

## Central Washington University ScholarWorks@CWU

---

All Master's Theses

Master's Theses


---

1968

# The Relationship of the Institutionalized Juvenile Delinquent's Self-Concept to reading Achievement and IQ

Donald L. Lorentsen  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Lorentsen, Donald L., "The Relationship of the Institutionalized Juvenile Delinquent's Self-Concept to reading Achievement and IQ" (1968). *All Master's Theses*. 876.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/876>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

295

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE INSTITUTIONALIZED  
JUVENILE DELINQUENT'S SELF-CONCEPT TO  
READING ACHIEVEMENT AND IQ

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education

---

by  
Donald L. Lorentsen

June 1968

LD

5771.3

L 868<sup>ro</sup>  
SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

171003

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

Hyrum S. Henderson, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Darwin J. Goodey

---

John E. Davis

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Hyrum Henderson for his advice and encouragement in directing the writing of this paper, and to Mr. Darwin Goodey and Dr. John Davis for their helpful suggestions.

Special mention and thanks are due to my wife, Jane, whose continued cooperation and support throughout the program has made this possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	2
Hypothesis of the Study . . . . .	2
Terms Used in the Study . . . . .	3
Related Research . . . . .	3
METHOD . . . . .	8
Subjects . . . . .	8
Instrument . . . . .	8
Procedure . . . . .	10
RESULTS . . . . .	12
DISCUSSION . . . . .	15
Educational Implications . . . . .	18
SUMMARY . . . . .	20
REFERENCES . . . . .	21
APPENDIXES . . . . .	23

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Four-Month Test-Retest Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients on The Way I Feel About Myself . . . . .	10
2. Pearsonian Correlations of Self-Concept Scores of 28 Juvenile Delinquents with Reading Achievement and IQ . . . . .	12
3. Comparison of Self-Concept for Delinquent Sample and Standardization Sample -- N = 28 . . . . .	13
4. Comparison of the $\bar{X}$ Reading Score for Delinquent Sample and Standardization Sample -- N = 28 . . . . .	14

## INTRODUCTION

Reading is of fundamental importance in the academic life of children and is in many ways related to one's total life adjustment. Despite the marked improvement in teaching methods many children still cannot learn to read. Recognizing this, educators have been reluctant to attribute reading retardation solely to inadequate teaching programs (Kessler, 1966). If teaching methods are adequate, an area of interest to educators is the relationship between self-concept, reading achievement, and IQ.

"Everyone has an image or concept of himself as a unique person or self, different from every other self [Hamachek, 1965, p. 2]." The concept the child may have of himself as a fisherman could be quite different from the way he sees himself as a student, just as the concept he may have of himself as a brother or son could be quite different from the light in which he views himself as a member of a reading class.

Anderson (Hamachek, 1965, p. 7) maintains that

in the development of the self image, the first year of life is the most important, each succeeding year becoming of lesser importance, until the image is essentially completed before adolescence. This is not due to the fact that the earliest period of life is the most plastic or the most impressionable, but rather to the fact that the helplessness and dependency of the child are maximum



in the earliest period and, therefore, his necessity is so much greater.

The individual unconsciously builds his self-attitudes to reflect the love, acceptance and confidence--or the lack of these qualities--shown toward him by his parents and significant others.

### Purpose of the Study

The literature has suggested that delinquents are characterized by a reading disability and a negative self-concept. The problem was to determine if there was a significant correlation between the measured self-concept and reading achievement, self-concept and IQ, and reading achievement and IQ of Institutionalized Juvenile Delinquents. A secondary purpose of the study was to determine if there was a significant difference between the self-concept of the present sample and the self-concept of the standardization sample used in the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale.

### Hypothesis of the Study

The null hypothesis of no significant correlation between the self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale and reading achievement as measured by the Wide Range Achievement Test was postulated.

The null hypothesis of no significant correlation between IQ as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale and self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale was postulated.

### Terms Used in the Study

The following terms are defined within the context of this study.

#### Self-concept

For the purpose of this study, this term refers to the scores attained on the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale.

#### Reading Achievement

The term refers to the reading scores attained on the Wide Range Achievement Test.

#### Reading Quotient

The term refers to the scores attained by dividing the reading achievement score by the mental age.

#### Delinquent

The term refers to those individuals between the age of 8-18 years adjudged delinquent and sentenced by the courts of the State of Washington.

### Related Research

Various studies of the relationship between personality characteristics and reading difficulty have demonstrated a higher incidence of personal problems and emotional maladjustment among poor readers than among good ones (Wiksell, 1948). Fabian (1957) in a comparative study of the incidence of reading disability in several clinical settings revealed the following:

. . . an incidence of 10% in a school sample; 33% in a child guidance clinic sample; 62% in a sample from a child placement agency; 73% in the population of a psychiatric hospital's children's ward; and 83% in a sample of predelinquent children (p. 5).

Smith, Wood, Downer, and Raygar (1956), using the MMPI as a personality measure, found that poor readers tend to complain more about health and general physical condition and tend to be somewhat more immature and have a greater need for social acceptance. Poor readers also seem to be somewhat more depressed, more irresponsible, more shy and withdrawn, and show somewhat less enthusiasm and charm in their social contacts, and yet are slightly more extroverted.

Gates (1936, p. 205), in cataloging the symptoms of personality maladjustment found among retarded readers, emphasizes: "Extreme self-consciousness; becoming easily injured, blushing, developing peculiar fads and frills and eccentricities, inferiority feelings."

More recently, Stewart (1950), in a sample of thirty elementary age children, revealed that by using several personality inventories, children with reading disabilities on the Gates Reading Survey indicated that all inferior readers appear to be basically insecure. The finding suggests that personality maladjustment may influence reading achievement.

Gann (1945), on the basis of an intensive study of the personality of the retarded reader, concludes that:

. . . the findings in this study may be applied to the practical school situation where the retarded reader should be considered as a personality problem. Consideration

of his reading difficulty cannot be made apart from his personality adjustment and his attitudes toward the reading experience (p. 22).

In an investigation of the relationship between certain aspects of self-concept and academic achievement, Stevens (1956), using 52 college sophomores who were on the honor roll, compared them with a group of 49 college sophomores who had been put on probation because of poor grades. The results indicated that the self-concept is related to academic achievement.

It appears that the maladjusted person is characterized by many threatening perceptions, and his maladjusted behavior occurs largely as a result of his attempts to deal with the threats to which he feels himself subjected (Chodorkoff, 1955; Gough, 1949; Taylor and Combs, 1952).

As was previously mentioned, Fabian (1957), in a comparative study of the incidence of reading disability indicates that the delinquent population is characterized by a reading disability. In a similar view, Roman (1957) claims that "Many children with reading disabilities are not and never become delinquent, but many delinquents first manifest their difficulties in the development of reading disabilities [p. 4]."

Jersild (1952), in his book In Search of Self, commented:

When a person resists learning that may be beneficial to him, he is, in effect, trying to protect or to shield an unhealthy condition. But, more broadly speaking, he is not actually protecting something unhealthy as such; he is trying to safeguard his picture of himself, his self-concept . . . (p. 114)"

Brownfain (1952) observed that if the individual perceives the social environment as threatening, then he may respond to it with hostility which provokes counter-hostility in the group, leading to still further alienation. The purpose of the investigation by Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay (1957) was to explore the components underlying potential insulation against legal and social misconduct. As a result of this research it was suggested that:

. . . insulation against delinquency appears to be a function of the acquisition and maintenance of a socially acceptable or appropriate self-concept (p. 566).

In sharing this view, many years ago Adler (1925) remarked that people who feel inferior tend to withdraw from social participation until only a small group is left over for the maneuvers aiming at the various types of superiority to expend themselves upon.

It is important to note, however, that this behavior has been learned, and that learned behavior can be modified and adjusted. Until some significant person or persons in his life help him see himself as capable and worthwhile, the individual who has learned to see himself as stupid and insignificant is enslaved by this self-concept.

Deitche (1959) compared the self-concept ratings of two groups of boys, one group adjudged delinquent and the other non-delinquent. The bases of comparison were three dimensions of self and five frames of self which the individual ascribed to himself by checking the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The

delinquent group was composed of 50 white, 15- and 16-year-old males. The non-delinquent group was chosen from among the general public school population and was matched with the delinquent group on four variables: age, intelligence, ethnic origin, and stability of the home. The results revealed that the mean self-concept scores of non-delinquent boys were higher, that is, more positive, than the mean self-concept scores of delinquent boys.

In an investigation using an experimental and control group, Dolan (1964) concludes that: ". . . the evidence supports the proposition that effective counseling can change self-concepts enough to influence positively a score on a test of an educational skill such as reading [p. 134]."

As a whole, research findings emphasize that the maladjusted person, such as the delinquent, is characterized by a negative self-concept which may have an adverse influence upon reading achievement.

## METHOD

### Subjects

The sample consisted of 24 males and four females between the ages of 13-6 and 17-9 whose IQ's ranged between 74 and 128. Selection of subjects was based on the availability of subjects for testing. All had been adjudged delinquent and were on active status at the Cascadia Diagnostic Center near Tacoma, Washington. This information is summarized in Appendix A.

### Instrument

Piers and Harris (1964) designed The Way I Feel About Myself, a scale which consisted of eighty declarative statements which are answered by yes or no. The eighty declarative statements encompass these seven areas: intellectual and school status, behavior, anxiety, popularity, masculinity and femininity, appearance and prowess, and happiness and satisfaction. Items are scored in the direction of high (adequate) self-concept or low (inadequate) self-concept. It is suggested that the total number of "highs" be added and written on the front of the scale, and the number of "lows" be added and written below it. These should sum 80. The range of possible scores is zero to eighty.

As reported by Piers and Harris (1964), *The Way I Feel About Myself* has been standardized on third, sixth, and tenth grade classes. Initial standardization was conducted using approximately 365 subjects using a 95 item scale. Scores for boys and girls were reported separately until it was confirmed that sex contributed no significant difference in scores. After item analysis, 80 items met the criteria to significantly discriminate between the high and low groups. The eighty items remain to constitute the present scale.

Internal consistency and reliability were measured by the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 and "as a check the Spearman-Brown odd-even formula was applied to half the Grade 6 and Grade 10 sample, with a resulting coefficients of .90 and .87 respectively [p. 93]." The mean scores were consistently higher on the retest scores. Coefficients were reported in the low .70's at the .01 level of significance on each of the three levels, as is indicated in Table 1.

The reasons for selecting the Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale were: (1) *The Way I Feel About Myself* has standardization norms as low as the third grade and as high as the twelfth grade. (2) The scale appeared to be suited to the wide range of academic abilities encountered in this study. (3) The instrument could be read orally without affecting its reliability or validity. (4) The instrument could be administered in small groups. (5) The scale is relatively easy to administer, score, and interpret. (6) The scale takes less than one hour to administer.



TABLE 1  
FOUR-MONTH TEST-RETEST MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND  
RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS ON  
THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT MYSELF\*

Grade	N	November		March		r
		M	SD	M	SD	
3	56	68.73	16.97	77.5	12.02	.72
6	66	65.88	13.03	71.9	10.85	.71
10	60	69.10	11.51	73.6	11.23	.72

\*Piers and Harris, 1964, p. 94.

### Procedure

The Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale was administered to the 28 subjects in four groups. Administering procedure was identical (Appendix B). The scale was read orally, each statement read and repeated, with a momentary pause for marking before proceeding to the next statement. Subjects responded by circling either "yes" or "no" on a separate answer sheet.

The IQ and reading achievement scores were obtained from case histories on file at the diagnostic center. These scores were results of tests administered by Cascadia personnel and obtained one to six weeks prior to the administration of the self-concept scale.

The reading quotient (reading achievement  $\div$  mental age) was used to determine the differences in age and reading achievement. The Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to compare self-concept and reading quotient and self-concept and IQ. The formula was also used to correlate reading quotient and IQ.

## RESULTS

The null hypotheses (there would be no significant correlation between the self-concept and reading achievement and no significant correlation between the self-concept and IQ) were not rejected. The results disclosed a Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of  $-.015$  between self-concept and reading achievement,  $+.029$  between self-concept and IQ, and  $+.139$  between reading achievement and IQ. A correlation coefficient of  $.373$  was necessary to be significant at the  $.05$  level (Table 2).

TABLE 2

PEARSONIAN CORRELATIONS OF SELF-CONCEPT SCORES OF 28 JUVENILE DELINQUENTS WITH READING ACHIEVEMENT AND IQ

Index	r	P
Self-concept -- Reading Achievement	$-.015$	ns
Self-concept -- IQ	$+.029$	ns
Reading Achievement -- IQ	$+.139$	ns

Note: A correlation greater than  $.373$  was needed to be significant.

The secondary concern of this study was to determine if there was a significant difference in the self-concept of the

present sample and self-concept of the standardization sample. Results indicated a significant difference in the means of the two samples. The delinquent population obtained a mean score of 54.2 with a standard deviation of 16.1 as compared with the mean score of 69.1 and a standard deviation of 11.5 for the standardization sample. A comparison of groups revealed a significant difference at the .001 level of confidence ( $t=4.50$ ) (Table 3).

TABLE 3  
COMPARISON OF SELF-CONCEPT FOR DELINQUENT SAMPLE  
AND STANDARDIZATION SAMPLE -- N = 28

Sample	Mean	SD	t
Delinquent	54.21	16.10	
Standardization**	69.10	11.51	
			4.50*

\*Significant at .001 level.  
\*\*Piers and Harris, 1964, p. 94.

The mean reading score of the delinquent population was compared with the mean reading score of the standardization sample employed in the Wide Range Achievement Test. The present sample obtained a mean score of 53.0 with a standard deviation of 15.6 as compared with the mean score of 55.7 and a standard deviation of 12.7 for the standardization sample. A comparison of the means showed that the difference was not significant at the .05 level of confidence ( $t=.90$ ) (Table 4).

TABLE 4  
 COMPARISON OF THE  $\bar{X}$  READING SCORE FOR DELINQUENT SAMPLE  
 AND STANDARDIZATION SAMPLE -- N = 28

Sample	Mean	SD	t
Delinquent	53.0	15.65	
Standardization**	55.7	12.72	
			.90*

\*Insignificant at .05 level.  
 \*\*Jastak and Jastak, 1965, p. 10.

## DISCUSSION

If there is any validity to the premise that the self-concept is related to reading achievement and IQ one would expect to find a significant correlation. However, such was not revealed in the present analysis. One possible interpretation of this finding emphasizes the lack of validity in the instruments used. Another interpretation, around which this discussion will center, assumes that there is actually no relation between self-concept, reading achievement, and IQ.

A comparison of the appropriate standardization scores for the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale was computed with the scores of the total population of this study. Such comparison revealed a significant difference at .001 level of confidence ( $t=4.50$ ). This significance implies that the total population of delinquents has a lower, that is, more negative, self-image than the standardization sample. These results are in agreement with previous research using delinquents conducted by Deitche (1959) using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Since the results have indicated that the delinquent possesses a negative self-concept and other studies (Gann, 1945; Stevens, 1956; Stewart, 1950) have shown the self-concept to be related to academic achievement, one would expect to

find a significant correlation between self-concept and reading achievement. The results have disclosed a near zero correlation ( $r=-.015$ ), which is in contrast to the findings of Dolan (1964). A possible explanation is that the present sample was made up entirely of institutionalized delinquents who may possess a negative self-concept regardless of academic achievement. Another possibility is that the delinquents are not reading at an extremely lower reading level than may be found in a regular classroom since the mean reading score was not significantly lower than the mean reading score of the sample used in standardizing the reading test. The findings suggest that one may rule out the existence of a relationship between the juvenile delinquent's self-concept and reading achievement.

A near zero correlation ( $r=+.029$ ) was revealed between self-concept and IQ. Stated another way, the mean self-concept scores were independent of the present level of intellectual functioning. In general, the delinquents tested in courts and institutions have average IQ's in the high 80's and low 90's (Kessler, 1966). The mean IQ of the present sample was 98.8 with a standard deviation of 12.8 which is extremely close to a random sample of the normal population. Therefore, it could possibly be argued that the present sample is not a true indication of juvenile delinquents, at least in regard to intelligence. The results suggest that, even though the delinquent may be capable of achieving academically, this capability does not in itself affect his self-image.

Since the study has shown that the delinquent's self-concept is not related to reading achievement and IQ, perhaps the feelings of inadequacy are originating early in life before formal contact with the competitive environment of the classroom as suggested by Hamachek (1965) and Jersild (1952). One may even speculate that the delinquent's self-concept is a result of parental and family interaction combined with social experiences, that is, social experiences aside from academic experiences.

A low, but insignificant correlation ( $r=+.139$ ) was revealed between reading achievement and IQ. The results indicate that intelligence tests may not be reliable predictors of reading success in delinquents. The results are in agreement with Hirsch, Jansky, and Langford (1965) who have stated that:

An intelligence quotient represents a global rather than a differentiated evaluation of a person's potential and fails to take into account some aspects of perceptual functioning that seems to be important determinants in early reading success or failure (p. 3).

Since reading skills can be improved by instruction and practice in addition to other factors such as experience and interest of the individual, Wheeler (1949) concludes that, "Using ability to read as a major factor in determining intelligence is a dangerous educational policy [p. 226]."

It appears that many factors other than intelligence are operating in the lives of the present population of delinquents that are influencing a score on a reading test such as the one employed in this study.



### Educational Implications

The present study supports the contention that juvenile delinquents do express negative self-concepts. The self-concept, as Perkins (1958) has inferred, is a psychological construct which enables deeper understanding and insight into the behavior and development of a child. With the insight which can be obtained through self-concept studies, failures and degrading experiences can be reduced. It must also be realized that the measured self-concept may not be the actual self-concept. However, it is not essential to obtain an historical evaluation on the development of a negative self-concept to enable modification.

Self-concept scales can be useful as a guide "to determine the qualities a person feels he does or does not possess [Zunich, 1965, p. 771]." Every person views himself differently and is viewed differently by others. If a person feels he lacks certain qualities which are expected of him, a negative self-concept is generally formed. A child must be liked in order to like; he must be respected for himself in order to respect. It is the task of all those involved with the delinquent to do what is in their power to help that individual develop a positive self-concept.

The study also suggests that the self-concept of the delinquent will not necessarily be improved by placing greater emphasis on the reading program. As stated previously, success in an educational skill such as reading may not be

predicted by the intelligence quotient alone. Other factors, such as quality of instruction, practice, experience, and interest appear to be important determinants in reading success.

## SUMMARY

It was concluded that the self-concept scores significantly differentiated the delinquent from the non-delinquent standardization sample. The data was tabulated and analyzed by means of the t-test for significance. The results disclosed a difference significant at .001 level of confidence. A low and insignificant correlation ( $r=+.139$ ) was obtained between reading achievement and IQ. Near zero correlations were obtained between self-concept and IQ and self-concept and reading achievement ( $r=+.029$  and  $-.015$  respectively). The data, then, supports hypotheses 1 and 2.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, A. The practice and theory of individual psychology. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench and Trubner, 1925.
- Brownfain, John. Stability of the self-concept as a dimension of personality. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 597-606.
- Chodorkoff, B. Self-perception, perceptual defense, and adjustment. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 50-51, 508-512.
- Deitche, John H. The performance of delinquent and non-delinquent boys on the Tennessee department of mental health self-concept. Dissertation Abstracts, 1959, 20, 1437-1438.
- Dolan, K. G. Counseling as an aid for delayed readers. Journal of Reading, 1964-1965, 8, 129-135.
- Fabian, A. As quoted by Roman, M. Reaching delinquents through reading. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1957.
- Gann, E. Reading difficulty and personality organization. New York: Kings, Inc., 1945.
- Gates, A. I. Failure in reading and social maladjustment. Journal of the National Education Association, 1936, 25, 205-206.
- Gough, H. G. Factors relating to the academic achievement of high-school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1949, 40, 65-78.
- Hamachek, D. E. The self in growth, teaching, and learning. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965.
- Hirsch, K. D., Jansky, J. & Langford, W. Predicting reading failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Jastak, J. F. and Jastak, S. R. The wide range achievement test manual. Delaware: Guidance Associates, 1965.

- Jersild, A. T. In search of self. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1952.
- Kessler, J. W. Psychopathology of childhood. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Perkins, H. Teachers' and peers' perceptions of children's self-concepts. Child Development, 1958, 29, 203-220.
- Piers, E. V. & Harris, D. B. Age and other correlates of self-concept in children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55, 91-95.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. & Kay B. The self-component in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 566-570.
- Roman, M. Reaching delinquents through reading. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1957.
- Smith, D., Wood, R. L., Downer, J. W., & Raygar, A. L. Reading improvement as a function of student personality and teaching methods. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 47-59.
- Stevens, P. H. An investigation of the relationship between certain aspects of self concept behavior and student's academic achievement. Dissertation Abstracts, 1956, 16, 2531-2532.
- Stewart, R. S. Personality maladjustment and reading achievement. American Journal of Orthopsychology, 1950, 20, 410-417.
- Taylor, C. & Combs, A. Self-acceptance and adjustment. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 89-91.
- Wheeler, L. R. The relation of reading to intelligence. School and Society, 1949, 70, 225-227.
- Wiksell, W. The relationship between reading difficulties and psychological adjustment. Journal of Educational Research, 1947-1948, 41, 557-558.
- Zunich, M. & Ledwith, B. E. Self-concepts of visually handicapped and sighted children. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1965, 21, 771-774.

**APPENDIX A**

APPENDIX A

RAW DATA

Self-Concept Scores, Chronological Age in Months,  
IQ Scores, and Reading Quotients

N = 28

	SC	CA	IQ	RQ
S-1	52	204	128	.71
S-2	74	184	115	.95
S-3	47	188	85	.95
S-4	33	197	78	.82
S-5	27	164	113	.91
S-6	47	192	109	.97
S-7	31	204	110	.80
S-8	34	180	104	1.20
S-9	62	198	124	.70
S-10	42	191	95	.97
S-11	41	195	106	.90
S-12	43	212	74	.54
S-13	55	182	82	.62
S-14	58	169	101	1.00
S-15	38	179	100	1.20
S-16	63	162	111	.83
S-17	26	174	91	.87
S-18	58	174	100	.93
S-19	66	186	87	.54
S-20	70	210	97	.58
S-21	62	193	91	.97
S-22	69	209	93	1.20
S-23	68	201	96	1.00
S-24	76	211	96	1.10
S-25	75	206	92	1.00
S-26	75	182	90	.73
S-27	52	210	93	.97
S-28	79	213	105	1.10
Mean	54.2	192	98.7	.89
S.D.	16.1	14.7	12.8	.18

**APPENDIX B**



## APPENDIX B

### DIRECTIONS GIVEN SUBJECTS BEFORE ADMINISTERING PIERS-HARRIS SELF CONCEPT SCALE

I am going to ask you some questions concerning the way you feel about yourself. Your answers will in no way affect your grades in school or your future. However, you are to give an honest answer to each question. This questionnaire is being given to find out how young people feel about themselves.

Answer each question by drawing a circle around either the yes or no. Be sure to answer every question. If you want to change your answer use your eraser.

Print your name, first name first, in the space for name at the top of the answer sheet.

Now let's do one together. I will read the question twice. Wait until I have finished before you circle your answer. Draw a circle around the answer that tells best how you feel about yourself most of the time. Do you have any questions? Now let's continue.

**APPENDIX C**

APPENDIX C  
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING PIERS-HARRIS  
SELF-CONCEPT SCALE  
Grade III-XII

1. Before distributing the scale, the examiner should talk to the students about the value of finding how boys and girls really feel about themselves, in order to help them, and the necessity, therefore, for a completely honest response rather than a socially desirable one. Particularly for research purposes, the obtaining of norms should be stressed, rather than individual scores. It should also be stressed that the scale will have nothing to do with their school grades, and will be kept confidential. At this stage in the development of the scale, it is not recommended that they be used by teachers for screening purposes.

2. Because of difficulties in reading, instructions and items should always be read aloud by the examiner in Grades III and IV. It has been found desirable to read them aloud even with Grades V and VI, since this keeps the group together and too busy to share opinions. From Grade VII on, only instructions need be read.

3. Items should be read clearly twice without haste, but not so slowly that second thoughts or distractions will occur. After a few items, the examiner can usually determine the optimal pace for that class. A few moments can be given at the end for the slower members to finish. Although there is no time limit, 20 minutes is usually ample.

4. Students should be told that they must circle either the Yes or the No for all items. There should be no omissions and no double circles, even when some items are hard to decide. It has been found helpful to have an additional proctor go up and down the aisles making sure all children are marking the items correctly, and keeping up with the examiner.

5. One or two words in the scale are difficult for younger groups and may be explained. "Disobedient" is one of these, "unpopular" another. It is also permissible to answer one or two other questions at the beginning, particularly with reference to the all-or-none quality of the items. It should be explained that everyone feels differently at different times, but that they should mark the item the way they generally feel.

Additional questions are usually unnecessary and should be discouraged. Otherwise the "worrier" or the class clown will constantly question.

## THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT MYSELF

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. 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 | 12. I am well behaved in school                      | YES | NO |
| 2. I am a happy person                          | YES | NO | 13. It is usually my fault when something goes wrong | YES | NO |
| 3. It is hard for me to make friends            | YES | NO | 14. I cause trouble to my family                     | YES | NO |
| 4. I am often sad                               | YES | NO | 15. I am strong                                      | YES | NO |
| 5. I am smart                                   | YES | NO | 16. I have good ideas                                | YES | NO |
| 6. I am shy                                     | YES | NO | 17. I am an important member of my family            | YES | NO |
| 7. I get nervous when the teacher calls on me   | YES | NO | 18. I like being the way I am                        | YES | NO |
| 8. My looks bother me                           | YES | NO | 19. I am good at making things with my hands         | YES | NO |
| 9. When I grow up I will be an important person | YES | NO | 20. I give up easily                                 | YES | NO |
| 10. I get worried when we have tests in school  | YES | NO | 21. I am good in my schoolwork                       | YES | NO |
| 11. I am unpopular                              | YES | NO | 22. I do many bad things                             | YES | NO |

- |  |     |    |   |     |    |
|--|-----|----|---|-----|----|
| 23. I can draw well                                      | YES | NO | 40. I feel left out<br>of things                          | YES | NO |
| 24. I am good in<br>music                                | YES | NO | 41. I have nice hair                                      | YES | NO |
| 25. I behave badly<br>at home                            | YES | NO | 42. I often volunteer<br>in school                        | YES | NO |
| 26. I am slow in<br>finishing my<br>schoolwork           | YES | NO | 43. I have a pleasant<br>face                             | YES | NO |
| 27. I am an important<br>member of my<br>class           | YES | NO | 44. I sleep well at<br>night                              | YES | NO |
| 28. I am nervous   | YES | NO | 45. I hate school   | YES | NO |
| 29. I have pretty<br>eyes                                | YES | NO | 46. I am among the<br>last to be chosen<br>for games      | YES | NO |
| 30. I can give a good<br>report in front<br>of the class | YES | NO | 47. I am sick a lot                                       | YES | NO |
| 31. In school I am a<br>dreamer                          | YES | NO | 48. I am often mean<br>to other people                    | YES | NO |
| 32. I pick on my<br>brother(s) and<br>sister(s)          | YES | NO | 49. My classmates in<br>school think I<br>have good ideas | YES | NO |
| 33. My friends like my<br>ideas                          | YES | NO | 50. I am unhappy  | YES | NO |
| 34. I often get into<br>trouble                          | YES | NO | 51. I have many<br>friends                                | YES | NO |
| 35. I am disobedient<br>at home                          | YES | NO | 52. I am cheerful   | YES | NO |
| 36. I am unlucky   | YES | NO | 53. I am dumb about<br>most things                        | YES | NO |
| 37. I worry a lot  | YES | NO | 54. I am goodlooking                                      | YES | NO |
| 38. My parents expect<br>too much of me                  | YES | NO | 55. I have lots of<br>pep                                 | YES | NO |
| 39. I usually want my<br>own way                         | YES | NO | 56. I get into a lot<br>of fights                         | YES | NO |
|  |     |    | 57. I am popular<br>with boys                             | YES | NO |

- |  |     |    |   |     |    |
|--|-----|----|---|-----|----|
| 58. People pick on me  | YES | NO | 74. I am often afraid                       | YES | NO |
| 59. My family is disappointed in me                            | YES | NO | 75. I am always dropping or breaking things | YES | NO |
| 60. I wish I were different                                    | YES | NO | 76. I cry easily                            | YES | NO |
| 61. When I try to make something, everything seems to go wrong | YES | NO | 77. I am different from other people        | YES | NO |
| 62. I am picked on at home                                     | YES | NO | 78. I think bad thoughts                    | YES | NO |
| 63. I am a leader in games and sports                          | YES | NO | 79. I can be trusted                        | YES | NO |
| 64. I am clumsy  | YES | NO | 80. I am a good person                      | 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 dislike my brother (sister)                              | YES | NO |   |     |    |
| 73. I have a bad figure  | YES | NO |   |     |    |

### Methods of Scoring

The Way I Feel About Myself was scored according to the following instructions:

Items are scored in the direction of high (adequate) self-concept. It is suggested that the total number of "highs" be added and written on the front of the scale, and then the number of "lows" be added and written below it. These should sum to 80.

1. No	21. Yes	41. Yes	61. No
2. Yes	22. No	42. Yes	62. No
3. No	23. Yes	43. Yes	63. Yes
4. No	24. Yes	44. Yes	64. No
5. Yes	25. No	45. No	65. No
6. No	26. No	46. No	66. No
7. No	27. Yes	47. No	67. Yes
8. No	28. No	48. No	68. No
9. Yes	29. Yes	49. Yes	69. Yes
10. No	30. Yes	50. No	70. Yes
11. No	31. No	51. Yes	71. No
12. Yes	32. No	52. Yes	72. No
13. No	33. Yes	53. No	73. No
14. No	34. No	54. Yes	74. No
15. Yes	35. No	55. Yes	75. No
16. Yes	36. No	56. No	76. No
17. Yes	37. No	57. Yes	77. No
18. Yes	38. No	58. No	78. No
19. Yes	39. No	59. No	79. Yes
20. No	40. No	60. No	80. Yes