University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Open Access Dissertations

1996

Age Differences in Multidimensional Self-Concept

Erika Natalie Gardiner

University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Gardiner, Erika Natalie, "Age Differences in Multidimensional Self-Concept" (1996). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1083.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1083

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

BF723
528
G373
1996

AGE DIFFERENCES IN MULTIDIMENSIONAL SELF-CONCEPT

BY

ERIKA NATALIE GARDINER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

36131742

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1996

Abstract

Since James (1890) introduced the psychological importance of the self, researchers have continued to debate several issues concerning self-concept and self-esteem. This study examined the ratings of multiple domains of self-concept, the importance of those domains, ratings of general self-concept, and self-esteem of 691 students from a North East school district in grades 4, 8, and 12. Students were chosen to represent three developmental levels: pre-adolescence, early adolescence, and late adolescence. All students completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, a form of the Harter Self-Perception Profile and its accompanying importance ratings. Significant age and gender differences in the ratings were analyzed using a repeated measures ANOVA design. The three-way interaction of Grade by Sex by Self-Concept Domain was found to be significant, indicating differences between males and females in athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct at each of the three grade levels. When specific domains were examined, many of the gender differences in ratings of competency were in the direction of gender stereotypes. Significant Grade by Domain and Sex by Domain interactions of importance ratings were also found. Gender differences were found in global self-worth and self-esteem, with males consistently reporting higher ratings. Significant grade differences were also found in ratings of global self-worth. However, the predicted U-shaped trend in ratings of self-esteem was found for female participants but not for males. When domain and importance ratings were used in linear regression models to predict global self-concept and self-esteem, importance ratings were not found to reliably increase the predictability of either global measure. However, ratings of physical appearance were found to significantly predict global measures at each developmental level. Implications and possible interventions are discussed.

Acknowledgments

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to my major professor, Jerry Cohen. He guided me through my master's thesis, helped me shape the idea that became this dissertation, and (most helpful of all!) was a calm sounding board regarding the questions and anxieties that arose during the two years that I "lived" this project.

I am also grateful for the help and support of the many administrators, teachers, and staff of the Warwick Public Schools who assisted with this research. In particular I would like to thank the Director of Special Services, John F. Sharkey for lobbying for my project, and the school psychologists Richard Lloyd, Jay Mulshenock, Tom Barry and Lincoln Monro, for facilitating the staff contacts and data collection. I could not have done this without them.

A special thanks is extended to my parents, sister, brother, and friends. Their interest in and support of this research in all its stages was immeasurably helpful. Also, a thank you to my friend Patrick LaGrego, who, when I told him I was going to graduate school to become a psychologist, replied, "I always knew you would be a doctor." That conversation periodically crossed my mind and is fondly remembered now.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Introduction	1
Method	21
Results	29
Discussion	57
Conclusions	71
References	74
Figures	79
Appendix A: Fourth Grade Consent Forms and Measures	92
Appendix B: Eighth Grade Consent Forms and Measures	105
Appendix C: Subscales From the Self-Perception Profile - Child Form Administered to the Eighth Grade Participants	118
Appendix D: Twelfth Grade Consent Forms and Measures	124
Bibliography	136

The study of the self has been an ongoing activity among philosophers and scientists since the time of Plato. Numerous investigators have attempted to understand the structure of the self, and the process by which it is formed. However, these investigations have yielded few unambiguous answers. Instead, several issues continue to be debated in the self literature. William James (1890) described several controversial issues that continue to influence the current self research. These include the characteristics and dimensions of self, methodologies to study the self, and the effects of the self on motivation, behaviors, and processing of information. Definitional issues have fostered debate as to whether there is a distinction between descriptive and evaluative components of the self. Attempts have also been made to describe the characteristics and dimensions of self. Finally, investigation has occurred around potential developmental changes of self. This research is an attempt to address aspects of these definitional, descriptive and developmental issues of self.

The first area to be addressed in this research is issues around definition of self-concept. Two interrelated constructs are often used interchangeably by researchers and has added confusion to the self literature. These are the constructs of self-concept and self-esteem. In general terms, self-concept can be viewed as an individual's perception of him or herself (Sigelman and Shaffer, 1991). A closely related construct is self-esteem, which Sigelman and Shaffer (1991) define as a person's general evaluation of his or her worth. Although these constructs are related, this research will consider self-concept and self-esteem as two separate entities, and therefore suggest using separate measures of each.

Despite clarification of differences between descriptive and evaluative components of self, intra-definitional issues regarding the nature of self-concept

continue. Byrne (1984) states that although no clear, concise, universally accepted definition of self-concept exists, researchers have typically evaluated the self as a single entity. However, more recent research has proposed that the examination of a multi-dimensional self is more relevant and empirically substantiated in order to understand the self (see Marsh and Gouvenet, 1989, for an overview). For example Rosenberg (1979, p. 73) states, "Self-concept is not a collection but an organization of parts, pieces, and components and that these are hierarchically organized and interrelated in complex ways." In addition, possible models of self-concept have been proposed, which differ in terms of their definition, situation-specificity, and interrelatedness of their dimensions (Byrne, 1984). For example, Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) propose that self-concept is multifaceted, hierarchically organized, and becomes increasingly differentiated with age. Regardless of the model endorsed, Byrne (1984, p. 427), concluded that self-concept "is a multidimensional construct, having one general construct and several specific facets." In this research, self-concept will be considered as a multidimensional construct, comprised of a general self-concept and multiple related domains.

With an increased focus on the specific domains of self-concept, the role of general self-concept has become less clear. Marsh (1986) states that no widely accepted definition of general self-concept exists. He has proposed five common operational definitions (p. 1224):

1. A hierarchical general self that appears at the apex of hierarchical models such as Shavelson's (Shavelson et al., 1976);
2. A conglomerate general self that is the total score from a hodgepodge of self-referant items that attempt to sample broadly from a range of characteristics;
3. A global self-esteem scale that is relatively unidimensional and content free in that it is composed of items that infer a general sense of self-worth or self-confidence that could be applied to many specific areas (e.g., the

General Self scale from the SDQ III and other scales described by Harter, 1982, and Rosenberg, 1965);

4. A discrepancy general self for which ratings of specific facets of self (actual ratings) are subtracted from ideal ratings (e.g., Higgins, Klein, & Strauman, 1985; Harter, 1985; but also see Wylie, 1974 for a critical discussion);

5. A weighted average general self where specific facets are weighted according to their salience, value, or importance (e.g., Hoge & McCarthy, 1984; Watkins, 1978).

It is important to acknowledge that multiple definitions of general self-concept exist. They are related to the purposes of this research in two ways. First, confusion exists as to whether general self-concept is different from self-esteem. Therefore, this research examined the relationship between these two constructs. Second, the weighted average definition was investigated in this research. This definition, whereby the salience or importance of specific factors is seen to influence the general self, has gained prominence. William James (1890/1963) argued that an individual's negative evaluation of an area deemed unimportant would have little impact on that individual's general appraisal of him or herself. Rosenberg (1979, p. 73) proposed that "one cannot appreciate the significance of a specific self-concept component for global self-esteem if one fails to recognize the importance or centrality of that component to the individual."

Models Incorporating Importance Ratings

Although many theorists have reiterated the necessity of considering the importance of aspects of self-concept (see Marsh, 1986, p. 1224 for a review), they have also stated that empirical research testing this idea is scarce.

Rosenberg (1965) asked high school juniors and seniors how likeable they were and related this rating to global self-esteem. He found that the strength of the relationship depended on the importance attached to being likeable. A

strong relationship was found among subjects who highly valued being likeable; a weaker relationship was found if the quality of being liked mattered less. Coopersmith (1967, p. 6) wrote that an individual's "overall appraisal of his abilities would presumably weight these areas according to their subjective importance enabling him to arrive at a general level of self-esteem." However, he also added that "objective evidence on the method of arriving at general appraisals is sparse". Wylie (1974, p. 48) proposed, "The sum is simple expedient in the face of ignorance and should be so recognized. Steps should be taken to weight item ratings according to their perceived salience to S, but this has not yet been tried." This research investigated the ways in which persons weight and combine ratings of importance.

One of the reasons why research in these weighting methods may be scarce is because researchers are unsure of the process by which individuals formulate social cognitions, including self-concept. Rosenberg (1979) proposed that individuals may not be aware of how they integrate domain-specific information about the self. Researchers have proposed several statistical models to account for the integration process evident in the formulation of general self-esteem. These weighted average models share a common general method: Individuals are asked to complete several measures including a general self-esteem measure, such as the Rosenberg (1965) scale, ratings of specific self-concept domains (either in the form of single or multiple items per domain), and then indicate the importance or salience for each domain.

Marsh (1993), proposed one way to evaluate these models. He stated that the critical test of these models is whether domain-specific ratings, when combined with the individual's perceptions of domain importance, are better

able to predict general self-esteem than the domain-specific ratings alone. He distinguished several types of weighted average models. These include:

1. Simple unweighted models, where the weights are common across domains and individuals. Scores may be oriented in the same direction and/or standardized.

2. Constant weighted models, where weights may differ according to the domain, but be constant across individuals. Different weights may be assigned on the basis of theory or design, derived from group averages, or obtained by empirical procedures such as factor analysis or multiple regression.

3. Individually weighted models, where the weights may differ according to the domain and that the weights assigned to each domain may vary from individual to individual. For example, each specific domain may be individually weighted by the importance rating that domain has been given by the individual.

Marsh (1993) proposed evaluating these models in terms of their parsimony. He stated that simple unweighted models are the most parsimonious. Constant weighted models are less parsimonious than the unweighted models, but are more parsimonious than individually weighted models. According to Marsh (p. 976), "support for an individually weighted model requires that it is able to explain significantly more variance than the constant weighted models, and support for a constant weighted model requires it to explain more variance than the unweighted models." When significant differences are not determined, then the most parsimonious model is endorsed. Marsh's technique has been the only method for evaluating weighted models. This research continued to examine the manner in which importance information was combined with domain ratings.

Recently, several researchers have examined the salience of the individually weighted models as the best way to understand the relationship between general self-esteem, multiple self-concept domains, and ratings of the importance of these domains. Marsh (1993) suggested that this evaluation occur by applying a generalized multiple regression approach. With this

process, esteem is predicted by a set of domain-specific ratings, domain importance ratings, and domain x importance cross product terms. Then a backwards elimination of non-significant predictors is conducted. Marsh states that according to this process, support for the model is achieved when all terms are simultaneously included in the regression equation, or the cross product terms are retained after the backwards elimination of non-significant predictors.

Hoge and McCarthy (1984), using a high school sample, did not find support for the individually weighted model. Instead, they found that esteem was more highly correlated with unweighted mean ratings than mean ratings which had been weighted by individual importance scores.

Marsh (1986) examined potential methodological problems which may have accounted for the results in Hoge and McCarthy's study. Using a primarily female sample, with a mean age of 19.6 years, Marsh addressed two potential weaknesses. First, instead of the untransformed, raw data used in Hoge and McCarthy's study, Marsh used z score transformations of the self-concept domain ratings, and "ipsatized" importance ratings. Second, Marsh incorporated multiple-item rating scales, instead of the single-item self-concept domain ratings. Even with these adjustments, Marsh found little support for the individually weighted importance model. Using the multiple regression technique, only 2 of the 12 specific self-concept domains (Spiritual, Physical Abilities) interacted with the corresponding importance ratings. In addition, individually weighted models did not perform significantly better than constant weighted models. Minimal support for the individually weighted importance model was found when the same multiple regression approach was applied to the data from a 1989 study of Pelham and Swann (in Marsh, 1993).

Marsh (1993) again evaluated possible methodological problems that may have influenced previous research results. In this study, only school-

related domains were examined. In addition, an a priori dichotomous measure of importance was created by utilizing important versus non-important school subjects, defined as core versus non-core subjects. Subjects were males in grades 7-10 who were attending a Catholic boys school in Australia. Results showed that none of the individually weighted average models predicted more esteem variance than the a priori constant weighted average model. The constant weighted model with empirically derived optimal weights predicted the most variance of any of the models tested. Marsh interpreted these findings as support for a constant weighted model.

Marsh has proposed ways in which to combine importance information. By using these methods, he and others have found very little support for individually weighted models of importance. However, possible sampling and methodological artifacts may have contributed to his findings. Therefore, this research project includes continued investigation of the types of models Marsh has cited, but with changes in instruments and samples. It is also possible that age and possible age differences are important variables that Marsh has not investigated. Therefore, research on the development of self-concept must be considered as an additional context.

Theories of Self-Concept Development

Many theories have been proposed to account for general personality development. Theorists have used these theoretical frameworks to describe and predict the development of self-concept. For example, Mead (1934, cited in Peevers, 1987) cited the impact of culture and viewed the self as socially constructed through the interaction with others who shared a context and common language. Harre (cited in Peevers, 1987) also highlighted the importance of culture on the development of self by proposing that one's view of self is derived from the theory of the self prevalent in the society in which one

resides. The psychodynamic theorist Erikson also stressed the importance of social context on personality development. He and other ego psychologists viewed development as a "series of reorganizing around stage salient issues" (Shirk & Renouf, 1992, p. 53). At each of Erikson's psychosocial stages, which purports development in the context of a meaningful social environment, a developmental task must be resolved. Erikson (in Shirk & Renouf, 1992) proposed that middle childhood (roughly ages six to eleven) could be conceptualized as the age of industry, in which the primary task is to gain a sense of achievement and efficacy in the world. Parents and teachers are said to be the primary persons shaping this process at this time (Vander Zanden, 1989). During adolescence (roughly ages 12 to 18), the primary task is to formulate self-identity. Identity is viewed to be constructed through a summation or synthesis of "childhood identifications, social appraisals, unique abilities and needs, physiological givens, and positive and negative results of social experimentation " (Marcia, 1987, p. 166). Vander Zanden (1989) stated that to determine a sense of identity, the adolescent must understand physical changes, romantic relationships, and vocational choices. Based on Erikson's psychosocial stages, predictions about self-concept and the perceived importance of different areas of self-concept can be made. For example, it is possible that younger children (ages six to eleven) will perceive their academic accomplishments and relationships to parents to be more important than other areas, as school and home can be said to be important places to develop a sense of self-efficacy. Adolescents would be expected to place greater importance on physical attributes, social belonging, and vocational effectiveness.

Cognitive theorists have proposed numerous frameworks for the development of self-concept. Many of these views are based on Piagetian

cognitive developmental theory. According to Piaget, children ages seven to eleven are said to be in the concrete operational stage of development. Beginning at this stage, children learn to develop rational thinking and logical operations. Children older than 11 are said to be in the formal operational stage of development, and at this time acquire a greater ability to deal with abstraction (cited in Vander Zanden, 1989).

This Piagetian concept of qualitative changes in a child's cognitive abilities is reflected in Werner's Orthogenetic Principle (1957), cited in Montemayor & Eisen (1982). According to Werner, "whenever development occurs, it proceeds from a state of relative globality and lack of differentiation to a state of increasing differentiation, articulation and hierarchic integration" (1957, p.126). Montemayor and Eisen (1982) propose that this idea suggests that as a child matures, his or her cognitions shift from concrete to increasingly abstract.

Other researchers have extended Werner's Orthogenetic Principle to additional areas of cognitive development. Crockett (1965), cited in Montemayor & Eisen (1982), extended Werner's Orthogenetic Principle to the area of person perception. Crockett proposed that with increasing age, as a child is more able to think abstractly, the child is better able to differentiate another person's appearance, behavior and personality characteristics. Scarlett, Press and Crockett (1971), cited in Montemayor & Eisen (1982), found that with increasing age, a child's descriptive statements of others become less egocentric and utilize more abstract descriptions. Flavell (1977) expanded this idea to the development of self-concept by stating that the development of knowledge of the self parallels and overlaps the development of knowledge of others. Montemayor and Eisen (1982) also suggested that Crockett's ideas and findings can be applied to self-concept development. Specifically, they proposed that there is a greater use of psychological and abstract descriptors of

self with age. Utilizing Kuhn and McPartland's Who Am I? test (1954) with children ages 10 to 18, they found that with age, self-concept became less concrete and more abstract. Other researchers have found the same trend after incorporating younger ages in their samples. For example, Anderson (1992) reported that research using preschool samples has found that young children have an undifferentiated set of positive feelings about themselves that appears relatively resistant to negative feedback. Anderson stated that research incorporating older children and the use of oral or written self-descriptions repeatedly supports the "classic finding" (1992, p. 15) of descriptions moving from concrete to abstract .

Anderson (1992) reviewed other research methodologies, which also suggested qualitative changes in the self-concepts of early childhood, late childhood, and adolescence. Damon and Hart's (1982) model (cited in Anderson, 1992) suggests that a child focuses on different aspects of self at different ages. In infancy, the physical self predominates. In middle and late childhood, the active self is the focus. In early adolescence, a shift occurs to the social self. And in late adolescence, there is a concern with one's personal philosophy and belief system. Mullener and Laird (1971), cited in Anderson (1992), used rating scales to understand self-concept development, and suggested that "with age, there was a change from relatively global to relatively differentiated self evaluations" (1971, p. 235). These researchers also noted that less variance in the self-evaluations was related to generally higher scores overall, and suggested that simpler, less differentiated self-concepts are associated with more positive evaluations of self. Anderson (1992) stated that there are continued questions about this process of change in the self-structure. She hypothesized that with age, the self-structure becomes more complex, but also more stable.

Aboud and Ruble (1987) have stated that the development of identity constancy parallels Piagetian cognitive development. During the preoperational stage, constancy is not viewed as a salient construct. When it is noted, the child focuses on observable, physical characteristics. Around the age of eight, a child begins to expect sameness. It is during the concrete operational stage that the child begins to be aware of and focus on internal attributes and feelings.

Aboud and Ruble appear to be proposing changes in the way that children process information about themselves. The information processing model of self-concept also suggests changes in the manner in which children of different ages formulate ideas about themselves. According to Lynch (1981), self-concept can be viewed as an information processing model which uses algorithms for classification or discrimination of information. Lynch proposed that some of these rules are innate, but beginning in early childhood, language fosters the creation of many new rules and algorithms that govern cognitive processes, including the self-concept. In middle childhood, the child increasingly incorporates verbal, logical and abstract societal rules. These rules are presented primarily through schooling and are viewed as relatively constant. In adolescence, rules focus on social acceptability, especially acceptability of physical characteristics. Cultural rules validate desirability of these characteristics. Although the information processing model describes the self in a different way than other cognitive based views of self, it shares the idea of developmental changes and the impact of social context.

Methodological Issues in the Development of Self Research

Developmental research that has been conducted has used various operational definitions of self-concept. For example, Lewis and Brooks-Gunn (1979) (as cited in Sigelman and Shaffer, 1991) examined the use of language and the use of personal pronouns as a method of determining the emergence of a toddler's sense of self. Children as early as three years old were found to have been able to describe themselves to others. Damon and Hart (1982) (as cited in Sigelman and Shaffer, 1991) found that preschoolers focus on and describe their physical characteristics, physical actions, and possessions. Very few children at this age describe themselves in terms of psychological traits, feelings, or inner qualities. This ability to reflect on and describe their thoughts and feelings starts to become evident around the age of eight (Damon and Hart, 1982, cited in Sigelman and Shaffer, 1991). In a study of Baltimore youth, ages 8-19, Rosenberg (1979) found that in response to an open-ended question format, only 21% of his 8-9 age sample described their thoughts, feelings, and wishes. Instead, most of their responses related to overt behavior, physical abilities, and preference for activities. In contrast, 57% of adolescents older than 16 gave "inner world" responses. Only 19% of this age group gave responses concerning behavior, abilities, and activities (Rosenberg, 1979, p. 198). Rosenberg (1979) cites Shantz (1975, p. 314) who observed that "there is a developmental trend towards conceiving of people less in terms of their surface appearance, possessions, and motor behavior and more in terms of an underlying reality." However, Rosenberg added the dimension of importance to this developmental trend. He stated, "If the older child spontaneously cites a trait or inner feeling, then, it is not because the other components are not also important elements of his self-concept, but either because they are taken for

granted, have a lower priority, or centrality in his scale of values, or are felt to be less of what he truly and deeply feels himself to be" (1979, p. 215).

Besides interviews with children, surveys and questionnaires have been used as another means of understanding the development of childrens' self-concept. However, these instruments often have been criticized for their poor psychometric properties and lack of theoretical basis (Wylie, 1979). In a review of the developmental studies of self-concept conducted prior to 1977, Wylie (1979) proposed other common problems to this area of research. Among these were (a) the unwarranted use of discrepancy scores, (b) overly small sample sizes, (c) non-equivalent groups in cross-sectional designs, (d) attrition in longitudinal designs, and (e) little research combining cross-sectional with longitudinal elements within a single design. Based on her comprehensive review of developmental studies of self-concept, Wylie reported no convincing evidence for age differences in overall self-concept between the ages of 6 and 50 years.

Since Wylie's review, longitudinal and cross-sectional studies have been conducted examining possible age effects in self-concept. Longitudinal designs were favored by Wylie, despite possible differential effects of testing, subject attrition, and inattention or carelessness by younger respondents. McCarthy and Hoge (1982) concurred with Wylie and stated that as a method for detecting changes in self-esteem with age, longitudinal studies are superior, as problems with sampling variability and error are less likely to intrude on the data and cause spurious effects. They cited the research design of Bachman and O'Malley (1977), which Wylie (1979) described as "superior to that of most other studies" (p. 32). This study found increases in the self-esteem of males over an eight-year period of repeated measurement, beginning in the 10th grade. McCarthy and Hoge (1982) examined self-esteem changes in 7th, 9th,

and 11th grade students over a two year span. They found that all three cohorts displayed systematic increases in self-esteem over time. Cross-sectional comparisons were less consistent in showing self-esteem increases by age. O'Malley and Bachman (1983) assessed self-esteem in a national sample of senior high school students through the use of a "Rosenberg-type scale" (p. 257). Participants were assessed during their senior year and every two years after graduation. Significant increases in self-esteem were seen in all groups. O'Malley and Bachman combined their results with those of McCarthy and Hoge (1982) to propose showing "significant increases in self-esteem for various segments of the interval from about age 13 to early adulthood" (p. 261).

Design problems that affect internal and external validity are evident in these longitudinal studies of self-esteem. In addition to questions about the generalizability of findings of self-esteem to self-concept, these include the use of unsubstantiated short-forms of instruments, a truncated age range of subjects, and comparisons made with possibly non-compatible samples.

Cross-sectional designs, even with their possible threats to internal and external validity, have been conducted, and tend to demonstrate a general trend in the development of self-concept. Marsh (1985) examined age differences in self-concept for a large Australian sample from grades 2-6. He utilized the Self Description Questionnaire, a multidimensional self-concept instrument, which measures 7 domains of self-concept, plus a general self domain. He found a systematic decline in self-concepts during these preadolescent years. Marsh (1989) also sought to examine self-concept changes over a larger range of ages. Summarizing previous research on age effects of self-concept, Marsh reported the following general findings. During preadolescent years, self-concept appears to decline. Studies which have examined multiple dimensions of self demonstrate this decline across most of

the domains. For early to middle adolescent years, there appears to be no consistent pattern of age effects. Some suggest a curvilinear effect, where self-concept reaches a low point in early adolescence. Others have found systematic increases or decreases in self-concept for this age group. In late adolescence and early adulthood, general self-concept appears to steadily increase. In his 1989 study, Marsh utilized the normative samples from his three Self Description Questionnaires, which spanned youth in grade 2 to early adulthood. He found that preadolescents demonstrated a statistically significant linear decline in all self-concept domains and the general self domain with age. For early to middle adolescent participants, a U shaped quadratic effect seemed evident, with relatively high self-concepts in grade 7, a decline over grades 8 and 9, and an increase in grades 10 and 11. This may be due to the direction of the linear age effects for these ages not being consistent across the different SDQ scales: positive trends were seen in some, negative trends in others. The quadratic effect was statistically significant for 8 of the 11 domain scores and the general self score. For the late adolescent/young adult sample, statistically significant positive increases in self-concept were seen in 9 of the 13 domains, as well as in general self. Marsh interprets these findings as "strong support for the increase in self-concept during late adolescence and reasonably good support for its decline during preadolescence" (p. 426). He suggests that this implies a quadratic, U-shaped curve during adolescence, but allows that additional research including less limited age ranges needs to be conducted to consider non-linear effects.

In summary, Wylie (1979) alerted researchers to some of the methodological problems inherent in doing research on developmental changes in self-concept. Since that date, a number of researchers have employed longitudinal and cross-sectional designs to examine age effects.

Although each study has methodological shortcomings, when results across studies are combined, a general quadratic relationships between age and self-concept appears to have support.

Adolescent Self-Concept

Results of the above-mentioned research generally suggest that adolescence is a time when self-esteem and self-concept changes are evident, generally in a negative direction. Although the concept of adolescent "storm and stress" is considered not to be supported (Demo & Savin-Williams, 1992), a number of factors have been proposed to account for these negative self-evaluations. Peterson (1981) described five major influences, or normative age-graded influences, on adolescent self-concept: the entrance to adolescent status, physical changes, school structural changes, peer relations, and parental influences. Each of these will be briefly discussed.

Peterson (1981) stated that the adolescent must fulfill new expectations to him or her self and others when labeled an adolescent. He or she must deal with a series of implicit and explicit societal expectations regarding the appropriate adolescent role. For example, schools expect a higher degree of independence and maturity in social interactions in the adolescent years.

The second of Peterson's normative age-graded influences is physical, biological and cognitive changes. Puberty initiates a number of changes of which the adolescent may or may not be aware. Timing of puberty has been considered to have an impact on self-esteem. Simmons (1987) found that the early onset of puberty was related to positive changes in self-esteem of males, but negative changes in the self-esteem of females. Researchers have also suggested that other people's positive or negative appraisals of these physical changes affects self-esteem and self-concept. Harter (1987) (as cited in Shirk &

Renouf, 1992) found that self-ratings of physical appearance was the best predictor of self-esteem in early adolescence.

Adolescents must also navigate changes to new schools. Hirsch and Raphin (1987) (as cited in Demo & Savin-Williams, 1992) suggested that the transition to a new school, with its inherent changes in organizational structure and potential discontinuity in peer groups, is stressful. Lipka, Hurford and Litten (1992) cited the studies of Eccles et al., presented in 1987, who concluded that self-esteem is related to the transition to junior high school, with the lowest self-esteem found in the autumn months of seventh grade. Simmons (1987) described research conducted in the 1970's which examined the effect of school organization on reported self-esteem of adolescents. Simmons found that males demonstrated a gradual rise in self-esteem from grade 6 to grade 9, whether they had attended a junior high school or a school comprised of kindergarten through eighth grades. Females who had attended the K-8 school demonstrated a similar trend in self-esteem. However, females who attended junior high showed lower self-esteem ratings in grades 6 through 9, with the lowest ratings occurring at the beginning of grade 7.

Close friendships and acceptance by the peer group are proposed to be related to adolescent self-esteem. Demo and Savin-Williams (1992) state that adolescents begin to spend more time with peers than adults, and that "the most important sources of validation are friendships, other interpersonal relationships with peers, and one's status among same-age peers" (p. 125). Harter (1987) (as cited in Shirk & Renouf, 1992) found that adolescents rated social acceptance as the area of most importance.

Although the peer group has been viewed as an increasing focus of the adolescent, relationships with parents have also been theorized to be important. Shirk and Renouf (1992) described parent/child relations as being

part of the general construct of social support, and stated that changes in social support are seen as a key to continuity of self and high self-esteem.

Adolescents and their parents must reorganize the parent/child relationship, which can be a difficult task. Peterson (1981) noted that in middle adolescence, parental pressure peaks, and therefore is expected to impact on adolescent self-concept. Simmons (1987) found that early independence from parental supervisions was related to negative self-esteem, especially at the transition to junior high school.

To summarize, potential developmental changes in self-concept were investigated with this research. It was hypothesized that there would be age differences when examining multidimensional self-concept and the perceived importance of those domains. For example, to extrapolate from the work of Damon and Hart (1982), and Rosenberg (1979), young pre-adolescents may more highly rate themselves and attach more importance to physical attributes and behavior. Changes in general self-concept and self-esteem were examined. Although much of the previous research has examined age differences in self-esteem, it will be useful to compare whether similar changes, are evident in general self-concept.

Sex Differences

Although not a primary focus of this study, potential sex differences in self-concept are appropriate to mention briefly, primarily because researchers have proposed possible age by sex interactions. Wylie (1979) in her review of the self-concept research conducted prior to 1977, stated that no evidence for sex differences in overall self-concept existed at any age level. However, she added that sex differences in different domains may become lost when a total or general self-concept score is calculated, or focused upon. Research since 1979 have found sex differences in global self-concept. For example, Marsh,

Relich and Smith (1983) found that pre-adolescent males reported higher overall self-concepts than females. In terms of sex differences in multidimensional self-concept, research has been inconsistent. Some researchers (Dusek & Flaherty, 1981; Marsh, Barnes, Cairns & Tidman, 1984) have suggested that the reason for sex differences not having been found is because counterbalancing occurs with many of the specific domains of self-concept (some favor males, some females), in favor of traditional sex stereotypes. Marsh (1989) concludes, in a review of sex differences, that males tend to score slightly higher on measures of general self-concept and self-esteem. Larger sex differences in the direction of traditional sex stereotypes have been found on domain-specific ratings, but these results have been inconsistent as well. Recently, Gardiner (1992) found significant sex differences in ratings of general self-concept, multiple domains of self-concept, and ratings of importance of self-concept with a fifth grade sample. Males reported higher general self-concepts than females. Significant differences were also found in appraisals of multiple domains of self-concept. In a comparison of physical, social and academic areas of self-concept, sex differences were found primarily in physical self-concept, with males having higher ratings than females. In a more specific, seven-domain analysis, females reported lower self-concepts than males in all areas, except reading and general school subjects.

Gardiner (1992) also found sex differences in the ratings of importance of self-concept domains. In between-sex comparisons, males rated the physical domain as significantly higher in importance than their female peers. In within-sex comparisons across categories, females rated the academic, social and physical domains as of similar importance.

Present Study

The purpose of the present study was to examine several questions. First, this research investigated possible differences in multiple domain self-concept ratings. It was hypothesized that significant age and gender differences in these ratings would be found. A second area of investigation was potential differences in the ratings of importance of the multiple domains. Again, age and gender differences were expected. Based on Eriksonian theory and previous research that utilized adolescent samples, it was predicted that compared to younger participants, adolescents would place greater importance in the areas of physical appearance, close friendships, romantic relationships, and vocational competency. Third, by measuring both general self-concept and self-esteem, this study examined the relationship between these variables. Although seen as different constructs, it was predicted that there would be a high degree of correspondence between them. In addition, this research examined possible changes in both general self-concept and self-esteem over time. Based on previous research by Marsh (1989), Mullener and Laird (1971), and others, a U-shaped trend, with general measures of general self-concept and self-esteem dropping in early adolescence and rising again in later adolescence, was predicted. Gender differences were predicted, with the expectation that males would produce higher ratings on global measures of self-concept and self-esteem, as well as the specific self-concept domain of athletic competence. Finally, this research examined how the domain self-concept ratings and the perceived importance of these ratings were used to predict general self-concept or self-esteem. It was assumed that importance ratings would be salient in these models, regardless of age. Domain and importance ratings were predicted to be used differently at each age. For example, as Damon and Hart (1982) suggested that preadolescents focus on

their physical selves, it was predicted that these ratings would be most salient. Harter (1987) had reported that physical appearance was the most significant predictor of self-esteem in early adolescence. This finding was expected to be replicated by this research.

Method

Participants

Participants, chosen to represent three different developmental levels, were selected from three age groups, operationalized on the basis of educational level. Participants were fourth, eighth and twelfth grade students enrolled in the Warwick Public Schools, the second largest school district in Rhode Island. A total of approximately 12,000 students attend the 26 schools comprised by the district. In the Warwick Public Schools, elementary schools correspond to grades kindergarten through six, junior high school to grades seven and eight, and high school to grades nine through twelve. Data collection was initiated in March, 1995, but due to logistics, was not completed by June, when summer recess began. Data collection resumed in September, 1995 and was finished in December, 1995. Table 1 shows the number of participants by grade and time of data collection.

Table 1
Number of Participants By Grade and Time of Participation

Time	Grade		
	4	8	12
Spring, 1995	164	52	142
Fall, 1995	0	226	107

Principals of all participating schools were initially contacted with the assistance of district school psychologists. The examiner met with each principal to explain the study and arrange a meeting with classroom teachers of the appropriate grade. All principals contacted agreed to allow participation in the study. Principals at the fourth and eighth grade levels wrote a letter for parents endorsing participation in study. Of the 3 high schools comprised by the district, 2 principals permitted their schools to participate; of the 3 junior high schools, 3 participated; and of the 15 elementary schools, 5 participated.

A total of 691 students participated. At the fourth grade level, 164 students (91 male, 68 female) participated. The mean age of this sample was 9.5 years and ranged from 8 to 11 years. Five students did not indicate their gender. At the eighth grade level, 278 students (108 males, 170 females) participated. Their mean age was 13.2 years and ranged from 12 to 15 years. At the twelfth grade level 249 students (106 males, 142 females) participated. The mean age of this sample was 17.5 years and ranged from 16 to 19 years. Gender was not indicated by one student.

Instruments

Harter Self-Perception Profile Harter's Self-Perception Profile for Children (1985) and Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (1988) were selected because each measure consists of a multi-item scale for general self, and multi-item scales for multiple self-concept domains and importance of those domains. These measures share standard self-concept domains at multiple ages, as well as additional domains determined to be pertinent for that age group. The addition of multiple item importance scales is unique to these instruments. Utilizing multiple item importance scales was suggested as being more reliable and valid by Marsh (1986).

The Self-Perception Profile for Children (SPPC) is a self-report measure for children in grades three through eight and was completed by the fourth grade sample in this study. The Self-Perception Profile for Children contains 36 items representing five self-concept domains (scholastic competence, athletic competence, social acceptance, physical appearance, behavioral conduct), plus a general self domain. Responses are made using a structured alternative-choice format, with participants choosing the degree they feel they are similar to negative or positive descriptions of other children. Scores for each item range from 1 to 4, with 1 corresponding to a low rating of competency and 4 to a high rating of competency. According to Harter (1985), internal consistency estimates for specific scales across multiple samples range from .71 to .86, with subscale intercorrelations ranging from .01 to .73. Factor analytic techniques confirmed the five factor domain solution for grades five and eight, but a four factor solution was found for grades three and four (Wylie, 1989). Harter (1985) attributes these differences to variations in educational theory and teaching applications among the samples.

The Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA) is a self-report measure for adolescents in grades eight through twelve, and was completed by both the eighth and twelfth grade samples in this study. The Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents contains 45 items representing eight self-concept domains (scholastic competence, athletic competence, social acceptance, physical appearance, behavioral conduct, close friendships, romantic appeal, job competence), plus a general-self domain. A 16 item importance scale examines perceptions of importance of the eight domains. The response format and scoring are the same as described for the SPPC. Internal consistency estimates for specific scales across multiple samples range from .74 to .91, with

subscale intercorrelations ranging from .02 to .73. Factor analytic techniques supported an eight factor solution (Wylie, 1989).

Table 2 lists the SPPC (1985) and SPPA (1988) manual descriptions of the content of each domain, as well as a sample question from each of the domains.

Table 2
Self-Perception Profile Subscales and Sample Items

Scholastic Competence: reflects the child's perception of his/her competence or ability within the realm of scholastic performance.

Some kids feel that they are very good at their schoolwork BUT Other kids worry about whether they can do the schoolwork assigned to them.

Social Acceptance: reflects the degree to which one has friends, feels one is popular, and feels that most kids like them.

Some kids find it hard to make friends BUT Other kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.

Athletic Competence: reflects content relevant to sports and outdoor games.

Some kids do very well at all kinds of sports BUT Other kids don't feel that they are very good when it comes to sports.

Physical Appearance: reflects the degree to which the child is happy with the way he/she looks, likes one's height, weight, body, face, hair, and feels that he/she is good-looking.

Some kids are happy with the way they look BUT Other kids are not happy with the way they look.

Behavioral Conduct: reflects the degree to which children like the way they behave, act the way they are supposed to, avoid getting into trouble, and do the things they are supposed to.

Some kids do not like the way they behave BUT Other kids usually like the way they behave.

Global Self-Worth: reflects the extent to which the child likes oneself as a person, is happy the way one is leading one's life, and is generally happy with the way one is.

Some kids are often unhappy with themselves BUT Other kids are pretty pleased with themselves.

Close Friendships: reflects one's ability to make close friends one can share personal thoughts and secrets with.

Some teenagers do have a close friend they can share secrets with BUT Other teenagers do not have a really close friend they can share secrets with.

Romantic Appeal: reflects perceptions that they are romantically attractive to those in whom they are interested, are dating the people they would like to be dating, and feel they are fun and interesting on a date.

Some teenagers feel that if they are romantically interested in someone, that person will like them back BUT Other teenagers worry that when they like someone romantically, that person won't like them back.

Job Competence: reflects perceptions that he/she has job skills, is ready to do well at part-time jobs, and feels that one is doing well at the job he/she has.

Some teenagers feel that they are really able to handle the work on a paying job BUT Others teenagers wonder if they are really doing as good a job at work as they should be doing.

Note. For the Adolescent Form, the word "kids" is replaced by "teenagers."

Self-Perception Profile Importance Ratings Both forms of the Self-Perception Profile include an optional set of questions designed to measure perceptions of importance of the scale's multiple domains. The Child form of the Self-Perception Profile comprises 10 items, two from each of the five domains, excluding Global Self-Worth. The Adolescent form consists of 16 items, two from each of the eight domains, and also excludes Global Self-Worth. Responses are made in the same structured alternate format as the Self-Perception Profile, with each item offering positive or negative scoring options. Like the Self-Perception Profile, scores range from 1, indicating low importance, to 4, indicating high importance. Harter intended these importance ratings to be used "for determining the relationship between competence in domains deemed important and global self-worth" (1989, p. 24). This procedure required the calculation of a discrepancy score by subtracting a domain's rating of importance from its competence value. No psychometric properties of the importance ratings or the discrepancy scores are reported in either manual.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965) was included as a measure of global self-esteem. Rosenberg originally designed the scale to be used to measure adolescent self-esteem. Wylie (1989) reported that the scale and "its modifications" have been utilized in research with a wide range of ages, and psychiatric, socioeconomic, and ethnic groups (p. 25).

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) was originally designed as a Guttman-type scale that reflected a unidimensional view of self-esteem (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Crandall, 1973). According to Wylie (1989) the scale was constructed with the assumption that the individual does not simply sum items to formulate global self-esteem, but instead considers and weights a "a unique set of attributes of varying importance" (p. 25). Guttman scoring of the

RSES reflects this assumption by formulating six "contrived items" (Wylie, 1989, p. 25). Guttman scoring of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale yields scores 0 (positive self-esteem) to 6 (negative self-esteem), with a mean of 1.89, a standard deviation of 1.44, and skewness of .648 (Wylie, 1989). However, researchers have also utilized a Likert-type 5 to 7-point scale (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). Scoring in this manner sums across the 10 items, with reverse scoring of negative items. Using this approach, a participant's score could range from 0 to 40. Wylie (1989) reports descriptive statistics using this scoring method are not available.

Researchers have questioned whether the scale is indeed unidimensional. Blascovich and Tomaka (1991) stated that some researchers have reported a single factor structure, whereas others have reported two highly correlated factors, with the additional factor reflecting the negatively worded items. (See Wylie, 1989, for a more thorough overview of these studies.) Wylie concluded that despite this controversy, the research "cleanly separates the items into those that are worded self-favorably and self-unfavorably" (p. 29). Internal consistency ratings varied from .77 to .92, depending on the sample (Wylie, 1989). Finally, Wylie indicated that no formal studies of the factor structure across gender, age, or national groups have been reported.

This study utilized the original, 10 item scale. Items of the RSES are both negatively and positively worded. Responses are made on a 4-point Likert-type scale, from 1, corresponding to Strongly Agree, to 4, corresponding to Strongly Disagree.

Procedure

The examiner addressed all prospective participants in group format. During this explanation of the study, students were given a stapled packet composed of the consent forms, and at the fourth and eighth grade levels, the principal's letter of endorsement. At the fourth grade level, prospective participants were addressed in their fourth grade classrooms. Eighth grade students were addressed in the spring months through group assembly, and in autumn months through eighth grade math and health classes. Twelfth grade students were addressed in the spring months through a group assembly and social studies classes, and in the autumn months through health and psychology classes. All classroom teachers contacted by the examiner agreed to allow student participation. Students younger than eighteen years of age were required to have written consent by a parent or guardian. Students eighteen years of age or older were permitted to sign the consent form themselves. Samples were drawn from those students who returned the signed consent form. Non-participating students were provided with alternative activities by the classroom teacher.

Questionnaires were group administered. Instructions and items were read aloud to the fourth grade participants. Eighth and twelfth grade participants were read the instructions and asked to complete the packet at their own rates.

Each participant completed a packet of instruments. Appendices A, B, and C contain copies of the consent forms and instruments administered to the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade participants, respectively. All participants initially completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory. The Self-Perception Profile for Children and accompanying Importance ratings was administered to the fourth grade sample. The eighth and twelfth grade samples received the

Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents and the accompanying Importance ratings. To establish comparability of self-concept domains across the two forms of the Self-Perception Profile, the eighth grade sample was divided into fifths. Each fifth received an additional subset of questions composed of two of the five domains of the Self-Perception Profile for Children.

Results

Instrumentation

Although all fourth grade data were collected in the spring months, eighth and twelfth grade data had to be collected during both the spring and fall months of 1995. It was assumed that these groups of eighth and twelfth grade students were comparable and that analyses would not need to involve time of participation as an additional variable. To assess possible sample differences at the eighth and twelfth grades, groups were compared in age, and on the overall measures of the Global Self-Worth subscale of Harter's Self-Perception Profile and the Self-Esteem index of the RSES. Significant differences in age were found between spring and autumn participants at both the eighth ($t(276) = 3.88, p < .05$) and twelfth grade levels ($t(247) = 7.63, p < .05$). An examination of the mean difference at the eighth grade (mean difference = .35) and at the twelfth grade (mean difference = .59) indicates differences in age corresponding to the interval between times of data collection. Significant differences were not found between spring and fall participants on the measures of global self-worth at either the eighth ($t(273) = -1.54, p > .05$) or twelfth grade ($t(243) = -.25, p > .05$) levels. This finding was also demonstrated with ratings of self-esteem, with no significant differences found between spring and fall participants at either the eighth ($t(269) = 1.30, p > .05$) or twelfth grade ($t(244) = -.95, p > .05$) levels. These findings suggest that despite age differences, eighth and twelfth grade groups were comparable on general

measures across time of participation. Mean ratings by time of participation are reported in Table 3.

Table 3
Eighth and Twelfth Grade Group Means For Age, Global Self-Worth, and Self-Esteem By Time of Participation

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Grade 8</u>		<u>Grade 12</u>	
	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Autumn</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Autumn</u>
<u>Age</u>	13.52	13.17	17.73	17.14
<u>Global Self-Worth</u>	2.67	2.87	2.85	2.88
<u>Self-Esteem</u>	2.14	1.81	1.59	1.77

Self-Perception Profile. To better understand the factor structure of both forms of the Self-Perception Profile, three Oblique rotation Principle Components Analyses were performed, one for each grade sample. Manual instructions described excluding Global Competency scale items as well as the use of an Oblique rotation; therefore this methodology was utilized in this study. Results replicated Harter's findings of a five factor solution for the fourth grade sample and accounted for 55% of the variance. Results for the eighth and twelfth grade samples also replicated Harter's findings of an eight factor solution. Results from the eighth grade sample accounted for 65% of the variance. Results from the twelfth grade sample accounted for 65% of the variance. Tables 4, 5, and 6 shows the items and factor loadings of each subscale for the fourth, eighth and twelfth grades, respectively.

Table 4

Factor Pattern of the Self-Perception Profile for Children, Fourth Grade Sample

	<u>Scholastic Competence</u>	<u>Social Acceptance</u>	<u>Athletic Competence</u>	<u>Physical Appearance</u>	<u>Behavioral Conduct</u>
1. Good at schoolwork	.774				
7. Just as smart	.002				
13. Do schoolwork quickly	.572				
19. Remember things easily	.486				
25. Do well at classwork	.689				
31. Can figure out answers	.685				
2. Easy to make friends		.777			
8. Have a lot of friends		.586			
14. Easy to like		.585			
20. Do things with a lot of kids		.418			
26. Most kids like me		.582			
32. Popular with others		.612			
3. Do well at sports			.835		
9. Good enough at sports			.838		
15. Good at outdoor activity			.620		
21. Better than others at sports			.706		
27. Play rather than watch			.699		
33. Good at new outdoor games			.570		
4. Happy with the way I look				.673	
10. Happy with height and weight				.514	
16. Like body the way it is				.796	
22. Like physical appearance as is				.804	
28. Like face and hair as is				.804	
34. Are attractive or good looking				.681	
5. Like the way I behave					.632
11. Usually do the right thing					.511
17. Act the way supposed to					.647
23. Don't get in trouble					.742
29. Don't do things shouldn't					.610
35. Kind to others					.665

Table 5

Factor Pattern of the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents, Eighth Grade Sample

	<u>Scholastic Competence</u>	<u>Social Acceptance</u>	<u>Athletic Competence</u>	<u>Physical Appearance</u>	<u>Behavioral Conduct</u>
1. Just as smart	.639				
10. Slow to finish work	.713				
19. Do well at classwork	.792				
28. Trouble with answers	.821				
37. Feel are intelligent	.665				
2. Hard to make friends		.806			
11. Have a lot of friends		.736			
20. Hard do like		.471			
29. Popular with others		.746			
38. Are socially accepted		.693			
3. Do well at sports			.888		
12. Do well at new athletic activity			.856		
21. Better than others at sports			.840		
30. Don't do well at outdoor games			.755		
39. Do not feel are athletic			.887		
4. Not happy way I look				.760	
13. Wish body was different				.784	
22. Wish physical appearance different				.835	
31. Think are good looking				.743	
40. Really like looks				.791	
7. Do the right thing					.599
16. Often get in trouble					.660
25. Feel good about way act					.203
34. Do things shouldn't					.676
43. Act way supposed					.751
		<u>Romantic Appeal</u>	<u>Job Competence</u>	<u>Close Friendships</u>	
6. Person will like them back		.292			
15. Not dating		.825			
24. Feel others attracted to them		.323			
33. Feel fun on a date		.405			
42. Don't go out with a date		.856			
5. Ready for part time job			.815		
14. Don't have skills for job			.488		
23. Old enough to get a job			.841		
32. Do better at work for pay			.211		
41. Able to handle work on a job			.848		
8. Make close friends				.563	
17. Have friend to share secrets				.874	
26. Have friend to share things				.868	
35. Make friends can trust				.517	
44. Don't have friend to share thoughts				.891	

Table 6

Factor Pattern of the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents, Twelfth Grade Sample

	<u>Scholastic Competence</u>	<u>Social Acceptance</u>	<u>Athletic Competence</u>	<u>Physical Appearance</u>	<u>Behavioral Conduct</u>
1. Just as smart	.780				
10. Slow to finish work	.700				
19. Do well at classwork	.632				
28. Trouble with answers	.828				
37. Feel are intelligent	.770				
2. Hard to make friends		.741			
11. Have a lot of friends		.757			
20. Hard do like		.521			
29. Popular with others		.775			
38. Are socially accepted		.634			
3. Do well at sports			.889		
12. Do well at new athletic activity			.876		
21. Better than others at sports			.891		
30. Don't do well at outdoor games			.854		
39. Do not feel are athletic			.875		
4. Not happy way I look				.767	
13. Wish body was different				.847	
22. Wish physical appearance different				.825	
31. Think are good looking				.679	
40. Really like looks				.825	
7. Do the right thing					.718
16. Often get in trouble					.747
25. Feel good about way act					.150
34. Do things shouldn't					.789
43. Act way supposed					.728
		<u>Romantic Appeal</u>	<u>Job Competence</u>	<u>Close Friendships</u>	
6. Person will like them back		.575			
15. Not dating		.780			
24. Feel others attracted to them		.624			
33. Feel fun on a date		.229			
42. Don't go out with a date		.636			
5. Ready for part time job			.831		
14. Don't have skills for job			.549		
23. Old enough to get a job			.869		
32. Do better at work for pay			.411		
41. Able to handle work on a job			.726		
8. Make close friends				.600	
17. Have friend to share secrets				.829	
26. Have friend to share things				.818	
35. Make friends can trust				.601	
44. Don't have friend to share thoughts				.859	

Both the Self-Perception Profile for Children and the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents were scored by the process described in the instrument manual. Negatively worded items were reverse scored. All items were then grouped according to the manual instructions. For the fourth grade sample, which completed the SPPC, the 36 items were combined into five domains (scholastic competence, athletic competence, social acceptance, physical appearance, behavioral conduct), plus a general self domain. Subscale means were calculated by combining the responses to the items and dividing by six. A general self domain was also formulated by using the same process.

For the eighth and twelfth grade samples, the 45 items were combined into the five domains common to the Child form, plus three additional domains (close friendships, romantic appeal, job competence), and a general competency rating. Subscale means were calculated by combining the responses to the items and dividing by five.

To examine the comparability of the Self-Perception Profile Child and Adolescent forms, correlations between the mean domain scores of the two forms were computed from the eighth grade sample. Correlations for each of the five subdomains and the global competency domain ranged from .83 to .92. These findings suggested that the eighth grade sample's manner of responding to the two forms was highly related. In addition, this high degree of relatedness suggested that it was appropriate to compare the child and adolescent forms across the six domains common to the two forms.

To examine factor consistency of the Self-Perception Profile at each grade level, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated. For the fourth grade sample, these coefficients ranged from .75 to .84. For the eighth grade sample, they ranged between .71 to .91. For the twelfth grade sample, they

ranged from .69 to .93. Table 7 shows the alpha coefficients of each factor by grade.

Table 7
Self-Perception Profile Factor Alpha Coefficients By Grade

Factor	Grade		
	4	8	12
Scholastic Competence	.746	.837	.823
Social Acceptance	.798	.815	.799
Athletic Competence	.821	.908	.929
Physical Appearance	.840	.904	.905
Behavioral Conduct	.809	.804	.692
Global Self-Worth	.753	.877	.864
Job Competence	-----	.710	.745
Romantic Appeal	-----	.776	.757
Close Friendships	-----	.853	.836

Importance Ratings Importance ratings included in the two forms of the Self-Perception Profile were used in this study. They were scored by adding the ratings of the two items comprising each subscale and then dividing by two to provide a mean factor score for each subdomain. Reliability coefficients were calculated to examine consistency of each importance factor at each grade. For the fourth grade sample, the coefficients ranged from .33 to .55. For the eighth grade sample, the coefficients ranged from .58 to .80. For the twelfth grade sample, the coefficients ranged from .44 to .88. The importance ratings alpha coefficients for each grade level are provided in Table 8.

Table 8
Importance Factor Alpha Coefficients By Grade

Importance of:	Grade		
	4	8	12
Scholastic Competence	.326	.575	.437
Social Acceptance	.340	.590	.554
Athletic Competence	.535	.801	.877
Physical Appearance	.531	.705	.711
Behavioral Conduct	.551	.800	.556
Job Competence	-----	.612	.822
Romantic Appeal	-----	.647	.647
Close Friendships	-----	.660	.696

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was scored using the Guttman procedure. Six scale items were created for scoring purposes. Item I was formulated by combining the responses to questions 3, 7, and 9. If two or more of the questions were answered positively, a value of 1 was given to Item I. If one or fewer questions was answered positively, a value of 0 was given to Item I. Scale Item II was created by combining the responses to questions 4 and 5. One or more positive responses led to a value of 1 on Item II. Scale Items III, IV, and V reflected questions 1, 8, and 10, respectively, and were each scored with a value of 1 if endorsed in the positive direction. Postive endorsement of Scale Item VI was formulated by combining the responses to questions 2 and 6. One or more positive responses led to a value of 1 for Item VI. Values obtained from the scoring of the six items were summed to create a final, overall self-esteem index. Therefore, according to this scoring procedure, scores between 0 and 6 could be obtained, with low scores

corresponding to positive self-esteem, and high scores to negative appraisals of self-esteem.

To better understand the factor structure of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale at each grade, three Varimax Principle Components Analyses were performed, one for each grade sample. Table 9 shows the factor identification of each question by grade. Only factor loadings of .5 or higher were used. Results of these analyses indicated a highly similar factor structure across the three grades. The eighth and twelfth grade samples produced identical two-factor solutions, with Factor One corresponding to positive affect, and Factor Two to negative affect. The fourth grade sample produced a three-factor solution. This third factor, comprised of three questions, appeared to reflect ratings of competence. The remaining questions loaded on the same factors as the eighth and twelfth grade groups.

Table 9
Factor Identification of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale by Grade

Item	Grade		
	4	8	12
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	I	I	I
2. At times I think I am no good at all.	II	II	II
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	I	I	I
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	III	I	I
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	III	II	II
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	II	II	II
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	I	I	I
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	II	II	II
9. All in all, I am inclined to think I am a failure.	III	II	II
10. I take a positive attitude towards myself.	I	I	I

Note. Factor I = positive affect, Factor II = negative affect,
 Factor III = competence.

The above analyses indicated that the measures demonstrated reasonable reliability. In addition, the factor structure of the two forms of the Self-Perception Profile produced by this sample conforms to Harter's initial sample.

Age and Sex Differences in Multiple Domain Self-Concept Ratings

To examine whether the entire sample demonstrated significant differences in their perceptions of domain competence, a 3 (grade) by 2 (sex) by 5 (common self-concept domains) repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted on the mean scores of the five common domains. A total of 627 completed profiles were analyzed, comprised of 75 fourth grade males, 61 fourth grade females, 104 eighth grade males, 164 eighth grade females, 95 twelfth grade males and 128 twelfth grade females. The source table for this analysis is shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Source Table for the Repeated Measures ANOVA on the Five Common Domains of the SPP

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Grade	2	31.81	15.90	14.51*
Sex	1	20.30	20.30	18.51*
Grade X Sex	2	8.03	4.02	3.66*
Error-Between	621	680.78	1.10	
Domain	4	83.94	20.98	55.24*
Grade X Domain	8	25.31	3.16	8.33*
Sex X Domain	4	41.96	10.49	27.62*
Grade X Sex X Domain	8	7.02	.88	2.31*
Error-Within	2484	943.60	.38	

*p<.05

Significant main effects for grade, sex and domain were found. Regarding the main effect for grade, $F(2,621) = 14.51$, $p<.05$, fourth grade participants reported the highest composite score ($M=3.02$), followed by eighth grade ($M=2.78$) and twelfth grade ($M=2.73$) participants. The significant main

effect for sex, $F(1,621)=18.51$, $p<.05$, showed that males reported a higher composite of the five self-concept domains ($M=2.93$) than females ($M=2.72$). The significant main effect for domain showed significant domain differences, $F(4,2484) = 55.24$, $p<.05$. The overall sample's ranking of the domain means, from highest to lowest was: social acceptance, $M=3.10$; academic competence, $M=2.88$; athletic competence, $M=2.83$; behavioral conduct, $M=2.79$; physical appearance, $M=2.47$.

Several interactions also were significant. A significant grade by sex interaction was found on the composite of the domains, $F(2, 621) = 3.66$, $p<.05$. Simple effects tests indicated that significant differences between males and females on the overall score were found only at the eighth grade level, with the mean score for males ($M=2.97$) being higher than the mean score for females ($M=2.66$). Significant differences were not found between males ($M=3.07$) and females ($M=2.94$) at the fourth grade level, or between males ($M=2.77$) and females ($M=2.70$) at the twelfth grade level.

A significant grade by domain interaction was found, $F(8,2484)=8.33$, $p<.05$. Simple effects tests indicated that there were significant differences by grade in the areas of academic competence, physical appearance, athletic competence, and behavioral conduct. Examining the academic domain, it was found that fourth grade mean score was the highest and differed significantly from both the eighth and twelfth grade mean scores. Similarly, in the appearance domain, the fourth grade mean was higher and differed significantly from both the eighth and twelfth grade means. Regarding the athletic competence domain, fourth grade participants rated this domain significantly higher than did both the eighth and twelfth grades. In addition, the eighth grade domain mean was found to be significantly higher than the twelfth grade mean. Finally, in the behavior domain, the fourth grade mean was again

found to be significantly higher than either the eighth or twelfth grade means. Domain means for the three age groups are shown in Figure 1.

A significant sex by domain interaction was found, $F(4,2484)=27.62$, $p<.05$. Simple effects tests indicated significant differences between males and females in their perceptions of physical appearance, athletic competence, and behavioral conduct. Males and females produced similar ratings in the academic and social competency domains. Females rated themselves significantly lower in athletic competence and physical appearance, but higher in behavioral conduct. Domain means for males and females are shown in Figure 2.

A significant three-way interaction of grade by sex by domain was also found, $F(8,2484)=2.31$, $p<.05$. To examine the trends in domain means by sex at each grade level, simple effects tests were conducted. These results will now be presented for each grade level.

At the fourth grade level, a significant simple interaction of sex by domain was found, $F(4,536)=4.48$, $p<.05$. Significant differences between males and females were found in perceptions of athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct. Males rating themselves significantly higher in athletic competence ($M=3.31$) than did their females peers ($M=2.84$). Also, males' ratings of physical appearance ($M=2.99$) were significantly higher than the females' ratings ($M=2.86$). Females rated themselves significantly higher in only one area of competence, behavioral conduct. Mean ratings for that domain were 2.99 for the female sample, and 2.88 for the male sample.

For eighth grade participants, a significant simple interaction between sex and domain, $F(4,1064)=22.51$, $p<.05$ indicated significant differences in perceptions of athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct. Although females ($M=2.78$) rated their behavior higher than did their

male counterparts ($M=2.65$), their perceptions of their own athletic competence and physical appearance were strikingly lower. Mean ratings for the female and male samples in the area of athletic ability were, in order, 2.59 and 3.26, and in physical appearance, 2.08 and 2.79.

For the twelfth grade participants, a significant simple interaction between sex and domain, $F(4,884) = 10.58$, $p < .05$ indicated significant differences in perceptions of athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct. Similar to the eighth grade sample, females rated their behavior ($M=2.84$) higher than did their male counterparts ($M=2.70$), but their perceptions of their athletic ability ($M=2.45$) and physical appearance ($M=2.19$) were considerably lower than their male peers' ratings of athletic ability ($M=2.88$) and physical appearance ($M=2.50$). A graph of the grade by sex by domain interaction is found in Figure 3.

An additional analysis was conducted to examine possible significant grade and sex differences in the additional three subdomains of the adolescent form of the Self-Perception Profile. To examine whether the eighth and twelfth grade groups differed significantly in their perceptions of job competence, romantic attractiveness and close friendships, a 2 (grade) by 2 (sex) by 3 (self-concept domain) repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted on the mean scores of the three domains. A total of 501 completed profiles were analyzed, composed of 101 eighth grade males, 162 eighth grade females, 102 twelfth grade males and 136 twelfth grade females. The source table for this analysis is shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Source Table for the Repeated Measures ANOVA on the Three Additional Domains of the SPP - Adolescent Form

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Grade	1	2.02	2.02	3.18
Sex	1	.33	.33	.52
Grade X Sex	1	6.25	6.25	9.83*
Error-Between	497	316.15	.64	
Domain	2	150.27	75.14	211.59*
Grade X Domain	2	2.09	1.05	2.94
Sex X Domain	2	7.50	3.75	10.56*
Grade X Sex X Domain	2	1.38	.69	1.94
Error-Within	994	352.98	.36	

*p<.05

A significant grade by sex interaction was found $F(1,497) = 9.83, p<.05$. For eighth grade participants, males demonstrated overall higher ratings ($M=3.05$) than did the females ($M=2.87$). At the twelfth grade level, females had a higher composite score ($M=3.09$) than did males ($M=2.99$).

The main effect for domain was significant, $F(2,994) = 211.59, p<.05$. Close friendships was rated the highest ($M=3.29$), followed by job competence ($M=3.18$). Ratings of romantic appeal ($M=2.59$) were considerably lower.

Finally, a significant sex by domain interaction was found $F(2,994) = 10.56, p<.05$. Simple effects tests indicated significant gender differences in all three domains. Males rated themselves higher in job competency ($M=3.25$) and romantic appeal ($M=2.63$) than did their female peers (means were 3.13 and 2.46, respectively). Females rated themselves more competent at close friendships ($M=3.36$) than did males ($M=3.19$). Figure 4 depicts the means of these three domains by sex.

Age and Sex Differences in Multiple Domain Importance Ratings

To examine whether the entire sample demonstrated significant differences in their ratings of domain importance, a 3 (grade) by 2 (sex) by 5 (importance of common domains) repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted on the mean importance ratings of the five common domains. A total of 651 completed profiles were analyzed, composed of 82 fourth grade males, 60 fourth grade females, 105 eighth grade males, 165 eighth grade females, 100 twelfth grade males and 139 twelfth grade females. The source table for this analysis is shown in Table 12.

Table 12
Source Table for the Repeated Measures ANOVA on the Five Common Domains of Importance

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Grade	2	60.87	30.43	26.71*
Sex	1	.01	.01	.01
Grade X Sex	2	.51	.25	.22
Error-Between	645	735.00	1.14	
Domain	4	139.61	34.90	73.47*
Grade X Domain	8	67.91	8.49	17.87*
Sex X Domain	4	35.00	8.75	18.42*
Grade X Sex X Domain	8	4.85	.61	1.28
Error-Within	2580	1225.59	.48	

*p<.05

A significant main effect for grade was found, $F(2,645) = 26.71$, $p < .05$, with the eighth grade having the highest mean overall importance score ($M=3.16$), followed by the fourth grade ($M=2.92$), and finally the twelfth grade ($M=2.86$).

In addition, a significant main effect for domain was found, $F(4,2580) = 73.47$, $p < .05$, indicating significant differences in the overall group's perceived importance of the combination of the five domains. Mean ratings of domain importance, ranked from highest to lowest were: academic competency,

M=3.34; behavioral conduct, M=3.13; physical appearance, M=2.94; social acceptance, M=2.81; athletic competence, M=2.77.

A significant grade by domain interaction was found, $F(8,2580) = 17.87$, $p < .05$. Simple effects tests indicated that there were significant differences by grade in the importance of social acceptance, athletic competence, physical appearance and behavioral conduct. Simple comparison tests indicated that for the importance of social acceptance, the eighth grade participants' scores were significantly higher than both the fourth and twelfth grade scores. In addition, fourth grade scores were significantly higher than those of the twelfth grade. Regarding the importance of athletic competence, eighth grade participants' scores were significantly higher than both the fourth and twelfth grade scores. Physical appearance was rated as significantly more important by the eighth grade participants than by either the fourth or twelfth grade participants. In addition, twelfth grade scores were significantly higher than fourth grade scores in this domain. Finally, regarding the importance of behavioral conduct, significant differences were found between the fourth and eighth grade ratings, and between the fourth and twelfth grade ratings. No significant grade differences were found in the perceived importance of academic competence. Domain means by grade are shown in Figure 5.

A significant sex by domain interaction also was found, $F(4,2580) = 18.42$, $p < .05$. Simple effects indicated significant differences between males and females in the perceived importance of academic competence, athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct. The importance of academic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct were rated as significantly higher by females than males. Athletic competence was rated as significantly more important to males than to females. No gender

differences were found in the importance of social acceptance. Domain means for males and females are shown in Figure 6.

To examine possible differences in the ratings of importance of the additional three domains utilized by the eighth and twelfth grade samples, an additional analysis was conducted of their perceptions of the importance of job competence, romantic attractiveness and close friendships within a 2 (grade) by 2 (sex) by 3 (importance of domains) repeated measures analysis of variance. A total of 513 completed profiles were analyzed, comprised of 107 eighth grade males, 168 eighth grade females, 100 twelfth grade males and 138 twelfth grade females. The source table for this analysis is shown in Table 13.

Table 13
Source Table for the Repeated Measures ANOVA on the Three Additional Importance Domains of the SPP - Adolescent Form

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Grade	1	.01	.01	.01
Sex	1	3.63	3.63	5.79*
Grade X Sex	1	.13	.13	.21
Error-Between	509	318.67	.63	
Domain	2	7.53	3.76	11.52*
Grade X Domain	2	6.93	3.47	10.61*
Sex X Domain	2	3.56	1.78	5.45*
Grade X Sex X Domain	2	2.12	1.06	3.25*
Error-Within	1018	332.57	.33	

*p<.05

A significant main effect for sex was found, $F(1,509) = 5.79$, $p<.05$, with females reporting overall higher importance ratings ($M=3.47$) than did the males ($M=3.37$). Also, a significant main effect for domain was found, $F(2, 1018) = 11.52$, $p<.05$, indicating that the participants rated the three domains of differing importance. Close friendship was rated as most important ($M=3.53$), followed by the importance of job competence ($M=3.43$), and being considered romantically appealing ($M=3.33$).

Eighth and twelfth grade participants differed in their ratings of importance of the three domains, as demonstrated by a significant interaction between grade and domain, $F(2, 1018) = 10.61, p < .05$. Simple effects tests indicated that the two groups differed significantly only in their ratings of importance of the job competency and romantic appeal domains. The eighth grade group ($M=3.51$) rated job competence as significantly more important than did the twelfth grade group ($M=3.35$). However, the twelfth grade group ($M=3.41$) rated romantic appeal as more important than did the eighth grade group ($M=3.25$). A graph of the grade by domain interaction is shown in Figure 7.

In addition, a significant sex by domain interaction was found, $F(2,1018) = 5.45, p < .05$. Simple effects tests indicated significant differences between males and females only in ratings of the importance of close friendships, with females ($M=3.62$) considering close friendships to be more important than did males ($M=3.39$). A graph of the sex by domain interaction is shown in Figure 8.

Finally, a significant grade by sex by domain interaction was found, $F(2,1018) = 3.25, p < .05$. To examine the trends in domain means by sex at each grade level, simple effects tests were conducted. At the eighth grade level, simple effects tests indicated that male and female eighth grade students differed only in their ratings of the importance of close friendships. Importance ratings of close friendships were higher for females ($M=3.64$) than males ($M=3.36$). At the twelfth grade level, the simple interaction was not significant, $F(2,472) = .90, p > .05$. Therefore no additional analyses were conducted at the twelfth grade level. A graph of this three-way interaction is shown in Figure 9.

Global Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

To determine the relatedness of general self-concept and self-esteem, correlations between the factor score of Harter's Global Self-Worth and the overall self-esteem index of Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale were computed at each grade level. At the fourth grade level, $r = -.47$ ($p < .05$), at the eighth grade level, $r = -.72$ ($p < .05$) for the adolescent form, and $r = -.79$ ($p < .05$) for the child form, and at the twelfth grade level, $r = -.71$ ($p < .05$).

To examine whether the entire sample demonstrated significant differences in their perceptions of general self-concept, a 3 (grade) by 2 (sex) analysis of variance was conducted on the mean factor score of global self-worth. A total of 651 completed profiles were analyzed, comprised of 81 fourth grade males, 62 fourth grade females, 103 eighth grade males, 165 eighth grade females, 103 twelfth grade males and 137 twelfth grade females. The source table for this analysis is shown in Table 14.

Table 14
Source Table for the ANOVA on the Global Self-Worth Domain of the SPP

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>E</u>
Grade	2	17.73	8.87	17.34*
Sex	1	10.39	10.39	20.32*
Grade X Sex	2	3.53	1.76	3.45*
Error	645	329.77	.51	

* $p < .05$

A significant main effect for grade was found, $F(2,645) = 17.34$, $p < .05$. Fourth grade participants reported higher mean self-concept scores ($M = 3.29$) than both the eighth ($M = 2.82$) and twelfth grade ($M = 2.87$) participants. Eighth and twelfth grade mean scores did not significantly differ from each other. A significant main effect for sex was found, $F(1,645) = 20.32$, $p < .05$, and indicated that males reported higher global self-concept scores ($M = 3.11$) than the females ($M = 2.81$).

Finally, a significant grade by sex interaction was found, $F(2,645) = 3.45$, $p < .05$. Simple effects tests indicated no sex differences in mean ratings of global self-worth at the fourth grade level. However, males and females at both the eighth and twelfth grade levels significantly differed in their ratings of global self-worth. Simple effects showed that at the eighth grade level, males had higher global self-concept ratings ($M=3.11$) than did their female peers ($M=2.66$). This trend of males obtaining higher mean global self-concept ratings ($M=2.97$) as compared to females ($M=2.78$) also was found at the twelfth grade level. The global self-worth means are shown by grade and by sex in Figure 10.

To examine whether the entire sample demonstrated significant differences in their self-ratings of self-esteem, a 3 (grade) by 2 (sex) analysis of variance was conducted on the overall index of self-esteem. A total of 651 completed profiles were analyzed, comprised of 81 fourth grade males, 62 fourth grade females, 103 eighth grade males, 165 eighth grade females, 103 twelfth grade males and 137 twelfth grade females. The source table for this analysis is shown in Table 15.

Table 15
Source Table for the ANOVA on the Overall Self-Esteem Index of the RSES

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Grade	2	5.39	2.70	1.31
Sex	1	45.49	45.49	22.11*
Grade X Sex	2	13.60	6.80	3.31*
Error	645	1326.90	2.06	

* $p < .05$

A significant main effect for sex was found, $F(1,645) = 22.11$, $p < .05$, with male participants obtaining lower scores, and therefore higher self-esteem, ($M=1.45$) than females ($M=1.99$).

Also, a significant grade by sex interaction was found, $F(2,645) = 3.31$, $p < .05$. Simple effects tests indicated no significant gender differences at the fourth or twelfth grade levels. At the eighth grade level, females obtained a significantly higher mean RSES score, corresponding to perceptions of lower self-esteem ($M=2.23$), than did their male peers ($M=1.31$). The graph of the mean self-esteem scores by grade and by sex is shown in Figure 11.

Regression Analyses and Importance Models

In order to investigate the manner in which participants utilized ratings of domain importance, various theoretical orientations were considered. This study incorporated the ideas of James (1890/1963), who believed that individuals take into account the importance of a dimension of self ratings when formulating general overall appraisals of themselves. This study operationalized James' concept by collecting ratings of domain competence and domain importance and then combining them in multiple ways. Harter (1985), Higgins, Klein, and Strauman (1985) and others have incorporated these ratings through the use of a "discrepancy model." In this study, importance ratings were used more similarly to the work of Marsh (1993).

As a baseline comparison, a model was formulated by excluding importance ratings. This additive model of domain scores was created by summing, for each individual, only the domain ratings to calculate a predicted domain-only global self-worth score. This predicted score was then correlated with the actual global self-worth and self-esteem scores. The multiple R for each grade is shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Correlations Between Predicted Domain-Only and Actual Self-Worth and Self-Esteem Scores By Grade

	<u>Global Self-Worth</u>	<u>Self-Esteem</u>
Grade 4	R = .73	R = -.49
Grade 8	R = .79	R = -.64
Grade 12	R = .77	R = -.62

In an effort to most closely approximate James' theory, a model was created that took, for each individual, his or her mean importance ratings and weighted the corresponding domain rating by the importance score. These "weighted" ratings were summed over the domains to create a predicted global self-worth score. The global self-worth score was then correlated with the actual Global Self-Worth score or Self-Esteem index. The multiple R for each grade is shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Correlations Between Predicted and Actual Self-Worth and Self-Esteem Scores By Grade

	<u>Global Self-Worth</u>	<u>Self-Esteem</u>
Grade 4	R = .59	R = -.38
Grade 8	R = .68	R = -.49
Grade 12	R = .58	R = -.37

Results showed that the simple additive model had a higher level of prediction than when the importance ratings were included.

To better understand the relationships between domain ratings and importance ratings in predicting global self-worth and self-esteem, additional multiple linear regression analyses were undertaken. At each grade, the following equations were used:

1. A forward stepwise inclusion of domain scores to predict global self-worth or self-esteem.
2. A forward stepwise inclusion of importance ratings to predict global self-worth or self-esteem.
3. A forward stepwise inclusion of domain x importance cross product terms to predict global self-worth or self-esteem.
4. A forward stepwise inclusion of domain scores and domain x importance cross product terms to predict global self-worth or self-esteem.
5. A forward stepwise inclusion of domain scores, importance ratings, and cross product terms to predict global self-worth or self-esteem.

Table 18 shows the Beta Weights, R and R Squared values from equations 1 through 3. Results of equations 4 and 5 are shown in Table 19.

In addition to those equations which predicted global self-worth, linear regression analyses were conducted to predict self-esteem. The results of these analyses are shown in Tables 20 and 21.

Table 18
Domain Beta Weights in Prediction of Global Self-Worth

	Academic	Social	Athletic	Appearance	Behavior	Job	Romantic	Friend	R	R ²
<u>Equation 1: (DScores)</u>										
Grade 4	.09	.16	.09	.58	.26	-	-	-	.78	.61
Grade 8	.19	.21	.07	.52	.23	.06	.03	.08	.84	.71
Grade 12	.25	.23	.09	.49	.17	.05	.07	.03	.82	.68
<u>Equation 2: (IScores)</u>										
Grade 4	.02	.11	.33	-.17	.24	-	-	-	.41	.17
Grade 8	.18	.07	.20	-.14	.25	.10	-.04	.03	.48	.23
Grade 12	.07	.09	.17	-.21	.21	-.02	-.01	.09	.31	.10
<u>Equation 3: (CPScores)</u>										
Grade 4	.07	.07	.28	.29	.39	-	-	-	.61	.38
Grade 8	.18	.03	.15	.38	.24	.06	.05	.10	.72	.53
Grade 12	.24	.07	.14	.36	.09	.06	.14	.07	.61	.37

Note.

Numbers in bold face type are significant predictors, $p < .05$.
D=Domain, I=Importance, CP=Cross Product

Table 19
Significant Beta Weights By Grade in the Prediction of Global Self-Worth

<u>Equation 4: D and CP Scores</u>										B	B ²
Grade 4	Appear (.55)	CPBehavior (.27)	Social (.18)	CPAthletic (.13)						.80	.64
Grade 8	Appear (.64)	Behavior (.24)	Social (.21)	Academic (.19)	CPAthletic (.30)	CPAppear (-.20)	Athletic (-.20)			.85	.72
Grade 12	Appear (.59)	Academic (.25)	Social (.25)	Behavior (.18)	CPAppear (-.14)	Athletic (.09)				.82	.67
<u>Equation 5: D, I, and CP Scores</u>											
Grade 4	Appear (.55)	CPBehavior (.27)	Social (.18)	CPAthletic (.13)						.80	.64
Grade 8	Appear (.46)	Behavior (.22)	Social (.17)	Academic (.18)	CPAthletic (.12)	IAppear (-.12)	CPFriend (.09)			.85	.72
Grade 12	Appear (.48)	Academic (.27)	Social (.20)	Behavior (.17)	IAppear (-.14)	CPSoc (.11)				.82	.68

Note. D=Domain, I = Importance, CP = Cross Product

Table 20
Domain Beta Weights in Prediction of Self-Esteem

	Academic	Social	Athletic	Appearance	Behavior	Job	Romantic	Friend	R	R ²
Equation 1: (D Scores)										
Grade 4	-.17	-.09	-.27	-.24	-.03	-	-	-	.51	.26
Grade 8	-.35	-.05	-.13	-.41	-.11	-.08	-.02	-.08	.69	.47
Grade 12	-.17	-.06	-.12	-.43	-.13	-.04	-.14	-.04	.67	.45
Equation 2: (I Scores)										
Grade 4	-.10	-.05	-.26	.08	.01	-	-	-	.26	.07
Grade 8	-.27	-.04	-.14	.22	-.14	-.06	.01	-.06	.36	.13
Grade 12	.04	.01	-.03	.21	-.14	.07	.07	.02	.22	.05
Equation 3: (CP Scores)										
Grade 4	-.15	-.15	-.34	-.12	-.12	-	-	-	.34	.12
Grade 8	-.37	.05	-.15	-.22	-.09	-.03	-.01	-.05	.55	.30
Grade 12	-.13	.03	-.07	-.38	-.05	-.03	-.11	-.02	.44	.19

Note.
Numbers in bold face type are significant predictors, $p < .05$.

Table 21

Significant Beta Weights By Grade in the Prediction of Self-Esteem

Equation 4: D and CP Scores

Equation 4: D and CP Scores										B	B ²
Grade 4	Athletic (-.30)	Appear (-.27)								.47	.22
Grade 8	Appear (-.60)	Academic (-.34)	CP Appear (.26)	Athletic (-.13)	Friend (-.10)					.70	.49
Grade 12	Appear (-.39)	Academic (-.39)	Behavior (-.18)	CP Academic (.25)	Romantic (-.14)	Athletic (-.39)	CP Athl (.30)			.70	.49

Equation 5: D.I. and CP Scores

Grade 4	Athletic (-.30)	Appear (-.27)						.47	.22
Grade 8	Appear (-.60)	Academic (-.34)	CPAppear (.26)	Athletic (-.13)	Friend (-.10)			.70	.49
Grade 12	Appear (-.38)	Academic (-.20)	Behavior (-.18)	Iacademic (.13)	Romantic (-.14)	Athletic (-.26)	Iathl (.21)	.70	.49

Note. D=Domain, I = Importance, CP = Cross Product

Discussion

Instrumentation

First, some clarification and caution regarding the Self-Perception Profiles will be presented. When considering the results of the SPPC and SPPA, the response format must be understood. Both scales were designed by Harter using a four-point forced-choice format, where respondents must determine which of two descriptions of children is more like them. One description presents a positive ideal (e.g. Some kids have a lot of friends), and the other description presents a dichotomous negative image (e.g. Other kids don't have very many friends). Respondents are asked to choose one of the descriptions and then rate their degree of similarity (i.e. sort of, really) to that description. Therefore, responses reflect the degree of endorsement of one of two diametrically opposed models. Low ratings (i.e. less than two) would suggest a perceived similarity to the negative model, and higher ratings (i.e. more than three) similarity to the positive model. However, ratings between two and three are somewhat difficult to interpret. They can be seen as an endorsement of neither description or as a blend of the description. This indirect way of measuring self-concept makes interpretation of results somewhat confusing.

The SPPC and SPPA format also provided some difficulties in administration. Participants frequently asked whether they should answer the items to reflect their own feelings or their perceptions of the feelings of others. Some adolescent participants also expressed discomfort with the forced choice response format. They described confusion at having to choose between the negative and positive descriptions of adolescents, and frequently stated that they would have liked a "mid-point" description that would have reflected a

blend between the two types of persons described. (Many of the mean ratings were between two and three, offering some support that this is what adolescents actually did.) These reports suggest that adolescents may not see themselves so much in terms of the dichotomies utilized in the Harter measures. Other formats may be less confusing to the participants and provide clearer information. Suggestions for alternative formats include scales that incorporate a five-point response system, with a center point reflecting a blend of the two dichotomies, or a three or five point system requiring participants to indicate the degree they feel they are similar to a single item description.

In this study, eighth grade participants completed the entire Adolescent form of the Self-Perception Profile (SPPA), as well as two factors of the Child form of the instrument (SPPC). Responses were found to be highly similar across the two forms, suggesting that eighth grade students, who fall at either the high end of the normative age group of the SPPC or the low end of the normative group of the SPPA, can use either instrument. Anecdotally, some eighth grade participants in this study related that they disliked the use of the word "kid" in the Child Form. Therefore, taking into account this preference, the Adolescent form may be the better instrument to use with eighth grade participants.

Regarding the importance ratings used in this study, Cronbach's alpha coefficients obtained at all three grades were lower than those generated from the corresponding domain items. These findings suggest that the importance ratings factor structures may be less homogeneous and consistent than those of domain competence. However, as each importance factor comprises two items, it is not surprising that these reliability coefficients were lower than those of the domain factors, which contained five or six items per factor. Importance alpha coefficients may have been higher if each factor contained a higher number of

items. It is hoped that future research will go in to developing instruments that reflect a higher number of importance items per factor.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) was administered to the participants at each of the three grade levels, despite the understanding that this instrument was designed for use with adolescents and adults. Although an alternative form of the RSES is available for youngsters (the Rosenberg-Simmons Self-Esteem Scale, 1972), that instrument utilizes an interview format, which was considered to be inappropriate for the purposes of this study. Principle Components Analyses conducted on the RSES scores indicated a similar factor structure across the three grades. A two factor solution, corresponding to positive affect and negative affect, was found at the eighth and twelfth grade levels. A three factor solution was found at the fourth grade level, with three of the ten questions corresponding to perceptions of "competence," and the other seven questions corresponding to the same factors indicated by the eighth and twelfth grade participants. Although previous research has not cleanly delineated the factor structure of the RSES, results of this study's eighth and twelfth grade responses support a two factor solution, as predicted by Wylie (1989). This study also extended the literature regarding the factor structure of responses from a younger age group. Results of this study suggest that the RSES is an instrument that may be used with younger age groups, such as fourth graders. Anecdotally, however, the wording of some of the RSES items appeared to be confusing to the fourth grade participants. In contrast, the Likert-type format was described as easy to understand, and preferable to the four-point forced-choice format of the Self-Perception Profile. Therefore, potential difficulties with the vocabulary and syntax level of the RSES should be recognized when considering the use of this instrument for pre-adolescent populations.

Domain Ratings

Significant differences in domain ratings were found between the three grade levels as well as between males and females. Discussion of these differences will be presented by grade and by gender.

When overall ratings of domain competence were examined, fourth grade participants were found to have produced the highest scores. This trend of fourth grade participants describing higher levels of competency (or a higher degree of similarity to a competent model), when compared to eighth and twelfth grade participants also was found when individual domains were examined. In the areas of academic competency, physical appearance and behavioral conduct, fourth grade students produced significantly higher ratings of competency than both the eighth and twelfth grade students. In the area of athletic competence, fourth grade students again rated their sports activity abilities as higher than those of the eighth grade students, but in this area, eighth grade students also perceived their athletic abilities as significantly higher than those of the twelfth grade students. These results provide some support for the previous findings of Marsh (1989) and Marsh (1985), who found a decline in multiple domain scores from pre-adolescence to early adolescence.

In addition, early and late adolescents rated their job competency, romantic appeal, and close friendships in a similar fashion. Overall, these adolescents reported highly positive ratings in the areas of job competency and close friendships. They rated their romantic appeal in a less positive manner, suggesting their perceptions that they are more dissimilar to a romantically competent ideal.

Trends across the domains showed that fourth grade participants rated the multiple domains in a similar, and as previously mentioned, highly positive

manner. More differentiation in domain ratings was found at the eighth and twelfth grade levels, suggesting that adolescents endorse the self-descriptions in a more variable fashion. These results provide some support of Werner's Orthogenetic Principle and the previous findings of Mullener and Laird, 1971. When examining their self structure, early and late adolescents appear to be using a magnifying glass which pinpoints specific differences in the ratings of various domains and differences in the endorsement of images of types of teenagers. This magnifying glass also appears to show perceptions of flaws, as evidenced by the range in positive and negative ratings across the domains.

Results of this study replicated the earlier work of Gardiner (1992) and Marsh (1989), who had found gender differences in domain ratings in the direction of traditional gender stereotypes. Males reported higher ratings of athletic competency and physical appearance. Females produced higher ratings of behavioral conduct. However, no gender differences were found in the areas of social acceptance or academic competency. The lack of gender differences in the area of academic competency may be due to the manner in which the questions were asked: the factor items were global in nature and focused on the participants' ability to complete and remember schoolwork in a rapid manner. Gardiner (1992) and Marsh (1989) examined more specific areas of academics, namely competency in reading and in mathematics, and found gender differences in the direction of gender stereotypes. It is possible that if the academic scales used in this study had reflected these specific factors, gender differences may have been found.

Regarding the lack of gender differences in the area of social acceptance, the results from the additional three adolescent domains may provide some clarification. In the areas of job competence and romantic appeal, males produced higher scores. Females rated themselves more highly

in their ability to relate to close friends. These findings suggest that when social relationships are examined more specifically, gender differences are more apt to be found.

Results of the grade by sex by domain interactions can be seen as "snapshots" of various stages of development. Fourth grade participants, regardless of gender, produced similarly high ratings in academic competence, social acceptance, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct. In one area, athletic competence, males produced higher ratings than did their female peers.

At the eighth grade (early adolescent level), no gender differences were found in ratings of academic competence or social acceptance. However, females rated themselves higher than males in behavioral conduct, but significantly lower in physical appearance and athletic competence. These findings suggest that by early adolescence, females are already significantly influenced by cultural expectations of appropriate female roles, such as good behavior and body consciousness. Although females demonstrated low scores in athletic ability in pre-adolescence, their scores were even lower in adolescence, thereby increasing the gap between males and females in this domain of competence by the eighth grade.

Even more striking was the drop from pre to early adolescence in females' ratings of acceptance of their physical appearance and body type. This change produced a wide gap between male and female ratings of physical appearance at the eighth grade level. This change may be better understood by considering that by the eighth grade, many females have reached puberty. These physical changes appear to be negatively perceived. Puberty typically commences later for males, so it is possible that the male and female eighth grade samples were in different stages of physical development. The apparent lack of differences between pre and early adolescent male ratings of physical

appearance may reflect that males are generally more satisfied with their physical appearance, or have not reached a stage in their physical development where the changes are perceived in a negative fashion.

In grade twelve, or late adolescence, males and females again produced similar and relatively high ratings of academic competency and social acceptance. Females reported higher ratings of their behavioral conduct. However, the gap between the ratings of males and females in the areas of athletic competence and physical appearance was smaller. This trend in these two domains appears to be caused by male ratings having decreased. Although cross-sectional design issues may have provided an artifact, this trend may suggest two additional interpretations. First, by later adolescence, it is expected that males have reached puberty. The lower ratings in physical appearance may reflect the same changes that their female peers had experienced earlier. Second, it is possible that late adolescent males are also increasingly influenced by cultural expectations of fitness and beauty. Although media typically uses female models to illustrate societal notions of beauty and fitness, male models are being increasingly incorporated into advertisements. This increase in prevalence of male models may now be starting to influence adolescent males' physical self-concepts.

It is interesting to note that at all three developmental levels, males and females significantly differed in their ratings of athletic competence, physical appearance, and behavioral conduct. Differences were in the direction of gender stereotypes. These findings indicate that by fourth grade, children are already rating their similarity or dissimilarity to an ideal in a gender-specified manner. Gender and social roles appear to be ingrained by an early age. By twelfth grade, significant differences in these three domains continue to be evident, suggesting the strength in the salience of these roles. Again, these

ratings do not indicate actual abilities or competencies, only perceptions of abilities. Nonetheless, at all three developmental levels, participants appear to be endorsing societal expectations of competencies.

However, gender differences were not consistently found in ratings of academic competence and social acceptance. A possible explanation for this is that these two areas may have been increasingly targeted by teachers, parents and media. Females' perceptions of their academic competence has been a focus of many media reports. Perhaps teachers and parents have been influenced into action by these reports, and have been attempting to reinforce female academic efforts, especially in the areas of mathematics and science. In contrast, parents and teachers may be trying to break the stereotypical notion that males behave in a more individual fashion, and therefore have been reinforcing group activities and acceptance.

Changes in these two areas would be considered to be socially acceptable and helpful. Society would probably agree that it would benefit from a larger academically competent and socially integrated population, regardless of gender. However, society at the present does not seem to be ready to change its notions of physical attractiveness. Indications of this resistance to change include increases in rates of eating disorders in both males and females (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition), as well as the increased popularity and media-hype of "Super Models." Given that society does not appear ready to give up its current ideals in physical beauty, females stand to be more at risk. As Sanford and Donovan state, "The proscription against being fat is not applied equally to both sexes. In men, fat is often construed as appropriate symbol of power. However, fat never symbolizes power in a woman; it symbolizes inferiority and worthlessness"

(1985, p. 374). These standards are expected to continue to influence female's own ratings of physical appearance.

Importance Ratings

Similar to the ratings of domain competency, significant grade and gender differences were found in the ratings of importance of these domains. Significant differences between fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade participants were found, but whereas analyses of domain ratings showed fourth graders reporting the highest ratings regardless of domain, results of importance ratings were less straight forward.

Three of the five common domains were rated as most important by the eighth grade participants: social acceptance, athletic ability, and physical appearance. In the domain of athletic competence, fourth and twelfth grade participants did not differ in their ratings of importance of that domain. In the area of physical appearance, twelfth grade participants rated this area as more important than did the fourth grade participants. However, social acceptance was viewed as more important to the fourth grade students than the twelfth grade students. Behavioral conduct was viewed as most important to fourth grade participants. Eighth and twelfth grade students viewed this domain as being of lesser importance. All three grades viewed academic competence of high and equal importance. These findings provide some support for the theory of Lynch (1981), who asserted that adolescents focus on social acceptance and physical characteristics. However, Lynch's assertion that appropriate behavior would be seen as more important to adolescents than to younger children was not substantiated.

Further examination of the areas of adolescent importance was provided through analyses of the three additional domains that Harter included as part of her adolescent form of the Self-Perception Profile. Adolescents, regardless of

grade level, rated these areas as highly important. Close friendships were rated as equally important to early and late adolescents. Job competency was viewed as more important to the eighth grade participants, perhaps suggesting that members of this age group believes that they are ready to handle increased responsibility in new areas of their lives. Romantic attractiveness was reported as more important to late adolescents, suggesting a possible focus in the nature of the relationships that this age group desires.

Whereas academic competency was seen as highly important regardless of developmental level, behavioral competence was of more importance to pre-adolescents. Social interactions and components of the physical self appear to be more important in adolescence. These findings fit with Eriksonian developmental theory (Shirk & Renouf, 1992). In late childhood, children are described as struggling with issues of competency. Overt indicators of competency, such as academic ability and behavior, are strongly reinforced by teachers and parents. By adolescence, the focus is considered to shift to identity formation. Social information has been proposed by many theorists as important in this formulation process. Unfortunately, the SPPC and SPPA did not provide information regarding social interactions with parents. Social acceptance with peers was measured and viewed to be highly important to early adolescents (replicating Harter, 1987), and close friendships were seen as highly important to both early and late adolescents. In addition, physical attributes, deemed as highly important in this culture and to the adolescents in this study, are most likely an integral consideration in the formulation of identity. Finally, vocational competency was also seen as highly important to both early and late adolescents.

Gender differences also were found in ratings of importance. Female participants rated the areas of academic competency, physical appearance,

and behavioral conduct as being more important than did their male peers. Males reported higher importance ratings of athletic competence. This suggests that Gardiner's (1992) findings of fifth grade males' ratings of the importance of athletic abilities being higher than the females' ratings of that domain may also be true at other grade levels. No gender differences were found in the importance of social acceptance.

When the importance of job competence, romantic appeal, and close friendships was examined, it was found that both males and females described these areas as highly important. They differed only in their ratings of the importance of close friendships, with females rating that area as more important. When possible gender differences were examined at the two grades, it was found that late adolescents had similar ratings of importance in the three domains, regardless of gender. However, at the eighth grade level, female participants rated close friendships as more important than did their male peers.

When domain ratings were examined, pre-adolescents demonstrated high and relatively undifferentiated ratings. In contrast, when importance ratings were examined, this trend was most similar to the one found at the eighth grade level. It appears that in early adolescence, all areas of the self are considered highly important, or that a high degree of similarity to positive models in all areas of competency is considered important. This finding suggests that during early adolescence, males and females are striving to "be" the ideal in all areas of competency.

Global Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

Correlations between indices of general self-concept and self-esteem suggested that even though related, these constructs share only half the variance, and therefore reflect unique aspects of the individual. The lower correlation between these concepts at the fourth grade level may be due to the

way in which participants interpreted the questions across the two instruments. Fourth grade interpretations of the RSES appear different than the eighth and twelfth grade responses, which reflected a two-factor structure and therefore similar views of the construct of self-esteem. The lower correlation at the fourth grade level may be partially due to instrumentation and a difficulty with the vocabulary and syntax. However, no grade differences were found in ratings of self-esteem, suggesting that the three age groups were not using the instrument in different ways. Therefore, it is proposed that the correlations reflect differences between the constructs, with global self-worth referring to a more objective indice of self and self-esteem to one which is more evaluative.

Significant grade and gender differences were found on the measure of global self-worth. Males demonstrated a downward trend in scores between pre-adolescence and adolescence. Fourth grade male participants endorsed the most similarity to the positive ideal, as compared to the male eighth and twelfth grade participants. Eighth and twelfth grade males appeared to be using less strong descriptions, resulting in lower ratings. Females also demonstrated this downward trend in global self-worth ratings between pre and early adolescence, but the trend appeared to be reversing itself by the twelfth grade.

Similar to Gardiner (1992), and Marsh (1989), gender differences were found on the measure of global self-worth, with males reporting the higher ratings. However, these gender differences were significant only at the eighth and twelfth grade levels.

Unlike global self-worth, no significant grade differences were found in ratings of self-esteem. This finding is in contrast to those of McCarthy and Hoge (1982), and O'Malley and Bachman (1982) who reported increases in self-esteem over age.

However, as reported by Marsh (1989), and Marsh, Relich, and Smith (1983), gender differences were found in this study, with males reporting higher self-esteem. These differences were significant only at the eighth grade level. At this point in early adolescence, female self-esteem was found to be significantly lower than male self-esteem.

Comparing these findings of global self-worth and self-esteem, some similarities are evident. Male participants reported higher levels of global self-worth and self-esteem. A similar decline in self-worth and self-esteem scores was seen for females at the eighth grade level. Female ratings of both constructs appeared to be rising by later adolescence. The largest gap between male and female ratings of both general self-worth and self-esteem occurred in early adolescence.

When the eighth grade importance ratings also are considered, it is not surprising to find low global self-worth and self-esteem ratings at that developmental stage. Early adolescents appear to be striving to be similar to the positive ideal descriptions in all self-concept areas, yet rate their competency in several areas as dissimilar to this ideal. This discordant information is expected to be associated with negative perceptions of global self.

Some differences were noted in the way that participants used the two constructs. On the measure of global self-worth, fourth grade participants, regardless of gender, produced higher ratings than the adolescents participants. Male ratings of self-worth then were found to decrease at adolescence. Female ratings decreased at the eighth grade level, but then appeared to be rising at later adolescence. With self-esteem, the quadratic trend was evident for females, but a reverse trend appeared to be occurring with male ratings.

A possible reason for these differences in trends relates to the aforementioned discussion that self-esteem and global self-concept are separate constructs. It would not be surprising then, that differences in the ratings of two concepts would be found. Examination of the content of the two measures suggests that the global self-worth instrument places more of an emphasis on competency. The self-esteem measure places an emphasis on approval of self.

Importance Models and Regression Analyses

This study utilized several models and linear regression equations to determine if importance ratings were used by participants in predicting global self-worth and self-esteem. Results of this study indicated that importance ratings did not reliably increase the predictability of either global self-worth or self-esteem. Results of individually weighted models showed that regardless of grade, domain ratings alone were more highly correlated with self-worth and self-esteem than when both domain ratings and importance ratings were used. A variety of linear regression equations, using combinations of domain ratings, importance ratings and their cross-product terms, also showed that importance ratings added very little to the predictability of either global self-worth or self-esteem. These results support the earlier findings of Marsh (1993), who found little support for individually weighted models and minimal support for constant weighted models. The scientific parsimony rule referred to by Marsh (1993) provides further support for the domain only models.

This study also examined whether domain and importance ratings were used in a similar fashion at each grade level. Although the degree of predictability was relatively constant at each grade level, differences were found in the terms that were significant predictors at each grade level. For example, when only domain ratings were entered into regression equations, the

academic domain ratings were found to be significant predictors at the eighth and twelfth grade levels, but not at the fourth grade level. These findings suggest that persons of different ages use the domain and importance ratings in different ways.

However, one area, physical appearance, was a significant predictor in the majority of equations, regardless of grade level. In many equations, physical appearance had the highest predictive value. Therefore, perceptions of physical appearance seem to be highly related to self-worth and self-esteem at each developmental level.

Conclusions

This study examined the domain ratings and importance ratings of persons from three different developmental stages: pre-adolescence, early adolescence, and late adolescence. As expected, differences in these ratings and the use of these ratings were found at each level. Pre-adolescent participants tended to have high ratings of competence in most areas of self-concept. In adolescence, the ratings of competence in many of these areas was found to drop significantly, and in some instances to not rebound by a later stage of adolescent development. Gender differences also were found, both within a developmental level and across levels. Males consistently reported higher ratings on global measures. When specific domains were examined, many of the differences in ratings of competency were in the direction of gender stereotypes.

Based on this study's findings, early adolescence appears to be a pivotal time in the formulation of self. Multiple researchers have previously suggested that this developmental stage is a particularly difficult time for a variety of reasons. Ambivalent negative appraisals of identity do not appear to be clarified by later adolescence, as evidenced by the similarity of ratings of eighth

and twelfth grade students. These findings imply that identity formation continues well beyond high school. Further examination of the multiple domain and self-esteem ratings of college students may provide additional information regarding this identity process.

Regarding the use of domain and importance ratings, this study's results did not support the contention that importance ratings are influential in the prediction of general self-concept and self-esteem. These findings do not suggest that this information is not used in the cognitive process of formulating global perceptions of self. It is possible that importance ratings are inherently used when an individual considers his or her self-perceptions, but in a way that researchers have yet been able to measure or document. Hopefully, future research will continue to explore ways to measure the importance of the many domains of self-concept and other ways that importance ratings are utilized in the formulation of self.

It is hoped that future research will continue to examine these stages of development and the impact of cultural forces such as family, schools and media. In addition, it is hoped that these cultural forces will be sensitive to the potential difficulty of the adolescent developmental period, and also understand the significant, and at times negative, contribution they have in shaping identity.

Although this study was primarily descriptive in nature, it is hoped that the information contained in it may be useful in eliciting further research to address prevention and intervention issues. As this and other research has reported generally high self-concept ratings of pre-adolescents, this stage of development would appear to be an appropriate time for schools and families to instill programs that would aim to prevent the increasingly negative ratings in adolescence. In addition, this study found gender differences in the perceptions of competence of many domains. Addressing these findings is expected to be

difficult. Gender roles can be seen as mirroring the desires and requirements of society. Although programs can be designed to address, for instance, the negative female ratings of athletic competency, they are not expected to have a lasting effect unless their aims reflect those of society in general. Therefore, determining how to potentially change negative perceptions that cross gender and encompass multiple age groups is expected to be extremely difficult. For example, persons can lament the finding that females present such negative appraisals of their physical appearance. Yet, these perceptions are not expected to significantly change when media continues to present and revere images that are beyond the attainment of most persons. Perhaps the best (and most difficult) level to address prevention efforts is at what Bronfenbrenner (1977) calls the Macrosystem. This level reflects cultural values and historical events that are seen as the most general context of development. This level is seen to influence other levels of the context of human development.

Finally, readers are asked to use caution when generalizing these findings. A number of factors preclude generalizations to overall developmental trends. Participants were voluntary, from one region of the North Eastern United States and were primarily caucasian and from middle class families. It is expected that social economic status and ethnicity are important variables in understanding developmental differences in self-concept, but were not included in this study. In addition, it is not known how this study's findings would have differed if other instruments had been used. Further replication with other measures of self-concept and self-esteem is encouraged.

References

- Aboud, F. E., & Ruble, D. N. (1987). Identity constancy in children: Developmental processes and implications. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 95-107). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, K. M. (1992). Self-complexity and self-esteem in middle childhood. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 11-52). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bachman, J., & O'Malley, P. (1977). Self-esteem in young men: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of education and occupational attainment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 365-380.
- Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes: Vol. 1. Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Brinthaupt, T. H., and Lipka, R. P. (1992). Introduction. In T. H. Brinthaupt and R. P. Lipka (Eds.), The self: Definitional and methodological issues (pp. 1-11). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 32, 513-531.
- Byrne, B. (1984). The general/academic self-concept nomological network: A review of construct validation research. Review of Educational Research, 54, 427-456.
- Crandall, R. (1973). The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute For Social Research.
- Crockett, W. H. (1965). Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in Experimental Personality Research, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Damon, W. & Hart, D. (1982). The development of self-understanding from infancy through adolescence. Child Development, 53, 841-864.

- Demo, D. H. , & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1992). Self-concept stability and change during adolescence. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 116-148). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dusek, J., & Flaherty, J. (1981). The development of self-concept during adolescent years. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 46 (4, Serial No. 191).
- Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Reuman, K., & MacIver, D. (1987). Changes in self-perceptions and values at early adolescence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Flavell, J. H. (1977). Cognitive development (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Gardiner, E. N. (1992). A comparison of the self-concepts of gifted pre-adolescents and a non-gifted peer group. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.
- Harter, S. (1982). The Perceived Competence Scale for Children. Child Development, 53, 87-97.
- Harter, S. (1985). Self-perception profile for children. Denver: University of Denver.
- Harter, S. (1986). Self-perception profile for college students. Denver: University of Denver.
- Harter, S. (1987). The determinants and mediational role of global self-worth in children. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), Contemporary topics in developmental psychology. New York: Wiley.
- Harter, S. (1988). Self-perception profile for adolescents. Denver: University of Denver.
- Higgins, E. T., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1985). Self-concept discrepancy theory: A psychological model for distinguishing among different aspects of depression and anxiety. Social Cognition, 3, 51-76.
- Hoge, D. R., & McCarthy, J. D. (1984). Influence of individual and group identity salience in the global self-esteem of youth. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 403-414.
- James, W. (1963). The principles of psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. (Original work published in 1890).
- Kuhn, M. H. & McPartland, T. S. (1954). An empirical investigation of self-attitudes. American Sociological Review, 19, 68-76.

- Lewis, M. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1979). Social cognition and the acquisition of self. New York: Plenum.
- Lipka, R. P., Hurford, D. P. & Litten, M. (1992). Self in school: Age and school experience effects. In R.P. Lipka & T.M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 93-115). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lynch, M. D. (1981). Self-concept development in childhood. In M.D. Lynch, A.A. Norem-Hebeisen, & K.J. Gergen (Eds.), Self-concept: Advances in theory and research (pp. 119-132). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Marcia, J. E. (1987). The identity status approach to the study of ego identity development. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 161-171). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marsh, H. (1985). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of preadolescent self-concept: A replication and extension. Australian Journal of Psychology, 37, 197-204.
- Marsh, H. (1986). Global self-esteem: Its relation to specific facets of self-concept and their importance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1224-1236.
- Marsh, H. (1989). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of self-concept: Preadolescence to early adulthood. Journal of Educational Psychology, 3, 417-430.
- Marsh, H. (1993). Relations between global and specific domains of self: The importance of individual importance, certainty, and ideals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 975-992.
- Marsh, H., Barnes, J., Cairns, L., & Tidman, M. (1984). Self-Description Questionnaire: Age and sex effects in the structure and level of self-concept for preadolescent children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 940-956.
- Marsh, H., & Gouvenet, P. (1989). Multidimensional self-concepts and perceptions of control: Construct validation of responses by children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81, 57-69.
- Marsh, H., Relich, J., & Smith, I. (1983). Self-concept: The construct validity of interpretations based upon the SDQ. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 173-187.
- McCarthy, J., & Hoge, D. (1982). Analysis of age effects in longitudinal studies of adolescent self-esteem. Developmental Psychology, 18, 372-379.

- Montemayor, R., & Eisen, M. (1982). The development of self-conceptions from childhood to adolescence. In M. Rosenberg & Kaplan, H. B. (Eds.), Social psychology of the self-concept (pp. 289-296). Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.
- Mullener, N. & Laird, J. D. (1971). Some developmental changes in the organization of self-evaluations. Developmental Psychology, 5, 233-236.
- O'Malley, P., & Bachman, J. (1983). Self-esteem: Change and stability between the ages of 13 and 23. Developmental Psychology, 19, 257-268.
- Peevers, B. H. (1987). The self as observer of the self: A developmental analysis of the subjective self. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 147-158). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pelham, B., & Swann, W. (1989). From self-conceptions to self-worth: On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 672-679.
- Peterson, A. C. (1981). The development of self-concept in adolescence. In M. D. Lynch, A. A. Norem-Hebeisen, & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), Self-concept: Advances in theory and research (pp. 191-202). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Rosenberg, M. & Simmons, R. G. (1972). Black and white self-esteem: The urban school child. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Sanford, L. T. & Donovan, M. (1985). Women and self-esteem: Understanding and improving the way we think and feel about ourselves. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Scarlett, H. H., Press, A. N., & Crockett, W. H. (1971). Children's descriptions of peers: a Wernerian developmental analysis. Child Development, 42, 439-453.
- Shantz, C. (1975). The development of social cognition. In E. M. Hetherington, (Ed.), Review of Child Development Theory and Research: Vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. (1976). Validation of construct interpretations. Review of Educational Research, 46, 437-441.
- Shirk, S. R. & Renouf, A. G. (1992). The tasks of self-development in middle childhood and early adolescence. In R.P. Lipka & T.M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 53-90). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sigelman, C., & Shaffer, D. (1991). Life-span human development. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Simmons, R. G. (1987). Self-esteem in adolescence. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 172-192). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.
- Watkins, D. (1978). The development and evaluation of self-esteem measuring instruments. Journal of Personality Assessment, 42, 171-182.
- Vander Zanden, J. (1989). Human Development. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Werner, H. (1957). The concept of development from a comparative and organismic point of view. In D. B. Harris (Ed.), The concept of development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1974). The self-concept (rev. ed., Vol. 1). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1979). The self-concept (rev. ed., Vol. 2). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1989). Measures of self-concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Mean Domain Scores By Sex

Figure 3

Grade By Sex By Mean Domain Score Interaction

Grade Four Mean Domain Scores By Sex

Grade Eight Mean Domain Scores By Sex

Grade Twelve Mean Domain Scores By Sex

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

Figure 9

Grade By Sex By Mean Domain Importance Score Interaction

Grade Eight Mean Importance Ratings By Sex

Grade Twelve Mean Importance Ratings By Sex

Figure 10

Mean Global Self-Worth Ratings By Grade and Sex

Figure 11

Appendix A: Fourth Grade Consent Forms and Measures

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
600 Chafee Building
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881-4808

UNIVERSITY OF
RHODE ISLAND

Phone: 401-792-2193
Fax: 401-792-2137

Dear Parent or Guardian:

We are contacting you in hopes that you will allow your child to participate in a research study which will help us better understand children's self-esteem and self-perceptions. Self-perception is how an individual would describe him or herself, and self-esteem is how the individual feels about him or herself. We would like to ask your permission to have your son or daughter participate in a one-time, group administered psychological research project conducted by Erika Gardiner of the University of Rhode Island. All responses will be anonymous and are considered to be confidential. She is gathering this data as part of her dissertation research in School Psychology and in conjunction with the Warwick Public Schools.

We believe that self-esteem is an important part of any child's development. It may influence how he or she performs in school and how he or she may interact with other people. We are interested in furthering our understanding of what makes up self-concept (a person's self-perception) and whether children at various ages feel differently about themselves. This study examines the self-esteem and self-concepts of fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade students. All participants will be asked to complete two pencil and paper surveys, which should take no longer than 45 minutes. Students will read the questions along with Ms. Gardiner and then make a pencil mark in the response box that represents their answer. These measures are widely used in research around the country, and address how children and adolescents see themselves. The following questions are examples of items that appear on the questionnaires:

Some kids do very well at all kinds of sports.
Some kids think it is important to behave the way they should.
Some teenagers think it is important to be intelligent.
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

We believe that minimal risk is involved in this research process. However, if your child or adolescent feels uncomfortable during or after completion of the measures, Ms. Gardiner will be available for consultation both during and after administering the questionnaires. Your child or adolescent's performance on the measures will not affect his or her grades in the classroom. All responses will be anonymous, since names will not be filled in on the measures, and results will be examined by the researchers only. Teachers will not have access to the completed surveys. Only general group results, such as age and sex differences, will be examined and reported. There will be no direct benefit to your child if he or she participates, although we hope that ultimately this information can be used to better school curriculums regarding self-esteem and self-concept.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Erika Gardiner at (401) 792-2193, Dr. Cohen at (401) 792-2193, or the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, at (401) 792-2635.

We hope that you will now sign this consent form and have your child return it to his or her classroom teacher.

Thank you for your help in this project!

Erika N. Gardiner, M. A.

Jerry L. Cohen, Ph. D.

This document is the property of the University of Rhode Island and should be returned to the Department of Psychology.

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Chafee Social Science Center
Kingston, RI 02881

Age Differences in Self-Concept
CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

I have read the previous letter and wish that my child participate in the study as described.

I grant permission for _____ to participate in the study as described.
(child's name)

Signature of parent or guardian Today's date

PLEASE SIGN THIS FORM AND HAVE YOUR CHILD RETURN IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU!

THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Psychology

I have been asked to take part in a study of student's self-esteem and self-perceptions. Ms. Gardiner will describe the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, my parents or I can contact Erika Gardiner (792-2193) or Dr. Jerry Cohen (792-2193).

I have been asked to take part in a study which examines how students of different ages view themselves. If I decide to take part in this study, I will be answering two questionnaires by reading along with Ms. Gardiner and then making a mark next to my answer. This should take about 45 minutes all together.

Participation is not expected to be harmful to me. Ms. Gardiner will be available to answer any questions or concerns that I may have. There is no direct benefit for me to participate, but answers may help Ms. Gardiner and others better understand how kids of different ages feel about themselves.

My part in this study is confidential. None of my answers will identify me by name. All information will be collected anonymously. The only place my name is used is at the bottom of this form to say that I have agreed to participate in this study. My participation will not effect my grades in class.

The decision to take take part in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate. If I decide to participate, I can decide to quit at any time by contacting Ms. Gardiner or my teacher.

If I am not happy with the way this study went, my parents or I can discuss my complaints with Ms. Gardiner or Dr. Cohen, anonymously if I choose.

I have read the consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in this study.

My signature and today's date

Signature of researcher and today's date

Please answer the following questions:

Your grade _____

Your age _____

Your school _____

Your teacher _____

Circle whether you are a: Male or a Female

I am interested in what each of you is like, what kind of person you are. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers and everyone will have different answers. Be sure that your answers show how you feel about yourself. Please do not talk about your answers with anyone else. I will keep your answers private and not show them to anyone. If you have any questions, raise your hand and I will come to help you answer them.

I would like you to answer some some questions about yourself. I would like you to put an X in one of the four boxes after each question. Each question asks you whether you agree or disagree with each sentence.

Here is an example:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
On the whole, I like living in Rhode Island.	[]	[]	[]	[]

Now I would like you to answer some questions about yourself. Remember to put a mark in one of the boxes after each question.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]
2. At times I think I am no good at all.	[]	[]	[]	[]
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	[]	[]	[]	[]
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	[]	[]	[]	[]
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	[]	[]	[]	[]
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	[]	[]	[]	[]
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	[]	[]	[]	[]
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]
9. All in all, I am inclined to think I am a failure.	[]	[]	[]	[]
10. I take a positive attitude towards myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]

SELF-PERCEPTION PROFILE

When you are ready to begin, please read each sentence and decide your answer. There are four possible answers for each question, one box for each of the answers. The answers are written at the top of the boxes. Choose your answer to a sentence and put an X in the box under the answer you choose. DO NOT say your answer out loud or talk about it with anyone else.

Let me explain how these questions work. There is a sample question at the top, marked (a). I'll read it out loud and you follow along with me. This question talks about two kinds of kids, and I want to know which kids are most like you.

First decide whether you are more like the kids on the left side, or whether you are more like the kids on the right side.

Now, the second thing I want you to decide is whether that is only **sort of true for you**, or **really true for you**. If it's only sort of true, then put an X in that box, under sort of true. If it's really true, then put an X in that box, under really true.

For each sentence, check only one box. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, another time it will be on the other side of the page. You don't check both sides, just the one side most like you. You should have only one answer for each sentence.

Let's try the sample question...

What I Am Like

Name _____ Age _____ Birthday _____
Month Day Group _____

Boy or Girl (circle which)

SAMPLE SENTENCE

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me			Sort of True for me	Really True for me
(a)	☐	☐	Some kids would rather play outdoors in their spare time	BUT	Other kids would rather watch T.V.	☐
<hr/>						
1.	☐	☐	Some kids feel that they are <i>very good</i> at their school work	BUT	Other kids worry about whether they can do the school work assigned to them.	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some kids find it <i>hard</i> to make friends	BUT	Other kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some kids do very <i>well</i> at all kinds of sports	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> feel that they are very good when it comes to sports.	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with the way they look	BUT	Other kids are <i>not</i> happy with the way they look.	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some kids often do <i>not</i> like the way they <i>behave</i>	BUT	Other kids usually <i>like</i> the way they behave.	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some kids are often <i>unhappy</i> with themselves	BUT	Other kids are pretty <i>pleased</i> with themselves.	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some kids feel like they are <i>just as smart</i> as as other kids their age	BUT	Other kids aren't so sure and <i>wonder</i> if they are as smart.	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some kids have <i>alot</i> of friends	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> have very many friends.	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me			Sort of True for me	Really True for me	
	☐	☐	Some kids wish they could be alot better at sports	BUT	Other kids feel they are good enough at sports.	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with their height and weight	BUT	Other kids wish their height or weight were <i>different</i> .	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some kids usually do the <i>right</i> thing	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> do the right thing.	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>don't</i> like the way they are leading their life	BUT	Other kids <i>do</i> like the way they are leading their life.	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some kids are pretty <i>slow</i> in finishing their school work	BUT	Other kids can do their school work <i>quickly</i> .	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some kids would like to have alot more friends	BUT	Other kids have as many friends as they want.	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some kids think they could do well at just about any new sports activity they haven't tried before	BUT	Other kids are afraid they might <i>not</i> do well at sports they haven't ever tried.	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their body was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their body the way it is.	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some kids usually <i>act</i> the way they know they are <i>supposed</i> to	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> act the way they are supposed to.	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with themselves as a person	BUT	Other kids are often <i>not</i> happy with themselves.	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Some kids often <i>forget</i> what they learn	BUT	Other kids can remember things <i>easily</i> .	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	Some kids are always doing things with alot of kids	BUT	Other kids usually do things <i>by themselves</i> .	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
21.	☐	☐	Some kids feel that they are <i>better</i> than others their age at sports	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> feel they can play as well.	☐	☐
22.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their physical appearance (how they look) was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their physical appearance the way it is.	☐	☐
23.	☐	☐	Some kids usually get in <i>trouble</i> because of things they do	BUT	Other kids usually <i>don't</i> do things that get them in trouble.	☐	☐
24.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>like</i> the kind of <i>person</i> they are	BUT	Other kids often wish they were someone else.	☐	☐
25.	☐	☐	Some kids do <i>very well</i> at their classwork	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> do very well at their classwork.	☐	☐
26.	☐	☐	Some kids wish that more people their age liked them	BUT	Other kids feel that most people their age <i>do</i> like them.	☐	☐
27.	☐	☐	In games and sports some kids usually <i>watch</i> instead of play	BUT	Other kids usually <i>play</i> rather than just watch.	☐	☐
28.	☐	☐	Some kids wish something about their face or hair looked <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their face and hair the way they are.	☐	☐
29.	☐	☐	Some kids do things they know they <i>shouldn't</i> do	BUT	Other kids <i>hardly ever</i> do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐	☐
30.	☐	☐	Some kids are very <i>happy</i> being the way they are	BUT	Other kids wish they were <i>different</i> .	☐	☐
31.	☐	☐	Some kids have <i>trouble</i> figuring out the answers in school	BUT	Other kids almost <i>always</i> can figure out the answers.	☐	☐
32.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>popular</i> with others their age	BUT	Other kids are <i>not</i> very popular.	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
33.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>don't</i> do well at new outdoor games	BUT	Other kids are <i>good</i> at new games right away.	☐	☐
34.	☐	☐	Some kids think that they are good looking	BUT	Other kids think that they are not very good looking.	☐	☐
35.	☐	☐	Some kids behave themselves very well	BUT	Other kids often find it hard to behave themselves.	☐	☐
36.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>are</i> not very happy with the way they do alot of things	BUT	Other kids think the way they do things is <i>fine</i> .	☐	☐

Now we have some other types of questions to answer.

These questions ask you how **important** certain things are to you. Please read each sentence and then check one box for each sentence, just like you did with the earlier questions. Here are two examples:

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to be on the soccer team	BUT	Other kids don't think it is important to be on the soccer team	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to have dessert every night	BUT	Other kids would think it's ok to skip dessert every now and then	☐	☐

HOW IMPORTANT ARE THESE THINGS TO HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF AS A PERSON?

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to do well at schoolwork in order to feel good as a person	BUT	Other kids don't think how well they do at schoolwork is that important.	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some kids don't think that having a lot of friends is all that important	BUT	Other kids think that having a lot of friends is important to how they feel as a person.	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some kids think it's important to be good at sports	BUT	Other kids don't think how good you are at sports is that important.	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some kids think it's important to be good looking in order to feel good about themselves	BUT	Other kids don't think that's very important at all.	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some kids think that it's important to behave the way they should	BUT	Other kids don't think that how they behave is that important.	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some kids don't think that getting good grades is all that important to how they feel about themselves.	BUT	Other kids think that getting good grades is important.	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some kids think it's important to be popular	BUT	Other kids don't think that being popular is all that important to how they feel about themselves.	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some kids don't think doing well at athletics is that important to how they feel about themselves as a person	BUT	Other kids feel that doing well at athletics is important.	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some kids don't think that how they look is important to how they feel about themselves as a person	BUT	Other kids think that how they look is important.	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some kids don't think that how they act is all that important	BUT	Other kids think it's important to act the way you are supposed to.	☐	☐

Thank you for filling out these questionnaires. Your responses will help me to better understand the way that students of different ages feel about themselves.

Appendix B: Eighth Grade Consent Forms and Measures

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
306 Chafee Building
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881-6808

UNIVERSITY OF
RHODE ISLAND

Phone: (401) 792-2193
Fax: (401) 792-2635

Dear Parent or Guardian:

We are contacting you in hopes that you will allow your child to participate in a research study which will help us better understand children's self-esteem and self-perceptions. Self-perception is how an individual would describe him or herself, and self-esteem is how the individual feels about him or herself. We would like to ask your permission to have your son or daughter participate in a one-time, group administered psychological research project conducted by Erika Gardiner of the University of Rhode Island. All responses will be anonymous and are considered to be confidential. She is gathering this data as part of her dissertation research in School Psychology and in conjunction with the Warwick Public Schools.

We believe that self-esteem is an important part of any child's development. It may influence how he or she performs in school and how he or she may interact with other people. We are interested in furthering our understanding of what makes up self-concept (a person's self-perception) and whether children at various ages feel differently about themselves. This study examines the self-esteem and self-concepts of fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade students. All participants will be asked to complete two pencil and paper surveys, which should take no longer than 45 minutes. Students will read the questions along with Ms. Gardiner and then make a pencil mark in the response box that represents their answer. These measures are widely used in research around the country, and address how children and adolescents see themselves. The following questions are examples of items that appear on the questionnaires:

Some kids do very well at all kinds of sports.
Some kids think it is important to behave the way they should.
Some teenagers think it is important to be intelligent.
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

We believe that minimal risk is involved in this research process. However, if your child or adolescent feels uncomfortable during or after completion of the measures, Ms. Gardiner will be available for consultation both during and after administering the questionnaires. Your child or adolescent's performance on the measures will not affect his or her grades in the classroom. All responses will be anonymous, since names will not be filled in on the measures, and results will be examined by the researchers only. Teachers will not have access to the completed surveys. Only general group results, such as age and sex differences, will be examined and reported. There will be no direct benefit to your child if he or she participates, although we hope that ultimately this information can be used to better school curriculums regarding self-esteem and self-concept.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Erika Gardiner at (401) 792-2193, Dr. Cohen at (401) 792-2193, or the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, at (401) 792-2635.

We hope that you will now sign this consent form and have your child return it to his or her classroom teacher.

Thank you for your help in this project!

Erika N. Gardiner, M. A.

Jerry L. Cohen, Ph. D.

This document contains confidential information and is intended for the use of the individual named above.

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Chafee Social Science Center
Kingston, RI 02881

Age Differences in Self-Concept
CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

I have read the previous letter and wish that my child participate in the study as described.

I grant permission for _____ to participate in the study as described.
(child's name)

Signature of parent or guardian Today's date

PLEASE SIGN THIS FORM AND HAVE YOUR CHILD RETURN IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.
THANK YOU!

THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Psychology

I have been asked to take part in a study of student's self-esteem and self-perceptions. Ms. Gardiner will describe the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, my parents or I can contact Erika Gardiner (792-2193) or Dr. Jerry Cohen (792-2193).

I have been asked to take part in a study which examines how students of different ages view themselves. If I decide to take part in this study, I will be answering two questionnaires by reading along with Ms. Gardiner and then making a mark next to my answer. This should take about 45 minutes all together.

Participation is not expected to be harmful to me. Ms. Gardiner will be available to answer any questions or concerns that I may have. There is no direct benefit for me to participate, but answers may help Ms. Gardiner and others better understand how kids of different ages feel about themselves.

My part in this study is confidential. None of my answers will identify me by name. All information will be collected anonymously. The only place my name is used is at the bottom of this form to say that I have agreed to participate in this study. My participation will not effect my grades in class.

The decision to take take part in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate. If I decide to participate, I can decide to quit at any time by contacting Ms. Gardiner or my teacher.

If I am not happy with the way this study went, my parents or I can discuss my complaints with Ms. Gardiner or Dr. Cohen, anonymously if I choose.

I have read the consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in this study.

My signature and today's date

Signature of researcher and today's date

Please answer the following questions:

Your grade _____

Your age _____

Your school _____

Your teacher _____

Circle whether you are a: Male or a Female

I am interested in what each of you is like, what kind of person you are. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers and everyone will have different answers. Be sure that your answers show how you feel about yourself. Please do not talk about your answers with anyone else. I will keep your answers private and not show them to anyone. If you have any questions, raise your hand and I will come to help you answer them.

I would like you to answer some some questions about yourself. I would like you to put an X in one of the four boxes after each question. Each question asks you whether you agree or disagree with each sentence.

Here is an example:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
On the whole, I like living in Rhode Island.	[]	[]	[]	[]

Now I would like you to answer some questions about yourself. Remember to put a mark in one of the boxes after each question.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]
2. At times I think I am no good at all.	[]	[]	[]	[]
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	[]	[]	[]	[]
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	[]	[]	[]	[]
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	[]	[]	[]	[]
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	[]	[]	[]	[]
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	[]	[]	[]	[]
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]
9. All in all, I am inclined to think I am a failure.	[]	[]	[]	[]
10. I take a positive attitude towards myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]

SELF-PERCEPTION PROFILE

When you are ready to begin, please read each sentence and decide your answer. There are four possible answers for each question, one box for each of the answers. The answers are written at the top of the boxes. Choose your answer to a sentence and put an X in the box under the answer you choose. DO NOT say your answer out loud or talk about it with anyone else.

Let me explain how these questions work. There is a sample question at the top, marked (a). I'll read it out loud and you follow along with me. This question talks about two kinds of kids, and I want to know which kids are most like you.

First decide whether you are more like the kids on the left side, or whether you are more like the kids on the right side.

Now, the second thing I want you to decide is whether that is only **sort of true for you**, or **really true for you**. If it's only sort of true, then put an X in that box, under sort of true. If it's really true, then put an X in that box, under really true.

For each sentence, check only one box. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, another time it will be on the other side of the page. You don't check both sides, just the one side most like you. You should have only one answer for each sentence.

Let's try the sample question...

What I Am Like

SAMPLE SENTENCE

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me			Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
a)	☐	☐	Some teenagers like to go to movies in their spare time	BUT	Other teenagers would rather go to sports events.	☐
1.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are just as smart as others their age	BUT	Other teenagers aren't so sure and wonder if they are as smart.	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some teenagers find it hard to make friends	BUT	For other teenagers it's pretty easy.	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do very well at all kinds of sports	BUT	Other teenagers don't feel that they are very good when it comes to sports.	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are not happy with the way they look	BUT	Other teenagers are happy with the way they look.	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are ready to do well at a part-time job	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they are not quite ready to handle a part-time job.	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that if they are romantically interested in someone, that person will like them back	BUT	Other teenagers worry that when they like someone romantically, that person won't like them back.	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some teenagers usually do the right thing	BUT	Other teenagers often don't do what they know is right.	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are able to make really close friends	BUT	Other teenagers find it hard to make really close friends.	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are often disappointed with themselves	BUT	Other teenagers are pretty pleased with themselves.	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are pretty slow in finishing their school work	BUT	Other teenagers can do their school work more quickly.	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some teenagers have a lot of friends	BUT	Other teenagers don't have very many friends.	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think they could do well at just about any new athletic activity	BUT	Other teenagers are afraid they might not do well at a new athletic activity.	☐

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
13.	☐	☐	Some teenagers wish their body was different	BUT	Other teenagers like their body the way it is.	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they don't have enough skills to do well at a job	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they do have enough skills to do a job well.	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are not dating the people they are really attracted to	BUT	Other teenagers are dating those people they are attracted to.	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some teenagers often get in trouble for the things they do	BUT	Other teenagers usually don't do things that get them in trouble	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do have a close friend they can share secrets with	BUT	Other teenagers do not have a really close friend they can share secrets with	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't like the way they are leading their life	BUT	Other teenagers do like the way they are leading their life.	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do very well at their classwork	BUT	Other teenagers don't do very well at their classwork.	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are very hard to like	BUT	Other teenagers are really easy to like.	☐	☐
21.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are better than others their age at sports	BUT	Other teenagers don't feel they can play as well.	☐	☐
22.	☐	☐	Some teenagers wish their physical appearance was different	BUT	Other teenagers like their physical appearance the way it is.	☐	☐
23.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel they are old enough to get and keep a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers do not feel they are old enough, yet, to really handle a job well	☐	☐
24.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that people their age will be romantically attracted to them	BUT	Other teenagers worry about whether people their age will be attracted to them.	☐	☐
25.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel really good about the way they act	BUT	Other teenagers don't feel that good about the way they often act	☐	☐
26.	☐	☐	Some teenagers wish they had a really close friend to share things with	BUT	Other teenagers do have a close friend to share things with.	☐	☐
27.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are happy with themselves most of the time	BUT	Other teenagers are often not happy with themselves.	☐	☐
28.	☐	☐	Some teenagers have trouble figuring out the answers in school	BUT	Other teenagers almost always can figure out the answers.	☐	☐

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
29.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are popular with others their age	BUT	Other teenagers are not very popular.	☐	☐
30.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't do well at new outdoor games	BUT	Other teenagers are good at new games right away.	☐	☐
31.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think that they are good looking	BUT	Other teenagers think that they are not very good looking.	☐	☐
32.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel like they could do better at work they do for pay	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they are doing really well at work they do for pay.	☐	☐
33.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are fun and interesting on a date	BUT	Other teenagers wonder about how fun and interesting they are on a date.	☐	☐
34.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do things they know they shouldn't do	BUT	Other teenagers hardly ever do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐	☐
35.	☐	☐	Some teenagers find it hard to make friends they can really trust	BUT	Other teenagers are able to make close friends they can really trust.	☐	☐
36.	☐	☐	Some teenagers like the kind of person they are	BUT	Other teenagers often wish they were someone else.	☐	☐
37.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are pretty intelligent	BUT	Other teenagers question whether they are intelligent.	☐	☐
38.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are socially accepted	BUT	Other teenagers wished that more people their age accepted them.	☐	☐
39.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do not feel that they are very athletic	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they are very athletic.	☐	☐
40.	☐	☐	Some teenagers really like their looks	BUT	Other teenagers wish they looked different.	☐	☐
41.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are really able to handle the work on a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers wonder if they are really doing as good a job at work as they should be doing	☐	☐
42.	☐	☐	Some teenagers usually don't go out with the people they would really like to date	BUT	Other teenagers do go out with the people they really want to date.	☐	☐
43.	☐	☐	Some teenagers usually act the way they know they are supposed to	BUT	Other teenagers often don't act the way they are supposed to.	☐	☐
44.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't have a friend that is close enough to share really personal thoughts with	BUT	Other teenagers do have a close friend that they can share personal thoughts and feelings with.	☐	☐
45.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are very happy being the way they are	BUT	Other teenagers wish they were different.	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me			Sort of True for me	Really True for me
46.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with the way they look	BUT	Other kids are <i>not</i> happy with the way they look.	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some kids often do <i>not</i> like the way they <i>behave</i>	BUT	Other kids usually <i>like</i> the way they behave.	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with their height and weight	BUT	Other kids wish their height or weight were <i>different</i> .	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some kids usually do the <i>right</i> thing	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> do the right thing.	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their body was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their body the way it is.	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some kids usually <i>act</i> the way they know they are <i>supposed</i> to	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> act the way they are supposed to.	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their physical appearance (how they look) was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their physical appearance the way it is.	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some kids usually get in <i>trouble</i> because of things they do	BUT	Other kids usually <i>don't</i> do things that get them in trouble.	☐
54.	☐	☐	Some kids wish something about their face or hair looked <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their face and hair the way they are.	☐
55.	☐	☐	Some kids do things they know they <i>shouldn't</i> do	BUT	Other kids <i>hardly ever</i> do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐
56.	☐	☐	Some kids think that they are good looking	BUT	Other kids think that they are not very good looking.	☐

Now we have some other types of questions to answer.

These questions ask you how **important** certain things are to you. Please read each sentence and then check one box for each sentence, just like you did with the earlier questions. Here are two examples:

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to be on the soccer team	BUT	Other kids don't think it is important to be on the soccer team	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to have dessert every night	BUT	Other kids would think it's ok to skip dessert every now and then	☐	☐

HOW IMPORTANT ARE EACH OF THESE THINGS TO YOU?

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think it is important to be intelligent	BUT	Other teenagers don't think it is important to be intelligent	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think its all that important to have a lot of friends	BUT	Other teenagers think that having a lot of friends is important	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to be good at sports	BUT	Other teenagers don't care much about being good at sports	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't really think that their physical appearance is all that important	BUT	Other teenagers think that their physical appearance is important	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't care that much about how well they do on a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers feel its important that they do well on a paying job	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important that the people they are romantically interested in like them back	BUT	Other teenagers don't really care that much whether someone they are interested in likes them that much	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think its that important to do the right thing	BUT	Other teenagers think that doing the right thing is important	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to be able to make really close friends	BUT	Other teenagers don't think making close friends is all that important	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think that doing well in school is really that important	BUT	Other teenagers think that doing well in school is important	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to be popular	BUT	Other teenagers don't care that much about whether they are popular	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think that being athletic is that important	BUT	Other teenagers think that being athletic is important	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think that how they look is important	BUT	Other teenagers don't care that much about how they look	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to do their best on a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers don't think that doing their best on a job is all that important	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't care that much whether they are dating someone they are romantically interested in	BUT	Other teenagers think its important to be dating someone they are interested in	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to act the way they are supposed to	BUT	Other teenagers don't care that much whether they are acting the way they are supposed to	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't care that much about having a close friend they can trust	BUT	Other teenagers think its important to have a really close friend you can trust	☐	☐

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!

Appendix C: Subscales From the Self-Perception Profile - Child Form
Administered to the Eighth Grade Participants

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
46.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with the way they look	BUT	Other kids are <i>not</i> happy with the way they look.	☐	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some kids often do <i>not</i> like the way they <i>behave</i>	BUT	Other kids usually <i>like</i> the way they behave.	☐	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with their height and weight	BUT	Other kids wish their height or weight were <i>different</i> .	☐	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some kids usually do the <i>right</i> thing	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> do the right thing.	☐	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their body was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their body the way it is.	☐	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some kids usually <i>act</i> the way they know they are <i>supposed</i> to	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> act the way they are supposed to.	☐	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their physical appearance (how they look) was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their physical appearance the way it is.	☐	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some kids usually get in <i>trouble</i> because of things they do	BUT	Other kids usually <i>don't</i> do things that get them in trouble.	☐	☐
54.	☐	☐	Some kids wish something about their face or hair looked <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their face and hair the way they are.	☐	☐
55.	☐	☐	Some kids do things they know they <i>shouldn't</i> do	BUT	Other kids <i>hardly ever</i> do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐	☐
56.	☐	☐	Some kids think that they are good looking	BUT	Other kids think that they are not very good looking.	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me			Sort of True for me	Really True for me
46.	☐	☐	Some kids find it <i>hard</i> to make friends	BUT	Other kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some kids do very <i>well</i> at all kinds of sports	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> feel that they are very good when it comes to sports.	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some kids have <i>alot</i> of friends	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> have very many friends.	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some kids wish they could be <i>alot</i> better at sports	BUT	Other kids feel they are good enough at sports.	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some kids would like to have <i>alot</i> more friends	BUT	Other kids have as many friends as they want.	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some kids think they could do well at just about any new sports activity they haven't tried before	BUT	Other kids are afraid they might <i>not</i> do well at sports they haven't ever tried.	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some kids are always doing things with <i>alot</i> of kids	BUT	Other kids usually do things <i>by themselves</i> .	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some kids feel that they are <i>better</i> than others their age at sports	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> feel they can play as well.	☐
54.	☐	☐	Some kids wish that more people their age liked them	BUT	Other kids feel that most people their age <i>do</i> like them.	☐
55.	☐	☐	In games and sports some kids usually <i>watch</i> instead of play	BUT	Other kids usually <i>play</i> rather than just watch.	☐
56.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>popular</i> with others their age	BUT	Other kids are <i>not</i> very popular.	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
46.	☐	☐	Some kids do very well at all kinds of sports	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> feel that they are very good when it comes to sports.	☐	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with the way they look	BUT	Other kids are <i>not</i> happy with the way they look.	☐	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some kids wish they could be alot better at sports	BUT	Other kids feel they are good enough at sports.	☐	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with their height and weight	BUT	Other kids wish their height or weight were <i>different</i> .	☐	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some kids think they could do well at just about any new sports activity they haven't tried before	BUT	Other kids are afraid they might <i>not</i> do well at sports they haven't ever tried.	☐	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their body was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their body the way it is.	☐	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some kids feel that they are <i>better</i> than others their age at sports	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> feel they can play as well.	☐	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some kids wish their physical appearance (how they look) was <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their physical appearance the way it is.	☐	☐
54.	☐	☐	In games and sports some kids usually <i>watch</i> instead of play	BUT	Other kids usually <i>play</i> rather than just watch.	☐	☐
55.	☐	☐	Some kids wish something about their face or hair looked <i>different</i>	BUT	Other kids <i>like</i> their face and hair the way they are.	☐	☐
56.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>don't</i> do well at new outdoor games	BUT	Other kids are <i>good</i> at new games right away.	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
46.	☐	☐	Some kids often do <i>not</i> like the way they <i>behave</i>	BUT	Other kids usually <i>like</i> the way they <i>behave</i> .	☐	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some kids are often <i>unhappy</i> with themselves	BUT	Other kids are pretty <i>pleased</i> with themselves.	☐	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some kids usually do the <i>right</i> thing	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> do the right thing.	☐	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>don't</i> like the way they are leading their life	BUT	Other kids <i>do</i> like the way they are leading their life.	☐	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some kids usually <i>act</i> the way they know they are <i>supposed</i> to	BUT	Other kids often <i>don't</i> act the way they are supposed to.	☐	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some kids are <i>happy</i> with themselves as a person	BUT	Other kids are often <i>not</i> happy with themselves.	☐	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some kids usually get in <i>trouble</i> because of things they do	BUT	Other kids usually <i>don't</i> do things that get them in trouble.	☐	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some kids <i>like</i> the kind of <i>person</i> they are	BUT	Other kids often wish they were someone else.	☐	☐
54.	☐	☐	Some kids do things they know they <i>shouldn't</i> do	BUT	Other kids <i>hardly ever</i> do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐	☐
55.	☐	☐	Some kids are very <i>happy</i> being the way they are	BUT	Other kids wish they were <i>different</i> .	☐	☐
56.	☐	☐	Some kids behave themselves very well	BUT	Other kids often find it hard to behave themselves.	☐	☐

	Heally True for me	Sort of True for me			Sort of True for me	Heally True for me
46.	☐	☐	Some kids feel that they are <i>very good</i> at their school work	BUT	Other kids worry about whether they can do the school work assigned to them.	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some kids find it <i>hard</i> to make friends	BUT	Other kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some kids feel like they are <i>just as smart</i> as as other kids their age	BUT	Other kids aren't so sure and wonder if they are as smart.	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some kids have <i>alot</i> of friends	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> have very many friends.	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some kids are pretty <i>slow</i> in finishing their school work	BUT	Other kids can do their school work <i>quickly</i> .	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some kids would like to have <i>alot</i> more friends	BUT	Other kids have as many friends as they want.	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some kids often <i>forget</i> what they learn	BUT	Other kids can remember things <i>easily</i> .	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some kids are always doing things with <i>alot</i> of kids	BUT	Other kids usually do things <i>by themselves</i> .	☐
54.	☐	☐	Some kids do <i>very well</i> at their classwork	BUT	Other kids <i>don't</i> do very well at their classwork.	☐
55.	☐	☐	Some kids wish that more people their age liked them	BUT	Other kids feel that most people their age <i>do</i> like them.	☐
56.	☐	☐	Some kids have <i>trouble</i> figuring out the answers in school	BUT	Other kids almost <i>always</i> can figure out the answers.	☐

Appendix D: Twelfth Grade Consent Forms and Measures

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
306 Chace Building
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881-4808

UNIVERSITY OF
RHODE ISLAND

Phone: (401) 792-2193
Fax: (401) 792-2635

Dear Parent or Guardian:

We are contacting you in hopes that you will allow your child to participate in a research study which will help us better understand children's self-esteem and self-perceptions. Self-perception is how an individual would describe him or herself, and self-esteem is how the individual feels about him or herself. We would like to ask your permission to have your son or daughter participate in a one-time, group administered psychological research project conducted by Erika Gardiner of the University of Rhode Island. All responses will be anonymous and are considered to be confidential. She is gathering this data as part of her dissertation research in School Psychology and in conjunction with the Warwick Public Schools.

We believe that self-esteem is an important part of any child's development. It may influence how he or she performs in school and how he or she may interact with other people. We are interested in furthering our understanding of what makes up self-concept (a person's self-perception) and whether children at various ages feel differently about themselves. This study examines the self-esteem and self-concepts of fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade students. All participants will be asked to complete two pencil and paper surveys, which should take no longer than 45 minutes. Students will read the questions along with Ms. Gardiner and then make a pencil mark in the response box that represents their answer. These measures are widely used in research around the country, and address how children and adolescents see themselves. The following questions are examples of items that appear on the questionnaires:

Some kids do very well at all kinds of sports.
Some kids think it is important to behave the way they should.
Some teenagers think it is important to be intelligent.
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

We believe that minimal risk is involved in this research process. However, if your child or adolescent feels uncomfortable during or after completion of the measures, Ms. Gardiner will be available for consultation both during and after administering the questionnaires. Your child or adolescent's performance on the measures will not affect his or her grades in the classroom. All responses will be anonymous, since names will not be filled in on the measures, and results will be examined by the researchers only. Teachers will not have access to the completed surveys. Only general group results, such as age and sex differences, will be examined and reported. There will be no direct benefit to your child if he or she participates, although we hope that ultimately this information can be used to better school curriculums regarding self-esteem and self-concept.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Erika Gardiner at (401) 792-2193, Dr. Cohen at (401) 792-2193, or the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, at (401) 792-2635.

We hope that you will now sign this consent form and have your child return it to his or her classroom teacher.

Thank you for your help in this project!

Erika N. Gardiner, M. A.

Jerry L. Cohen, Ph. D.

This document is not to be distributed outside of the research project.

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Chafee Social Science Center
Kingston, RI 02881

Age Differences in Self-Concept
CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

I have read the previous letter and wish that my child participate in the study as described.

I grant permission for _____ to participate in the study as described.
(child's name)

Signature of parent or guardian Today's date

PLEASE SIGN THIS FORM AND HAVE YOUR CHILD RETURN IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU! ,

THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Psychology

I have been asked to take part in a study of student's self-esteem and self-perceptions. Ms. Gardiner will describe the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, my parents or I can contact Erika Gardiner (792-2193) or Dr. Jerry Cohen (792-2193).

I have been asked to take part in a study which examines how students of different ages view themselves. If I decide to take part in this study, I will be answering two questionnaires by reading along with Ms. Gardiner and then making a mark next to my answer. This should take about 45 minutes all together.

Participation is not expected to be harmful to me. Ms. Gardiner will be available to answer any questions or concerns that I may have. There is no direct benefit for me to participate, but answers may help Ms. Gardiner and others better understand how kids of different ages feel about themselves.

My part in this study is confidential. None of my answers will identify me by name. All information will be collected anonymously. The only place my name is used is at the bottom of this form to say that I have agreed to participate in this study. My participation will not effect my grades in class.

The decision to take take part in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate. If I decide to participate, I can decide to quit at any time by contacting Ms. Gardiner or my teacher.

If I am not happy with the way this study went, my parents or I can discuss my complaints with Ms. Gardiner or Dr. Cohen, anonymously if I choose.

I have read the consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in this study.

My signature and today's date

Signature of researcher and today's date

Please answer the following questions:

Your grade _____

Your age _____

Your school _____

Your teacher _____

Circle whether you are a: Male or a Female

I am interested in what each of you is like, what kind of person you are. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers and everyone will have different answers. Be sure that your answers show how you feel about yourself. Please do not talk about your answers with anyone else. I will keep your answers private and not show them to anyone. If you have any questions, raise your hand and I will come to help you answer them.

I would like you to answer some some questions about yourself. I would like you to put an X in one of the four boxes after each question. Each question asks you whether you agree or disagree with each sentence.

Here is an example:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
On the whole, I like living in Rhode Island.	[]	[]	[]	[]

Now I would like you to answer some questions about yourself. Remember to put a mark in one of the boxes after each question.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]
2. At times I think I am no good at all.	[]	[]	[]	[]
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	[]	[]	[]	[]
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	[]	[]	[]	[]
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	[]	[]	[]	[]
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	[]	[]	[]	[]
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	[]	[]	[]	[]
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]
9. All in all, I am inclined to think I am a failure.	[]	[]	[]	[]
10. I take a positive attitude towards myself.	[]	[]	[]	[]

SELF-PERCEPTION PROFILE

When you are ready to begin, please read each sentence and decide your answer. There are four possible answers for each question, one box for each of the answers. The answers are written at the top of the boxes. Choose your answer to a sentence and put an X in the box under the answer you choose. DO NOT say your answer out loud or talk about it with anyone else.

Let me explain how these questions work. There is a sample question at the top, marked (a). I'll read it out loud and you follow along with me. This question talks about two kinds of kids, and I want to know which kids are most like you.

First decide whether you are more like the kids on the left side, or whether you are more like the kids on the right side.

Now, the second thing I want you to decide is whether that is only **sort of true for you**, or **really true for you**. If it's only sort of true, then put an X in that box, under sort of true. If it's really true, then put an X in that box, under really true.

For each sentence, check only one box. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, another time it will be on the other side of the page. You don't check both sides, just the one side most like you. You should have only one answer for each sentence.

Let's try the sample question...

What I Am Like

SAMPLE SENTENCE

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me			Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me	
a)	☐	☐	Some teenagers like to go to movies in their spare time	BUT	Other teenagers would rather go to sports events.	☐	☐
1.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are just as smart as others their age	BUT	Other teenagers aren't so sure and wonder if they are as smart.	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some teenagers find it hard to make friends	BUT	For other teenagers it's pretty easy.	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do very well at all kinds of sports	BUT	Other teenagers don't feel that they are very good when it comes to sports.	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are not happy with the way they look	BUT	Other teenagers are happy with the way they look.	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are ready to do well at a part-time job	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they are not quite ready to handle a part-time job.	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that if they are romantically interested in someone, that person will like them back	BUT	Other teenagers worry that when they like someone romantically, that person won't like them back.	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some teenagers usually do the right thing	BUT	Other teenagers often don't do what they know is right.	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are able to make really close friends	BUT	Other teenagers find it hard to make really close friends.	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are often disappointed with themselves	BUT	Other teenagers are pretty pleased with themselves.	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are pretty slow in finishing their school work	BUT	Other teenagers can do their school work more quickly.	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some teenagers have a lot of friends	BUT	Other teenagers don't have very many friends.	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think they could do well at just about any new athletic activity	BUT	Other teenagers are afraid they might not do well at a new athletic activity.	☐	☐

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
13.	☐	☐	Some teenagers wish their body was different	BUT	Other teenagers like their body the way it is.	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they don't have enough skills to do well at a job	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they do have enough skills to do a job well.	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are not dating the people they are really attracted to	BUT	Other teenagers are dating those people they are attracted to.	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some teenagers often get in trouble for the things they do	BUT	Other teenagers usually don't do things that get them in trouble	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do have a close friend they can share secrets with	BUT	Other teenagers do not have a really close friend they can share secrets with	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't like the way they are leading their life	BUT	Other teenagers do like the way they are leading their life.	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do very well at their classwork	BUT	Other teenagers don't do very well at their classwork.	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are very hard to like	BUT	Other teenagers are really easy to like.	☐	☐
21.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are better than others their age at sports	BUT	Other teenagers don't feel they can play as well.	☐	☐
22.	☐	☐	Some teenagers wish their physical appearance was different	BUT	Other teenagers like their physical appearance the way it is.	☐	☐
23.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel they are old enough to get and keep a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers do not feel they are old enough, yet, to really handle a job well	☐	☐
24.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that people their age will be romantically attracted to them	BUT	Other teenagers worry about whether people their age will be attracted to them.	☐	☐
25.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel really good about the way they act	BUT	Other teenagers don't feel that good about the way they often act	☐	☐
26.	☐	☐	Some teenagers wish they had a really close friend to share things with	BUT	Other teenagers do have a close friend to share things with.	☐	☐
27.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are happy with themselves most of the time	BUT	Other teenagers are often not happy with themselves.	☐	☐
28.	☐	☐	Some teenagers have trouble figuring out the answers in school	BUT	Other teenagers almost always can figure out the answers.	☐	☐

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
29.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are popular with others their age	BUT	Other teenagers are not very popular.	☐	☐
30.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't do well at new outdoor games	BUT	Other teenagers are good at new games right away.	☐	☐
31.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think that they are good looking	BUT	Other teenagers think that they are not very good looking.	☐	☐
32.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel like they could do better at work they do for pay	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they are doing really well at work they do for pay.	☐	☐
33.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are fun and interesting on a date	BUT	Other teenagers wonder about how fun and interesting they are on a date.	☐	☐
34.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do things they know they shouldn't do	BUT	Other teenagers hardly ever do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐	☐
35.	☐	☐	Some teenagers find it hard to make friends they can really trust	BUT	Other teenagers are able to make close friends they can really trust.	☐	☐
36.	☐	☐	Some teenagers like the kind of person they are	BUT	Other teenagers often wish they were someone else.	☐	☐
37.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are pretty intelligent	BUT	Other teenagers question whether they are intelligent.	☐	☐
38.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are socially accepted	BUT	Other teenagers wished that more people their age accepted them.	☐	☐
39.	☐	☐	Some teenagers do not feel that they are very athletic	BUT	Other teenagers feel that they are very athletic.	☐	☐
40.	☐	☐	Some teenagers really like their looks	BUT	Other teenagers wish they looked different.	☐	☐
41.	☐	☐	Some teenagers feel that they are really able to handle the work on a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers wonder if they are really doing as good a job at work as they should be doing	☐	☐
42.	☐	☐	Some teenagers usually don't go out with the people they would really like to date	BUT	Other teenagers do go out with the people they really want to date.	☐	☐
43.	☐	☐	Some teenagers usually act the way they know they are supposed to	BUT	Other teenagers often don't act the way they are supposed to.	☐	☐
44.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't have a friend that is close enough to share really personal thoughts with	BUT	Other teenagers do have a close friend that they can share personal thoughts and feelings with.	☐	☐
45.	☐	☐	Some teenagers are very happy being the way they are	BUT	Other teenagers wish they were different.	☐	☐

Now we have some other types of questions to answer.

These questions ask you how **important** certain things are to you. Please read each sentence and then check one box for each sentence, just like you did with the earlier questions. Here are two examples:

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to be on the soccer team	BUT	Other kids don't think it is important to be on the soccer team	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some kids think it is important to have dessert every night	BUT	Other kids would think it's ok to skip dessert every now and then	☐	☐

HOW IMPORTANT ARE EACH OF THESE THINGS TO YOU?

	Really True for Me	Sort of True for Me				Sort of True for Me	Really True for Me
1.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think it is important to be intelligent	BUT	Other teenagers don't think it is important to be intelligent	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think its all that important to have a lot of friends	BUT	Other teenagers think that having a lot of friends is important	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to be good at sports	BUT	Other teenagers don't care much about being good at sports	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't really think that their physical appearance is all that important	BUT	Other teenagers think that their physical appearance is important	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't care that much about how well they do on a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers feel its important that they do well on a paying job	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important that the people they are romantically interested in like them back	BUT	Other teenagers don't really care that much whether someone they are interested in likes them that much	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think its that important to do the right thing	BUT	Other teenagers think that doing the right thing is important	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to be able to make really close friends	BUT	Other teenagers don't think making close friends is all that important	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think that doing well in school is really that important	BUT	Other teenagers think that doing well in school is important	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to be popular	BUT	Other teenagers don't care that much about whether they are popular	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't think that being athletic is that important	BUT	Other teenagers think that being athletic is important	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think that how they look is important	BUT	Other teenagers don't care that much about how they look	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to do their best on a paying job	BUT	Other teenagers don't think that doing their best on a job is all that important	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't care that much whether they are dating someone they are romantically interested in	BUT	Other teenagers think its important to be dating someone they are interested in	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some teenagers think its important to act the way they are supposed to	BUT	Other teenagers don't care that much whether they are acting the way they are supposed to	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some teenagers don't care that much about having a close friend they can trust	BUT	Other teenagers think its important to have a really close friend you can trust	☐	☐

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!

Bibliography

- Aboud, F. E., & Ruble, D. N. (1987). Identity constancy in children: Developmental processes and implications. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 95-107). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, K. M. (1992). Self-complexity and self-esteem in middle childhood. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaup (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 11-52). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bachman, J., & O'Malley, P. (1977). Self-esteem in young men: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of education and occupational attainment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 365-380.
- Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes: Vol. 1. Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Brinthaup, T. H. , and Lipka, R. P. (1992). Introduction. In T. H. Brinthaup and R. P. Lipka (Eds.), The self: Definitional and methodological issues (pp. 1-11). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 32, 513-531.
- Byrne, B. (1984). The general/academic self-concept nomological network: A review of construct validation research. Review of Educational Research, 54, 427-456.
- Crandall, R. (1973). The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute For Social Research.
- Crockett, W. H. (1965). Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in Experimental Personality Research, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Damon, W. & Hart, D. (1982). The development of self-understanding from infancy through adolescence. Child Development, 53, 841-864.

- Demo, D. H. , & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1992). Self-concept stability and change during adolescence. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaup (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 116-148). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dusek, J., & Flaherty, J. (1981). The development of self-concept during adolescent years. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 46 (4, Serial No. 191).
- Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Reuman, K., & MacIver, D. (1987). Changes in self-perceptions and values at early adolescence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Flavell, J. H. (1977). Cognitive development (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Gardiner, E. N. (1992). A comparison of the self-concepts of gifted pre-adolescents and a non-gifted peer group. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.
- Harter, S. (1982). The Perceived Competence Scale for Children. Child Development, 53, 87-97.
- Harter, S. (1985). Self-perception profile for children. Denver: University of Denver.
- Harter, S. (1986). Self-perception profile for college students. Denver: University of Denver.
- Harter, S. (1987). The determinants and mediational role of global self-worth in children. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), Contemporary topics in developmental psychology. New York: Wiley.
- Harter, S. (1988). Self-perception profile for adolescents. Denver: University of Denver.
- Higgins, E. T., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1985). Self-concept discrepancy theory: A psychological model for distinguishing among different aspects of depression and anxiety. Social Cognition, 3, 51-76.
- Hoge, D. R., & McCarthy, J. D. (1984). Influence of individual and group identity salience in the global self-esteem of youth. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 403-414.
- James, W. (1963). The principles of psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. (Original work published in 1890).
- Kuhn, M. H. & McPartland, T. S. (1954). An empirical investigation of self-attitudes. American Sociological Review, 19, 68-76.

- Lewis, M. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1979). Social cognition and the acquisition of self. New York: Plenum.
- Lipka, R. P., Hurford, D. P. & Litten, M. (1992). Self in school: Age and school experience effects. In R.P. Lipka & T.M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 93-115). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lynch, M. D. (1981). Self-concept development in childhood. In M.D. Lynch, A.A. Norem-Hebeisen, & K.J. Gergen (Eds.), Self-concept: Advances in theory and research (pp. 119-132). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Marcia, J. E. (1987). The identity status approach to the study of ego identity development. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 161-171). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marsh, H. (1985). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of preadolescent self-concept: A replication and extension. Australian Journal of Psychology, 37, 197-204.
- Marsh, H. (1986). Global self-esteem: Its relation to specific facets of self-concept and their importance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1224-1236.
- Marsh, H. (1989). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of self-concept: Preadolescence to early adulthood. Journal of Educational Psychology, 3, 417-430.
- Marsh, H. (1993). Relations between global and specific domains of self: The importance of individual importance, certainty, and ideals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 975-992.
- Marsh, H., Barnes, J., Cairns, L., & Tidman, M. (1984). Self-Description Questionnaire: Age and sex effects in the structure and level of self-concept for preadolescent children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 940-956.
- Marsh, H., & Gouvenet, P. (1989). Multidimensional self-concepts and perceptions of control: Construct validation of responses by children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81, 57-69.
- Marsh, H., Relich, J., & Smith, I. (1983). Self-concept: The construct validity of interpretations based upon the SDQ. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 173-187.
- McCarthy, J., & Hoge, D. (1982). Analysis of age effects in longitudinal studies of adolescent self-esteem. Developmental Psychology, 18, 372-379.

- Montemayor, R., & Eisen, M. (1982). The development of self-conceptions from childhood to adolescence. In M. Rosenberg & Kaplan, H. B. (Eds.), Social psychology of the self-concept (pp. 289-296). Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.
- Mullener, N. & Laird, J. D. (1971). Some developmental changes in the organization of self-evaluations. Developmental Psychology, 5, 233-236.
- O'Malley, P., & Bachman, J. (1983). Self-esteem: Change and stability between the ages of 13 and 23. Developmental Psychology, 19, 257-268.
- Peevers, B. H. (1987). The self as observer of the self: A developmental analysis of the subjective self. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 147-158). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pelham, B., & Swann, W. (1989). From self-conceptions to self-worth: On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 672-679.
- Peterson, A. C. (1981). The development of self-concept in adolescence. In M. D. Lynch, A. A. Norem-Hebeisen, & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), Self-concept: Advances in theory and research (pp. 191-202). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Rosenberg, M. & Simmons, R. G. (1972). Black and white self-esteem: The urban school child. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Sanford, L. T. & Donovan, M. (1985). Women and self-esteem: Understanding and improving the way we think and feel about ourselves. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Scarlett, H. H., Press, A. N., & Crockett, W. H. (1971). Children's descriptions of peers: a Wernerian developmental analysis. Child Development, 42, 439-453.
- Shantz, C. (1975). The development of social cognition. In E. M. Hetherington, (Ed.), Review of Child Development Theory and Research: Vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. (1976). Validation of construct interpretations. Review of Educational Research, 46, 437-441.
- Shirk, S. R. & Renouf, A. G. (1992). The tasks of self-development in middle childhood and early adolescence. In R.P. Lipka & T.M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), Self-perspectives across the life span (pp. 53-90). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sigelman, C., & Shaffer, D. (1991). Life-span human development. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Simmons, R. G. (1987). Self-esteem in adolescence. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan (pp. 172-192). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.
- Watkins, D. (1978). The development and evaluation of self-esteem measuring instruments. Journal of Personality Assessment, 42, 171-182.
- Vander Zanden, J. (1989). Human Development. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Werner, H. (1957). The concept of development from a comparative and organismic point of view. In D. B. Harris (Ed.), The concept of development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1974). The self-concept (rev. ed., Vol. 1). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1979). The self-concept (rev. ed., Vol. 2). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1989). Measures of self-concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.