AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF CHILDREN
WITH LOW LEVELS OF INTELLIGENCE

APPROVED:

Jack R. Haynor
Major Professor

Audrey Hamilton
Minor Professor

Harold D. Holloway
Chairman of the Department of Psychology

Robert B. Tealouere
Dean of the Graduate School
AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SELF-CONCEPT OF CHILDREN WITH LOW LEVELS OF INTELLIGENCE

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Ronald Carroll Hughes, B. A.
Denton, Texas
January, 1970
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIST OF TABLES</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. METHODS AND PROCEDURE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Summary of Analysis of Variance of Self-Concept Scores</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Fisher's t of Self-Concept Scores</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Self-concept has been investigated by numerous researchers in a large number of studies. Despite the large number of studies that have been concerned with this phenomenon, there is today no precise consensual definition of self-concept. This study used a definition similar to that used by Guggenheim (11), which took self-concept to mean the perception or image that a person has of himself.

The literature on the research of self-concept has been reviewed by McCandless (18) and Wylie (25). The question arose from these two authors and elsewhere (3) as to the necessity of obtaining a discrepancy score between the ideal self and real self. Often the individuals differ only on real self, with all subjects agreeing on what is the ideal self. Chase (2) found that both the adjusted and the mal-adjusted have similar ideal self images and a similar impression of the average person. It is thus believed that a single score is the only necessary measure in studying self-concept. The present study adhered to that opinion, and a single self-concept score was obtained for each subject.

It is quite possible that perceived self would be a better term than real self. A person's perception of himself
as he really is may be quite different from what is actually the case. A person's real self may not even be within his realm of consciousness. The term real self tends to imply that it is a reality rather than a value judgment that is "admissible to awareness" (23, p. 136).

Self-concept has been compared with various factors, for example: learning, anxiety, adjustment, intelligence, and academic achievement. Perkins and Shannon (19) have commented on the lack of information on the relationship between self-concept and intelligence. This lack of information is partially offset by the large number of studies comparing self-concept and academic achievement. It has been demonstrated that a great amount of intelligence may be related to superior academic performance, while a great lack of intelligence may relate to low academic performance (5). Academic achievement may thus be an indirect measure of intelligence.

In a study of fifth and sixth grade children a correlation of .36 was found between self-concept and school achievement (6). The authors of the self-concept scale used in the present study found a .32 correlation between their scale and achievement of third and sixth graders (21). Other positive correlations between these variables have also been found by Walsh (24) and by Lekarcyk and Hill (15). In using the discrepancy score between real and ideal self, Perkins and Shannon (19) found that I.Q. and achievement are positively
related to ideal self and adjustment, while Chickering (3) found that the discrepancy was negatively related to school achievement. It appears from these studies that self-concept is related to academic achievement, which can be assumed to be an indirect measure of intellectual ability. When intellectual ability is directly measured, the results are somewhat more confusing.

Results of studies comparing scores on the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale with group I.Q. test scores have yielded coefficients of .169 and .251 (20). In an unpublished research report, the authors of the Piers-Harris scale found that correlations with scores on the Otis ranged from -.04 to .36. Eastman (9), in comparing WISC scores to the Piers-Harris scale found correlations which ranged from .08 on the WISC performance I.Q. to .50 on the WISC verbal I.Q. This latter correlation used only Factor I of the self-concept scale, which has to do with school status. Another study (8) found a correlation of .48 between the Piers-Harris scale and the California Test of Mental Maturity.

All the studies reviewed thus far have dealt with children of average intelligence. The relationship between self-concept and I.Q. of children with subnormal intelligence has received little attention to date. In fact, as late as 1965, there were few studies of any nature concerning self-concept of retardates.
McAfee and Cleland have commented on this lack of information.

During the past fifteen years, self-concept studies have inundated the psychological literature. Most of the research relating to self-concept utilized subjects with normal intelligence. Only three self-concept studies employing retardates were found in a review of the literature (17, p. 63).

The purpose of the present study was to add to the body of knowledge concerning self-concept generally and specifically to the relationship between I.Q. and self-concept of subnormal intelligent children.

Review of Literature

Despite the fact that some studies have revealed a significant relationship between self-concept and I.Q., others have found non-significant results. Often the case is that conflicting results are found within the same study (7, 9, 20, 21).

The results of studies showing no correlation have led to some interesting conclusions. Ashcraft and Pitts, in their study of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, "Made no attempt to control for sex, I.Q., education, or other variables, indicating that these variables do not significantly affect the scores on the instrument" (1, p. 115).

At a less extreme position are the authors of the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale.
One would expect correlations between self-concept and intelligence test scores to be positive, but low. Here the test methods are very different, but insofar as the child knows and accepts his intellectual status he might be expected to have it affect not only items relating directly to intellect, but possibly to his feelings about himself generally. Coopersmith (1967) found that in most of his group, self esteem and tested intelligence followed the same rank order, but that his Low-High group (low in self esteem, high in esteem by others) apparently ignored their high intelligence as a basis for self evaluation. His total correlation between subjective self esteem and intelligence was .28 (22, p. 16).

Piers and Harris (21) have found that institutionalized retardates have a lower self-concept than normals. It has been found that institutionalized retardates have a lower self-concept than non-institutionalized retardates (13, 16). In the only two studies that broke the range of intelligence of their subjects into subgroups, conflicting results were found. Mayer (16) found no significant differences between self-concept scores of three groups separated on the basis of M.A. scores. This separation on the basis of M.A. was not an exact differentiation between I.Q. of the groups, since discrepancy between M.A. and C.A. was not controlled. This study yielded a correlation of .04 between the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale and WISC or Binet Standard scores. This study seems to indicate that not only is there no significant difference between self-concept of retardates at various levels of intelligence, but also that I.Q. and self-concept of retardates do not significantly correlate.

Results contrary to those of Mayer have been found. The authors of the study found a "small but significant relationship"
between I.Q. and scores on the Laurelton Self-Attitude Scale (10, p. 554). They interpreted the significant positive correlations to mean that higher intelligence is associated with a tendency to present the self in a more favorable light.

McAfee and Cleland found a nonsignificant -.22 correlation between I.Q. and ideal-self image of educable mentally retarded males. They also found a correlation of .34 between I.Q. and discrepancy scores of their subjects. This was significant at the .01 level (17). They concluded that "Educable mentally retarded males with higher I.Q.'s perceive society's mores and folkways of acceptable behavior more clearly than educable mentally retarded males with less intelligence" (17, p. 67), and, owing to this, "Evidently the educable mentally retarded males with higher I.Q. are more cognizant of the discrepancy between their capacities and those of individuals with normal intelligence" (17, p. 66).

Statement of the Problem

It has been estimated that for every institutionalized retardate there are six of the same level of intelligence living effectively in the community (12, p. 223). Why is it that one child can function effectively and another of even higher capacity can not? One possible answer is differences in self-concept. Holland (14, p. 96) states that we have a good idea of how we actually are as well as how we appear to
others. He speaks of an "exalted" or "depreciatory" self-image and mentions that a person with a depreciatory self-image may not make a real effort to reach his goals. A child who feels he cannot succeed has no desire to compete. On the contrary, he desires not to compete in order to escape the anxiety of another defeat. This desire not to try may bring his level of functioning below his level of ability. "Any clinician is familiar with numerous instances in which a child's conception of his abilities severely limited his achievement, even though his real abilities may have been superior to his perception of them" (4, p. 149). The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between intelligence and self-concept of children with low levels of mental maturity. In order to get a clearer picture of this relationship, the self-concept of children at various levels of mental deficiency was investigated.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis for this study was that the self-concept of children with low levels of intelligence would be significantly related to their I.Q., and that the relationship would be a curvilinear one.

The grounds for this hypothesis are that a person is aware, to some extent, of his ability. The greater the discrepancy between himself and others, measured by I.Q. in this case, the lower will be his self-concept. There is a point
on the intellectual continuum at which, because of diminished perceptual ability and environmental awareness, the person no longer perceives this discrepancy. Because of this, his self-concept should begin to rise.
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CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects in this study were all males, whose ages ranged from nine to fifteen. The mean age for the group was 12.95 years old. The subjects were divided into four groups. Their placement was determined by their full-scale I.Q. as measured by the WISC. Group one contained subjects whose I.Q. ranged from seventy to seventy-nine. This is Wechsler's classification of borderline mental defective (9). The I.Q. of groups two and three ranged from sixty to sixty-nine and from fifty to fifty-nine respectively. The I.Q. range of groups two and three coincides with the I.Q. range that is classified as mild retardation by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation (6). The I.Q. of group four ranged from forty to forty-nine. The I.Q. range of group four coincides with the upper two-thirds of the I.Q. range that is classified as moderate retardation by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. There were ten subjects in each group.

The subjects for groups two, three, and four were obtained from the Denton State School. The subjects for group one were obtained from Denton Public School special education classes. This was necessitated because children of an I.Q.
above seventy are not admitted to the Denton State School. This sampling from two separate populations was not considered an extraneous variable since it has been shown that institutionalized retardates have a lower self-concept than non-institutionalized retardates (3). A curvilinear relationship between I.Q. and self-concept, and thus a subsequent rise in self-concept at lower levels of intelligence, should be all the more significant because of the subject's institutionalization.

Although it has been shown that institutionalized retardates have a lower self-concept than non-institutionalized retardates, it appears that it is not the institutionalization per se that affects their self-concept. Rather, it seems that other factors which make institutionalization necessary may also affect the child's self-concept. Because of this, no attempt was made to control for length of stay in the institutional setting, since it was assumed that this would not affect their self-concept. This assumption was based on the results of previous research.

It has been found that long-term psychotherapy and other factors are necessary for change in self-concept (2). Taylor (8) and Engel (2) have found the self-concept relatively stable for periods of seven months and two years, respectively. McAfee and Cleland have stated that "Length of residence in a state school appears to have little effect
upon self-concept, ideal-self and discrepancy scores of educable mentally retarded males" (4, p. 66).

Instruments

There are a large number of scales today which purport to measure self-concept. Many of these were directed toward adults, and this makes them inappropriate for use with children. The limited intelligence of the subjects in this study greatly diminished the utility of these scales. The self-concept scale developed by Piers and Harris is an exception. The Way I Feel About Myself was designed for use with children. It was felt that this scale's relative absence of abstract terms and attempt to keep the vocabulary simple made it the most appropriate of those available for this study.

The Piers-Harris scale contains eighty statements about the self that are to be answered yes or no. A positive self-concept is indicated by answering some questions yes and answering some no. The higher the score, which can range from zero to eighty, the more positive the self-concept.

The original standardization study (7) produced coefficients of .87 and .90 by the Spearman-Brown odd-even formula. A retest after four months gave coefficients of .71 and .72. Another investigation has found a test-retest reliability of .77 for fifth grade students (10). It should be noted that the original study used ninety-five items instead of the present eighty-item scale.
In another investigation of the validity of the test, a .68 correlation was found between the Piers-Harris scale and the Lipsitt Children's Self-Concept Scale (7). Another study found a -.64 correlation between the Piers-Harris and the number of big problems listed by children on the SRA Junior Inventory (1). Because of the simple language and concepts of the scale and because of the adequate validity and reliability coefficients, the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale is perhaps the most acceptable for use with retardates.

The WISC was used to measure the I.Q. of all subjects. This was done to eliminate possible interscale errors.

Procedure

A WISC I.Q. was obtained for each subject. The subjects were then placed in their respective groups according to their full-scale I.Q. score. A minor difficulty arose in computing I.Q. scores for subjects in group four. The lowest full scale I.Q. listed in the WISC manual is forty-six (9). In order to score forty-six or above, a scaled score of at least twenty-six must be obtained, and several of the boys in group four did not attain the score. The I.Q. scores for these subjects were computed from a table of extrapolated WISC full-scale I.Q. scores (5).

On a subsequent day the subjects were given the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale. This was done on an individual basis. In order to eliminate possible errors arising from reading difficulty, the scale was read to all subjects.
In a preliminary pilot study it was found that the subjects were confused as to how to respond to the first-person statements, such as "I cry easily." It was found that they responded much more readily when the statements were put to them as a second-person direct question. This procedure necessitated the slight rewording of items sixty-five and seventy-one. Number sixty-five was changed to read "In games and sports, do you watch or play?" Number seventy-one was changed to read "Had you rather work alone or with a group?" The two items were scored correct for answering in the positive direction.

During the pilot study it was also noted that many of the children, in responding to items eleven and fifty, would smile proudly and answer in the wrong direction. It appeared that they did not comprehend the meaning of the negative prefixes to words such as "unpopular" and "unhappy." For this reason these prefixes were dropped.

In order to test for significance between the self-concept scores of each I.Q. group, a one-way analysis of variance was carried out. An F-ratio between eta and the Pearson product-moment correlation was also computed. This was done to determine if the relationship between I.Q. and self-concept was a curvilinear one.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The hypothesis in this study stated that the self-concept scores for each I.Q. group would be significantly different. A one-way analysis of variance was computed to investigate this, with the level of significance set at .05. The results are presented in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F-level</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1369.2800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>456.4266</td>
<td>5.8597</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2804.1000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77.8916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4173.3800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table I it can be seen that there was a significant difference in the self-concept scores. This implies that the self-concept scores in the four I.Q. groups represented differ more than would be expected by chance.
In order to find out where this significant difference between the groups was, a Fisher's $t$ test for significance was computed. The results are presented in Table II.

**TABLE II**

**MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND FISHER'S $t$ OF SELF-CONCEPT SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.600</td>
<td>7.6052</td>
<td>4.1044</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.400</td>
<td>10.3266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.100</td>
<td>8.1908</td>
<td>1.3174</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>62.4000</td>
<td>6.9885</td>
<td>-2.2042</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.400</td>
<td>10.3266</td>
<td>2.7869</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.100</td>
<td>8.1908</td>
<td>-2.7869</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>62.4000</td>
<td>6.9885</td>
<td>-2.7869</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.1000</td>
<td>8.1908</td>
<td>-.5827</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>62.4000</td>
<td>6.9885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen in Table II that there was a significant difference between groups one and two and between groups two and four. From Table II it can also be seen that I.Q. group one had the highest mean self-concept score, and that group two had the lowest. The subsequent rise in mean self-concept scores of groups three and four indicates a possible curvilinear relationship.

An eta was computed in order to determine if a curvilinear relationship existed. Eta was found to be .574. The Pearson product-moment correlation produced a coefficient of .031. The F-value, indicating the difference between the two coefficients, was 8.798. With two and thirty-six degrees of freedom, this was significant beyond the .001 level. This indicates that there is a curvilinear relationship between I.Q. and self-concept of the subjects investigated in this study.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that there is a significant difference in self-concept of children at different levels of subnormal intelligence. The results are seemingly contrary to those of Mayer (2). However, the I.Q. of his subjects ranged from fifty to seventy-five, and there was likewise no significant difference between the self-concept of subjects in the present study whose I.Q.'s ranged from fifty to sixty-nine. Also, Mayer's raw data were grouped
according to M.A. only, thus not differentiating exactly between I.Q.'s of the subjects.

The significant differences between the four groups in the present study concur with the results of Gorlow, Butler, and Guthrie (1). These authors found that "a relationship exists between intelligence and self attitude" of retarded women whose I.Q.'s ranged from fifty to eighty (1, p. 551). As stated earlier, the authors concluded that "The significant positive correlations argue that higher intelligence is associated with a greater predisposition to present the self in a more favorable light" (1, p. 551). McAfee and Cleland came to a similar conclusion concerning their significant correlation between I.Q. and discrepancy scores (3). Their contention was that as I.Q. increases, the retardates become more cognizant of society's norms.

The above two studies imply a linear relationship, and it is here that the present study differs. Significant results regarding the predicted curvilinear relationship indicate that there is a curvilinear relationship between self-concept and I.Q. of children with low levels of intelligence. Had the authors of the aforementioned studies extended downward the I.Q. range of their subjects, it is possible that the relationship would have appeared not only non-linear but non-significant as well. This possibility is due to the fact that with a curvilinear relationship, the Pearson product-moment correlation is inappropriate and will yield
non-significant results. In these cases an eta is necessary to determine if a relationship exists. In view of this, it seems quite possible that many reported non-significant "linear" correlations between I.Q. and self-concept might actually be significant curvilinear relationships.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between self-concept and I.Q. of children with low levels of intelligence. The hypothesis for this study stated that the self-concept of children with low levels of intelligence would be significantly related to their I.Q., and that the relationship would be a curvilinear one. The all-male subjects were selected, according to their WISC full-scale I.Q., from either the Denton State School or Denton Public School special education classes. Each group contained ten subjects of approximately the same age. The I.Q.'s ranged from forty to seventy-nine, with a ten-point range comprising each group.

One-way analysis of variance found the relationship between I.Q. and self-concept significant beyond the .01 level. An F-ratio between eta and the Pearson product-moment correlation found the curvilinear relationship significant beyond the .001 level. It was suggested that the significant results, contrary to the results of other studies, might be due to differences in statistical procedure.
Conclusions

The results of this study indicate that self-concept varies in a curvilinear fashion, rather than linearly, with changes in I.Q. among retardates. The results also indicate that within this group, self-concept and I.Q. are correlated. Although cause and effect are beyond the scope of this study, the results lend some support to the theory that a person's perception of his ability may affect his performance (1).

If this theory is correct, the results of this study give some indication as to why one retardate can function while an intellectually superior one can not. If correct, the results explain why a retardate of very low I.Q. may be adequately adjusted and content with his menial tasks and inferior performance. Under a theory of a causal relationship between perception and performance it can be seen that a retardate who does not perceive himself as inadequate will perform at an optimum level of his ability. What determines his conception of himself as adequate or inadequate is his ability to accurately perceive himself in relation to his environment.

It has generally been agreed that a retardate's behavior is influenced by the way others respond to him. "The retarded person learns a set of attitudes, favorable or unfavorable, about himself, his worth, his talents, his threat to others, and these reflected appraisals influence many aspects of his behavior" (2, p. 223). These learned appraisals or conceptions
of him tend to become his own. As he perceives his lack of success in competing with others, whether directly or through others' appraisals, his lowered self-concept and deprecatory self-esteem may become pervasive. This lowered self-concept may become so incapacitating that his performance level drops below his level of ability. In such an instance it may happen that the retardate of a lower I.Q. who is not subject to the crippling anxiety of noticed failure may actually perform better than his intellectually superior counterpart.

In improving the functioning of retardates, training might be aimed at improving their self-image. By setting up a program of limited reality-testing in which the child could not help but succeed, his level of functioning might be brought nearer to his level of ability, because of an improved self-concept.
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THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT MYSELF

NAME .................................................................
AGE .................................................. GIRL OR BOY ..................
GRADE ................................. SCHOOL ..........................
DATE .................................

© Ellen V. Piers and Dale B. Harris, 1969
Here are a set of statements. Some of them are true of you and so you will circle the yes. Some are not true of you and so you will circle the no. Answer every question even if some are hard to decide, but do not circle both yes and no. Remember, circle the yes if the statement is generally like you, or circle the no if the statement is generally not like you. There are no right or wrong answers. Only you can tell us how you feel about yourself, so we hope you will mark the way you really feel inside.

1. My classmates make fun of me . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
2. I am a happy person . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
3. It is hard for me to make friends . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
4. I am often sad . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
5. I am smart . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
6. I am shy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
7. I get nervous when the teacher calls on me . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
8. My looks bother me . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
9. When I grow up, I will be an important person . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
10. I get worried when we have tests in school. . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
11. I am unpopular . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
12. I am well behaved in school . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
13. It is usually my fault when something goes wrong . . . . . . yes no
14. I cause trouble to my family . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
15. I am strong . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
16. I have good ideas . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
17. I am an important member of my family . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
18. I usually want my own way . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
19. I am good at making things with my hands . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
20. I give up easily . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
21. I am good in my school work .................................. yes no
22. I do many bad things ............................................. yes no
23. I can draw well .................................................. yes no
24. I am good in music .............................................. yes no
25. I behave badly at home .......................................... yes no
26. I am slow in finishing my school work ....................... yes no
27. I am an important member of my class .................................. yes no
28. I am nervous .................................................... yes no
29. I have pretty eyes ............................................... yes no
30. I can give a good report in front of the class ............... yes no
31. In school I am a dreamer ....................................... yes no
32. I pick on my brother(s) and sister(s) ......................... yes no
33. My friends like my ideas ....................................... yes no
34. I often get into trouble ........................................ yes no
35. I am obedient at home ......................................... yes no
36. I am lucky ........................................................ yes no
37. I worry a lot ..................................................... yes no
38. My parents expect too much of me ............................. yes no
39. I like being the way I am ....................................... yes no
40. I feel left out of things ......................................... yes no
41. I have nice hair ........................................... yes no
42. I often volunteer in school ........................................... yes no
43. I wish I were different ........................................... yes no
44. I sleep well at night ........................................... yes no
45. I hate school ........................................... yes no
46. I am among the last to be chosen for games ........................................... yes no
47. I am sick a lot ........................................... yes no
48. I am often mean to other people ........................................... yes no
49. My classmates in school think I have good ideas ........................................... yes no
50. I am unhappy ........................................... yes no
51. I have many friends ........................................... yes no
52. I am cheerful ........................................... yes no
53. I am dumb about most things ........................................... yes no
54. I am good looking ........................................... yes no
55. I have lots of pep ........................................... yes no
56. I get into a lot of fights ........................................... yes no
57. I am popular with boys ........................................... yes no
58. People pick on me ........................................... yes no
59. My family is disappointed in me ........................................... yes no
60. I have a pleasant face ........................................... yes no
61. When I try to make something, everything seems to go wrong . . . . yes no
62. I am picked on at home . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
63. I am a leader in games and sports . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
64. I am clumsy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
65. In games and sports, I watch instead of play . . . . . . . yes no
66. I forget what I learn . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
67. I am easy to get along with . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
68. I lose my temper easily . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
69. I am popular with girls . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
70. I am a good reader . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
71. I would rather work alone than with a group . . . . . . yes no
72. I like my brother (sister) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
73. I have a good figure . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
74. I am often afraid . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
75. I am always dropping or breaking things . . . . . . . yes no
76. I can be trusted . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
77. I am different from other people . . . . . . . . . . yes no
78. I think bad thoughts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
79. I cry easily . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no
80. I am a good person . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . yes no

Score: _______
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