale to each adjective "This is the way I am" and "This is the way I would like to be." Eighteen adjectives are scored positively, 12 negatively. The subject checks as characteristic of himself nearly always, about half the time, or just now and then, with positive adjectives scored 3, 2, and 1, respectively, and negative adjectives reversed.

Reliability and Validity

Test-retest reliabilities (2-week interval) ranged from .66 to .81 for the ages 8 to 14. Correlations with anxiety scales run consistently negative, ranging from -.30 to -.46. For boys, correlations are positive with intelligence (California IQ) and achievement (CAT) .43 (fourth grade total battery, N = 65) and .39 (sixth, N = 76). Correlation with California Test of Personality Self-Adjustment Scale is .39 (N = 56, fifth grade pupils).
Evaluation

The variety and number of adjectives used in the scale and the marking system would make this instrument confusing for children. Therefore, this instrument was not chosen for the study.

The Self-Esteem Questionnaire

The Self-Esteem Questionnaire (Hoffmeister, 1971) contains 12 self-esteem items and 9 items where subjects rate how much their answer to a previous self-esteem item upsets them. These later items are called "self-other satisfaction." All answers are answered on a 5-point labeled scale from not at all to yes, very much. Three of the self-esteem items measure confidence or satisfaction with the self. The other nine deal with acceptance by others or competence compared to others.

Self-esteem and self-other satisfaction are scored from 1 to 5. Scores are reported only as low, situational, and high to discourage overinterpretation.

Reliability and Validity

Test-retest reliability for 2 weeks for 250 elementary school students was .70 for both measures. In a group of about 225 fifth graders the correlation of the self-esteem scale was .61 with the Coopersmith (1967) short self-esteem form.
Evaluation

In reviewing this instrument, Crandall (1984) reported that little information is available for this test. He also stated that the marking system would be very difficult for children to mark. Therefore, this test was not accepted for the survey.

Self-Perception Inventory

The Soares Perception Inventory (SPI) (Soares & Soares, 1971) has three sets of measures: one each for students, adults, and teachers. Each set has six to eight different forms in which the same short set of questions is asked repeatedly from different perspectives: how the subject sees himself or herself, how he or she thinks others see him or her, and the actual rating from significant others. The questions in each set of forms include statements such as, "I trust people," "I am sure of myself," and "I am not afraid of things."

Reliability and Validity

The test-retest reliability coefficients range from .68 to .89, with median .79. Shepard (1984) reviewed the instrument and stated that the reliability values should be tempered with the knowledge that the retest intervals were from 3 to 4 weeks, allowing memory to enhance the stability of such short instruments. The student self-concept form correlates .68 with Coopersmith's (1967) Self-Esteem Concept Scale and .44 with the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.
Evaluation

Strengths of the inventory were judged as straightforward, short directions, and clear format. The only administrative difficulty seems to be in the excessive time demands the multiple forms would create for young students or slow readers. Limited time was available to administer the instrument; therefore, this test was not acceptable.

The Self-Esteem Inventory

The Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967) is based on a perceptual psychology approach. The perceptual psychology approach consists of self-report statements which reveal a person's perceptual field or his "reality." Preference and desire statements are included as well as self-evaluation items.

The Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) is reported by Coopersmith (1967) in his book The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. To measure self-esteem, a 50-item inventory was developed during an investigation of the antecedents, consequences, and correlates of self-esteem. Most of the items selected from the inventory were based on items selected from the Rogers and Dymond (1954) scale. All of the items selected for the final scale were judged and agreed upon by five psychologists as indicating either high or low esteem. The original test was applied to two sample groups, 102 subjects in New York State and 1,748 children in Connecticut. The SEI was developed for children in the fourth and fifth grade, but it has been used with many other age
groups.

The SEI long form consists of 58 items, 50 items plus an 8-item lie score. A shorter form of 25 items was also developed by Cooper-smith (1967). The longer form has been reported on in greater detail in research literature. The 58-item form is the one Coopersmith used in his original research and reported on in his book. This form was selected for this research. There are four subscales which cycle in sequence the length of the SEI. The subscales are General Self, Social Self-Peer, Home-Parents, and School-Academic. The subscales can be scored separately or together with the exception of the lie score which consists of 8 items. It is a separate score totaling the number of responses indicative of defensive lie reaction. Cooper-smith suggested that the total SEI score be multiplied by 2 so that the maximum score is 100. For example, the SEI score of 50 x 2 = 100. The lie score would be figured separately with a possible total of 8. Coopersmith (1967) used position in the group as an index of relative self-appraisal. The upper quarter was considered as indicative of high-esteem, the lower quartile indicative of low self-esteem, and the interquartile range indicative of medium self-esteem. The final form of the inventory was administered to two classes (Grades 5 and 6; N = 87) of both males and females. The scores ranged from 40 to 100 (maximum possible of 100) with a mean of 82.3 and a standard deviation of 11.6. The mean score for the 44 males was 81.3 with a standard deviation of 12.2. The mean score for the 43 females was 83.3 with a standard deviation of 16.7. The differences between the mean scores for males and females was not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
significant. The distribution was skewed in the direction of high esteem (negatively skewed).

**Reliability and Validity**

Coopersmith (1967), using a sample of 30 fifth graders, reported a test-retest reliability after a 5-week interval of .88. The inventory was administered to a total of 1,148 children attending the public schools of central Connecticut. These children were more diverse in ability, interest, and social background than the initial sample. Test-retest reliability after a 3-year interval with a sample of 56 children from this population was .70.

Simon and Simon (1975) correlated the SEI and SRA Achievement Series scores of 87 children in Grade 4 and obtained coefficient of .33 ($p < .01$). The children's SEIs were also correlated with their scores on the Forge-Thorndike Intelligence Test. The obtained coefficient was .30.

A factor analysis on the SEI responses of 7,600 children in Grades 4-8 was performed by Kokenes (1978). Students from all socioeconomic ranges were included in the sample. Four pairs of bipolar factors emerged; each pair seemed to be highly congruent with the subscales of the SEI. There were factors related to the Social Self-Peer subscale (Success and Failure); factors related to the School-Academic subscale (Success and Failure); factors related to the Home-Parents subscale (Good-Poor); and factors related to the General Self subscale (Perceived Adequacy of Self, Perceived Inadequacy of Self, and Rejection of Self). Fullerton (1972) found a validity
coefficient between the SEI and the Behavior Rating Form (BRF), \( r = .44, p < .005 \), which indicated support of the convergent validity of self-esteem. He also found a marked contrast between this coefficient of validity and small heterotrait, heteromethod correlations of \(-.05, .11, .00, \text{ and } .02\). This seemed to provide evidence of the discriminate validity for self-esteem.

**Evaluation**

The Self-Esteem Inventory was chosen because of the length of the test—50 items plus 8 lie scale items—and the simplicity of response—check "Like me" or "Unlike me"—could be easily followed by children. The instrument also included information important to the study.

**Collection of Data**

Contact was made with the central administration of the school district chosen for the research. Permission was received for use of the SEI with teachers and students in the selected sample. Four schools which form a cluster were selected and the principal of each building was contacted. The schools chosen were similar in school populations.

Permission was received from the principals to conduct research in the selected schools. Individual fourth and fifth grade teachers in the buildings were sent letters inviting them to a meeting for a short period after school on a specific date. The project was explained and nine teachers agreed to participate.
Each teacher completed an SEI form for each child in his or her classroom and each child completed an SEI form for himself or herself. The children were administered the report by the researcher. The data collected included 232 children's responses and 232 teacher's responses to the SEI or a total of 464 SEI reports.

Treatment of Data

The statistical technique used in the treatment of data was the t test. Means for the total SEI and subscales were completed for the four groups: children, teachers, boys, and girls.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the design and procedural aspects of the study and the methods used to collect and treat the data. A detailed description of the population and the setting of the schools is given. Also included is an explanation of the administering and collection procedures followed in obtaining the data for the study. The chapter is concluded with the statistical methods used to examine the reports.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the difference between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of these children. The male and female reported self-concepts were examined for any differences. The children's self-concepts and the teachers' perceptions of the children were recorded on a self-esteem instrument. The target population was fourth and fifth grade students in a medium sized urban school district.

To answer questions and to ascertain if there were significant differences between the children's responses to the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) and the teachers' perception of the children's responses, a t test was used. The t test is often used to compare the means of two groups (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1979). The .05 level was selected as the level at which significance would be attained on the Fisher's Table of Critical Values for t (Kerlinger, 1973). The test administered was two-tailed with both correlated and independent samples.

Scoring of Instrument

Scores were computed on a possible total of 50 responses. Each correct response was multiplied by 2 to obtain a possible score of 46.
100 as recommended by Coopersmith (1967). The instrument had four subscales: Subscale 1, General Self, 26 points; Subscale 2, Social Self-Peers, 8 points; Subscale 3, Home-Parents, 8 points; and Subscale 4, School-Academic, 8 points.

Analysis of Data

Question 1

What differences, if any, exist between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perception of the self concept of the children in general self, social-self-peers, home-parents, and school-academic on the self-esteem instrument?

The teachers' mean score for general self was 16.12, and the students' mean score was 13.91. (The $t$ value = 4.72, $p > .01$.) The teachers' mean score for social-self-peers was 5.53, and the students' mean score was 4.89. (The $t$ value = 4.68, $p > .01$.) The teachers' mean score for home-family was 5.48, and the students' mean score was 4.72. (The $t$ value = 6.08, $p > .01$.) The teachers' mean score for school-academic was 4.62, and the students' mean score was 4.37. (The $t$ value = 2.16, $p > .05$.) These data are reported in Table 3.
Table 3

The t-Test Values for Teacher and Students on Self-Esteem Inventory for General, Social, Home, and School Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' general</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' general</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher social</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student social</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher home</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student home</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher school</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student school</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P > .05.

Question 2

What differences, if any, exist between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the children on the total self-concept on the self-esteem instrument?

The teachers' mean score for total concept was 31.78, and the students' mean score was 27.93. (The t value = 6.11, p > .05.) These data are reported in Table 4.
Table 4
The t-Test Values for Teachers and Students on Self-Esteem Inventory for Total Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

Question 3

What differences, if any, exist between the females' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perception of the concept of the females in general concept, social-self-peers, home-parents, and school-academic on a self-esteem instrument?

The teachers' mean score in general concept was 16.94, and the females' mean score was 14.33. (The t value = 3.39, p > .05.) The teachers' mean score for social-self-peers was 5.70, and the females' mean score was 5.02. (The t value = 3.91, p > .01.) The teachers' mean for home-family was 5.96, and the females' mean score was 4.86. (The t value = 5.34, p > .01.) The teachers' mean for school-academic was 4.81, and the females' mean was 4.70. (The t value = 0.72, p > .05.) These data are shown in Table 5.
Table 5

The t-Test Values for Teachers and Females on Self-Esteem Inventory for General, Social, Home, and School Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher general</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female general</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher social</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female social</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher home</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female home</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher school</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female school</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

Question 4

What differences, if any, exist between females' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the females on the total self-concept on a self-esteem instrument?

The teachers' mean score for total concept was 33.15. The females' mean score was 28.92. (The $t$ value = 4.39, $p > .05$.) These data are shown in Table 6.
Table 6

The $t$ Value for Teachers and Females on Self-Esteem Inventory for Total Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>$t$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

**Question 5**

What differences, if any, exist between the males' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the males in general concept, social-self-peers, home-parents, and school-academic?

The teachers' mean for general concept was 15.13, and the males mean was 13.41. (The $t$ value = 3.87, $p > .01$.) The teachers' mean score for social-self-peers was 5.32, and the males' mean was 4.73. (The $t$ value = 2.72, $p > .01$.) The teachers' mean score for home-family was 5.22, and the males' mean score was 4.56. (The $t$ value = 3.32, $p > .01$). The teachers' mean score for school-academic was 4.39, and the males' mean score was 3.97. (The $t$ value = 2.49, $p > .05$.) These data are shown in Table 7.
Table 7

The $t$ Value for Teachers and Males for General Concept, Social, Home, and School on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference mean</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher general</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male general</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.87*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher social</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male social</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher home</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male home</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher school</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male school</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

Question 6

What differences, if any, exist between the males' reported self-concept and teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the males on total self-concept on a self-esteem instrument?

The teachers' mean score for total concept was 30.10. The males' mean score was 26.72. (The $t$ value = 4.44, $p > .01$.) The data for these are found in Table 8.
Table 8  
The t Values for Teachers and Males on the Total Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>4.44*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

Question 7

What differences, if any, exist between the reported female self-concept and the reported male self-concept in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school-academic?

The males' mean score on general concept was 13.41. The females' mean score was 14.33. (The t value = -1.89, p > .05.) The male mean score for social-self-peers was 4.73 and the females' mean score was 5.02. (The t value = -1.34, p > .05.) The mean score for the males in home-family was 4.56 and the females' mean score was 4.86. (The t value = -1.58, p > .05.) The males' mean score in school-academic was 3.97, and the females' mean score was 4.70. (The t value = -3.48, p > .01). These data are found in Table 9.
Table 9

The $t$ Value for Males and Females for General Concept, Social, Home, and School Relationships on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-3.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p > .05$.

Question 8

What differences, if any, exist between the reported female self-concept and the reported male self-concept in total self-esteem?

The males' mean score for the total concept score was 26.72, and the females mean score was 28.92. (The $t$ value = -2.68, $p > .05$.) These data are found in Table 10.
Table 10
The \( t \) Values for Males and Females on the Total Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>-2.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total female</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p > .05 \).

Summary of Findings

The teacher mean scores were higher than the student mean scores in the categories of general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, school-academic, and total scores. There was a significant difference for each of these subscales.

The difference between mean scores for teachers and females were higher for the teachers than the females in general concept, social-self-peers, home-parents, school-academic, and total concept. There was a significant difference in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and total concept. There was no significant difference in school-academic.

The difference between mean scores for teachers and males were higher for the teachers than the males in the categories of general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and total concept. There was a significant difference for each of these categories.
Two independent samples were used to compare the male and female mean scores. There were 127 females and 104 males in the sample. The female mean was higher in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, school-academic, and total concept. No significant difference was found in general concept, social-self-peers, and home-family. There was a significant difference in school-academic and total concept.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of these children. The male and female reported self-concepts were examined for any differences. The children's self-concept and the teachers' perceptions of the children were recorded on a self-esteem instrument. The target population was fourth and fifth grade students in a medium sized, urban school district.

Eight research questions were investigated.

1. What differences, if any, exist between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perception of the self-concept of the children in general self, social-peers, home-parents, and school-academic on the self-esteem instrument?

2. What differences, if any, exist between children's reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the children on the total self-concept on the self-esteem instrument?

3. What differences, if any, exist between the females' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perception of the females' concept in general concept, social-self-peers, home-parents, and school-academic on a self-esteem instrument?
4. What differences, if any, exist between females' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the females on the total self-concept of a self-esteem instrument?

5. What differences, if any, exist between the males' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the males in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school-academic?

6. What differences, if any, exist between the males' reported self-concept and their teachers' reported perceptions of the self-concept of the males on total self-concept on a self-esteem instrument?

7. What differences, if any, exist between females' reported self-concept and males' reported self-concept in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and school-academic?

8. What differences, if any, exist between females' reported self-concept and males' reported self-concept in total self-esteem?

To investigate these questions teachers and students completed Coopersmith's (1967) Self-Esteem Inventory for 231 students. The data obtained were analyzed by computation of t tests for each of the research questions.

Major Findings

The major findings for the eight questions were:

1. The mean scores for the teachers were higher than the students' mean scores in the categories of general concept, social-self-
peers, home-family, school-academic, and total scores. There was a significant difference (.05) for each of these subscales.

2. The difference between mean scores for teachers and females were higher for the teachers than the females in general concept, social-self-peers, home-parents, school-academic, and total concept. There was a significant difference in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and total concept. There was no significant difference in school-academic (.05).

3. The teachers' mean scores were higher than the males' mean scores for the categories of general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and total concept. There was a significant difference (.05) for each of these categories.

4. Two independent samples were used to compare the male and female mean scores. There were 127 females and 104 males in the sample. The female mean was higher in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, school-academic, and total concept. No significant difference (.05) was found in general concept, social-self-peers, and home-family. There was a significant difference (.05) in school-academic and total concept.

Conclusions and Interpretations

The findings for Questions 1 and 2 were the teachers had higher reported perceptions of the students than the students had of themselves in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, school-academic, and total concept. The positive responses given by the teachers about the students do not seem to have been conveyed to the
students by the teachers. Researchers have reported the importance of teachers communicating positive feelings to children. Davidson and Lang (1960) said that communicating positive feelings to children by teachers is necessary to strengthen positive self-appraisals by students and stimulate their growth academically as well as interpersonally.

The perceptions of the students and teachers might have been different for varied reasons. The measurement used in the study was a sequence of questions presented in a similar format. This type of instrument might lead to response patterns affecting items in the last half of a test differently than in the first half, possibly because the respondents become aware of their adaptation pattern by the middle of the instrument and shift to a variation to avoid monotony or conformity (Isaac & Michael, 1983). The students might have followed this pattern more than the teachers. The teachers' scores were consistently high. The fact that the teachers included in the sample were made aware of the necessity for positive self-esteem in students through district wide in-service several years ago might have had some effect on the high perceptions the teachers marked; some teachers think it is socially unacceptable to think negatively of students. Therefore, some of the teachers might have marked the instrument as they thought they would be expected to. The findings of Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 showed that the teachers had higher perceptions of both the males and the females in general concept, social-self-peers, home-family, and total concept that the males or females had for themselves. There was a significant
difference in the teachers' and males' perceptions of school-academic, but there was no significant difference between the females and teachers in this category. A number of researchers have reported that positive self-esteem is related to good achievement in school (Brookover & Erickson, 1969; Flynn, 1974; Gowan, 1960; Wattenberg & Clifford, 1964). Therefore, it is important for boys also to receive positive feedback from teachers about academics. The elementary child is very vulnerable and believes, with few exceptions, the feedback received from peers and adults. The child accepts these evaluations made by teachers and parents without questioning or understanding them (Hamachek, 1975).

For the findings of Questions 7 and 8 no significant difference was found between the males and females in the categories of general concept, social-self-peers, and home-family. The males and females both seem to need help in raising their self-esteem in these categories. Research has shown that if teachers can provide experiences to enhance self-esteem for those students who lack positive self-esteem, the children will respond and presumably grow toward more positive self-feelings (Samuels, 1977). The females had higher perceptions in school-academic and total concept than the males. This is a further indication that there is a need for positive interaction between the males and teachers in the classroom. According to related research females perceive their teachers' feelings toward them more favorably than do the boys (Davidson & Lang, 1960).
Recommendations

After considering the findings of this study and the findings of related studies, recommendations for further studies are:

1. Administer the test using a shorter instrument and one where the method of answering questions varies.

2. Use the interview method for students and teachers to avoid monotony or conformity to the instrument.

3. Use the observation method to conduct the study in the classroom, noting the interaction between students and teachers. This would avoid teachers marking the instrument in the manner that social pressures influence them to mark.


5. A study of achievement and self-concepts should be done.

Discussion

Teacher perception of the self-concept of students and the students' reported self-concept were examined in this study. From the results it was learned that the teachers had a more positive perception of the students' self-concept than the students had of themselves in all areas except the females in school-academic. Teachers need to make a concentrated effort to develop methods to convey positive feelings in their interactions with students.

The teachers had a very positive perception of the students in the area of home-parents. The teachers had no experience in
observing the students in this category. Perhaps they were judging things as they thought they should be. Through communication parents and teachers could form a coalition to work toward helping students develop a positive self-concept.

The differences in the male and female perception in the school-academic category should be of special concern. The teachers' and females' perceptions of the females' self-esteem were both positive in this area. If this is allowed to continue the males' academic achievement could be in serious trouble, because according to researchers school achievement is related to self-esteem. If the problem is not solved the males could be more prone to achievement problems than the females.

There is a need for types of interaction between teachers and students that help build positive self-esteem. Open and ongoing communication between school representatives and the home is needed to enhance student levels of aspiration, self-expectations, academic motivation, and behavior in general.
SELF ESTEEM INVENTORY

Name ______________________________ School _________________________
Class ____________________________ Date _________________________

Please mark each statement in the following way:

If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check (√) in the column "LIKE ME."

If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check (✓) in the column "UNLIKE ME."

There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LIKE ME</th>
<th>UNLIKE ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: I'm a hard worker</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I spend a lot of time daydreaming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I'm pretty sure of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often wish I were someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I'm easy to like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I never worry about anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wish I were younger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I'm a lot of fun to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKE ME</td>
<td>UNLIKE ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I get upset easily at home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I always do the right things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Someone always has to tell me what to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I'm often sorry for the things I do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I'm popular with kids my own age.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My parents usually consider my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I'm never unhappy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I'm doing the best work that I can.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I give in very easily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I can usually take care of myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I'm pretty happy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I would rather play with children younger than me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>My parents expect too much from me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I like everyone I know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I like to be called on in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I understand myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>It's pretty tough to be me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Things are all mixed up in my life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Kids usually follow my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>LIKE ME</td>
<td>UNLIKE ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. No one pays much attention to me at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I never get scolded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I can make up my mind and stick to it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I really don't like being a boy/girl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I have a low opinion of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I don't like to be with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. There are many times when I'd like to leave home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I'm never shy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I often feel upset in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I often feel ashamed of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I'm not as nice looking as most people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. If I have something to say, I usually say it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Kids pick on me very often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. My parents understand me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I always tell the truth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I don't care what happens to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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