D.M.
CORR. 1

Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada

REPETITION OF GRADE IN A PORTUGUESE PRIMARY SCHOOL: HOW CHILDREN PERCEIVE AND EVALUATE THEMSELVES.

DISSERTATION

Advanced Diploma in Educational Psychology

Maria da Luz Correia
Educational Psychologist

C.

Lisbon, October 1989

INDEX

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to W. Peter Robinson (University of Bristol), to Margarida Alves Martins (ISPA-Lisbon), to David Satterly (University of Bristol) and to António Pires (ISPA-Lisbon) for their indispensable specialized guidance and encouragement; to the children and to the Teachers who kindly complied with the researcher's request; to the Ministry of Education (D.G.E.B.S. and G.E.P.) who provided useful informations; to Eileen SuaKay (Speech Therapist) for her advice in the English version of this text; and to those who live with me, for their goodwill and affection.

1. INTRODUCTION

The work in a special school with children who have experienced repetition of grade in the regular school, has given rise to a strong interest on their representation of that experience.

The usual interview for admission or psychological help includes the encouragement of these children to express their ideas and feelings about repeating the grade in school, and to express what they expect from themselves and from significant persons in their life.

Very often these interviews provide a precious insight to children's beliefs which seem to influence significantly their academic and social behaviour. The understanding of these relationships is very fruitful, in the sense that it may be used as guide to an effective educational intervention by the Teacher or by the Educational Psychologist.

Besides that, the contact with children remaining in the regular school has shown some points in common, or surprising aspects such as in the case of a girl about whom the Teacher comments: "She knows, she is able to do it, but she is so insecure and underestimates so much her abilities that her achievement is lower than it could be".

The approach to the questions involved in these situations is complex, given the nature of this study's object: how the child perceives and evaluates his/her experience.

There is a strong **subjective component** part which is an obstacle to any reliable study.

Research on self-concept and self-esteem offers a relevant contribution to the Educational and Clinical intervention.

Education professionals share the idea that the **self-evaluations** of ability and competence **affect** children's academic behaviour with a tendency to believe that a positive self-evaluation favours academic success.

Apart from the reticences to the establishment of simplistic cause-effect relationships between these variables, it is unquestionably worth the effort to understand how the level of self-esteem influences the child daily life or school life and vice-versa.

The knowledge of these processes is also important to the Clinical Psychologist for diagnosis, counselling and therapeutical intervention.

Methodological reasons led this researcher to the choice of academically unsuccessful children who remain in the regular school (and not those removed to the special school).

In this study we will consider repeating children, those that, due to academic difficulties, remain another year in the same grade. Non-repeating children are those who don't have to repeat.

This study is guided basically by the following **questions**:

1. **How** do repeating and non-repeating children **perceive** and **evaluate** themselves?
2. How do they **value** their ability and competence?
3. To what measure are their perceptions and evaluations distant or close to those made by **Teachers**?
4. Which is the relationship between the perceived **academic competence** and the perceived **global self-esteem** as a person?

Will repeating schoolchildren tend to show a self-depreciation as a consequence of that experience?

The search for the answer to these questions will be developed across a theorectical framework where the references underlying this project will be emphasized, with a further description of the method used here. Then, the analysis and discussion of the results will be followed by the confrontation with the preliminary experimental questions.

2. THEORECTICAL FRAMEWORK

The relevance of the study and research on self-concept in a developmental perspective lays in the understanding of the relationship between social behaviour and cognitive development. It also concurs to provide well-being to the child, the sense of personal worth, helping him/her to form a positive self-image, and to identify and develop his/her qualities.

In the particular case of behaviour in the school conduct, one finds indications from some authors (BANDURA, 1977; COVINGTON, 1984; NICHOLLS, 1982; WEINER, 1979) that the child's perception of reality would have a much stronger predictive value of his/her orientation for academic success than reality itself (school marks, tested abilities and so on).

In the last 15 years the self has been "rehabilitated" as a valid theorectical construct. It became an object of study for the representatives of different theorectical areas such as social, learning, causal attribution, developmentalism or, even, the clinical psychologists adopting cognitive-behaviourist treatment models.

This phenomenon appeared after periods of enthusiasm (introspeccionism, f. ex.) which followed periods of desinterest due, to the rising of behaviourism or to the dissatisfaction caused by the results of the american affective educational programmes designed to ameliorate children's self-images.

An acceptable **definition** of self may be the one proposed by BANNISTER (6, p.253), which emphasizes the following qualities:

- the notion that each individual has of **being different** from the others, based on the experience of the difference between the comunication with himself (internal) and with the others (externalized);
- the notion of **integrity**, of the strictly personal experience contour;
- the notion of the **performance of individuality** along the time, that provides the feeling of continuity, of one's life;

- the notion the individual has of being **subject** of decisions, as **causing** events and sharing the responsibility of the consequences of his actions;
- the notion of the "other" by analogy with himself, in which **different subjective** experiences are **compared**;
- the awareness of having a self, of being simultaneously **"I" and "Me"**.

Many theorists of the self did not take the perspective of the self in development. Therefore, their work was quite unsatisfactory, namely with respect to the question about the self (wich displays the subject as observer and as an observed object) which is influenced by changes in cognitive processes occurring along infancy, adolescence and adulthood.

The approach to the self in the **social context** complements the perspective of individual development because it takes place also in the interaction with the others. The child does not have from birth an already made self-image. He/She acquires it through experience and, specially, by observation of other people's reactions to him/her and by the opinions from others.

In this perspective, the central question is to know how the judgements made by the **significant persons** influence the child's self-concept. The ability to decentrate (in Piagetian terms) and to consider the other plays an important role in the development of self-awareness.

The analysis of the involved processes lays, inevitably, in an area where cognitive developmental factors intersect social factors.

The self-concept development has been frequently approched in parallel to the evaluative orientation of the "I", called **self-esteem**.

Self-esteem has an evaluative component. Unlike conceptual understanding, it may have a positive or a negative value which is quantitatively measurable.

It is commonly assumed among psychologists and teachers that the positive or negative feelings the child has towards him/herself influence significantly his/her relationship with others, school achievement mental health and adaptation to the environment (JERSILD, 1952; ROSENBERG, 1979). DEBORAH PHILLIPS (19) found that about 20% of 117 academically competent fifth graders - both girls and boys - showed low perceived competence associated with lower standards and expectancies for success than children whose self-perceptions were adequate. As the author refers, children whose express doubts in their abilities are particularly vulnerable to academic pressures, showing discouragement and behaviours largely independent of academic ability.

Do girls and boys perceive themselves differently?

Self-concept studies focusing sex differences are not conclusive and raise some controversy. When sex differences are found they emphasize, for ex., boys' higher scores on "lie" scales and "defensiveness" scales, while girls tend to assume more easily their weaknesses; or that teachers tend to rate girls as having higher self-esteem, although the same boys and girls do not differ in their self evaluations, according to COOPERSMITH (1959, 1967) (16).

Similarly, OMARK, *et al.* (1973) (16) found that boys overestimate their position in a "toughness hierarchy more often than girls did. "Machismo" is an interesting aspect of boys' ego defenses and expresses a denial of feminin attributes by exaggeration of super masculine behaviour (16p. 160). According to BOGO *et al.* (1970) boys defend their egos more by turning against a real or presumed external frustrating object, whereas girls tend to self-blame.

WHITING and POPE (1974) (16) found that boys from different cultures tend to "show off" more frequently and that sex differences seem to be stronger at 7-11 years of age.

In her Manual for the "Self-Perception Profile for Children", S. HARTER refers, for ex., that among elementary and middle school children boys perceive themselves as significantly more athletically competent than girls. Self-perceived behaviour and self-perceived appearance are more favourable for girls than for boys in middle school.

Research on this field comes across the difficulty to find a satisfactory theorectical frame of reference about the self-understanding development, following WYLIE's conclusions (1979), in her review of the litterature (in 3).

There is a **proliferation** of studies on self-concept and self-esteem, but many of them show neither a clear theorectical definition of these constructs nor its operational definition.

The **diversity of instruments** created to measure self-concept and self-esteem confirms the variety of theories about the **nature** of the same.

The attempts to operationalize these concepts did not meet all the requirements. This happened even with well known scales, such as COOPERSMITH's "Self-Esteem Inventory" (1967) or the PIERS-HARRIS' "Self-Concept Scale" (1964, 1969). Their items cover a large range of contents: cognitive competences, personality traits, popularity, etc..

This diversity is not an obstacle to the simple addition of the answers. In COOPERSMITH's procedure the total score has an indicatory value of global self-esteem.

Thus COOPERSMITH (1967), among others, assumes self-concept as an **unidimensional** construct. He does not believe that children are able to make differentiations of their specific competences.

PIERS-HARRIS' approach (1969) adopted a theorectical model placed between the **unidimensional and the multidimensional** model although, at the begining, self-concept had been considered as unidimensional. Factorial analysis revealed, then, the existence of different factors. This conclusion put in evidence the need for measures, adequate to the evaluation of specific areas, as S. HARTER remarks (14).

The **hierarchichal** models of the self classify self-concept and self-esteem as a superior category, under which other categories of the self are organized. Their representatives, EPSTEIN (1973) on the one side, or SHAVELSON, HUBNER and STANTON (1976) on the other side, or still L'ÉCUYER, have selected self-concept at the top of the hierarchy. They differ, basically, in the classification and in the number of subcategories.

Hierarchichal models represent a progress in the understanding of the Self, when they are compared with the preceding models. However, they still contain important limitations, namely in what concerns the agreement between the hierarchizing of the different domains, conceived by theorists, and different forms of hierarchizing made by individuals.

ROSENBERG (1979) represents a fourth approach when he identifies, in adults, the sense of **global** personal worth above the judgements made about specific areas in their lifes.

The self-esteem global evaluation is considered a valid entity **by itself** (and not by addition of the answers to several specific areas). The measure created by him contains this distinction and makes its **direct** evaluation (instead of evaluating presumed specific bases of self-esteem).

The combination of the multidimensional perspective of judgements, in specific areas, with that of the global self-esteem and its evaluation considering the importance attributed by the subject, represents the fifth theorectical model.

TESSER *et al.*, (1980, 1983) (14) have remarked that adults' self-esteem is affected when they make low self-evaluations of their competence in an area judged important.

Moving herself in this theorectical area, **SUSAN HARTER**, has made important advances both at the conceptual level and at the concepts operationalization level.

This is the basic theorectical reference of the present work.

SUSAN HARTER built a perspective of self-concept **in development** along the individual's life. Her approach has its roots in the research that has been done from the 70's. Those works assumed the individual differences and the modifications inherent to the self-concept developments.

One of her main objectives has been the understanding of the **functional** role of self-esteem and "the impact that self-worth has on one's affective and motivational orientation" (15, page 2), added to the study of its **determinants** and **antecedents**.

Along the child's growth the number of self-concept areas increases and he/she becomes more and more able to **differentiate** and to **articulate** them.

Following HARTER and PIKE (1984) (15),children aged 4 to 7 years are already able to make reliable judgements about their cognitive competence, social acceptance and behaviour, although these domain are not yet completely differentiated. The instrument used to measure has a pictorial presentation of concrete manifestations of relevant behaviours.

Only after some years later on, are children able to express and to make reliable judgements about their global worth as a person (when their cognitive development allows the concept formation). This chronology is conditioned by the adjustement of children's verbalization, which is a limitation of the self-evaluation measures for the younger children.

After 8 years of age, the change in the self-concept structure is shown by the child's ability to make and express judgements about his/her global worth and to differentiate more specific domains. These are: Scholastic Competence, Athletic Competence, Social Acceptance by Peers, Behavioural Conduct and Physical Appearance.

This evolution reveals the hierarchichal nature of the self evaluation process: self-esteem is a superordinate construct and judgements about competence are lower order category (12). The articulation and the discrimination of specific areas progresses and adolescents are also able to discriminate Close Friendship, Romantic Appeal and Job Competence. Although Close Friendship, for ex., is familiar to older children, it is not yet differentiated from the more general acceptance by peers (HARTER((15).

SUSAN HARTER and her collaborators identified specific domains for College students and adults, for whom they created adequate measure instruments based on these specific conceptual structures.

The scale for children is not appropriate for **special groups**, such as mental retardation or learning difficulties. These children produce different factorial models. For this reason HARTER (1985) and RESNICK (1985) (13) have proposed specific scales for each one of these groups.

Some of the most significant changes in self-concept occurred in the developmental stages focused here are made salient:

- During childhood and adolescence modifications seem to occur in terms of cognitive development of the ability to differentiate more areas of self-concept. **After** adolescence, the distinctions of different domains indicate changes in the valuation of certain aspects of life.
- The younger children represent cognitive **competence** through basic knowledge: the colours, the letters, the numbers. Older children and adolescents show a change oriented toward academic performance.
- The nature of social relationships influence on self-concept also takes different forms: in two first periods of childhood it is measured by a single scale of acceptance by peers, while in adolescence it becomes necessary to use a distinction of acceptance by peers under the form of popularity, of the ability to make and keep close friends and the romantic appeal.
- In what concerns behaviour and morality domains there are also changes in the content. The youngest are more worried with the **observable** behaviours, specially those punished by adults.
- From the age of 8 years children show that they have already formed the cognitive concept of their worth as a person (what should not be confounded with general competence).

S. HARTER's conceptual and practical model contains the possibility of studying the relationship of the global self-esteem with the perceived specific competences.

In the study of the determinants of global self-esteem S.HARTER resorted to **W.JAMES'** (1892) and **COOLEY's** (1909) theories which, in spite of being different, are complementary.

Self-esteem, according to **W. JAMES**, derives from the relationship between the competence judged by the subject and the competence to which he aspires. Different persons attach a different value to success in each domain of life. As a result, if the evaluated competence is lower than the aspired competence, self-esteem will be low.

COOLEY's contribution consists of a conception of global self-concept as a social construction. The sense of personal worth derives from the internalization of attitudes that the subject thinks the significant persons have toward him, from the informations they express about himself.

S. HARTER determines the relationship between competence in areas judgeg important and global self-esteem through the calculation of the **discrepancy** between competence/adequacy perceived by the child (in the "Self-Perception Profile") and the importance ("pretensions" in JAMES) he/she ascribes to each one of the 5 areas.

The lower the discrepancy, the higher the self-esteem score. The higher the importance ascribed to an area in which perceived competence is low, the lower will be the self-esteem score.

HARTER's investigations led to the conclusion that, following COOLEY's conceptualization, the more the child feels the significant others care for him/her, the higher his/her sense of global personal worth, the higher is the regard to him/herself.

In what concerns the effects of each one of these constructs, both are conclusive. According to HARTER (15), the congruence of competence and importance hierarchies does not protect completely the child from the impact of a low level of the significant others' regard. And the child receiving high levels of **support** from the **significant** others is, even so, vulnerable to the impact of a high discrepancy score.

The **value** of each specific area as a **predictor** of global personal worth varies and Physical Appearance is the most important, followed by Social Acceptance.

The interpretation of these results is polemic. Its discussion will be retaken in the final part of this work.

In what concerns the social areas, there is a different contribution from each **source of support**. The support from parents and classmates represents the main influence on global self-esteem (correlations between .42 and .46). Less important (with a lower impact) is the support from the close friend and the teacher (correlations between .27 and .37).

In order to complete the set of basic concepts used in this work, concept of academic failure/success of schoolchildren, or repetition/non repetition of grade to use a more objective term, will be presented next.

The Portuguese definition for repetition in primary school follows the "rule" of definitions and decisions in the context of the educational policy in a country. As happens in other countries, the analysis of previous experience has an ideological content.

In a relatively recent past, academic experience was defined by reference to a system in which there were 4 levels in primary school. Children who did not reach the academic objectives determined by the teacher would "fail" and, the following year, they would remain in the same grade, repeating the complete academic program of the last year. Portuguese figures for repetition were calculated for each one of the four grades and/or for the total of grades.

More recently the grading system was divided into "phases". The 4 years of primary school were grouped in 2 phases, each phase consisting of 2 years. This system was designed to prevent and reduce the high level of repetition of grades. The theorectical basis consisted of the recognition of different development rates in children. The existance of 2 phases (each one having 2 grades) was considered as favourable to academic progresses according to the individual learning rate.

The system of "phases" provides the child more time to recover from academic slowness. Children with a ~~ø~~ lower development/learning rate would not be at a disadvantage, since the progress from 1st to 2nd year is automatic in each phase.

It is in this context that repetition occurs, when the pupil makes his/her matriculation for the 3rd or more times in the same phase. For example, the figures for repetition in Portugal in 1982 was 41% for the 1st Phase and 27% for the 2nd Phase. In 1987, the global figures for repetition was 41% (according to "G.E.P." - Ministry of Education). And, each schoolyear, about 1% of children leave school prematurely (before the age limit of 14 years old).

From now on, it is necessary to know what happens to such a high number of children experiencing repetition at school. Some questions come easily: to what extent does this experience **affect** their self-concept as persons, their academic self-concept, their aspirations for the future?

However, it is also reasonable to reflect on the extent to whih many of those children would have more unfavourable aspirations and self-concepts than other children, **before** repetition was formally assumed by the school.

The use of HARTER's scales will help to understand some aspects involved in this process and allows the reformulation of the initial **questions** in more specific terms:

1. Will there be significant differences between repeating and non repeating children in their self-perception?

2. Will the importance ascribed by repeating and non repeating children to their competences in specific domains be significantly different?

3. How do the **discrepancy** scores between perceived **competence/adequacy** and importance judgements vary in both groups of children?

4. To what extent is **perceived** competence/adequacy close to or far from **teachers' judgements** in both groups of children?

5. Which of the five areas of competence/adequacy has more influence upon global self-esteem?

6. Are there significant modifications in social acceptance of repeating children by the peers (repeating pupils make new acquaintances each year they repeat)?

Next, the methodology will be presented in order to analyse the results.

3. METHOD

3.1. SUBJECTS

The total sample consists of 68 children, aged 10-12 years, caucasian, attending the 3rd or 4rd grade in primary school in 1987/1988. It is divided in two groups of 34 children (17 girls and 17 boys). In **one group** children **repeated 2 or more years** since their 1st grade; in the **other group**, children **never** repeated the year.

They come from 3 suburban schools of Lisbon. The schools are **mixed** in what concerns the SES of their families. There is a predominance of middle-class families.

The children have neither psychiatric problems, serious health problems or physical disabilities.

The differentiation of **school achievement** is made by using the simple available criteria: 2 or more years of repetition/no repetition.

This is due to the fact that Portuguese elementary school does not use any classifying system with standardized marks or achievement tests. In addition, one year of repetition was considered a short experience, not satisfactory for the purposes of the study.

The selection of the children was based on school records concerning age, race and achievement (repeating or passing in each schoolyear).

All the available repeating children in the required conditions were used in the sample. The non repeating children were selected randomly, in each classroom.

The number of children initially expected decreased because some teachers made mistakes about the number of years of repetition, age and some even indicated non-white children (teachers' fatigue was obvious in the last months of the schoolyear).

Although most of the children were attending the 4th grade, five children at the 3rd grade were accepted. Their situation was a guaranty they had a satisfactory level of reading competence and autonomy for adequate interpretation of the questionnaires.

The last months of the schoolyear - May and June - were chosen to administer the questionnaires because, at that time, it was easier to find non repeating children aged 10 years.

3.2. INSTRUMENTS

Three questionnaires from SUSAN HARTER were used:

A - The "**Self-Perception Profile for Children**" ("What I am like?");

B - The "**Importance Scale**" ("How important are these things to how you feel about yourself as a Person?");

C - The "Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's Actual Behaviour".

The first two questionnaires are filled out by the child and the third by the teacher.

Children's Questionnaires

A - The "**Self-Perception Profile for Children**" (SUSAN HARTER, 1985) can be used with children aged from 8 years attending, at least, the 3rd grade. It is a revision of the "Perceived Competence Scale for Children" (S. HARTER, 1972, 1982).

It is composed by 6 subscales. Five of them focuse on the following specific areas:

1. Scholastic Competence
2. Social Acceptance
3. Athletic Competence
4. Physical Appearance
5. Behavioural Conduct

The sixth is the **global self-worth** scale.

The scale has 36 items divided into groups of 6 items in each subscale.

The title of the scale reflects the expression of children's perceptions of themselves; the aspect of being a "profile" reflects the possibility of studying accurately one's self-concept through the analysis of differences in a subject's scores, obtained in different specific areas.

The problems associated with the classic two-choice format ("True-False" or "Like Me-Unlike Me") of self-concept scales were drastically reduced by HARTER's advantageous alternative **format.** Socially desirable responses from children will hardly take place in these questionnaire format, given the type of question and the process of choice it demands.

Example:

Really true for Me	Sort of true for Me				Sort of true for Me	Really true for Me
☐	☐	Some kids have a lot of friends	BUT	Other kids don't have very many friends	☐	☐

In first place, the child has to decide which kind of kid he/she is most like and, then, whether that is sort of true or really true for him/her.

As S. HARTER states (13) "The effectiveness of this question format lies in the evidence from statistical data", and in the conclusion that "half of the kids in the world (or in one's reference group) view themselves in one way, whereas the other half view themselves in the opposite manner". This aspect is reinforced by the fact that children verbally express accurate self-perceptions rather than socially desirable answers when they are asked for the reasons of their choice.

There is no possibility for the child to make artificial choices due to some perceived constant arrangement of the items. The **structure** of the questionnaire contains, in each subscale, 3 items in which the first part of the statement reflects high competence or adequacy and low competence or adequacy in the other 3 items, arranged randomly.

The general **scoring procedures** consists of scoring each item on a 4 point scale, where the score 1~~4~~ indicates low perceived competence, and the score 4 indicates high perceived competence - both correspond to "Really True for me" type of description. The scores 2 and 3 indicate the child's choice is "Sort of True" for him/her, in a more self-unfavourable or self-favourable description, respectively.

B - Importance Scale

It is a ten-item scale that measures the child's importance judgements about the five specific areas. There are 2 items for each one of the specific areas.

The scoring procedure is similar to the previous scale.

It provides the study of the relationship between competence in areas judged important and global self-worth.

W. JAMES' assumption - that only those areas in which personal success is considered important will affect general self-esteem - underlies HARTER's procedure in calculating the discrepancy scores. Thus, the children's importance scores taken in account are **3.0** (Sort of Important), **3.5** (Median Importance), or **4.0** (Very Important).

A specific formula works the comparison between perceived competence and judgement of importance in the five competence/adequacy areas. It makes possible the comparison between the mean discrepancy score for a specific domain and global self-worth score.

The questionnaires for children can be administered individually or in group.

C - **"Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's Actual behaviour".**

In their questionnaire, teachers rate the child's actual behaviour in each specific area, in parallel with the "Self-perception Profile for Children".

For each specific area three items were considered sufficient to obtain high reliable judgements, following the results from HARTER's experience with teachers' ratings. Global self-worth items were eliminated because the attributes involved are not observable objectively.

Teachers' scores can be compared directly with the child's scores, which is useful for comparative studies. For this reason, this scale may be used by teachers as well as by counselors, therapists, parents, etc., in order to rate the child's perceived competence or adequacy.

3.3. PROCEDURE

Children's Questionnaires Administration

Perceived Competence Scale and Importance Scale were previously administred to 10 children (chosen by the 2 variables sex and achievement) in the first Portuguese version.

This pre-test situation had the purposes of training the researcher in the administration of the scales and selecting the vocabulary and sentence structure more familiar to the children.

The review of the questionnaires produced two alterations in items 21 and 29 of the Self-Perception Scale.

After the review, the questionnaires were administered to groups of **four or five** children, during playtime (about 30 or 40 minutes) or after school activity. The place was the classroom or a quiet place when the other children were in the playground and the teachers had gone out.

The formation of groups with a **maximum of 5 children** was decided for different reasons.

The main reason refers to some **children's distractibility** and its prejudice on the interpretation and fulfilling of the items. It was observed that, when controlling the answer (by suggestion of the researcher) the child became **surprised** because the marked choice did **not** correspond to the choice he/she had in mind. Others had **forgotten** the instructions.

After introducing the scale, the sample item was read outloud by the researcher. Children were asked to produce **similar** examples. Each one of them was encouraged to read outloud **by himself** one or two of the first items, in order to facilitate his/her concentration on the task (about 70% of the children were proud when they read for the others). This was **repeated** occasionaly along the remaining items to help the maintenance of **attention**.

This methodology seems to be useful in preventing false choices. The Self-Perception Scale is particularly long and perhaps a little **tiresome** for some children. The researcher would find it difficult to follow adequately children's behaviour if the group was much larger.

About 60% of the children filled out both questionnaires - Self-Perception Scale and Importance Scale - in only one session. The remaining needed another 10 or 15 minutes more (in a total of 50 minutes).

Children accepted and **collaborated** very well. About 40% wanted to know if their written opinions would be shown to their teachers. When they were told that their **responses destination** was the researcher herself they expressed their relief. They felt more at ease to make "whatever choices they wished to".

Their **curiosity** about the purpose of their collaboration and of the researcher's work was satisfied with the following **explanation**: the researcher is interested on a better understanding of how children develop and wishes to know how children of their age think and give opinions about themselves and what they do.

15% of the children wished to know if their answers were "correct"; they found it hard to accept that there was no right or wrong answers.

After finishing their work, children often said they had enjoyed it. As they finished their task they came back to help their peers.

Ten children called the researcher's attention to the **differentiation** they made of **their behaviours** in different situations on item 5 of the questionnaire "What I am like". For example, one boy explained that he behaves well in the classroom but he behaves badly in the playground.

On item 27 (games and sports) of the same questionnaire three repeating children explained they **behave differently** in the school playground and in the street where they live. One of them went into curious detail saying: "At school I am not allowed to play because I am big; if I play I'll become afraid of hurting the kids. But I'm always playing in my street, because they are big there".

The remaining children made superficial comments such as "It was easy to understand" or "I did not understand only one word".

Administration of Teachers' Questionnaire

The sixteen teachers involved were female and were working in their profession for more than 3 years. One was teaching for the first time and the remaining worked for 2 or more years in their present school (1987/88).

In order to make it clear to the teachers the kind of collaboration expected from them, **written information** about the **aims** of the study and the **criteria** for selection was given to the Headteacher in an interview. The Headteacher and the researcher agreed on the conditions for the meetings with teachers and pupils concerned. Each teacher of the 1st and 2nd year of the 2nd phase received the written information from the Headteacher in April 1988.

A few personal contacts with the teachers were necessary until the relevant informations about the children were available. There was opportunity for exchange of information..

All the teachers kindly complied with the researcher's request (even the three teachers who were reluctant at the begining because this will be "one more questionnaire to fill out, in accumulation with others to fill obligatorly in the end of the schoolyear"). Agreement was made on the calendar for the researcher's meetings with the children.

Sometimes, teachers tried to take advantage of the researcher's presence as a psychologist, to discuss problems they were worried about. In their opinion, if these children filled out the questionnaires there would be more information about their psychological problems and a better understanding of their educational needs.

"Teachers Rating Scale" was delivered to each teacher **after** all the children had filled their questionnaires. Teachers found the instructions clear enough. They expressed curiosity about what they would find out when they could compare their ratings with children's judgements.

When the questionnaires returned, teachers said they were a bit **confused** about the items related to **sports**; they did not know to judge the child's **athletic competence**. There are some aspects of the school's mode of functioning and teacher's work underlying the mentioned difficulties.

Portuguese elementary school does not have a real sports program. Very often the physical conditions in the school are not adequate. Teachers have learnt some general techniques about the subject, but they are more **concerned** with the **scholastic achievement** of their 3rd or 4th graders than with child's physical activity. The amount of time alloted to sports depends on the teacher's decision and work conditions .

Thus, many teachers did not have the slightest idea about their pupils' competence in this area, while 30% had made some **sporadic** observations, which was not enough to rate objectively. The researcher's **indication** was that teachers should rate in accordance with their judgements about **outdoor games**. This was the only acceptable solution for all the teachers, except for two, who never had looked at their pupils playing in the playground. They were invited to judge their (four) pupils' competence in both sports and outdoor games as objectively as possible.

3.4. TEACHERS' SUGGESTIONS

The good collaboration of teachers is also revealed in the suggestions made, namely concerning the advantage of adding items refering to the relationship among peers at school and agressive behaviour specially.

Putting together what each one said, three main aspects emerge:

1) Criticism to the questionnaires format, structure and content.
2) Comments upon children's expressed self-perceptions.
3) Recognition of the advantages such a research project brings to the teacher's ideas.

1) Teachers criticized:

- the characteristics of the **text**: the child is forced to read it from top to bottom, instead of reading from left to right, which may cause additional difficulties for dyslexic children or for those who have lateralization problems;
- the **spatial** dispositions of the 2 squares before the piece of ~~the~~ text on the left column: it forces the child to go back, after reading the text, which makes the task more confusing;
- the use of "**AND**" (in the present portuguese version); it should be substituted by "OR", because it demarcates more clearly the difference of opinions (on the left and right column);
- **item 8**, in the "Self-Perception Profile": "Some kids have a lot of friends"/"Other kids don't have very many friends" statements should be substituted be "Some Kids have more friends than others"/"Other kids have less friends than others;
- the **structure** of the **sentences** and the vocabulary are difficult to understand at this age, namely the terms "physical appearance" and "as a person";
- the **general structure** of the scales and the "complicate process of personal choice it implies"; some teachers found "it probably is easy to fill out by american primary schoolchildren because they are familiar with this kind of questionnaire" but "not adapted to portuguese children who never saw such a questionnaire".

Other teachers expressed a more optimistc view, saying that the questionnaires are accessible to these children if they have enough opportunities to learn how to fill them out.

2) Teachers made the following comments about children's self-perception:

- the opinions given by many children are contradictory, because they expressed self-favourable or unfavourable opinion about the same area content, which is dispersed by different items;
- some children seem to give answers to please adults;
- the answers given by some children suggest they find it difficult to distinguish between what they **are**, what they **should** be, and what they **would** like to be;
- there were opinions considered "realistic" by the teachers and coincident with their judgements;
- other opinions surprised the teachers because they were unexpected but, in any case, they were considered "sincere";
- some children's answers were judged "irrealistic" because they overestimated or underestimated some personal aspects;
- according to 80% of the teachers, the more "realistic" and "adequate" self-perceptions tend to be made by "most able", "the most intelligent" and the "most mature" children. These characteristics are found predominantly in the non repeating children.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The data will be analysed and discussed according to the six initial questions presented in the theorectical part.

4.1. TREATMENT

Children's and teachers' answers were scored following HARTER's procedures, including her four point scale.

ANOVA-2 was used to study children's self evaluations in the five specific areas of competence/adequacy, the judged importance and the discrepancies between competence and importance.

Matched-pair t tests were used to compare the children's self-evaluations with judgement made by teachers, allowing the discrimination of sex differences, as well as repeating/non repeating children differences.

Correlational studies were made for the sample and for the four sub-groups (constituted by criteria of sex/repetition) in order to allow a better understanding of the results.

Multiple regression test was used to identify which specific area(s) influences global self-worth more strongly.

4.2. RESULTS

The more relevant results will be evidenced.

The comparison of the perceived competences (Question 1) shows significant differences in only two specific areas. Repeating children evaluate themselves as less competent in their academic life than non-repeating children do ($p<.003$). Self-perceived behaviour is less favourable for boys than for girls ($p<.001$).

TABLE 1

Mean Harter Self-Concept Scores as a Function of Repetition and Gender, with 2-way ANOVA's (n=17 per cell).

	Sub-scale Area					
Repetition	Scholastic Competence	Social Acceptance	Athletic Competence	Physical Appearance	Behavioural Conduct	Self-Worth
Repeating						
Girls	2.44	2.57	2.61	3.05	3.14	2.88
Boys	2.44	2.72	2.84	3.21	2.94	2.88
Non Repeating						
Girls	2.92	2.80	2.64	3.36	3.45	3.46
Boys	2.83	2.84	2.60	3.15	2.76	2.94
F Ratios						
Repetition	9.82 (003)	.21	.48	.38	.26	3.08
Gender	.12	.49	.53	.84	2.44 (001)	1.78
Interaction	.13	.70	.13	.20	3.90	5.71 (020)

Significance levels in brackets

In what concerns self-worth, the interaction sex x repet~~ance~~ition is significant ($p<.02$). The four sub-groups show positive self evaluations although non repeating girls' evaluations are significantly higher than their repeating peers ($t=2.93$, $p<.007$), than non repeating boys ($t=3.16$, $p<.003$) and repeating boys ($t=2.25$, $p<.032$.)

The **importance** (Question 2) ascribed to the specific areas by repeating and non repeating girls and boys does not differ significantly. **Academic Competence** and **Behavioural Conduct** are the **more** valued specific areas.

TABLE 2

Mean Perceived Importance of Areas of Harter's Self-Concept Scores as a Function of Repetition and Gender, with 2-way ANOVA's (n=17 per cell)

	Sub-scale Area				
Repetition	Scholastic Competence	Social Acceptance	Athletic Competence	Physical Appearance	Behavioural Conduct
Repeating					
Girls	3.52	3.26	2.58	3.14	2.29
Boys	3.50	3.38	3.20	2.97	3.35
Non Repeating					
Girls	3.82	3.05	2.70	3.26	3.58
Boys	3.61	3.20	3.02	3.08	3.50

The **discrepancy** between perceived competence/adequacy and the judged importance (Question 3) varies only in the **Athletic** area, in which **boys** show a **higher** discrepancy score. Only 11 girls and 22 boys found this area important.

TABLE 3

Mean Perceived Competence/Importance Discrepancy Scores as a Function of Repet~~ance~~ition and Gender with 2-way ANOVA's (n's variable).

	Sub-scale Area				
Repetition	Scholastic Competence	Social Acceptance	Athletic Competence	Physical Appearance	Behavioural Conduct
Repeating					
Girls	-1.24 (15)	-0.79 (15)	.76 (4)	-.44 (10)	-0.30 (14)
Boys	-1.05 (17)	-0.86 (15)	-.61 (13)	-.22 (10)	-0.47 (15)
Non Repeating					
Girls	-0.92 (16)	-0.46 (12)	-.12 (7)	-.11 (14)	-0.14 (16)
Boys	-0.84 (17)	-0.60 (13)	-1.02 (9)	-.03 (13)	-0.84 (15)
F Ratios					
Repetition	.97	.21	.06	.07	.46
Gender	.32	.99	7.96 (006)	.79	.96
Interaction	.32	1.00	3.11	.80	.48

Significance levels in brackets; n's also in brackets.

It is interesting to note the **inexistence** of a significant difference between the discrepancy of repeating and non repetating children in **Academic** area.

Teachers' judgements about competence/adequacy are **close** to children's self-evaluations (Question 4) in **Academic Competence**, in the sense that their judgements make clear distinctions between repeating and non repeating children (p<.001). As their pupils, teachers find that **girls** behave **better** than boys (p<.001). But they also find that repeating pupils behave worse than non repeating pupils. This distinction does not appear in children's judgements.

On the contrary, teacher's judgements **deviate** from children's self-evaluations (they are more favourable than children's) in the **Social Acceptance** (p=.008), **Athletic Competence** (p=.043) and **Physical Appearance** (p=.016) areas.

TABLE 4

Harter Self-Concept Mean Scores: Child's Own and Teacher's Ratings (Matched-Pairs t test, n=68).

	Sub-scale Area				
Source of Rating	Scholastic Competence	Social Acceptance	Athletic Competence	Physical Appearance	Behavioural Conduct
Child	2.66	2.47	2.69	3.20	3.08
Teacher	2.62	3.04	2.89	3.42	2.93
t	.39	2.73	2.06	2.48	1.61
p	.70	.008	.043	.016	.112

Global self-worth is more strongly **influenced** (Question 5) by Behavioural Conduct (r=.60) and Physical Appearance (r=.56). Therefore, it is possible to conclude, for the **total sample**, that being well behaved and physically attractive is particularly important to these children's sense of self-worth.

However, these conclusions become **misleading** when one observes the results, of the correlations coefficient of global self-worth with the five specific areas.

This correlational study is indispensable for the reason of the importance of its conclusions:

- The correlations are **stonger** in the **total** sample than in the two groups;
- The **sub-groups** (sex x repetition) show **differences**, namely the non repeating girls, who show high correlations for the 3 specific areas with global self-worth.
- The sub-group of the **repeating boys** also shows differences: only the behaviour area influences significantly their global self-worth.
- **Non-repeating girls'** self-worth is strongly influenced by 3 specific areas: Behavioural Conduct, Academic Competence and Social Acceptance.
- In the **repeating girls'** case there is a correlation at **.86** between Physical Appearance and global self-worth, which means that being physically attractive is important to their sense of self-worth.

The **Social Acceptance** (Question 6) of repeating pupils is not put in doubt. Being well accepted by the peers is more important for the non-repeating girls and is almost insignificant for the repeating girls. There is a general good social acceptance of all the sub-groups of children by both peers and teachers.

TABLE 5

Mean Teacher Ratings of Children on Harter Scales as a Function of Repetition and Gender, with 2-way ANOVA's (n=17 per cell).

	Sub-scale Area				
Repetition	Scholastic Competence	Social Acceptance	Athletic Competence	Physical Appearance	Behavioural Conduct
Repeating					
Girls	2.07	2.99	2.70	3.19	3.13
Boys	2.09	2.80	2.92	3.17	2.19
Non Repeating					
Girls	3.17	3.17	2.97	3.76	3.50
Boys	3.19	3.17	2.95	3.56	2.90
F Ratios					
Repetition	21.71 (001)	2.56	.96	8.41 ((.006)	7.73 ((.007)
Gender	.00	.34	.38	.42	15.90 ((.001)
Interaction	.02	.33	.55	.28	.79

Significance levels in brackets; n's also in brackets.

5. CONCLUSIONS

These children, aged 10 to 12 years, are not only able to evaluate and discriminate their own specific competences, but also to express them clearly and realistically. One examle is that of the repeating children when they express a low perceived academic competences (lower than their non repeating peers)

The analysis of the results **puts in question** the **design** itself. The "comparison repeating/non repeating children" type of questions does not provide a satisfactory design for the study of their self-concept and self-esteem.

As shown before, the simple comparison of the two groups is misleading the comprehension of these processes and hides important differences among sub-groups. The correlations for the total sample are more significant than for the sub-groups.

In parallel, some usually expected differences did not occur. It's the case of repeating children's global self-worth, which is not significantly affected by their low perceived academic competence. And it is not lower than non repeating children's self-worth although there is a significant gender x repetition interaction (due to the non-repeating girl's scores, which are significantly **higher** than those of the other sub-groups).

Thus, there is no evidence, here, of a characteristic pattern for the repeating children, for the girls or for the boys.

The fact that the repeating children express a **lower** perceived **academic competence**, in accordance to their teachers, **does not affect** neither the **importance** they ascribe to that competence nor their **global self-worth**.

These children seem to have somewhat lower aspirations than their non repeating peers, because the discrepancy scores of perceived competence and their aspirations are not significantly different.

Global self-worth mean is higher for girls (they conform more to their teachers' "ideal type" of pupil) than for boys, although these have a positive mean.

Non repeating girls' self-worth is strongly influenced by perceived Behavioural Conduct, Academic Competence and Social Acceptance. This means that they feel well as a person being well behaved in the classroom, doing well at school and being sociable.

The fact that teachers' rates of boys' behaviour are more unfavourable than boys's own self-evaluations suggests that they may be less vulnerable to adults' definition of the "ideal pupil",in our culture.

The **repeating girls** - they are not considered academically competent or particularly well behaved - seem to have recourse to a **source of personal worth**. Physical Appearance and, to a lower degree, Athletic Competence. To be physically attractive (to males?) seems to be specially important to their sense of self-worth. Although less important, it is somewhat surprising that to be agile and good at physical activity is a significant source of personal satisfaction (in HARTER's findings this area is more important for boys than for girls).

In the particular case of repeating boys, it is not so easy to understand which is the source of personal satisfaction. On one side, their self-worth mean is not very low; on the other side they have a low academic competence and are considered the less well behaved by teachers.

According to this, they do not conform to the "ideal pupil" and do not show important sources of personal satisfaction, as far as HARTER's scales cam measure.

Thus, it seems acceptable to put the hypothesis that **those sources** are not measured by these scales and will refer to different values. In this case, the **explanation** will go in

P.ROBINSON's theorectical direction (20), in the sense that these boys may have built a system of values, alternative to those existent in school, which will be an important source of their personal worth. This will provide the maintenance of self-worth along the prolonged experience of academic failure. Those values will be based on characteristics of adult behaviour.

As there are no measures of these aspects in the present work, it is only possible to refer to some of the **teachers information** about boys involved in petty crime (and about 70% help their father in his activities of subsistence).

Knowing that also about 70% of the repeating girls baby sit for their younger brothers and sisters and participate actively in their mothers' tasks at home, one wonders to what extent the **time** consumed in **adult work** is an important factor leading to repetition at school. Or, still, to what extent it represents a number of social-familiar factors that are adverse to these children's academic success.

Repeating children are not negatively discriminated at the social level in school. Although there are some individual expressed preoccupations, they do not seem to affect their satisfactory social participation.

Final synthesis:

- **No** significant association was found between **repetition** and **global self-worth.**

- The research focusing on the individual differences **within** groups is more fruitful. It provides more reliable, informations about **real** bases of children's sense os self-worth than the simple analysis of differences **across** groups.

Using such an approach, a further research about the bases of self-concept and self-esteem of repeating children (both those who remain in school and these who leave school prematurely) will provide a constructive view towards educational reforms designed to prevent academic failure.

HARTER's scales can be used as instruments to **explore qualitatively** children's judgements, during interviews. The data obtained could eventually provide ideas for specialized instruments for research in this field.

This work - even within its limitations - alerts teachers and other professionals concerned to the need for more "realistic" evaluations of the bases of children's general behaviour and the underlying values.

A better understanding of the processes involved will certainly have good repercussions, namely in pupils' motivation, in pupils' assurance that they **can** be successful at school if they make **adequate efforts**.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BORG, Walter R. (1987) - "Applying Educational Research - A pratical Guide for Teachers", 2nd Ed., Longman Inc.

2. BURNS, R.B. (1982) - "Self-concept development and Education" Eastbourne: Holt. Open Univ. Social Relationships, E 201, Block 7, Part 2.

3. DAMON, W., HART, D. (1982) - Child Development, 53, 841-864. "The development of self-understanding from infancy through Adolescence".

4. EDER, Rebecca A., GERLACH, Suzanne G., PERLMUTTER, M. (1987) - Child Development, 58, 1044-1050, "In Search of Children's Selves: Development of the Specific and General Components of the Self-concept".

5. FINK, A., KOSECOFF, J. (1985) - "How to conduct surveys". Sage Publications.

6. FONTANA, D. (....) - "Psychology for Teachers", Cap. 12, A. Chapman and A.Gale, Ed.

7. FORMOSINHO, Júlia O., PINTO, Conceição A. (....) - Cadernos do I.E.D., "Auto-estima, auto-conceito académico, alienação e sucesso escolar".

8. FREY, K., RUBLE, D.N. (1985) - Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 18-30. "What Children say when the Teacher is not around: Conflicting goals in Social Comparison and Performance Assessment in the Classroom".

9. FREY, K., RUBLE, D.N. (1987) - Child Development, 58, 1066-1078. "What Children Say about Classroom Performance: Sex and Grade Differences in Perceived Competence".

10. GREENE, J., D'OLIVEIRA, M. (1982) - "Tests in Phsychology. A Student's Guide". Open University.

11. HARTER, Susan (1981) - Developmental Psychology, Vol. 17, No3, 300-312. "A New Self-Report Scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the Classroom: Motivational and Informational Components".

12. HARTER, Susan (1982) - Child Development, 53, 87-97. "The Perceived Competence Scale for Children".

13. HARTER, Susan (1985) - "Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Children" (Revision of Perceived Competence Scale for Children), Univ. of Denver.

14. HARTER, Susan (1986) - "Processes underlying the construction, maintenance, and enhancement of the Self-Concept in Children", in "Psichological Perspectives on the Self", Vol. 3, edited by Jerry Sauls and A.G.Greenwald, L. Erlbaum Ass. Publ., London.

15. HARTER, Susan (1988) - "Causes, correlates and the functional role of global Self-worth: a life-span perspective", Univ. Denver. (Chapter to publish in: J. Kolligian and R. Sternberg (Eds.) "Perceptions of Competence and Incompetence across the life-span", New Haven, Ct.: Yale Univ. Press, 1988).

16. MACCOBY, Eleanor E., JACKLIN, Carol N. (1975) - "The Psychology of Sex Differences", Chapter 4, London, Oxford Univ. Press.

17. MUSSEN, P.H. (Ed.) - "Handbook of Child Psychology", Vols. 3 e 4.

18. PARSONS, J., KACZALA, C., MEECE, J. (1982) - Child Development, 53, 322-329. "Socialization of achievement attitudes and beliefs: Classroom influences".

19. PHILLIPS, Deborah (1984) - Child Development, 55, 2000-2016. "The illusion of incompetence among academically competent children".

20. ROBINSON, W.P., TAYLER, Carol A. (1986) - Análise Psicológica, nº1, série V, 105-113. "Auto-estima,

desinteresse e insucesso escolar em alunos do ensino secundário".

21. SATTERLY, D. (1981) - "Assessment in Schools", Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

22. STIPEK, D.J., TANNATT, L. (1984) - J. of Educational Psychology, 76, 75-84. "Children's judgements of their own and their peers' Academic Competence".

COMO É QUE EU SOU

NOME ______________________________ ____º ANO

IDADE __________ DATA DE NASCIMENTO ______________________

RAPAZ ☐ RAPARIGA ☐ (põe uma cruz ☒ no teu quadrado)

EXEMPLO

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assim
a)	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos gostam mais de brincar na rua.	E	Outros miúdos gostam mais de ficar a ver televisão	☐	☐
1.	☐	☐	Alguns acham que são muito bons nos trabalhos da escola	E	Outros preocupam-se porque não sabem se são capazes de fazer os trabalhos da escola	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Alguns acham difícil fazer amigos	E	Outros acham muito fácil Fazer amigos	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Alguns são muito bons em ginástica	E	Outros acham que não são bons em ginástica	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Alguns gostam do aspecto que têm	E	Outros não gostam do aspecto que têm	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Alguns acham mal a maneira como se portam	E	Outros costumam achar bem a maneira como se portam	☐	☐

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assi
6.	☐	☐	Alguns não gostam da sua maneira de ser	E	Outros gostam da sua maneira de ser	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Alguns acham que são tão espertos como os outros da mesma idade	E	Outros não têm a certeza e acham que talvez não sejam tão espertos	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Alguns têm muitos amigos	E	Outros não têm muitos amigos	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Alguns gostavam de ser muito melhores nos desportos	E	Outros acham que são bons nos desportos	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Alguns acham bem a altura e o peso que têm	E	Outros preferiam que a sua altura ou o peso fossem diferentes	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Alguns costumam fazer o que devem	E	Outros não costumam fazer o que devem	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Alguns não gostam da maneira como levam a vida	E	Outros gostam da maneira como levam a vida	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Alguns demoram muito tempo a acabar os trabalhos da escola	E	Outros conseguem fazer os trabalhos da escola depressa	☐	☐

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assim
14.	☐	☐	Alguns gostavam de ter muitos amigos	E	Outros têm todos os amigos que querem	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Alguns acham que podiam fazer bem qualquer desporto novo que nunca fizeram	E	Outros acham que podem não ser capazes de fazer bem desportos que nunca fizeram	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Alguns preferiam que o seu corpo fosse diferente	E	Outros gostam do seu corpo tal como é	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Alguns costumam fazer as coisas como deve ser	E	Outros não costumam fazer as coisas como deve ser	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Alguns estão geralmente contentes consigo próprios	E	Outros não estão contentes consigo próprios muitas vezes	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Alguns esquecem-se muitas vezes das coisas que aprenderam	E	Outros conseguem lembrar-se das coisas facilmente	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	Alguns fazem sempre as coisas com outros miúdos	E	Outros costumam fazer as coisas sozinhos	☐	☐

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assim
21.	☐	☐	Alguns acham que são melhores do que outros da mesma idade	E	Outros acham que não conseguem jogar tão bem como os outros	☐	☐
22.	☐	☐	Alguns preferiam que o seu aspecto físico (a maneira como parecem) fosse diferente	E	Outros gostam do seu aspecto físico tal como é	☐	☐
23.	☐	☐	Alguns arranjam complicações muitas vezes por causa das coisas que fazem	E	Outros não costumam fazer coisas que lhes arranjem complicações	☐	☐
24.	☐	☐	Alguns gostam de ser o tipo de pessoa que são	E	Outros preferiam ser outra pessoa	☐	☐
25.	☐	☐	Alguns fazem muito bem o seu trabalho nas aulas	E	Outros não fazem muito bem o seu trabalho nas aulas	☐	☐
26.	☐	☐	Alguns gostavam que mais miúdos da sua idade gostassem deles	E	Outros acham que a maior parte dos miúdos da sua idade gostam deles	☐	☐
27.	☐	☐	Nos jogos e no desporto alguns miúdos ficam a ver a maior parte das vezes em vez de jogarem	E	Outros jogam a maior parte das vezes em vez de ficarem só a ver	☐	☐

	ou tal e ual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assim
8.	☐	☐	Alguns gostavam mais que a cara ou o cabelo fosse diferente	E	Outros gostam da cara e do cabelo que têm	☐	☐
29.	☐	☐	Alguns fazem coisas que sabem que não deviam fazer	E	Outros quase nunca fazem coisas que eles sabem que não deviam	☐	☐
30.	☐	☐	Alguns estão muito satisfeitos por serem como são	E	Outros preferiam ser diferentes	☐	☐
31.	☐	☐	Alguns têm dificuldade em responder às perguntas do professor	E	Outros conseguem quase sempre dar as respostas	☐	☐
32.	☐	☐	Alguns são muito conhecidos dos outros da mesma idade	E	Outros não são muito conhecidos	☐	☐
33.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos não jogam bem jogos novos de rua	E	Outros são bons a jogar jogos novos	☐	☐
34.	☐	☐	Alguns acham que são giros (têm bom aspecto)	E	Outros acham que não são giros	☐	☐

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assim
35.	☐	☐	Alguns portam-se bem	E	Outros acham difícil portarem-se bem	☐	☐
36.	☐	☐	Alguns não estão muito satisfeitos com a maneira como se portam	E	Outros acham que a maneira como fazem as coisas é boa	☐	☐

(Este questionário foi traduzido e adaptado por Mª da Luz Correia, em 1988, a partir do original americano "What I Am Like", de Susan Harter, Univ. de Denver, 1985.)

NOME______________________________ IDADE__________ ____ º ANO

QUAL A IMPORTÂNCIA QUE DÁS A ESTAS COISAS NA MANEIRA COMO PENSAS DE TI PRÓPR

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal e qual assim
1.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que é importante fazer bem o trabalho da escola	E	Outros acham que não é assim tão importante a maneira como fazem o trabalho da escola	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que não é assim tão importante ter amigos	E	Outros acham que ter muitos amigos é importante	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que é importante ser bom em desporto	E	Outros acham que isso não é assim tão importante	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que é importante ter bom aspecto	E	Outros acham que isso não é assim tão importante	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que é importante portar-se como deve ser	E	Outros acham que portar-se bem não é assim tão importante	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que ter boas notas não é assim muito importante	E	Outros miúdos acham que ter boas notas é importante	☐	☐

	Sou tal e qual assim	Sou um bocadinho assim				Sou um bocadinho assim	Sou tal qual ass
7.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham importante que muita gente os conheça	E	Outros acham que ser muito conhecido não é assim tão importante	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que ser bom em jogos de rua não é assim muito importante	E	Outros acham que ser bom em jogos de rua é importante	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que a sua aparência física não é importante para a maneira como se sentem como pessoa	E	Outros miúdos acham que a sua aparência física é importante	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Alguns miúdos acham que a maneira como se portam não é assim tão importante	E	Outros acham que é importante a maneira como se portam	☐	☐

(Este questionário foi traduzido e adaptado por Mª da Luz Correia, em 1988, a partir do original americano "How important are these things to how you feel about yourself as a person?", de Susan Harter, Univ. de Denver, 1985.)

ESCALA DE AVALIAÇÃO DO COMPORTAMENTO ACTUAL DA CRIANÇA PELA PROFESSORA

(acompanha a escala de auto percepção para crianças)

Nome da criança______________________________________ ____º ano

Professor_______________________________ Escola_________________

Queira indicar em cada questão, por favor, qual é <u>a sua opinião</u> sobre as <u>competências desta criança</u>. Decida, em <u>1º lugar</u>, com que tipo de criança ele/ela é parecido/a: com o tipo indicado à esquerda ou com o indicado à direita. Em <u>2º lugar</u> indique se ele/ela é "um bocadinho assim" ou "tal e qual assim", assinalando com uma cruz o respectivo quadrado, em cada um dos quinze items.

	É tal e qual assim	É um bocadinho assim				É um bocadinho assim	É tal e qual assim
1.	☐	☐	Esta criança é realmente boa nos trabalhos escolares	OU	Esta criança não consegue fazer os trabalhos escolares que lhe são pedidos	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Esta criança acha difícil fazer amigos	OU	Para esta é muito fácil fazer amigos	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Esta criança faz muito bem todo o tipo de desportos	OU	Esta não é lá muito boa no desporto	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Esta criança tem bom aspecto	OU	Esta criança não tem lá muito bom aspecto	☐	☐

	É tal e qual assim	É um bocadinho assim				É um bocadinho assim	É tal e qual assi
5.			Esta criança porta-se bem, em geral	OU	Esta não se porta bem, frequentemente		
6.			Esta criança esquece-se frequentemente do que aprendeu	OU	Esta consegue lembrar-se das coisas fácilmente		
7.			Esta criança tem muitos amigos	OU	Esta criança não tem muitos amigos		
8.			Esta criança é melhor do que as outras da sua idade no desporto	OU	Esta não consegue fazer tão bem como as outras no desporto		
9.			Esta criança tem uma aparência física bonita	OU	Esta não tem uma aparência física bonita		
1o.			Esta criança costuma proceder adequadamente	OU	Esta seria melhor se procedesse de maneira diferente		
11.			Esta tem dificuldade em responder ao Professor na escola	OU	Esta criança consegue responder quase sempre		
12.			Esta é muito popular entre os da sua idade	OU	Esta criança não é muito popular		

	É tal e qual assim	É um bocadinho assim				É um bocadinho assim	É tal e qual assim
13.	☐	☐	Esta criança não faz bem jogos de rua novos	OU	Esta joga bem em jogos novos	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Esta criança não tem lá muito bom aspecto	OU	Esta tem muito bom aspecto	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Esta criança mete-se em sarilhos por causa das coisas que faz	OU	Esta criança em geral não faz coisas que a metem em sarilhos	☐	☐

(Este questionário foi traduzido e adaptado por Mª da Luz Correia, em 1988, a partir do original americano "Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's actual Behavior", de Susan Harter, Univ. de Denver, 1985)

DATA CODING SHEET FOR SELF PERCEPTION PROFILE FOR CHILDREN

(from Revision of the Perceived Competence Scale for Children, by Susan Harter, Ph.D., Univ. of Denver, 1985)

S#	SEX	GRADE	Scholastic Competence Subscale							Social Acceptance Subscale							Athletic Competence Subscale						
			1	7	13	19	25	31	Mean	2	8	14	20	26	32	Mean	3	9	15	21	27	33	Mean
1	F	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.16	2	3	2	3	2	3	2.5	2	2	3	3	2	2	2.33
2	F	4	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.33	2	4	1	2	2	4	2.5	4	2	3	3	3	2	2.83
3	F	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.16	4	4	4	1	2	2	2.83	2	3	2	1	2	3	2.16
4	F	4	1	1	3	2	1	1	1.5	2	1	1	1	1	2	1.33	2	2	2	2	1	2	1.83
5	F	4	2	2	4	2	2	2	2.33	4	4	4	1	4	4	3.5	3	2	2	2	2	4	2.66
6	F	4	4	4	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	2	1	3	3	2.16	4	2	4	2	3	4	3.16
7	F	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	3.16	4	1	4	1	1	3	2.33	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.66
8	F	4	1	1	3	2	1	2	1.66	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.5	3	1	3	3	3	3	2.66
9	F	4	3	4	3	4	4	1	3.16	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.33	3	4	2	3	1	1	2.33
10	F	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	2.16	3	4	3	2	4	3	3.16	4	3	3	2	4	3	3.16
11	F	4	2	1	1	1	1	2	1.33	4	4	3	1	3	2	2.83	2	3	4	2	3	3	2.83
12	F	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	2.33	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.66	1	3	2	1	3	2	2
13	F	3	3	1	4	4	2	2	2.66	1	1	1	1	3	2	1.5	3	3	3	2	1	4	2.66
14	F	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.83	3	4	3	3	3	3	3.16	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.83
15	F	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3.16	3	4	4	1	1	3	2.66	3	2	2	3	2	2	2.33
16	F	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	2.33	2	2	3	2	3	3	2.5
17	F	3	2	3	4	3	2	2	2.66	2	4	1	1	3	4	2.5	4	3	4	2	4	4	3.5
Mean									2.44							2.57							2.61

S#	Physical Appearance Subscale							Behavioral Conduct Subscale							Global Self-Worth Subscale						
	4	10	16	22	28	34	Mean	5	11	17	23	29	35	Mean	6	12	18	24	30	36	Mean
1	3	3	2	2	2	3	2.5	2	3	3	2	2	3	2.5	2	2	3	3	3	2	2.5
2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2.16	1	3	3	1	3	3	2.33	2	3	2	2	2	3	2.33
3	3	4	4	1	2	3	2.83	2	2	2	4	3	3	2.66	2	2	2	1	2	3	2
4	4	3	2	1	4	2	2.66	2	3	4	4	3	3	3.16	3	1	2	1	4	2	2.16
5	3	3	4	4	4	4	3.66	2	3	3	4	3	4	3.16	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83
6	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.	4	3	3	2	3	4	3.16	4	2	4	2	4	4	3.33
7	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83
8	4	4	4	2	1	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	2.33
9	4	3	1	3	3	2	2.66	3	2	3	4	1	4	2.83	4	4	2	2	2	3	2.83
10	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.66	1	4	4	4	4	4	3.5
11	2	1	4	3	2	1	2.16	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	1	3	3	1	2.33
12	2	1	3	3	3	2	2.33	3	2	2	3	3	4	2.83	3	3	2	2	2	1	2.16
13	4	3	4	4	4	2	3.5	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.83	4	1	2	4	4	4	3.16
14	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.66	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.33
15	4	2	4	4	4	3	3.5	1	4	4	4	4	4	3.5	4	3	3	3	4	4	3.5
16	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	2	2.83
17	4	4	2	4	4	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean							3.05							3.14							2.87

REPEATING GIRLS

DATA CODING SHEET FOR SELF PERCEPTION PROFILE FOR CHILDREN

(from Revision of the Perceived Competence Scale for Children, by Susan Harter, Ph.D., Univ. of Denver, 1985)

S #	SEX	GRADE	Scholastic Competence Subscale 1	7	13	19	25	31	Mean	Social Acceptance Subscale 2	8	14	20	26	32	Mean
18	M	4	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	4	1	3	3	2.83
19	M	4	3	4	4	3	4	2	3.33	4	3	4	1	2	3	2.83
20	M	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.16	3	4	2	2	3	3	2.83
21	M	4	3	4	3	2	2	2	2.66	4	2	4	2	4	4	3.33
22	M	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	3	1	3	2.83
23	M	4	3	4	2	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	1	4	1	3
24	M	4	2	1	1	1	2	2	1.5	1	4	1	1	1	3	1.83
25	M	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1.33	2	2	2	3	2	1	2
26	M	4	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	4	4	1	4	1	2	2.66
27	M	4	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.66	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.5
28	M	4	1	3	2	2	3	2	2.16	4	4	1	2	4	3	3
29	M	4	3	4	2	2	4	2	2.83	3	3	4	1	3	3	2.83
30	M	4	2	4	2	1	4	3	2.66	3	4	4	1	1	4	2.83
31	M	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3.66	2	4	2	4	4	4	3.33
32	M	4	3	3	2	3	4	2	2.83	3	3	2	1	2	4	2.5
33	M	4	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	4	4	1	3	1	2	2.33
34	M	4	3	4	3	2	3	2	2.83	1	4	1	1	1	3	1.83
Mean									2.44							2.72

S #	Athletic Competence Subscale 3	9	15	21	27	33	Mean	Physical Appearance Subscale 4	10	16	22	28	34	Mean
18	3	2	3	1	4	4	2.83	2	1	4	4	4	3	3
19	4	4	1	4	2	4	3.16	4	3	4	4	4	3	3.66
20	4	1	3	2	3	2	2.5	3	4	3	3	2	3	3
21	4	4	4	2	3	2	3.16	4	4	3	4	2	2	3.16
22	4	1	2	2	3	2	2.33	3	1	3	1	4	4	2.66
23	3	1	4	4	2	3	2.83	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.66
24	4	3	2	2	1	3	2.5	4	2	4	4	4	3	3.5
25	4	1	3	1	2	2	2.16	3	4	4	4	3	3	3.5
26	4	1	4	4	1	3	2.83	4	3	3	2	1	4	2.83
27	4	1	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83
28	3	1	3	3	4	3	2.83	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
29	2	4	4	3	4	2	3.16	4	2	1	4	1	3	2.5
30	4	4	4	1	4	4	3.5	3	1	4	4	4	4	3.33
31	2	3	4	4	4	2	3.16	2	2	2	4	1	3	2.33
32	2	3	2	2	4	2	2.5	4	2	4	3	2	3	3
33	3	3	2	2	2	2	2.33	4	2	4	3	2	3	3
34	4	4	3	4	4	3	3.66	4	4	4	4	2	4	3.66
Mean							2.84							3.21

S #	Behavioral Conduct Subscale 5	11	17	23	29	35	Mean	Global Self-Worth Subscale 6	12	18	24	30	36	Mean
18	2	2	3	3	4	2	2.66	3	4	4	4	3	4	3.66
19	4	3	4	3	2	4	3.33	4	4	4	3	4	2	3.5
20	2	2	2	3	2	2	2.16	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.83
21	2	2	3	4	2	2	2.5	2	2	3	1	2	2	2
22	2	4	1	1	3	4	2.5	3	3	2	4	4	4	3.33
23	2	4	4	3	2	4	3.16	4	4	4	3	3	2	3.33
24	1	3	3	2	2	2	2.16	1	2	3	4	3	2	2.5
25	4	3	3	3	3	4	3.33	2	4	4	2	1	1	2.33
26	4	4	4	3	3	4	3.66	4	4	3	1	4	4	3.33
27	2	2	2	3	2	2	2.16	4	4	4	4	3	2	3.5
28	4	4	4	3	4	3	3.66	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
29	3	4	4	3	3	4	3.5	4	4	3	4	4	2	3.5
30	2	3	4	4	2	4	3.16	3	2	1	4	4	1	2.5
31	3	3	1	1	3	4	2.5	2	4	3	2	4	1	2.66
32	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.16
33	3	4	3	3	3	3	3.16	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.66
34	4	2	4	4	3	4	3.5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean					-		2.94							3.1

REPEATING BOYS

DATA CODING SHEET FOR SELF PERCEPTION PROFILE FOR CHILDREN

(from Revision of the Perceived Competence Scale for Children, by Susan Harter, Ph.D., Univ. of Denver, 1985)

S #	SEX	GRADE	Scholastic Competence Subscale 1	7	13	19	25	31	Mean
35	F	4	2	1	3	2	3	2	2.16
36	F	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	3.16
37	F	4	2	2	3	2	3	3	2.5
38	F	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3.33
39	F	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3.16
40	F	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3.5
41	F	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3.66
42	F	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	2.66
43	F	4	3	4	4	2	3	4	3.33
44	F	4	2	2	3	2	3	3	2.5
45	F	4	1	1	4	2	2	2	2
46	F	4	3	2	3	2	2	2	2.33
47	F	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.16
48	F	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
49	F	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3.16
50	F	4	2	2	4	4	3	4	3.16
51	F	4	2	2	4	3	3	4	3
Mean									2.92

S #	Social Acceptance Subscale 2	8	14	20	26	32	Mean
35	3	2	1	1	2	1	1.66
36	3	4	4	3	4	4	3.66
37	4	4	4	1	4	3	3.33
38	2	4	3	2	4	3	3
39	4	3	1	1	2	2	2.16
40	2	4	4	1	2	1	2.33
41	4	4	1	4	1	1	2.5
42	4	1	3	2	3	3	2.66
43	3	2	2	2	2	3	2.33
44	1	4	4	2	3	3	2.83
45	3	2	2	1	2	2	2
46	3	4	3	2	3	3	3
47	2	3	3	2	3	3	2.66
48	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
49	4	3	3	2	4	4	3.33
50	4	4	1	4	4	4	3.5
51	2	4	1	3	2	4	2.66
Mean							2.8

S #	Athletic Competence Subscale 3	9	15	21	27	33	Mean
35	4	1	2	3	2	2	2.33
36	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.5
37	4	4	3	2	3	3	3.16
38	2	2	2	3	2	3	2.33
39	2	2	2	2	3	3	2.33
40	2	1	2	3	4	3	2.5
41	4	4	4	1	1	1	2.5
42	3	3	3	2	3	2	2.66
43	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.33
44	2	4	1	2	2	3	2.33
45	3	2	3	4	2	4	3
46	2	3	3	2	3	2	2.5
47	2	2	3	3	2	2	2.33
48	3	4	4	3	4	3	3.5
49	3	4	3	3	3	4	3.33
50	3	4	2	3	2	4	3
51	1	3	2	3	2	3	2.33
Mean							2.64

S #	Physical Appearance Subscale 4	10	16	22	28	34	Mean
35	3	2	4	4	2	3	3
36	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
37	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.83
38	4	4	4	1	1	3	2.83
39	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83
40	4	4	4	4	2	3	3.5
41	4	1	1	1	1	1	1.5
42	4	4	2	1	4	4	3.16
43	4	4	4	2	2	3	3.16
44	2	4	4	4	3	2	3.16
45	3	4	4	2	2	4	3.16
46	3	4	4	3	3	3	3.33
47	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.16
48	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
49	3	3	4	4	4	4	3.66
50	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
51	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean							3.36

S #	Behavioral Conduct Subscale 5	11	17	23	29	35	Mean
35	3	3	2	2	2	3	2.5
36	3	3	3	3	2	3	2.83
37	3	3	4	3	3	4	3.33
38	4	3	4	2	3	3	3.66
39	4	4	4	4	3	3	3.66
40	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
41	4	4	4	4	2	4	3.66
42	4	3	3	3	4	3	3.33
43	3	4	3	3	4	3	3.33
44	3	4	4	3	3	3	3.33
45	4	1	2	4	3	4	3
46	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
47	3	3	4	3	3	3	3.16
48	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
49	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
50	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
51	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean							3.45

S #	Global Self-Worth Subscale 6	12	18	24	30	36	Mean
35	2	2	2	4	2	2	2.33
36	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.66
37	3	4	3	4	3	4	3.5
38	4	4	3	4	3	3	3.5
39	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83
40	4	1	4	4	4	4	3.5
41	4	4	4	4	4	1	3.5
42	4	2	3	4	4	3	3.33
43	4	4	4	3	3	2	3.33
44	3	4	3	4	4	2	3.33
45	4	1	2	4	4	2	2.83
46	3	4	3	4	3	2	3.16
47	3	2	3	4	3	3	3
48	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
49	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
50	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
51	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean							3.45

NON REPEATING GIRLS

DATA CODING SHEET FOR SELF PERCEPTION PROFILE FOR CHILDREN

(from Revision of the Perceived Competence Scale for Children, by Susan Harter, Ph.D., Univ. of Denver, 1985)

			SCHOLASTIC COMPETENCE SUBSCALE							SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SUBSCALE							ATHLETIC COMPETENCE SUBSCALE							PHYSICAL APPEARANCE SUBSCALE							BEHAVIORAL CONDUCT SUBSCALE							GLOBAL SELF WORTH SUBSCALE						
S #	SEX	GRADE	1	7	13	19	25	31	Mean	2	8	14	20	26	32	Mean	3	9	15	21	27	33	Mean	4	10	16	22	28	34	Mean	5	11	17	23	29	35	Mean	6	12	18	24	30	36	Mean
52	M	4	2	2	4	2	3	3	2.66	3	4	4	1	4	4	3.33	2	1	2	1	1	4	1.83	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.83	2	3	2	3	2	3	2.5	4	4	3	4	4	3	3.66
53	M	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.66	3	4	2	3	2	3	2.83	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	4	3	3	3
54	M	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	3.33	4	4	4	1	4	1	3	4	4	1	4	4	4	3.5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.66	4	4	1	4	4	3	3.33
55	M	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.83	4	4	4	2	3	2	3.16	1	1	2	2	4	3	2.16	3	1	4	4	4	4	3.33	3	4	3	4	3	4	3.5	4	3	3	4	4	3	3.5
56	M	4	3	3	1	3	3	3	2.66	4	4	3	3	4	3	3.5	4	4	3	2	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83	2	4	4	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	4	4	2	2.66
57	M	4	1	1	1	4	2	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	4	1.83	2	1	4	1	1	3	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	3.66	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.66	3	3	1	4	2	1	2.33
58	M	4	3	2	3	2	3	2	2.5	2	3	3	2	2	3	2.5	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.66	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.83	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.83	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
59	M	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	2.83	3	3	2	3	2	3	2.66	2	2	2	2	3	3	2.33	3	2	2	2	2	3	2.33	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2.5
60	M	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	3.5	4	4	1	4	4	4	3.5	4	1	2	4	4	4	3.16	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	3	3.16	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.83
61	M	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.83	4	4	4	2	2	4	3.33	3	1	4	2	2	3	2.5	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.83	2	2	3	3	3	2	2.5	3	3	3	3	4	2	3
62	M	4	3	2	4	3	2	3	2.83	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	1	2.5	2	1	3	1	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	2.33	3	4	3	2	3	2	2.83
63	M	4	3	4	4	2	3	4	3.33	3	4	3	2	1	2	2.5	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3.16	3	4	4	4	3	4	3.66	4	3	3	4	3	3	3.33
64	M	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3.16	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	4	1	4	2.66	3	3	4	2	2	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	4	3.16	3	3	3	2	4	3	3
65	M	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3.66	3	3	1	3	1	3	2.33	1	3	2	3	3	3	2.5	4	1	4	4	4	4	3.5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	2	4	2	2.83
66	M	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	2.33	2	4	2	2	2	3	2.5	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.5	2	3	4	3	2	2	2.66	2	3	2	2	2	2	2.16	2	1	2	2	2	2	1.83
67	M	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.83	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.66	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.5	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.83	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.66
68	M	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	1	4	4	3.5	3	2	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2.33	1	4	3	4	2	4	3	3	1	4	2	4	2	2.66
Mean									2.83							2.84							2.6							3.15							2.76							2.93

NON REPEATING BOYS

MEAN PERCEIVED COMPETENCE / IMPORTANCE DISCREPANCY SCORES

Subjects	Scholastic Comp.	Social Acceptance	Athletic Comp.	Physical Appear.	Behavioral Conduct
1	–	–	–	–	–
2	- 1.67	- 1.	–	–	–
3	- 1.84	- 0.67	–	- 1.17	- 0.84
4	- 2.5	- 2.17	–	- 1.34	+ 0.16
5	- 1.67	- 0.5	–	- 0.34	- 0.84
6	- 1.	- 0.84	- 0.84	–	- 0.84
7	- 0.84	- 0.67	–	- 0.67	- 0.17
8	- 1.84	+ 0.5	- 0.84	0	- 1.
9	+ 0.16	- 1.17	–	- 0.84	–
10	–	- 0.34	–	+ 0.83	- 0.34
11	- 2.67	- 0.17	–	–	+ 0.5
12	- 0.67	–	–	–	- 0.17
13	- 1.34	- 2.5	- 0.84	- 0.5	- 0.17
14	- 0.17	+ 0.16	–	–	0
15	- 0.84	- 0.34	–	–	- 0.5
16	- 0.5	- 0.67	–	0	0
17	- 1.34	- 1.5	- 0.5	- 0.34	0
Mean	- 1.248	- 0.792	- 0.755	- 0.437	- 0.300
	REPEATING GIRLS				

18	- 2.	- 0.17	–	–	- 0.84
19	+ 0.33	- 0.17	- 0.84	–	- 0.67
20	- 0.84	- 0.67	- 0.5	0	- 0.84
21	- 1.34	–	–	–	- 0.5
22	- 1.	- 1.17	- 0.67	–	–
23	- 0.5	- 1	- 0.67	- 0.34	- 0.84
24	- 2.	- 2.17	–	- 0.5	- 0.84
25	- 2.17	- 1.5	- 0.84	–	+ 0.33
26	- 1.5	–	- 1.17	- 0.67	+ 0.66
27	- 0.34	0	0	- 0.17	–
28	- 1.84	- 1	- 0.67	+ 1.	- 0.34
29	- 1.17	- 0.17	+ 0.16	–	0
30	- 1.34	- 1.17	- 0.5	- 0.67	- 0.84
31	+ 0.66	+ 0.33	- 0.34	–	- 1.
32	- 0.67	- 1.	- 1.5	- 0.5	- 1.
33	- 1.	- 0.67	–	0	+ 0.16
34	- 1.17	- 2.17	- 0.34	- 0.34	- 0.5
Mean	- 1.052	- 0.868	- 0.606	- 0.219	- 0.470
	REPEATING BOYS				

MEAN PERCEIVED COMPETENCE / IMPORTANCE DISCREPANCY SCORES

Subjects	Scholastic Comp.	Social Acceptance	Athletic Comp.	Physical Appear.	Behavioral Conduct
35	-1.84	-1.34	–	0	-1.67
36	-0.84	-0.34	0	0	-0.17
37	-1.5	-0.17	+0.16	+0.33	-0.67
38	-0.67	–	–	-1.17	-0.34
39	-0.34	-1.34	-0.67	+0.83	+0.16
40	-0.5	–	–	–	0
41	-0.34	-1.	–	-2.5	-0.34
42	-1.34	-0.34	-0.34	+0.16	+0.33
43	-0.67	-0.67	–	–	-0.17
44	-1.5	–	–	+0.16	+0.33
45	–	–	0	-0.84	–
46	-0.67	0	–	-0.17	0
47	-1.84	-0.34	–	–	+0.16
48	0	+1.5	0	0	0
49	-0.84	-0.67	–	-0.34	0
50	-0.84	0	0	+1.5	0
51	-1.	-0.84	–	+0.5	0
Mean	-0.920	-0.462	-0.12	-0.11	-0.148
	NON REPEATING GIRLS				

Subjects	Scholastic Comp.	Social Acceptance	Athletic Comp.	Physical Appear.	Behavioral Conduct
52	-1.34	-0.67	-2.17	-0.17	-1.5
53	-0.34	-0.67	-1.5	+0.83	0
54	-0.67	–	-0.5	+0.5	-1.34
55	-1.17	+0.16	-0.84	-0.17	-0.5
56	-1.34	0	–	+0.83	-1
57	-2.	-1.67	–	–	-0.84
58	-0.5	-0.5	–	-0.17	–
59	-0.17	–	–	–	-1
60	–	-0.5	-0.84	0	-0.84
61	-0.67	-0.17	–	-0.17	-1
62	-1.17	-2	–	-1	-1.67
63	-0.67	-0.5	0	–	-0.34
64	-0.34	–	-1.34	-0.5	+0.16
65	-0.34	-1.17	-1.	+0.5	-1.
66	-1.67	–	–	-0.34	-0.84
67	-1.	-0.17	–	-0.5	–
68	-1.	0	-1.	–	-1.
Mean	-0.846	-0.604	-1.021	-0.027	-0.847
	NON REPEATING BOYS				

DATA CODING SHEET FOR TEACHER'S RATING SCALE OF CHILD'S ACTUAL BEHAVIOUR

(from "Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's actual Behavior", S. Harter, Univ. of Denver, 1985)

SUBSCALES

		Scholastic Competence Subscale				Social Acceptance Subscale				Athletic Competence Subscale				Physical Appearance Subscale				Behavioral Conduct Subscale			
S	SEX	1	6	11	MEAN	2	7	12	MEAN	3	8	13	MEAN	4	9	14	MEAN	5	10	15	MEAN
1	F	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2.33	2	2	1	1.66	2	2	3	2.33
2	F	2	1	2	1.66	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.33	3	3	3	3	4	1	3	2.66
3	F	2	2	2	2	3	4	3	3.33	2	2	3	2.33	3	4	3	3.33	4	3	2	3
4	F	3	2	3	2.66	4	3	3	3.33	2	2	3	2.33	2	3	2	2.33	3	2	3	2.66
5	F	1	2	2	1.66	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	2.33	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	3
6	F	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3.33	3	4	4	3.66	4	4	4	4
7	F	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
8	F	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.33	2	2	1	1.66
9	F	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	3	3.33	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2.66
10	F	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	2.66	3	1	3	2.33
11	F	2	1	1	1.33	2	1	2	1.66	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	3.33
12	F	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2.33	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3.66
13	F	3	2	2	2.33	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2.33
14	F	3	2	3	2.66	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3.33	4	4	4	4
15	F	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	3	3.66	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
16	F	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
17	F	2	2	1	1.66	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.33	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.66
Mean					2.07				2.99				2.70				3.19				3.13

REPEATING GIRLS

DATA CODING SHEET FOR TEACHER'S RATING SCALE OF CHILD'S ACTUAL BEHAVIOUR

(from "Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's actual Behavior", S. Harter, Univ. of Denver, 1985)

SUBSCALES

		Scholastic Competence Subscale				Social Acceptance Subscale				Athletic Competence Subscale				Physical Appearance Subscale				Behavioral Conduct Subscale			
S	SEX	1	6	11	MEAN	2	7	12	MEAN	3	8	13	MEAN	4	9	14	MEAN	5	10	15	MEAN
18	M	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	1	1.66	1	1	1	1
19	M	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
20	M	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	1	1	1.33
21	M	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2.33	1	2	1	1.33	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
22	M	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1.33	3	2	3	2.66	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
23	M	2	3	2	2.33	2	2	3	2.33	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.33	3	2	1	2
24	M	1	3	3	2.33	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
25	M	1	1	2	1.33	3	2	2	2.33	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	3	1	1	2	1.33
26	M	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.33	2	3	4	3
27	M	2	1	1	1.33	4	4	3	3.66	3	3	4	3.33	4	3	3	3.33	3	3	3	3
28	M	3	1	1	1.66	3	3	2	2.66	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	3	3.66	4	3	4	3.66
29	M	3	4	4	3.66	4	4	3	3.66	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.66
30	M	2	2	3	2.33	4	3	3	3.33	3	3	4	3.33	2	3	2	2.33	1	2	1	1.33
31	M	2	1	2	1.66	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	1.66
32	M	3	4	3	3.33	3	4	3	3.33	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2.66
33	M	2	3	3	2.66	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2.33	3	2	3	2.66
34	M	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mean					2.09				2.8				2.92				3.17				2.19

REPEATING BOYS

DATA CODING SHEET FOR TEACHER'S RATING SCALE OF CHILD'S ACTUAL BEHAVIOUR

(from "Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's actual Behavior", S. Harter, Univ. of Denver, 1985)

SUBSCALES

		SCHOLASTIC COMPETENCE SUBSCALE				SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SUBSCALE				ATHLETIC COMPETENCE SUBSCALE				PHYSICAL APPEARANCE SUBSCALE				BEHAVIORAL CONDUCT SUBSCALE			
S	SEX	1	6	11	MEAN	2	7	12	MEAN	3	8	13	MEAN	4	9	14	MEAN	5	10	15	MEAN
35	F	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	3.33	4	3	3	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.66
36	F	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
37	F	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.66	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.66
38	F	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
39	F	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3.33
40	F	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
41	F	3	4	4	3.66	3	4	4	3.66	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.33
42	F	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2.66	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
43	F	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.66
44	F	4	4	3	3.66	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.66
45	F	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2.66	3	2	2	2.33
46	F	3	2	3	2.66	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2.66
47	F	3	2	2	2.33	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	3	3.33	3	2	3	2.66
48	F	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	2.33	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.66
49	F	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
50	F	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
51	F	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3.66	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean					3.17				3.17				2.97				3.76				3.50

NON-REPEATING GIRLS

DATA CODING SHEET FOR TEACHER'S RATING SCALE OF CHILD'S ACTUAL BEHAVIOUR

(from "Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's actual Behavior", S. Harter, Univ. of Denver, 1985)

SUBSCALES

		SCHOLASTIC COMPETENCE SUBSCALE				SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SUBSCALE				ATHLETIC COMPETENCE SUBSCALE				PHYSICAL APPEARANCE SUBSCALE				BEHAVIORAL CONDUCT SUBSCALE			
S	SEX	1	6	11	MEAN	2	7	12	MEAN	3	8	13	MEAN	4	9	14	MEAN	5	10	15	MEAN
52	M	3	3	4	3.33	3	2	3	2.66	3	2	3	2.66	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	2.66
53	M	3	3	4	3.33	4	3	3	3.33	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
54	M	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	1	2	1.66
55	M	3	4	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
56	M	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
57	M	2	3	3	2.66	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.33	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	2.33
58	M	2	2	2	2	4	4	3	3.66	4	3	3	3.33	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	2.66
59	M	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3.33	2	2	3	2.33	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	2
60	M	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.66	3	4	3	3.33	2	4	3	3
61	M	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3.33	4	4	3	3.66	4	3	3	3.33	4	4	3	3.66
62	M	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
63	M	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	2.33	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
64	M	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
65	M	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	2.33	4	3	4	3.66	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1
66	M	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3.33	4	3	3	3.33	4	3	3	3.33	3	3	3	3
67	M	1	1	1	1	3	3	4	3.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3.33
68	M	3	4	3	3.33	3	4	3	3.33	2	2	2	2	4	4	3	3.66	4	4	4	4
Mean					3.19				3.17				2.95				356				2.90

NON-REPEATING BOYS