FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-ESTEEM AMONG STUDENTS OF RIVER JOHN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL (JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL)

by

LINDA M. THOMPSON-REID

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts (Education)

Faculty of Education
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Canada

April 1993

SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Education for acceptance, a thesis entitled FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-ESTEEM AMONG STUDENTS OF RIVER JOHN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL (JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL) submitted by Linda M. Thompson-Reid in partial fulfillment for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION).

Bernard LeBlanc

(Supervisor)

Terry Piper

(Dean of Education)

Date April 26, 1993

SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: LINDA M. THOMPSON-REID

TITLE OF THESIS: FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-ESTEEM AMONG STUDENTS OF RIVER JOHN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL (JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL)

DEGREE: MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

YEAR GRANTED: 1993

Linda M. Thompson-Reid

P. O. Box 3, River John

Nova Scotia

B0K 1N0

Date April 26, 1993

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE TO REPRODUCE THESES

LICENCE NON EXCLUSIVE DE REPRODUIRE DES THÈSES

Surname — Nom de famille: THOMPSON - REID

Given names — Prénoms: LINDA MARGARET

Date of birth — Date de naissance: AUGUST 17, 1955.

Canadian citizen? Citoyen canadien? [X] Yes Oui [ ] No Non

Permanent address — Résidence principale: P.O. BOX 3, RIVER JOHN, PICTOU CO., N.S. B0K1N0.

Full name of university — Nom complet de l'université: SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY

Faculty, department, school — Faculté, département, école: EDUCATION

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse a été présentée: MASTER OF ARTS

Date degree awarded — Date d'obtention du grade: MAY 10, 1993.

Supervisor — Directeur de thèse: DR. BERNARD DAVIS

Title — Titre: Factors Related to Self-Esteem Among Students of River John Consolidated Scho (Junior High School Level)

Language of text — Langue du texte: ENGLISH

In consideration of the National Librarian making copies of my thesis available to interested persons, I, LINDA M. THOMPSON-REID hereby grant a non-exclusive licence to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada as represented by the National Librarian:

a) to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of my thesis (the title of which is set forth above) in microform, paper or electronic formats;

b) to authorize or procure any of the acts mentioned in paragraph (a).

I undertake to submit a copy of my thesis, through my university, to the National Librarian. Any abstract submitted with the thesis will be considered to form part of the thesis.

I represent and promise that my thesis is my original work, does not infringe any rights of others, and that I have the right to make the grant conferred by this non-exclusive licence.

I retain ownership of the copyright in my thesis, and may deal with the copyright in my thesis, in any way consistent with rights granted by me to Her Majesty in this non-exclusive licence.

I further promise to inform any person to whom I may hereafter assign or licence my copyright in my thesis of the rights which I have conferred on Her Majesty by this non-exclusive licence.

Je, _____

en considération du fait que le Directeur général de Bibliothèque nationale du Canada désire mettre des exemplair de ma thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées, accor par les présentes à Sa Majesté la Reine du Canada, représent par le Directeur général de la Bibliothèque nationale, une licen non exclusive pour:

(a) reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de ma thèse (dont le titre est mentionné ci-haut) sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique;

(b) autoriser ou engager toute mesure mentionnée à l'alinéa (a)

Je m'engage à ce que ma thèse soit remise au Directeur géné de la Bibiliothèque nationale par mon université. Tout résur analytique soumis avec la thèse sera considéré comme faisa partie de la thèse.

Je déclare sur mon honneur que ma thèse est mon oeuv originale, qu'elle n'empiète pas sur les droits de quiconque et q j'agis de plein droit en accordant cette licence non exclusive.

Je conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège ma thèse peux disposer de ce droit de toute manière compatible avec l droits accordés à Sa Majesté par les présentes.

Je promets également d'informer toute personne à qui je pourr ultérieurement céder mon droit d'auteur sur ma thèse ou à qu pourrais accorder une licence, des droits accordés à Sa Maje par les présentes.

Linda M. Thompson Reid
Signature

April 26, 1993.
Date

ABSTRACT

FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-ESTEEM
AMONG STUDENTS OF RIVER JOHN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL
(JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL)

The purpose of this thesis was to explore the factors related to self-esteem among junior high school students of selected schools. To identify the level of self-esteem, junior high school students were chosen from a rural area to participate in this study. The results of the rural sample were then compared to the results of an urban sample, completed in 1985 by Phil Cassidy of the North York Board of Education, North York, Ontario.

A Junior High Student Questionnaire was developed to provide biographical information about the rural respondents. The eight-item instrument required responses to the following: (1) Personal information (sex, grade, age); (2) Living arrangements; (3) Marital status of parents; (4) Number of siblings; (5) Father's employment; (6) Mother's employment; (7) Average grade last year; (8) Future plans. The students were asked to check the appropriate space on the Questionnaire.

The North York Self-Concept Inventory: Junior High/Middle School Level was utilized. The 25-item instrument was designed to examine aspects of self-esteem related to the school environment, self and peers. The

items were declarative statements of self-concept requiring "true" and "not true" responses. One point was given for each response which indicated a positive self-concept. The scores in the inventory can range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 25.

The relations of each of the ten variables, on the Junior High Questionnaire, to self-esteem were analysed by an analysis of variance. The results indicated that the relationship between sex and the self-esteem score is significant. In the comparison of sex versus total score, the female students had a significantly higher mean score than their male counterparts. The relationship between future plans and the self-esteem score is significant.

With regard to the comparison of the results of the rural and urban respondents, who completed the North York Self-Concept Inventory, the rural sample had the higher mean score for each of the junior high school grades.

Recommendations for further research include a study desgined to more accurately identify parental self-esteem and its relationship to adolescent self-esteem. The Offer Self-Image Questionnaire could be of assistance in this area. It is hoped that this study will reinforce the importance of a high level of self-esteem for all students, regardless of their grade level. Educators, as well as parents, should take into consideration the various factors which can individually, or collectively contribute to global self-esteem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the support of Dr. Bernard Davis and Farida Blacklock, whose time and advice were instrumental in the preparation of this thesis.

Mary Jane Craik's patience in the creation of this document for print was endless and sincerely appreciated.

Sue Conrad's collaboration in the preparation of the statistics was greatly appreciated.

The cooperation of Pictou District School Board, Principal, Junior High Staff and Students of River John Consolidated School enabled this thesis to be completed.

The encouragement and support I received from my family were invaluable and truly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of Self-Esteem

Do we, as educators, frequently take into consideration, or even earnestly try to understand what children think about themselves? "Children, as they develop, enlarge on their general concepts about themselves in connection with interpersonal relationships and achievement." (Gordon, 1972, p. 10). The importance of external relationships cannot be underestimated, whether they originate in the family setting or in the school environment. "The behavior of children is greatly influenced by both their generalized and their specific notions about themselves (Gordon, 1972, p. 11). The level of self-esteem, which affects behavior, can be determined early in the child's academic career. Educators, as well as parents, must be knowledgeable to the factors which create a high level of self-esteem.

Adolescence is a critical period with respect to the development of self. "For adolescents, in particular, the desire to know the self is tied up with learning how to relate to others, while also acquiring a sense of separateness and autonomy, the quest to achieve what Erikson (1950) calls 'identity'" (Offer, Ostrov & Howard, 1981, p. 11). At the same time, adolescence is a stage in life rich in "affective issues such as emerging sexuality, separation

from family, the quest to form a new nuclear family, increased motility, and striving for vocational identity and autonomy" (Offer et al., 1981, p. 24).

"Adolescents' self-concepts and self-esteems are important to their mental health, to their interpersonal competence in social relationships, and to their progress in school" (Rice, 1979, p. 230). Personal and social relationships, as well as academic achievement, are dependent upon the adolescents' level of self-esteem. Adolescents with inadequate self-conception and low self-esteem, whose concepts of themselves are much less positive than their images of an ideal self, manifest internal conflict and anxiety" (Rice, 1979, p. 231). This, in turn, influences all of their external relationships. The importance of a high level of self-esteem cannot be ignored, particularly at the junior high level.

The development of the adolescent's emotional health encompasses each of the considerations which will be investigated in this study. The factors, affect the adolescent's ability to acknowledge important feelings and opinions, with regard to himself and others. A positive self-concept must be emphasized by educators, as well as parents, in order for the adolescent to achieve success, both academically and interpersonally. Therefore, nothing is more basic to fulfill the needs of the adolescent, than the evolution of a high level of self-esteem.

"Teenagers are persons -- persons whose feelings,

thoughts and behaviors are as varied and rich as those of adults. The portrait of the adolescent is best drawn by himself or herself" (Offer et al, 1981, p. 129).

Measurement Instruments

Self-esteem is the focal point of many comparative studies, despite difficulties of definition and measurement (Mussen, 1983). Dr. Stanley Coopersmith (1967), author of The Antecedents of Self-Esteem, defines self-esteem, as follows:

> By self-esteem we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a "personal" judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself. (p. 5).

Several measures of self-esteem have been employed to study the changing character of the adolescent, which include self-report indexes and interview strategies. The most widely utilized instruments appear to be the Coopersmith (1967) batteries, the Piers-Harris (1969) scale and the Rosenberg (1965) forms. The Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (1962), the Self-Esteem Index (1990), the Dusek and Flaherty (1981) scale, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (1964), and the North York Self Concept Inventory (1982) are currently being utilized due to their ease of administration and scoring and their applicability to the adolescent population. I have examined several instruments, which will be discussed on the following pages.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory is a 50-item instrument which measures self-esteem from the perspective of the subject (Coopersmith, 1967). The majority of items in this inventory were based upon items chosen from "the Rogers and Dymond (1954) scale" (cited in Coopersmith, 1967, p. 10). In addition several original items were included. "The final inventory consisted of 50 items concerned with the subject's self-attitudes in four areas: peers, parents, school and personal interests" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 10). The domain of self consists of three separate factors, Perceived Inadequacy of Self, Perceived Adequacy of Self, and Rejection of Self. Parent relationships have two separate factors, Good Parent Relationships and Poor Parent Relationships. The school area involves two factors, Academic Success and School Failure. Peer items form one factor, Social Success with Peers. (Coopersmith, 1967).

The School Form (for ages 8 - 15) self-report questionnaires are intended to measure "the evaluation a person makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 5). Each questionnaire presents respondents with favorable or unfavorable statements, which they designate as "like me" or "unlike me" (Coopersmith, 1967).

Peterson & Austin (cited in Mitchell, 1985) consider the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory among the "best known and most widely used of the various self-esteem measures" (p. 396). Sears (1969) felt that Coopersmith "has gone a

long way beyond his predecessors in the construction of a useful model for self-esteem" (p. 13).

The Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale. The Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale items were based on a number of statements collected by Jersild (1952), who asked children to respond to characteristics about themselves . For Piers and Harris, self-concept refers to "a set of relatively stable self-attitudes which are not only descriptive but also evaluative" (Piers, 1976, p. 1).

The Piers-Harris measure contains six factors: behavior, intellectual status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity, and happiness/satisfaction (Harter, 1983). The initial factor analysis was performed in 1963. Piers (1976) summarized studies which have performed factor analyses, using different populations and age groups. According to Piers (1976) the first three factors are strongly supported. The fourth factor, emerges consistently across various samples; though the loadings are small (Piers, 1976). The fifth and sixth factors, popularity and happiness/satisfaction, appear to be the weakest; however, they are worth retaining (Piers, 1976).

Harter (1983) suggests there has been "little attention given to the possibility that the factor structure might change for different developmental levels or in different populations, either in terms of the numbers of factors or their interpretation" (Harter, 1983, p. 329). Wylie (1974) and Robinson and Shaver (1973) question its

(Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale) reliability for low scorers.

Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965) utilizes an open-ended interview technique, which was originally designed for adolescents and adults. Rosenberg constructed a unidimensional instrument that focuses on general self-worth. The 10 item scale measures the degree to which "one is satisfied with his or her life, feels he or she has a number of good qualities, has a positive attitude toward oneself, feels useless, desires more self-respect, or thinks one is a failure" (cited in Harter, 1983, p. 330).

Wylie (1974) rates the measure as a brief, direct approach. "It does not assume that a group of items with hetereogeneous content, may be summed to indicate global self-regard" (Harter, 1983, p. 330).

The Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (OSIQ). "In 1962, the Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (OSIQ) was developed as a means of tapping the feelings and attitudes that teenagers have about themselves" (Offer, Ostrov & Howard, 1981, p. 30). The primary use of the OSIQ, since that time, has been to provide a standardized and reliable method of gathering information about the self of teenagers (Offer et al., 1981). When the OSIQ was developed, items were categorized according to five dimensions: the psychological, social, sexual, familial and coping selves (Offer et al., 1981).

The OSIQ contains 130 items, based on the five dimensions, which call for a numerical response ranging from one to six. One corresponds to "describes me very well" and six corresponds to "does not describe me at all" (Offer et al., 1981).

Hogan (cited in Mitchell, 1985) rates the OSIQ as a well-developed measure of adolescent self-esteem. Although it contains no validity data, the "OSIQ is a quick measure of personality to be used with normal teenaged populations, it is among the very best measures available" (p. 1079).

The Self-Esteem Index. The Self-Esteem Index is "designed to elicit children's perceptions of their personal traits and characteristics" (Kramer & Conoley, 1992, p. 807). It was developed in 1990 by Brown and Alexander, for ages 7 to 18. It is an 80 - item self-report instrument designed to provide a "reliable, valid and theoretically sound norm-referenced measure of self-esteem in school-aged children and adolescents" (Self-Esteem Index, Manual, p. 1).

The Index is comprised of four 20 - item scales: Perception of Familial Acceptance, Perception of Academic Competence, Perception of Peer Popularity, Perception of Personal Security. An estimate general self-esteem, the Self-Esteem Quotient (SEQ) is also provided. This score is determined by totaling the responses to all of the test items (Kramer & Conoley, 1992).

Although extensive item analysis and standardization information are provided in the manual, "the reliability

data include only internal consistency estimates, along with the standard error of measurement" (Kramer & Conoley, 1992, p. 808). The test-re-test data are not available for Self-Esteem Quotient scores. "The validity data are promising, but far too sparse to support the clinical or research usefulness of the Self-Esteem Index" (Kramer & Conoley, 1992, p. 808). Therefore, work is necessary, if the Self-Esteem Index is to be considered "reliable, valid or theoretically sound" (Kramer & Conoley, 1992, p. 808).

The Dusek and Flaherty Instrument. Dusek & Flaherty (1981) conducted a three year study of self-concept development during adolescent years to asses continuity/discontinuity and stability/instability. The instrument utilized in the study was a "semantic differential scale composed of 21 bipolar adjective pairs, separated by a seven-point scale" (Dusek & Flaherty, 1981, p. i). The adjective pairs were adapted by Monge (1973) from Smith's (1962) earlier work. "The responses to the 21 items of the self-concept measure were scored with a " 7" for the space closest to the positive end of the scale, and a "1" for the space closest to the negative end of the scale" (Dusek & Flaherty, 1981, p. 14).

Hill (cited in Dusek & Flaherty, 1981) considers the findings of the study, in relation to the two principal questions, to be consistent and impressive. Hill states "the study is technically superior in most and amply supported by data" (cited in Dusek & Flaherty, 1981, p. 66).

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was developed in 1964, to be used with ages 12 and older who can read on at least a fourth-grade level. It is considered to be one of the "most popular measures of self-concept available today, due to its broad appeal and widespread use" (Kramer & Conoley, 1992, p. 931). It contains 90 Likert-Scale items, designed to measure three internal dimensions (Identity, Self-Satisfaction, and Behavior) and five external dimensions (Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, and Social Self) of self-concept (Kramer & Conoley, 1992). An additional ten items measure self-criticism and a lie scale patterned after the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (M.M.P.I.) Scale (Kramer & Conoley, 1992).

Kramer & Conoley (1992) cite it as an "easily administered instrument, widely applicable and quite carefully researched" (p. 932). Strong support exists for the validity and reliability of the total score. It is a comprehensive instrument that may provide a multidimensional view of an individual's self-concept.

The North York Self Concept Inventory. The Research Department staff of the North York Board of Education have responded to educators concerns for their student's feelings about themselves. The development of paper and pencil inventories was "designed to provide a measure of a pupil's self-esteem within the school environment" (Cassidy, 1982, p. 1). These instruments are available for elementary students, junior high school students and secondary stu-

dents.

From a review, by the Research Department staff, of the "10X Self Appraisal Inventory, Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory and Comfort's Self-Esteem Scale", a collection of items were drawn (Cassidy, 1982, p. 1). The original form consisted of 32 items. Items were discarded which did not significantly discriminate between students with high and low self-esteem scores. An instrument, composed of 25 items, was established for school use (Cassidy, 1982).

The North York Junior High/Middle School Self Concept Inventory (See Appendix B) is comprised of 25 declarative statements, for example, "Most people are better liked than I am." Students are asked to indicate their "true" or "not true" responses for each statement. Each response which indicates a positive self concept is given one point. The scores can range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 25 (Cassidy, 1982).

The North York Self Concept Inventory can be administered in about 15 minutes, depending on the size of the group. It can be scored easily by the classroom teacher. Interpretation of the results is relatively simple. The mean and standard deviation can be arrived at quickly in each sample size, as well as the distribution of scores.

I chose the North York Self Concept Inventory (1982) because it is readily available and it is relatively simple to administer and to score. The results can be arrived at

quickly and without a great deal of difficulty. The results can be interpreted by a regular classroom teacher, who could then specify recommendations for students who have a low level of self-esteem.

The North York Self Concept Inventory (See Appendix B) was administered to the rural participants of the present research. The results were then compared to the urban sample, who were administered the North York Self Concept Inventory by Phil Cassidy, of the North York Board of Education, North York, Ontario (Cassidy, 1985).

Figure I represents the North York sample. It contains the mean, standard deviation and sample size for each of the grades who had completed the North York Self Concept Inventory.

Figure I

Mean and Standard Deviation on the North York Junior High/Middle School Self Concept Inventory.

	GRADES					
	6	7	8	9 (Advanced Level)	9 (General Level)	Total Gr. 9
MEAN	20	17.0	16.6	17.3	15.2	16.7
Standard Deviation	6.2	4.7	4.9	4.2	4.3	4.3
Sample Size	368	1402	1179	546	339	1173

(Cassidy, 1985, p. 3).

The grade 7 mean of the North York sample is 17.0.

The grade 8 mean of the North York sample is 16.6 and the North York mean for total grade nine is 16.7. The grade 7, 8 and 9 standard deviations for the North York sample are 4.7, 4.9 and 4.3.

Gender Differences

Coopersmith's (1967) intensive investigation of self-esteem reported that boys with high self-regard tend to be more intelligent, to appear more content to their mothers, to develop more quickly in locomotor areas, and to achieve better in school. According to Hansen (1973) males exhibit a stronger relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement than do females. Dusek and Flaherty (1981) examined sex differences in four aspects of the self-concept. "Males scored higher than females on the achievement/leadership and masculinity/femininity factors and scored lower than the females on the congeniality/sociability factor" (Dusek & Flaherty, 1981, p. 40).

The most salient findings in the 'Psychological Self' aspect of the Offer Self-Image Questionnarie (OSIQ) were that "normal adolescents had positive psychological self-images and that males had better self-images than the females did" (Offer et al., 1981, p. 50). In this body of research, the findings repeatedly show that:

> (1) girls see themselves more positively than do boys with respect to interpersonal relations and sociability (Wiggins, 1973; Monge, 1973) or when their self-image is more involved with sociability (Helland, 1973); and
> (2) boys see themselves more positively than do girls with respect to achievement (Monge, 1973), academic aspirations (Wiggins, 1973), self-assertion (Gregory, 1977), and body image (Musa and Roach, 1973; Healey and Deblassie, 1973; Clifford, 1971). (Offer et al., 1981, p.96).

In Chapter VIII - Self And Others, of the Canada Health Attitudes and Behaviours Survey (King, 1985), the results indicate that boys' self-esteem is typically more positive than girls. "The gender differences were most pronounced in the 'I have confidence in myself' and 'I feel good about the way I look' items, with more males responding positively" (King, 1985, p. 151).

Grade

"The differences in these items, ('I have confidence in myself' and 'I feel good about the way I look'), were substantially greater in Grades 7 and 10, than Grade 4, with more males responding positively on all items except 'I make friends easily'" (King, 1985, p. 151).

Age

The Canada Health Attitudes and Behaviours Survey (King, 1985) was designed to obtain information about 9, 12 and 15 year olds, in order to develop and improve health promotion programs. The main focus of the research had been directed toward the physical health of young Canadians. However, there are many general concerns which have arisen from social and emotional issues.

The Health of Canada's Youth study (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992) was designed to simulate a longitudinal study by surveying three age groups -- 11, 13 and 15 year olds. A total of eleven countries participated in the study, which was sponsored by the World Health Organization (WHO). The survey attempted to assess the extent to which youth are socially well-adjusted. The Canadian survey included items on this theme, as well as questions regarding self-esteem (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992).

To measure self-esteem in the Health of Canada's Youth study, "six items related to self-confidence, decisiveness, and acceptability of self, actions and appearance have been used" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 69). On most scale items boys consistently responded more positively than girls, particularly the 13 and 15 year olds. "Responses to these items measuring self-esteem are similar from age to age, although self-confidence declines somewhat for the 15 year olds" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 69).

Self-Esteem and Parental Relationships

Implications of parental self-esteem for the personality qualities and self-esteem of the developing child were explored by Rosenberg et al. (1984). Results indicated that high self-esteem in mothers and fathers is associated with children of "maturity, ego resiliency, and differentiation at adolescence" (Rosenberg et al., 1984, p. 9). It was concluded that parental self-esteem is significantly related to the emerging personality of the child throughout

childhood and adolescence.

Pipp & Robinson (1985) conducted a study on the influence of the relationship with significant others and the adolescent's sense of affective self.

> The results revealed that self-esteem was related significantly to projected mother and father esteem, but it was independent of projected best-friend esteem. In contrast, significantly more traits and a higher percentage of positive traits were shared with best friend than with parents. These results suggest that mothers, fathers, and peers serve important, but different, affective functions for adolescents (Pipp & Robinson, 1985, p. 1).

In agreement with the Pipp & Robinson (1985) study, research suggests that parents and peers both play important functions for adolescents, but in different domains. "Parents are seen as influencing career goals and future plans, while peer advice is sought for questions of popularity in peer society" (Brittain, 1963, 1968 & 1969; Musgrove, 1963, p. 4).

Coopersmith (1967) attempted to identify components related to the development of high self-esteem. His research revealed a significant relationship between parental characteristics and childrearing customs and their children's self-esteem. Parents with high self-esteem have children who also have a high self-esteem. Mothers who are not emotionally stable are more likely to have children with low self-esteem (Lefrancois, 1986). Baumrind (1977) has noted from her research that it is a "combination of parental warmth and firm discipline that is likely to produce a self-reliant, self-controlled, adequate-feeling

youngster" (cited in Adams, 1980, p. 91).

Dusek's (1987) review of the literature has revealed that "parents who express unconditional love for their adolescent help their offspring develop constructive and appropriate relationships with others, a sense of confidence in their own identity, and a relatively positive self-esteem" (p. 148).

Coopersmith's (1967) research also supports this observation. Here is a brief summary of some of the conclusions:

> Parents of children with high self-esteem are concerned and attentive toward their children;...they structure the worlds of their children along lines they believe to be proper and appropriate and...they permit relatively great freedom within the structures they have established.
> Definite and forced limits are associated with high rather than low self-esteem...families which establish and maintain clearly defined limits permit greater rather than less deviation from conventional behavior, and freer individual expression...
> Other things being equal, limits and rules are likely to have enhancing and facilitating effects...Parents who have definite values, who have a clear idea of what they regard as appropriate behavior, and who are able and willing to present and enforce their beliefs are more likely to rear children who value themselves highly. (p.236).

In summarizing the Health of Canada's Youth survey, (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992), with regard to findings on relationships, "the most well-adjusted young people come from supportive home environments where there is little conflict about important issues such as how time is spent" (p. 74). The most significant finding in this study is

that "young Canadians are experiencing more strain in their relationships with their parents compared with young people from European countries" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 96). The Health of Canada's Youth survey recommends that "initiatives should be designed to improve communication between parents and their children and to provide a greater understanding of the stress young people feel in today's rapidly changing society" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 96).

As a result of his research, Buri (1991) found that positive parental relationships provide firm foundations for self-esteem during the adolescent years. Many adolescents undergo various subtle and obvious changes and experience instability in their lives. Therefore, it is necessary for adolescents to become involved in supportive, stable relationships with parents. When the possibility of this type of relationship is available, adolescents are better able to deal with changes and imbalances in their lives.

Two of the questions on the Junior High Student Questionnaire (see Appendix A) focus on the student's living arrangements and the marital status of their parents. During the past number of years the family structure has changed to a great extent. In more families both parents are working, and more husbands and wives are living apart. Young people are constantly dealing with these changing family structures. "In a 1984 study of Ontario adolescents, it was found that 80% of young people lived with

both parents. Four years later the figure had dropped to 75%" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 63).

The majority of the literature reviewed has focused on intact families; for example, Coopersmith (1967) has done extensive research on integral families. "The most recent research in this area has focused on the impact of divorce on children and the effects of being brought up in a one-parent family, of day-care facilities or other substitute caretakers, and of father absence" (Lefrancois, 1986, p. 326). One of the purposes of the present research is to distinguish between intact families and other living arrangements. The results of the questionnaires will provide information regarding the students' self-esteem and their family status.

Academic Achievement and Self-Esteem

A review of the literature has consistently indicated a correlation between self-esteem and academic achievement. Measures of self-esteem are positively correlated with grades earned in school and with achievement test performance (Dusek, 1987). Students with "higher self-esteem get higher grades and do better on achievement tests than do children with lower self-esteem" (Dusek, 1987, p. 393).

The attainment of a favorable attitude towards oneself is an important aspect of a student's ability to achieve success in school. Those students who feel good about themselves and their abilities are more likely to be successful. Those who view themselves and their abilities in

a negative manner are less likely to succeed in school (Cassidy, 1985). Adolescents who have a positive feeling of self worth have the confidence and curiosity that productive learning requires (Hoyt & Schoonmaker, 1990). Coopersmith (1967) maintains that self-esteem is a better predictor of success in school than is intelligence.

The recent emphasis in the research conducted on self-esteem and achievement stems from the belief that student's feelings about themselves are key factors in school achievement (Pottebaum, et al, 1986). The assumption of many theorists seems to be that the "child's developmental needs, including positive self-concept, should be the basis for educational progress" (Pottebaum, et al, 1986, p. 140).

Students who possess self-confidence have the motivation to live up to what they believe about themselves (Rice, 1976). Those students who have negative attitudes about themselves or have a lack of confidence "impose limitations on their own achievement" (LaBenne, 1969, p. 57). They feel "they can't do it anyhow" or "they are not smart enough" (Hansen, 1973, p. 59).

Children who have an unfavorable view of themselves, begin their schooling with a feeling they aren't going to do well, and as a result, they don't do well (Rice, 1976). Underachievement can begin very early in the child's academic career, and can be very well established in the junior high school years (Rice, 1976). This problem is becoming increasingly difficult to deal with, for educators, students, and parents.

The available evidence supports the theory that there is a relationship between self-esteem and achievement in school. Ringness (1965) suggests that the higher the grade averages, the more likely the student is to have a high level of self-acceptance. The research evidence clearly shows a "persistent and significant relationship between the self-concept and academic achievement" (Purkey, 1970, p. 15).

In summarizing the literature on self-esteem and achievement, Purkey (1970) concluded that "enhancing the self-concept is a vital influence in improving academic performance" (p. 27). The two factors, positive self-esteem and high achievement, are considered to be "mutually reinforcing" (Rice, 1976, p. 222). Positive self-esteem contributes to academic achievement, and academic achievement can enhance self-esteem (Rice, 1976). "Overall, the results on the relationship between achievement and self-evaluation suggest that achievement impacts one's self-evaluation, provided that judgments focus on the academic domain" (Harter, 1983, p. 335).

Future Plans

Studies have revealed that women who combine a career and a marriage have higher self-esteem than those who have become homemakers (Rice, 1979). "Boys who aspire to upward mobility also show a strong sense of self-esteem, whereas downwardly mobile boys more often wish for changes in self that are so extensive that they indicate self-rejection"

(Rice, 1979, p. 223).

> In general, those with low self-esteem want to avoid positions where they will be forced to exercise leadership, and they want to avoid jobs where others dominate them. They want to be neither power-wielders nor power-subjects. Avoiding leadership or supervision by others is a way of avoiding criticism or judgment. (Rice, 1979, p. 223).

Harrington and O'Shea (1983) conducted a study on vocational self-concepts. They found that grades 7 - 9, appeared to be a significant period for vocational development. It is a time when male and female variables can be compared easily. Adolescents with high self-esteem have higher career aspirations. Their vocational choices are higher in status than adolescents with low self-esteem (Harrington and O'Shea, 1983). High self-esteem individuals choose "occupations in which there is a demand for leadership and power, and avoid vocations in which they are subservient or dominated by others" (Dusek, 1987, p. 394).

Peer Relationships

Peers are considered to be important to the developing sense of self for the adolescent, but in different ways and for different reasons (Adams, 1980).

> Membership in a peer group can be a stabilizing influence insofar as it: offers a replacement for the family while the 'moving away' is taking place; provides a certain security in numbers as adolescents try themselves in new ways; provides a reference source of 'OK - not OK' behavior, against which adolescents can measure themselves; and offers opportunities for 'practice by doing' and for using others as models from whom to learn new behavior patterns. (Adams, 1980, p. 104).

Coopersmith's (1967) findings indicate that "individuals with high self-esteem were more likely to be selected

as friends; found it easier to form friendships; were more likely to assume an active role in group discussions, rather than a listening role" (Lefrancois, 1986, p. 509). Horowitz (1962) found that children who had negative self-concepts were rated unpopular by their peers. These children tended to be dissatisfied with themselves and aspired to become like the other children whom they thought were more popular. This dissatisfaction manifests itself in numerous ways in the classroom setting. For example, signs of withdrawal from other students is evident, as well as a change in behavior or a lack of interest in academic progress.

"The adolescent's acceptance by peers is profoundly important for social and psychological well-being" (Lefrancois, 1986, p. 532). "Our self-esteem and confidence is strengthened when we feel support and appreciation from others" (Stanish, 1982, p. 43). Without the support from peers, many adolescents become loners; they tend to blend in with the woodwork of the classroom. Greenberg, Siegel and Leitsch (1983) have found that adolescent self-esteem and life satisfaction are related to peer relationships. In agreement, Lefrancois (1986) states that peer groups are important in developing positive self-concepts, "as well as in the formation of values and attitudes" (p. 436). Although some adolescents can and do survive without peer relationships, the majority of students do in fact require these types of interpersonal associations.

The Health of Canada's Youth study states the importance of friendships for adolescents cannot be minimized. "To be fully accepted by a group of peers is a fundamental component of an individual's mental health" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 64). Adams (1968) considers the peer group an important source of self-esteem; however, it can also have a negative effect for the adolescent who is isolated. Gordon (1972) states "peer support during the teens is a powerful force in relation to 'adequacy' concepts" (p. 19). In agreement, Brazelton (cited in Hoyt & Schoonmaker, 1990) says "the ability to make friends and have relationships is representative of an inner sense of competence" (p. 104).

The Health of Canada's Youth study reported that Canadian girls had the highest response percentage, in all three groups (11, 13, and 15 year olds) which indicates how well they are socialized among their peers and how important friends are to the decisions they make. The degree to which one feels part of a group is an important factor for positive self-esteem. "The overall social integration results of the survey for Canadian 13 year old girls indicate that they made new friends easily, spend a great deal of time with friends and find it easy to talk about problems with opposite sex friends" (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992, p. 66).

Extensive research undertaken by Offer and Offer (1975) has concluded that for some adolescents, the peer grouping may "reinforce self-esteem, aid in separation from

parents, and provide new interpersonal relationships" (p. 187). Offer (1981) found that adolescents are "emphatic with their peers, which lends them to be able to identify positively with others" (p. 74). The peer group can function as an auxiliary to the parental unit, during adolescence, providing a possible emotional alternative (Offer & Offer, 1975). In a document prepared by Berndt (1990), the findings indicate that students' sense of self is influenced by their peers, particularly at the junior high level.

Summary

The review of the literature has shown that definitions of self-esteem are varied. The most popular and most widely applied definiton appears to be the one formulated by Dr. Stanley Coopersmith (1967), author of The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. In short, "self-esteem is a 'personal' judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (p. 5). Researchers agree that self-esteem is essential for psychological survivial. "It is an emotional sine qua non -- without some measure of self-worth, life can be enormously painful, with many basic needs going unmet" (McKay & Fanning, 1987, p. 1).

Many determinants affect adolescents, which create a low or a high level of self-esteem. Adademic achievement, gender differences, relationships with parents and peers affect the self-esteem of adolescents, individually and

collectively. Rice (1979) "stresses the importance of adolescents' self-esteems, in relation to their progress in school and to their interpersonal competence in family and social relationships" (p. 230). Adolescents with low self-esteem are more likely to have internal conflict and foreboding, which influences all of their external relationships (Rice, 1979).

Offer (1981) stresses the importance of research on the adolescent self-image. It presents an ideal period for better understanding, the psychological aspects of the self. Changes that have occurred since childhood and the preparations for adulthood can be observed during the adolescent period. "The portrait of the adolescent is best drawn by him/herself" (Offer et al. 1981, p. 129).

Rationale

It was the purpose of my thesis to explore the factors related to self-esteem among junior high students of selected schools. To identify the level of self-esteem, junior high students were chosen from a rural area to participate in this study. I will compare scores in this study to those of the study comprising a sample of students from each of the 21 junior high schools in North York, Ontario. These students had completed the questionnaires, under the supervision of Phil Cassidy, of the North York Board of Education.

It is hoped that this thesis will reinforce the importance of a high level of self-esteem for adolescents. For generations, wise educators have sensed a significant

relationship between a student's concept of himself and his performance in school. They believed that those students who have a positive attitude toward themselves and their capabilities are the ones who are most likely to be successful (Purkey, 1970). Emphasis should be placed on areas of strength, or competency, not areas of inadequacy as a method of enabling adolescents to improve their self-concepts (Santrock, 1981).

Chapter 2

Research Design and Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to identify the self-esteem of River John Consolidated School students, junior high school level. To fulfill the purpose of this thesis, the following research questions had to be investigated.

(1) Do gender differences in self-esteem exist?

(2) Does the self-esteem level of students vary among the three junior high grades?

(3) Is age a significant factor in relation to the students' level of self-esteem?

(4) Do parental relationships affect the level of self-esteem?

(5) Is there a relationship between academic achievement and self-esteem?

(6) Are the future plans of junior high school students related to the level of self-esteem?

(7) Does peer pressure affect an individual student's level of self-esteem?

The independent variables are: gender, grade, age, living arrangements, marital status of parents, number of siblings, father's employment, mother's employment, average grade last year and future plans. The dependent variable is self-esteem. The operational definition of self-esteem, is the students' score on the North York Self Concept Inventory. The theoretical definition employed in this thesis is

"the value adolescents place on themselves and their behavior, which would be evaluated by finding out at a general level whether adolescents feel good or bad about themselves" (McCandless & Evans, 1973, p. 376).

Subjects

The subjects are grade 7, 8 and 9 students at River John Consolidated School. Their ages are 12 to 15 inclusive. The subjects are an easily accessible group. They have not participated in a similar study before. The number of subjects are categorized, by gender, as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Grade 7	6	12	18
Grade 8	10	17	27
Grade 9	6	11	17
Total	22	40	62

Instruments

Part A of the Questionnaire

A Junior High Student Questionnaire (See Appendix A) was developed to provide biographical information about the respondent. The eight-item instrument required responses to the following: (1) Personal information (sex, grade, age); (2) Living arrangements; (3) Marital status of parents; (4) Number of siblings; (5) Father's employment; (6) Mother's employment; (7) Average grade last year; (8) Future plans. The students were asked to check the appropriate space.

Part B of the Questionnaire

The North York Self-Concept Inventory: Junior

High/Middle School Level (See Appendix B) was utilized. The 25-item instrument was designed to examine aspects of self-esteem related to the school environment, self or peers, "with high discriminatory power between high scoring or low scoring groups of students" (Cassidy, 1982, p. 2). The items are declarative statements of self-concept requiring "true" and "not true" responses. One point is given for each response which indicates a positive self-concept. The scores in the inventory can range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 25 (Cassidy, 1982).

Procedure

The principal of the school, Mrs. Janette Sears, granted permission to administer the questionnaires to the junior high school students, during the second week of October, 1992. The exact date and time was agreed upon by the individual home room teachers of grades 7, 8 and 9 students. The questionnaires were administered on Thursday, October 8th, 1992, in three separate sessions, to the grade 7, 8 and 9 students. Each class was given a 20-minute period to complete the questionnaires. The students completed the questionnaires during classtime. The questionnaires were distributed to the students by the researcher, and collected upon completion. Mrs. Sears had requested that the questionnaires be completed anonymously. The students were informed that the results will be available to the public and that anonymity would be guaranteed.

Chapter 3

Results

The Junior High Questionnaire

The relations of each of the ten variables to self-esteem were analysed by an analysis of variance. A summary of these results are found in Appendix C, Tables 1 to 13 inclusive.

Gender Differences (Question 1, part a of the Junior High Questionnaire)

The relationship between Sex and Self-Esteem Score is significant, F = 4.107 and p = .0472 (See Table 1).

In the comparison of sex versus total score, the 40 female students had the higher mean score of 19.450. The 22 males had the lower mean score of 17.045.

Grade (Question 1, part b of the Junior High Questionnaire)

The relationship between Grade and Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = 2.245 and p = .1149 (See Table 2).

Age (Question 1, part c of the Junior High Questionnaire)

The relationship between Age and Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = 1.458 and p = .2354 (see Table 3).

Self-Esteem and Parental Relationships (Questions 2 and 3)

Question 2, Live With vs Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = .194 and p = .9003 (see Table 4).

Question 3, Marital Status - Parents vs Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = .815 and p = .4907 (see Table 5).

Question 4, Number of Siblings vs Self-Esteem Score is

not significant, F = 1.834 and p = .1807 (see Table 6).

Question 5, Father's Employment vs Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = .373 and p = .8648 (see Table 7).

Question 6, Mother's Employment vs Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = .171 and p = .9522 (see Table 8).

Academic Achievement and Self-Esteem (Question 7)

Question 7, Average Grade Last Year vs Self-Esteem Score is not significant, F = 2.682 and p = .0768 (see Table 9).

Future Plans (Question 8)

Question 8, Future Plans vs Self-Esteem Score is significant, F = 3.846 and p = .0078 (see Table 10).

An analysis of variance was performed to test the interrelationships of the following variables: sex, average grade last year and future plans. Sex and average grade last year are not significantly related, F = 3.317 and p = .0735 (see Table 11). Sex and future plans are mildly significant, F = 4.032 and p = .0492 (see Table 12). Future plans and average grade last year are highly significant, F = 3.378 and p = .015 (see Table 13). The best predictor of self-esteem is future plans.

Peer Relationships

The Junior High Questionnaire did not have any questions which dealt with peer relationships.

Mean Scores

The 18 grade 7 students at River John Consolidated School had a mean score of 20.111, (see Table 2) compared to 17.0 for the grade 7 North York sample of 1402 students

(see Figure I). The grade 8 students, who numbered 27 at River John Consolidated School had a mean of 17.296. The grade 8 students of North York had a mean score of 16.6; the sample size was 1179. The 17 grade 9 students of River John Consolidated School had a mean score of 19.059. The grade 9 students of North York had a mean score of 16.7 for 1173 students.

t Values

The t values were calculated, comparing each of the junior high grades of the River John sample, to the same grade in North York. The most significant was Grade 7, $t = 2.7837$, $p < .01$. Grade 9 was significant, with a t value of 2.1975, $p < .05$. Grade 8 was not significant, $t = 0.6285$, $p > .05$.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

The research questions investigated in this thesis are:

(1) Do gender differences in self-esteem exist?

(2) Does the self-esteem level of students vary among the three junior high grades?

(3) Is age a significant factor in relation to the students' level of self-esteem?

(4) Do parental relationships affect the level of self-esteem?

(5) Is there a relationship between academic achievement and self-esteem ?

(6) Are the future plans of junior high school students related to the level of self-esteem?

(7) Does peer pressure affect as individual student's level of self-esteem?

Do gender differences in self-esteem exist? Contrary to the evidence in the literature, the female students at River John Consolidated School had a significantly higher mean score than their male counterparts. The Canada Health Attitudes and Behaviours Survey (King, 1985) and the Health of Canada's Youth study (Health & Welfare Canada, 1992) each reported that males responded more positively than females to self-esteem items. The Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (OSIQ) findings revealed that "normal adolescents had positive psychyological self-images and that males had

better self-images than the females did" (Offer et al., 1981, p. 50).

Does the self-esteem level of students vary among the three junior high grades? The research has found no significant differences among the three junior high grades at River John Consolidated School.

Is age a significant factor in relation to the students' level of self-esteem? (Question 1, part c of the Junior High Questionnaire). The relationship between the Age of the student and the Self-Esteem Score is not significant, $p > .05$. In this study, no differences were found.

Do parental relationships affect the level of self-esteem? (Questions 2 and 3 of the Junior High Questionnaire), the results indicate that the relationship between Live With and Self-Esteem Score is not significant, $p > .05$ (Question 2). The Marital Status of Parents and its relationship to the Self-Esteem Score is not significant, $p > .05$ (Question 3). These findings contrast with the review of the literature, which has been conducted for this thesis. However, it should be noted that the majority of the literature reviewed focused on intact families.

Is there a relationship between academic achievement and self-esteem? Questions about the students' academic achievement are part of the North York Self Concept Inventory, which indicate that academic accomplishment and self-esteem are closely related. These results are in agreement with the review of the literature, which has consistently

indicated a correlation between self-esteem and academic achievement. In contrast, Question 7 of the Junior High Questionnaire, Average Grade Last Year vs Self-Esteem Score is not significant, $p > .05$. Students with "higher self-esteem get higher grades and do better on achievement tests than do children with lower self-esteem" (Dusek, 1987, p. 393). In order to succeed, students must feel good about themselves and their abilities (Purkey, 1970). "There is a persistent and significant relationship between the self-concept and academic achievement" (Purkey, 1970, p. 15).

Are the future plans of junior high school students related to the level of self-esteem? (Question 8 of the Junior High Questionnaire), the results indicate that the relationship between Future Plans and Self-Esteem Score is significant, $p < .01$. These findings are in agreement with the literature reviewed. Harrington and O'Shea (1983) found that grades 7 to 9 appeared to be an important period for vocational development. Adolescents with high self-esteem have higher career aspirations than adolescents with low self-esteem (Harrington and O'Shea, 1983).

Does peer pressure affect an individual student's level of self-esteem? Checking the questions against the total score, Questions 1, 2, 6, 8 and 13 are high significant; whereas, Questions 4 and 10 are not significantly related. Pipp & Robinson (1985) maintain that peers play important functions for adolescents. "...peer advice is sought for questions of popularity in peer society" (Brittain, 1963, 1968 & 1969; Musgrove, 1963, p. 4). "Peer

support during the teens is a powerful force in relation to 'adequacy' concepts" (Gordon, 1972, p. 19).

The results of the research clearly show the level of self esteem, or total score, of each junior high school student at River John Consolidated School. The results indicate that the junior high sample at River John Consolidated School had a higher mean score at each grade level, in comparison to the North York sample. The mean score is significantly higher for grades seven and nine, of the River John sample, compared to grades seven and nine of the North York sample. The grade eight mean score is not significantly higher.

"Adolescents' self-concepts and self-esteems are important to their mental health, to their interpersonal competence in social relationships, and to their progress in school" (Rice, 1979, p. 230). Rice (1979) emphasizes the significance of the development of an adequate self-concept, as it influences all of the adolescents' external relationships.

It would be desirable to permit the characterization of each junior high school student at River John Consolidated School as "feeling confident, happy and self-satisfied" (Offer et al., 1981, p. 83). However, taking into consideration the results of the biographical questionnaire and the North York Self Concept Inventory, this is not entirely possible. Concern about the male students, in particular, is a reality.

Need for further research is evident. It would be interesting to have the same group of students complete the Offer Self-Image Questionnaire (OSIQ), which was developed in 1962. It is more extensive than the North York Self-Concept Inventory, which was administered to the students of River John Consolidated School. The results of the OSIQ could then be compared to the data accumulated over an eighteen-year period by Offer, Ostrov and Howard (1981).

A study designed to more accurately identify parental self-esteem and its relationship to adolescent self-esteem, could be important. The Offer Self-Image Questionnaire could also be of assistance in this area. "The Familial Self of the Normal Adolescent" section of the OSIQ would be helpful in the process of identification.

Educators, have the opportunity to observe students, on a daily basis. It is hoped that this study will reinforce the importance of a high level of self-esteem, not only for adolescents, but, for all students, regardless of their grade level. Consideration should be given to the various factors which can individually, or collectively contribute to global self-esteem.

Adults and educators, must recognize the fact that adolescents are also participants in the human condition (Offer et al., 1981). Just as adults experience conflict and disappointment, so do adolescents. Just as adults have the capacity for being happy, so do adolescents. "Adolescence is a period when one leaves the protected harbor of childhood and enters the open sea of adulthood" (Offer et

al, 1981, p. 45). River John students, many of whose relatives are fishermen, know the dangers involved when one leaves the tranquil waters of John Bay and sails out upon the perilous sea.

REFERENCES

Adams, James F. (1968). Understanding adolescence. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated.

Adams, James F. (1980). Understanding adolescence (rev. ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated.

Baumrind, D. (1977). What research is teaching us about the differences between authoritative and authoritarian child-rearing styles. In D. E. Hamachek (Ed.), Human Dynamics in Psychology and Education (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated.

Berndt, Thomas J. (1990). Relations of friendships and peer acceptance to adolescents' self-evaluations. (Report No. PS 018 702). Indiana (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 307).

Brittain, C. V. (1963). Adolescent choices and parent-peer cross pressures. American Sociological Review, 28, 385 391.

Brittain, C. V. (1968). An exploration of the bases of peer-compliance and parent-compliance in adolescence. Adolescence, 2, 445 - 458.

Brittain, C. V. (1969). A comparison of rural and urban adolescence with respect to peer versus parent compli ance. Adolescence, 3, 59 - 68.

Buri, John R. (1991). Stability of parental nurturance as a salient predictor of self-esteem. (Report No. CG 023 687). Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 711).

Cassidy, Phil. (1982). North York self-concept inventory: junior high level. (Report No. TM 830 053). Willow dale, Ontario: North York Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 025).

Cassidy, Phil. (1985). North York self concept inventory: junior high/middle school level. North York, Ontario: North York Board of Education.

Coopersmith, Stanley. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman and Company.

Dusek, Jerome B. (1987). Adolescent development and behav ior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Incor porated.

Dusek, Jerome B. & Flaherty, John F. (1981). The Development of the self-concept during the adolescent years. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 46 (4, Serial No. 191).

Gordon, Ira J. (1972). Children's views of themselves. Washington, D. C.: Stansbury Design Incorporated.

Greenberg, M. T., Siegel, J. M., & Leitsch, C. J. (1983). The nature and importance of attachment to parents and peers during adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12, 373 - 386.

Hansen, J. C. and Maynard, P. E. (1973). Youth: self-concept and behavior. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Harrington, Thomas F. & O'Shea, Arthur (1983). Vocational self-concepts: A stratified U. S. sample, grades 7 - 13. (Report No. CG 017 091). Massachusetts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 837).

Harter, Susan (1983). Developmental perspectives on the self system. In Paul H. Musser (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology (pp. 298 - 339). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Health and Welfare Canada. (1992). The health of Canada's youth. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Horowitz, F. D. (1962). The relationship of anxiety, self-concept, and sociometric status among fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65, 212 - 214.

Hoyt, Michael & Schoonmaker, Mary Ellen. (1990, September). The friendship factor. Family Circle, pp. 103 - 104.

Jersild, A. T. (1952). In search of self: an exploration of the role of the school in promoting self-understanding. New York: Teachers College.

King, A. J. C.., Robertson, A. S. & Warren, W. K. (1985). Summary Report: Canada health attitudes and behaviours survey: 9, 12 and 15 year olds (1984 - 85). Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada.

Kramer, Jack J. & Conoley, Jane Close. (Eds.). (1992). The eleventh mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press.

La Benne, W. D. and Greene, B. I. (1969). Educational implications of self-concept theory. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Lefrancois, Guy R. (1986). Of children. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

McCandless, B. R. & Evans, E. (1973). Children and youth: psychological development. Evanston, Ill.: Dryden Press.

McKay, Matthew & Fanning, Patrick. (1987). Self-esteem. Oakland, California: New Harbringer Publications.

Mitchell, James V. (Ed.) (1985). The ninth mental measurements yearbook, (Vols. 1 & 2). Linclon, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press.

Monge, R. H. (1973). Developmental trends in factors of adolescent self-concept. Developmental Psychology, 8, 382 - 393.

Musgrove, F. (1963). Intergenerational attitudes. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 2, 209 - 223.

Mussen, Paul H. (Ed.). (1983). Handbook of child psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Offer, Daniel & Offer, Judith Baskin. (1975). From teenager to young manhood: a psychological study. New York: Basic Books, Incorporated.

Offer, Daniel, Ostrov, Eric & Howard, Kenneth I. (1981). The adolescent: a psychological self-portrait. New York: Basic Books Incorporated.

Piers, E. V. (1976). The Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale. (Research Monograph No. 1). Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests.

Pipp, Sandra & Robinson, Julianne D. (1985). Adolescents constructs of self, parents and peers.. (Report No. CG 019 161). Toronto, Ontario: Society for Research in Child Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 704).

Pottebaum, Sheila M., Keith, Timothy Z. & Ehly, Stewart W. (1986). Is there a causal relation between self-concept and academic achievement? Journal of Educational Research, 79 (3), 140 - 144.

Purkey, William W. (1970). Self-concept and school achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated.

Rice, Philip F. (1976). The adolescent. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated.

Rice, Philip F. (1979). The adolescent: development, relationships, and culture. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated.

Ringness, Thomas A. (1965). Emotional adjustment of aca demically successful and non-successful bright ninth grade boys. The Journal of Educational Research, 59, 88 - 91.

Robinson, J. P. & Shaver, P. R. (1973). Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Insti tute for Social Research.

Rosenberg, B. G. and Others. (1984). Parental self-esteem and personality development in children. (Report No. PS 014 720). Toronto, Ontario: Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. (ERIC Docu ment Reproduction Service No. ED 251 187).

Santrock, John W. (1981). Adolescence: an introduction. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.

Sears, Robert R. (1969). The antecedents of self-esteem, by Stanley Coopersmith. Contemporary Psychology, 14, 136 - 147.

Self-Esteem Index (1990). Brown, Linda & Alexander, Jac quelyn. PRO-ED, Inc., Publishers.

Smith, P. A. (1962). A comparison of three sets of rotated factor analytic solutions of self-concept data. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64, 326 - 333.

Stanish, Bob. (1982). Connecting rainbows. Missouri: Patterson Printing Company.

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (1964). Fitts, William H. & Roid, Gale H. Western Psychological Services, Pub lishers.

Wylie, R. C. (1974). The self-concept: a review of meth odological considerations and measuring instruments, volume one. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PART A OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Junior High Student Questionnaire

JUNIOR HIGH STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the following questionnaire, using a check mark (✓), to best describe your personal situation.

(1) Personal information:

Male _____

Female _____

Grade _____

Age _____

(2) I live with:

Both parents _____

Father _____

Mother _____

Grandparents _____

Guardian _____

Other _____

(i.e. Aunt, Sister, etc.)

(3) My parents are:

Married _____

Separated _____

Divorced _____

Widowed _____

(4) I have _____ brothers

I have _____ sisters

(Include step-brothers and step-sisters)

(5) Employment: Father

Full-time _____

Part-time _____

Seasonal _____

Unemployed _____

Self-employed _____

Retired _____

(6) Employment: Mother

Full-time _____

Part-time _____

Seasonal _____

Unemployed _____

Self-Employed _____

Retired _____

Housewife _____

(7) Last year my average grade was:

Excellent _____

Satisfactory _____

Unsatisfactory _____

(8) My plans for the future are to:

Complete Junior High School _____

Graduate from High School _____

Attend Community College _____

Join the Armed Forces _____

Get a job _____

Attend University _____

Other _____

APPENDIX B

PART B OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

North York Self-Concept Inventory
Junior High/Middle School Level

SELF CONCEPT INVENTORY

JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOL LEVEL

NAME: _____

SCHOOL: _____ TEACHER: _____

GRADE _____ DATE: _____

THIS IS A QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNED TO DETERMINE
HOW STUDENTS FEEL ABOUT THEMSELVES AND SCHOOL

DIRECTIONS: ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE A SERIES OF STATEMENTS PEOPLE SOMETIMES USE TO DESCRIBE THEMSELVES. PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY AND DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT IT IS TRUE FOR YOU.

IF YOU THINK A STATEMENT IS TRUE FOR YOU OR DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL MOST OF THE TIME, CHECK THE TRUE SQUARE. IF YOU THINK A STATEMENT IS NOT TRUE FOR YOU OR DOES NOT DESCRIBE HOW YOU FEEL MOST OF THE TIME, CHECK THE NOT TRUE SQUARE.

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS, ONLY YOU CAN TELL US HOW YOU FEEL.

The Board of Education for the City of North York

Educational Research & Evaluation Services

April 1973
(Revised 1984)

		TRUE	NOT TRUE
1.	OTHER STUDENTS SEEM HAPPIER THAN I AM	A	B
2.	PEOPLE BOSS ME AROUND TOO MUCH	A	B
3.	I FIND IT HARD TO TALK IN FRONT OF THE CLASS	A	B
4.	I HAVE ONLY A FEW FRIENDS IN SCHOOL	A	B
5.	I AM GOOD IN MY SCHOOL WORK	A	B
6	MY CLASSMATES THINK I AM A GOOD STUDENT	A	B
7.	MY TEACHERS MAKE ME FEEL I AM NOT GOOD ENOUGH	A	B
8.	MOST PEOPLE ARE BETTER LIKED THAN I AM	A	B
9.	THERE ARE LOTS OF THINGS ABOUT MYSELF I'D CHANGE IF I COULD	A	B
10.	BOTH BOYS AND GIRLS LIKE ME	A	B
11.	I AM NOT DOING AS WELL IN SCHOOL AS I WOULD LIKE TO	A	B
12.	I LIKE GOING TO SCHOOL A LOT	A	B
13.	KIDS USUALLY FOLLOW MY IDEAS	A	B
14.	SCHOOL WORK IS TOO HARD FOR ME	A	B
15.	I OFTEN FEEL UPSET IN SCHOOL	A	B
16.	I FORGET MOST OF WHAT I LEARN	A	B
17.	SCHOOL WORK IS FAIRLY EASY FOR ME	A	B

		TRUE	NOT TRUE
18.	IT TAKES ME A LONG TIME TO GET USED TO ANYTHING NEW.	A	B
19.	I CAN GIVE A GOOD REPORT IN FRONT OF THE CLASS	A	B
20.	TEACHERS EXPECT TOO MUCH FROM ME	A	B
21.	THINGS USUALLY DON'T BOTHER ME	A	B
22.	IT'S PRETTY TOUGH TO BE ME	A	B
23.	I FIND IT HARD TO STICK TO ONE PROJECT FOR VERY LONG	A	B
24.	I AM SLOW IN FINISHING MY SCHOOL WORK	A	B
25.	SOMETIMES I WISH I COULD GO TO SOME OTHER SCHOOL	A	B

APPENDIX C

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Table 1

One Factor ANOVA X ₁ : Sex Y ₁ : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	82.065	82.065	4.107
Within groups	60	1198.855	19.981	p = .0472
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 2.187

One Factor ANOVA X ₁ : Sex Y ₁ : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Male	22	17.045	5.42	1.156
Female	40	19.45	3.863	.611

One Factor ANOVA X ₁ : Sex Y ₁ : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Male vs. Female	-2.405	2.374*	4.107*	2.027

* Significant at 95%

Table 2

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Grade Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	2	90.571	45.285	2.245
Within groups	59	1190.349	20.175	p = .1149
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 1.244

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Grade Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
seven	18	20.111	4.337	1.022
eight	27	17.296	5.261	1.012
nine	17	19.059	3.071	.745

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Grade Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
seven vs. eight	2.815	2.735*	2.121	2.059
seven vs. nine	1.052	3.04	.24	.693
eight vs. nine	-1.763	2.783	.803	1.267

* Significant at 95%

Table 3

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Age Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	3	89.831	29.944	1.458
Within groups	58	1191.089	20.536	p = .2354
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = .634

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Age Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-12	19	19.947	4.49	1.03
B-13	20	17.8	5.033	1.125
C-14	17	18.941	3.191	.774
D-15	6	16	6.066	2.477

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Age Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-12 vs. B-13	2.147	2.906	.729	1.479
A-12 vs. C-14	1.006	3.029	.147	.665
A-12 vs. D-15	3.947	4.248	1.153	1.86
B-13 vs. C-14	-1.141	2.993	.194	.763
B-13 vs. D-15	1.8	4.223	.243	.853

Table 3

One Factor ANOVA X_1 : Age Y_1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
C-14 vs. D-15	2.941	4.308	.623	1.367

Table 4

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Live With Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	3	12.705	4.235	.194
Within groups	58	1268.214	21.866	p = .9003
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = -2.566

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Live With Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Both Parents	50	18.5	4.743	.671
B-Father	4	19	4.899	2.449
C-Mother	7	19.429	3.952	1.494
D-Grandparents	1	16	•	•

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Live With Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Both Par... vs. B-Father	-.5	4.864	.014	.206
A-Both Par... vs. C-Mother	-.929	3.778	.081	.492
A-Both Par... vs. D-Grand...	2.5	9.454	.093	.529
B-Father vs. C-Mother	-.429	5.867	.007	.146
B-Father vs. D-Grandpar...	3	10.466	.11	.574

Table 4

One Factor ANOVA X_1 : Live With Y_1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
C-Mother vs. D-Grandpar...	3.429	10.007	.157	.686

Table 5

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Marital Status-Parents Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	3	51.824	17.275	.815
Within groups	58	1229.095	21.191	p = .4907
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = -.568

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Marital Status-Parents Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Married	50	18.5	4.743	.671
B-Separated	2	16.5	.707	.5
C-Divorced	7	20.714	4.03	1.523
D-Widow(er)	3	16.667	3.786	2.186

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Marital Status-Parents Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Married vs. B-Separated	2	6.645	.121	.602
A-Married vs. C-Divorced	-2.214	3.719	.474	1.192
A-Married vs. D-Widow(...	1.833	5.478	.15	.67
B-Separated vs. C-Divor...	-4.214	7.389	.435	1.142
B-Separated vs. D-Widow...	-.167	8.413	.001	.04

Table 5

One Factor ANOVA X_1 : Marital Status-Parents Y_1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
C-Divorced vs. D-Widow(...	4.048	6.359	.541	1.274

Table 6

Simple Regression X 1 : # Of Sibs Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Count:	R:	R-squared:	Adj. R-squared:	RMS Residual:
62	.172	.03	.013	4.551

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
REGRESSION	1	38.001	38.001	1.834
RESIDUAL	60	1242.918	20.715	p = .1807
TOTAL	61	1280.919		

No Residual Statistics Computed

Simple Regression X 1 : # Of Sibs Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Beta Coefficient Table

Variable:	Coefficient:	Std. Err.:	Std. Coeff.:	t-Value:	Probability:
INTERCEPT	17.626				
SLOPE	.404	.298	.172	1.354	.1807

Confidence Intervals Table

Variable:	95% Lower:	95% Upper:	90% Lower:	90% Upper:
MEAN (X,Y)	17.44	19.753	17.631	19.563
SLOPE	-.193	1.001	-.094	.902

Table 7

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Father's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	5	41.243	8.249	.373
Within groups	53	1171.469	22.103	p = .8648
Total	58	1212.712		

Model II estimate of between component variance = -1.519

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Father's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Full Time	21	18.381	4.307	.94
B-Part time	9	18.333	4.637	1.546
C-Seasonal	12	18.167	6.686	1.93
D-Self Employed	10	19.7	3.268	1.033
E-Unemployed	4	19.75	3.304	1.652

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Father's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
F-Retired	3	16	2	1.155

Table 7

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Father's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Full Time vs. B-Part ti...	.048	3.757	1.293E-4	.025
A-Full Time vs. C-Seasonal	.214	3.413	.003	.126
A-Full Time vs. D-Self E...	-1.319	3.623	.107	.73
A-Full Time vs. E-Unempl...	-1.369	5.145	.057	.534
A-Full Time vs. F-Retired	2.381	5.821	.135	.821

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Father's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
B-Part time vs. C-Seasonal	.167	4.159	.001	.08
B-Part time vs. D-Self E...	-1.367	4.333	.08	.633
B-Part time vs. E-Unempl...	-1.417	5.667	.05	.501
B-Part time vs. F-Retired	2.333	6.287	.111	.744
C-Seasonal vs. D-Self Em...	-1.533	4.038	.116	.762

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Father's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
C-Seasonal vs. E-Unempl...	-1.583	5.445	.068	.583
C-Seasonal vs. F-Retired	2.167	6.088	.102	.714
D-Self Emp... vs. E-Unem...	-.05	5.579	6.463E-5	.018
D-Self Emp... vs. F-Retired	3.7	6.208	.286	1.196
E-Unemplo... vs. F-Retired	3.75	7.203	.218	1.044

Table 8

One Factor ANOVA X ¦ : Mother's Empl. Y ¦ : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	4	15.212	3.803	.171
Within groups	57	1265.708	22.205	p = .9522
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = -1.566

One Factor ANOVA X ¦ : Mother's Empl. Y ¦ : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Full time	20	18.5	4.501	1.007
B-Part time	17	18.471	4.81	1.167
C-Seasonal	9	17.778	6.399	2.133
D-Self Employed	4	19	4.243	2.121
G-Housewife	12	19.417	3.423	.988

One Factor ANOVA X ¦ : Mother's Empl. Y ¦ : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Full time vs. B-Part ti...	.029	3.113	8.950E-5	.019
A-Full time vs. C-Seasonal	.722	3.788	.036	.382
A-Full time vs. D-Self Em...	-.5	5.169	.009	.194
A-Full time vs. G-Housew...	-.917	3.446	.071	.533
B-Part time vs. C-Seasonal	.693	3.89	.032	.357

Table 8

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Mother's Empl. Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
B-Part time vs. D-Self E...	-.529	5.244	.01	.202
B-Part time vs. G-House...	-.946	3.558	.071	.532
C-Seasonal vs. D-Self Em...	-1.222	5.671	.047	.432
C-Seasonal vs. G-Housew...	-1.639	4.161	.156	.789
D-Self Emp... vs. G-House...	-.417	5.449	.006	.153

Table 9

One Factor ANOVA X ¡ : Avg. Gr. Last Yr. Y ¡ : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	2	106.752	53.376	2.682
Within groups	59	1174.168	19.901	p = .0768
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 2.107

One Factor ANOVA X ¡ : Avg. Gr. Last Yr. Y ¡ : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Unsatisfactory	1	23	•	•
B-Satisfactory	33	17.424	4.555	.793
C-Excellent	28	19.821	4.347	.821

One Factor ANOVA X ¡ : Avg. Gr. Last Yr. Y ¡ : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Unsatisf... vs. B-Satisf...	5.576	9.062	.758	1.231
A-Unsatisf... vs. C-Excell...	3.179	9.086	.245	.7
B-Satisfact... vs. C-Excel...	-2.397	2.294*	2.187	2.091

* Significant at 95%

Table 10

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Future Plans Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	4	272.22	68.055	3.846
Within groups	57	1008.7	17.696	p = .0078
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 6.817

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Future Plans Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Jr.High	1	6	•	•
B-Get a Job	3	15	1	.577
C-High School	12	17.417	3.848	1.111
D-Comm. College	3	22.333	1.155	.667
E-University	43	19.209	4.475	.682

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Future Plans Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Jr.High vs. B-Get a Job	-9	9.728	.858	1.853
A-Jr.High vs. C-High Sch...	-11.417	8.769*	1.7	2.607
A-Jr.High vs. D-Comm. C...	-16.333	9.728*	2.827*	3.362
A-Jr.High vs. E-University	-13.209	8.522*	2.409	3.104
B-Get a Job vs. C-High S...	-2.417	5.438	.198	.89

* Significant at 95%

Table 10

One Factor ANOVA X_1 : Future Plans Y_1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
B-Get a Job vs. D-Comm....	-7.333	6.879*	1.14	2.135
B-Get a Job vs. E-Univer...	-4.209	5.031	.702	1.676
C-High Sch... vs. D-Comm...	-4.917	5.438	.82	1.811
C-High Sch... vs. E-Unive...	-1.793	2.75	.426	1.305
D-Comm. C... vs. E-Unive...	3.124	5.031	.387	1.244

* Significant at 95%

Table 11

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Sex Y 1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	.903	.903	3.317
Within groups	60	16.339	.272	p = .0735
Total	61	17.242		

Model II estimate of between component variance = .022

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Sex Y 1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Male	22	2.273	.456	.097
Female	40	2.525	.554	.088

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Sex Y 1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Male vs. Female	-.252	.277	3.317	1.821

Table 12

One Factor ANOVA X $_1$: Sex Y $_1$: Future Plans

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	4.294	4.294	4.032
Within groups	60	63.9	1.065	p = .0492
Total	61	68.194		

Model II estimate of between component variance = .114

One Factor ANOVA X $_1$: Sex Y $_1$: Future Plans

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Male	22	4	1.234	.263
Female	40	4.55	.904	.143

One Factor ANOVA X $_1$: Sex Y $_1$: Future Plans

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Male vs. Female	-.55	.548*	4.032*	2.008

* Significant at 95%

Table 13

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Future Plans Y 1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	4	3.304	.826	3.378
Within groups	57	13.938	.245	p = .015
Total	61	17.242		

Model II estimate of between component variance = .079

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Future Plans Y 1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
A-Jr.High	1	2	•	•
B-Get a Job	3	2.667	.577	.333
C-High School	12	2	.426	.123
D-Comm. College	3	2.333	.577	.333
E-University	43	2.558	.502	.077

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Future Plans Y 1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
A-Jr.High vs. B-Get a Job	-.667	1.144	.341	1.168
A-Jr.High vs. C-High Sch...	0	1.031	0	0
A-Jr.High vs. D-Comm. C...	-.333	1.144	.085	.584
A-Jr.High vs. E-University	-.558	1.002	.311	1.116
B-Get a Job vs. C-High S...	.667	.639*	1.091	2.089
B-Get a Job vs. D-Comm....	.333	.809	.17	.826
B-Get a Job vs. E-Univer...	.109	.591	.034	.368
C-High Sch... vs. D-Comm...	-.333	.639	.273	1.044
C-High Sch... vs. E-Unive...	-.558	.323*	2.988*	3.457
D-Comm. C... vs. E-Unive...	-.225	.591	.145	.761

* Significant at 95%

Table 14

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q1-Others Happier Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	262.586	262.586	15.472
Within groups	60	1018.333	16.972	p = .0002
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 17.625

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q1-Others Happier Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	8	13.25	5.203	1.84
Group 2	54	19.389	3.955	.538

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q1-Others Happier Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-6.139	3.122*	15.472*	3.933

* Significant at 95%

Table 15

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q2-Others Boss Around? Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	186.075	186.075	10.197
Within groups	60	1094.845	18.247	p = .0022
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 22.425

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q2-Others Boss Around? Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	4	12	5.831	2.915
Group 2	58	19.052	4.174	.548

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q2-Others Boss Around? Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-7.052	4.418*	10.197*	3.193

* Significant at 95%

Table 16

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q3-Hard to Talk In Front Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	169.609	169.609	9.157
Within groups	60	1111.31	18.522	p = .0036
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 5.44

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q3-Hard to Talk In Front Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	21	16.286	4.628	1.01
Group 2	41	19.78	4.132	.645

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q3-Hard to Talk In Front Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-3.495	2.31*	9.157*	3.026

* Significant at 95%

Table 17

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q4-Few Friends Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	53.21	53.21	2.6
Within groups	60	1227.709	20.462	p = .1121
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 2.637

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q4-Few Friends Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	7	16	3.416	1.291
Group 2	55	18.927	4.63	.624

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q4-Few Friends Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-2.927	3.631	2.6	1.613

Table 18

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q5-Good school work Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	208.842	208.842	11.688
Within groups	60	1072.077	17.868	p = .0011
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 20.773

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q5-Good school work Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	5	12.4	3.912	1.749
Group 2	57	19.14	4.249	.563

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q5-Good school work Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-6.74	3.944*	11.688*	3.419

* Significant at 95%

Table 19

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q6-Others think Good Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	153.552	153.552	8.172
Within groups	60	1127.367	18.789	p = .0058
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 8.758

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q6-Others think Good Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	9	14.778	3.866	1.289
Group 2	53	19.245	4.402	.605

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q6-Others think Good Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.468	3.126*	8.172*	2.859

* Significant at 95%

Table 20

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q7-Teachers feel not good Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	453.604	453.604	32.897
Within groups	60	827.315	13.789	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 40.578

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q7-Teachers feel not good Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	6	10.333	3.386	1.382
Group 2	56	19.482	3.742	.5

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q7-Teachers feel not good Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-9.149	3.191*	32.897*	5.736

* Significant at 95%

Table 21

One Factor ANOVA X ₁ : Q8-others liked better Y ₁ : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	135.726	135.726	7.111
Within groups	60	1145.193	19.087	p = .0098
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 5.381

One Factor ANOVA X ₁ : Q8-others liked better Y ₁ : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	14	15.857	4.036	1.079
Group 2	48	19.396	4.457	.643

One Factor ANOVA X ₁ : Q8-others liked better Y ₁ : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-3.539	2.655*	7.111*	2.667

* Significant at 95%

Table 22

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q9-change myself Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	352.734	352.734	22.802
Within groups	60	928.185	15.47	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 10.891

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q9-change myself Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	30	16.133	4.289	.783
Group 2	32	20.906	3.568	.631

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q9-change myself Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.773	2*	22.802*	4.775

* Significant at 95%

Table 23

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q10-boys/girls like Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	47.893	47.893	2.331
Within groups	60	1233.026	20.55	p = .1321
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 3.654

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q10-boys/girls like Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	4	15.25	.957	.479
Group 2	58	18.828	4.646	.61

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q10-boys/girls like Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-3.578	4.688	2.331	1.527

Table 24

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q11-like to do better Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	299.876	299.876	18.34
Within groups	60	981.043	16.351	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 10.208

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q11-like to do better Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	21	15.524	4.739	1.034
Group 2	41	20.171	3.646	.569

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q11-like to do better Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.647	2.171*	18.34*	4.283

* Significant at 95%

Table 25

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q12-like school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	296.875	296.875	18.101
Within groups	60	984.044	16.401	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 9.085

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q12-like school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	33	16.545	4.744	.826
Group 2	29	20.931	3.07	.57

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q12-like school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.386	2.062*	18.101*	4.255

* Significant at 95%

Table 26

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q13-my ideas followed Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	157.437	157.437	8.408
Within groups	60	1123.483	18.725	p = .0052
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 4.794

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q13-my ideas followed Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	23	16.522	4.851	1.012
Group 2	39	19.821	3.993	.639

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q13-my ideas followed Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	**Scheffe F-test:**	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-3.299	2.276*	**8.408***	2.9

* Significant at 95%

Table 27

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q14-school work hard Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	399.716	399.716	27.216
Within groups	60	881.204	14.687	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 27.629

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q14-school work hard Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	8	12	4.209	1.488
Group 2	54	19.574	3.78	.514

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q14-school work hard Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-7.574	2.904*	27.216*	5.217

* Significant at 95%

Table 28

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q15-feel upset in school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	373.477	373.477	24.694
Within groups	60	907.442	15.124	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 21.363

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q15-feel upset in school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	10	13	4	1.265
Group 2	52	19.673	3.869	.537

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q15-feel upset in school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-6.673	2.686*	24.694*	4.969

* Significant at 95%

Table 29

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q16-forget what I learn Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	278.985	278.985	16.707
Within groups	60	1001.935	16.699	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 11.047

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q16-forget what I learn Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	16	15	3.847	.962
Group 2	46	19.848	4.163	.614

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q16-forget what I learn Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.848	2.373*	16.707*	4.087

* Significant at 95%

Table 30

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q17-school work is easy Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	361.941	361.941	23.631
Within groups	60	918.978	15.316	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 14.6

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q17-school work is easy Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	16	14.5	4.442	1.111
Group 2	46	20.022	3.721	.549

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q17-school work is easy Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-5.522	2.272*	23.631*	4.861

* Significant at 95%

Table 31

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q18-long time used to new Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	384.365	384.365	25.723
Within groups	60	896.554	14.943	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 15.56

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q18-long time used to new Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	16	14.375	4.66	1.165
Group 2	46	20.065	3.562	.525

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q18-long time used to new Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-5.69	2.244*	25.723*	5.072

* Significant at 95%

Table 32

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q19-can make good report Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	309.242	309.242	19.095
Within groups	60	971.677	16.195	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 10.551

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q19-can make good report Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	21	15.476	4.445	.97
Group 2	41	20.195	3.796	.593

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q19-can make good report Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.719	2.16*	19.095*	4.37

* Significant at 95%

Table 33

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q20-teacher's expect too much Y 1 : Self Esteem Sc...

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	302.599	302.599	18.558
Within groups	60	978.32	16.305	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 13.933

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q20-teacher's expect too much Y 1 : Self Esteem Sc...

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	13	14.308	4.008	1.112
Group 2	49	19.735	4.045	.578

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q20-teacher's expect too much Y 1 : Self Esteem Sc...

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-5.427	2.52*	18.558*	4.308

* Significant at 95%

Table 34

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q21-Things don't bother me Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	64.669	64.669	3.19
Within groups	60	1216.25	20.271	p = .0791
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 1.738

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q21-Things don't bother me Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	18	17	3.395	.8
Group 2	44	19.25	4.871	.734

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q21-Things don't bother me Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-2.25	2.52	3.19	1.786

Table 35

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q22-tough to be me Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	333.471	333.471	21.118
Within groups	60	947.448	15.791	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 12.873

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q22-tough to be me Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	17	14.824	4.68	1.135
Group 2	45	20.022	3.683	.549

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q22-tough to be me Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-5.199	2.263*	21.118*	4.595

* Significant at 95%

Table 36

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q23-stick to one project Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	239.242	239.242	13.78
Within groups	60	1041.678	17.361	p = .0005
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 7.542

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q23-stick to one project Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	24	16.125	4.902	1.001
Group 2	38	20.158	3.636	.59

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q23-stick to one project Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.033	2.173*	13.78*	3.712

* Significant at 95%

Table 37

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q24-slow in school work Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	520.577	520.577	41.08
Within groups	60	760.342	12.672	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 20.582

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q24-slow in school work Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	17	13.882	4.498	1.091
Group 2	45	20.378	3.15	.47

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q24-slow in school work Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-6.495	2.027*	41.08*	6.409

* Significant at 95%

Table 38

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q25-go to other school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Analysis of Variance Table

Source:	DF:	Sum Squares:	Mean Square:	F-test:
Between groups	1	338.479	338.479	21.549
Within groups	60	942.44	15.707	p = .0001
Total	61	1280.919		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 10.69

One Factor ANOVA X 1 : Q25-go to other school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Group:	Count:	Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:
Group 1	36	16.611	4.258	.71
Group 2	26	21.346	3.509	.688

One Factor ANOVA X 1 Q25-go to other school Y 1 : Self Esteem Score

Comparison:	Mean Diff.:	Fisher PLSD:	Scheffe F-test:	Dunnett t:
Group 1 vs. Group 2	-4.735	2.041*	21.549*	4.642

* Significant at 95%

APPENDIX D

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL QUESTIONS

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Sex

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
1.645	.482	.061	.233	29.321	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	2	1	102	182	0

X_2 : Grade

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
1.984	.757	.096	.574	38.173	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	3	2	123	279	0

X_3 : Age

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
2.161	.978	.124	.957	45.267	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	4	3	134	348	0

X_4 : Live With

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
1.339	.745	.095	.556	55.676	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	4	3	83	145	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Marital Status-Parents

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
1.403	.877	.111	.769	62.501	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	4	3	87	169	0

X_2 : # Of Sibs

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
2.403	1.954	.248	3.818	81.31	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	9	9	149	591	0

X_3 : Father's Empl.

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
2.593	1.533	.2	2.349	59.101	59
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	6	5	153	533	3

X_4 : Mother's Empl.

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
2.919	2.19	.278	4.797	75.021	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
1	7	6	181	821	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Avg. Gr. Last Yr.

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
2.435	.532	.068	.283	21.829	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
1	3	2	151	385	0

X_2 : Future Plans

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
4.355	1.057	.134	1.118	24.279	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
1	5	4	270	1244	0

X_3 : Q1-Others Happier

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	[illegible]	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.871	.338	[illegible]	.114	38.804	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	[illegible]	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
0	1	[illegible]	54	54	0

X_4 : Q2-Others Boss Around?

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	[illegible]	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.935	.248	[illegible]	.061	26.476	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	[illegible]	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
0	1	[illegible]	58	58	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Q3-Hard to Talk in Front

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.661	.477	.061	.228	72.152	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	41	41	0

X_2 : Q4-Few Friends

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.887	.319	.041	.102	35.967	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	55	55	0

X_3 : Q5-Good school work

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.919	.275	.035	.075	29.859	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	57	57	0

X_4 : Q6-Others think Good

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	[illegible]	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.855	.355	[illegible]	.126	41.545	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	[illegible]	53	53	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X1 : Q7-Teachers feel not good

Mean:		Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.903		.089	33	62
Minimum:		Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	* Missing:
0		56	56	0

X2 : Q8-others liked better

Mean:		Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.774		.178	54.447	62
Minimum:		Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	* Missing:
0		48	48	0

X3 : Q9-change myself

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.516	.504	.064	.254	97.615	62
Minimum:	Maximum:	Range:	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	* Missing:
0	1	1	32	32	0

X4 : Q10-boys/girls like

Mean:	Std. D		Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.935	.248		.061	26.476	62
Minimum:	Maximum:	Range:	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	* Missing:
0	1	1	58	58	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Q11-like to do better

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.661	.477	.061	.228	72.152	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
0	1	1	41	41	0

X_2 : Q12-like school

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.468	.503	.064	.253	107.545	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
0	1	1	29	29	0

X_3 : Q13-my ideas followed

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.629	.487	.062	.237	77.422	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
0	1	1	39	39	0

X_4 : Q14-school work hard

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.871	.338	.043	.114	38.804	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
0	1	1	54	54	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Q15-feel upset in school

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.839	.371	.047	.137	44.211	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	52	52	0

X_2 : Q16-forget what I learn

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.742	.441	.056	.195	59.458	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	46	46	0

X_3 : Q17-school work is easy

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.742	.441	.056	.195	59.458	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	46	46	0

X_4 : Q18-long time used to new

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.742	.441	.056	.195	59.458	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	46	46	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Q19-can make good report

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.661	.477	.061	.228	72.152	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	41	41	0

X_2 : Q20-teacher's expect too much

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.79	.41	.052	.168	51.928	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	49	49	0

X_3 : Q21-Things don't bother me

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.71	.458	.058	.209	64.482	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	44	44	0

X_4 : Q22-tough to be me

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.726	.45	.057	.202	61.965	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	45	45	0

Means, Standard Deviations, etc. of All Factors

X_1 : Q23-stick to one project

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.613	.491	.062	.241	80.121	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	38	38	0

X_2 : Q24-slow in school work

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.726	.45	.057	.202	61.965	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	45	45	0

X_3 : Q25-go to other school

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.419	.497	.063	.247	118.63	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
0	1	1	26	26	0

X_4 : Self Esteem Score

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
18.597	4.582	.582	20.999	24.641	62
Minimum:	**Maximum:**	**Range:**	**Sum:**	**Sum of Sqr.:**	**# Missing:**
6	25	19	1153	22723	0