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ABSTRACT

The significance of significant others’ (parents, peers and teachers) ratings on children’s self-reported levels of self-concept were investigated. Self-reported levels of self-concept were determined by administering the Multidimensional Self Concept Scale (MSCS), while parent, peer, and teacher ratings of children were determined by the use of rating scales designed using selected MSCS items. Results indicated that all significant others’ ratings were positively correlated to children’s self-reported levels of self-concept. Peer ratings were the most predictive of self-reported level of self-concept, while teacher ratings were the second most predictive variable and parent ratings the least predictive variable. The findings are congruent with past self-concept research that stressed the importance of significant others’ perceptions on an individual’s reported level of self-concept.
Introduction

The topic of self-concept has been a common theme in psychological research for much of the past one hundred years. William James is often cited as the first researcher who examined the notion of self-concept in 1890. Although the debate over what self-concept is or is not continues to rage, current researchers recognize that self-concept develops within a social context (e.g., Burnett & McCrindle, 1999 and Epkins, 1995). The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between children’s reported level of self-concept and their social context (parents, teachers, and peers perceptions of them).

For the purpose of this study, (1) parents and care givers are interchangeable, and (2) Bracken’s (1992) definition of self-concept is adapted: “Self-concept is defined as a multidimensional and context dependent learned behavioral pattern that reflects an individual’s evaluation and description of past behaviors and experiences, influences an individual’s current behaviors, and predicts an individual’s future behaviors” (p.10). However, the complexity of arriving at a common description of self-concept can be appreciated only within the context of early research that has grappled with the idea.

Literature Review

Historical Perspective of Self-concept. Starting with the definition proposed by James, it was hypothesized that self-concept was a unitary or global construct (James as quoted in Bracken, 1992). Essentially, James proposed that a person’s self esteem is a function of his or her presumed abilities and actual accomplishments (James as quoted in Bracken, 1992). Other early researchers, such as C.H. Cooley, were also proponents of
the generalized view of self-concept, but early measures of self-concept proved to be unidimensional due to the unidimensional definition in place (Bracken, 1992).

Following the work of the early researchers, such as James and Cooley, later researchers (Bracken, 1992) started to question the appropriateness of the unidimensional model of self-concept. The unidimensional model was seen as ineffective and impractical as it failed to address variations that may exist in a person’s abilities and behaviors across different domains. This unidimensional model of self-concept failed to take into account the influence that environment has on human behavior. Therefore, researchers began to assert that self-concept was instead a multidimensional construct, a definition that examined variations within an individual across different domains in life (Shavelson et al., 1976). Since that time, numerous studies have produced results that detail the complexities of self-concept, and the multiple dimensions or domains that underlie the construct (Eccles et al., 1989; Harter, 1982; Marsh, 1990). Further, research has also demonstrated that the multiple dimensions of self-concept follow very similar patterns and trajectories in self-concept development (Cole et al., 2001).

In general, researchers have concluded that self-concept is truly a multidimensional construct, and such a construct more aptly examines variations across different domains in a person’s life. Historically, these domains were considered to include social, academic, and physical factors. Early researchers examined the dimensions that most impacted the individual’s self-concept. Although results were inconclusive, the researchers were able to ascertain which dimensions or domains are universally considered to be the most prevalent and foundational to an individual’s level
of self-concept; such as social, competence, affect, physical, academic, and family (Marsh, 1990).

Although the multidimensional nature of self-concept has been widely accepted for over thirty years, arguments quickly arose over whether a hierarchy exists in the multidimensional structure. In particular, the hallmark research by Shavelson and colleagues (1976) asserted that a hierarchy indeed existed, and that general self-concept constituted the apex of the hierarchy and that the various interdependent domains of self-concept comprised the second tier of the hierarchy. This notion of a hierarchical and multidimensional view of self-concept gained popular support from researchers, as it appeared to be a reasonable notion. It also resembled the hierarchical structure of intelligence noted by Spearman and others (Bracken, 1992).

Shavelson and his colleagues' research was not only important because of the hierarchical assertion, but they also led the call for researchers to expand the self-concept knowledge base and move towards an agreed upon definition of self-concept. In fact, one of the key points these researchers noted as problematic with self-concept was the fact that it lacked a consistent definition across self-concept research. They asserted that without a formal and consistent definition, there was too much overlap with research, and that lack of a precise definition only added error to studies. Therefore, Shavelson et al. cited seven features that describe the notion of self-concept, and that were critical in any definition of the construct. They stated that self-concept could be described as: organized, multifaceted, hierarchical, stable, developmental, evaluative, and differentiable (Shavelson et al., 1976). In sum, they indicated that these seven critical features should be examined or included in any definition of self-concept. By urging
researchers to address these seven areas, it was likely that a more precise definition of self-concept would emerge and be generally accepted and applied to measurement tools.

Adding to the confusion of developing a functional definition for self-concept was the fact that past research had often used the terms self-concept and self-esteem interchangeably (Shavelson et al., 1976). However, further research efforts have rectified some of the confusion: self-esteem is seen as one of the second tier domains of self-concept that inevitably plays a determining factor in shaping one's level of self-concept (Shavelson et al., 1976). In particular, self-esteem is seen as only an evaluative component of one's self, as it merely considers the worth of self-concept descriptions (King, 1997). In sum, Bracken (1992) asserted, "Self concept can be defined as a multidimensional and context dependent learned behavioral pattern that reflects an individual's evaluation or descriptions of past behaviors and experiences, influences an individual's current behaviors, and predicts an individual's future behaviors" (p. 10).

**Theoretical Perspective of Self-Concept.** Another factor that the issue of self-concept has created is the argument between cognitive theorists and behaviorists. Cognitive theorists have long believed and asserted that self-concept, just like other self-functions, such as self-esteem and self-reward, was nothing more than a cognitive structure (Harter, 1978). Harter and other cognitive theorists before her surmised that self-concept was the sensing, feeling, monitoring, and regulating part of an individual. However, behaviorists disagreed with this viewpoint. Led by B.F. Skinner, behaviorists asserted that self-concept was instead a behavioral construct because one cannot observe "self". Thus, behaviorists theorized that self-concept could be inferred by the unique patterns of behavior manifested by an individual (Skinner, 1990). Essentially,
behaviorists thought that self-concept could be described as the process where individuals make descriptive and evaluative personal statements that reflect their past behaviors and predict their future behaviors.

The developmental aspect of self-concept has also been examined in depth throughout the past. In particular, theorists have examined the general developmental path of self-concept, as well as gender-specific development of self-concept (Cole et al., 2001). In general, research has demonstrated that self-concept grows increasingly more stable as a person progresses through development (Shavelson et al., 1976). This stability is largely attributed to the fact that children’s personal self-beliefs become more realistic and tightly linked to appraisals from significant others, which inevitably leads to a higher stability of one’s self-concept (Wigfield et al., 1991).

Research has also indicated that stability of self-concept is correlated with transitions experienced throughout one’s development. In particular, studies have indicated that through several developmental periods, contextual and developmental transitions occur that affect the stability of self-concept. These transitions are found to occur during middle childhood, early adolescence, and late adolescence; typically during 1) early years of elementary school, 2) transition from elementary school to middle school, and 3) transition from middle school to high school. These transitions are largely due to cognitive changes (development of concrete & operational thinking), social changes (reliance on appraisals from significant others), and physical changes (puberty). The result of these developmental transitions is that cognitive, physical, and social changes lead children from having largely positive, unrealistic views of themselves to
having more moderate personal views that include strengths and weaknesses in various domains (Cole et al., 2001; Marsh, 1990; Shavelson et al., 1976).

The hierarchical construct, consistent definition of self-concept, developmental aspect, and the cognitive-behavioral debate still did not answer the problems of evaluating self-concept. One issue that remained unanswered was whether self-concept was an internalized mechanism (formed within the individual), or if it was instead formed from sources outside the individual. The aforementioned Cooley was one of the first researchers who forwarded the idea that people apply a “looking glass self”, a term suggesting that individuals consider themselves in terms of how others reflect their actions and characteristics back to them (Cooley as quoted in Bracken, 1992). Numerous scholars and researchers (e.g., Burnett & McCrindle, 1999; Epkins, 1995) have since recognized that self-concept is highly dependent on how others rate individuals or react to their behaviors. Further, youth typically internalize others’ actions towards them as factual information and interpretations about themselves rather than as social interactions or as expectations that may not be valid (Obiakor, 1999). Such a belief, thus, presumes that an individual’s self-concept is dependent and correlated with the environmental domains that surround her or him.

The assumption that environmental domains contribute to the shaping of an individual’s level of self-concept has led current researchers to conclude that self-concept is socially constructed, with people’s perceptions and assessments of themselves being greatly influenced by others’ evaluations (Uszynska-Jarmoc, 2001). It has also been found that children’s competence beliefs seem to be more tightly linked to the appraisals of significant others (Cole et al., 2001). A few studies have investigated the relationship
between statements made by significant others and one’s self-perceptions or concept. For example, Burnett et al. (1999) found that positive interactions and statements made by significant others were related to high self-esteem or self-concept and that negative interactions were associated with low levels of self-esteem or self-concept.

In addition, a growing body of research has indicated that the perceptions of significant others (e.g., peers, family, coworkers, and so on) about an individual can affect that individual’s reported level of self-concept. The effects of such evaluative feedback from significant others may be detrimental to an individual’s future development of self-concept (Thomas, 1997). For instance, childhood peer-rejection is considered a serious threat to future socio-emotional development. Poor peer relationships and evaluations are also indicated to be central features in major child and adolescent mental disorders including under-socialized conduct disorders, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, and Schizoid Disorders (Thomas, 1997). Likewise, Milich, McAninch, and Harris (1992) found that labels attached to children via significant others, including the reputation that they hold, can affect how other peers perceive them, interpret their behaviors, and even interact with them. Research by La Greca (1998) also illustrated the importance of peer evaluations, indicating that children who are rejected or neglected by peers are more socially anxious and have a higher risk of developing social anxiety. Rejected peers (with negative peer evaluations) have also been found to differ from nonrejected peers on a variety of issues, such as increased behavioral, cognitive, and affective dimensions including aggression, hyperactivity, social problem solving, social withdrawal, and academic problems (Waas & Graczyk, 1999).
Not only have peer evaluations been found to be highly important in a child’s development, but parent and teacher evaluations and perceptions may also contribute. Research has demonstrated that teacher evaluations may create expectancies, relationships, and positive and negative experiences, which can affect children’s self-concept (Burnett & McCrindle, 1999). Likewise, Proctor (1984) concluded that low teacher expectations are generally associated with “minority group membership, low SES, male gender, nonconformity personality, physical unattractiveness, nonstandard speech patterns, and low achievement” (p. 476). Regarding parents, Uszynska-Jarmoc (2001) suggested that the quality, character, and results of self-concept in children is dependent on the attitude of children’s parents. Further, Burnett and McCrindle stated that parent evaluations can also directly impact a child: Positive evaluations from parents are generally associated with higher levels of self-esteem while negative statements from parents typically adversely affect self-esteem. It appears the perceptions and reactions of these three evaluative groups or significant others (parents, peers, and teachers) are vital to the development of the child, because children spend the majority of their time socializing with classmates, parents, and teachers (Bracken, 1992).

Statement of the Problem

Research, thus far, has supported the notion that the three major evaluative groups: parents, peers, and teachers, are vital in defining a child’s perception of his or her own level of self-concept (Cole et al., 2001). However, although each evaluative group’s relationship to children’s self-concept has been studied, limited research to date has examined all three evaluative groups simultaneously to identify which evaluative group and evaluation of the child best predicts the child’s self-reported level of self-concept.
Thus, the purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between evaluative groups’ (parents, teachers, and peers) perceptions of a child and the child’s self-reported level of self-concept. A variety of measures have been used to examine self-concept, for instance Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale, Self-Description Questionnaire, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and Self-Esteem Index (Bracken et al., 1994), Adaptive Behavior Inventory (Brown & Leigh, 1986), and Pupil Evaluation Inventory (Pekarik et al., 1976; Johnston et al., 1988). In this study, the Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS; Bracken, 1992) and its adapted version for peer, parent and teacher rating scales were used.

*The Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale*

The Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS; Bracken, 1992) is a self-report measure designed to assess self-concept in children and youth. The MSCS consists of 150 Likert-type items and can be administered to either a group or an individual. The MSCS takes 20 to 30 minutes to complete and yields standard scores for each of the scale’s six domains (Social, Competence, Affect, Academic, Family, and Physical), as well as providing a Total Composite standard score. The MSCS reflects a multidimensional, context-dependent self-concept model and assesses self-concept in the following six domains: Social, Competence, Affect, Academic, Family, and Physical. The MSCS was normed on 2,501 students between the ages of 9 and 19 (grades 5 through 12) in 17 sites scattered in all regions of the United States. Thus, this large standardization sample closely matches the U.S. population demographics of the 1990 census (Bracken, 1992). Sample items from the MSCS include such statements as, “I am proud of myself,” “I often feel dumb,” “My parents are proud of me,” “A lot of people make fun of me” and “I
would change my looks if I could.” Responses are on a Likert Scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”

The MSCS reports strong psychometric properties, total scale score reliabilities range from .97 to .99. Furthermore, the manual reports that four of the six MSCS subscales have subscale reliability coefficients that fall within the range of .90 to .97, while the remaining two subscales have reliability coefficients that fall within the range of .85 to .92. The MSCS also reports .98 total scale internal consistency and .90 stability after two weeks. In addition, subscale internal consistency coefficients range from .87 to .97. Content validity of the MSCS was established and also compared to the content of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, Piers-Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale, Self-Description Questionnaire, Self-Description Questionnaire-II, and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale-Revised. This comparison provided support to the notion that the construct of self-concept appears to be a multidimensional construct that can be measured by the six domains of the MSCS (Bracken, Bunch, Keith, & Keith, 2000). Other strengths of the MSCS include its detailed theoretical background, substantive research support that documents its appropriate use in research and diagnostic endeavors, and its relative ease of administration to individuals or groups (Bracken, 1992; Bracken & Mills, 1994).

**Peer Rating Scale**

To examine how student participants would evaluate or perceive their fellow classmates, the Peer Rating Scale (PRS) was adapted and modified from the Bracken MSCS. The PRS is composed of 35 items in a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response format. All items were taken from the Social Domain of the MSCS and select items from the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale that Bracken (2000) documented as having loaded on the Social
Factor of the MSCS. Each item was reworded so that it was pertinent to peer raters. Sample items on the PRS were “People pick on him/her,” “Is unpopular,” “He/she has a lot of friends,” and “Feels left out of things.” Prior research has demonstrated that peer ratings, such as the PRS, are more reliable and stable than other peer evaluative models, because each child is rated in a peer rating model (Epkins, 1995). These types of peer assessments have also been found to be advantageous over other peer assessment models, because they do not necessarily require negative criteria for selection (Yugar & Shapiro, 2001). The PRS yielded the percentage of items rated as positive and negative. The maximum score each rating form could yield would be 100%, which would indicate that all items were answered in a positive fashion. Likewise, the lowest score each rating form could yield would be 0, which would indicate that all items were answered in a negative fashion.

Caregiver Rating Scale

The Caregiver Rating Scale (CRS) was constructed using the MSCS and Piers-Harris (Bracken, 2000) items, and was used to examine how parents or caregivers evaluate their children’s level of self-concept. The CRS has 69 items structured in a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response format and aimed at maintaining consistency between the items being rated by parents and children. Items were taken from the Competence, Family, and Affect Domains of the MSCS. The CRS provided the percentage of negative and positive responses. The maximum score each rating form could yield would be 100%, which would indicate that all items were answered in a positive fashion. The lowest score each rating form could yield would be 0, indicating that all items were answered in
a negative fashion. Examples of sample items would be “Feels insecure,” “Is very self-confident,” “Worries a lot,” “Feels like a failure,” and “Is not a happy person.”

**Teacher Rating Scale**

To examine how teachers would evaluate their students’ self-concept, the Teacher Rating Scale (TRS) was constructed from the MSCS and Piers-Harris items. The TRS is composed of 69 items structured in a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response format. Items were taken from the Competence, Academic, and Affect Domains of the MSCS and select items from the Piers-Harris that Bracken (2000) listed as having loaded on the three domains (competence, academic and affect). The TRS yielded the percentage of negative and positive answers. The maximum score each rating form could yield would be 100%, which would indicate that all items were answered in a positive fashion. Likewise, the lowest score each rating form could yield would be 0, which would indicate that all items were answered in a negative fashion. Sample items on the TRS were, “Is very self-confident,” “Has good ideas,” “Is not a happy person,” “Too often says the wrong thing” and “Frequently feels helpless.”

In summary, the primary purpose of this study was to assess if evaluative groups’ (parents, peers, and teachers) perceptions of a child predict the child’s self-reported level of self-concept. For this study, the child’s self-reported level of self-concept is the predicted variable while the predictor variables are teachers’, parents’ and peers’ evaluations or ratings. The following hypotheses were made:

1. Based on past research that indicates the importance of peer ratings on an individual, it is hypothesized that peer evaluations would be the most predictive
factor that correlate with a child's reported level of self-concept (Thomas, 1997 & La Grece, 1998).

2. The child's reported level of self-concept would be directly correlated with the evaluations of the particular group – parent, teacher or peer. Thus, negative evaluations made by significant others would predict a more negative level of self-concept, and positive evaluations would predict a more positive level of self-concept. According to Burnett et al. (1999), children who show high self-esteem or self-concept enjoy a positive relationship with significant others, and that negative interactions were associated with low levels of self-esteem or self-concept.
Method

Participants

One hundred fifty seven (157) people were involved in this study. There were three groups of participants: student participants, parent participants, and teacher participants. Seventy six (76) children, between the ages of 10 and 16, served as student participants. Thirty three percent of the participants were male students \( (n = 25) \) while 67% were female students \( (n = 51) \). Student participants also represented three grade levels and were classified as elementary school, 5th grade, students \( (36\%, \ n = 27) \), middle school, 7th grade, students \( (26\%, \ n = 20) \), and high school, 10th grade, students \( (38\%, \ n = 29) \). No child under the age of 8 participated in the study, because research indicates that children start to differentiate between their own personal competencies and those of others by or after age eight (Heyman and Gelman, 1999). In addition to student participants, five female teachers and 76 parents or caregivers participated in this study.

Participants resided in a rural community in southeastern Illinois. Because of the ethnic makeup of this geographic area, the sample was homogenous, Caucasians only.

Instruments

Four different instruments were used. The Multidimensional Self-concept Scale (MSCS, Appendix C) assessed the student participants' self-reported level of self-concept while peer, parent, and teacher evaluations of student participants were assessed using a Peer Rating Scale (Appendix D), a Parent or Caretaker Rating Scale (Appendix F), and a Teacher Rating Scale (Appendix E), respectively. These scales were adapted from the MSCS and Piers-Harris Scale.
The Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale (MSCS; Bracken, 1992): To measure the student participants' self-reported levels of self-concept, the MSCS was administered to student participants as a group. The MSCS is composed of 150 Likert-type items and yielded standard scores for each of the scale's six domains (Social, Competence, Affect, Academic, Family, and Physical), as well as providing a Total Composite standard score and percentile scores. The Total Composite standard scores were used for data comparisons.

Peer rating Scale (PRS): The PRS was administered to all student participants in each classroom to examine how participants evaluate or perceive their fellow participants in the class. The PRS is composed of 35 items in a 'yes' or 'no' response format and tapped social factors similar to Bracken's MSCS. The PRS yielded the percentage of positive ratings.

Caregiver or Parent Rating Scale (CRS): The CRS was used to examine how parents or caregivers evaluate their children's level of self-concept. The CRS is composed of 69 items structured in a 'yes' or 'no' response format, and items tapped the Competence, Family, and Affect Domains of the MSCS and Piers-Harris Scale. The CRS provided the percentage of positive responses.

Teacher Rating Scale (TRS): Teacher participants evaluated the students in their respective classrooms by completing the TRS for each student participant. The TRS is composed of 69 items structured in a 'yes' or 'no' response format. Items tapped the competence, academic and affect domains, also found in the MSCS. The TRS yielded the percentage positive answers.
Procedure

First, permission for participation was obtained from the school districts, parents and teachers (Appendices A and B). Participation was limited only to students with parent permission. To minimize the chance of obtaining false reports, participants were not told the true purpose of the study [Self-concept research in the past has alluded to the problem of raters being unduly influenced by social desirability factors (Ledingham et al., 1982)]. Once data collection was completed, participants received a debriefing statement explaining the true purpose of the study (Appendix G).

Participation was voluntary and confidential. All students who participated in the study in each classroom comprised that particular peer group, thus, excluding non-participating students (those without parental consent) from their ratings. Teacher ratings paralleled this system, as they completed rating forms only for those students who participated in the study. A number identification system was used to ensure confidentiality. Each student participant was assigned a number and the same number was used to match the student to his or her parent and teacher. For the purpose of data management, a master list was kept by the primary researcher. At the completion of the study, the master list was destroyed. Further, no names were used in data reporting and only aggregate data were reported.

Testing occurred over a four-week time period, and was conducted in the regular education classroom (two 5th grade classrooms, two 7th grade classrooms, and two 10th grade English/literature classes), as well as a designated testing area (free testing room) in the schools. Students were administered the MSCS during a class-wide group administration. On a separate occasion, each student participant was issued his or her
Evaluative Groups

respective PRS packet (rating scales for all classmates) to complete. The order of these scales was counterbalanced to offset the chance of any ordering effect. To conduct parent evaluations, parent participants were mailed a copy of the Caregiver Rating Scale. The researcher provided instructions and directions on how to properly fill out the rating scales (Appendix F), as well as a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the rating scale to the researcher. In order not to interfere with classroom instructions, teacher participants’ rating scales were completed before and after school over a two-day time period. A detailed instruction was also provided (Appendix E). This procedure was expected to encourage accuracy of teacher ratings by eliminating interference from students or other professionals.

Once all rating scales had been completed, a debriefing statement was sent home with each student participant, and debriefing statements were hand delivered to participating teachers (Appendix G). Finally, the primary researcher scored the protocols.

This was a correlational study designed to examine the relationship between three evaluative groups’ ratings of a child (parents, teachers, and peers) and a child’s self-reported level of self-concept. The predicted variable was the level of self-concept that was reported by an individual child, and the predictor variables were: 1) teacher ratings, 2) peer ratings, and 3) parent ratings. In order to identify what predictor variable best predicted the level of a child’s self-reported self-concept, a given child’s reported level of self-concept was compared to his or her parent’s, teacher’s and peers’ ratings of him or her. The following scores were used to make comparisons: Composite Standard Score of the MSCS, and the total percentage of positive rating scores (responses) from the PRS,
Evaluative Groups CRS, and the TRS. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to assess the relationship between self-reported level of self-concept and each evaluative group’s ratings. Finally, stepwise regression was conducted to ascertain which predictor variable (teacher ratings, peer ratings, or parent ratings) most predicted a child’s self-reported level of self-concept.

Results

The mean score for the MSCS, self-reported self-concept, was highest for elementary school age participants \( (M = 107.41, SD = 13.19) \), lowest for middle school age participants \( (M = 95.9, SD = 10.65) \), and high school participants’ mean score fell between the two age groups \( (M = 102.28, SD = 12.50) \). According to the authors of the MSCS, scores that fall at these levels suggest Average levels of self-concept. Student participants’ scores fell within the range of 76 and 131 \( (SD = 12.95) \).

Teacher reports across the three age groups or grade levels were also consistent with the pattern exhibited by the student participants' self-ratings, as a serial curve pattern existed with the teacher report data. Teacher ratings were highest for elementary school children \( (M = 86.67, SD = 20.22) \), lowest for middle school children \( (M = 65.65, SD = 22.46) \), and more stabilized for high school children \( (M = 81.69, SD = 22.38) \). The range for teacher report scores was between 19 and 100 \( (SD = 22.98) \). Peer ratings across the three age groups or grade levels were likewise consistent with the pattern exhibited by the students’ self-ratings and teacher ratings, as a serial curve pattern was also apparent with this group of data. Peer ratings were highest for elementary school students \( (M = 78.15, SD = 15.97) \), lowest for middle school students \( (M = 67.20, SD = 16.53) \), and more stabilized for high school students \( (M = 73.34, SD = 11.72) \). The range for peer rating
scores fell between 23 and 96 ($SD = 15.08$). Parent report data demonstrated a different pattern of scores. Parent ratings for middle school children were the highest ($M = 87.4$, $SD = 10.83$), while they rated high school students the lowest ($M = 78.17$, $SD = 22.11$) and elementary students between the two groups ($M = 85.78$, $SD = 17.02$). Parent rating scores ranged from 28 to 100 ($SD = 18.15$).

A series of One-Way ANOVA were conducted to examine if self-reported self-concept, parent ratings, teacher ratings, and peer ratings of students differ across grade levels. A significant relationship was found between grade level and self-reported levels of self-concept, $F (2, 75) = 5.03, p < .05$. A Tukey’s test further reveals that self-reported levels of self-concept in elementary school ($M = 107.41$) were significantly different from those in middle school ($M = 95.90$), $p < .05$. There was also a significant relationship between grade level and peer ratings, $F (2, 75) = 3.21, p < .05$. Results of a follow-up Tukey’s test shows that elementary students were rated significantly higher ($M = 78.15$) than middle school students ($M = 67.20$) by their peers, $p < .05$. The relationship between grade level and teacher ratings was also significant, $F (2, 75) = 5.71, p < .05$. A Tukey’s test reveals that teachers rated elementary students significantly higher ($M = 86.67$) than middle school students ($M = 65.65$), $p < .05$. Likewise, they rated the high school students significantly higher ($M = 81.69$) than the middle school students, $p < .05$. However, the relationship between parent reports and grade level was nonsignificant, $F (2, 75) = 1.97, p > .05$.

Pearson’s correlation results indicated significant correlations between self-reported self-concept and teacher and peer ratings. Figure 1 presents a significant positive linear relationship between self-reported self-concept and peer ratings, $(r = .71)$. 

This linear relationship between the peers' ratings and self-reported self-concept levels was found to account for approximately 50% of the total variance, $r^2 = .50, p < .05$. Self-reported self-concept also correlated significantly with teachers' ratings ($r = .54$). However, the correlation between self-reported self-concept and parents' ratings was moderate ($r = .34$). Table 1 presents Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients between self-reported self-concept and parent, peer and teacher ratings.

A $t$-test for independent means was conducted to determine if the gender of the child was an important factor for the three evaluative groups. There were no significant gender differences in the parents' ratings, $t (76) = -1.33, p > .05$, the peers' ratings, $t (76) = -1.18, p > .05$, and teachers' ratings, $t (76) = -.53, p > .05$.

A stepwise regression was conducted to examine how parents, peers, and teachers predicted a student's self-reported level of self-concept. Results indicated that peer ratings accounted for most of the variance (49%), $p < .001$. The linear relationship between self-reported levels of self-concept and peer ratings was highly significant, $F (1, 75) = 73.56, p < .001$.

Discussion

The results of the present study are congruent with past self-concept research, which postulates that self-concept levels are intertwined with appraisals or evaluations made by significant others (Burnett & McCrindle, 1999; Blake, 1993). As was hypothesized in this study, self-reported levels of self-concept were positively linked to appraisals made by significant others (i.e., parents, peers, and teachers). Higher levels of self-concept were found to be more indicative of higher appraisals from others, while lower levels of self-concept were more congruent with lower appraisals from others. In
this study, students' self-reported self-concept levels were significantly positively correlated with ratings made by all three significant groups, with peer ratings being highly correlated. These findings are indicative of the influence appraisals made by significant others have on the formation of a child's self-concept level.

Findings indicated that peers' ratings are the most predictive factors in a student's self-concept level, followed by teachers' ratings. One conclusion may be that these two groups spend the most time with students on a day-to-day basis and participate in more activities, in comparison to parents who spend a relatively limited time with their children daily. For example, 11-year-olds spend 50 percent of their time with peers, and the percentage increases for adolescents who spend more time with peers than with adults (Brownell, 1990). In addition, Sandberg and Hofferth (2001) found that in a two parent household, children on the average spent 31 hours a week with their parents in 1997. This differential in time spent with students inevitably may contribute to the lower correlation between parents' evaluation of their child and the child's self-reported level of self-concept, while peers and teachers have a higher predictive relationship.

It is encouraging that the data suggested that the gender of the child being rated did not influence the ratings made by significant others. The gender of the child appeared to be inconsequential to the ratings being made by significant others, as both male and female students were rated in a similar manner. These results seem to contradict prior research findings that indicated that gender differences did exist in self-concept evaluations and appraisals (Cole et al., 2001; Marsh, 1989). However, Wilgenbusch and Merrell (1999), conducted a meta-analysis of gender differences in self-concept, and found contradictory and inconsistent findings with small effect. Thus, they concluded
that gender differences in self-concept are not very great and have limited clinical significance.

Developmental trends in self-concept were also observed in the data. There was a significant relationship between grade level of student participants and the ratings made by teachers, peers, and individual students' self-concept ratings. Higher levels of self-reported self-concept were found in elementary age participants, a decrease in self-concept was observed in middle school students, while high school self-concept ratings stabilized and were almost identical to the mean of all participant self-concepts ($M = 102.42, SD = 12.95$). This U-shape pattern is similar to developmental research that states that elementary school children hold a high, idealized view of self. The stability of self-concept increases with age except for a period of destabilization during the transition from sixth to seventh grade; and high school age children exhibit a more realistic and stabilized self-concept level (Wigfield et al., 1991; Cole et al., 2001).

In summary, both hypotheses examined in this study were supported. Participants' self-reported self-concept levels were indeed positively linked to appraisals or evaluations made by significant others (parents, peers, and teachers). Peer ratings were found to be the most predictive and highly correlated factor with a participant's self-reported self-concept, with teacher ratings having the second highest correlation. All ratings made by significant others were found to be significantly positively correlated with participants' self-reported self-concept levels. Results of this study also supported past research that illustrates developmental trends in individual self-concept levels (Cole et al., 2001). Taken together, the results of this study and previous self-concept research
begin to point to an increasingly consistent pattern of findings regarding the importance of and predictive nature of significant others' appraisals on individuals' self-concept.

The primary implication of the study may be that children who do not receive positive appraisals in general and specifically from their peers may suffer from low self-concept and may also be at risk for developing social, academic and behavioral problems (La Greca, 1998; Waas & Graczyk, 1999). Thus, it is imperative that interventions are available to these children. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to review interventions, research has demonstrated that peer perceptions of one another, and ultimately one's own self-concept may improve if children practice new skills in the presence of their peers who provide feedback, which is critical in helping them assess the effectiveness of their behaviors (Helper, 1997). Further, peer perceptions and students' self-concept levels seem to improve when students learn to increase positive self-talk and evaluative statements; and when significant others foster positive expectations in them (Obiakor, 1999; Burnett & McCrindle, 1999; DeMoulin, 1999).

It should be noted that some limitations exist, and caution must be exercised when generalizing the results of this study. First, the predominately homogenous subject pool used in this study might have led to ratings that were uncharacteristically higher or lower than what would be expected with a more diverse population. Secondly, more female students (67%) participated in this study. Also, students' self-reported self-concept composite scores were used for self-reports, and prior research has suggested possible domain differences in self-concept (Cole et al., 2001). Therefore, future studies may possibly investigate the relationship between domain specific self-concept levels and significant others' appraisals. Finally, the rating scales used in this study were an
adaptation and modification of a standardized scale, and may not be perceived as technically sound.

Future studies with a larger sample size may benefit from examination of gender differences. Replication of the present study with a diverse group of children is clearly needed as research has demonstrated some differences in self-concept of minority students and those students from diverse populations. For example, teacher expectations have been found to differ when evaluating minority students, which inevitably affect the student’s self-concept (Obiakor, 1999). Furthermore, previous research has suggested that cultural factors impact the development of self-concept (Cole et al., 2001). Future research may also want to focus on determining what characteristics or behavioral repertoires of children lead to positive appraisals by their peers.

In conclusion, results of the present study contribute to understanding the relationship between significant others’ appraisals of a child and the child’s self-reported level of self-concept. Perhaps by recognizing the implications of the results of this study, parents and teachers can strive to adopt a more positive interaction with children, foster positive peer relationships, as well as seek interventions for children who do not receive positive appraisals from their peers.
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Table 1

**Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients between Self-reported Self-concept and Parent, Peer and Teacher Ratings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Group</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (n = 76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.340*</td>
<td>.706*</td>
<td>.538*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.583*</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.569*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *. All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*
Figure 1. Linear relationship between self-reported levels of self-concept and peer ratings
Appendix A

Certification of Parent and Student Participant Consent Form

Investigator: Terry Burgener

I, ___________________________ hereby certify that I have been informed by Terry Burgener either orally or in writing, or both, about the research on Peer Interactions. I have been told about the procedures, what my part and my child’s part in the study will be, and the time involved in the study: I understand that my child and I will complete rating scales independently. I understand that any records that can identify my child or myself or other participants in this study will be kept confidential.

I understand that my and my child’s participation in this study is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate; and I may refuse to have my child participate. Further, I may withdraw my consent both for my child and myself and stop taking part in the research at any time without penalty or prejudice.

I understand that I have the right to ask questions at any time and that I should contact Terry Burgener (618-392-7686) or Dr. Assege HaileMariam (217-581-6615) for answers about the research.

I hereby freely consent to participate and also have my child take part in this research project.

______________
Child’s Name

____________________
Parent Signature

____________________
Date
Appendix B

Certification of Teacher Participant Consent

Investigator: Terry Burgener

I, __________________________________________ hereby certify that I have been informed by Terry Burgener, either orally or in writing, or both, about the research on Peer Interaction. I have been told about the procedures, what my part will be, and the time involved for the study: I understand that I will complete a rating scale for each child participant in my class and also facilitate student participation. Further, I understand that any records that can identify me or any other participant in this study will be kept confidential.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw my consent and stop taking part in the research at any time without penalty or prejudice.

I understand that I have the right to ask questions at any time during the study, and that I should contact Terry Burgener (618-392-7686) or Dr. Assege HaileMariam (217-581-6615) for answers about the research.

I hereby freely consent to take part in this research project.

Participant’s Signature ____________________________ Date ____________
Appendix C

The Multidimensional Self-Concept Scale

Please rate the following statements according to how well the statement applies to you. There are no right or wrong answers, but it is important that you rate each statement according to how you honestly feel about yourself. Be sure to be honest with yourself as you consider the statement you are rating. To mark your answer, simply circle the letters that correspond with your feelings toward the statement. Each statement should be rated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SA)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL SUBSCALE**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am usually a lot of fun to be with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>People do not seem interested in talking with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am too shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Most people like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>People avoid me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A lot of people make fun of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am not accepted by people who know me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Most people think I am interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>People enjoy being with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Most of the time I feel ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel desired by members of the opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>No one seems to laugh at my jokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Most people appreciate me just the way I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I often feel like I am left out of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>People tell lies about me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I have a lot of friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I spend a lot of time feeling lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am never sure how to act when I am with people I don’t know well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>People tell me their secrets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>People pick on me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>People do not seem to notice me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I get a lot of phone calls from friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Many people have a low opinion of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I let people bully me too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>People have to get to know me before they like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Too often I say the wrong thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am too lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I have a good sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I am basically a weak person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I feel that most people respect me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am not very good at speaking my mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I am assertive when I need to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPETENCE SUBSCALE**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Too often I say the wrong thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am too lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I have a good sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I am basically a weak person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I feel that most people respect me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am not very good at speaking my mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I am assertive when I need to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. I am unlucky
35. I am very self confident
36. I don’t seem to have any control over my life
37. I frequently put off doing important
tings until it is too late
38. I give people good reason to trust me
39. I am not as good as I should be
40. I don’t keep quiet when I should
41. I am successful at most things
42. I handle my personal business responsibly
43. I lack common sense
44. I always seem to be in trouble
45. I can do most things pretty well
46. I am not very smart
47. I am a coward in many ways
48. Others believe that I will make something of myself
49. Too often I do dumb things without thinking
50. I waste money foolishly

51. I enjoy life
52. I am afraid of many things
53. There are many things I would like to
change about myself
54. I am not able to laugh at myself very easily
55. I am not a happy person
56. I am proud of myself
57. I feel like a failure
58. My life is discouraging
59. I am happy with myself just the way I am
60. I am too emotional
61. I have good self control
62. I often disappoint myself
63. My life is unstable
64. I have a positive outlook on life
65. I am frequently confused about my feelings
66. Sometimes I feel worthless
67. I often feel ashamed of things I have done
68. I frequently feel helpless
69. I feel loved
70. I wish I could be someone else
71. I feel insecure
72. I am a good person
73. I am not as happy as I appear
74. I am usually very relaxed
75. There are times when I don’t like myself

76. Classmates usually like my ideas
77. I frequently feel unprepared for class
78. I am good at mathematics
79. Learning is difficult for me
80. I usually do well on tests
81. I am proud of my school work
82. I can spell better than most people my age
83. I read as well as most people my age
84. I don’t think very quickly
85. I work harder than most of my classmates
86. I don’t understand much of what I read
87. I learn fairly easily
88. I never seem to have good ideas
89. My teachers like my classroom behavior
90. I often feel dumb
91. Most of my teachers seem to like me
92. I have poor study habits
93. Science is easy for me
94. I am uncomfortable in school
95. I usually work very hard
96. Most people would rather work with me than someone else
97. My teachers have a low opinion of me
98. Most subjects are pretty easy for me
99. I am not very creative
100. I usually feel good about my written work

**FAMILY SUBSCALE**

101. My parents care about my happiness
102. My family makes me feel loved
103. My family ruins everything for me
104. In my family, we take care of each other
105. I feel appreciated by my family
106. I have fun with my family
107. I wish I could trade families with someone else
108. My parents are interested in me
109. My parents don’t trust me
110. My home is warm and caring
111. My parents do not like my being around them
112. My parents help me when I need it
113. I am an important member of my family
114. My parents are proud of me
115. My family is no good
116. Nothing I do seems to please my parents
117. My parents attend events that are important to me
118. My parents believe in me
119. I am proud of my family
120. My parents care about my education
121. My family is one of the most important parts of my life
122. My parents love me just as I am
123. I don’t know why my family stays together
124. My parents care about my future
125. My home is not a happy place

**PHYSICAL SUBSCALE**

126. I feel good
127. I am attractive
128. I am in poor shape
129. When I look in the mirror, I like what I see
130. I tire too quickly
131. I have nice looking teeth
132. I look nice in just about anything I wear
133. I am ugly
134. I am stronger than most people
135. I have a nice figure
136. I am healthy
137. I feel good about how I look
138. I am good at most sports
139. I do not like how my clothes fit me
140. I am typically chosen among the last for team sports
141. I am physically fit
142. My hair never seems to look very good
143. My skin is attractive
144. I do not like to be seen in a swimsuit
145. There are parts of my body that I try to keep others from noticing
146. My clothes look good on me
147. I do not seem to have the energy to do very much
148. My weight is just about where it should be
149. I would change my looks if I could
150. I am graceful
Appendix D

PEER RATING SCALE

Here is a set of statements that tell how some students behave. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes the way you see your fellow classmate. If it is true or mostly true, put a check mark under the word “yes”, if it is false or mostly false put a check under the word “no”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATER #</th>
<th>STUDENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classmates make fun of him/her</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is unpopular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is among the last to be chosen for games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has a lot of pep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is easy to get along with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People do not seem to be interested in talking with him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A lot people make fun of him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People enjoy being with him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most people appreciate him/her just the way they are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. He/she has a lot of friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People tell him/her their secrets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People bully or pick him/her often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Many people have a low opinion of him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. People tell lies about him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. No one seems to laugh at his/her sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Most people think he/she is interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People avoid him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. He/she is usually a lot of fun to be with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Has a lot of friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feels left out of things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is shy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is hard for him/her to make friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. His/her friends like his/her ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Is often mean to other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Gets into a lot of fights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. He/she would rather work alone than with a group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Most people like him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. He/she is not accepted by people who know him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Most of the time, he/she is ignored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. He/she is often left out of things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. He/she spends a lot of time feeling lonely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. People do not seem to notice him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. People have to get to know him/her before they like them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Teacher Rating Scale

Instructions to Teachers

In the enclosed packet, you will find the Teacher Rating Scales for each student participant who has parent permission to participate in this research project. Please read each item carefully when completing the scale for the respective student being rated and answer each question based on your knowledge of the child how you honestly perceive him or her. There is no right or wrong answer, but it is very important that you are honest with yourself when answering each statement. For quality control, please complete these forms in the absence of your students, so as to limit the distractions during your participation in this study.
Here is a set of statements that tell how some students behave. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes the way you see your student. If it is true or mostly true, put a check mark under the word “yes”, if it is false or mostly false put a check under the word “no”.

YES  NO

1. Is too lazy
2. I feel most people respect him/her
3. Is unlucky
4. Frequently puts off doing important things until it is too late
5. Does not keep quiet when he/she should
6. Lacks common sense
7. Is not very smart
8. Too often he/she does dumb things without thinking
9. When he/she grows up, he/she will be an important person
10. Does many bad things
11. Can be trusted
12. Is afraid of many things
13. Feels like a failure
14. Has good self-control
15. Sometimes he/she feels worthless
16. Feels loved
17. Is usually very relaxed
18. Is unhappy
19. Usually wants things his/her own way
20. Gets worried when he/she has tests in school
21. Is slow at finishing his/her school work
22. Often volunteers in school
23. Forgets what he/she has learned
24. Is honest
25. Has a good sense of humor
26. Is not very good at speaking his/her mind
27. Is very self-confident
28. Gives people good reason to trust him/her
29. Is successful at most things
30. Always seems to be in trouble
31. Is a coward in many ways
32. Wastes money foolishly
33. It is usually his/her fault when something goes wrong
34. Often gets in trouble
35. He/she has good ideas
36. Is not a happy person
37. Is happy with himself/herself just the way he/she is
38. His/her life is unstable
39. Frequently feels helpless
40. Is a good person
41. Worries a lot
42. Loses his/her temper easily
43. He/she worries a lot
44. Is well behaved in school
45. Is an important member of the class
46. Hates school
47. Too often says the wrong thing
48. Is basically a weak person
49. Is assertive when he/she needs to be
50. Does not seem to have any control over his/her life
51. He/she is not as good as he/she should be
52. Handles their personal business responsibly
53. Can do most things pretty well
54. Others believe that he/she will make something of themselves
55. Is smart
56. Gives up easily
57. Is dumb about most things
58. Enjoys life
59. Is proud of himself/herself
60. Is too emotional
61. Has a positive outlook on life
62. Feels insecure
63. Is not as happy as he/she appears
64. Is nervous
65. Is often afraid
66. Gets nervous when teacher calls on him/her
67. Is good at school work
68. In school, is a dreamer
69. His/her classmates in school think he/she has good ideas
Appendix F

Parent Rating Scale

Instructions to Parents

Enclosed, you will find the Parent Rating Scale for you to complete regarding your child. Please read the items on the scale carefully, and answer each item according to how you honestly perceive your child. For quality control, please complete this scale without help from your spouse or child, so as to limit distractions and possible influence from another individual.
Parent Rating Scale

Parent ID # ____________________________  Student ID # ____________________________

Here is a set of statements that tell how some students behave. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes the way you see your child. If it is true or mostly true, put a check mark under the word “yes”, if it is false or mostly false put a check mark under the word “no”.

1. Is honest
2. Has a good sense of humor
3. Is not very good at speaking his/her mind
4. Is very self-confident
5. Gives people good reason to trust him/her
6. Is successful at most things
7. Always seems to be in trouble
8. Is a coward in many ways
9. Wastes money foolishly
10. It is usually his/her fault when something goes wrong
11. Often gets in trouble
12. He/she has good ideas
13. Picks on brothers, sisters, and/or other children
14. Is proud of his/her family
15. He/she feels appreciated by his/her family
16. Enjoys life
17. Is proud of himself/herself
18. Is too emotional
19. Has a positive outlook on life
20. Feels insecure
21. Is not as happy as he/she appears
22. Is nervous
23. Is often afraid
24. Is too lazy
25. I feel most people respect him/her
26. Is unlucky
27. Frequently puts off doing things until it is too late
28. Does not keep quiet when he/she should
29. Lacks common sense
30. Is not very smart
31. Too often he/she does dumb things without thinking
32. When he/she grows up, he/she will be an important person
33. Does many bad things
34. Can be trusted
35. Behaves badly at home
36. Is picked on at home
37. He/she believes his/her parents are interested in him/her