TEACHERS' APPRAISAL OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT: ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CHILDREN'S BEHAVIORAL STYLES, SELF-ESTEEM AND PARENTS' VALUING STYLES

by

Karen Hanula Rosen

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Child Development

APPROVED:

Linda F. Little, Chairman

Joseph W. Maxwell

Martin Gerstein

June, 1984
Blacksburg, Virginia

TEACHERS' APPRAISAL OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT: ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CHILDREN'S BEHAVIORAL STYLES, SELF-ESTEEM AND PARENTS' VALUING STYLES

by

Karen H. Rosen

(ABSTRACT)

This study examined the relationship between teachers' assessment of children's overall school adjustment and children's self-esteem, behavioral styles, and the valuing styles of parents. Subjects were 75 third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade children from middle-class families in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area who were subjectively rated by teachers (n=8) as best adjusted (n=38) or least adjusted (n=37) in terms of overall psychosocial and academic functioning in the classroom. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory was used to measure children's self-esteem, Dimensions of Temperament Survey to measure their temperament, and Matthews Youth Test for Health to measure their Type A behavior pattern. The Little Parental Valuing Styles Scale was the instrument used to measure parents' self-reported valuing styles. One-factor multivariate analysis of variance was used to evaluate mean score differences for either best and least adjusted children, or their parents for each instrument. The best adjusted children were found to have higher self-esteem, were more rhythmic, less reactive, more competitive and less impatient-aggressive than least adjusted children. Parents

of best adjusted children were more accepting and less overprotective and rejecting than parents of least adjusted children.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research and completion of my degree could not have been accomplished without help from many people. I extend deepest appreciation to my husband, Cecil, whose encouragement and understanding have been immeasureable during the process of completing this project and fulfilling other degree requirements. I am also grateful to my sons, Jeffrey and Michael, who have persevered with good humor and provided frequent domestic assistance.

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Linda Little for her scholarly advice and encouragement throughout execution of this research project. I am deeply grateful, not only for her valuable suggestions, but also for personal concern and friendship she has so generously given me.

I extend thanks to Drs. Joseph Maxwell and Martin Gerstein, members of my committee, for their scholarly contributions to this project. I also thank Judy Barokas for her patient statistical consultation.

I am grateful to Natialy Walker, principal of Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School, for her enthusiastic support during the data collection phase. I extend special thanks to teachers, other staff, students, and parents whose gracious participation has made this project possible.

I also thank Sigma Xi, the Scientific Research Society, for a grant which partially funded this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

TEACHERS' APPRAISAL OF CHILDREN'S SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT: ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CHILDREN'S BEHAVIORAL STYLES, SELF-ESTEEM AND PARENTS' VALUING STYLES

The adjustment of young children to the learning environment has been a concern to educational professionals and parents for many years. It is during the early school years that children are first exposed to the realities of institutional life and develop adaptive strategies that tend to remain with them throughout the balance of their education and beyond (Berlin, 1975; Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, & Trost, 1973; Kohn, 1977). In reviews of related literature, it has been reported that from 10 to 40 percent of American children experience school maladjustment (Berlin, 1975; Kohn, 1977; Lorion, Cowen, Kraus & Milling, 1977; Reeve & Kauffman, 1978; Roberts, 1968). While these figures are staggering, research suggests that during the early years failure can most easily be prevented, and if it does occur, can be corrected within the school environment (Cowen, Trost, Lorion, Dorr, Izzo, & Isaacson, 1975; Rubin, 1978).

Self-esteem has been of major interest as a personality variable within school settings for some time. A review of related literature suggested that children's self-attitudes are related to their academic achievement (Coopersmith, 1967; Gordon, 1977; Purkey, 1970; Rubin, 1978; Rubin, Dorle,

& Sandidge, 1977), attitudes toward school (Metcalfe, 1981), and classroom behavior (Reynolds, 1980).

Another variable of interest in the school setting is children's temperament. Thomas and Chess (1977), after an extensive 20-year longitudinal study, concluded that certain temperament patterns (i.e., arrhythmic, low in approach and adaptability, intense and negative mood) predispose children to behavior problems and play important roles in children's adaptation to school. The results of Thomas and Chess have been partially supported by Gordon & Thomas (1967), Carey, Fox, and McDevitt (1977) and more recently by Pullis (1980), Lerner (1981), and Palermo (1982).

The Type A behavior pattern, a construct developed in the 1950's by Friedman and Rosenman (1974) to describe a consistent pattern of responding to the environment which they observed in the behavior of cardiac patients, is another variable that seems to be related to children's behavior in school. The major characteristics of Type A behavior -- extremes of competitiveness, achievement-striving, impatience, aggressiveness, and easily aroused hostility -- have also been identified in children and seem to be a stable pattern over time (Matthews & Avis, in press; Siegel & Matthews, note 1). A review of related literature indicated Type A children are more aggressive during play, more impatient while completing a frustrating task, exert

greater effort to excel on tasks with vague performance criteria, are less empathic with peers, and have fewer positive attitudes toward school than Type B children (Matthews & Angulo, 1980; Matthews & Volkin, 1981; Johnson, Johnson, & Anderson, 1978; Barnett, Matthews, & Howard, 1979). Matthews (1977) speculated that Type A behavior may be generated and/or reinforced by early parental and/or teacher pressure to achieve. Reports of its relationship to overall school adjustment have yet to be published if explored.

Most mental health professionals consider the family to be a significant influence on the growth and development of children. Several recent studies have focused on relationships between particular familial variables and specific school adjustment difficulties. For example, researchers have investigated the association between parent-child variables and competence in nursery-school children (Baumrind, 1977; Heinicke, Busch, Click, & Kramer, 1973), severe maladjustment in elementary school (Love & Kaswan, 1974; Lorion et al., 1977), truancy in junior high school (Little & Thompson, 1983), and school behavior disorders (Friedman, 1973). A review of these related studies suggested that parental rejection, overindulgence, overprotectiveness, ignoring, and extrinsic valuing (valuing for the needs of the parent met by the child) are

characteristic of parenting styles related to children experiencing adjustment difficulties in school. Parental intrinsic valuing (accepting the child as an individual) was related to adaptive functioning in children.

Teachers interact closely with children for long periods of time on a daily basis and, according to some sources, are able to make valuable and accurate assessments of children's adaptive functioning (Bower, 1969; Davis, 1978; Bolstad & Johnson, 1977; Love & Kaswan, 1974). Other sources suggest however, that teachers tend to make judgments of children based on stereotypes, misconceptions, individual biases, and/or quickly gathered information which may not be valid over time (Brophy & Good, 1974; Guttmann & Bar-Tal, 1982; Kedar-Voivodas, 1983). In either case, teacher's perceptions, when viewed from a systemic perspective, affect how teachers interact with children, and in turn, how children behave (Braun, 1976; Little & Thompson, 1983; Palardy, 1969; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Samuels, 1977; Walzer, Richmond & DeBuno, 1975). Braun suggested that as a first step to intervene in the teacher-student system when its results are unhealthy for children (e.g., when children are perceived as maladjusted by teachers), educators need to understand the factors that contribute to their perceptions of students. Do children who are perceived by teachers as least adjusted in the

classroom possess characteristics and parent-child relationship patterns which have been identified in the literature as affecting school adjustment?

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of children's overall school adjustment and four variables implicated in previous research as related to children's adjustment in school, i.e., children's self-esteem, temperament, Type A behavior pattern, and valuing styles of parents. Hypotheses were concerned with patterns of mean score differences between children rated by teachers as best adjusted and least adjusted for instruments used to measure children's self-esteem, temperament, Type A behavior patterns, and their parents' valuing styles. Each hypothesis was tested at the .05 alpha level.

Methodology

Subjects

Subjects were third, fourth, and fifth graders, their teachers, and parents in a predominantly White middle-class metropolitan Washington, D.C. suburb. The entire third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade teaching staff (n=9) in the selected public school was asked to participate in the study. The eight teachers (all female) who agreed to participate (one fifth-grade teacher refused) subjectively selected the six best and six least adjusted children in

their class and rated the Type A behavior of each child who had parental permission to participate. Of the 96 children originally selected by teachers, 75 (78%) were given parental permission to participate (38 best adjusted, 37 least adjusted). Self-esteem and temperament instruments were administered to these children (27 third-graders, 30 fourth-graders, and 18 fifth-graders). Parents of 67 children (89% of children participating; 32 best adjusted, 35 least adjusted) participated in the study by responding to a parenting instrument.

Instruments

Self-esteem. The Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) developed by Coopersmith (1967) was used to measure children's self-reported self-esteem. This inventory consists of 50 scored items concerning feelings about peers, parents, school, and self to which subjects respond "like me" or "unlike me". Items responded to in a positive self-esteem direction are worth two points.

Reliability coefficients of .88 and .70 (test-retest) were reported by Coopersmith, and .85 to .79 (internal consistency) by Spatz and Johnston (1973). Kokenes (1978) provided empirical support for the construct validity of SEI subscales using a variation of Thurston's Orthogonal Rotation technique for a sample of 7593 children in grades four through eight.

Temperament patterns. The Dimensions of Temperament Survey (DOTS), developed by Lerner, Palermo, Spiro, and Nesselroade (1982) to measure aspects of temperament theoretically and empirically linked to psychosocial development by Thomas and Chess (1977), was the instrument used to measure children's self-reported temperament styles. The DOTS has 34 items measuring five factors: activity level, attention span/distractibility, adaptability/approach-withdrawal, rhythmicity, and reactivity. Responses are recorded on a 2-point rating scale. Subjects are asked to answer "true" if the statement is more true than false, and "false" if the statement is more false than true.

Lerner et al. (1982) reported subscale reliability coefficients for a sample of 66 undergraduate students (test-retest) and a sample of 508 elementary school students (internal consistency) respectively as follows: .86 and .87 for activity level; .60 and .69 for attention span/distractibility; .93 and .50 for adaptability/approach-withdrawal; .87 and .64 for rhythmicity; and .83 and .31 for reactivity. Lerner (1981) and Palermo (1982) provided validational data which supported use of the DOTS to investigate the person-context interactional framework suggested by Thomas and Chess (1977). That is, students whose DOTS scores matched demands regarding behavioral style

held by their teachers, parents, and/or peers tended to have higher scores on measures of adaptive functioning than students who had a "poor fit" between temperamental attributes and demands.

Type A behavior patterns. The Matthews Youth Test for Health (MYTH), developed by Matthews and Angulo (1980) to identify young people who characteristically exhibit overt behaviors typical of Type A and Type B adults, was the instrument used to measure children's Type A behavior pattern. The MYTH contains 17 statements that describe competitive achievement-striving, aggressive-hostility, and a sense of time urgency in children. Each statement is rated by subjects' classroom teacher on a scale of 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 5 (extremely characteristic). After three items are reverse coded, ratings are summed to yield an overall Type A and two subscale scores, competitiveness and impatience-aggression.

Reliability coefficients of .83 (test-retest) and .90 (internal consistency) were reported by Matthews and Angulo (1980) for a sample of 485 elementary school children in grades K through six. Support for the validity of the MYTH was provided in three independent studies through a series of experiments and rater observations where children classified as Type A or Type B by MYTH scores demonstrated expected reactions and behaviors if they had been classified

accurately (Matthews & Angulo, 1980; Barnett et al., 1979; Matthews, 1979).

Parent's valuing styles. The Little Parental Valuing Styles Scale (LPVSS), originally developed by Little (note 2) to assess attitudes and behaviors expressed by parents toward children identified as "problematic", was the instrument used to measure self-reported parental valuing styles. The six LPVSS subscales evaluate attitudes and behaviors that cluster into distinctive styles of parenting. Five subscales measure parenting styles identified in the literature as typical of dysfunctional parent-child relationships: Rejection, Ignoring, Overprotection, Overindulgence, and Extrinsic Valuing. The sixth subscale, Intrinsic Valuing, measures parental attitudes and behaviors related in the literature to functional parent-child relationships (Little, note 2). Parent responses are recorded on a six-point Likert Scale with choices ranging from "hardly ever" to "almost always."

Results from four independent studies support reliability and validity of the LPVSS (Little, note 2; note 3; note 4; Little & Thompson, 1983). In an initial study of the LPVSS conducted with 68 parents, alpha coefficients for the six subscales ranged from .50 to .79. Data analysis suggested that parenting styles which emerged as positively correlated with self-reports by parents of problematic

children were those theoretically supported in related literature (Little, note 2). Eight week test-retest reliability coefficients for a sample of 61 parents ranged from .65 ($p<.0001$) to .82 ($p<.0001$) for the six LPVSS subscales (Little, note 4).

Procedure

In February 1983 three third-grade, three fourth-grade, and two fifth-grade teachers subjectively selected six best and six least adjusted students in their classrooms (approximately top and bottom 20%). Teachers were asked to make selections in light of their familiarity with the children and in terms of students' overall functioning in the classroom (e.g., academic achievement, social and emotional functioning, task behavior). They were asked to conceal to which group students belonged until after all data were collected.

Introductory and follow-up letters and consent forms were sent to parents of children selected. Parents were asked to consent for themselves and their children's participation in a project designed to facilitate children's adjustment to school. Participants were assured that all information collected would be totally confidential and used only for the purpose of this research. Code numbers were placed on all questionnaires in lieu of names to insure

confidentiality.

The researcher administered the SEI and DOTS to participating students in group settings outside the classroom. At the time of test administration students were apprised of the purpose of the study and nature of the questionnaires. They were assured that parents and teachers would not see their answers or learn of their scores and they had the right to refuse to answer any or all questions without penalty. All directions and questions were read aloud by the researcher (while children read silently and marked their responses) to avoid bias due to reading ability. The researcher was not aware of children's group position at the time of testing.

Teachers were asked to complete MYTH forms for each participating student. Completed forms were returned directly to the researcher.

Parents who consented to participate in the study were sent a cover letter and LPVSS questionnaires via their children. They were asked to complete the questionnaire without consultation from anyone else and to return the completed form directly to the researcher via the self-addressed envelope provided. Follow-up letters and LPVSS questionnaires were sent to parents who had not returned completed forms by two weeks after the initial LPVSS correspondence.

Results

Data were obtained for 79% of the children originally identified by teachers as best adjusted and 77% of the children identified as least adjusted relative to classmates. Parents of 67% of the children originally identified by teachers as best adjusted and 73% of the children identified as least adjusted provided information concerning their attitudes and behaviors toward their children. Of the children whose parents provided information, 94% were living in two-parent families.

Demographic data provided by parents were analyzed to ascertain group differences. Chi square analyses revealed no significant group difference for the following five demographic variables: number of parents who provided data (χ^2=2.38; df=2; p<.30); number of children with two parents living in the home (χ^2=.883; df=1; p<.35); number of siblings (χ^2=1.99; df=2; p<.37); mothers' educational level (χ^2=.35; df=2; p<.84); fathers' educational level (χ^2=.93; df=2; p<.63). Parents differed, however, in their reports of children's level of problematic behaviors. T-test results revealed that parents of children identified as least adjusted reported their children significantly more problematic in their behaviors than did parents of the best adjusted children (t=3.64; df=65; p<.0005).

A one-factor multivariate analysis of variance was used

to test for equality of mean vectors on SEI, LPVSS, DOTS and MYTH subscales for best and least adjusted groups of children or their corresponding parents. The F ratio for equality of mean vectors was found to be significant for all four instruments: $F=5.16(4,70)$ $p<.002$ for SEI subscales; $F(5,69)=7.41$ $p<.0001$ for DOTS subscales; and $F(2,72)=35.19$ $p<.0001$ for MYTH subscales; and $F(6,60)=2.89$ $p<.02$ for LPVSS subscales.

Univariate F statistics were useful in locating subscales most responsible for the significant multivariate F for each instrument. The univariate F statistics for three of the SEI subscales, two of the DOTS subscales, both of the MYTH subscales, and three of the LPVSS subscales were significant at the .05 alpha level and therefore, seen as contributing most to their respective significant F ratio. Best adjusted children scored significantly higher on General Self-Esteem ($F=10.59$ $p<.002$), Home Self-Esteem ($F=8.15$ $p<.006$), and School Self-Esteem ($F=19.18$ $p<.0001$) subscales of the SEI than children in the least adjusted group. Children in the best adjusted group scored significantly higher on Rhythmicity ($F=3.98$ $p<.05$) and lower on the Reactivity subscale ($F=20.22$ $p<.0001$) of the DOTS than children in the least adjusted group. The best adjusted group of children scored significantly higher on the MYTH Competitiveness subscale ($F=37.57$ $p<.0001$) and

significantly lower on the Impatience-Aggressive subscale (F=17.84 p<.0001) than the least adjusted group of children. Parents of best adjusted children scored significantly lower on the Rejection (F=8.60 p<.005) and Overprotective (F=4.94 p<.03) subscales and significantly higher on Intrinsic Valuing (F=13.50 p<.0005) subscale of the LPVSS than parents of least adjusted children.

Means and standard deviations of Total SEI and MYTH scores were also computed. Differences between group means for best and least adjusted children were analyzed by use of independent t tests. Results indicated that means for Total SEI scores were significantly higher for the best adjusted group of children than the least adjusted group of children (T=3.77 p<.0003). There was no significant difference between best and least adjusted children when group means were compared for Total MYTH scores (T=.24 p<.82). Means and standard deviations for all subscale scores as well as Total Myth and Total SEI scores by group are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about Here

Discussion

Children in this study identified by teachers as least adjusted expressed a significantly lower self-esteem than children identified as best adjusted in the classroom. This relationship was particularly evident in areas of school, home and feelings about self in general. It could almost be considered obvious that children having difficulty in school would be more anxious about school performance and themselves in general than children who are more successful in this arena. School occupies a large part of their lives and education is usually considered important by middle-class parents. It has been suggested that there is a reciprocal relationship between self-esteem and school adjustment with failure leading to lowered self-esteem and low self-esteem leading to more failure (Purkey, 1970; Rubin, 1978).

It is interesting to note that least adjusted children expressed no more anxiety about peer relationships than best adjusted children. This result supports findings of Kokenes (1978) that peer relationships are the most powerful source of positive self-esteem for children in grades four through eight. It may be hypothesized that children who do not perceive themselves as successful in school turn to peers as a source of self-esteem, perhaps to the point of distracting them further from educational tasks. It is also

interesting to note that children in this sample who were less successful in school than their classmates were more anxious about their relationship with their parents. This suggests that dysfunctional parent-child relationships may contribute to children's inability to function effectively in school as indicated in previous research (e.g., Little & Thompson, 1983; Baumrind, 1977) and/or children's school problems may generate conflict in the parent-child relationship.

Children identified as having more than average difficulty in school were less rhythmic and more reactive -- traits identified by Thomas and Chess (1977) as part of the Difficult Child cluster -- than more successful children. According to a review of the related literature by Kedar-Voivodas (1983), these were also characteristics similar to those that invoked attitudes of rejection by teachers. The results of the present study, when viewed in light of previous research, suggest that constitutional tendencies may play a systemic role in children's adaptation to the learning environment via children's behavior and teacher's attitudes. Perhaps children who are highly rhythmic and low in reactivity are better able to adjust to classroom routine and, when confronted with frustrating situations, are less likely to be significantly disturbed or strike out at others. It is possible that these children also reap the

benefits of their teacher's acceptance and approval.

Data indicated that overall Type A behavior pattern was unrelated to school functioning for children in this study. However, best adjusted children were more competitive and less impatient-aggressive than least adjusted children. Type A behavior pattern can be conceptualized in terms of an interaction between predispositions and environmental circumstances (Wolf, Sklov, Wenzl, Hunter, & Berenson, 1982). Related research suggested that frustrating environmental circumstances produce heightened aggression among Type A adults (Carver & Glass, 1978; Glass, 1977). It could be hypothesized that Type A children become frustrated when faced with failure to control their external environment (e.g., achievement of academic success) and substitute prosocial efforts to control (i.e., competing with peers) with antisocial efforts to control (i.e., impatient and aggressive behavior toward peers) to obtain a sense of mastery over their environment. Since children whom teachers selected as best adjusted were also the most competitive, it could be speculated that teachers prize and, therefore, reinforce competition between students. Unfortunately, teachers first selected best and least adjusted children and subsequently responded to MYTH instruments for these children. Therefore, results must be viewed with caution. Further research, perhaps with a

larger sample size so that sex differences may be examined and with independent assessment of school functioning and Type A behavior, may provide more certain results about the relationship between Type A behavior pattern and school functioning.

In this study, parents of children less successful in the academic arena tended to be more rejecting and overprotective and less accepting of their children as individuals than parents of more adaptive children. These parenting styles have been related in other studies to truancy (Little & Thompson, 1983), low self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967), poor task orientation (Baumrind, 1977; Heinicke, Busch, Click & Kramer), school behavior disorders (Friedman, 1973), and a host of emotional disorders in children (Sayeda, 1978). In view of empirical evidence reported here and in the past, it may be hypothesized that parents contribute to children's difficulty in developing coping behaviors conducive to optimum functioning in school. It has been speculated that parents who tend to protect children from the consequences of their behavior and fail to accept children as independent individuals participate in a cycle that leads to the maintenance of dependent and maladaptive behavior in children (Abrams & Kaslow, 1977).

This study was conducted to enhance understanding of teachers' perception of children's overall school adjustment

and its relationship to selected psychosocial variables. In summary, results support previous research suggesting that teachers are effective in identifying children who are unable to function effectively in the classroom. That is, selected variables associated in previous research with specific aspects of school adjustment (e.g., academic achievement, social adjustment, task behavior) were significantly related to teacher's subjective assessment of children's overall school adjustment in the present study. The results of this study indicate that children's self-esteem, temperament traits, Type A behavior, and parent-child relationship patterns are salient variables to examine when teachers observe and wish to ameliorate specific instances of school maladjustment.

Given the assumption that teachers are significant others who have considerable influence on the development of children, future research is warranted to clarify the relationship between teachers' perceptions of children, children's characteristics, and the systemic interplay between the two. Subsequent investigations could replicate the present study and include one or more of the following: observation of children's and teachers' classroom behavior; teachers' perceptions of "idealized teachable" students (see Kornblau, 1982); and teachers' self-reported styles of interacting with students (see Little & Thompson, 1983).

This study was limited in several respects. Teachers were chosen to participate from an experimentally available population. No male teachers participated. Sample size of children was too small to adequately assess contribution of children's gender to the grouping process. Participants were predominantly middle-class. Future studies could utilize a simple stratified sampling of classrooms so that gender and socioeconomic status of children and gender of teacher could be built in as blocking variables in a factorial design.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations on Instruments by Group

Instruments	Best Adjusted			Least Adjusted		
	n	Means	SD	n	Means	SD
SEI	38			37		
General		19.00	4.44		15.57	4.69
Social		6.18	1.63		5.43	2.17
Home		6.03	1.70		4.73	2.21
School		6.00	1.95		4.08	1.85
Total		74.42	16.52		59.62	17.50
DOTS	38			37		
Activity		1.82	1.41		1.92	1.26
Attention span		6.00	2.55		6.92	2.51
Adaptability		3.87	1.48		3.47	1.50
Rhythmicity		3.45	1.75		2.57	2.06
Reactivity		2.76	1.34		4.05	1.13
MYTH	38			37		
Competitiveness		29.29	4.82		21.86	5.65
Impatience-Aggression		20.11	6.29		26.89	7.58
Total		49.39	7.79		48.86	11.31
LPVSS	32			35		
Rejection		15.38	2.91		18.53	5.40
Ignoring		29.83	3.79		30.27	3.33
Overprotective		11.64	2.58		13.30	3.42
Overindulgence		17.00	3.84		15.77	3.19
Extrinsic		33.65	5.12		33.48	4.90
Intrinsic		52.63	4.14		47.54	6.74

Reference Notes

1. Siegel, J. M., & Matthews, K. A. Type A behavior, achievement striving, and their childhood origins. Chapter to appear in T. R. Kratochwill (Ed.), Advances in school psychology, (Vol. 3). Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

2. Little, L. F. An initial report on a diagnostic instrument for parents of children identified as problematic: The Little Parental Valuing Styles Scale. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1982.

3. Little, L. F. The impact of Gestalt group psychotherapy on parents' perceptions of children identified as problematic. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1982.

4. Little, L. F. Type A behavior pattern in children: Its relationship to parents' perfectionism and valuing styles. Unpublished manuscript, 1984. (Available from Virginia Tech Northern Virginia Graduate Center, 2990 Telestar Court, Falls Church, Virginia, 22042).

References

Abrams, J. C. & Kaslow, F. K. (1977). Family systems and the learning disabled child: Intervention and treatment. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10, 27-31.

Barnett, M. A., Matthews, K. A., & Howard, J. A. (1979). Relationship between competitiveness and empathy in 6- and 7-year-olds. Developmental Psychology, 15(2), 221-223.

Baumrind, D. (1977). Some thoughts about childrearing. In S. Cohen & T. Comiskey (Eds.), Child Development (pp. 248-258). Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Berlin, I. N. (1975). Children in the seventies: Developmental findings and recommendations from the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. In I. N. Berlin (Ed.), Advocacy for child mental health (pp. 11-26). New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.

Bolstad, O. D., & Johnson, S. M. (1977). The relationship between teachers' assessment of students and the students' actual behavior in the classroom. Child Development, 48, 570-578.

Bower, E. (1969). A process for identifying disturbed children. In W. G. Coggan (Ed.), Readings in child psychology (pp. 143-147). New York: MSS Educational Publishing Company, Inc.

Braun, C. (1976). Teacher expectation: Sociopsychological dynamics. Review of Educational Research, 46(2), 185-213.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1974). Teacher-student relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Carey, W. B., Fox, M., & McDevitt, S. (1977). Temperament as a factor in early school adjustment. Pediatrics, 60, 621-624.

Carver, C. S. & Glass, D. C. (1978). Coronary-prone behavior pattern and interpersonal aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,36(4), 361-366.

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

Cowen, E. L., Pederson, A., Babigian, H., Izzo, L. D., & Trost, M. (1973). Long-term follow up of early detected vulnerable children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41(3), 438-446.

Cowen, E. L., Trost, M. A., Lorion, R. P., Dorr, D., Izzo, L. D., & Isaacson, R. V. (1975). New ways in school mental health. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Davis, W. E. (1978). A comparison of teacher referral and pupil self-referral measures relative to perceived school adjustment. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 22-26.

Friedman, M., & Rosenman, R. H. (1974). Type A behavior and your heart. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Crest.

Friedman, R. (1973). School behavior disorders and the family. In R. Friedman (Ed.), Family roots of school learning and behavior disorders (pp. 65-81). Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Glass, D. C. (1977). Behavior patterns, stress, and coronary disease. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Gordon, D. A. (1977). Children's beliefs in internal-external control and self-esteem as related to academic achievement. Journal of Personality Assessment, 41, 383-392.

Gordon, E. M., & Thomas, A. (1967). Children's behavioral style and the teacher's appraisal of their intelligence. Journal of School Psychology, 5, 292-300.

Guttmann, J. & Bar-Tal, D. (1982). Stereotypic perceptions of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 19(4), 519-528.

Heinicke, C. M., Busch, F., Click, P., & Kramer, E. (1973). Parent-child relations, adaptation to nursery school and the child's task orientation: A contrast in the development of two girls. In J. C. Westmen (Ed.), Individual differences in children (pp. 159-197). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Anderson, D. (1978). Student cooperative, competitive and individualistic attitudes, and attitudes toward schooling. Journal of Psychology, 100, 183-199.

Kedar-Voivodas, G. (1983). The impact of elementary children's school roles and sex roles on teacher attitudes: An interactional analysis. Review of Educational Research, 53(3), 415-437.

Kohn, M. (1977). Social competence, symptoms and underachievement in childhood: A longitudinal perspective. New York: Wiley.

Kokenes, B. (1978). A factor analytic study of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. Adolescence, 13, 149-156.

Kornblau, B. (1982). The teachable pupil survey: A technique for assessing teachers' perceptions of pupil attributes. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 170-174.

Lerner, J. V. (1981). The role of congruence between temperament and school demands in school children's academic performance, personal adjustment, and social relations. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3602B. (University Microfilms No. 8105755)

Lerner, R. M., Palermo, M., Spiro, A., & Nesselroade, J. R. (1982). Assessing the dimensions of temperamental individuality across the life span: The Dimensions of Temperament Survey (DOTS). Child Development, 53, 149-159.

Little, L. F., & Thompson, R. (1983). Truancy: How parents and teachers contribute. The School Counselor, 30(4), 285-291.

Lorion, R. P., Cowen, E. L., Kraus, R. M., & Milling, L. S. (1977). Family background characteristics and school adjustment problems. Journal of Community Psychology, 5, 142-148.

Love, L. R., & Kaswan, J. W. (1974). Troubled children: Their families, schools and treatments. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Matthews, K. A. (1977). Caregiver-child interactions and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Child Development, 48, 1752-1756.

Matthews, K. A. (1979). Efforts to control by children and adults with the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Child Development, 50, 842-847.

Matthews, K. A., & Angulo, J. (1980). Measurement of the Type A behavior pattern in children: Assessment of children's competitiveness, impatience-anger, and aggression. Child Development, 51, 466-475.

Matthews, K. A., & Avis, N. E. (in press). Stability of overt Type A behaviors in children: Results from one-year longitudinal study. Child Development.

Matthews, K. A., & Volkin, J. I. (1981). Efforts to excel and the Type A behavior pattern in children. Child Development, 52, 1283-1289.

Metcalfe, B. (1981). Self-concept and attitude to school. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51, 66-76.

Palardy, J. M. (1969). What teachers believe - what children achieve. Elementary School Journal, 69, 370-374.

Palermo, M. (1982). Child temperament and contextual demands: A test of the goodness-of-fit model. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43. 121A. (University Microfilms No. 8213334)

Pullis, M. E. (1980). An investigation of the relationship between children's temperament and school adjustment. Dissertations Abstracts International, 40, 3768-3769A. (University Microfilms No. 8001395)

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

Reeve, R., & Kauffman, J. M. (1978). The behavior disordered. In N. G. Haring (Ed.), Behavior of exceptional children. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Reynolds, W. (1980). Self-esteem and classroom behavior in elementary school children. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 273-277.

Roberts, G. L. (1968). Personal growth and adjustment. Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teachers's expectations and pupil's intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rubin, R. A. (1978). Stability of self-esteem ratings and

their relationship to academic achievement: A longitudinal study. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 430-433.

Rubin, R. A., Dorle, J., & Sandidge, S. (1977). Self-esteem and school performance. Psychology in the Schools, 14, 503-507.

Samuels, S. C. (1977). Enhancing self-concept in early childhood. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Sayeda, A. (1978). Parental attitudes and resultant behaviour of children. Child Psychology Quarterly, 11, 37-48.

Spatz, K. C., & Johnston, J. O. (1973). Internal consistency of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33,875-876.

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). Temperament and development. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.

Walzer, S., Richmond, J. B., & DeBuno, T. (1975). Epidemiology and disordered learning. In I. N. Berlin (Ed.), Advocacy for child mental health (pp. 46-67). New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publisher.

Wolf, T. M., Sklov, M. C., Wenzl, P. A., Hunter, S. M., & Berenson, G. S. (1982). Validation of a measure of Type A behavior pattern in children: Bogalusa Heart Study. Child Development, 53, 126-135.

Appendix A

Review of Related Literature

Review of Literature

The following review of literature is focused on teachers' perceptions of children and on the dependent variables investigated in this study -- self-esteem, temperament, Type A behavior pattern, and parent-child relationship patterns -- and how these variables relate to children's adjustment.

Teachers' Perceptions of Children's School Adjustment

Teachers' appraisals of children's school adjustment have been examined by researchers for many years. It has been suggested that teachers' perceptions are often accurate assessments of children's behavior. Teachers' assessments of children's behavior have been found to be congruent with clinical diagnosis of maladjustment (Bower, 1969), students' appraisals of their own attributes (Davis, 1978; Marsh, Smith & Barnes, 1983), independent rater observations of children's behavior (Bolstad & Johnson, 1977; Love & Kaswan, 1974), and parents' reports of children's behavior at home (Love & Kaswan, 1974).

Empirical evidence has also suggested that teachers have a tendency to make judgments of children based on stereotypes, misconceptions and individual biases (Good, Sikes & Brophy, 1973; Stake & Katz, 1982)). Subsequent

research has revealed evidence which suggests that teachers are willing to update their initial judgments reflective of new behavior based information. On the basis of three interconnected empirical studies, Guttmann and Bar-Tal (1982) concluded that although teachers do evaluate individual students on the basis of stereotypic cues, after personal contact stereotypic perceptions are often overridden on the basis of student achievement. These authors stressed the importance of teacher awareness of the detrimental effects of stereotypic perceptions in order to reduce the influences they might have on their evaluations and expectations of students' achievement.

Natriello & Dornbusch (1983) conducted two complementary studies with 156 teachers in 14 secondary schools and 168 teachers in 18 secondary schools to investigate the effects of student characteristics and classroom behavior on teachers' classroom behavior. Their analysis suggested that teachers' behavior is affected more by immediate student behavior and information relevant to student performance (e.g., achievement and social behavior record) than by student characteristics such as sex or race. These researchers stressed that in view of previous research, their study highlights the importance of teachers knowing the facts surrounding a particular problem so they are less likely to be influenced by less relevant attributes

of students. Natriello & Dornbusch concluded that teachers' problem of obtaining useful information to help them develop appropriate expectations and responses to students becomes the researcher's problem of deciding what student variables to emphasize in studies of teacher behavior.

Review of related literature indicated that teachers' perceptions of students are a part of a systemic teacher-student interaction process that may influence children's school success (Braun, 1976; Little & Thompson, 1983; Palardy, 1969; Pullis, 1980; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Samuels, 1977; Walzer, Richmond & DeBuno, 1975). More specifically, teacher's perceptions which are student-influenced affect how teachers interact with students, and in turn affect how students behave. For example, in a study of 94 truant junior high school students and a matched sample of regular attenders and their teachers, Little and Thompson (1983) found that teachers were more rejecting and overprotective and less accepting of truant children than teachers of their regular attending counterparts. The researchers concluded that teachers may inadvertently contribute to truant children's unwillingness or inability to consistently attend school through their participation in a dysfunctional cyclical relationship where cause and effect of children's impaired functioning are closely interwoven.

What follows is a closer look at three variables (self-esteem, temperament, and parents' valuing styles) which research consistently indicates have significant effect on children's school adjustment. A fourth variable, Type A behavior, which has received considerable attention in recent years in terms of its relationship to the coronary health of adults and its antecedents in childhood, is also discussed. However, research is minimal and inconclusive in terms of the relationship of Type A behavior and children's school functioning.

Self-Esteem

Children's level of self-esteem is a significant factor in their ultimate growth and development because it influences the kinds of friends they choose, how they get along with others, their ability to take risks, their resiliency in the face of failure, and their development of independent work habits, self-initiative and creativity (Briggs, 1970; Phillips & Zigler, 1980; Satir, 1972; Swayze, 1980). Moreover, the quality of self-esteem tends to perpetuate itself. When children see themselves as worthless, that is the way they tend to act, and that is the way they are treated by others (McDonald, 1980).

Self-esteem has been implicated as a contributing factor in delinquency (Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1978), teenage pregnancy (Abernathy, 1974; Herold, Goodwin, & Lero, 1979;

Kaplan, Smith, & Pokorny, 1979), and adolescent drug abuse (Brehm & Beck, 1976; Norem-Heisen, 1975). Self-esteem has also been related to effective functioning in adult roles, e.g., teaching (Purkey, 1970; Samuels, 1977) and parenting (Briggs, 1970; Love & Kaswan, 1974; Satir, 1972; Steele, 1977).

Research evidence consistently indicates a positive relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement (Coopersmith, 1967; Gordon, 1977; Purkey, 1970; Rubin, 1978; Rubin, Dorle, & Sandidge, 1977; Sears, 1970). According to Purkey there is a sufficiently strong reciprocal relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement and reason to assume that enhancing self-esteem is vital to improving academic performance. Rubin (1978) and Rubin et al. (1977) reported empirical evidence to support the concept of systemic reciprocity between self-esteem and academic achievement.

Metcalfe (1981) found that children's self-esteem is related to their attitudes toward school. For a sample of 182 children 11+ years of age, children with high self-esteem had more positive attitudes toward their relationship with teachers and the class, higher academic self-image, more interest in school work, and lower anxiety in class than children with low self-esteem.

Self-esteem has also been empirically related to

behavior in the classroom (Reynolds, 1980; Rubin et al., 1977). For a sample of 54 fifth- and sixth-grade students, Reynolds found that self-esteem impinges upon learning-related behaviors such as attention, persistence, and response to directions. Reynolds suggested that a teacher who wants to modify classroom behavior should consider measures that would be congruent with enchancing students' self-attitudes. Similarly, Rubin et al., who investigted school outcomes in relation to socioeconomic status, IQ, and self-esteem for a sample of 530 twelve-year-olds, found that self-esteem was the best single predictor of classroom behavior, i.e., poor control, anxious-neurotic, and overall teachers' ratings of behavior.

Temperament

Thomas and Chess (1977) conducted an extensive 20-year study (New York Longitudinal Study) of children's temperament and its relationship to interactions with the environment. These researchers found that temperament styles appear to be largely constitutional in origin, are at least partially observable in the first few days of life, become somewhat more stable by three or four months, and constantly interact with the environment with mutual modification.

Thomas and Chess (1977) identified nine temperament variables: activity, rhythmicity of biological functions,

approach/withdrawal, adaptability, intensity, mood, persistence, distractibility, and sensory threshold. They derived three significant clusters of traits from these nine temperament variables: 1) the Difficult Child (arrhythmic, low in approach and adaptability, intense and negative mood); 2) the Easy Child (rhythmic, high in approach and adaptability, mild reaction and positive mood); 3) the Slow-To-Warm-Up Child (low in activity, approach, and adaptability; and negative mood, variable rhythmicity, and mild in intensity). On theoretical, clinical, and empirical grounds these researchers concluded that certain temperament patterns, particularly those of the Difficult Child, predispose children to behavior problems and play important roles in parent-child interaction and in children's adaptation to school.

Gordon and Thomas (1967) reported empirical evidence to support the theory that children's temperament plays a role in their school functioning. Teachers who participated in their study tended to overestimate the intelligence of children who were high in adaptability and approach and to underestimate the intelligence of children who were low in adaptability and approach. Gordon and Thomas concluded that if teachers' judgments of children's intellignece are significantly distorted by their perceptions of specific aspects of children's temperament, then children may come to

under-or overestimate themselves which may affect their actual learning, their self-esteem, or put added achievement pressures on them in school.

In another study, Carey, Fox, and McDevitt (1977) found that adaptability and persistence related to problem solving for a sample of 50 elementary school children. Since adaptability was also correlated with a measure of overall school adjustment, these researchers concluded that this temperament characteristic is a significant factor in general classroom behavior.

Pullis (1980) found that children's (n=321) temperament styles were related to their school performance, to teachers' (n=13) perceptions of their ability and to teachers' interaction with them in the classroom. More specifically, children's Task Behavior (activity level, persistence, and distractibility) was related to measures of children's academic performance. Teachers' perceptions of children's intellectual abilities were related to children's Task Behavior and Flexibility (adaptability, approach tendencies, and positive mood). Children's Task Behavior, Flexibility, and Negativity (intensity, negative mood, and threshold response) were temperament styles affecting many of the teachers' classroom management decisions.

Type A Behavior Pattern

The Type A behavior pattern is a construct that arose

from the observations of the behavior of cardiac patients seen by Friedman and Rosenman (1974) in their private medical practice in the 1950's. The major characteristics of Type A behavior are extremes of competitiveness, achievement-striving, impatience, aggressiveness, and easily aroused hostility. People who exhibit a majority of these behaviors are called Type A's, those who do not are called Type B's (Friedman & Rosenman, 1974).

Although Type A behavior pattern was first recognized in adults as a risk factor in coronary heart disease, recent studies have indicated that Type A behavior can be identified in children (for a complete review see Siegel & Matthews, note 1) and is a stable pattern over time (Matthews & Avis, in press). For example, when Type A children and adults are threatened by loss of control, they make greater efforts to reassert control than do Type B's (Matthews, 1979). Type A children are more aggressive during play and are more impatient while completing a frustrating task than Type B children (Matthews & Angulo, 1980). Empirical evidence also suggested that Type A children exert greater efforts to excel on tasks which do not have clear performance criteria and are willing to perform longer on a tiring task than do Type B children (Matthews & Volkin, 1981).

Self-esteem was negatively related to the Type A

behavior pattern in children (Wolf, Hunter, & Webber, 1979; Wolf, Hunter, Webber, & Berenson, 1981). An explanation for this finding might be in the observation of Friedman and Rosenman (1974) that Type A adults have no internalized standards of excellence and as a result have a deep sense of insecurity. Their feelings of self-worth are often contingent on feedback they get from other significant people, rather than reliance on self-appraisal. This hypothesis was partially supported by Matthews and Siegel (in press), who found that Type A children tended to compare their own performance with better performing peers more than did Type B children, thus maintaining their struggle to strive after ever-escalating goals. In addition, observational data indicated that Type A boys elicit more remarks from caregivers designed to encourage them to set higher and higher standards than did Type B boys (Matthews, 1977). These data suggest the possibility that Type A behavior may be generated and/or reinforced by early parental and/or teacher pressure to achieve. Excessive parental pressure to achieve has been related to anxious and immature coping strategies (Lorion, Cowen, Kraus, & Milling, 1977) and medium self-esteem in children (Coopersmith, 1967).

Johnson, Johnson, and Anderson (1978) found that cooperativeness (as opposed to competitiveness) in young

children was consistently related to a broad range of positive attitudes toward the schooling experience, e.g., school personnel were important and pleasant, intrinsic motivation for doing school work, willingness to express ideas in front of the class, and listening to the teacher. However, competitiveness showed a relationship to several positive attitudes toward the schooling experience in junior and senior high school. Barnett, Matthews, and Howard (1979) suggested that Type A behavior plays a role in children's social relationships with their peers. Highly competitive elementary school boys (n=84 ; 6-7 years old) were less empathic (an expression of prosocial behavior) than less competitive boys. These researchers speculated that extreme competitiveness in 6-7 year-old boys is associated with heightened self-concern, which may serve to make the feelings of others less important.

Parent-Child Relationships

Most mental health professionals consider the family to be a significant influence on the growth and development of children. The precise way in which parent-child relationships and family environment contribute to the adaptation or maladaptation of children is difficult to determine. It seems clear that there is no best way to raise children. However, researchers have discovered that certain parental attitudes and child-rearing practices seem

to be more conducive to healthy development of children than others.

With the assumption that a high self-esteem is essential to children's adaptive functioning, researchers have investigated the relationship between parental attitudes and child-rearing practices and children's self-esteem. Parental warmth and support, acceptance (intrinsic valuing), concern and availability, and firm yet flexible discipline were among the child-rearing attitudes and practices associated with high self-esteem in children. Parental appreciation and valuing for the needs of the parent (extrinsic valuing), psychological and physical intrusiveness, overpermissiveness, ignoring, drastic discipline (love-depriving techniques, harshness, guilt), low nurturance, overprotection, and excessive achievement pressure have been linked to low and/or medium (unsure of self-worth) self-esteem in children (Coopersmith, 1967; Graybill, 1978; MacDonald, 1973; Sears, 1970).

Researchers have investigated the association between parent-child variables and competence in nursery-school children (Baumrind, 1977; Heinicke, Busch, Click & Kramer, 1973). Baumrind found that competent children (children rated as active, self-assertive, and socially responsible in the preschool environment) had parents who were able to communicate and enforce clearly defined limits (firm

discipline) and yet were respectful and responsive to children's individual abilities and suggestions. These parents also seemed to value individuality and self-assertiveness in their children, yet had high demands and clear expectations concerning what was acceptable behavior. A study conducted by Heinicke et al. tended to replicate the results of Baumrind.

Love and Kaswan (1974) studied 91 families of children (mean age 9.5 years) who were severely maladjusted in school and 29 families of a matched sample of children who were functioning adequately in school. These researchers discovered that interactions within families of maladjusted children were characterized by chronic turmoil, tension, and a lot of ignoring behavior. Children who functioned adequately in the school setting tended to have parents with differentiated, complementary, and stable roles, who openly expressed high regard and respect for their children's personal and interpersonal attributes, and who reported more frequent positive interaction with their children than parents of maladjusted children.

Lorion et al.(1977) emphasized the efficacy of considering family relationship patterns when trying to understand children's school adjustment problems. In studying maladjusted elementary school children, these researchers found that lack of interest and support from

parents related to children's difficulty mastering basic educational skills, while overinvestment and excessive pressure to succeed from parents related to children's shy, anxious, and immature coping with academic demands. Lorian et al. also discovered that children who were rejected by their parents had more serious acting out behaviors than overprotected children who showed more signs of anxiety and interpersonal discomfort.

In studying parents of truant junior high school students and parents of a matched sample of regular school attenders, Little & Thompson (1983) found that parents of truant children tended to be more overprotective and overindulgent and less accepting of their children as individuals than parents of children who attended school regularly. These researchers suggested that parents may inadvertently contribute to the unwillingness or inability of truant children to attend school regularly.

Summary

A review of related research suggested that children's levels of self-esteem, temperament styles, Type A behavior patterns, and relationships with parents are variables which influence interactions with teachers and peers in the school environment. High self-esteem was empirically associated with children's overall adaptive functioning,

scholastic achievement, positive attitudes toward school, and desirable classroom behavior. Children's temperament styles were related to teachers' appraisals of their ability, children's achievement, teacher-child interactions, and children's behavior in the classroom. The Type A behavior pattern was positively related to children's persistence and striving to achieve. Type A behavior was negatively associated with self-esteem and to aspects of peer relationships. Parental overprotection, overindulgence, extrinsic valuing, ignoring, and rejection were child-rearing attitudes associated with maladaptive functioning in children. Parental intrinsic valuing was a style associated with adaptive functioning in children. These variables seem to affect children's ability to adjust and realize their potential in the classroom. Teachers' perceptions of children's adjustment in the classroom are valuable indicators of children's behavior as well as an influence on the cyclical teacher-student relationship. Therefore, the relationship between teachers' perception of children and children's self-esteem, temperament styles, Type A behavior and parents' valuing is worth exploration to enhance understanding of children's functioning in the classroom.

Appendix B

Additional Results

Additional Results

This study was a descriptive survey of two polar groups of elementary school children; those children rated by teachers as best adjusted and those children rated by teachers as least adjusted in the classroom. The static-group comparison design was used in this study (Huck, Cormier & Bounds, 1974). Comparisons were made between 38 children who were identified by their teachers as best adjusted in the classroom and 37 children who were identified by their teachers as least adjusted in the classroom on selected psychosocial and familial variables.

All data compiled in this study were analyzed by computer using Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software program. One factor multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test hypotheses. Where multivariate tests of significance showed significant F scores, univariate F-Tests were analyzed to determine specific amounts of contribution. The level of significance employed in this study was the .05 alpha level.

Demographic data provided by parents of 67 children (89% of the children participating) were analyzed to determine differences between the two groups of children on demographic variables not addressed by hypotheses. Groups of children were compared by number of parents responding,

most responsible parent, number of parents in the home, number of siblings, and parents' educational level. Independent samples chi-square analyses revealed: a) no significant difference when groups were compared by the number of parents who responded to the LPVSS (see Table 2); b) no significant difference when groups were compared by who was most responsible parent (see Table 3); c) no significant difference when groups were compared by number of parents presently in the home (see Table 4); d) no significant difference when groups were compared by number of siblings (see Table 5); e) no significant difference when groups were compared by mothers' educational level (see Table 6); and f) no significant difference when groups were compared by fathers' educational level (see Table 7). Independent t test revealed a significant difference between groups with regard to parents' report of children's problematic behavior. That is, parents of children in the least adjusted group reported their children significantly more problematic in their behavior than did parents of the best adjusted children ($t=3.64$; $p<.0005$).

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated there would be no difference in Self-Esteem Inventory scores of the best adjusted group of children and the least adjusted group of children. Items on the SEI were arranged into four subscales: (a) general self-

Table 2

Number of Parents Responding to LPVSS by Best Adjusted and Least Adjusted Group of Children

Number of parents Frequency Percent Row PCT Col PCT	Group Best Adjusted	Least Adjusted	Total
No parents	6 8.00 75.00 15.79	2 2.67 25.00 5.41	8 10.67
One parent	21 28.00 45.65 55.26	25 33.33 54.35 67.57	46 61.33
Two parents	11 14.67 52.38 28.95	10 13.33 47.62 27.03	21 28.00
Total	38 50.67	37 49.33	75 100.00

Chi-Square = 2.383 df = 2 p = 0.3038

Table 3

Most Responsible Parent by Best Adjusted and Least Adjusted Group of Children

Most responsible parent Frequency Percent Row PCT Col PCT	Group Best Adjusted	Least Adjusted	Total
Mother	22 32.84 50.00 68.75	22 32.84 50.00 62.86	44 65.67
Father	1 1.49 20.00 3.13	4 5.97 80.00 11.43	5 7.46
Both parents	7 10.45 43.75 21.88	9 13.43 56.25 25.71	16 23.88
Other	2 2.99 100.00 6.25	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 2.99
Total	32 47.76	35 52.24	67 100.00

Chi-Square = 3.924 df = 3 p = 0.2698

Table 4

Number of Parents in the Home by Best Adjusted and Least Adjusted Group of Children

Number of parents in the home Frequency Percent Row PCT Col PCT	Group Best Adjusted	Least Adjusted	Total
Two parents	31 46.27 49.21 96.88	32 47.76 50.79 91.43	63 94.03
One parent	1 1.49 25.00 3.13	3 4.48 75.00 8.57	4 5.97
Total	32 47.76	35 52.24	67 100.00

Chi-Square = .883 df = 1 p = 0.3473

Table 5

Number of Siblings by Best Adjusted and Least Adjusted Group of Children

Number of siblings Frequency Percent Row PCT Col PCT	Best Adjusted	Least Adjusted	Total
0, 1, or 2 siblings	24 36.36 45.28 75.00	29 43.94 54.72 85.29	53 80.30
3, 4, or 5 siblings	7 10.61 70.00 21.88	3 4.55 30.00 8.82	10 15.15
More than 5 siblings	1 1.52 33.33 3.13	2 3.03 66.67 5.88	3 4.55
Total	32 48.48	34 51.52	66 100.00

Chi-Square = 2.347 df = 2 p = 0.3093

Table 6

Educational Level of Mothers by Best Adjusted and Least Adjusted Group of Children

Years of school Frequency Percent Row PCT Col PCT	Group Best Adjusted	Least Adjusted	Total
7-12	12 17.91 40.00 37.50	18 26.87 60.00 51.43	30 44.78
13-16	19 28.36 54.29 59.38	16 23.88 45.71 45.71	35 46.67
18	1 1.49 50.00 3.13	1 1.49 50.00 2.86	2 2.99
Total	32 47.76	35 52.24	67 100.00

Chi-Square = 1.325 df = 2 p = 0.5154

Table 7

Educational Level of Fathers by Best Adjusted and Least Adjusted Group of Children

Years of school Frequency Percent Row PCT Col PCT	Group Best Adjusted	 Least Adjusted	Total
10-12	7 10.61 43.75 21.88	9 13.64 56.25 26.47	16 24.24
13-16	13 19.70 44.83 40.63	16 24.24 55.17 47.06	29 43.94
17-22	12 18.18 57.14 37.50	9 13.64 42.86 26.47	21 31.84
Total	32 48.48	34 51.52	66 100.00

Chi-Square = 0.929 df = 2 p = 0.6284

esteem (GENSEI); (b) social self-esteem (SOCSEI); (c) home self-esteem (HSEI); and (d) school self-esteem (SCHSEI). Means and standard deviations on the SEI subscales for the two groups are presented in Table 8. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance are shown in Table 9. The F ratio for equality of mean vectors was found to be significant (F=5.16, p<.0001) and hypothesis 1 was rejected. Scores of the two groups of children on the GENSEI (F=10.59, p<.002), the HSEI (F=8.15, p<.006), and SCHSEI (F=19.18, p<.0001) subscales contributed most to the multivariate F statistic (see Table 9).

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no difference between the scores of the best adjusted group of children and the least adjusted group of children when subscale scores of the DOTS were compared. Items on the DOTS were arranged into five subscales: (a) the activity level subscale (ACT); (b) the attention span/distractibility subscale (ATT); (c) the adaptability/approach-withdrawal subscale (ADAPT); (d) the rhythmicity subscale (RHYT); and (e) the reactivity subscale (REACT). Means and standard deviations on the DOTS subscales for the two groups are presented in Table 10. The F ratio for equality of mean vectors was found to be significant (F=7.41, p<.0001) and hypothesis 2 was rejected. The results of the multivariate

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations on SEI Subscales by Group

Subscales	Group 1		Group 2	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
GENSEI	19.00	4.44	15.57	4.69
SOCSEI	6.18	1.63	5.43	2.17
HSEI	6.03	1.70	4.73	2.21
SCHSEI	6.00	1.95	4.08	1.85
n per group	38		37	

Table 9

Multivariate Analysis of Variance on SEI Scores for Best and Least Adjusted Children

Hotelling-Lawley Trace	
$F(4,70) = 5.16$	$p<.0011$

Summary of Univariate Statistics for SEI Scores of Best and Least Adjusted Children

	Univariate Fs			
Source of Variation	GENSEI	SOCSEI	HSEI	SCHSEI
Group	10.59*	2.90	8.15*	19.18*

*$p<.05$

analysis of variance is presented in Table 11. Scores for the two groups of children on the RHYT (F=3.98, p<.05) and the REACT (F=20.22, p<.0001) subscales contributed most to the multivariate F statistic (see Table 11).

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be no difference between the scores of the best adjusted group of children and the least adjusted group of children on the MYTH and its subscales. Items on the MYTH were arranged into two subscales and an overall score: (a) the competitive achievement-striving subscale (COMP); (b) the impatient-aggressive subscale (IA); and the overall Type A behavior (TYPE A). Means and standard deviations on the MYTH and its subscales are presented in Table 12. In analyzing MYTH subscale scores the F ratio for equality of mean vectors was found to be significant (F=35.19, p<.0001) and the hypothesis that there would be no difference in subscale scores was rejected. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance and univariate F statistics are presented in Table 13.

A t test was computed to determine whether significant differences existed between the overall MYTH scores of the two groups of children (Table 12). The t test was not significant at the .05 alpha level of confidence, and therefore, the data supported the hypothesis that there

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviation on DOTS by Group

Subscales	Group 1		Group 2	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
ACT	1.82	1.41	1.92	1.26
ATT	6.00	2.55	6.92	2.51
ADAPT	3.87	1.46	3.47	1.50
RHYT	3.45	1.75	2.57	2.06
REACT	2.76	1.34	4.05	1.13
N=	38		37	

Table 11

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of DOTS Scores for Best and Least Adjusted Children

Hotelling-Lawley Trace	
$F(5,69) = 7.41$	$p<.0001$

Summary of Univariate Statistics for DOTS Scores of Best and Least Adjusted Children

	Univariate Fs				
Source of Variation	ACT	ATT	ADAPT	RHYT	REACT
Group	.11	2.48	1.25	3.98*	20.22*

*$p<.05$

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations on MYTH Subscales by Group

Subscales	Group 1		Group 2	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
ABCOMP	29.29	4.82	21.86	5.65
ABIA	20.11	6.29	26.89	7.58
N=	38		37	

Means, Standard Deviations, and T Test Statistics on Total Myth Scores

	N	Means	SD	t	p
Group 1	38	49.39	7.79	.2357	.8144
Group 2	37	48.86	11.31		
df=73					

Table 13

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of MYTH Scores for Best and Least Adjusted Children

Hotelling-Lawley Trace	
$F(2,72) = 35.19$	$p<.0001$

Summary of Univariate Statistics for MYTH Scores of Best and Least Adjusted Children

	Univariate Fs	
Source of Variation	ABCOMP	ABIA
Group	37.57*	17.84*

*$p<.05$

would be no difference in overall MYTH scores.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be no difference between the scores of parents of the best adjusted group of children and parents of the least adjusted group of children when subscale scores of the LPVSS were compared. Items on the LPVSS were arranged into six subscales: (a) the Rejection subscale (REJ); (b) the Ignoring subscale (IG); (c) the Overprotection subscale (OP); (d) the Overindulgence subscale (OI); (e) the Extrinsic Valuing subscale (EXT); and (f) the Intrinsic Valuing subscale (INT). Means and standard deviations on the LPVSS subscales for the two groups are presented in Table 14. The F ratio for equality of mean vectors was found to be significant ($F=2.89$, $p<.02$) and hypothesis 2 was rejected. Table 15 presents the results of the multivariate analysis of variance. Scores of the two groups of parents on the REJ ($F=8.60$, $p<.005$), OP ($F=4.94$, $p<.03$) and the INT ($F=13.50$, $p<.0005$) subscales contributed most to the multivariate F statistic (see Table 15).

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations of LPVSS Subscales by Group

Subscales	Group 1		Group 2	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
REJ	15.38	2.91	18.53	5.40
IG	29.83	3.79	30.27	3.33
OP	11.64	2.58	13.30	3.42
OI	17.00	3.84	15.77	3.19
EXT	33.65	5.12	33.48	4.90
INT	52.63	4.14	47.54	6.74
N=	32		35	

Table 15

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of LPVSS Scores for Parents of Best and Least Adjusted Children

Hotelling-Lawley Trace	
$F(6,60) = 2.89$	$p<.0153$

Summary of Univariate Statistics for LPVSS Scores for Parents of Best and Least Adjusted Children

	Univariate Fs					
Source of Variation	REJ	IG	OP	OI	EXT	INT
Group	8.60*	.25	4.94*	2.03	.02	13.50*

*$p<.05$

Appendix C

Instruments

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

Code # _____

Please mark each statement in the following way:

If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check ( ) in the column headed "Like Me."

If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check ( ) in the column headed "Unlike Me."

There are no right or wrong answers.

		Like Me	Unlike Me
1.	I spend a lot of time daydreaming.	_____	_____
2.	I'm pretty sure of myself.	_____	_____
3.	I often wish I were someone else.	_____	_____
4.	I'm easy to like.	_____	_____
5.	My parents and I have a lot of fun together.	_____	_____
6.	I never worry about anything.	_____	_____
7.	I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.	_____	_____
8.	I wish I were younger.	_____	_____
9.	There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.	_____	_____
10.	I can make up my mind without too much trouble.	_____	_____
11.	I'm a lot of fun to be with.	_____	_____
12.	I get upset easily at home.	_____	_____
13.	I always do the right thing.	_____	_____
14.	I'm proud of my school work.	_____	_____
15.	Someone always has to tell me what to do.	_____	_____

		Like Me	Unlike Me
16.	It takes me a long time to get used to anything knew.	_____	_____
17.	I'm often sorry for the things I do.	_____	_____
18.	I'm popular with kids my own age.	_____	_____
19.	My parents usually consider my feelings.	_____	_____
20.	I'm never happy.	_____	_____
21.	I'm doing the best work that I can.	_____	_____
22.	I give in very easily.	_____	_____
23.	I can usually take care of myself.	_____	_____
24.	I'm pretty happy.	_____	_____
25.	I would rather play with children younger than me.	_____	_____
26.	My parents expect too much of me.	_____	_____
27.	I like everyone I know.	_____	_____
28.	I like to be called on in class.	_____	_____
29.	I understand myself.	_____	_____
30.	It's pretty tough to be me.	_____	_____
31.	Things are all mixed up in my life.	_____	_____
32.	Kids usually follow my ideas.	_____	_____
33.	No one pays much attention to me at home.	_____	_____
34.	I never get scolded.	_____	_____
35.	I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.	_____	_____

		Like Me	Unlike Me
36.	I can make up my mind and stick to it.	_____	_____
37.	I really don't like being a boy - girl.	_____	_____
38.	I have a low opinion of myself.	_____	_____
39.	I can make up my mind and stick to it.	_____	_____
40.	There are many times when I'd like to leave home.	_____	_____
41.	I'm never shy.	_____	_____
42.	I often feel upset in school.	_____	_____
43.	I often feel ashaved of myself.	_____	_____
44.	I'm not as nice looking as most people.	_____	_____
45.	If I have something to say, I usually say it.	_____	_____
46.	Kids pick on me very often.	_____	_____
47.	My parents understand me.	_____	_____
48.	I always tell the truth.	_____	_____
49.	My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.	_____	_____
50.	I don't care what happens to me.	_____	_____
51.	I'm a failure.	_____	_____
52.	I get upset easily when I'm scolded.	_____	_____
53.	Most people are better liked than me.	_____	_____
54.	I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.	_____	_____

		Like Me	Unlike Me
55.	I always know what to say to people.	_____	_____
56.	I often get discouraged in school.	_____	_____
57.	Things usually don't bother me.	_____	_____
58.	I can't be depended on.	_____	_____

Code # _____

Dimensions of Temperament Survey

HOW TO ANSWER: On the following pages are some sentences. They are about how children like you may behave. Some of the sentences may be true of how you behave and others may not be true for you. For each sentence we would like you to say if the sentence is usually true of you or is usually untrue of you, if it is usually false. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers because all children behave in different ways. All you have to do is answer what is true for you.

Here is an example of how to answer. Suppose a sentence was:

"I eat the same things for breakfast every day."

If the sentence were almost always true for you, you would write in:

"true," more true than false.

If the sentence were almost always false for you, you would write in:

"false," more false than true.

On the line to the left of each sentence write true if the statement is more true than false of you, or write false if the statement is more false than true of you.

PLEASE REMEMBER THESE FOUR THINGS AS YOU ANSWER:

1. Give only answers that really tell about you. It is best to say what you really think.

2. Don't spend too much time thinking over each question. Give the first answer as it comes to you. Of course, the sentences are too short to say everything you might like. But give the best answer you can. Some sentences may seem just like others because they are about the same things. But, each sentence asks about a different part of the way you behave. Therefor, your answers may be different.

3. Answer every question one way or the other. Don't skip any.

4. Remember: true = more TRUE than false

   false = more FALSE than true

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

1. _____ I can't sit still for long.

2. _____ I wake up at different times.

3. _____ Once I am involved in a task, I can't be distracted away from it.

4. _____ I persist at a task until it's finished.

5. _____ I can make myself at home anywhere.

6. _____ I react intensely when hurt.

7. _____ No matter what I'm doing, I can be distracted by something else.

8. _____ There is no set time when I go to sleep.

9. _____ I stay with an activity for a long time.

10. _____ If I'm doing one thing, something else occurring won't get me to stop.

11. _____ I do not do any one thing for a long period.

true = more TRUE than false false = more FALSE than true

---

12. _____ I eat about the same amount for dinner whether I am home, visiting someone, or traveling.

13. _____ Things going on around me can take me away from what I'm doing.

14. _____ Sunlight bothers my eyes.

15. _____ Once I take something up, I stay with it.

16. _____ When I have to be still, I get very restless after a few minutes.

17. _____ When a person comes towards me my reponse is to move back.

18. _____ I don't keep at an activity when other things are going on around me.

19. _____ In meeting a new person I tend to move towards him or her.

20. _____ When I react to something, I will always go back to it.

21. _____ If stopped from doing something, I will always go back to it.

22. _____ I never seem to slow down.

23. _____ It takes me no time at all to get used to new people.

24. _____ If watching something, I will keep at it for a long period.

25. _____ I move a great deal in my sleep.

26. _____ I seem to get sleepy just about the same time every night.

27. _____ I move towards new situations.

28. _____ When I am away from home, I still wake up at the same time each morning.

true = more TRUE than false false = more FALSE than true

---

29. _____ I eat about the same amount at breakfast from day to day.

30. _____ I move a lot in bed.

31. _____ It takes me a long time to get used to new people.

32. _____ I eat about the same amount at supper from day to day.

33. _____ I don't move around much at all in my sleep.

34. _____ My appetite seems to stay the same day after day.

MYTH

This rating scale is designed to assess various aspects of a child's behavior. Please mark how well the statement characterizes the child using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
extremely uncharacteristic	uncharacteristic	neutral	characteristic	extremely characteristic

---

1. When this child plays games, he/she is competitive.

   1 2 3 4 5

2. This child works quickly and energetically rather than slowly and deliberately.

   1 2 3 4 5

3. When this child has to wait for others, he/she becomes impatient.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. This child does things in a hurry.

   1 2 3 4 5

5. It takes a lot before this child gets angry at his/her peers.

   1 2 3 4 5

6. This child interrupt others.

   1 2 3 4 5

7. This child is a leader in various activities.

   1 2 3 4 5

8. This child gets irritated easily.

   1 2 3 4 5

9. He/she seems to perform better than usual when competing against others.

   1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
extremely uncharacter-istic	uncharacter-istic	neutral	character-istic	extremely character-istic

10. This child likes to argue or debate.

1 2 3 4 5

11. This child is patient when working with children slower than he/she is.

1 2 3 4 5

12. When working of playing, he/she tries to do better than other children.

1 2 3 4 5

13. This child can sit still long.

1 2 3 4 5

14. It is important to this child to win, rather than to have fun in games or schoolwork.

1 2 3 4 5

15. Other children look to this child for leadership.

1 2 3 4 5

16. This child is competitive.

1 2 3 4 5

17. This child tends to get into fights.

1 2 3 4 5

18. How confident are you of the above ratings?

1	2	3	4	5
extremely unconfident	unconfident	neutral	confident	extremely confident

THANK YOU!

LPVSS

Developed by:
Linda F. Little

Child's Number_____ Child's Age _____
Child's Gender _____ Child's Grade _____

This questionnaire is designed to gather information on the way your child interacts with you, the parent. Each statement asks you to decide whether "hardly ever, once in a while, sometimes, often, very often, almost always," best describes your child's behavior in interacting with you. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG RESPONSES. Your opinions and feelings at the time are the only correct guides for your responses. Since your opinion is what counts, please do not ask others to advise you how you should respond.

The _____that occurs with each statement refers to your child's name.

Please circle ONE number that best describes your child's behavior for EACH STATEMENT.

My relationship to the child is MOTHER____, FATHER _____, OTHER_____.
(please describe)

0 hardly ever	1 once in a while	2 sometimes	3 often	4 very often	5 almost always

1.	When ____acts up in front of others, I am embarrassed.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2.	_____goes places without asking or telling me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.	____needs help in dressing self.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.	____is a good child.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	____goes to bed later than I like.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	____just doesn't do anything right.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Page 2

0 hardly ever	1 once in a while	2 sometimes	3 often	4 very often	5 almost always

7.	____is with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	____wants help in choosing which clothes to wear.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	____is fun to be with.	0	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I care that ____looks neat and clean.	0	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I get upset and angry with ____'s behavior.	0	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I try to meet ____'s demands of me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
13.	____is a special child who needs extra care, instructions and attention.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14.	____interferes with my plans.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15.	____seeks my approval.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16.	____is capable of making some choices for what he/she wishes to do.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17.	____ has my attention.	0	1	2	3	4	5
18.	____needs to be yelled at and punished.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19.	____seems to win when I seem to lose.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	When other people don't like ____, I am unhappy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21.	____acts independently.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Page 3

0 hardly ever	1 once in a while	2 sometimes	3 often	4 very often	5 almost always

22.	I worry that _____is not happy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
23.	_____is a bad child.	0	1	2	3	4	5
24.	_____is capable of meeting his/her needs by self.	0	1	2	3	4	5
25.	_____embarrasses the family.	0	1	2	3	4	5
26.	_____accepts discipline that protects his/her health and safety.	0	1	2	3	4	5
27.	_____needs to be told what to do and when to do it.	0	1	2	3	4	5
28.	_____gets his/her way.	0	1	2	3	4	5
29.	_____needs guidance from me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
30.	_____is fun to be around.	0	1	2	3	4	5
31.	_____feels good about who he/she is.	0	1	2	3	4	5
32.	I feel ill-at-ease in public with _____.	0	1	2	3	4	5
33.	_____reminds me of someone I don't like.	0	1	2	3	4	5
34.	_____takes my time.	0	1	2	3	4	5
35.	_____forgives me when I make mistakes.	0	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I want to keep away from touching _____.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Page 4

0 hardly ever	1 once in a while	2 sometimes	3 often	4 very often	5 almost always

37.	_____gets away with things at home that he/she would not get away with in public.	0	1	2	3	4	5
38.	_____needs to be taken to the doctor or have activities restricted because he/she just doesn't seem well.	0	1	2	3	4	5
39.	I get upset when _____is unhappy with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I feel happy when others are pleased with _____.	0	1	2	3	4	5
41.	_____'s happiness or sadness affects my own.	0	1	2	3	4	5
42.	_____does things that I don't approve of which I allow so that he/she will be happy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
43.	I am unhappy with _____.	0	1	2	3	4	5
44.	_____can accept that other people's needs may interfere with his/her own.	0	1	2	3	4	5
45.	_____acts differently at home than in public.	0	1	2	3	4	5
46.	_____is clumsy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
47.	I forget that _____is around.	0	1	2	3	4	5
48.	I want _____to be the best in whatever he/she does.	0	1	2	3	4	5
49.	_____is accepted by others.	0	1	2	3	4	5

page 5

0 hardly ever	1 once in a while	2 sometimes	3 often	4 very often	5 almost always

50.	____keeps his/her thoughts and feelings from me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
51.	____seems to learn more slowly than other children.	0	1	2	3	4	5
52.	____can be trusted by him/ herself.	0	1	2	3	4	5
53.	____was reading by the age of three.	0	1	2	3	4	5
54.	____seeks my approval often.	0	1	2	3	4	5
55.	____forgives me when I make mistakes.	0	1	2	3	4	5
56.	____is a behavior problem child.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Please go to the next page.

Page 6

Please provide the following additional information about ____ and his/her family life.

1. Ages and gender of additional siblings:

2. ____has several friends in the neighborhood to play with. (___)true, (____)false

3. Do two parents live in the home? (___)yes, (___)no

4. Highest grade level completed by ____'s mother is (____).

5. Highest grade level completed by ____'s father is (____).

6. What person is most responsible for ____'s care? (____)mother, (____)father, (____)other

Reference Notes

1. Siegel, J. M., & Matthews, K. A. Type A behavior, achievement striving, and their childhood origins. Chapter to appear in T. R. Kratochwill (Ed.), Advances in school psychology (Vol. 3). Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

References

Abernathy, V. (1974). Illegitimate conception among teenagers. American Journal of Public Health, 64, 662-665.

Barnett, M. A., Matthews, K. A., & Howard, J. A. (1979). Relationship between competitiveness and empathy in 6- and 7-year-olds. Developmental Psychology, 15(2), 221-223.

Baumrind, D. (1977). Some thoughts about childrearing. In S. Cohen & T. Comiskey (Eds.), Child Development. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Bolstad, O. D., & Johnson, S. M. (1977). The relationship between teachers' assessment of students and the students' actual behavior in the classroom. Child Development, 48, 570-578.

Bower, E. (1969). A process for identifying disturbed children. In W. G. Coggan (Ed.), Readings in child psychology (pp. 143-147). New York: MSS Educational Publishing Company, Inc.

Braun, C. (1976). Teacher expectation: Sociopsychological dynamics. Review of Educational Research, 46(2), 185-213.

Brehm, M. L. & Beck, K. W. (1976). Self image and attitudes towards drugs. In G. Austin & D. Lettieri (Eds.), Drugs and personality. Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Briggs, D. C. (1970). Your child's self-esteem. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Carey, W. B., Fox, M., & McDevitt, S. (1977). Temperament as a factor in early school adjustment. Pediatrics, 60, 621-624.

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

Davis, W. E. (1978). A comparison of teacher referral and pupil self-referral measures relative to perceived school adjustment. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 22-26.

Friedman, M., & Rosenman, R. H. (1974). Type A behavior and your heart. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Crest.

Good, T. L., Sikes, J. N., & Brophy, J. E. (1973). Effects of teacher sex and student sex on classroom interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 74-87.

Gordon, D. A. (1977). Children's beliefs in internal-external control and self-esteem as related to academic achievement. Journal of Personality Assessment, 41, 383-392.

Gordon, E. M., & Thomas, A. (1967). Children's behavioral style and the teacher's appraisal of their intelligence. Journal of School Psychology, 5, 292-300.

Graybill, D. (1978). Relationship of maternal child-rearing behaviors to children's self-esteem. Journal of Psychology, 100, 45-47.

Guttman, J., & Bar-Tal, D. (1982). Stereotypic perceptions of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 519-528.

Heinicke, C. M., Busch, F., Click, P., & Kramer, E. (1973). Parent-child relations, adaptation to nursery school and the child's task orientation: A contrast in the development of two girls. In J. C. Westmen (Ed.), Individual differences in children. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Herold, E. S., Goodwin, M. S., & Lero, D. S. (1979). Self-esteem, locus of control, and adolescent contraception. Journal of Psychology, 101, 83-88.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Anderson, D. (1978). Student cooperative, competitive and individualistic attitudes, and attitudes toward schooling. Journal of Psychology, 100, 183-199.

Kaplan, H. B., Smith, P. B., & Pokorny, A. D. (1979). Psychosocial antecedents of unwed motherhood among indigent adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 181-205.

Little, L. F., & Thompson, R. (1983). Truancy: How parents and teachers contribute. The School Counselor, 30(4), 285-291.

Lorion, R. P., Cowen, E. L., Kraus, R. M., & Milling, L. S. (1977). Family background characteristics and school adjustment problems. Journal of Community Psychology, 5, 142-148.

Love, L. R., & Kaswan, J. W. (1974). Troubled children: Their families, schools and treatments. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

MacDonald, R. R. (1973). Parataxic distortion and perceived parenting. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 123, 337-343.

Marsh, H., Smith, I., & Barnes, J. (1983). Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the self-description questionnaire: Student-teacher agreement on multidimensional ratings of student self-concept. American Educational Research Journal, 20(3), 333-357.

Matthews, K. A. (1977). Caregiver-child interactions and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Child Development, 48, 1752-1756.

Matthews, K. A. (1979). Efforts to control by children and adults with the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Child Development, 50, 842-847.

Matthews, K. A., & Angulo, J. (1980). Measurement of the Type A behavior pattern in children: Assessment of children's competitiveness, impatience-anger, and aggression. Child Development, 51, 466-475.

Matthews, K. A., & Avis, N. E. (in press). Stability of overt Type A behaviors in children: Results from one-year longitudinal study. Child Development.

Matthews, K. A., & Siegel, J. M. (in press). Type A behaviors by children, social comparison, and standards for self-evaluation. Developmental Psychology.

Matthews, K. A., & Volkin, J. I. (1981). Efforts to excel and the Type A behavior pattern in children. Child Development, 52, 1283-1289.

McDonald, K. A. (1980). Enhancing a child's positive self-concept. In T. D. Yawkey (Ed.), The self-concept of the young child. Brigham Young University Press.

Metcalfe, B. (1981). Self-concept and attitude to school. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51, 66-76.

Natriello, G., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1983). Bringing behavior back in: The effects of student characteristics and behavior on the classroom behavior of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 20, 29-43.

Norem-Hebeisen, A. A. (1975). Self-esteem as a predictor of adolescent drug abuse. In D. Lettieri (Ed.), Predicting adolescent drug abuse: A review of issues, methods and correlated. Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Palardy, M. (1969). What teachers believe - what children achieve. Elementary School Journal, 69, 370-374.

Phillips, D. A., & Zigler, E. (1980). Self-concept theory and its practical implications. In T. D. Yawdey (Ed.), The self-concept of the young child. Brigham Young University Press.

Pullis, M. E. (1980). An investigation of the relationship between children's temperament and school adjustment. Dissertations Abstracts International, 40, 3768-3769A. (University Microfilms No. 8001395)

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

Reynolds, W. (1980). Self-esteem and classroom behavior in elementary school children. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 273-277.

Rosenberg, F. R., & Rosenberg, M. (1978). Self-esteem and delinquency. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7, 279-291.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher's expectations and pupil's intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rubin, R. A. (1978). Stability of self-esteem ratings and their relationship to academic achievement: A longitudinal study. Psychology in the Schoold, 15, 430-433.

Rubin, R. A., Dorle, J., & Sandidge, S. (1977). Self-esteem and school performance. Psychology in the Schools, 14, 503-507.

Samuels, S. C. (1977). Enhancing self-concept in early childhood. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Satir, V. (1972). Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, Ca: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.

Sayeda, A. (1978). Parental attitudes and resultant behavior of children. Child Psychiatry Quarterly, 11, 37-48.

Sears, R. E. (1970). Relation of early socialization experiences to self-conepts and gender role in middle childhood. Child Development, 41, 267-289.

Stake, J. E., & Katz, J. F. (1982). Teacher-pupil relationships in the elementary school classroom: Teacher-gender and pupil-grade differences. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 465-471.

Steele, B. F. (1977). Working with abusive parents from a psychiatric point of view (DHEW Publication No. OHDS 77-30070). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Swayze, M. C. (1980).Self-concept development in young children. In T. D. Yawkey (Ed.), The self-concept of the young child. Brigham Young University Press.

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). Temperament and development. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.

Walzer, S., Richmond, J. B., & DeBuno, T. Epidemiology and disordered learning. In I. N. Berlin (Ed.), Advocacy for child mental health (pp. 46-67). New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.

Wolf, T. M., Hunter, S., & Webber, L. (1979). Psychosocial measures and cardiovascular risk factors in children and adolescents. Journal of Psychology, 101, 139-146.

Wolf, T. M., Hunter, S. M., Webber, L. S., & Berenson, G. S. (1981). Self-concept, locus of control, goal blockage, and coronary-prone behavior pattern in children and adolescents: Bogalusa heart study. The Journal of General Psychology, 105, 13-26.

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 1 of 2

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 2 of 2