

Self-concepts of Kindergarten Children
Across and Within Socio-economic Status Levels:
an exploratory study

Janet H. Perdue

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

October, 1984



Janet H. Perdue, 1984

ABSTRACT

Self-concepts of Kindergarten Children Across and Within Socio-economic Status Levels: an exploratory study

Janet H. Perdue.

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate and compare the self-concept of Montreal kindergarten students from different socio-economic classes. Data for this investigation was acquired from two separate Montreal Island groups:

- 1) 78 English-speaking Caucasian pupils from a middle class environment
- 2) 78 English-speaking Caucasian pupils from a socio-economically deprived area

The research was designed to assess the subjects' concept of self after one year of exposure to a schooling situation. The basic question probed was: Does social class make a difference to a kindergarten child's self-concept? Secondary questions explored were: How do sex, age, classroom teacher relate to the kindergarteners' self-concept scores? Self-concept scores were obtained using the McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973). Multivariate analyses and two-tailed t tests were performed on the dependent variables.

Findings from this exploratory research indicated that some but not all low SES children possess more negative self-concepts than middle class children. In both social groups children who entered school older had a significantly higher school-self. Significant sex differences in the schooling-self were obtained favoring girls and appeared to be teacher related.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks to Mona Farrell, my advisor, for her time, professionalism, idealism, knowledge, guidance, support and interest. She allowed me the opportunity to integrate my academic requirements with my professional responsibilities and to research an area in which I was specifically interested.

An additional thank you to my three children, Dianne, Mark and Gregg for their love and concern.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Problem	1
1.2 Definition of 'Self-concept'	2
1.3 Research on Self-Concept of Kindergarten Children	5
1.4 Significance of the Study	6
1.5 Statement of the Problem to be Investigated	7
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1 Family and Self-Concept	10
2.2 Maternal Factors and Self-Concept	16
2.3 Paternal Factors and Self-Concept	20
2.4 Schooling and Self-Concept	22
2.4.1 Kindergarten Studies	23
2.4.2 Studies of Elementary Level	25
2.5 Age and Sex as related to Self-Concept	32
2.6 Teacher and Students' Self-Concept	35
2.7 Summary	38
2.8 Hypotheses	38
III METHODS AND PROCEDURES	
3.1 Subjects	40
3.2 Instrumentation	41
3.3 Procedures	43
3.4 Limitations of the Study	44
3.5 Analysis of Data	44

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV RESULTS	
4.1 Introduction	46
4.2 Kindergarteners Self-Concept and SES	46
4.3 Teacher/classroom variable and students' self-concept	47
4.4 Sex variable and kindergarten self-concept	51
4.5 Age variable and kindergarten self-concept	56
4.6 Interactions	59
V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	
5.1 Relationship between kindergarten self-concept scores and SES levels	61
5.2 SES relationships between kindergarten children's sex and their self-concept scores	66
5.3 SES relationships between kindergarten children's age and their self-concept scores	70
5.4 Conclusion	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76
APPENDIX A	82
APPENDIX B	83
APPENDIX C - Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests. Tables 2-10.....	84

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Socio-economic status differences in mean self-concept scores of English-speaking kindergarten children	47
2	Significant differences in mean self-concept scores between teacher/classrooms within social class	48
3	Significant differences in mean self-concept scores between subjects by teacher/classroom and by social class	49
4	Mean self-concept significant differences (t-tests) between lower and middle class girls and lower and middle class boys	52
5	Mean self-concept significant differences (t-tests) between like-sex comparisons in individual classrooms	53
6	Mean self-concept significant differences between kindergarten girls and boys within social class	54
7	Mean self-concept scores and t-test differences for girls and boys in Teacher 2's (LC) classroom	55
	Mean self-concept scores and t-test differences for girls and boys in Teacher 1's (LC) classroom	55
8	Multivariate analysis of SES significant differences in self-concept between males and females for two different classroom combinations..	56
9	Significant differences in mean self-concept scores for four age groupings of kindergarteners between SES classes	57
10	Significant differences in mean self-concept scores for four age groupings of kindergarteners within the low and middle SES groups	58
11	Multivariate analysis of significant differences in mean self-concept scores for SES, sex, age interactions	60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

To educate the 'complete child' is the ultimate aspiration of today's educational endeavors. This includes developing the emotional, physical, psychological, intellectual and social needs of the child. For the past two decades humanistic education has been promoted in the schools and tremendous emphasis has been placed on personal and social objectives (Shavelson et al, 1976). The more recent 'Back-to-Basics' movement has elicited great concern that all factors excluding intellectual may be ignored in the push to acquire the basic skills of reading, language and mathematics. Since this emphasis appears to be particularly concentrated on the low socio-economic status (SES) child the consequences for these children can be serious (Ausubel & Ausubel, 1963; Wylie, 1963; Long & Henderson, 1968; Philips & Zigler, 1980; Osborne & Legette, 1982).

A United States survey (Klein, 1979) involving teachers and parents from 13 elementary schools was conducted to determine which measures they viewed as paramount to a child's development. In the 129 classes participating in this questionnaire study, it was noted that self-concept measures were ranked second to intellectual measures but both were viewed as of salient importance. A more recent survey (Silvernail, 1982) conducted with administrators and teachers also revealed that the development of a strong positive

self-concept is certainly a top priority within the educational structure.

Although the self-concept of all children seems to be a concern of the educator, it is possible that the self-concept of the low SES kindergarten child may be particularly vulnerable since researchers have indicated that the low SES child enters school less able to adapt to new social experiences, new roles, new ways of evaluating his competence and aptitudes (Gergen, 1978) all of which may strongly affect and diminish a child's feeling about himself. If low SES children are likely to have low self-concepts then it behooves us to establish this fact and to do something about it for Wylie (1979) claims that a positive self-concept is strongly associated with all aspects of the self-- cognitive, psychological and emotional.

1.2 Definitions of 'Self-concept'

Definitions of 'self-concept' and 'self-esteem' are imprecise and vary according to theorists and research studies. Germain (1978) lists "the 'self' as the 'real self', the true or absolute which comes into existence when an individual becomes aware of being a separate entity" (p. 386). Early writers, who originally described self-concept, saw it in phenomenological terms as simple, unitary and unidimensional (James, 1890; Mead, 1934; Maslow, 1954). But in 1976, Shavelson et al, suggested that self-concept has a hierarchical and multi-faceted structure.

3

Self-concept, broadly defined, is a person's perceptions of himself or herself. These perceptions are formed through one's experiences with and interpretations of one's environment and are influenced especially by reinforcements, evaluations by significant others, and one's attributions for one's own behavior. The self-concept construct is further circumscribed by seven critical features: a) organized, b) multifaceted, c) hierarchical, d) stable, e) developmental, f) evaluative, g) differentiable. (p. 407-415)

However, more recently Winnie et al (1978) claimed that self-concept seemed more unitary than a multidimensional construct.

Over the years, nevertheless, one fundamental distinction has come to be recognized-- that between the self as subject and the self as object of the person's own knowledge and evaluation (Wylie, 1974). Based on personal empirical material, M. Rosenberg wrote Conceiving the Self (1979) which establishes for the first time a general theory of self-concept. The crucial importance of the term 'self-concept' according to Rosenberg is the "totality of the individual's thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object" (p. 7). It is this objective concept that utilizes perception and reflection of the individual, including the emotional responses to that perception and reflection. Rosenberg states the self-concept is largely revealed by characterizing individuals in terms of universal attitude dimensions such as social identity elements, dispositions and physical characteristics; directionality and intensity of feelings; salient involvement in personal verbal and performance tasks; consistency, accuracy and clarity in description of self-

picture; stability of self-attitudes and verification of these components which are susceptible of objective confirmation (p. 23-24). The author indicated that using these attitudinal dimensions one could establish an individual's self-picture and would have a good description of the individual's self-concept.

'Self-esteem' is a term frequently used interchangeably with self-concept. Self-esteem is one of the components, motives or principles associated with the composite view of self-concept. In his book Rosenberg (1979) indicated that "self-esteem signifies a positive or negative orientation toward an object" (p. 54). In characterizing a person as having high self-esteem, it is meant that the person has self-respect, considers himself a person of worth, appreciates his own merits and recognizes his faults, faults which he hopes and expects to change. Self-esteem has also been defined as a result of development of a sense or feeling of belonging, competence and worth (Felker, 1974) and as "a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds towards himself" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 148). Certainly as the child develops and becomes more aware of 'self' it would appear that he can perceive himself in terms of abilities and a number of other self characteristics, which may very well be distinct and differentiable one from the other as well as belong to the total mosaic we call self-concept.

For the purpose of this study the term 'self-concept'

will be used to denote the totality of the child's thoughts and feelings about himself as described by the McDaniel-Piers, Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973). This scale postulates three aspects of the self-- the feeling-self, the schooling-self and the behaving-self which when combined constitutes the global self-concept of the child.

1.3 Research on Self-Concept of Kindergarten Children

Limited research has been found in the literature dealing with the self-concepts of kindergarten age children (Wylie, 1979) and results from these few studies tend to be conflicting. Focusing on the restricted number of studies of kindergarten children, it can be noted that the majority of these investigations are primarily concerned with the relationship of self-concept and achievement (Wattenberg & Clifford, 1964; Ozehosky & Clark, 1970), self-concept and maternal teaching styles (Dreyer & Haupt, 1966; Hess & Shipman, 1965), self-concept and paternal verbal interaction (Radin, 1972), self-concept and impulsivity-relectivity (Talor & Talor, 1982). Only one study looked at self-concept across socio-economic levels (SES) (Long & Henderson, 1968). Even this study compared black with white kindergarteners in the United States and findings are not likely to be applicable to the Caucasian Canadian subjects.

Another major difficulty until recent years was that of how to measure the self-concept of the kindergarten child. Established instruments were available for children from

Grade 2 upwards but for younger levels self-concept was typically researched by observer ratings or other subjective measures. In the late 70's a number of new approaches including the McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale were designed which provided more objective measurement of the self-concepts of young children.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The limited research on the kindergarten child and his self-concept together with the absence of Canadian documented research in this area indicates a salient need for this present study. This investigation compared the self-concept of two socio-economically different groups of Montreal/Canadian kindergarten children, using Caucasian English speaking students thus eliminating race as a confounding variable. The study investigated the relationship between the sex and the self-concept of the kindergarten child, which relationship had not been previously studied at this level. Furthermore, the study compared the self-concept of kindergarteners from four different classrooms in the attempt to explore the relationship between the child's self-concept and the teacher.

Although studies on self-concept have increased dramatically during the 70's (Wylie, 1979; Hansford & Hattie, 1982) most of these have been at the elementary through high school grade levels. All of these investigations seem to indicate the need for a positive self-concept in order to succeed in school. Given this assumption is accurate, it would appear

that unless the child has developed a strong self-concept by the time he enters school or at least before he begins Grade One where academic pressures really begin, he is likely to be seriously handicapped. Indeed, a major factor in the school failure of a low SES child could be the lack of a positive self-concept. Is the low SES child less able to cope with the academic, social, psychological and emotional stress which he must face in school and across the years because he has a weaker self-concept than the middle class child?

This study is important because if it is found that the low SES child has a significantly less positive self-concept than the middle class child, then educators must decide if they are going to undertake remedial action to counteract this problem. Programs to enhance self-concept at the kindergarten level will need to be designed, tested and evaluated. If on the other hand, the self-concept of the low SES kindergarteners is as positive as that of the middle SES children then the educator's concern, effort and time might be more valuably spent in concentrating on the basic intellectual skills area.

1.5 Statement of the Problem to be Investigated

The purpose of the proposed study is to investigate the child's self-concept in two different socio-economic status populations (middle class Caucasian kindergarteners and socio-economic disadvantaged Caucasian kindergarteners) during the introductory and transitional year prior to a

structured academic setting. The basic question being probed is: Does social class make a difference to a kindergarten child's self-concept?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the early 70's research studies on self-concept are being reported in gigantic proportions (Hansford & Hattie, 1982) and the quantity, if not quality, of research on self-concept has been impressive (Wylie, 1979). However, despite the volume of research investigations reported as well as noted in the following review of literature, there is a noticeable deficit of self-concept research for young children of kindergarten age.

In essence, self development begins at birth and child's self-concept is fashioned by numerous interactions with his environment. The most crucial interactions in a child's early years occur in the familial setting where the behavior, attitudes and ability of the parents and significant others affect the child. A supportive environment, with many stimuli and visible love and care, will most likely enhance the development of a strong positive self-concept. The opposite environment will, in all likelihood, contribute to the development of children who feel inadequate, less confident, less competent and who think more negatively about themselves.

In this chapter, a review of factors which would appear to moderate a child's positive or negative view of self and how such factors differ across socio-economic groups (SES) is presented.

2.1 Family and Self-Concept

The young child's self-concept is influenced by a number of factors primordial among which is his family. The development of self begins immediately at birth as the child interacts with his environment. By the fourth month, the infant begins to see himself as separate from other people and is beginning to acquire a concept of 'self perception' (Silvernail, 1981). In 1958, Burton White began an investigation into the development of the lives of children less than three years of age and ten years later his research findings indicated that a long-term approach to understanding good development including the self had to start with a focus on the first three years of life. For White, the child's own family is so obviously central to good development that he stated: "Indeed, we came to believe that the informal education that families provide for their children makes more of an impact on a child's total educational development than the formal educational system. If a family does its job well, the professionals can then provide effective training." (p. 4) According to White, to begin to look at a child's development when he is two years of age is already much too late, particularly in the area of social skills and attitudes and this probably applies to the development of a positive self-concept for the young child also.

White states that the first eight months of an infant's life are the easiest of all times for parents if they provide the baby with a normal amount of love, attention and physical

care. The period that starts at eight months and ends at three years is a period of primary importance. The emphasis during this developmental stage consists of four key goals which are language development, the development of curiosity, social and self development, and nurturing the roots of intelligence (p. 110). "The most important social influences are those of the nuclear family, especially the parents, who are the powerful and nearly ever-present controllers of both stimuli and satisfactions" (Scheirer & Kraut, 1979, p. 142).

These findings have also been substantiated by several other researchers who have viewed the family structure as playing a paramount role in the first five years of a child's life (Felker, 1974; Gordon, 1972; Dreyer, 1966; Rand, 1965). These researchers firmly believe that parental caring coupled with a good family circle relationship instill within the child feelings of value as a separate entity.

"Favorable concepts of self in terms of feeling of comfort, in relation to expectations about how the world will treat him, are begun early in life and develop throughout life, resting on the base of warm, loving, acceptable behavior on the part of the parenting ones" (Gordon, 1972, p.14).

This early parental care has a crucial impact on the self-concept of children. In a seven year investigative study on conditions associated with self-esteem development, Coopersmith (1967) listed these findings:

- 1) Total or nearly total acceptance of children by their parents. The findings reveal that the mothers of children with high self-esteem are more loving and have closer relationships with their children than do the mothers of children with less self-esteem. The greater acceptance

of the child with high and medium self-esteem is manifested by interest, concern about companions, availability, and congenial joint activities (p.178).

- 2) Clearly defined and enforced limits. The conditions that exist within the families of children with high self-esteem are notable for the demands the parents make and the firmness and care with which they enforce those demands. Reward is the preferred mode of affecting behavior, but where punishment is required, it is geared to managing undesired responses rather than to harsh treatment or loss of love (p. 196).
- 3) Respect and latitude for individual action. Families with high self-esteem can establish extensive set of rules, are most zealous in enforcing them and recognize the rights and opinions of the child. Discussions are permitted and concessions granted if differences exist (p. 213).

The literature on low SES children suggests that in all three of these areas the young child receives less than optimum treatment. Delapidation, unsanitary conditions and overcrowding often characterize the physical setting in which the low SES child resides. These impoverished family conditions are caused by lack of money which can also manifest itself in terms of malnourishment, inadequate clothing for the child, lack of parental attention and lack of natural ability of the parents to interact in a positive manner with their children. Thus, the low SES child could be physically and mentally ignored which may overtly cause the young child distress. Some research cites that low SES children are ignored by their parents or their parents are either unaware or lack the ability to become intimate with their off-springs.

Research by Deutsch (1968) and Purkey (1970) indicates that a lack of adequate stimulation, lack of defined order

and limits and lack of role models reduces the self-concept of children. The Coopersmith findings also indicate the importance for a positive self-concept of defined and enforced limits being placed upon children, the importance of rewarding desired behaviors and never using withdrawal of love or harsh treatment as punishment. He also indicates the importance of parental interest in the child's activities and joint interactions between parents and child. Research on the low SES child suggests that the setting of reasonable limited behavioral parameters and loving discipline are not regarded by their parents as priorities in their lifestyles. A lack of stimulation and harsh disciplinary traits have also been cited by Richmond et al (1965). These researchers stated that "there are indeed many children who spend their formative years in extremely non-reinforcing situations- neglected, untaught, unloved and sometimes battered and beaten" (p. 15). Other researchers (Rosenberg, 1965; Purkey, 1970) have substantiated the Coopersmith findings, claiming a positive relationship between parental acceptance of children and children's self-evaluations.

Negative attitudes exhibited within a home environment affect children dramatically. The majority of a young child's life is under the control of others over whom he has no control or from whom he cannot separate. A negative home environment can produce poor behavior, anxiety, inability to cope with responsibility, limited achievement and anti-social tendencies (Felker, 1974) all of which have

a detrimental affect on a young child's self-concept.

Hess & Shipman (1965) indicated that "an unresponsive environment offers children little motivation to act and to develop techniques for dealing with possible future options. The consequences for the lower SES children are that the styles of learning established at home interfere with subsequent learning and teaching processes in school" (p. 59). The lack of coping techniques implied here places the child in a constant inferior/disadvantaged role which may very well result in him viewing himself as less than adequate. It is also possible that such negative encounters affect the child's sense of competence and mastery with concomitant reduction in his self-concept. Furthermore such experiences are likely to suppress the young child's curiosity with negative consequences for his cognitive and intellectual growth and the net outcome is that he is caught in a vicious circle with few opportunities to develop a positive self-concept.

Researchers (Kohn, 1963; Henggeler & Tavormina, 1980; Richmond, 1965) have described lower class family relationships as less warm and more conflictual than their middle class counterparts. Henggeler & Tavormina (1980) stated that the lower SES families "possess characteristic interaction patterns that impede optimal interpersonal functioning" (p. 212). These impeding factors include father absence or non-involvement if present, slum conditions, low income, lack of privacy, lack of attention and mother's stress and

anxiety. Bloom (1964) stated "the nature of the individual's pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness may be largely determined by the nature of the environmental conditions under which he has lived in his formative years" (p. 193). This view strongly supports Felker's (1974) and Combs & Snygg's (1959) speculation that a child's early childhood homelife is of critical importance and possibly causes a child to have a negative self-concept which may very well persist in his adult years.

Researchers have also noted that parents of middle class status value self-direction and self-control in their children, whereas the lower SES parents place more emphasis on conformity to external rules and standards and are less concerned with the child's internal feelings (Kohn, 1963). Wylie (1979) noted that parents of the lower SES class use different techniques of child rearing from their middle class peers. They tend to rely more on physical punishment, less reasoning and more withdrawal of love as behavioral deterrents.

Since the external behavioral management techniques seem to vary between the lower SES parents and their middle class counterparts it also is conceivable that the internal traits of self-direction, self-control and self-concept also differ. Rosenberg (1979) attempt to explain this by suggesting that the occupational level of an adult is the barometer which specifies the self-esteem of that person. Most lower SES parents are engaged in occupational activities which

require little or no self-direction and no opportunity to exercise independent judgement. They are under close supervision and there is no complexity to the job routine. Thus, the hard reality of the differences between the lower class and middle class parents may be reduced to differences in power, prestige and possessions. According to Rosenberg, this socio-economic inequality would appear to translate into differences between the self-esteem of these two groups of parents. In turn, these parents influence the self-concept direction of their children as they are their role models. Langner & Michael (1963) stated that "the self-esteem of a child is based, to a large degree, on the status of the parents and the parents' self-esteem" (p. 455).

2.2 Maternal Factors and Self-Concept

Within a family environment, the mother is the primary person in a young child's life. "She is the one most likely to have the almost-total responsibility for a baby's upbringing" (White, 1975, p. 115). The mother also functions in the role of teacher. Research has suggested that maternal level of intelligence and the mother's number of years of schooling strongly influence the cognitive levels and positive/negative self-concept of her children. Hess & Shipman (1965) studied mothers from middle and lower socio-economic backgrounds instructing their young children on selected tasks. Parent educational and occupational levels were controlled for both the experimental and control subgroups. These researchers used 163 nonworking mothers and their four-year-old children

as subjects for their investigation. Compared with the lower class mothers, middle class mothers relied less on physical feedback, preferred motivating the child to controlling through implied threat, gave more orientation to the task, reinforced correct responses more than errors and used more specific language. The investigators concluded: "It appears that in spite of a mother's good intentions, if she fails to inject sufficient cognitive meaning into her interactions with her child, she may structure the interactions so that he not only fails to learn but develops a negative response to the experience" (p. 80). Such research indicates how the low SES mother may induce negative feelings of self competence in her child and how she is conditioning negative attitudes towards a task all of which may result in the child developing a negative self-concept.

Other researchers (Laosa, 1980; Ramey, 1979) have supported these findings and have indicated that better educated, higher SES mothers use more enquiry methods, more praise, are more helpful, responsive, attentive and indirectly controlling; participate more actively in their children's activities; use less direction, modelling, verbal cues and negative physical control than less educated and low SES mothers (Laosa, 1980). Ramey et al (1979) indicated that "when one compares the behaviors of the low-income mothers in this sample with those of a local general population, the behavior of low-income mothers certainly

appears to be different. Low SES mothers were less verbal and less interactive, they were less warm and maintained more authoritarian attitudes" (p. 812). These differences in maternal behaviors may very well result in differences in self-concept but such speculation needs verification.

Very real differences appear to exist among social classes in patterns of mother-child interaction. Farran & Haskins (1980) studied the mother-child interactions of fifty-one three-year-old children and their mothers from both the middle and low SES groups and reported that middle-income mothers and children spent more than twice as much time in mutual play as did the lower SES mothers and their children. The children from middle income families spent much less total time in independent activities compared to the low-income children and much more time interacting with their mothers. "Low-income mothers tended to remain uninvolved with their children" (p. 789). This lack of involvement with mothers could mean that the low SES child has little opportunity to receive positive reinforcement which could help develop a more positive self-concept. On the other hand, this lack of involvement could result in a reduction of negative reinforcement for the child thereby affirming whatever self-concept he has developed.

In a study by Dreyer & Haupt (1966) thirty-two middle class kindergarten children, their mothers and teachers served as subjects. The results indicated that kindergarten pupils

who were sampled and exhibited high self-esteem came from homes in which mothers encourage autonomy and independence within a framework. According to Hess & Shipman (1965) independence and autonomy are not encouraged in the low SES homes. The lower class mother had a tendency to use coercion and minimal verbal instruction when interacting with her child. She stressed the non-verbal aspects of a task and used more negative than positive reinforcement. In contrast, the middle class mother explained the task and her expectations to the child. She used verbal praise and gave more positive reinforcement than the lower class mother. Their findings support the belief that the low SES child lacks the positive feedback required to enhance a strong positive self-concept.

The importance of the maternal role was reinforced in a study by Clark-Stewart (1973) also examining the relationship between mother and child. The interaction patterns suggested that the best predictor of a child who exhibited a positive self-concept was his confident self assured play behavior in the laboratory reflecting the amount of stimulation with toys and objects which he received from the mother at home. "The essential role of mother as mediator of environmental stimulation is apparent" (p. 70).

It would appear from the research presented on the mother-child relationship that the mother's involvement with her child affects self-concept development of the child and may cause the child to enter the schooling environment

with deficits in a number of developmental areas including self-concept.

2.3 Paternal Factors and Self-Concept

White (1975) indicated that child-rearing is not sex-linked and therefore "fathers could probably do the job not only as well as the mother, but in some instances even better" (p. 257). Pedersen et al (1979) studied 55 infants in the inner city in low SES circumstances. One-half of the subjects were reared in single family units while the other half had a father who was present in the family. The results indicated that the father is a significant influence on development as early as the first half year of life for male infants. His interaction with the infant stimulates social responsiveness and several aspects of early cognitive and motivational development.

Pearlin & Kohn (1966) reported that lower SES fathers stress obedience as the important parental value. As a result the low SES father tends to elicit compliance to his rules and if this is not obtained he can resort to physical or verbal abuse. It was also noted by Sears (1970) that fathers who tend to dominate and control all decision-making within the family have been associated with more negative self-concepts in their children. In a recent article entitled End the Other Abuse, Strickland et al (1982) stated "the figures do not reflect what may be an even more pervasive, insidious and difficult-to-counteract phenomenon: emotional abuse: abuse of the child's self-concept and feelings of

worth" (p. 9).

Radin (1972) studied patterns of interaction between white middle class and working-class fathers and their children. The interaction involved nurturance or restrictive verbal patterns. It was suggested that paternal warmth facilitates the child's identification with him, particularly in the male child. Identification with the father should lead to the child's incorporation of the father's ideas, attitudes and feelings. The nurturant father communicates a positive acceptance of the child as a person which enhances the child's self-concept. Paternal restrictiveness does not facilitate positive communication and paternal identification by the child. A restrictive father generally reacts negatively to the child's behavior, attempts to handle the symptom of the problem and not the needs of the child, control behavior and cut off the usual patterns of identification and communication with the child. A father's restrictiveness tends to lead the child to develop a negative self-concept.

In summary, the impact of the early paternal care on self-concept development appears to be important. Fathers who induce a sense of direction, feelings of acceptance and constructive limits promote strong positive self-concepts in children. Fathers are not typically present for the lower SES child, therefore, there is a high probability that he will develop a low or negative self-concept.

2.4 Schooling and Self-Concept

With a child's entrance into school, his self-concept must accommodate, incorporate and integrate several new experiences. The child must adapt to new social experiences, new roles, new ways of evaluating his competence and aptitudes (Gergen, 1978).

The low SES child is less likely to be able to assimilate the stresses, pressures and anxiety produced by student academic demands (Lipsitt, 1958). It has frequently been suggested that the self-concept of the low SES school child is likely to be seriously affected as a result of: a) the encounter with cognitive demands that are beyond the child's capabilities, b) the social comparison process involving the child's more highly achieving peers, c) the child's perception of the school and its demands as threatening and conflicting with the values and behavior of home (Ausubel & Ausubel, 1963).

Low SES youngsters are less prepared for educational experiences. They arrive in kindergarten lacking basic skills (Waksman, 1980), exhibiting limited language usage and experiences (Granite, 1966; Richards, 1982), and displaying impulsive behaviors (Tolor et al. 1982). Lacking such fundamental skills, it seems feasible that the low SES child will encounter many negative educational experiences. Furthermore, as cited by Miller (1981) competition within the educational sphere produces stress and anxiety and produces self-labelled losers. The low SES child may

develop negative feelings about himself and his ability in his formative years within the home environment and then the schooling milieu may increasingly add to his negative self-worth. Even the child who arrives in school with an adequate or positive self-concept may find the harsh reality of the educational scene so overwhelming that his self image is reduced to a mere remnant.

Several studies have reported a positive relationship between children's self-concept and educational achievement (Brookover et al. 1964; Wattenberg & Clifford, 1964; Caplin, 1969; Primavera et al. 1974; Tompkins, 1979; Eshel & Klein, 1981; Hansford & Hattie, 1982). The majority of these investigators studied children from Grade 3 upwards probably because the well established self-concept instruments (Piers-Harris, Coopersmith) were designed for those age levels.

2.4.1 Kindergarten Studies

Only a few studies of young children have been located and only two compared kindergarteners across SES levels. Wattenberg & Clifford (1964) did an investigative study using 59 middle class kindergarteners and 69 lower class kindergarteners. A verbal measure of self-concept which was not identified and the Detroit Beginning First Grade Intelligence Test were used to measure the scores at the close of the second semester of kindergarten. The results supported their hypothesis "that the self-concept of the child in kindergarten has greater influence in the development of reading skill than the reading experience has upon the self-concept" (p. 465).

These findings were upheld for their subjects' reading achievement two and one-half years later. The investigators also noted that early achievement in reading is linked to socio-economic class. They also reported that the low SES child enters school with less verbal skills, listening and perceiving abilities and less word analysis performance than his middle class counterpart. However, they did not report any relationship between SES and self-concept.

In 1970, Ozehosky & Clark conducted a study concerning the relationship between children's self-concept measured by teacher ratings and achievement in kindergarten. The subject population consisted of 1042 children enrolled in 37 kindergarten classes. The question posed was "Does the self-concept have functional utility at the kindergarten level?" The answer was affirmative. Regarding the functional utility of the self-concept at the kindergarten level, the researchers established that at this age level self-concept is related to achievement. It is of some importance to note that not only were teacher ratings of children's self-concept predictive of achievement at this level, but that teacher ratings of children's self-concept was shown to be stable over a period of time.

An additional study involving kindergarten age children investigated self-concept and learning style (Tolor & Tolor, 1982). It has been suggested that the response style of impulsive children often interferes with the attainment of success in various learning situations, despite an adequate

or above average intellectual ability and this further causes a development of negative self-concepts. Since the literature indicates that lower SES children appear to be less structured, organized and introspective in their behavior and thoughts, in speculation it would seem that these children are again in a situation which could cause further degeneration of the self-concept.

Tolor & Tolor (1982) designed a study to investigate the relationship between self-concept and impulsivity-reflectivity in kindergarten children. Thirty-nine kindergarten children, enrolled in two separate classes at one elementary school comprised the sample population. Children were administered individually the Kagan's Matching Familiar Figures Test (Form F) and the Primary Level Self-Appraisal Inventory. Also a Draw-A-Man Test was used. Results yielded a non-significant relationship between self-concept and learning style. The young child's self-concept was found to be more difficult to change than had been anticipated. There was no simple correspondence between problem-solving style and attitudes about self held by these kindergarten children.

2.4.2 Studies of Elementary Children

A) Comparison of self-concept between SES levels

Findings from studies at the elementary level comparing the self-concepts of low SES versus middle class children have been mixed and not at all consistent. The studies by Trowbridge et al (1970), Muller & Leonetti (1974), Soares & Soares (1969-1972) and Farrell & Derevensky (1978) indicated

that the self-concepts of disadvantaged children are higher or not significantly different than the advantaged children. These investigators suggested that the disadvantaged groups come from more homogeneous socio-economic backgrounds where the teachers' expectations for them are met, whereas the advantaged groups are subjected to more pressure which could result in a depressed or lowered self-concept. In 1978, Farrell & Derevensky reported on the self-concept patterns of academically high and low achieving white inner-city children at each grade level of the elementary school (kindergarten through Grade 6). Two inner-city schools were investigated in this study. Findings indicated that the relationship between self-concept and achievement is complex. The self-concept scores were not as susceptible to the effects of low achievement as expected. "Approximately two thirds of the children with low academic achievement scores have an average or high self-concept and approximately one half (46 percent) with low reading achievement scores had a high self-concept" (p. 19). In comparing the self-concept scores of the two different schools there was evidence that kindergarten through Grade 2 low income minority children had higher self-concepts than grade equivalent English speaking children.

Soares and Soares conducted a study in 1969 involving 514 children from Grades 4 through 8. Their advantaged and disadvantaged samples were formed by taking groups from schools located in both areas. Their second study (1972)

investigated 1378 elementary and 1033 high school subjects from disadvantaged and advantaged localities. Results from both studies were entirely consistent: disadvantaged groups always had high self-concepts.

Trowbridge et al (1970) tested 3700 low and middle socio-economic status students (Grades 3 through 8) using the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory which has four dimensions: 1) general self, 2) social self-peers, 3) school-academic 4) home-parents. The findings indicated that the self-concept of the deprived socio-economic status students was significantly higher than those of the middle SES on the first three items. Only on the home-parent section did the middle SES students score higher.

Muller & Leonetti (1974) used the Primary Self-Concept Inventory with Mexican-American and Anglo low income children. This instrument required the children to circle pictures which were most like themselves. Findings indicated no significant differences in self-concept scores between the two groups of children in Grades One through Four.

On the other hand, the studies of Long & Henderson (1968) and Owen (1977) indicated that the self-concept of certain disadvantaged children are more negative than their more advantaged counterparts. Long & Henderson (1968) conducted a study using a non-verbal method to investigate the self and social concepts of disadvantaged school beginners. The experimental group consisted of 72 black children who were about to begin first grade and had not attended kinder-

garten. Eighty percent of these families had incomes which registered in the two lowest income categories on the Hollingshead's Occupational Scale. The control group consisted of 72 white children from the same community with one-half of these students having attended kindergarten. Forty percent of these families had incomes listed in the lowest two categories on the occupational scale. The results indicated the more disadvantaged black experimental children were found to have lower self-esteem, less identification with father and greater identification with mother and teacher than the control group. The lower self-esteem found for the black disadvantaged children suggested to these researchers that the "low social status and poverty level of the child's family has penetrated the self-concept of the six-year-old child" (p. 50).

In a research review undertaken by Cookston et al (1977) on self-concepts of elementary students, they stated that Owen (1977) found a close relationship between self-concepts of disadvantaged children regardless of race (black/white). "Disadvantaged children of both races had negative self-concepts" (p. 639).

B) Self-concept as related to achievement

Much of the research on the self-concept of elementary children from different SES classes is linked to their academic achievement. Since the educational achievement of low SES children is typically reported in the literature to be consistently below that of middle SES children the

question arises, 'Is this related in anyway to the child's self-concept?' Tompkins (1979) research explored self-concept in children from different SES backgrounds with regard to beginning reading. Forty first grade children from four elementary schools were studied (Schools A & B inner-city, low-income; School C middle class; School D upper-middle class). The results indicated that the children's self-concepts as readers generally paralleled the variations in economic levels of the school communities and children's sense of being able to learn to read by themselves was associated with their self-concepts as readers and with the school economic level.

In a four year investigation on academic self-concept, Eshel & Klein (1981) studied 2199 pupils in Grades 1 through 4 who participated in a school integration program involving both middle and low SES children. The results confirmed that a certain decrease in academic self-concept is the rule rather than the exception throughout the early school years for both middle and lower class children. In both middle and low SES samples, self-concept scores are high in pre-school and throughout the first grade but by the third grade these are on the decline. For children of younger ages, the research study did "not support the important role often ascribed to academic self-concept in the literature as a major determinant of lower class pupils' poor achievement" (p. 293).

Findings of studies by Primavera et al (1974),

Brookover et al. (1965), Caplin (1969) and Hansford & Hattie (1982) indicate positive relationship between self-concept and academic achievement.

In a study conducted by Primavera et al. (1974) which investigated 180 fifth and sixth grade students self-concept and academic achievement, "the relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement held without exception" (p. 215). A study by Brookover et al. (1965) involving over one thousand seventh graders found a positive relationship between self-concept and achievement, while Caplin (1969) studying 60 students from the intermediate grades in two different school settings noted that "there is a significant positive relationship between self-concept and academic achievement" (p. 16).

Hansford & Hattie (1982) conducted a meta-analysis examining the relationship between self and achievement performance. One hundred twenty eight studies formed the data base representing 202,823 persons. Findings implicit to this research indicate that during the formal school years (pre-school to secondary) there is an increase in the relationship between self-concept and academic performance but there is a trend for persons of lower SES to have a less positive relationship between self-measures and achievement.

C) Positive self-concept change through Intervention Programs

Studies of intervention programs which attempted to change self-concept have shed little light on the self-

concept of kindergarteners from different SES classes.

Scheirer & Kraut (1979) conducted an extensive search concerned with evaluating intervention programs to change self-concept and achievement. They selected eight published studies and 18 unpublished doctoral dissertations which met their methodological criteria. In the Head Start Program little advance in academic achievement was found and post-testing by Westinghouse-Ohio University study of first to third graders did not show significant differences to either teacher ratings or pupil ratings of self-concept. However, the Gray & Klaus (1970) study involved randomly assigned experimental and control groups which focused on academic competency and attitudes related to school success 'especially self-concept as a necessary condition for achievement'. The results showed a slight positive difference in the beginning but this did not continue in the upper elementary grades. In the primary grades, the evaluators of the Follow Through Planned Variations projects concluded that highly structured models involving both academic achievement and self-concept advantages were noted in the behavior learning approach to education.

Calsyn & Kenny (1977) explored whether self-concept is the cause or effect of academic achievement. According to these investigators "self-enhancement theorists argue that self-concept variables are primarily causes of academic achievement and that considerable initial time and effort should be spent in trying to increase the self-concept of

children in school" while the "skill development theorists argue that self-concept variables are primarily consequences of academic achievement" (p. 136). They conducted a longitudinal study with 556 adolescents using five years of data and their results are "clearly more supportive of a skill development model in which academic achievement is causally predominant over self-concept of ability, rather than a two-stage self-enhancement model in which perceived evaluations of others are causally predominant over self-concept of ability, which in turn is causally predominant over academic achievement" (p. 142). The causal patterns did not appear to vary across SES levels.

2.5 Age and Sex as related to Self-Concept

There is very little information examining the relationship between self-concept and the sex and age of kindergarten children. Unfortunately, studies of sex differences and self-concept at the elementary levels have yielded conflicting reports. There is evidence to support the position that females perceive themselves less positively (Marx & Winnie, 1975; Wylie, 1963) and more positively (Brookover et al. 1965; Alberti, 1970) than do their male counterparts. To complicate the issue further, several studies have shown that no sex differences in self-concept occur (Primavera et al. 1975; Soares & Soares, 1969; Osborne & LeGette, 1982; Hansford & Hattie, 1982). Alberti (1970) administered the Self-Perception School Inventory to 656 children in Grades 1, 2, 3

in a middle class school district. The results indicated that girls aged 6, 7, 8 have a more positive self-concept than boys of the same age. In 1982, Osborne & LeGette investigated differences in self-concept scores of 384 adolescents representing grades seven, nine and eleven by sex, age and social class. Their findings concluded that there were no significant differences in the global scores of males and females and there were no significant differences in global self-concept when the self-concept scores were compared by grade level (seven, nine, eleven).

Hansford & Hattie's (1982) meta-analysis involving 128 studies concluded that self-concept is similar for males and females. Phillips and Zigler (1980) studied sexual differences in self-concept but the investigation looked at the disparity between the individual's current view of self (real self) and the ideal person he would like to be (ideal self). They studied 40 second graders and 40 fifth graders from two diverse SES neighborhoods (middle and low). They reported: 1) boys were found to exhibit greater self-image disparities than girls, 2) children's SES was found to affect their self-image scores (i.e. lower ideal self-image was found for low compared to middle SES children and the low SES child did not exhibit depressed real self-images relative to middle SES children of the same age), 3) a child's gender and social class affects the size of his self-image indirectly by influencing the developmental level he achieves. Those researchers concluded that "in relation to the debate

concerning the self-image development of disadvantaged children, the results present additional compelling support for the position that children who are reared under conditions of relative economic privation and social prejudice are capable of developing positive self-images commensurate with those of their middle SES peers" (p. 699).

Empirical research focusing on how self-concept relates to age of the young child is hard to find. It is generally believed that self-concept can change with age as a function and product of individual experiences. According to Yamamoto (1970) and Glasser (1969), the years between 5 and 10 are the most critical for the development of self-concept. L'Ecuyer (1978) likewise supports this latter view claiming that the self-concept expands to include the variety of experiences resulting from the child's beginning school. Whether change or variations occur in self-concept measured during the child's first year in school has not been studied.

Wylie (1979), who has provided the most comprehensive analysis of self-concept studies claimed that there was little or no relationship between age and the total self-concept. She has indicated that studies relating age to self-concept of children older than kindergarteners have yielded positive, negative and no change findings in terms of the positive self-concept development of older children. Farrell & Heroux (1983) reported on one of the few longitudinal studies of self-concept for low-income children aged 5-8 years old. These investigators found that the global self-concept,

feeling-self, schooling-self and behaving-self increased significantly ($p = .001$, $p = .001$, $p = .01$, $p = .01$ respectively) in a positive direction between the ages of 5 and 7 years but changed in a negative direction although not significantly between 7 and 8 years of age. This raises the question as to whether change of self-concept can be detected between the 5 and 6 year age bracket.

2.6 Teacher and Students' Self-Concept

Although very little research on how the teacher affects a student's self-concept has been found, it seems from what has been documented of teachers' treatment of a low SES child as well as their limited expectancy of the low SES child that teachers may very well influence or condition how a child views himself. Certainly teacher ratings and expectancies can be communicated to the students. The ways in which a teacher evaluates the student most likely affects the student's self-concept and more likely the student's conception of his academic ability.

The basic hypothesis of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) research was that students, more often than not, do what is expected of them. To test this hypothesis, the two researchers conducted an experiment in an elementary school of 650 students. The teachers were told on the basis of ability tests administered the previous spring, approximately one-fifth of the students could be expected to evidence significant increases in mental ability during the year. The teachers were then

given the names of high-potential students whose names were chosen at random by the experimentors. Months later these randomly chosen students were described by their teachers as happier, more interesting, more self-assured and as having a better chance of future success. These researchers summarized their study by stating "children who are expected by their teachers to gain intellectually in fact do show greater intellectual gains after one year than do children of whom such gains are not expected" (p. 121). It seems reasonable if one expects positive growth from students and these expectations are conveyed with understanding, the students will endeavor to comply. The same can be true of developing a positive self-concept and developing and enhancing a strong self-concept in children. However, the literature in this area tends to suggest that teachers of deprived children can convey messages that could condition and/or re-enforce negative self-concepts in these children. Rist (1970) documented how first grade teachers perpetuated a social class hierarchy within their classrooms by assigning students to reading groups according to their socio-economic background. The teachers placed middle class children in higher reading levels than the lower class children. Research conducted by Freedman (1972) and Karlins (1969) found that lower class children are viewed in general as less intelligent than their middle class counterparts.

Fahey & Phillips (1981) analyzed a five year 'disadvantaged school program' established in New South Wales. The

characteristics of the low SES children were described as "being in possession of poor self-concepts, poor school marks and poor attitudes to learning" (p. 223). A random sample from two disadvantaged schools consisting of 2100 children ages 6 to 11 was compared with 364 non-disadvantaged children. The results indicated that disadvantaged children have a more externalized, concrete, less differentiated and less future-oriented view of self, however they do not have a totally negative view of self. They view themselves less positively in the functioning aspects of self in respect to school achievement and skills. The research findings are "at odds with the submissions by teachers claiming that children in disadvantaged schools have lower self-concepts, poorer language skills and an inability to express themselves clearly" (p. 230). The results of this study suggest that the differences related to environmental differences but "do not necessarily reflect a poor self-concept and teacher assessments of these children as having poor self-images may reflect biased and limited cultural value judgements" (p. 231).

Leacock (1979) studied teacher involvement and attitudes towards lower class students. She stated "they are either ignored, allowed to 'be', or criticized and undermined in their attempts to learn". She further suggested that teachers are "teaching their children not to learn". "The teachers' unfortunate attitudes towards their pupils pervade the lower-class schools and doom these children to failure" (p. 402).

Leacock also studied teacher expectations between the middle and lower class children and found that teachers universally expected less of lower SES children, even in the very first years of elementary school as compared to their middle class peers. How such experiences actually affect the self-concepts of these children is not clear. It is possible the teacher may only have an impact on the child's schooling-self and other areas of the child's self-concept may remain unscathed. It may be that the other factors which comprise the global self-concept are innately positive.

2.7 Summary

In summary, Wylie (1979) concluded that studies cannot be "conclusively interpreted or synthesized. Positive, negative and null relationships have been reported between self-regard and socio-economic level" (p. 97). There is little self-concept research between SES groups at the kindergarten level. However, this is probably a crucial time in the development of the self-concept of the young child, who is integrating his adequacy and competency in the school setting into his previously acquired view of self.

2.8 Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to investigate the kindergarten child's self-concept in two different socio-economic status populations (middle class Caucasian kindergarteners and socio-economic disadvantaged Caucasian kindergarteners) during the introductory and transitional year

prior to a structured academic setting. The basic question being probed is: Does social class make a difference to a kindergarten child's self-concept? Secondary questions being probed are: How do sex, age, classroom teacher relate to the kindergarten child's self-concept?

Based on the review of literature in the Chapter, the following hypotheses have been developed for the main variable being studied, socio-economic status:

- 2.8.1 that the total self-concept as measured by the McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (MP) (1973) of the low SES kindergarten child will be significantly less positive than that of the middle class child
- 2.8.2 that the schooling self-concept as measured (MP) of the low SES kindergarten child will be significantly less positive than that of the middle class child
- 2.8.3 that the feeling self-concept as measured (MP) of the low SES kindergarten child will be significantly less positive than that of the middle class child
- 2.8.4 that the behaving self-concept as measured (MP) of the low SES kindergarten child will be significantly less positive than that of the middle class child

CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

3.1 Subjects

The sample included 78 Caucasian kindergarten pupils from a low socio-economic status (SES) setting and 78 middle class Caucasian kindergarten subjects. All were English-speaking. The sample was drawn from two Montreal Elementary Schools. One school is serving a low income inner city population with approximately 90 percent of the families on welfare. The school has been classified as one of the Operation Renewal Schools by the Island Council of Montreal which identified the school as serving a low income population. The second school serves a middle class suburb where professional and semi-professional families live. All parents were employed. About 25 percent of these middle class parents have both parents in the employment force.

These subjects came from four different kindergarten classrooms (two in each SES setting) and were taught by four different teachers. The sample consisted of 42 males and 36 females in the low income school and 31 males and 47 females in the middle class school. The data below presents the mean ages of the subjects by SES.

	LOW SES (months)	MIDDLE SES (months)
Number	78	78
Boys	72.2	72.7
Girls	73.6	71.7
Group	72.9	72.2

Age: In order to study the age variable the children were grouped into four age categories as follows:

- Age group 1 - 68-70 months
- Age group 2 - 71-73 months
- Age group 3 - 74-76 months
- Age group 4 - 77-79 months

Teacher: All four teachers have had at least 10 or more years of kindergarten teaching experience. Three of the four teachers had been in the research schools for five or more years and the fourth (Teacher 2) in one low SES classroom was new to the school but had been with the children for almost a year at the time of testing. It should be noted however, that for kindergarten children the teacher is always new. The children had been assigned randomly to all four classrooms.

3.2 Instrumentation

The McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (MP) was administered to the kindergarten subjects (see Appendix A). The MP is described by its author, McDaniel (1973), as the "downward extension of the well established and widely used Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale".

The MP was designed to measure the self-concept of young children aged six to eight. It consists of 40 self-descriptive statements. For this study the statement 'I am a good reader' was eliminated. Thus, a total score of 39 would represent a very positive global self-concept. Each statement is given one point for a correct answer. The

global self-concept score is obtained by adding the scores from the three sub-factors: feeling-self, schooling-self and behaving-self.

Examples of some of the statements are as follows:

Feeling-self:

1. I am often sad.
2. Meeting new people scares me.
3. I am often blamed when something goes wrong.
4. I feel left out of things.
5. I am happy.

Schooling-self:

1. I think up good things to do.
2. If I have a hard time doing something, I stop doing it.
3. My classmates like the things I think up.
4. My classmates make fun of me.
5. I hate school.

Behaving-self:

1. I cause trouble to my family.
2. I behave well at home.
3. I am often mean to other people.
4. My family is disappointed in me.
5. I want my own way most of the time.

In order to verify the reliability of the scale, McDaniel conducted a longitudinal study and examined the stability of the concept of self during the first three years of school. The norms for the score total were based on the responses given by 2000 children in eight different Metropolitan areas in the United States. The reliability coefficients based on the Kuder-Richardson formula (KR-20) were 0.73 in the first year, 0.80 in the second year and 0.86 in the third year. These results were reported by Denner from Purdue University in his master's thesis in 1975.

More recently in the context of a Canadian longitudinal study which used the MP to measure self-concept, Farrell & Beltempo (1980) also reported on the reliability of the MP. These investigators from repeated administration of the MP to 420 children reported approximate reliability coefficients for kindergarten of 0.77, 0.81 for the first grade and 0.82 for the second grade.

Concerning the validity of the MP, it was reported in the manual that a coefficient of concurrent validity of .68 was obtained between the PH Scale and the Lipsitt Self-Concept Scale. Although the data on validity of the MP is far from strong, the instrument has acceptable face validity.

3.3 Procedures

In mid-May 1982, the McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (MP) was administered to all subjects. It involved one- twenty minute session for each subject. The testing was administered to groups of ten children at one sitting. The investigator was responsible for the testing of subjects in the middle class environment while an experienced researcher was responsible for the testing of subjects within the deprived area.

The MP was administered at the end of the Kindergarten school year in May, when the majority of the children have reached the age of six. The subjects were taught the words 'YES' and 'NO'. The test was administered once it was firmly established that each child understood, could recognize and

discriminate these two printed words. The Scale items were read aloud by the administrator and repeated as often as required by the subjects. The children responded 'YES' or 'NO' on a special answer sheet (see Appendix B) devised to ensure they were on the correct item. The Scale produces a total score and three part scores: feeling-self, school-self and behaving-self.

3.4 Limitations of the study

This study is limited by the following constraints:

- 3.4.1 Since this study does not have an experimental design no cause and effect relationships are implied or postulated.
- 3.4.2 Generalizability beyond the socio-economic status groups, geographic region sampled is not scientifically valid.
- 3.4.3 This is a correlational study attempting to explore relationships between self-concept and SES levels, sex, age and teacher. Findings therefore are useful mainly for predictive purposes.

3.5 Analysis of Data

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviation) were calculated. Data were analysed for significant differences using two-tailed t tests. Multivariate analyses were performed using BMDP4V (authors M. Davidson & J. Toporek, BMDP statistical software, 1981) to test for the main effects of sex and age as well as the following interactions: SES/age,

SES/sex, age/sex and SES/age/sex. The level of significance was set at .05.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This study investigated the kindergarten child's self-concept in two different socio-economic status (SES) populations (middle class Caucasian kindergarteners and socio-economic disadvantaged Caucasian kindergarteners) during the introductory and transitional year prior to a structured academic setting. The basic question being probed was: Does social class make a difference to a kindergarten child's self-concept? Additional probing questions involved the relationship between sex, age, classroom teacher and a kindergarten child's self-concept.

4.2 Kindergarteners Self-Concept and SES

Means and standard deviations for the global self-concept scores plus the scores of the feeling-self, schooling-self and behaving-self comparing the two socio-economic status groups (that is, combining subjects in the two classrooms in each SES category) are presented in Table 1. As hypothesized, the mean global self-concept of the middle class kindergarten children was significantly higher ($p=.039$), that is more positive than the global self-concept mean scores of the lower SES subjects. Similar significantly more positive self-concept mean scores were obtained for the middle class kindergarteners in the sub-factored scores of the feeling-self ($p=.005$) and the behaving-self ($p=.006$). However, no significant differences were obtained in mean

scores between the two SES groups for the schooling-self.

Table 1

Socio-economic status differences in mean self-concept*
scores of English-speaking kindergarten children

Self- Concept	LOW SES (N=78)		MIDDLE SES (N=78)		2-tail p
	M	SD	M	SD	
Global	25.6026	6.009	27.7436	6.787	.039
Feeling	8.9103	3.088	10.3974	3.359	.005
Schooling	10.3718	2.815	10.0000	2.697	.401
Behaving	6.3205	2.441	7.3333	2.112	.006

*McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

4.3 Teacher/classroom variable and students' self-concept

Since four classrooms, two in each SES category, were used and children were assigned randomly to each classroom, the data were analyzed to explore student mean self-concepts within and across SES levels by classroom in an effort to probe the relationship between teacher/classroom and children's self-concept. Tables 2 and 3 present the within social class and between social class analyses by teacher/classroom. As can be noted in Table 2 only one significant difference (feeling-self, $p=.05$) was obtained for the children's self-concept, in the two different middle class classrooms with subjects in Teacher 3's classroom having significantly more positive feeling-self. In the low SES school strong significant differences were obtained for the global-self ($p=.002$), the feeling-self ($p=.03$) and the schooling-self ($p=.02$) for the two different classrooms with subjects in Teacher 1's classroom having significantly more positive self-concepts in these instances.

Table 2

Significant differences in mean self-concept* scores
between teacher/classrooms within social class

	GSC** p	FS* p	SS** p	BS** p
Low SES (Teacher 1- N=38) (Teacher 2- N=40)	.002	.03	.02	-
Middle SES (Teacher 3- N=40) (Teacher 4- N=38)	-	.05	-	-

*McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global self-concept, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

However in neither SES level were significant differences between teacher/classrooms found for the behaving-self. These findings suggest that the two classrooms of middle class children are comparable, differing only in one self-concept sub-factor but not in total self-concept, however the two low SES groupings appear to be significantly different. Thus subsequent analysis had to take these differences in the two low SES classrooms into consideration.

As can be noted in Table 3 two significant differences were obtained between Teacher 1 from the low SES setting and the two middle class teachers, one in each case. Children in Teacher 3's classroom had a significantly more positive feeling-self ($p=.04$) compared to the children in Teacher 1's classroom whereas Teacher 1's children had a significantly more positive schooling-self ($p=.02$) when compared to children in Teacher 4's classroom. However children in the lower class Teacher 1's classroom did not differ significantly in the global self-

concept, in the behaving-self, or in the schooling-self from children in the middle class Teacher 3's classroom or in the global-self, the feeling-self or behaving-self from children in middle class Teacher 4's classroom.

Table 3

Significant differences in mean self-concept* scores between subjects by teacher/classroom and by social class

Teacher 1 Low SES subjects N=38	GSC** p	FS** p	SS** p	BS** p
versus				
Teacher 3 Middle SES subjects N=40	-	.04	-	-
Teacher 4 Middle SES subjects N=38	-	-	.02	-
Teacher 2 Low SES subjects N=40				
versus				
Teacher 3 Middle SES subjects N=40	.000	.000	-	.000
Teacher 4 Middle SES subjects N=38	.056	.05	-	.05

* McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

More striking significant differences were obtained when comparing the data from Teacher 2's low SES classroom and the two middle class classrooms. Teacher 3's classroom registered strikingly, significantly more positive scores when compared with the children in Teacher 2's classroom in the global self-concept ($p=.000$), feeling-self ($p=.000$) and behaving-self ($p=.000$). In contrasting the children from

Teacher 4's classroom with those in Teacher 2's classroom, Teacher 4's children had significantly more positive scores for the feeling-self ($p=.05$) and the behaving-self ($p=.05$) compared to Teacher 2's classroom. The significant difference obtained for the global self-concept ($p=.056$) between Teacher 2 and Teacher 4 registered slightly beyond the significance level of .05 established for this research. The school-self of the children in Teacher 2's low SES classroom did not differ significantly from either that of the children in Teacher 3 or Teacher 4's classrooms.

As a result of the findings reported in Table 2 and 3, namely that the global self-concept plus two of the three sub-factored self-concept scores of children in Teacher 2's low SES classroom were significantly lower ($p=.002$, .03, .02 respectively) than the mean self-concept of children in Teacher 1's low SES classroom, it was decided to attempt to differentiate the effect of SES from teacher/classroom by using a more powerful analysis. Multivariate BMDP4V developed by M. Davidson and J. Toporek in 1981 was used to compare subjects from the two middle SES classrooms with Teacher 1's low SES classrooms in multivariate Analysis A, (that is omitting subjects from Teacher 2's low SES classroom) and multivariate Analysis B analysed subjects from the two middle class classrooms versus subjects from the two lower SES classrooms. This approach was based on the rationale that if the pattern of results using a more powerful technique was similar for both analyses it would appear that SES was

a more important factor than teacher/classroom whereas if the pattern of findings were different the reverse might be hypothesized. The BMDP4V multivariate program used, analyzed main effect differences for SES, sex (male and female) and age (four quarterly groupings) as well as interactive effects of SES/age, SES/sex, age/sex and SES/age/sex. Results obtained from these analyses were only minimally informative. No significant differences were obtained for the main effects of SES on the global-self, feeling-self or behaving-self in either analyses A or B, however in the case of the schooling-self a main effect was noted of $p=.02$ in Analysis A but not in Analysis B which raises the question as to whether teacher is more important than SES in the case of the schooling-self but does not clarify interpretation. Other findings from the multivariate analyses will be presented in the following sections under the relevant variable being reported.

4.4 Sex variable and kindergarten self-concept

T-tests were performed on the mean self-concept scores for:

- a) like-sex comparisons between social classes
- b) like-sex comparisons between individual classrooms.
- c) girls versus boys within SES levels

The findings are presented in Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7.

It can be noted in Table 4 that no significant differences were obtained in mean self-concept scores between low SES girls and middle SES girls but significantly more positive mean feeling-self ($p=.03$) and behaving-self ($p=.03$)

scores were obtained for middle class boys compared to low SES boys. Mean scores for boys' global-self did not differ between the two SES classes.

Table 4

Mean self-concept significant differences (t-tests) between lower and middle class girls and lower and middle class boys

	GSC** p	FS** p	SS** p	BS** p
Girls:				
Low SES N=35				
Middle SES N=47	-	-	-	-
Boys:				
Low SES N=43				
Middle SES N=31	-	.03	-	.03

*McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

As can be noted in Table 5, girls did not differ significantly between classrooms in either social class except in two instances. Girls in Teacher 1's (LC) classroom exhibited a more positive schooling-self ($p=.005$) when compared to girls in Teacher 4's (MC) classroom while girls in Teacher 3's classroom (MC) exhibited a more positive feeling-self ($p=.03$) than the girls in Teacher 2's (LC) classroom.

Strong significant differences were obtained when comparisons of boys' mean self-concept scores were made between the four individual classrooms as can also be noted in Table 5. Boys in Teachers' 1 (LC) and 3 (MC) classrooms had significantly more positive self-concepts (Teacher 1's

classroom- global-self $p=.003$, feeling-self $p=.008$, behaving-self $p=.033$ and Teacher 3's classroom- global-self $p=.01$, feeling-self $p=.006$, behaving-self $p=.000$) when compared to boys in Teacher 2's (LC) classroom. Also boys in Teacher 4's (MC) classroom had significantly more positive scores (the feeling-self $p=.02$ and behaving-self $p=.03$) when compared to boys in Teacher 2's (LC) classroom. However, non-significant differences were obtained for the schooling-self of boys when inter-classroom comparisons were made.

Table 5

Mean self-concept*significant differences (t-tests)
between like-sex comparisons in individual classrooms

	GSC**	FS**	SS**	BS**
	P	P	P	P
GIRLS:				
Teacher 1 (N=19) vs. 2 (N=16) -		-	-	-
vs. 3 (N=26) -		-	-	-
vs. 4 (N=21) -		-	.005	-
Teacher 2 (N=16) vs. 3 (N=26) -		.03	-	-
vs. 4 (N=21) -		-	-	-
Teacher 3 (N=26) vs. 4 (N=21) -		-	-	-
BOYS:				
Teacher 1 (N=19) vs. 2 (N=24)	.003	.008	-	.033
vs. 3 (N=14) -		-	-	-
vs. 4 (N=17) -		-	-	-
Teacher 2 (N=24) vs. 3 (N=14)	.01	.006	-	.000
vs. 4 (N=17) -		.02	-	.03
Teacher 3 (N=14) vs. 4 (N=17) -		-	-	-

* McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS-schooling-self,
BS- behaving-self

*** Teachers 1 & 2 - Low SES --- Teachers 3 & 4 Middle SES

Table 6 presents the mean self-concept data between girls and boys within each social class grouping. Low SES girls were found to exhibit a significantly more positive self-concept than lower class boys on three of the four self-concept measures (global-self $p=.006$, schooling-self $p=.04$, behaving-self $p=.02$) whereas the mean self-concept scores of the middle class girls were found to differ significantly from that of the middle class boys only on the schooling-self ($p=.02$).

Table 6

Mean self-concept* significant differences between kindergarten girls and boys within social class

	GSC** P	FS** P	SS** P	BS** P
LOW SES:				
Girls N=35	.006	-	.04	.02
Boys N=43				
MIDDLE SES:				
Girls N=47	-	-	.02	-
Boys N=31				

* McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

Additional analyses were conducted comparing the mean self-concept scores of the girls versus the boys within each individual classroom. No significant differences in any of the self-concept variables measured were obtained between girls and boys for children in Teacher 1 (LC) or Teacher 3 (MC) or Teacher 4 (MC) classrooms, however very significant results were obtained between girls and boys self-concept scores in Teacher 2's class and are presented in Table 7.

Males global self-concept mean scores were significantly lower ($p=.008$) as were the feeling-self scores ($p=.027$) and behaving-self ($p=.004$) compared to the girls for this classroom. To highlight the differences in mean self-concept scores of girls versus boys within the low SES school groupings, Teacher 1's non-significant results are also presented for comparison purposes only.

Table 7

Mean self-concept scores* and t-test differences for girls and boys in Teacher 2's (LC) classroom

	GSC** P	FS** P	SS** P	BS** P
Girls (N=16)	26.6875	9.4375	10.1250	7.1250
Boys (N=24)	21.5833	7.2917	9.2917	5.0000
	.008	.027	.404	.004

Mean self-concept scores* and t-test differences for girls and boys in Teacher 1's (LC) classroom

	GSC**	FS**	SS**	BS**
Girls (N=19)	28.4211	9.6316	11.8947	6.8947
Boys (N=19)	26.9474	9.7895	10.4211	6.7368
	.415	.872	.070	.845

*McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

The multivariate analyses for sex are presented in Table 8. A main effect for sex differences was obtained for the self-concept sub-factor behaving-self ($p=.03$) and schooling-self ($p=.02$) when Teacher 1 (LC) and Teachers 3, 4 (MC) were used in the analysis. Significant differences were found between sexes for the global self-concept ($p=.04$) and

schooling-self ($p=.02$) when all four teachers were included in the analysis. This may tentatively suggest a possible teacher factor which appears stronger than the SES factor in terms of the global-self and the feeling-self although the pattern of results for the schooling-self appears to be more a function of SES.

Table 8

Multivariate analysis* of SES significant differences in self-concept between males and females for two different classroom combinations.

	ANALYSIS A	ANALYSIS B
	Teacher 1 (LC) N=38	Teacher 1,2 (LC)
	Teacher 3 (MC) N=40	N= 38/40
SEX	Teacher 4 (MC) N=38	Teacher 3,4 (MC)
		N= 40/38
Feeling-self	-	-
Schooling-self	.02	.02
Behaving-self	.03	-
Global-self	-	.04

* BMDP4V Multivariate Analysis (M. Davidson & J. Toporek, 1981)

4.5 Age variable and kindergarten self-concept

Analyses were performed to explore significant differences in mean self-concept scores for four age groupings between the two SES settings. The age groupings were:

- Group 1 - youngest children 68-70 months
- Group 2 - second youngest children 71-73 months
- Group 3 - third youngest children 74-76 months
- Group 4 - oldest children 77-79 months

Table 9 presents the mean self-concept data between the age groups and between the social classes. The youngest age grouping of middle class children exhibited significantly

more positive global-self ($p=.007$), feeling-self ($p=.01$) and behaving-self ($p=.02$) when compared to their youngest counterparts of the low SES setting while the second youngest middle class subjects also displayed more positive self-concept results for the feeling-self ($p=.005$) and the behaving-self ($p=.05$) when compared with the second youngest low SES age grouping. Non-significant results between social classes were obtained for both the third oldest and the oldest age grouping of subjects.

Table 9

Significant differences in mean self-concept scores* for four age groupings of kindergarteners between SES classes

	GSC** p	FS** p	SS** p	BS** p
Low SES versus Middle SES				
Group 1 (68-70 months)	.007	.01	-	.02
Group 2 (71-73 months)	-	.005	-	.05
Group 3 (74-76 months)	-	-	-	-
Group 4 (77-79 months)	-	-	-	-

* McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

The significant findings for the mean self-concept of the kindergarten children in the four age groupings within each SES level are presented in Table 10. These findings indicate that the lower SES children in Age Group 4 (oldest) had significantly better school self-concepts ($p=.008, .007, .022$) than children in the other three age groups but middle class

Age Group 4 children had also significantly more positive schooling self-concepts ($p=.034, .033$) than children in two of the three other age groups. The youngest age grouping did not differ significantly. It should be noted that the number of middle class children in the oldest age grouping is relatively small. Furthermore, these within analyses found that the global self-concepts of the oldest low SES children to be significantly more positive than those of the youngest low SES children ($p=.006$) or those of the second youngest low SES children ($p=.011$). No other significant differences in the self-concepts were obtained between the age groups in either social class.

Table 10

Significant differences in mean self-concept scores* for four age groupings of kindergarteners within the low and middle SES groups

	GSC**	FS**	SS**	BS**
	P	P	P	P
LOW SES:				
Group 1 (N=16) vs. Gr. 4 (N=13) (68-70 mos) (77-79 mos)	.006	-	.008	-
Group 2 (N=30) vs. Gr. 4 (N=13) (71-73 mos) (77-79 mos)	.011	.034	.007	-
Group 3 (N=17) vs. Gr. 4 (N=13) (74-76 mos) (77-79 mos)	-	-	.022	-
MIDDLE SES:				
Group 1 (N=30) vs. Gr. 4 (N=8) (68-70 mos) (77-79 mos)	-	-	-	-
Group 2 (N=24) vs. Gr. 4 (N=8) (71-73 mos) (77-79 mos)	-	-	.034	-
Group 3 (N=16) vs. Gr. 4 (N=8) (74-76 mos) (77-79 mos)	-	-	.033	-

*McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

** GSC- global-self, FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self

The multivariate analysis of age as a main effect for the four age groups resulted in no significant differences for either Analysis A (Teacher 1 - LC versus Teachers 3, 4 - MC) or Analysis B (Teachers 1, 2 - LC versus Teachers 3, 4 - MC).

4.6 Interactions

Table 11 presents the multivariate analysis of the interactions between SES, sex, age for the two different analyses performed. Analysis A compared Teacher 1 (LC) subjects and subjects of Teachers 3, 4 (MC) classrooms and Analysis B compared students in classrooms of Teachers 1, 2 (LC) with students in the classrooms of Teachers 3, 4 (MC). As can be noted in Table 11, the pattern of findings is similar for SES/age and age/sex for the two analysis groups and this pattern is non-significant. When Teacher 2's pupils were included in the analysis of SES/sex a significant difference ($p=.04$) was found for the behaving-self indicating a tentative teacher factor. Significant interactions for SES/age/sex were obtained in both analysis A & B ($p=.006, .01$ respectively) for the global-self suggesting a possible SES factor. A significant difference in SES/age/sex was obtained for the feeling-self ($p=.005$) in Analysis A but not in Analysis B whereas a non-significant result was reported for the schooling-self in Analysis A but a significant ($p=.04$) result for this variable was found in Analysis B. These results may indicate a teacher factor. However, since the numbers in the cells for the three-way interaction were relatively

small this is only speculation and needs further verification with larger numbers.

Table 11

Multivariate analysis* of significant differences in mean self-concept** scores for SES, sex, age interactions

INTERACTIONS	ANALYSIS A Teacher 1 (LC) vs. Teachers 3, 4 (MC)	ANALYSIS B Teachers 1, 2 (LC) vs. Teachers 3, 4 (MC)
<u>SES/AGE</u>		
FS***	-	-
SS***	-	-
BS***	-	-
GSC***	-	-
<u>SES/SEX</u>		
FS	-	-
SS	-	-
BS	-	.04
GSC	-	-
<u>AGE/SEX</u>		
FS	-	-
SS	-	-
BS	-	-
GSC	-	-
<u>SES/AGE/SEX</u>		
FS	.005	-
SS	-	.04
BS	-	-
GSC	.006	.01

* BMDP4V Multivariate Analysis (M. Davidson & J. Toporek, 1981)

** McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (1973)

*** FS- feeling-self, SS- schooling-self, BS- behaving-self,
GSC- global-self

Discussion concerning all of the preceding findings will be undertaken in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between kindergarten children's self-concepts and two socio-economic (SES) levels (i.e. low SES and middle SES). In addition to the initial self-concept and SES probe, this research has endeavored to explore associations between the self-concept scores and teacher/classroom, sex and age.

5.1 Relationship between kindergarten self-concept scores and SES levels

The most salient finding would appear to be that one cannot generalize with regard to the self-concepts of low SES children when comparing them to middle SES children. On first analysis the hypothesis that low SES kindergarteners would have significantly lower self-concepts than middle SES kindergarteners appeared to be confirmed. However, further analyses revealed that only some low SES kindergarteners in the sample had lower self-concepts than the middle class children whereas other low SES kindergarteners had self-concepts (global-self, schooling-self and behaving-self) very similar to those of the middle class children. Indeed children in one low SES classroom (Teacher 1) had significantly more positive ($p=.02$) schooling-self than middle class children in Teacher 4's classroom. Lower class subjects in Teacher 1's classroom had similar feeling-self's to children in middle class Teacher 4's room although the feeling-self of middle class Teacher 3's children was significantly ($p=.04$) more

positive than that of the lower class children. From this study, the relationships appear complex between social classes as well as between the subfactored facets of self-concept. They tend to highlight the problem of combining subjects of supposedly the same SES from different classrooms on the basis of random assignment to classrooms, an approach often used in educational research in order to boost numbers for statistical analyses. Furthermore, the findings point to the potential complexity of the lower class mosaic and suggests again as did the Follow Through research that large scale studies may provide few definitive answers. In fact increasing numbers for analyses of educational variables may not always yield accurate or meaningful findings.

The question as to why this unexpected difference in self-concept between two groups of lower class children attending the same school and living in the same neighborhood can only be addressed speculatively. Post hoc interviews by Dr. Farrell (whose lower SES research school was used) with teachers in the school revealed some interesting subjective data. Apparently Teacher 1 was viewed by her colleagues as an excellent teacher, completely dedicated with strong management and academic skills, who used the Direct Instructional model. In contrast, Teacher 2 was viewed as a 'laissez-faire' teacher with loose management skills and a loose approach (overly child centered) to learning.

As has been previously stated in Chapter Three, the four teachers involved in this study had between 10-15 years of

teaching experience with young children although Teacher 2 was new to the sample school but her previous assignment had been in a low income kindergarten environment. This latter fact hardly seems relevant since to all kindergarteners teachers are always new. What may be more critical is teacher style, teacher expectations and perhaps principal supervision. The three teachers (Teacher 1- low SES and Teachers 3, 4- middle SES) who were perceived by their peers as providing a challenging atmosphere for student growth, as instructing in skills to enhance children's decision-making responsibilities may also develop positive self-concepts in their children. Their classrooms apparently reflected firm guidance, mutual respect and a well-defined goal-oriented structure. Students were presumably provided with educational endeavors in which they experienced successful performance and which may have increased their positive image of self. From subjective reports, the fourth classroom was run in a loose and lax fashion. There was it seems little class control and no projected academic goals for the children. The teacher was reported to be warm and pleasant with the children but perhaps because of the low and undefined academic demands there were few teacher-child conflicts or educational opportunities for the children to develop self-worth and self-esteem. It also seems possible, in retrospect, subjective reports on Teacher 2 could reflect that the teacher may have had limited expectations for the children in the classroom and that a Rosenthal effect may have been operating-teacher

expects little from the children, children produce little and consequently have less to feel good about themselves.

These findings tend to indicate that low SES children in an unstructured, loosely disciplined classroom may have significantly lower self-concepts than their peers in a well structured, highly organized setting but this clearly needs further definitive study. The results may also suggest to curriculum planners and to administrators the need for better supervision and better articulated criteria for teachers who are employed to teach young children, particularly as kindergarten 'curriculum' is so loosely defined and so much is left to the teacher's discretion.

It is mere speculation to hypothesize that such teacher differences may be conditioning different self-concepts in children. An alternate hypothesis would be that the self-concept of the children in the two low SES classrooms were significantly different on school entry and teacher treatment may or may not interact with school entry level of self-concept. This study unfortunately did not control for level of self-concept on school entry and further research doing this is clearly indicated. In this study the confusion between self-concept at school entry, teacher and perhaps some other classroom variables cannot be separated. The most that can be said from this investigation is that some lower class kindergarten children have very significantly less positive self-concepts (global-self $p=.000$, feeling-self $p=.000$, behaving-self $p=.000$) when compared to the self-concepts of

some middle class kindergarten children whereas some other lower class children tend to have relatively similar self-concepts when compared to their middle class peers. The fact that Teacher 1's lower class children had a significantly more positive ($p=.02$) schooling-self when compared to one class of middle SES kindergarteners is very interesting and possibly reflects the impact of a strong teacher. Controlling for initial level of self-concept as school entry would have shed more light on this finding.

An additional interesting finding was noted in that although the self-concepts of children in the two middle SES classrooms were overall very similar one significant difference was noted in the subfactor feeling-self ($p=.02$). Further study of a larger number of individual middle class kindergarten classrooms seems indicated to test just how homogeneous self-concept and its various subfactors are even among middle class kindergarteners.

Findings using the more powerful BMDP4V Multivariate technique (M. Davidson & J. Toporek, 1981) suggested that there are no significant differences between the self-concepts of low and middle class kindergarteners although a significant difference in the schooling-self between the two social classes was obtained but seems to be associated more with either the classroom teacher or some alternate unknown and uncontrolled variable rather than SES per se. However the need for further research to disentangle these relationships and to clarify the findings obtained seems indicated.

Perhaps it is also worth noting that approximately one-third of the statements on the McDaniel-Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale (MP) was designated to distinguish the schooling-self however approximately one-third of these school items refer to physical appearance. Most young children whether low SES or middle SES tend to think positively about their physical appearance and one might speculate that the inclusion of such items weakens the sampling of the schooling-self and therefore may fail to capture variation between groups typically believed to differ in school performance. There appears to be a need for better instruments to sample the school-self of young children in order to study SES differences more thoroughly.

5.2 SES relationships between kindergarten children's sex and their self-concept scores

Comparing the self-concepts of all middle class kindergarten girls with all low SES kindergarten girls yielded no significant differences, however when all middle class boys were compared to all lower class boys they were found to exhibit significantly more positive feeling-self ($p=.03$) and behaving-self ($p=.03$) than all lower class boys, although middle class and lower class boys did not differ significantly in global-self. The fact that no significant differences in the global self-concept scores or in the subscale scores were obtained between social class groups could support the philosophy that girls irrespective of social class affiliation adjust and adapt easier to school with less negative

consequences for their self-concepts. Indeed many of the work skills required in kindergarten tend to foster more positive results for girls. Girls fine motor capabilities are on the average more advanced than those of boys at that age and girls can manipulate pencils, crayons, paint and scissors better than boys therefore lower class girls may experience more opportunities than boys in school which might help develop more positive views of the self. Another possibility may be that girls from a lower SES background may possess a more positive self-concept on school entry or may have already developed a more positive self-concept since low SES girls frequently are given responsible chores such as minding younger siblings which might develop a stronger feeling of importance and self-worth (e.g., a mother substitute). Sociologically, it appears that in the low SES background young females are more likely to be given a leadership role in the one-parent family situations which could also help develop a more positive view of the self.

It is interesting to note that when girls were compared for self-concept between individual classrooms that a couple of significant findings surfaced. Girls in lower class Teacher 1's room had a much better schooling-self ($p=.005$) than girls in middle class Teacher 4's room, a finding which is very puzzling and difficult to interpret. This finding however further explicates the differences previously reported between children in Teacher 1's and 4's classrooms since no significant differences for the schooling-self of boys in

those two classrooms was obtained. Given the fact that the schooling-self of girls is perhaps less developed on school entry than other aspects of the self, the question arises whether girls are more perceptive and sensitive to the quality of teacher interactions with them and teacher's feelings towards them on school related variables even as early as kindergarten age?

Comparisons of the self-concept of boys in individual classrooms yielded significant findings which may point to the effect of teacher on self-concept. Low SES boys in Teacher 2's classroom had very significantly lower self-concepts (global, feeling and behaving) than low SES boys in Teacher 1's classroom or Teacher 3's middle class classroom although strangely those lower class boys only differed significantly in their feeling-self from those in Teacher 4's middle class room. The fact that no significant difference in the schooling-self was obtained for boys in Teacher 2's classroom may suggest that when there is limited structured or articulated teacher demands that students may believe they are doing well within the academic setting and as a result their schooling-self remains more positive. The fact that differences in self-concept were found between the SES classes for boys may support research suggesting that boys on the average are more vulnerable than girls in many areas (e.g., boys tend to have more learning disabilities). The self-concept of some lower class boys may be particularly vulnerable since the lower class boy frequently is reported

to suffer from the absence of a father (a male model) or from more stern disciplining than girls even when father is present. The behaving-self sampled aggressive behavior traits when angry, feelings of incompetence within the familial and school setting and being a disappointment to parents. Many of these traits according to the literature are characteristic of the low SES male child. However, this study again suggests that not all low SES boys identify with these behaviors.

Within social class analysis revealed that middle class girls had a more positive schooling-self ($p=.02$) contrasted to middle SES males but, did not significantly differ from males on the other self-concept measures but that lower class girls had significantly more positive global-self, schooling-self and behaving-self than lower SES boys. The more positive schooling-self found for girls could be explained by considering the fact that girls tend to perform better and progress faster in kindergarten compared to boys and may therefore have a better school image than boys. The fact that the schooling-self included some personal appearance items may favor girls over boys for girls even at this tender age tend to exhibit more concern over their appearance and attire. Such suggestions are merely speculative and do nothing to explain the fact that the schooling-self of girls did not differ from boys in all four classrooms.

Individual classroom analyses of differences in the

global-self, feeling-self and behaving-self between males and females pointed to Teacher 2's classroom as contributing mainly to the boy/girl significant differences obtained. In the other three classrooms no significant differences between the sexes were obtained. This is an important finding if it relates to teacher impact but because of lack of control of level of self-concept at school entry in this study it is impossible to say. Could it be that a laissez-faire permissive teacher induces a more negative self-concept in boys than girls? This study would tend to suggest that this hypothesis needs to be studied.

Perhaps the most interesting result of this investigation may very well be the finding that different combinations of subjects yield different self-concept results for boys and girls. For example when all middle class subjects and all lower class subjects were compared the outcome was different than when individual classrooms were compared. Again this highlights the danger of perceiving all middle class and all lower class classrooms as homogeneous. There is tentative evidence from this study that boys and girls should be analyzed for differences in self-concept before being treated as a homogeneous sample.

5.3 SES relationships between kindergarten children's age and their self-concept scores

To compare the kindergarten children's self-concept scores and the age variable, all children were grouped into quarterly segments according to birthdate. Analyses were done

comparing children's self-concept between the two different SES levels as well as within each social class.

Significant differences between the social classes were found for only the two youngest age groups. The youngest (68-70 months) middle SES age group had a significantly more positive global-self ($p=.007$), feeling-self ($p=.01$) and behaving-self ($p=.02$) compared to the youngest lower class children. The second youngest group (71-73 months) was also significantly different in the feeling-self ($p=.005$) and the behaving-self ($p=.05$) from the second youngest lower class group. All other age comparisons were non-significant. This tends to suggest that the self-concept of middle class children may be more positive on school entry than that of lower class children and may continue to be more positive up to approximately six years of age after which there appears to be no difference between the social classes. Perhaps middle SES kindergarteners are better prepared, have clearer perceptions and expectations for themselves about school compared to low SES kindergarteners.

From the within SES analyses, an interesting pattern for the school-self relative to age was found in both SES groups. Significant differences were obtained between the oldest age group and all three other age groupings for the lower class kindergarteners and between the oldest age grouping and the second and third age groupings (i.e. omitting the youngest group) for the middle class kindergarteners. This tends to suggest a development sequence for the school-self

with the oldest children having a more positive school-self in both social class groupings. Further research should attempt to validate this finding. It was also interesting to find within the low SES setting that school entry age appears to have a more pervasive association with self-concept, the youngest and second youngest children were significantly different from the oldest grouping not only in the school-self but also in the global-self ($p=.006$ and $.011$). This would tend to support a SES difference hypothesis since the lower class child is typically believed to be developmentally delayed and generally lacking in many of the familial support systems which condition positive feelings of the self. The younger the child is on school entry, the more developmentally delayed he is likely to be relative to many school entry variables important to school success.

That significant relationships seem to exist between SES/age/sex for social class differences in kindergarten children's self-concept was confirmed by the multivariate analysis. What these interactions and relationships mean have been speculatively addressed and interpreted based on the paired comparison findings. However these multivariate results also indicate the need for further specific study.

CONCLUSION

This exploratory research resulted in a large number of unexpected questions. The findings that one group of low SES children was significantly different in self-concept from another group of low SES children was entirely unanticipated and created a complexity which mitigates against any clear cut conclusions. Certainly there appeared to be evidence in the data that some low SES children have significantly more negative self-concepts than middle class children and even significantly lower than some other low SES children. However there was also evidence that some lower class children had significantly more positive self-concepts than middle class children. There was also evidence that the self-concept of some lower class boys is significantly lower than that of middle class boys but even more significantly lower than that of some other lower class boys whereas other lower class boys had self-concepts just as positive as middle class boys. There was also evidence that school entry age is possibly related to the level of self-concept both for the low SES and middle SES children with the oldest children having significantly more positive self-concepts.

Findings from this research gave speculative focus on the impact of different teachers on the child's self-concept. There is an urgent need for further research in this area so that definitive information on how teacher behaviors affect student's self-concept may be filtered into the schools and into teacher training institutions. Over a decade ago,

Purkey (1970) insisted that "the prevention of negative self-concepts is a vital first step in teaching" (p. 43). He recommended that in order to make a positive impact on students, a teacher must become a significant person in their lives. The way a teacher becomes that 'significant other' in a student's view is depicted by what the teacher believes and what the teacher does. A most poignant verse by an anonymous author states it succinctly:

No printed word nor spoken plea
Can teach young minds what men should be,
Not all the books on all the shelves
But what the teachers are themselves.
(Purkey, 1970, p. 45)

A young child will strive to meet the teacher's positive/negative expectations for him. It is imperative for teachers to become educated on the vulnerability of their students' self-concepts. For, it is by their actions or inactions that teachers can determine in a large measure whether a child will depart their classroom with a psychologically sound and positive self-concept or a psychologically damaged and negative self-concept. However since this study failed to control for school entry level of self-concept, no definitive statement can be made on this dimension beyond the recommendation that this variable be considered in future work,

This study indicated the need for more research on the kindergarten child's self-concept. It also suggests that research combining different classrooms may cloud more meaningful issues than it provides answers. Perhaps

self-concept is yet another area where iterative research may in the long run yield more definite results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alberti, J.M. Self-Perception in School. Paper presented to the Northeastern Educational Research Association at Grossinger, New York, November 1970.
- Alberti, J.M. Correlates of Self-Perception-in-School. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, N.Y. February, 1971
- Ausubel, D.P. & P. Ausubel. Ego development among segregated Negro children. In H.A. Passow (Ed), Education in depressed areas. New York, 1963
- Bills, R.E. Sex, Race and Developmental Differences in Self-Concept Variables as Shown by the Index of Adjustment and Values. Paper presented at the Self-Concept Symposium, Boston, 1978
- Bloom, B.S. Affective Outcomes of School Learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59, 193-98
- Brookover, W.B. et al. Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement II: Improving Academic Achievement Through Students' Self-Concept Enhancement. U.S. Office of Education. East Lansing, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Brophy, J.E. & T.L. Good. Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-74.
- Calsyn, R.J. & D.A. Kenny. Self-Concept of Ability and Perceived Evaluation of Others: Causes or Effects of Academic Achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 136-45.
- Caplan, M. The relationship between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement. Journal Experimental Education, 1969, 37, 13-15.
- Clements, R.O. et al. The Accuracy of Students' Perceptions of Themselves and Their Classroom. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston, April 1980.
- Combs, A.W. et al. The Measurement of Self-Concept and Self-Report. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23, 493-500.

- Cookston, H.M. & B.O. Mason. Recent Studies on Self-Concept in Elementary Students. Educational Leadership, 1977, 34, 639-41.
- Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco. W.H. Freeman and CO. 1967.
- Deutsch, C. Environment and Perception. Social Class, Race and Psychological Development, Holt, Rinehard and Winston, New York, 1968, 58-85.
- Dreyer, A.S. and D. Haupt. Self-Evaluation in Young Children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1966, 108, 185-97.
- Eshel, Y. & Z. Klein. Development of Academic Self-Concept of Lower-Class and Middle-Class Primary School Children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, Vol. 73, No. 2, 287-293.
- Fahey, M. & S. Phillips. The Self-Concept of Disadvantaged Children: An Exploratory Study in Middle Childhood. The Journal of Psychology, 1981, 109, 223-232.
- Farran, D.C. & R. Haskins. Reciprocal influence in the social interactions of mothers and three year old children from different socio-economic backgrounds. Child Development. 1980, 51, 780-791.
- Farrell, M. A five year study of low and high academic achievement in two inner-city schools. Unpublished. Technical Report, 1982. Montreal Catholic School Commission.
- Farrell, M. & J. Derevensky. Personal, family and school factors affecting the successful achievement of elementary inner-city children: some preliminary results. Paper presented at annual conference of CERA, Fredericton, New Brunswick, June 1977.
- Farrell, M. & L. Heroux. Le développement du concept de soi chez les enfants de 5 à 8 ans. To be published, Revue de sciences de l'éducation, 1985.
- Felker, D.W. Building Positive Self-Concepts. Minneapolis, Minnesota. Burgess Publishing Co. 1974.
- Felker, D.W. et al. The Effects of a Teacher Program on Self-Concept Enhancement of Pupil's Self-Concept, Anxiety and Intellectual Achievement Responsibility. Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 66, 443-45.
- Gergen, K.J. Paper presented at the Self-Concept Symposium held in Boston, 1978.

- Germain, R.B. Self-Concept and Self-Esteem Reexamined. Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 15, 380-90.
- Glassner, W. Schools Without Failure. Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1969.
- Gordon, I.J. Children's View of Themselves. Association for Childhood International, Washington, D.C., 1972.
- Government of Quebec, Minister of Education. Pre-School and Elementary Education Information Document, Nov. 1982.
- Granite, J. Language Beacons for the Disadvantaged. The Elementary School Journal, Jan. 1966, 66, 4.
- Hansford, B. & J. Hattie. The Relationship Between Self and Achievement/Performance Measures. Review of Educational Research, Spring 1982, 52, 1, 123-42.
- Henggeler, S.W. & J. Tavormina. Social class and race differences in family interaction: Pathological normative or confounding methodological factors? Journal of Genetic Psychology. 1980, 137, 211-222.
- Hess, R. & V. Shipman. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 869-886.
- James, W. Principles of Psychology. 1890, New York: Holt (1950).
- Karlins, M., T. & G. Walters. On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 1-16.
- Klaus, R. & S. Gray. The early training project for disadvantaged children: A report after five years. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1968, 33, 4.
- Klein, M.F. et al. A study of Schooling Curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 61, 244-48.
- Kohn, M.L. Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Larned, D. & D. Muller. Development of Self-Concept in Grades One through Nine. The Journal of Psychology, 1979, 102, 143-155.

- Leacock, E. Teaching and Learning in City Schools, Basic Books, Inc. New York, 1969.
- L'Ecuyer, R. Le Concept de soi, 1978, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Leonetti, R. & D. Müller. The Spanish surnamed Child. The Elementary School Journal, 1976, 76, 247-255.
- Lipsitt, L.P. A self-concept scale for children and its relationship to the Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale. Child Development, 1958, 29, 463-72.
- Long, B.H. & E.H. Henderson. Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1968, 113, 41-51.
- Marx, R.W. & P. Winnie. Construct interpretations of three self-concept inventories. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 1, 99-109.
- Maslow, A.H. Vers une psychologie de l'Etre. 1968. Paris: Fayard (1972).
- Mead, G.H. Mind, Self and Society: from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1934.
- Miller, M.S. Children Under Stress/ How Our Schools Fail. Instructor, January 1981, 110-114.
- Osborne, W.L. & H. Legette. Sex, Race, Grade Level and Social Class Differences in Self-Concept. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, Jan. 1982, 14, 4.
- Ozehosky, R. & E. Clark. Children's Self-Concept and Kindergarten Achievement. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 75, 185-192.
- Pedersen, F.A., J. Rubenstein & L. Yarrow. Infant development in father absent families. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1979, 135, 51-61.
- Phillips, D. & E. Zigler. Children's Self-Image Disparity: Effects of Age, Socioeconomic Status, Ethnicity, and Gender. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39, 4, 689-700.
- Primavera, I., W. Simon & A. Primavera. The relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement: An investigation of sex differences. Psychology in the Schools, 1974, 11, 213-216.

- Purkey, W.W. Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, 1970.
- Radin, N. Father-Child Interaction and the Intellectual Function of 4 Year Old Boys. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 353-361.
- Rand, P. Achievement Motivation and School Performance Universitetsforlaget 1965.
- Richards, J.C. Some social aspects of language learning. Paper presented at the TESOL Convention. 1972.
- Richmond, J. & B. Caldwell. Roots of Identity in the Family, New York. 1965.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rosenberg, M. Conceiving the Self, Basic Books, Inc. New York, 1979.
- Rosenthal, R. & P. Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. 1968.
- Sears, R.R. Relations of Early Socialization Experience to Self-Concept and Gender Role in Middle Childhood. Child Development, 1970, 41, 267-89.
- Shavelson, R. et al. Self-Concept: Validation of Construct Interpretations. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 407-41.
- Shavelson, R. & R. Bolus, Self-Concept: The Interplay of Theory and Methods, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1982, 74, 1, 3-17.
- Sheirer, M. & R. Kraut. Increasing educational achievement via Self-Concept change. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 1, 131-150.
- Silvernail, D.L. Developing Positive Student Self-Concept. National Education Association Publication, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Silvernail, D.L. Educational Goals: Which Ones are Most and Least Important to Administrators and Teachers? NASSP Bulletin, 1982.
- Soares, A.T. & L. Soares. Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 31-45.

- Stenner, A.J. & W.C. Katzenmeyer. Self-Concept Development In Young Children. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 58, 356-57.
- Strickland, E.V. & K.C. Campbell. End the Other Abuse... Damaged Self-Concepts. Childhood Education, Sept/Oct. 1982, 9-12.
- Tolor, B. & A. Tolor. An attempted Modification of Impulsivity and Self-Esteem in Kindergarteners. Psychology in the Schools, 1982, 19, 528-31.
- Tompkins, C. The Effects of Socio-economic Differences on First Grade Children's Expectations Of and Attitudes Toward Reading. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, California. April, 1979.
- Trowbridge, N.T. Self-Concept and Socio-economic Class. Psychology in the Schools, 1970, 7, 3.
- Trowbridge, N.T. Self-Concept and Socio-economic Status in Elementary School Children. American Education Research Journal, 1972, 9, 525-37.
- Waksman, M. Mother as Teacher: A Home Intervention Program. Interchange, 10, 4, 1979-80.
- Wattenberg, W. & C. Clifford. Relations of Self-Concepts to beginning achievement in reading. Child Development, 1964, 36, 460-467.
- White, H.L. The First Three Years of Life. Toronto, Prentice Hall of Canada Limited, 1975.
- Wortis, H. et al. Child-Rearing Practices in a Low Socio-economic Group. Pediatrics, 1963, 32, 298-307.
- Wylie, R.C. The Self-Concept. A review of Methodological considerations and measuring instruments. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Wylie, R.C. The Self-Concept. rev. ed. Vol 2. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska, 1979.
- Yamamoto, K. The Child and his Image. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale

Script for Test Administrator

Point to the

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 1. | Bird | I am often sad. |
| 2. | Apple | Meeting new people scares me. |
| 3. | Boat | I am afraid when we have tests in school. |
| 4. | Cat | I am often blamed when something goes wrong. |
| 5. | Flag | I cause trouble to my family. |
| 6. | Bug | I am strong. |
| 7. | Car | I think up good things to do. |
| 8. | Spoon | I am an important member of my family. |
| 9. | Basket | If I have a hard time doing something, I stop doing it. |
| 10. | Dog | I am good in my schoolwork. |
| 11. | Fish | I do many bad things. |
| 12. | Book | I behave well at home. |
| 13. | Tree | I am an important member of my class. |
| 14. | Star | I have pretty eyes. |
| 15. | Boat | I am mean to the other children in my family. |
| 16. | Cup | My friends like the things I think up. |
| 17. | Flower | I often get into trouble. |
| 18. | Baseball | I am often upset. |
| 19. | Ice Cream
Cone | I feel left out of things. |
| 20. | Doll | I have nice hair. |
| 21. | Bird | I have a nice looking face. |
| 22. | Apple | I am often mean to other people. |
| 23. | Boat | My classmates like the things I think up. |
| 24. | Cat | I am goodlooking. |
| 25. | Flag | I get into a lot of fights. |
| 26. | Bug | I am a good reader. |
| 27. | Car | I sometimes think about doing things that I know I shouldn't. |
| 28. | Spoon | My classmates make fun of me. |
| 29. | Basket | It is hard for me to make friends. |
| 30. | Dog | I am among the last to be chosen for games. |
| 31. | Fish | I am lucky. |
| 32. | Book | My parents think I should do better than I do. |
| 33. | Tree | I am happy. |
| 34. | Star | My family is disappointed in me. |
| 35. | Boat | I wish I were different. |
| 36. | Cup | I am smart. |
| 37. | Flower | I want my own way most of the time. |
| 38. | Baseball | When I try to make something, everything seems to go wrong. |
| 39. | Ice Cream
Cone | I hate school. |
| 40. | Doll | I am always dropping or breaking things. |

Appendix B





















 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO
 YES NO	 YES NO

Table 2

Self-concept scores between teacher/classrooms within social class: means, standard deviations and t-tests

	GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*		GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*
	<u>Teacher 1/ low SES - (N=38)</u>					<u>Teacher 2/ low SES - (N=40)</u>			
<u>X</u>	27.6842	9.7105	11.1579	6.8158	vs.	23.6250	8.1500	9.6250	5.8500
SD	5.478	2.958	2.488	2.437		5.882	3.051	2.932	2.381
<u>t</u>	.002	.025	.015	.081					
	<u>Teacher 3/ middle SES - (N=40)</u>					<u>Teacher 4/ middle SES - (N=38)</u>			
<u>X</u>	29.1250	11.1250	10.2250	7.7750	vs.	26.2895	9.6316	9.7632	6.8684
SD	6.973	3.040	2.922	1.993		6.354	3.544	2.454	2.158
<u>t</u>	.064	.050	.451	.058					

* GSC- global self, FSC- feeling-self, SSC- schooling-self, BSC- behaving-self

Table 3
Self-concept scores for 11th grade subjects by teacher/classroom and by social class: means, standard deviations and t-tests

	GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*		GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*
	<u>Teacher 1/ low SES - (N=38)</u>				vs.	<u>Teacher 3/ middle SES - (N=40)</u>			
\bar{X}	27.6842	9.7105	11.1579	6.8168		29.1250	11.1250	10.2250	7.7750
SD	5.478	2.958	2.488	2.437		6.973	3.040	2.922	1.993
t	.312	.041	.133	.062					
	<u>Teacher 1/ low SES - (N=38)</u>				vs.	<u>Teacher 4/ middle SES - (N=38)</u>			
\bar{X}	27.6842	9.7105	11.1579	6.8168		26.2895	9.6316	9.7632	6.8684
SD	5.478	2.958	2.488	2.437		6.354	3.544	2.454	2.158
t	.309	.916	.016	.921					
	<u>Teacher 2/ low SES - (N=40)</u>				vs.	<u>Teacher 3/ middle SES - (N=40)</u>			
\bar{X}	23.6250	8.1500	9.6250	5.8500		29.1250	11.1250	10.2250	7.7750
SD	5.882	3.051	2.932	2.381		6.973	3.040	2.922	1.993
t	.000	.000	.362	.000					
	<u>Teacher 2/ low SES - (N=40)</u>					<u>Teacher 4/ middle SES - (N=38)</u>			
\bar{X}	23.6250	8.1500	9.6250	5.8500		26.2895	9.6316	9.7632	6.8684
SD	5.882	3.051	2.932	2.381		6.354	3.544	2.454	2.158
t	.059	.052	.822	.051					

*GSC- global-self, FSC- feeling-self, SSC- schooling-self, BSC- behaving-self

Table 4
Self-concept scores between lower and middle class girls and lower and middle class boys: means, standard deviations and t-tests (sex variable comparisons)

	GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*		GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*
	<u>Low SES Girls (N=35)</u>				vs.	<u>Middle SES Girls (N=47)</u>			
<u>X</u>	27.6286	9.5429	11.0857	7.0000		28.7660	10.5957	10.5957	7.5532
SD	5.483	2.924	2.571	2.058		6.627	3.443	2.337	2.165
<u>t</u>	.398	.139	.378	.243					
	<u>Low SES Boys (N=43)</u>					<u>Middle SES Boys (N=31)</u>			
<u>X</u>	23.9535	8.3953	9.7907	5.7674		26.1935	10.0968	9.0968	7.0000
SD	5.972	3.156	2.900	2.608		6.838	3.259	2.982	2.017
<u>t</u>	.148	.028	.321	.025					

*GSC- global-self, FSC- feeling-self, SSC- schooling-self, BSC- behaving-self

Self-concept scores between high- and low-SES students in individual classrooms: means, standard deviations, and t-tests

	GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	HSC*		GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	FSC*	
GIRLS:										
<u>Teacher 1/ low SES (N=19)</u>					vs.	<u>Teacher 2/ low SES (N=16)</u>				
X	28.4211	9.6316	11.8947	6.8947		26.6875	9.4375	10.1250	7.1250	
SD	5.157	3.095	1.487	2.132		5.873	2.804	3.243	2.029	
t	.365	.847	.058	.746		.837	.904	.779	.965	
<u>Teacher 1/ low SES (N=19)</u>					vs.	<u>Teacher 3/ middle SES (N=26)</u>				
X	28.4211	9.6316	11.8947	6.8947		30.1154	11.4231	10.7692	7.9231	
SD	5.157	3.095	1.487	2.132		6.895	2.845	2.747	2.208	
t	.351	.955	.085	.123		.095	.034	.513	.240	
<u>Teacher 1/ low SES (N=19)</u>					vs.	<u>Teacher 4/ middle SES (N=21)</u>				
X	28.4211	9.6316	11.8947	6.8947		27.0952	9.5714	10.3810	7.0971	
SD	5.157	3.095	1.487	2.132		6.024	3.893	1.746	2.071	
t	.458	.957	.005	.765		.837	.904	.779	.965	
<u>Teacher 2/ low SES (N=16)</u>					vs.	<u>Teacher 4/ middle SES (N=21)</u>				
X	26.6875	9.4375	10.1250	7.1250		27.0952	9.5714	10.3810	7.0971	
SD	5.873	2.804	3.243	2.029		6.024	3.893	1.746	2.071	
t	.095	.034	.513	.240		.837	.904	.779	.965	
<u>Teacher 2/ low SES (N=16)</u>					vs.	<u>Teacher 3/ middle SES (N=26)</u>				
X	30.1154	11.4231	10.7692	7.9231		27.0952	9.5714	10.3810	7.0971	
SD	6.895	2.845	2.747	2.208		6.024	3.893	1.746	2.071	
t	.116	.077	.559	.193		.837	.904	.779	.965	

Table 4
 Effect of placement in low SES or high SES individual classroom on individual reading and test scores

	GSC*	FSC	SSC	BSC	GSC†	FSC†	SSC†	BSC†
ROMC: Teacher 1/ low SES (N=19)								
X	26.9474	9.7895	10.4211	6.7368	21.4833	7.2917	9.2917	5.0000
SD	5.826	2.898	3.161	2.760	5.030	2.956	2.726	2.246
t	.003	.008	.216	.033				
Teacher 1/ low SES (N=19)								
X	26.9474	9.7895	10.4211	6.7368	27.2857	10.5714	9.2143	7.5000
SD	5.826	2.898	3.061	2.766	6.988	3.413	3.068	1.557
t	.884	.495	.273	.323				
Teacher 1/ low SES (N=19) vs. Teacher 3/ middle SES (N=14)								
X	26.9474	9.7895	10.4211	6.7368	25.2941	9.7059	9.0000	6.5882
SD	5.826	2.898	3.061	2.766	6.780	3.177	3.000	2.293
t	.441	.935	.169	.861				
Teacher 2/ low SES (N=24)								
X	21.5833	7.2917	9.2917	5.0000	27.2857	10.5714	9.2143	7.5000
SD	5.030	2.956	2.726	2.246	6.988	3.413	3.068	1.557
t	.014	.006	.938	.000				
Teacher 2/ low SES (N=24) vs. Teacher 4/ middle SES (N=17)								
X	21.5833	7.2917	9.2917	5.0000	25.2941	9.7059	9.0000	6.5882
SD	5.030	2.956	2.726	2.246	6.789	3.177	3.000	2.293
t	.066	.019	.752	.034				
Teacher 3/ middle SES (N=14) vs. Teacher 4/ middle SES (N=17)								
X	27.2857	10.5714	9.2143	7.5000	25.2941	9.7059	9.0000	6.5882
SD	6.988	3.413	3.068	1.557	6.789	3.177	3.000	2.293
t	.431	.475	.846	.200				

*GSC- global-self, FSC- feeling-self, SSC- schooling-self, BSC- behaving-self

Table 6

Self-concept scores between kindergarten girls and boys within social class: means, standard deviations and t-tests

	GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*		GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*
	<u>Low SES Boys (N=43)</u>					<u>Low SES Girls (N=35)</u>			
\bar{X}	23.9535	8.3953	9.7917	5.7674	vs.	27.6286	9.5429	11.0857	7.0000
SD	5.972	3.156	2.900	2.608		5.483	2.924	2.571	2.058
t	.006	.100	.040	.022					
	<u>Middle SES Boys (N=31)</u>				vs.	<u>Middle SES Girls (N=47)</u>			
\bar{X}	26.1935	10.0968	9.0968	7.0000		28.7660	10.5957	10.5957	7.5532
SD	6.838	3.259	2.982	2.017		6.627	3.443	2.337	2.165
t	.105	.520	.022	.254					

*GSC- global-self, FSC- feeling-self, SSC- schooling-self, BSC- behaving-self

Table 9
Self-concept scores for four age groupings of kindergarteners
between SES classes: means; standard deviations and t-tests

	GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*		GSC*	FSC*	SSC*	BSC*
	<u>Group 1 / low SES (N=16)</u> 68-70 months				vs.	<u>Group 1 / middle SES (N=30)</u> 68-70 months			
<u>X</u>	23.3125	8.2500	9.2500	5.8125		28.8000	10.7667	10.4000	7.6000
SD	5.896	2.978	3.587	2.509		6.615	3.298	2.513	2.207
<u>t</u>	.007	.013	.265	.023					
	<u>Group 2 / low SES (N=30)</u> 71-73 months				vs.	<u>Group 2 / middle SES (N=24)</u> 71-73 months			
<u>X</u>	24.6000	8.2000	10.5000	5.9000		27.2500	10.5417	9.5000	7.2083
SD	5.537	2.976	2.556	2.468		6.784	2.843	2.978	2.206
<u>t</u>	.129	.005	.198	.045					
	<u>Group 3 / low SES (N=17)</u> 74-76 months				vs.	<u>Group 3 / middle SES (N=16)</u> 74-76 months			
<u>X</u>	26.8235	9.5882	10.1176	7.1176		26.2500	9.8750	9.3125	7.0625
SD	6.921	3.392	3.018	2.781		6.865	3.575	2.845	2.048
<u>t</u>	.813	.815	.436	.949					
	<u>Group 4 / low SES (N=13)</u> 77-79 months				vs.	<u>Group 4 / middle SES (N=8)</u> 77-79 months			
<u>X</u>	29.2308	10.3846	12.0769	6.7692		28.2500	9.6250	11.3750	7.2500
SD	4.867	2.902	1.115	1.787		7.888	4.809	1.598	1.832
<u>t</u>	.758	.695	.299	.564					

* GSC- global-self, FSC- feeling-self, SSC- schooling-self, BSC- behaving-self

Table 10

Age variable within Low SES subjects:
means, standard deviations and t-tests

#	GSC	FSC	SSC	DSC	GSC	FSC	SSC	BSC
Age GR.1	<u>68-70 months</u>		(N=16)		GR.2	<u>71-73 months</u>		(N=30)
X	23.3125	8.2500	9.2500	5.8125	24.6000	8.2000	10.5000	5.9000
SD	5.896	2.978	3.587	2.509	5.537	2.976	2.556	2.468
t	.477	.957	.229	.911		.034	.007	.204
vs.					GR.4	<u>77-79 months</u>		(N=13)
Age GR.1	<u>68-70 months</u>		(N=16)		GR.3	<u>74-76 months</u>		(N=17)
X	23.3125	8.2500	9.2500	5.8125	26.8235	9.5882	10.1176	7.1176
SD	5.896	2.978	3.587	2.500	6.921	3.392	3.018	2.781
t	.126	.237	.460	.166				
vs.					GR.4	<u>77-79 months</u>		(N=13)
Age GR.1	<u>68-70 months</u>		(N=16)		GR.3	<u>74-76 months</u>		(N=17)
X	23.3125	8.2500	9.2500	5.8125	26.8235	9.5882	10.1176	7.1176
SD	5.986	2.978	3.587	2.500	6.921	3.392	3.018	2.781
t	.006	.062	.008	.242				
vs.					GR.4	<u>77-79 months</u>		(N=13)
Age GR.2	<u>71-73 months</u>		(N=30)		GR.3	<u>74-76 months</u>		(N=17)
X	24.6000	8.2000	10.5000	5.9000	26.8235	9.5882	10.1176	7.1176
SD	5.537	2.976	2.556	2.468	6.921	3.392	3.018	2.781
t	.266	.169	.663	.144				
vs.					GR.4	<u>77-79 months</u>		(N=13)
Age GR.2	<u>71-73 months</u>		(N=30)		GR.3	<u>74-76 months</u>		(N=17)
X	24.6000	8.2000	10.5000	5.9000	26.8235	9.5882	10.1176	7.1176
SD	5.537	2.976	2.556	2.468	6.921	3.392	3.018	2.781
t	.011	.034	.007	.204				
vs.					GR.4	<u>77-79 months</u>		(N=13)
Age GR.3	<u>74-76 months</u>		(N=17)		GR.3	<u>74-76 months</u>		(N=17)
X	26.8235	9.5882	10.1176	7.1176	29.2308	10.3846	12.0769	6.7692
SD	6.921	3.392	3.018	2.781	4.867	2.902	1.115	1.787
t	.273	.495	.022	.681				

*GSC - Global Self-Concept; FSC- Feeling-self; SSC- Schooling-self; BSC- Behaving-self

Table 10

Age variable within Middle SES subjects:
means, standard deviations and t-tests

#	GSC	FSC	SSC	BSC	GSC	FSC	SSC	BSC
Age GR.1 68-70 months (N=30)								
X	28.8000	10.7667	10.4000	7.6000	27.2500	10.5417	9.5000	7.2083
SD	6.615	3.298	2.513	2.207	6.784	2.843	2.978	2.206
t	.403	.789	.244	.520				
Age GR.1 68-70 months (N=30) vs. GR.2 71-73 months (N=24)								
X	28.8000	10.7667	10.4000	7.6000	26.2500	9.8750	9.3125	7.0625
SD	6.615	3.298	2.513	2.207	6.865	3.575	2.845	2.048
t	.234	.415	.209	.415				
Age GR.1 68-70 months (N=30) vs. GR.4 77-79 months (N=8)								
X	28.8000	10.7667	10.4000	7.6000	28.2500	9.6250	11.3750	7.2500
SD	6.615	3.298	2.513	2.207	7.888	4.809	1.598	1.832
t	.860	.542	.198	.654				
Age GR.2 71-73 months (N=24) vs. GR.3 74-76 months (N=16)								
X	27.2500	10.5417	9.5000	7.2083	26.2500	9.8750	9.3125	7.0625
SD	6.784	2.843	2.978	2.206	6.865	3.575	2.845	2.048
t	.653	.537	.842	.832				
Age GR.2 71-73 months (N=24) vs. GR.4 77-79 months (N=8)								
X	27.2500	10.5417	9.5000	7.2083	28.2500	9.6250	11.3750	7.2500
SD	6.784	2.843	2.978	2.206	7.888	4.809	1.598	1.832
t	.754	.622	.034	.959				
Age GR.3 74-76 months (N=16) vs. GR.4 77-79 months (N=8)								
X	26.2500	9.8750	9.3125	7.0625	28.2500	9.6250	11.3750	7.2500
SD	6.865	3.575	2.845	2.048	7.888	4.809	1.598	1.832
t	.553	.899	.033	.823				

*GSC- Global Self-concept; FSC- Feeling-self; SSC- Schooling-self; BSC- Behaving-self