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ABSTRACT

The present study, concerning children exposed to family violence, examined the relationships among the children's global self-worth, their perceived social support, their mothers' perceived social support, and their mothers education level. Fifty-six children aged 7 to 13 years from 38 families and their 38 mothers participated in the study. They were recruited through transition houses and community organizations which were offering counseling services for assaulted women and their children in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, Canada. Children were individually asked to complete a demographic information form and certain measures that assessed their global self-worth, their domain-specific competencies, the importance of different domains to them, and their perceived social support. Their mothers were individually asked to complete a demographic information form and a measure that assessed their perceived social support. The study found: (a) Doing well at school was the most significant domain which contributed to children's global self-worth, followed by being good looking, (b) mothers were the most important support providers who contributed to children's global self-worth, followed by non-kin adults (counselors and transition house staff), (c) the amount of support for children was related positively to their global self-worth, (d) children's social support contributed to their global self-worth- together with the mean of discrepancies between their perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance, (e) the higher the level of education the mothers had, the less satisfied they were with supports, and (f) children's social support and discrepancy between their perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance were the two strongest among four factors.
(children’s social support, discrepancy between their perceptions of competence and their
ratings of importance, their mothers’ social support, and their mothers’ education level)
as predictors of children’s global self-worth. These findings are discussed in light of the
current literature that describes outcome data for children exposed to family violence. The
thesis ends with a description of potential educational implications.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

According to Statistics Canada (1994), 29% of ever-married Canadian women have been subjected to physical or sexual assault at the hands of a marital partner (includes common-law relationships). The Violence Against Women Survey conducted by Statistics Canada (1994) revealed that: (a) 45% of wife assault cases resulted in physical injury to the women, and (b) one-third of women who were assaulted by a partner feared for their lives at some point during the abusive relationship. The 1,435 Canadian women killed by their husbands between 1974 and 1992 accounted for 38% of a total of 3,811 adult female homicide victims (over 15 years of age). Wilson, Daly, and Wright (1983) estimated that the probability that a registered-married woman would be killed by her spouse was nine times greater than the probability that she would be killed by a stranger. Therefore, wife assault is a serious problem in Canada.

In the early 1970s in Europe and North America community organizations worked to establish refuges, known in British Columbia as transition houses, to provide protection and help for assaulted women and their children. The first transition houses in Canada intended specifically for assaulted wives were opened in 1972 in B.C. and Alberta. The Symposium on Family Violence held in Vancouver in 1977 was the first major public platform for the discussion of these problems in B.C. (MacLeod, 1979). In Canada, the 1980s were years of significant progress in the field of family violence. Canada was the first country in the world to institute nation-wide police charging policies against men who assaulted. Public education to foster a growing awareness of the scope
and interrelated effects of marital violence was undertaken by most services and governments. In addition, the number of emergency shelters increased more than 400% to a total of over 300 (MacLeod, 1989). In 1993, Statistics Canada (1994) identified 371 residential facilities for assaulted women and their children. The term "transition house" is used broadly to refer to all shelters or residential facilities for assaulted women and their children. Transition houses are designed to meet the basic needs for shelter, safety, security, child care, counseling, clothing, information and referral services. As well, they offer women and children in transition emotional and group support and the opportunity to develop a sense of self-worth (MacLeod, 1979). On average, women can stay in a transition house up to a maximum of eight weeks (Statistics Canada, 1994). Second stage transition houses were developed for women who choose not to return to their husbands, but who require a longer stay than transition houses are able to offer. The maximum stay in second stage transition houses can range from three months to one year (Statistics Canada, 1994).

Statistics Canada (1994) revealed that children witnessing violence in the home appear to have been a factor in women's decision to go to a transition house for safety. According to the Violence Against Women Survey, three-quarters of the women who were seeking refuge from abusive situations on March 31, 1993 were admitted with children (Statistics Canada, 1994). Women whose children had witnessed the marital violence are twice as likely to have left their partners than in cases where the violence had not been witnessed by children (Statistics Canada, 1994). Services provided for children by transition houses include individual counseling, child care and group counseling (Statistics Canada, 1994).
Studies suggested that a violent environment deeply affected children whether or not they were physically a target (MacLeod, 1979). As Osofsky (1995a) pointed out, however, psychologists are just beginning to understand the serious effects on children of witnessing violence. In the present study, children who witness marital violence are the focus.

**Significance of Studying Children Who Witness Family Violence**

Children in transition houses were unfortunately born into a violent home environment.

Studying children who witness family violence is significant. There are two reasons for this statement. First, from a developmental perspective, children need a safe, anxiety-free environment which is the foundation of healthy emotional development (Osofsky, 1995a). Children from violent family environments are, however, deprived of the opportunity to take advantage of their environment. Furthermore, in order for an infant to develop optimally, he or she needs to be safely attached to a primary caregiver. The origins of human competence lie in securely attached parent-child relationships in which parents are warm, nurturant, and empathic with their children (Ainsworth & Bell, 1970; Connolly & Bruner, 1974). In a violent home environment, however, the parent-child relationship can be deeply affected, with a mother constantly having to cope with the physical and mental health aspects of having been assaulted (Wolfe, Jaffe, Wilson, & Zak, 1985). Parental support to children may decline when parents are themselves highly stressed, depressed, or demoralized (Belle, 1989). Second, we can not ignore the possibility of these children growing up to be violent members of our society. Social learning theory suggests that children imitate a number of the behaviors of adults around
them, including aggression, the construction of abstract conceptual rules, and moral behavior (Bandura, 1969). Stopping an intergenerational cycle of violence is our society's responsibility. As educators, we are responsible for helping these children: (a) develop a sense of self-worth, and (b) become healthy, productive members of our society who do not have to utilize violence to relate to others.

Self-Worth and Social Support of Children under Stress

Previous studies found that: (a) stressful life events may lead to a decrease in self-worth, and (b) decreased self-worth leads to psychological maladjustment in children and adolescents (Cohen, Burt, & Bjorck, 1987; Sandler, Miller, Short, & Wolchik, 1989). As Sandler, Miller, Short, and Wolchick (1989) pointed out, however, some children and adolescents were more resilient than others under stressful life circumstances. Studies revealed that social support received by children and adolescents was one of the important sources of this resilience (Belle, 1989; Cauce, Reid, Landesman, & Gonzales, 1990; Clair & Genest, 1986; Cohen & Willis, 1985; Sandler et al., 1989). Even among children and adolescents who were not under stress, researchers have found positive links between social support measures and self-worth scales (Cauce, 1986; Harter, 1982; Levitt, Gaucci-Franco & Levitt, 1993). Previous studies explored links between social support and socio-emotional adjustment of children: (a) of divorce (Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1982; Wolchick, Beals, & Sandler, 1989), (b) with the custodial parent (Hetherington, et al., 1982), (c) who had asthma (Wolchick, Beals, & Sandler, 1989), (d) who experienced the death of parent (Brown, Harris, & Bifulco, 1986), and (e) of alcoholic parents (Clair & Genest, 1986). Among children and adolescents who have
witnessed wife assault, however, links between their social support and socio-emotional
adjustment have not been explored.

Effects of Parents' Social Support on Their Developing Children

Studies suggested significant effects of parents' social support on their children's
sense of well-being (Cochran & Brassard, 1979; Hetherington, et al., 1982; Tietjen,
1989). Parents' own social support networks can help parents to deal with the life
stressors that may interfere with their parenting roles (Cochran & Brassard, 1979). As
Tietjen (1989) observed, parents with more social supports of their own were more
responsive and supportive in their relationships with their children. The socially isolated
parent who is unable to relieve stress through interaction with friends or other adults, on
the other hand, may become caught in an escalating cycle of aggression with the child.
Such parental hostility and rejection are known to be associated with poor self-image of
the child (Cochran & Brassard, 1979).

Parents' social support can have direct influences on child development. Parents'
network members often interact directly with children and in that sense may also function
as members of the child's own social network (Cochran & Brassard, 1979). By interacting
with the network members of their parents, children develop their own network-building
abilities such as reciprocal exchange skills, basic trust, and empathy, which are
prerequisite to the development of the more intense relationships with peers.

In most societies, including ours, the primary caregiver is the mother. Mothers are
primary sources of nurturance and intimacy throughout the school years and well into
adolescence (Belle, 1989). In transition houses children stay with their mothers. In
addition, their fathers have been the cause of the violent family environment. Therefore, in the present study, maternal support, rather than paternal support, is examined.

Social Support from Other Individuals

Previous studies identified children's significant support providers other than parents (e.g., siblings, grandparents, teachers, peers, non-parental adults) (Berndt & Perry, 1986, Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Harter, 1985b). Few studies, however, indicated who the important support providers were specifically for children who have witnessed family violence. In the present study, in addition to maternal support, social support from several significant others is examined: (a) teachers, (b) close friends, (c) siblings, and (d) non-kin adults.

Mothers' Education, Mothers' Social Support, and Their Children's Social Support

Previous studies revealed the links among parents' education, their social support, and their children's social support. Zelkowitz and Jacobs (cited in Tietjen, 1989) found that preschool children whose parents had more education had many more individuals in their social networks than other children, including family friends, peers, and substitute caregivers. Riley and Cochran (1987) found that the strongest predictor of the number of individuals in the child's social network was neither the child's gender nor family structure (single-parent household or two-parent household), but the mothers' education level. According to Cochran and Riley (cited in Tietjen, 1989), better-educated parents may be able to provide their children with more social opportunities and greater social skills. They observed that children whose mothers had a higher level of education were more likely to include their teachers as a member of their social network than were
children of less well educated mothers. The link between home and school strengthens the child's sense of the teacher as a significant person with whom he or she has a personal relationship, and may also strengthen the child's sense of the mother as a person competent to function in settings beyond the home (Tietjen, 1989).

In the present study, mothers' education level is examined as: (a) a direct factor related to mothers' social support, and (b) an indirect factor related to their children's social support.

**Domain-Specific Competence**

In the preceding sections, it was argued that there was a strong, positive link between children's social support and their sense of self-worth. According to Harter (1985a, 1990a), however, there exists another factor which impacts children's self-worth, that is, their perceptions of how well they perform in domains they believe important (e.g., academic, social, athletic). The link between children's self-worth and their domain-specific competence will be discussed further in the following chapter.

**Purpose of the Study**

The literature on social support (Cauce et al., 1990; Cochran & Brassard, 1979; Cohen & Willis, 1985; Hetherington, et al., 1982; Tietjen, 1989) described the role of social support as a buffer of life stress or as a direct contributor to well-being. Relatively little research has focused on children who witness marital violence (Osofsky, 1995a), considering the serious effects of exposure to violence on their development. Even less research has been undertaken with this unique population in terms of the links between their social support and socio-emotional adjustment. There is a need for empirical
research on children who witness marital violence with social support as a protective factor. In addition to social support, previous studies (Harter, 1985a, 1990a) revealed that children's perception of how well they performed in domains they believed important was another determinant of self-worth. This finding, however, has not been replicated with children from violent family environments. The purpose of this study is to examine the links between children's sense of worth and: (a) children's perception of how well they perform in domains they believe important, (b) children's social support, (b) mothers' social support, and (c) mothers' education level.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions apply:

**Family violence** is abuse that takes place in the family or in an intimate relationship. Such abuse takes many forms, including dating violence, wife assault, abuse and neglect of older adults, child abuse and neglect, child sexual abuse and witnessing the abuse of others in the family (MacLeod, 1994). Family violence can be physical and sexual, as well as psychological. It includes intimidation, neglect, and financial and personal exploitation (MacLeod, 1994). Wife assault is physical and/or psychological violence expressed by a husband, male, lesbian, or live-in lover (MacLeod, 1987). In the present study, family violence specifically indicates wife assault. Therefore, these two terms: (a) family violence, and (b) wife assault are used interchangeably.

**Transition house** refers to all shelters or residential facilities for abused women and their children (Statistics Canada, 1994). Transition houses: (a) house women and their children for up to eight weeks, (b) provide 24-hour service, and (c) meet the most basic and
practical needs of shelter, safety, a sense of security, child care, counseling, clothing, information and referral services. There is no charge.

Second stage transition house focuses on follow-up services rather than providing emergency refuge at a time of crisis. Second stage transition houses are developed to provide secure accommodation with some support and referral services for women and their children who choose not to return to their husbands and fathers (MacLeod, 1989). The maximum stay in second stage transition houses can range from three months to one year (Statistics Canada, 1994). In the present study, children and their mothers from both transition houses and second stage transition houses are examined.

Self-worth is "the degree to which one likes oneself as a person, likes the way one is leading one's life, is satisfied with oneself, in general, is happy with the way one is" (Harter, 1985a, p.1).

Children's social support refers to "the form of positive regard from significant others whose opinions would influence the self" (Harter, 1985b, p.1). Mothers' social support refers to their "beliefs that they have people who value and care about them and who are willing to try to help them if they need assistance or other support" (Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990, p.137-138).

Literature relevant to the present study will be reviewed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter critically reviews contemporary literature regarding wife assault, global self-worth, and social support. The literature is addressed under the following headings:

* The statistical facts of wife assault
* Effects of witnessing family violence on children
* Defining and assessing aspects of the self system
* Global self-worth
* Definitions of social support
* Harter's model of social support
* Sources of support for children
* Sources of support for children under stress
* Mothers' education level, mothers' social support, and their children's social support.

The chapter ends with a summary of the literature reviewed and a presentation of the research questions.

The Statistical Facts of Wife Assault

In this section, facts relevant to wife assault are presented. First, prevalence of wife assault is discussed. Second, types of violence occurring in marital relationships are identified. Third, educational level of victims and abusers is examined. Fourth, social
support for abused women is identified. Finally, the first language of women and age range of women and their children in transition houses are reported.

Wife assault happens in families of all cultural and social backgrounds, ages and income levels (MacLeod, 1979; Statistics Canada, 1994). Individuals with higher incomes, however, can more easily hide family violence and individuals with lower incomes are more likely to make use of public services, including the police (MacLeod, 1994).

Family violence can be physical and sexual, as well as emotional. Approximately one-third of all women who have ever been married have suffered emotional abuse (Statistics Canada, 1994). The most common forms of emotional abuse are: (a) the husband's insistence on knowing who his wife is with and where she is at all times, and (b) calling his wife names to put her down or make her feel bad (Statistics Canada, 1994). The most prevalent forms of physical abuse are women being pushed, grabbed, and shoved, followed by threats of hitting, slapping, throwing objects, and kicking, biting, and hitting with fists (Statistics Canada, 1994). A significant number of women also report being beaten up, sexually assaulted, choked, hit with an object, and having a gun or knife used against them (Statistics Canada, 1994). Statistics Canada (1994) revealed that: (a) one-third of women who were assaulted by a partner feared for their lives at some point during the abusive relationship, and (b) 45% of wife assault cases resulted in physical injury to the women.

Rates of wife assault show no variation by wives' educational level (less than high school diploma, high school diploma, some post secondary education, and university degree). Men with university education had the lowest rates of violence against their female partners (Statistics Canada, 1994).
When abused women were asked who they found most helpful in dealing with their traumatic experience, 40% stated that their family and friends were their greatest support (Statistics Canada, 1994).

Two-thirds of the women in transition houses preferred to speak English, almost one-quarter preferred French, and 12% had a preference for a language other than English or French (Statistics Canada, 1994). The largest proportion (64%) of women residing in transition houses were between the age of 25 and 44 (Statistics Canada, 1994). According to Statistics Canada (1994), 45% of all children admitted to residential facilities because of assault in the home were under 5 years old. Children between the ages of 5 and 9 accounted for 32%, and those between 10 and 14 made up 20%. The smallest group (3%) of children were between 15 and 18 years old.

**Effects of Witnessing Family Violence on Children**

In this section, both immediate and long-term effects of exposure to violence are considered. First, children's immediate, somatic, psychological and behavioral responses at different developmental levels are identified. Second, consequences of childhood exposure to domestic violence over the life-span are discussed.

**Immediate effects**

It has been documented that even infants are likely to exhibit irritability, sleep disturbance, and fear of being alone as a result of exposure to violence (Osofsky, 1995a). Young children may exhibit emotional distress, immature behaviors, somatic complaints, regressions in toileting and language, sleep disturbances and nightmares (Osofsky, 1995a, 1995b). School-age children may have externalizing and internalizing behavior problems (Jaffe, Wolfe, Wilson, & Zak, 1985, 1986). They may lie, cheat, destroy things at home or
school, or be cruel to others. They have difficulty in paying attention and concentrating. They may be withdrawn, passive, anxious, and less playful. They are likely to exhibit somatic complaints, school phobias, enuresis, and insomnia (Hilberman & Munson, 1977/1978; Osofsky, 1995a, 1995b). Adolescents may show high levels of aggression and anxiety. They may feel helpless and have school problems, including truancy. They may attach themselves to peer groups and gangs as substitute family and may act out (Osofsky, 1995a, 1995b).

**Long-term effects**

Social learning theory suggests that children imitate a number of the behaviors of adults around them, including aggression, the construction of abstract conceptual rules, and moral behavior (Bandura, 1969). Children who have witnessed wife assault may learn that violence is an acceptable way to relate to their partners and to resolve conflicts in relationships in the family (MacLeod, 1994). The Violence Against Women Survey (Statistics Canada, 1994) revealed that: (a) women currently in violent marriages were three times as likely as women in non-violent marriages to state that their fathers-in-law were violent towards their spouses, and were twice as likely to have witnessed their own fathers abusing their mothers, (b) women whose fathers-in-law were violent endured more severe and repeated types of violence than women whose fathers-in-law were not violent, and (c) 55% of women whose partners had witnessed violence reported that their own partners were violent on more than one occasion, compared to 35% of women whose partners had not witnessed violence. (Percentages do not add to 100 because of non-response.) Therefore, witnessing violence against one's mother will increase the likelihood that a woman will be involved in an abusive relationship herself, and that a man will be violent toward his spouse. As discussed in this section, children from violent
family environments may be highly stressed. As briefly presented in the previous chapter of this study, stressful life events may threaten a sense of worth in childhood (Cohen, Burt, & Bjorck, 1987; Sandler et al., 1989). In the next section, problems of definition in the study of self-worth will be addressed, followed by a brief discussion of existing theoretical models of the self system.

**Defining and Assessing Aspects of the Self System**

In the literature, self-concept and self-esteem often are used interchangeably because the distinction between these two terms is ambiguous. In addition, other self terms are used interchangeably with each of these two terms. "Terms used interchangeably with self-concept were identified as self, self-estimation, self-identity, self-image, self-perception, self-consciousness, self-imagery, and self-awareness; those used interchangeably with self-esteem were self-regard, self-reverence, self-acceptance, self-respect, self-worth, self-feeling, and self-evaluation" (Byrne, 1996, p.2). Conceptually, however, self-concept and self-esteem represent different aspects of the self system (Byrne, 1996). Brinthaupt and Erwin (1992) described the distinction between self-concept and self-esteem as similar to the difference between self-description and self-evaluation. According to Brinthaupt and Erwin (1992), self-concept refers to the descriptive aspects of the self. Self-esteem, on the other hand, refers to the evaluation of the described self.

As addressed above, there are a number of different terms used in the study of the self system, each of which slightly differs conceptually. Therefore, definitional imprecision at the conceptual level may cause us to choose the wrong measuring instrument, which ultimately threatens construct validity (Byrne, 1996). Byrne (1996)
described how definitional imprecision caused deficiencies in self system research as follows: (a) it makes replication of the study difficult; (b) it makes it difficult to select valid instruments; and (c) it obscures the conceptual model of the study. By doing so, it makes it impossible to link the research hypotheses and the findings to a particular theoretical model. Therefore, "it is critical that the researcher first clarify the particular theoretical framework he or she wishes to adopt and then select the most appropriate . . . measures accordingly" (Byrne, 1996, p.8). In order to do this in the present study, the term self-worth was chosen from the self terms described previously. Self-worth is operationalized as "the degree to which one likes oneself as a person, likes the way one is leading one's life, is satisfied with oneself, and is happy with the way one is" (Harter, 1985a, P.1). In order to justify the framework chosen for the present study, a brief discussion of existing theoretical models of the self system will be presented. According to Byrne (1996), there are seven theoretical models to define the self system.

**Nomothetic model**

In this model the term self-concept is used. In this model items on a measuring instrument tap different content areas (e.g., academic, social, physical, and emotional self-concept) and each area should be given equal weight. Then item scores are summed to yield one overall self-concept score. That is, this model considers that self-concept is an unidimensional construct.

**True unidimensional model**

In this model the term self-esteem is used. In this model each item on a measuring instrument is designed to measure only global self-esteem. The instrument yields a single score that represents only the level of an individual's global self-esteem. No attempt is
made to tap competencies in more specific domains (e.g., academic, social, physical). This model, naturally, considers self-esteem to be unidimensional.

**Independent-factor model**

In this model the term self-concept is used. In this model self-concept is composed of multiple facets (e.g., perceptions of self as a person, a student, and as competent in English, math, etc.), each of which is believed to be independent of all other dimensions; at worst, they should be only weakly correlated.

**Correlated-factor model**

In this model the term self-worth is used. This model considers that multiple, domain-specific competencies should be correlated both among themselves and with a separate facet of global self-worth. According to Harter (1990a), this model can theoretically and empirically separate domain-specific facets of self-perceived competence from a global self-worth construct. Furthermore, this model enables one to determine relationships that the specific competencies bear to global self-worth. In other words, this model can specify how the various dimensions are weighted and combined in yielding an overall sense of self-worth.

**Compensatory model**

In this model the term self-concept is used. This model considers that once a global self-concept has been accounted for, remaining variation is explained by multiple, domain-specific facets which can be negatively rather than positively correlated. This happens because in the unconscious attempt to maintain one's sense of well-being, low self-perceptions in one domain will be compensated by high self-perceptions in other domains.
**Taxonomic model**

In this model the term self-concept is used. This model requires performance of a factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) when the data are analyzed. In contrast to a one-way design in which there would be one facet (e.g., general self-concept) that has several levels (e.g., academic, social, physical self-concept), in a factorial design there would be at least two self-concept facets, each of which would have two or more levels. For example, the first facet could reflect domain-specific self-concept that has four levels (e.g., academic, social, physical and moral). The second facet could reflect an evaluative perspective that has two levels (e.g., a personal perspective and a significant-other perspective). In ANOVA terms, this factorial design, described above, exemplifies a 4 x 2 taxonomic design.

**Hierarchical model**

In this model the term self-concept is used. This model has a multidimensional and hierarchically ordered structure, with general self-concept at the apex of the pyramid. The second tier of the hierarchy comprises domain-specific self-concepts (e.g., academic, social, emotional, physical), which, although correlated, can be interpreted as separate constructs. The third tier of the hierarchy comprises subareas of each domain-specific self-concept (e.g., English, math under academic self-concept; peer acceptance under social self-concept; physical appearance under physical self-concept). "As such, general self-concept and each of its related domain-specific facets are tapped by items constituting each of their separate subscales" (Byrne, 1996, p.22).

In the present study global self-worth and domain-specific competencies of children in transition houses will be assessed. One of the questions explored in the study is: Which domain-specific competence has the strongest impact on the child's sense of
global self-worth? In order to explore this question, this study follows the Correlated-Factor Model developed by Harter (1985a). The following is an example of the investigation of this study.

Nine-year-old Mary and her mother have moved to the transition house for three weeks. Despite the fact that she had witnessed her mother being assaulted by her father for several years, Mary reported that she still evaluated her global self-worth as a person highly. Using the Correlated-Factor Model, it was found that: (a) Mary believed academic success to be very important; (b) she perceived herself as academically competent; and (c) academic competence had the strongest impact on her global sense of self-worth.

As previous studies indicate, "self-concept cannot be adequately understood if its multidimensionality is ignored" (Marsh, Byrne, & Shavelon, 1992, p.53). In Harter's model "individuals can make global judgments of their worth as a person as well as provide specific self-evaluations across a variety of domains" (Harter, 1996, p.10). In other words, this model considers self-concept to be multidimensional.

The Nomothetic Model and the True Unidimensional Model were not chosen for the present study because they consider self-concept to be unidimensional. The Independent-Factor Model was not chosen for the study because this model does not support the existence of a global self-concept (Byrne, 1996). In addition, though this model considered that each of several domain-specific self-concepts was independent of all other domains, substantial correlations among the subscales of multiple domains were reported by Marsh and Hattie (1996). Therefore, an instrument associated with this model is not empirically valid. The Compensatory Model was not chosen because its theoretical model was not defensible (Byrne, 1996; Marsh & Hattie, 1996). According to Marsh and Hattie (1996), the negative correlations among the domain-specific self-concepts don't
reflect a psychological process to maintain one's sense of well-being but an interpretational problem associated with the statistical analyses. In an instrument associated with this model, ranking yourself more highly on one scale (e.g., academic self-concept) necessarily means that rankings on the other scales (e.g., social, physical self-concept) must be lower. Therefore, these scores are deemed to be negatively correlated, which should not be interpreted as support for the compensatory model (Marsh & Hattie, 1996). The Taxonomic Model was not chosen in the present study because "scores that are based on [this model] are not always consistent with the design of the instrument" (Byrne, 1996, p.21). For example, the 4 x 2 taxonomic design mentioned earlier in this section allows two manifestations of moral self-concept (a personal perspective and a significant-other perspective). It is, however, inappropriate to summarize moral self-concept with a single score that confounds the two manifestations (Marsh & Hattie, 1996). The Hierarchical Model was not chosen in the present study because children start to think hierarchically, in other words, synthesize/integrate information at about 11 to 13 years (Luria, cited in Hattie & Marsh, 1996). Therefore, a hierarchical model of self-concept does not fit for all developmental levels of the participants of the present study (age ranging from 7 to 13). In addition, in this model, domains are not differentially weighted in terms of their importance to the self even though certain domains may be more important to one's overall sense of self than others (Harter, 1986, 1996).

As mentioned earlier in this section, the present study follows Harter's Correlated-Factor Model because this model: (a) considers self-concept to be multidimensional, (b) can measure the global self-worth construct directly in addition to self-evaluations across a variety of domains, (c) can weigh domains differently in terms of their importance to
the child's global self-worth, and (d) is relevant to middle childhood which is the period of development of interest in the present study.

In Harter's framework, self-worth is equivalent to self-esteem, operationalized as "the degree to which one likes oneself as a person, likes the way one is leading one's life, is satisfied with oneself, and is happy with the way one is" (Harter, 1985a, p.1). Accordingly, following Harter's theoretical model of self-concept, the term self-worth, rather than either self-concept or self-esteem, is used throughout the present study.

In the following section of this chapter, literature relevant to global self-worth is reviewed.

**Global Self-Worth**

Global self-worth is "an overall judgment about one's worth as a person" (Harter, 1985a, p.1). According to Harter (1985a, 1985b, 1990a), there are two factors related to a sense of global self-worth: (a) whether a person can perform competently in domains which he or she believes to be important (scholastic competence, athletic competence, peer social acceptance, behavioral conduct, and physical appearance), and (b) whether he or she can receive the emotional support from others they think significant.

The five domains mentioned above are relevant to children between the ages of eight and twelve (Harter, 1990a), the period which is the focus of the present study. "Developmentally, children's self-evaluations are affected by their cognitive capacities and consequently change profoundly over the life course" (Sandler et al., 1989, p.282). Therefore, as children develop, the number of domains that can be differentiated and evaluated increases (Harter, 1986). For example, developing an instrument for adolescents, Harter (1990a) included three new domains, close friendship, romantic
appeal, and job competence, in addition to the five mentioned above. According to Harter (1982, 1985b, 1986, 1990a, 1996) it is not until middle childhood (age 8) that children can make meaningful and reliable judgments about their global self-worth as a person. This is because "young children do not have a verbalizable concept of their self-worth, as tapped by self-report measures" (Harter, 1990a, p.70).

According to Harter (1985a, 1990a), James (as cited in Harter, 1990a) defined global self-worth as determined by the discrepancy between how well one aspired to perform in domains deemed important and how they actually performed in these domains. In order to test James's theory, Harter (1990a) conducted an empirical study. The independent variables she examined were: (a) children's' perceived competence or success across the various domains, (b) the importance attached to success in each domain, and (c) how competent children felt in domains they rated as important. The dependent variable was defined as global self-worth. Harter (1990a) found that global self-worth was determined by "one's prior evaluation of how competently one was performing in domains deemed important" (p.78). For example, one child may state, "I am not good at sports, but doing well in sports doesn't matter much to me. So, I still feel great about myself as a person." Another one may state, "I am very bad in mathematics, yet success in this subject is still extremely important to me. As a result, I feel terrible about myself as a person."

Therefore, in order for a child to enhance his or her global sense of worth, he or she needs to perform well in domains he or she believes to be important.

In this section, whether the child performs well in domains he or she believes to be important is defined as the determinant of a sense of global self-worth. As briefly mentioned earlier in this chapter, however, according to Harter (1985b, 1990a), there
exists another factor which impacts the child's sense of self-worth, that is, social support from significant others. Before turning to a discussion of Harter's model of social support, a brief description of existing theoretical models of social support will be presented.

**Definitions of Social Support**

Definitions of social support and their operationalization can be classified into three groups: social embeddedness, perceived social support, and enacted support (Barrera, 1986; Sandler et al., 1989; Wolchik et al., 1989).

**Social embeddedness**

Social embeddedness is "the connections that individuals have to significant others in their social environments" (Barrera, 1986, p.415). Measures of social embeddedness can examine structural characteristics of the social network such as: (a) the total number of social ties, (b) the presence or absence of an older sibling or a father, (c) the degree to which the network members interrelate with one another independent of their relationship with the focal person, and (d) the number of support providers who also are sources of interpersonal conflict (Wolchik et al., 1989). Measures of social embeddedness also can assess the number of network members who provide specific types of supportive exchanges (e.g., cognitive guidance, tangible assistance, recreation). Thus, measures of social embeddedness quantify the number of supporters or the amount of social contact.

**Perceived social support**

As discussed above, measures of social embeddedness identify important social relationships. It is erroneous, however, to assume that all such interpersonal relationships are characterized as supportive (Wellman, 1981). Measures of perceived social support,
on the other hand, attempt to capture individuals' perceived availability and adequacy of supportive ties. When perceived social support is assessed, social support is defined as individuals' beliefs that they are cared for and loved, esteemed, and have people who are willing to try to help them if they need support (Cobb, 1976; Sarason et al., 1990).

Enacted support

As discussed above, measures of perceived social support assess perceived availability and adequacy of support. Measures of enacted support, on the other hand, attempt to assess frequency and/or behavioral descriptions of received support (e.g., socializing, financial assistance, advice/guidance). There are two methods to measure enacted support. One approach actually assesses "perceived-received" support (Barrera, 1986, p.417) because these measures rely on one's retrospective evaluations. A second method involves behavioral observations of supportive exchanges. As Sarason, Shearin, Pierce, and Sarason (1987) argued, a measure of enacted support is influenced by the experience of life events; individuals who are currently dealing with stressful life events may be receiving more support than are others. In addition, people who are better able to cope successfully with a stressful situation on their own may not need as much support as others do (Sarason, Shearin, et al., 1987).

Previous studies revealed that perceived social support was highly correlated with measures of self-worth (Sarason et al., 1990; Sarason, Pierce, Bannerman, & Sarason, 1993). Sandler and Barrera (1984) found that: (a) perceived satisfaction with support was negatively related to measures of anxiety, depression, somatization, and an index of psychological disorder, and (b) scales assessing received support and total support network size were unrelated to any of the symptomatology measures. In addition, intercorrelations among social embeddedness, perceived social support, and enacted
support were reported to be low (Barrera, 1986; Wolchik et al., 1989), which indicated that these three concepts were distinctive. For example, as argued earlier in this section, having a larger number of members in the network does not mean that the individual is perceiving supportive interpersonal relationships more often than those who have relatively smaller network sizes. The lack of a link between perceived and enacted social support can be explained by the differing viewpoints of the support receivers. As Lakey and Lutz (1996) discussed, what is supportive for one person (e.g., advice) may be very unsupportive for others. Furthermore, perceived supportiveness often depends on how much a support provider is liked by a receiver, regardless of the supportive behaviors provided (Lakey & Lutz, 1996). Thus, it is measures of perceived social support, rather than either social embeddedness or enacted support, that: (a) are most indicative of good adjustment (Sarason, Shearin, et al., 1987), and (b) can be directly tied to theoretical models of the impact social support has on stressful life situations (Barrera, 1986; Wolchik et al., 1989).

In this section, three existing theoretical models of social support were introduced. In the following section of this chapter, a brief discussion of Harter's model of social support is presented, followed by a review of literature relevant to this framework.

**Harter's Model of Social Support**

According to Harter (1985a, 1985b, 1990a), Cooley (as cited in Harter, 1990a) defined global self-worth as determined by opinions of significant others toward the self. In order to test Cooley's theory, Harter (1990a) conducted a study in which others' opinions toward the self were defined as "the perceived positive regard as well as the emotional support that others displayed toward them" (p.77). Harter (1985b) examined:
(a) children's social support from significant others as the independent variable, and (b) their global self-worth as the dependent variable. Harter (1990a) found that "the more persons felt that significant others had regard for them, the higher their self-worth" (p.78). Therefore, in Harter's framework social support is: (a) perceived social support, (b) defined as "the form of positive regard from others" (Harter, 1985a, p.1), and (c) assessed as a determinant of the child's sense of global self-worth.

As discussed previously, another factor which impacts a sense of global self-worth is the child's perception of success in domains he or she believes to be important. According to Harter (1986, 1990a), the impact of these two determinants (perception of success in domains deemed important and social support) on self-worth is quite similar in magnitude. The low correlations between these two determinants reveal that they are relatively independent of each other (Harter, 1986, 1990a). Therefore, social support from significant others and whether the child performs well in domains he or she believes to be important are both equally influential on his or her level of self-worth.

In this section, children's support providers were described as significant others. In the following section, literature relevant to the significant others in children's lives will be presented.

Sources of Support for Children

As Pierce, Sarason, and Sarason (1992) pointed out, "the support people report receiving from others comes from a small group of significant individuals" (p.297). In the literature on children's social support networks, children's significant others are classified as: (a) parents, (b) siblings, (c) kin adults, (d) non-kin adults, (e) teachers, (f) peers, and (g) close friends.
Furman and Buhrmester (1985) identified children's significant others as the following individuals: (a) mother or stepmother, (b) father or stepfather, (c) grandparent, (d) older brother, (e) younger brother, (f) older sister, (g) younger sister, (h) best friend, and (i) teacher. In their study, Furman and Buhrmester (1985) assessed children's perceptions of personal relationships with the specific individuals mentioned above. They found that: (a) children were most satisfied with their relationships with mothers; (b) their relationships with mothers and fathers were most important; and (c) children expected different types of support (e.g., intimacy, companionship, affection, instrumental help) from different individuals in their lives.

Harter (1985b) defined children's significant others as: (a) parent, (b) classmate, (c) close friend, and (d) teacher. She included two sources of peer support (i.e., classmates and close friends) because she believed that "the nature and extent of support from these two groups might well differ" (Harter, 1985b, p.1). Her study of children and young adolescents revealed that parent and classmate support had the strongest impact on self-worth, followed by close friend support and then teacher support. It was noted that: (a) parents were still critical in their impact on their child's sense of worth in childhood and early adolescence, and (b) classmate support was significantly more predictive of self-worth than was close friend support during childhood and early adolescence (Harter, 1987).

In this section, particular significant individuals were described as important sources of support for children. In the following section, sources of support for children specifically under stress will be addressed.
Sources of Support for Children under Stress

In the present study, children who have witnessed wife assault are the focus. In this section, under the assumption that life must be stressful for these children, literature relevant to sources of support for children under stress will be discussed. According to the literature, children who need to cope with stressful life events are likely to have the following individuals as sources of support: (a) parents, (b) siblings, (c) kin adults, (d) non-kin adults, (e) teachers and (f) friends.

Parent support

Children with strong and determined surviving parents are protected from the negative impact of the death of a parent early in childhood (Brown, Harris, & Bifulco, 1986). Positive adjustment of children of divorce is related to a good relationship with the custodial parent, even when there was a poor relationship with the noncustodial parent (Hetherington et al., 1982).

Sibling support

Children with older siblings are protected from the negative impact of stressful life events (Sandler, 1980). Long and Long (as cited in Belle, 1989) observed that latchkey children without adult supervision were less likely to develop high levels of fear and sleep disturbance if they spent their unsupervised time at home with siblings rather than alone.

Kin adult support

Developmental psychologists are just beginning to understand the influence of nonhousehold adults, especially relatives, on child development. Riley and Cochran (1987) found a strong, positive link between the number of male relatives who took one-parent (mother-only) boys on outings and the boys' academic success.
Non-kin adult support

Sandler et al. (1989) suggested that new sources of support might be particularly salient for children experiencing family transitions. In transition houses, children are exposed to new sources of support (e.g., transition house staffs, child caregivers, counselors). In the literature on transition houses, however, supportive interactions between children and non-kin adults and their impact on children's sense of self-worth have not explored empirically.

Teacher support

Another form of non-kin adult support is support from teachers. According to Furman and Buhrmester (1992), Caucasian children from middle- to upper-middle-class families consider teachers as secondary attachment figures, providing them nurturance and assistance. As children grow older, they consider teachers as less frequent sources of support because support from others (e.g., peers, close friends) becomes more critical. Cauce, Felner, and Primavera (1982), on the other hand, examined a group of high-risk adolescents from the inner-city lower socioeconomic class (66.8% black, 22.4% white, 9.6% Hispanic, and 1.2% other) and came to a somewhat different conclusion. They defined support from individuals such as teachers, counselors, and clergy as Formal Support. They found that older adolescents perceived Formal Support as more helpful than their younger counterparts did. Therefore, according to Cauce et al. (1982), interventions employing individuals such as school personnel or counselors are particularly appropriate for high-risk adolescents.

Felner, Ginter, and Primavera (1982) found that support from teachers and peers was significantly helpful for adolescents making the transition to junior high school. In order to minimize the instability due to the students' new relations with other students and
teachers, they: (a) assigned the guidance and administrative duties usually carried out by other school personnel to the homeroom teacher, and (b) structured an environment so that students could take their core academic classes with the same group of peers. They found that students who had more stable and better organized relationships with teachers and peers, as compared with matched controls, achieved better grades, had fewer absences and less decrease in self-esteem, and perceived the new school environment more positively. Felner et al. noted that the stable relationships with teachers and peers provided students undergoing the transition experience a sense of security.

Friend support

Friends, as well as adults, can provide emotional security to children experiencing extreme stress including the loss of both parents (Freud & Dann, cited in Belle, 1989). Berndt and Perry (1986) found that when children needed help in adjusting to a new social situation (e.g., the transition to junior high school), friends who provided companionship and advice could be a significant source of support.

In the present study, children's social support from the following individuals will be examined: (a) mother, (b) non-kin adult, (c) teacher, (d) sibling, and (e) close friend. Father support will not be included in the study because: (a) fathers are the cause of the violent family environment, and (b) children who are to participate in the study don't reside with their fathers. Teacher support (Cause et al. 1982; Felner et al. 1982; Furman & Buhrmester, 1992), non-kin adult support (Sandler et al. 1989), sibling support (Long & Long, as cited in Belle, 1989; Sandler, 1980), and friend support (Berndt & Perry, 1986; Freud & Dann, as cited in Belle, 1989) will be included because, as discussed earlier in this section, their significant impacts on positive adjustment of children under
stress were reported in the literature. Throughout this study non-kin adult indicates people in transition houses (e.g., staff, childcare workers) and the counselors specifically trained for children who have witnessed wife assault.

   In the following section, literature relevant to the links among mothers' education level, mothers' social support, and their children's social support will be discussed.

**Mothers' Education Level, Mothers' Social Support, and Their Children's Social Support**

   As described in Chapter One of this thesis, previous studies revealed the links among parents' education level, their social support, and their children's social support. For example, Zelkowitz and Jacobs (as cited in Tietjen, 1989) found that preschool children whose parents had more education had many more individuals in their social networks than other children. Riley and Cochran (1987) found that the strongest predictor of the number of individuals in the child's social network was neither the child's gender nor family structure (mother-only household or two-parent household), but the mothers' education levels. The two studies described above focused on the number of individuals in children's networks as the outcome measure. The literature on social support discussed previously in this chapter, however, reveals that it is perceived availability of social support, rather than the number of individuals in the network, that is most indicative of good adjustment. Therefore, there is a need for a study which examines the links between parents' education level and their children's perceived social support. In addition, in the literature on social support, links among mothers' education level, mothers' perceived social support, and their children's perceived social support have not been explored with children under stress. In the present study, mothers' education level will be examined as:
(a) a direct factor related to mothers' perceived social support, and (b) an indirect factor related to their children's social support.

**Summary**

The literature reviewed in this chapter revealed: (a) the serious effects of witnessing wife assault on children's adjustment, (b) the lack of empirical research on links between support and sense of global self-worth in children who have witnessed wife assault, and (c) the need for empirical research on the links among mothers' education level, mothers' perceived social support, and their children's perceived social support.

Harter's model of global self-worth was chosen for this study because this model enables one to identify which domain has the strongest impact on children's global self-worth. Harter's model of social support was chosen for this study because this model enables one to examine: (a) children's perceptions of positive regard stemming from each of several important relationships, and (b) whose support is the biggest contributor to children's self-worth. The effects of support from non-kin adults (e.g., counselor, child caregiver, teacher) on children's global self-worth are of particular interest in the present study because non-kin adult support seems to be critical for children who have witnessed wife assault, and has not been examined fully in children's self-worth research.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of the present study is to address the following questions regarding children exposed to family violence.
Question 1: How are the discrepancies between children’s perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance across five domains (scholastic, athletic, social, behavioral, physical) related to their global self-worth?

Question 2: How are various types of children's social support related to their global self-worth?

Question 3: How is the mean of the discrepancies between children’s perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance across five domains related to their global self-worth?

Question 4: How are children’s social support related to their global self-worth?

Question 5: Will a combination of a particular level of discrepancy between children’s perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance and social support have an influence on children’s global self-worth?

Question 6: How are mothers' education levels and their perceived social support related to their children's social support?

Question 7: How is mothers’ social support related to their children’s social support without taking the effects of mother’s education level into account?
Question 8: How are children’s social support, the average of discrepancies between children’s perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance across five domains, their mothers’ social support, and their mothers’ education level related to children’s global self-worth?

Question 9: How is children’s social support related to their global self-worth without taking the effects of their mothers’ education level and their social support into account?

The next chapter states the hypotheses stemming from these questions and describes the methodology used in the present study. The present study utilizes a correlational design.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology used in the present study. The methodology is described under the following headings:

* Hypotheses
* Participants
* Setting
* Instruments
* Procedures
* Design
* Independent variables and dependent variables

The chapter ends with a summary of the methodology presented.

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study is to test the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1:

Physical appearance will be more positively related to children's global self-worth than the other four domain-specific competencies measured (i.e., scholastic competence, athletic competence, peer acceptance, and behavioral conduct). This hypothesis is based on Harter's (1985a) findings that: (a) certain domains had more significant impact on self-
worth than others, and (b) physical appearance was the most important contributor among five domain-specific competencies to self-worth for the children in middle childhood.

Hypothesis 2:

Mother support will be more positively related to children's self-worth than the other four supports (i.e., close friend support, sibling support, teacher support, non-kin adult support). This hypothesis is based on Harter's (1985b) finding that parent and classmate support among four supports (parent support, teacher support, close friend support, classmate support) had the strongest impact on children's self-worth.

Hypothesis 3:

Children with a low discrepancy between their perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance will have significantly higher senses of global self-worth than children with a high discrepancy.

Hypothesis 4:

Children with high social support will have significantly higher senses of global self-worth than children with low social support.

Hypothesis 5:

A combination of children's social support and discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance will be significantly related to their senses of global self-worth. This hypothesis is based on Harter's (1987, 1990a) findings that: (a) the child with the highest level of self-worth was one who possessed a
combination of high social support and a low discrepancy score, and (b) the child with the
lowest level of self-worth was one who possessed a combination of low social support
and a high discrepancy score.

Hypothesis 6:
Mothers' education level will be significantly positively related to their social
support.

Hypothesis 7:
Mothers' social support is a significant predictor of their children's social support,
holding constant the effects of mothers' education level.

Hypothesis 8:
Children's social support and discrepancy between children's perceptions of
competence and their ratings of importance are the two strongest among four independent
variables (children's social support, discrepancy between children's perceptions of
competence and their ratings of importance, their mothers' social support, and their
mothers' education level) as predictors of children's global self-worth.

Hypothesis 9:
Children's social support is a significant predictor of their global self-worth,
holding constant the effects of their mothers' education level and their social support.

In the following section, participants of this study will be described.
**Participants**

Participants were 31 boys and 25 girls (55% and 45% of the sample, respectively) aged 7 to 13 years from 38 different families and their mothers. Participants were recruited through transition houses and community organizations which were offering counseling services for assaulted women and their children in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. Approximately 30% of the families who had been contacted participated in the study. It was usually when the counsellors and/or transition house staff were interested in the study, and suggested that the families participate, that they actually did participate. At the time of data collection (1997-1998), 32 families were receiving the counseling services as the result of family violence. Table 1 displays demographic information for the children.

Table 1

*Means and Standard Deviations of Demographic Information for Children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in Months</td>
<td>116.75</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Brothers</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sisters</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 56.*

Six children (11%) had been taking home based school programs. All the children understood English sufficiently well to answer the questionnaires. Forty-four children (79%) spoke English as their first language. Other languages children spoke as their first languages were: Persian (n = 3), Cantonese (n = 3), Hindi (n = 2), Punjabi (n = 2), Spanish (n = 1), and Urdu (n = 1). In the present study, children were classified as
belonging to ethnic minority groups if they satisfied at least two out of three conditions as follows: (a) he/she was visible minority, (b) one of his/her parents had been born out of Canada, and (c) English was not spoken at his/her home. Twenty-four children (43%) were classified as belonging to ethnic minority groups. Fifteen children (27%) were residing in transition houses with their mothers. Forty-one children (73%) had left the transition houses already, and were living with their mothers on their own. Among those 41 children, some left the transition houses approximately two years ago, and others left fairly recently. Most of the children had been/were participating in group or individual counseling programs for children who witnessed family violence.

Table 2 displays demographic information for mothers. Table 3 shows the distribution of mothers' education levels.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Demographic Information for Mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 38.

Table 3

Distribution of Mothers' Education Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post secondary education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 38.
Mothers' education level was assessed using the following categorization developed by Statistics Canada (1994): (a) less than high school diploma, (b) high school diploma, (c) some post secondary education, and (d) university degree. This yields a mothers' education level score that ranges between 1 and 4 where 1 represents the lowest level of education and 4 represents the highest level of education.

English was spoken by 28 mothers (74%) as their first language. Other languages spoken by mothers were: Persian (n = 2), Cantonese (n = 2), Hindi (n = 2), Punjabi (n = 2), Spanish (n = 1), and Urdu (n = 1). Data were collected from two mothers with the help of interpreters. Eight mothers (21%) were residing in transition houses with their children. Thirty mothers (79%) had left the transition houses already, and were living on their own. Most of the mothers had been/were receiving group or individual counseling services as the result of having been assaulted by their husbands or boyfriends. The participants in the study consisted of low-income families who were/had been receiving services free of charge.

The participants agreed to act as volunteers for this study; therefore the sample was non-random. Mother characteristics were coded according to the following criteria: age in years, language preferred, and education level. Child characteristics were coded according to the following criteria: age in months, gender, language preferred, and number and age of siblings. Each mother and child gave the researcher informed consent to participate. The participants were assured that all information would be coded and kept confidential. All participants were guaranteed anonymity.
Setting

The data were collected in a designated room at the transition houses where children and their mothers resided and at the community organizations where children and/or their mothers were participating in the counseling programs.

In the following section, instruments used to measure: (a) children's global self-worth, (b) the discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance, (c) children's social support, (d) mothers' education level, and (e) mothers' social support are presented.

Instruments

The Self-Perception Profile for Children (SPPC; Harter, 1985a)

Designed for children ranging in age from eight to 15, the SPPC taps children's perceptions of themselves in a number of domains. This instrument is theoretically linked to the Correlated-Factor Model of self-concept addressed in the previous chapter. This instrument can: (a) measure the global self-worth construct directly, as well as independently of domain-specific perceptions of competence, and (b) weigh domains differently in terms of their importance to the child's global self-worth. The SPPC contains six separate subscales. Five scales are designed to tap the following five specific domains: (a) Scholastic Competence, (b) Social Acceptance, (c) Athletic Competence, (d) Physical Appearance, and (e) Behavioral Conduct. One is designed to tap global self-worth. The Scholastic Competence subscale taps "the child's perceptions of his or her competence or ability within the realm of scholastic performance" (Harter, 1985a, p.6). The Social Acceptance subscale taps "the degree to which the child is accepted by peers or feels popular" (Harter, 1985a, p.6). The Athletic Competence subscale taps the child's
perception of his or her competence within the realm of sports and outdoor games. The Physical Appearance subscale taps "the degree to which the child is happy with the way he or she looks, likes one's height, weight, body, face, hair, and feels that he or she is good-looking" (Harter, 1985a, p.6). The Behavioral Conduct subscale taps "the degree to which children like the way they behave, do the right thing, act the way they are supposed to, avoid getting into trouble, and do the things they are supposed to do" (Harter, 1985a, p.6). The Global Self-Worth subscale taps "the extent to which the child likes oneself as a person, is happy the way one is leading one's life, and is generally happy with the way one is" (Harter, 1985a, p.6).

Each subscale of the SPPC contains six items, constituting a total of 36 items. An example from the Scholastic Competence scale is, "Some kids feel that they are very good at their school work BUT Other kids worry about whether they can do the school work assigned to them." The child is first asked to choose which kind of kid is most like him or her, and then asked to judge whether this is "sort of true" or "really true" for him or her. The responses are scored on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (low perceived competence) to 4 (high perceived competence). In the example given above, the child who first judges that he feels that he is very good at his school work and then describes this as really true for him would receive a 4. The child for whom this part of the statement is only sort of true for him would receive a 3. The child who judges that he worries about whether he can do the school work assigned to him, though describes this as only sort of true for him, would receive a 2, and the child for whom this part of the statement is really true would receive a 1. Within each subscale, item scores are averaged, thereby yielding a total profile of six scores, each of which has a mean ranging from one to four. The effectiveness of this 4-point structured-alternative format, according to Harter (1985a), is
"the implication that half of the kids in the world...view themselves in one way, whereas the other half view themselves in the opposite manner" (p.7). Therefore, either choice is legitimate. In other words, the SPPC can avoid pulling for socially desirable responses. In the example given above, the first part of the statement reflects high competence, and the second part of the statement reflects low competence. Within each subscale, three out of the six items are worded such that the first part of the statement reflects high competence, and three items are worded such that the first part of the statement reflects low competence. Both the type of statement presented first and the domains represented are presented randomly.

Harter (1985a) reported internal consistency reliability coefficients for each of six subscales ranging from .80 to .85 for Scholastic Competence, from .75 to .80 for Social Acceptance, from .80 to .86 for Athletic Competence, from .76 to .82 for Physical Appearance, from .71 to .77 for Behavioral Conduct, and from .78 to .84 for Global Self-Worth. The factor pattern for the five domain-specific subscales was reported to be replicable across several samples (Harter, 1985a), which supported factorial validity of the SPPC. As Keith and Bracken (1996) pointed out, however, the Global Self-Worth subscale was not included in the factor analysis. Harter (1982, 1986, 1990b) reported predictive, convergent, discriminant, and construct validity of the SPPC. Test-retest reliability estimates are reported to range from .40 to .65, across the various subscales, over from one-month to one-year intervals (Harter, 1990b).

The discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance was assessed by administering a separate measure, entitled How Important
are These Things to How You Feel About Yourself as a Person, attached to the SPPC. Each of the five domain-specific subscales consists of two items, resulting in a ten-item scale. An example from the Social Acceptance scale is, "Some kids think it's important to be popular BUT Other kids don't think that being popular is all that important to how they feel about themselves." First, the child is asked to choose which kind of kid is most like him or her, and then asked to judge whether this is "sort of true" or "really true" for him or her. The responses are scored on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (low importance) to 4 (high importance). Second, in order to calculate the mean importance score for each domain, the two scores for each domain are averaged. As discussed in the previous chapter, Harter's model of self-worth is based on William James' (as cited in Harter, 1985a, 1985b, 1990a) view of development of the self. According to Harter (1985a), James assumed that only those domains in which success was important would have an impact on global self-worth. Therefore, those domains in which the Importance Score is either 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 are used for calculation of the discrepancy score. Third, the Importance Ratings which are either 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 in value are subtracted from their respective Competence scores for each domain rated as important. "If the Importance Rating...is greater than the Competence score...then the Discrepancy Score will be negative. If the Importance Rating is smaller then the Competence score, then the Discrepancy Score will be positive" (Harter, 1985a, p.24). In order to obtain a Total Discrepancy Score, the discrepancy scores are added up with their sign being taken into account. Finally, in order to obtain the Mean Discrepancy score, a Total Discrepancy score is divided by the number of domains rated as important. A large negative Mean Discrepancy score is related to low self-worth due to low perceived competence in domains deemed important. A small negative, zero, or positive Mean Discrepancy score
is related to high self-worth due to high perceived competence in domains deemed important. The graph presenting norms on the relationship between Mean Discrepancy and Self-Worth scores is provided in the SPPC.

The Social Support Scale for Children (SSSC; Harter, 1985b)

Designed for children in middle childhood (older than age eight), the SSSC taps "the perceived support and regard which significant others manifest toward the self" (Harter, 1985b, p.1). This instrument can identify several significant others whose opinions would influence one's sense of global self-worth as a person. Therefore, items in the SSSC tap "the degree to which others treated them like a person, liked them the way they are, cared about their feelings, understood them, and listened to their problems..." (Harter, 1985b, p.1). The SSSC examines social support from the following individuals: (a) parents, (b) teachers, (c) classmates, and (d) close friends. In the present study, however, Mother support, instead of Parent support, was assessed. Classmate support was replaced with Sibling support. In addition, Non-kin adult support was included in the instrument. Thus, the present study identifies five sources of support: (a) mothers, (b) close friends, (c) teachers, (d) siblings, and (e) non-kin adults. The mother scale of the SSSC taps "the extent to which [mothers] understand their children, want to hear about their children's problems, care about their feelings, treat them like a person who really matters, like them the way they are and act like what their children do is important" (Harter, 1985b, p.2). The close friend scale assesses "whether the child has a close friend who they can tell problems to, who really understands them, who they can complain to about things that bother them, who they can spend time with, and who really listens to what they say" (Harter, 1985b, p.2). The teacher scale taps "the degree to which one's teachers help them if they are upset, help them do their very best, care about them, are fair
to them, and treat them as a person" (Harter, 1985b, p.2). The sibling scale taps "the extent to which one's [siblings] like them the way they are, are friendly, don't make fun of them, listen to what they say, and ask them to join in play or games" (Harter, 1985b, p.2).

The non-kin adult scale assesses the degree to which people in transition houses understand children they deal with, want to hear about their problems, care about their feelings, treat them like a person who really matters, like them the way they are, help them if they are upset, help them do their very best, and are fair to them (Harter, 1985b).

In the present study, the parent and classmate scale were modified so as they could serve as the mother and sibling scale, respectively. This was done simply by changing the wording; "Parents", "classmates", and "recess" were replaced with "mothers", "brothers or sisters", and "time", respectively. Harter (1985b) suggested that when one adds subscales to tap different sources of support, it is wise to write more than six items per subscale (e.g., ten), so as one can make sure that a subset of approximately six will prove reliable.

In order to develop the non-kin adult scale, following Harter's suggestion, ten items were taken from the parent and teacher scale and modified; "parents" and "a teacher" were replaced with "grown-ups in this place."

Each of the mother, teacher, sibling, and close friend subscales contains six items. The non-kin adult subscale contains 10 items. There are a total of 34 items on the instrument. The question format of the SSSC is the same as that of the SPPC. An example from the Mother support scale is, "Some kids have mothers who care about their feelings BUT Other kids have mothers who don't seem to care very much about their feelings." The child is first asked to choose which kind of kid is most like him or her, and then asked to judge whether this is "sort of true" or "really true" for him or her. The responses are scored on a four-point scale ranging from 1 to 4 where 4 represents the
highest level of support (i.e., really true that my mother cares about my feelings) and 1 represents the lowest level of support (i.e., really true that my mother doesn't care very much about my feelings). Each subscale has a mean ranging from one to four.

Harter (1985b) reported internal consistency reliability coefficients for each of four subscales; these ranged from .78 to .88 for Parent support, from .74 to .79 for Classmate support, from .81 to .84 for Teacher support, and from .72 to .83 for Close friend support. Factor analysis revealed that: (a) for the elementary school children in Grade 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the two peer scales, classmate and close friend, combined to form one factor; in other words, these two peer scales were moderately or highly correlated with each other, and (b) for the middle school students in Grade 6, 7, and 8, the classmate and close friend subscale emerged as separate factors. Therefore, Harter (1985b) concluded that the younger children were not capable of differentiating the roles of classmates and close friends. The young adolescents, on the other hand, can make a clear distinction between the roles of classmates and close friends as close friendships become critical in their lives (Harter, 1985b). Harter (1985b) reported that social support from significant others was correlated with self-worth, which supported construct validity of the SSSC. Additional validity data were reported for individual subscales (Harter, 1985b). The Classmate support subscale was found to be positively and strongly correlated with one's perceived popularity. The Close friend subscale for the middle school students (Grade 6, 7, and 8) was found to be positively correlated with children's perceived ability to confide in a friend. In addition, the Parent support subscale was found to be positively correlated with a measure of the congruence of values among children in Grade 5 and 6 and their parents.
The Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ, Short Form; Sarason, Sarason, Shearin, & Pierce, 1987)

Mothers' perceived social support was assessed using the short form of the SSQ. This instrument measures adult's perceived availability of and satisfaction with social support. The SSQ defines social support as individuals' "beliefs that they have people who value and care about them and who are willing to try to help them if they need assistance or other support" (Sarason et al., 1990, p. 137-138). The SSQ consists of 6 items; it is a short form of the 27-item long form of the SSQ (Sarason, Sarason, Shearin et al., 1987). The short form of the SSQ asks participants to list up to nine individuals as potential supporters in each of six different situations. The original long form of the SSQ, on the other hand, asks participants to list up to nine individuals perceived to be available as potential supporters across 27 situations. The short form of the SSQ was developed by determining the group of items that correlated highly with the 27-item form of the SSQ. The correlations between the short and long form of the SSQ are high, even when the six items of the SSQ short are removed from the 27-item version (Sarason, Sarason, Shearin et al., 1987). The strengths of the long form of the SSQ are the absence of the ceiling effect and the accompanying heterogeneity of variance. The strengths of the short form of the SSQ are that it is psychometrically sound and can be administered in a few minutes. The long form of the SSQ, on the other hand, takes fifteen to eighteen minutes to administer. In the present study the short form of the SSQ was chosen because: (a) a previous study (Sarason, Sarason, Shearin et al., 1987) supported construct validity, test-retest reliability, and internal reliability of the short form of the SSQ; (b) it is less time-consuming for participants to complete; and (c) the long form of the SSQ may cause additional stress for mothers who are already in a stressful situation.
As described above, the SSQ short form consists of 6 items. First, each item asks participants to list up to nine individuals to whom they can turn and on whom they can rely in given sets of circumstances. The SSQ items include, "Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset?" and "Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?" The number (N) score for each item of the SSQ is the number of persons listed. The overall N score is obtained by dividing the sum of N scores for all items by 6, the number of items. Second, participants are asked to indicate how satisfied they are with social support in each of six situations. A satisfaction (S) score is rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging between 1 and 6 where 1 represents "very dissatisfied" and 6 represents "very satisfied." The overall S score is obtained by dividing the sum of S scores for all items by 6, the number of items.

The SSQ was chosen for the present study because: (a) it was developed for an adult population; (b) it has been found to have stability over time and high internal consistency among items (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983; Sarason, Sarason, Hacker, & Basham, 1985; Sarason, Sarason, & Shearin, 1986); and (c) previous studies supported its construct and discriminant validity (Pierce, Sarason, & Sarason, 1992; Sarason, Levine et al., 1983; Sarason, Sarason, Hacker et al., 1985; Sarason, Sarason, & Shearin, 1986; Sarason, Sarason, Shearin et al., 1987; Sarason et al., 1990; Sarason, Pierce, Shearin, Sarason, & Waltz, 1991; Sarason, Pierce, & Bannerman, 1993). In one study (Sarason, Levine et al., 1983), it was reported that: (a) the test-retest correlations for N and S were .90 and .83, respectively (4-week interval); and (b) the alpha coefficients of internal reliability for N and S were .97 and .94, respectively. Both the SSQ-N and SSQ-S scales have been shown to be negatively related to measures of loneliness, depression, anxiety, and hostility, as well as perceived separation anxiety in childhood. The SSQ-N
scores were found to be positively related to extroversion, whereas the SSQ-S scores were found to be inversely related to neuroticism. Furthermore, the correlation between negative life events and illness was much stronger among those with low SSQ scores. In addition, neither of the SSQ scales was significantly correlated with social desirability. Thus, the SSQ is not highly biased by the social desirability response set. In the same study (Sarason, Levine et al., 1983), the correlation between N and S scores was reported to be .34. According to Sarason, Levine et al. (1983) this low correlation indicated that the two SSQ scores represented different dimensions of the construct of perceived social support, that is, the perceived availability of support and the satisfaction with the support that is available. Likewise, factor analyses of the SSQ-N and SSQ-S scales revealed that these two scales were composed of different, unitary dimensions. In the present study, both the SSQ-N and the SSQ-S scales were administered to mothers.

**Procedures**

Twenty-four transition houses in Burnaby, Chilliwack, Coquitlam, Golden, Kamloops, Kelowna, Nanaimo, North Vancouver, Prince George, Richmond, Salmon Arm, Sunshine Coast, Surrey, Vancouver, Victoria, and Williams Lake, and 11 community organizations in Abbotsford, Langley, Maple Ridge, Mission, New Westminster, Penticton, Sunshine Coast, Vancouver, and White Rock received a letter inviting them to participate in the study. The letter included a consent form outlining the purpose of the present study, and guaranteeing anonymity to participants. The letter offered the participants a chance to obtain a summary of the research findings, and asked them to indicate whether they were interested in receiving such a summary. A copy of the letter to the transition house and/or community organization is shown in Appendix A. A
week later, each transition house and community organization was telephoned to determine their interest in participating. Six transition houses and nine community organizations in the lower mainland of British Columbia replied that they were willing to participate in the study.

After having obtained informed consent, the researcher visited the transition houses and community organizations to contact children ranging in age from 7 to 13 and their mothers. Each child and his or her mother received a letter. A copy of letter to the mother is shown in Appendix B. A copy of letter to the child is shown in Appendix C. The letter included a consent form outlining the purpose of the present study, and guaranteeing anonymity to participants. Children and their mothers were told that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. Within a couple of days, the researcher visited children and their mothers again, and asked for informed consent. The researcher scheduled the sessions for the data collection only with those mothers and their children who had agreed to participate in the study. Each family participated received an honorarium in the amount of $10. These procedures were repeated until 56 children from 38 different families were recruited from the three transition houses in Chilliwack and Vancouver, and the six community organizations in Burnaby, Maple Ridge, New Westminster, Sunshine Coast, Surrey, and Vancouver.

The sessions for the data collection were held by the researcher herself. All the questionnaires were administered individually to participants. Mothers were asked to fill out a demographic information form. A copy of this form is shown in Appendix D. After brief instructions, the Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ, Short Form; Sarason, Sarason, & Shearin et al., 1987) was administered to them. A copy of the SSQ and instructions to the mother as to how to answer the SSQ is shown in Appendix E. The administration
time for mothers was approximately 10 minutes. Children were asked to fill out a demographic information form. A copy of this form is shown in Appendix F. Then *The Self-Perception Profile for Children (SPPC; Harter, 1985a)*, the *How Important are These Things to How You Feel About Yourself (Harter, 1985a, attached to the SPPC; Harter, 1985a)*, and *The Social Support Scale for Children (SSSC; Harter, 1985b)* were administered. The sibling subscale of the SSSC was administered only to those who had siblings older than age six because it is recognized that children younger than age six are not capable of taking others' perspectives (Santrock & Yussen, 1992). Close friends and teachers referred to in the SSSC are those who were interacting with the study's participants at the time of the data collection. Brief instructions were given prior to the administration of each of the three questionnaires. Copies of the SPPC, *How Important are These Things to How You Feel About Yourself*, the SSSC, and instructions to the child as to how to answer these instruments are shown in Appendices G, H, and I. Following Harter's (1985a, 1985b) suggestions, the questionnaire items were read out loud for children from 7 to 10 years of age. It was emphasized that there were no right or wrong answers. The order of the three questionnaires was varied for each child in order to counter any effects of the order of presentation. The administration time for children was approximately 35 to 40 minutes. Children took a 5-minute break after administration of the demographic information form and one of the three questionnaires.

**Design**

The present study utilized a correlational design. The data were analyzed by computing zero-order correlations and performing multiple regressions. Results of these analyses are presented in Chapter 4.
Independent Variables and Dependent Variable

The independent variables of the present study were: (a) the discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance, (b) children's perceived social support, (c) mothers' education level, and (d) mothers' satisfaction with support. The dependent variables of this study were children's sense of global self-worth and children's perceived social support.

Summary

In this chapter, the study's hypotheses were presented, followed by relevant demographic characteristics of participants. The data collection procedures, as well as the instruments and the design chosen for this study were described. Finally, the independent variables and the dependent variables of the present study were defined.

The next chapter presents the results of the study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the present study. Descriptive statistics and the results of analyses pertinent to each of the nine hypotheses are presented. Analyses were performed using SPSS 7.5 (1997). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. The chapter ends with a summary of the results presented.

Effect of Gender

As described in the previous chapter, 31 boys and 25 girls participated in the present study. In order to test the effect of gender on Global Self-Worth and Children's Social Support, two one-way ANOVAs were performed. Neither test was significant, \( F(1, 55) = .008, p = .93 \), for Global Self-Worth, and \( F(1, 55) = 1.90, p = .17 \), for Children's Social Support.

Results of Analyses

For clarity of presentation, each hypothesis is restated before presenting relevant results.

Hypothesis 1

The discrepancy between children's perceptions of Physical Appearance and their ratings of importance in this domain will be more positively related to children's Global Self-Worth than discrepancies between the other four domain-specific competencies measured.
(i.e., Scholastic Competence, Athletic Competence, Social Acceptance, and Behavioral Conduct) and the ratings of importance in these domains.

In order to test Hypothesis 1, interrelations among Global Self-Worth and each discrepancy score for the five domains rated on Harter's (1985a) *Self-Perception Profile for Children* were examined. Two cases in each of Physical Appearance (Children 39 & 40) and Global Self-Worth (Children 2 & 49) were identified as univariate outliers because of their extremely low scores. These cases were deleted from this analysis and also from several subsequent analyses for Hypotheses 4, 5, 8, and 9. With all four outliers deleted, 52 cases remained for each variable. Table 4 displays means and standard deviations (SD) of variables for this subsample of children. Table 5 shows the intercorrelations among the variables.

Contrary to prediction, the discrepancy between children's perceptions of Scholastic Competence and the ratings of importance in this domain was found to be more positively related to Global Self-Worth than the discrepancies between the other four domain-specific competencies and the ratings of importance in these domains.

In order to test for the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficient for Global Self-Worth and Scholastic Competence/Importance Discrepancy, and the correlation coefficient for Global Self-Worth and Physical Appearance/Importance Discrepancy, a *t* test was conducted (Bruning & Kintz, 1987). A nonsignificant *t* was obtained, *t*(49) = .41.
Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations of Children's Global Self-Worth, Domain-Specific Competencies, Domain-Specific Importance, and Domain-Specific Competence/Importance Discrepancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Worth a</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain-Specific Competence b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Competence</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Conduct</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Appearance</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Competence</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain-Specific Importance c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Competence</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Conduct</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Appearance</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Competence</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Conduct/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Appearance/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Acceptance/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=52.
a The score ranged from 1 (low self-worth) to 4 (high self-worth).
b The score ranged from 1 (low perceived competence) to 4 (high perceived competence).
c The score ranged from 1 (low importance) to 4 (high importance).

Table 5
Intercorrelations among Global Self-Worth and Domain-Specific Competence/Importance Discrepancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Athletic Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavioral Conduct/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Appearance/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Acceptance/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scholastic Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=52.
* p < .05.  ** p < .01.
In order to understand the findings presented above further, intercorrelations among Global Self-Worth and each of the ratings of the five domain-specific competencies were examined. Because these ratings represent the absolute value assigned to them by children, they make a conceptual contribution to the study. These ratings were also examined because they are less variable than the discrepancy scores (see Table 4).

Table 6 displays the intercorrelations among the variables. Physical Appearance, Scholastic Competence, and Behavioral Conduct were found to be related significantly and positively to Global Self-Worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Athletic Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavioral Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scholastic Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 52 \).
* \( p < .05 \).  ** \( p < .01 \).

In order to test for the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficient for Global Self-Worth and Physical Appearance and the correlation coefficient for Global Self-Worth and Scholastic Competence a \( t \) test was conducted (Bruning & Kintz, 1987). A non-significant \( t \) was obtained, \( t (49) = .23 \).
Hypothesis 2

Mother Support (i.e., children's perceived support from their mothers) will be more positively related to children's Global Self-Worth than the other four supports (i.e., Close Friend Support, Sibling Support, Teacher Support, Non-Kin Adult Support).

As described in the previous chapter, the Non-Kin Adult Support subscale was developed for the present study. Each subscale of Mother Support, Teacher Support, Sibling Support, and Close Friend Support contains six items. The Non-Kin Adult Support subscale contains 10 items. In order to select a reliable subset of 6 items for the Non-Kin Adult Support subscale, a factor analysis and a reliability analysis were conducted. Table 7 summarizes the results from the factor analysis. Table 8 summarizes the results from the reliability analysis.

Table 7

| Item | Component 1  
|------|---------------|
| 9    | .833          
| 34   | .832          
| 29   | .827          
| 12   | .814          
| 6    | .745          
| 26   | .716          
| 20   | .684          
| 23   | .464          
| 3    | .449          
| 17   | .354          

Table 8

| Item | α if Item deleted  
|------|-------------------|
| 29   | .8181             
| 9    | .8195             
| 34   | .8235             
| 26   | .8241             
| 12   | .8254             
| 6    | .8260             
| 20   | .8345             
| 23   | .8528             
| 3    | .8523             
| 17   | .8647             

*One component extracted.

In both analyses, items 6, 9, 12, 26, 29, and 34 were retained, and items 3, 17, 20, and 23 were rejected. For the subset of 6 items high reliability was obtained, α = .89.
In order to test Hypothesis 2, interrelations among Global Self-Worth and each of the five support scales were examined using data from the whole sample of children. Table 9 displays means and standard deviations of variables for this sample of children. Table 10 shows the intercorrelations among the variables.

Table 9

*Means and Standard Deviations of Children’s Global Self-Worth and Social Support Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Support</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kin Adult Support</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Support</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend Support</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 56 for all the variables except Sibling Support (n = 44). The scores of social support variables ranged from 1 to 4, where a score of 1 indicated a low level of support and a score of 4 indicated a high level of support.

Table 10

*Intercorrelations among Social Support Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Close Friend Support</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-Kin Adult Support</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mother Support</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sibling Support</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Support</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 56 for all the variables except Sibling Support (n = 44).  
* p < .05.  ** p < .01.
As predicted, Mother Support was found to be more positively related to Global Self-Worth than the other four supports. Non-Kin Adult Support was also related significantly and positively to Global Self-Worth.

In order to test for the significance of the difference between the correlation coefficient for Global Self-Worth and Mother Support and the correlation coefficient for Global Self-Worth and Non-Kin Adult Support, a t test was conducted (Bruning & Kintz, 1987). A nonsignificant t was obtained, \( t(53) = .76 \).

**Hypothesis 3**

Children with a low discrepancy between their perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance will have significantly higher senses of Global Self-Worth than children with a high discrepancy.

In order to test Hypothesis 3, a zero-order correlation between Global Self-Worth and the average of the discrepancies across five domains (i.e., Scholastic Competence, Athletic Competence, Social Acceptance, and Behavioral Conduct) was examined. Two cases in Global Self-Worth (Children 2 & 49) and one case in Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy (Child 26) were identified as univariate outliers because of their extremely low scores. These cases were not deleted because the analyses yielded the same, nonsignificant results either with or without them. Thus, the results using data from the whole sample of children are reported as follows. Mean and standard deviation for children’s Global Self-Worth were 3.16 and .56, respectively. Mean and standard deviation for Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy were -0.62 and .62, respectively.
Contrary to prediction, Global Self-Worth was not related significantly to the competence/importance discrepancy score, \( r = .13, p = .34 \). The scatterplot of Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy with Global Self-Worth is presented in Appendix J.

In order to capture the nature of the distribution of scores for the discrepancies across five domains, the scatterplots of competence with importance for each domain were examined. The patterns were different for each of the five domains. The scatterplot of Athletic Competence with the ratings of importance in this domain (see Appendix K-1) indicated that many children felt they were good athletes; however, not many of them believed that doing well in this domain was important \( (r = .23, p = .09) \). The scatterplot of Social Acceptance with the ratings of importance in this domain (see Appendix K-2) indicated that those children who felt they were popular believed that being popular was important \( (r = .30, p = .03) \). The scatterplot of Scholastic Competence with the ratings of importance in this domain (see Appendix K-3) indicated that many children felt they were average learners; however, many of them believed that doing well at school was very important \( (r = .11, p = .41) \). The scatterplot of Physical Appearance with the ratings of importance in this domain (see Appendix K-4) indicated that most of children felt they were good looking; however, most of them did not believe that being good looking was important \( (r = .02, p = .87) \). The scatterplot of Behavioral Conduct with the ratings of importance in this domain (see Appendix K-5) indicated that most of children felt they were behaving well, and most of them believed that behaving well was very important \( (r = .33, p = .01) \).

In order to understand the relationship between children's perceptions of competence and their Global Self-Worth, the scatterplot of the average of absolute ratings of self perceptions of competence across five domains with Global Self-Worth (see
Appendix L) was examined. This scatterplot indicated that the more children felt competent across all five domains, the higher their Global Self-Worth was \((r = .50, p = .000)\).

**Hypothesis 4**

Children with high social support will have significantly higher senses of Global Self-Worth than children with low social support.

In order to test Hypothesis 4, a multiple regression was performed using the backward elimination method with Global Self-Worth as the criterion variable and Mother Support, Close Friend Support, Teacher Support, Sibling Support, and Non-Kin Adult Support as the predictor variables.

One case in each of the variables, Teacher Support (Child 26), Non-Kin Adult Support (Child 50), and Mother Support (Child 50), and two cases in Global Self-Worth (Children 2 & 49) were identified as univariate outliers because of their extremely low scores. These cases were deleted. Using Mahalanobis distance with \(p < .001\), no case was identified as a multivariate outlier. With all five outliers deleted, 52 cases remained for each variable except Sibling Support. For Sibling Support 41 cases remained because 11 children did not have any siblings. In the multiple regression analysis, only these 41 cases were analyzed. Table 11 displays means and standard deviations for the subsample of 41 children who had siblings. Assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were met. Table 12 summarizes the results of the regression analysis.
Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations of Children's Global Self-Worth and Social Support Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Support</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kin Adult Support</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Support</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend Support</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 41.

Table 12

Backward Elimination on Children's Global Self-Worth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig F</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$ In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Kin Adult</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>Close Friend</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>Non-Kin Adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>Close Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 41.

All the variables were entered into the first model. From this model, Non-Kin Adult Support was eliminated due to its contribution to a significant reduction in $R^2$, $t(35) = -.01, p = .99$. In the second model, Close Friend Support, Mother Support, Sibling Support, and Teacher Support remained. From this model, Close Friend Support was eliminated due to its contribution to a significant reduction in $R^2$, $t(36) = 1.04, p = .31$. In the third model, Mother Support, Sibling Support, and Teacher Support remained. From this model Teacher Support was eliminated due to its contribution to a significant
reduction in $R^2$, $t(37) = -.78$, $p = .44$. In the final model, Mother Support, $t(38) = 1.85$, $p = .07$, and Sibling Support, $t(38) = 1.70$, $p = .10$, remained. This model explained 16% ($R^2 = 16.32$) of the variance in Children's Self-Worth, $F = 3.71$, $p = .03$.

**Hypothesis 5**

A combination of Children's Social Support (i.e., the average of Mother Support and Sibling Support) and the Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy score (i.e., the average of the discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance) will be related significantly to their senses of Global Self-Worth.

In order to test Hypothesis 5, a standard multiple regression was performed with Global Self-Worth as the dependent variable and Children's Social Support and the Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy score as the independent variables. Children's Social Support was a new variable constructed by averaging Mother Support and Sibling Support which were identified as the two strongest support providers for children in the previous section.

One case in each of the variables, the Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy score (Child 26) and Children's Social Support (Child 50), and two cases in Global Self-Worth (Children 2 & 49) were identified as univariate outliers because of their extreme low scores. These cases were deleted. Using Mahalanobis distance with $p < .001$, no case was identified as a multivariate outlier. With all four outliers deleted, 52 cases remained for each variable. Means and standard deviations of this subsample of children are displayed in Table 13. Table 14 summarizes the results of the regression analysis.
Table 13

*Means and Standard Deviations of Children's Global Self-Worth, Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy, and Children's Social Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Social Support</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 52.*

*Mean of the discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance in each domain.  b Average of Mother Support and Sibling Support.

Table 14

*Standard Multiple Regression on Children's Global Self-Worth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Social Support</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .22 \]

Adjusted \( R^2 = .19 \)

\( R = .47^{*} \)

*Note. N = 52.*

* p < .01.

Assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were met. No suppression variable was found.

The model explained 22 % of the variance in Global Self-Worth, \( F(2, 51) = 7.00, p = .002. \) Children's Social Support was a significant and independent predictor of Global Self-Worth with the competence/importance discrepancy score controlled, \( t(49) = 3.43, p = .001. \)
Hypothesis 6

Mothers’ Education level will be related significantly and positively to Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support.

As described in Chapter 3, both Number of Support Providers for Mothers and Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support were assessed in the present study. As Sarason, Levine, Basham, and Sarason (1983) reported, the correlation between Number of Support Providers and Satisfaction with Support was low. The present study also found a low, non-significant correlation between Number of Support Providers for Mothers and Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support, $r = .14, p = .41$. Only the Satisfaction with Support score, however, was analyzed and reported in this thesis because the satisfaction with support seemed more important to determine than the availability of support in the population of assaulted women.

In order to test Hypothesis 6, a zero-order correlation between Mothers’ Education level and Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support was examined. As mentioned in the previous chapter, 38 mothers participated in the present study. Two cases in Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support (Mothers 18 & 30) were identified as outliers because of their extremely low scores. With these cases deleted, 36 cases remained for each variable. The scores for Mothers’ Education ranged from 1 to 4, where a score of 1 indicated less than high school diploma, 2 indicated high school diploma, 3 indicated some post secondary education, and 4 indicated a university degree. Mean and standard deviation for Mothers’ Education were 2.19 and .95, respectively. The scores for Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support ranged from 1 to 6, where a score of 1 indicated a low level of satisfaction and a
score of 6 indicated a high level of satisfaction. The Mean and standard deviation for Mothers' Satisfaction with Support were 5.31 and .59, respectively.

Contrary to prediction, the relationship between Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support was negative and nonsignificant, $r = -.30, p = .08$.

Hypothesis 7

Mothers' Satisfaction with Support is a significant predictor of Children's Social Support, holding constant the effect of Mothers' Education level.

A theoretical model suggested by a number of authors (e.g., Cochran & Brassard, 1979; Riley & Cochran, 1987; Tietjen, 1989) found that (a) Mothers' Education level affects Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and (b) Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support affect their Children's Social Support. In order to test Hypothesis 7, a hierarchical regression was performed with Children's Social Support as the dependent variable and Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support as the independent variables in order to test whether Mothers' Satisfaction with Support had an unique contribution to Children's Social Support above and beyond Mothers' Education level. Data from a subsample of 38 children, chosen randomly within families, were combined with data from the whole sample of mothers ($N = 38$) so each child was matched with his/her mother. Two cases in Mothers' Satisfaction with Support (Mothers 18 & 30) and one case in Children's Social Support (Child 50) were identified as univariate outliers. These cases were deleted. Using Mahalanobis distance with $p < .001$, no case was identified as a multivariate outlier. With all three outliers deleted, 35 cases remained for each variable. Table 15 displays means and standard deviations of
Children's Social Support, Mothers' Education, and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support for the subsample of children and mothers. Table 16 summarizes the results of the regression analysis.

Table 15
Means and Standard Deviations of Children's Social Support, Mothers' Education, and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Social Support</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Education</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Satisfaction with Support</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 35.

Table 16
Hierarchical Regression of Mothers' Education and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support on Children's Social Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mothers' Satisfaction with Support</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .016
Adjusted R² = -.05
R = .13

Note. N = 35.

Assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were met. No suppression variable was found.

Findings from this analysis failed to support Hypothesis 7. The first variable entered into the model was Mothers' Education level. Mothers' Education level alone explained 1.5 % of the variance in Children's Social Support, F(1, 34) = .52, p = .48. The second variable entered into the model was Mothers' Satisfaction with Support. Mothers'
Education level and Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support combined explained 1.6 % of the variance in Children's Social Support, $F(2, 33) = .27, p = .77$. The proportion of variance in Children's Social Support that Mothers' Satisfaction with Support accounted for above and beyond Mothers' Education level was 0.1 %, $t(32) = .17, p = .86$.

**Hypothesis 8**

Children's Social Support and the Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy (the discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance) are the two strongest among four independent variables (Children's Social Support, the Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy, Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and Mothers' Education level) as the predictors of children's Global Self-Worth.

In order to test Hypothesis 8, a standard multiple regression was performed using the same subsample of 38 mother-child pairs as used to test Hypothesis 7 with Global Self-Worth as the dependent variable and (a) Children's Social Support, (b) the Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy score, (c) Mothers' Education level, and (d) Mothers' Satisfaction with Support as the independent variables. Two cases in Mothers' Satisfaction with Support (Mothers 18 & 30), one case in Children's Social Support (Child 50), and one case in Children's Global Self-Worth (Child 49) were identified as univariate outliers. These cases were deleted. Using Mahalanobis distance with $p < .001$, no case was identified as a multivariate outlier. With all four outliers deleted, 34 cases remained for each variable. Table 17 displays means and standard deviations of variables for the subsample of children and mothers.
Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations of Children's Global Self-Worth, Children's Social Support, Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy, Mothers' Education, and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Social Support</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Education</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Satisfaction with Support</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 34.

Assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were met. No suppression variable was found. Table 18 summarizes the results of the regression analysis.

Table 18

Standard Multiple Regression of Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy, Children's Social Support, Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and Mothers' Education on Children's Global Self-Worth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Social Support</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Satisfaction with Support</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Education</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .29$

Adjusted $R^2 = .19$

$R = .53^*$

Note. N = 34.

*p < .05.

The model explained 29 % of the variance in Global Self-Worth, $F(4, 30) = 2.89$, $p = .04$. As indicated in Table 18, Children's Social Support was a significant and independent predictor of Global Self-Worth with the other three independent variables
controlled, \( t(29) = 2.70, p = .01 \). Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy was also found to be a significant and independent predictor of Global Self-Worth with the other three independent variables controlled, \( t(29) = 2.07, p = .05 \).

**Hypothesis 9**

Children's Social Support is a significant predictor of their Global Self-Worth, holding constant the effects of Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support.

The theoretical model suggested by a number of authors (e.g., Cochran & Brassard, 1979; Riley & Cochran, 1987; Tietjen, 1989) found that (a) Mothers' Education level affects Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, (b) Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support affect Children's Social Support, and (c) Mothers' Education level, Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and Children's Social Support affect Children's Global Self-Worth. A hierarchical regression was performed with Global Self-Worth as the dependent variable and (a) Mothers' Education level, (b) Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and (c) Children's Social Support as the independent variables in order to test whether Children's Social Support was a unique contributor to Children's Global Self-Worth above and beyond their Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support. Data from the same subsample of 38 mother-child pairs as used to test Hypothesis 7 and 8 were used. Two cases in Mothers' Satisfaction with Support (Mothers 18 & 30), one case in Children's Social Support (Child 50), and one case in children's Global Self-Worth (Child 49) were identified as univariate outliers. These cases were deleted. Using Mahalanobis distance with \( p < .001 \), no case was identified as a multivariate outlier. With all four cases deleted, 34 cases (mother-child pairs) remained for each variable. These cases were also used in testing Hypothesis 8.
Means and Standard deviations of variables for 34 mother-child pairs are shown in Table 17 in the previous section.

Assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were met. No suppression variable was found. Table 19 shows the summary information of the hierarchical regression of Children's Global Self-Worth.

Table 19
Hierarchical Regression of Mothers' Education, Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and Children's Social Support on Children's Global Self-Worth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE $B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mothers' Education</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mothers' Satisfaction with Support</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Children's Social Support</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .23$
Adjusted $R^2 = .15$
$R = .48$

Note. $N = 34$.

The first variable entered into the hierarchical model was Mothers' Education level. Mothers' Education level alone explained 0.5% of the variance in Global Self-Worth, $F(1, 33) = .15, p = .70$. The second variable entered into the model was Mothers' Satisfaction with Support. Mothers' Education level and Mothers' Satisfaction with Support combined explained 2.8% of the variance in Global Self-Worth, $F(2, 32) = .45, p = .64$. The increment in the proportion of variance in Global Self-Worth accounted for by Mothers' Satisfaction with Support was 2.3%, $t(31) = -.87, p = .39$. The third variable entered into the final model was Children's Social Support. Mothers' Education, Mothers' Satisfaction with Support, and Children's Social Support combined explained 18% of the variance in Global Self-Worth, $F(3, 31) = 2.18, p = .11$. The proportion of variance in
Global Self-Worth that Children’s Social Support accounted for above and beyond Mother’s Education and Mothers’ Satisfaction with Support was 15.2 %, \( t(30) = 2.35, \ p = .03 \).

Summary

In this chapter, the results of analyses and descriptive statistics pertinent to each of the nine hypotheses were presented. The analyses supported Hypotheses 2, 4, 5, and 8, but not 1, 3, 6, 7, and 9. The next chapter discusses these results.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the results of the present study. The purpose of the study is briefly described. Limitations and outliers of the study are described. Each of the nine hypotheses formulated is restated, followed by a summary and discussion of the results pertinent to each hypothesis. In addition, suggestions for improvement of the study are described. The chapter ends with comments about related future research.

Summary of Research Purpose

According to Harter (1985a, 1985b), there are two factors that impact children’s self-worth, that is, their perceived emotional support from significant others and their perceptions of how well they perform in domains they believe important. Also, research on children’s social support indicates a relationship between parents’ education level, and parents’ and children’s perceived social support (Cochran & Brassard, 1979; Riley & Cochran, 1987). How do these findings apply to children and families who are receiving services as the result of family violence? In order to examine this question, nine hypotheses were formulated.

Limitations of the Study

The study’s results should be discussed with age of the children and the characteristics of the participants taken into consideration.
Age of the children

The researcher included seven children younger than eight years of age, even though the measures for children used in the present study were designed for children aged eight and older. Procedures accounted for the children’s age, however. The questionnaires were administered individually by the researcher. When administering the questionnaires to the children, the researcher explained the procedures until they seemed to have fully understood. Also, the researcher read aloud each item in the questionnaires for those children younger than ten years of age. In addition, the researcher explained those words which were considered to be difficult for 7-year-olds to comprehend (e.g., popular, smart, and good-looking). Finally, only one of the seven 7-year-olds (child 26) was identified as an outlier in the analyses.

Characteristics of the participants

First, the participants in the present study were volunteers. They were willing to donate their time in order to contribute to the study. Thus, they may have been better adjusted than those who did not participate, or their situations may not have been as traumatic as others’.

Second, the mothers were not selected on the basis of duration of spousal abuse, residence in transition houses, or participation in the counseling programs. These factors may need to be controlled.

Third, the researcher included two mothers who did not comprehend English. As described in Chapter 3, the data were collected from these mothers with the help of interpreters. Though these mothers seemed to have fully understood the item content of the measures, this may have influenced the study’s results.
Fourth, the children were not selected on the basis of the factors that may have influenced the study's results. These factors include (a) duration of exposure to family violence, residence in transition houses, or participation in counseling programs, (b) whether they had actually witnessed or been exposed to violence, (c) frequency and intensity of such events, (d) developmental stages at which they were exposed, (e) whether they had been both victims of and witnesses to violence, (f) whether they were attending regular schools or home based school programs, or (g) how many times they had to change schools. These factors may also need to be controlled.

Finally, one should be cautious in comparing the results of this study with Harter's (1985a, 1985b, 1990a) which were obtained using the samples from four elementary schools in Colorado; approximately 90% of the children were Caucasian and were from lower middle to upper middle class families (Harter, 1985b). As described in Chapter 3, 43% of children participating in the present study belonged to ethnic minority groups, and the participants consisted of low-income families in the metropolitan Vancouver area who were/had been receiving various community services as the result of exposure to family violence.

Outliers of the Study

The researcher had to eliminate several outliers from the analyses. It seems worth commenting on these individuals because they may represent a subgroup of the entire sample of children of the study. Also, these four children constitute up to 7% of the sample or subsample analyzed. What might be an important subgroup in a study with a larger sample may have been reduced to one person in the present study. Thus, it seems important to keep these outliers in mind when interpreting the results of the study.
Child 26 (male) obtained two extremely low scores in mean competence/importance discrepancy and teacher support. At the time of data collection (1997), this child was 7 years old, and residing in a second stage transition house with his mother and six siblings. He and his siblings were taking home based school programs. He was cooperative during data collection. Child 50 (male) obtained three extremely low scores in non-kin adult support, mother support, and children's social support (the average of sibling and mother support). He was 9 years old. He was residing with his mother and a 3-year-old sister in their apartment. He was taking an individual counseling program due to exposure to family violence. The researcher was told by his counselor that he had had behavior problems. During the data collection, he was withdrawn, reluctant, distracted, and whiny. Child 2 (male) obtained an extremely low score in global self-worth. He was 11 years old, and residing with his mother and two sisters (8 months and 7 years old) in their apartment. He was taking a counseling program as the result of violence exposure. The researcher was told that he had had behavior problems. During the data collection, he was reluctant and often distracted. Child 49 (female) obtained an extremely low score in global self-worth. She was residing with her mother and 4 siblings in their apartment. She was taking an individual counseling program due to exposure to family violence. The researcher was told by her counselor that she had had behavior problems. During data collection, she was cooperative.

Judging from information obtained from their mothers and counselors and the researchers’ observations during data collection, it may be that children 2, 49, and 50 had emotional and/or behavioral problems, which were manifested by their extremely low scores on certain independent and dependent variables. In the case of child 26, his extremely low score on the teacher support subscale may have been caused by his taking
a home-based school program in which he seldom directly interacted with his teacher. This child also obtained an extremely low score in the mean competence/importance discrepancy. The reason for this is not clear. One speculation, however, would be that he was unable to understand the intent of the measure which had been developed for children 8 and older. In summary, eliminating these children’s data from certain analyses was necessary.

Mothers 18 (33 years old) and 30 (48 years old) obtained extremely low scores on the satisfaction with support scale. Mother 18 was residing in a second stage transition house with her 7-year-old son. Mother 30 was living on her own with her 7-year-old daughter. Both mothers were Caucasians whose first language was English. Both of them had some post-secondary education. They were cooperative during data collections. The reason for why these mothers were feeling an extremely low level of satisfaction with their support is not clear. It may have been that these women were more honest about their feelings, and more realistically judging their situations than the rest of the women.

In the following section, the study’s nine hypotheses are restated, followed by a summary and discussion of the results pertinent to each hypothesis.

**Hypotheses, Results, and Discussion**

**Hypothesis 1**

Physical appearance will be more positively related to children’s global self-worth than the other four domain-specific competencies measured (i.e., scholastic competence, athletic competence, peer acceptance, and behavioral conduct).

The analyses failed to support Hypothesis 1. The pattern of results revealed, however, that the discrepancy between the importance of doing well at school work and
one's evaluation of one's scholastic competence and the discrepancy between the importance of being good-looking and one's evaluation of one's perceived appearance were the two major concerns for children in the present study. The supplementary analysis also indicated that those children who had a high sense of self-worth felt that they were good at school work and good-looking.

The results described above are partially consistent with Harter's findings. Harter's (1990a) data showed that for children examined in regular school settings, physical appearance was the most important contributor to self-worth, followed by social acceptance and academic success. Why did children in the present study think academic success very important? According to Rutter (1987), "task accomplishment" can improve self-esteem. In their recent work, Moore and Pepler (1998) also argued that academic success may serve as a protective factor for children exposed to family violence. It may be that helping these children achieve in schools is the key to fostering their sense of self-worth.

That children felt behaving well was extremely important and that they were actually perceiving themselves behaving well (see Table 4; Appendix K-5) are other findings worth mentioning. This pattern of results contradicts much past and recent work with children exposed to family violence (e.g., Hughes, Parkinson, & Vargo, 1989; Jaffe, Wolfe, & Wilson, 1990; McCloskey, Figueredo, & Koss, 1995; Sternberg et al., 1993) in which they were described as aggressive. This may be due to the nature of the volunteer participants. Volunteers are a different group of individuals from randomly selected individuals. Children in the study may have been better adjusted behaviorally than those who did not participate. Another speculation is that the children were denying the fact
that they were actually behaving badly, thus engaging in “healthy denial” (Rosenberg & Rossman, 1990).

**Hypothesis 2**

Mother support will be more positively related to children’s self-worth than the other four supports (i.e., close friend support, sibling support, teacher support, non-kin adult support).

The analyses supported Hypothesis 2. The findings revealed further that support from non-kin adults (counselors, transition house staff, child care workers) was as significant as support from mothers for children in the present study. The importance of non-kin adult support for children exposed to family violence was also supported in a recent study (Jouriles et al., 1998).

The analysis found support from teacher and close friend to contribute least to children’s self-worth. This may be due to frequent moves and school changes experienced by these children. Furthermore, in the present study, six children (11%) had been taking home based school programs in which they had few opportunities to interact with their teachers and peers. The pattern of findings regarding close friend support is consistent with the literature. According to Graham-Bermann (1998), children exposed to family violence spent less time with their friends, were less likely to have a best friend, and had lower quality friendships than did children from nonviolent families. Also, Jouriles et al. (1998) observed that children exposed to family violence were often reluctant to bring friends to their homes and to talk openly about their home and family life with peers.
Hypothesis 3

Children with a low discrepancy between their perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance will have significantly higher senses of global self-worth than children with a high discrepancy.

The analyses failed to support Hypothesis 3. As the scatterplot of mean competence/importance discrepancy with global self-worth (see Appendix J) indicates, children 2, 8, 49, and 50 obtained a combination of low self-worth and small discrepancy, and children 17 and 26 obtained a combination of high self-worth and large discrepancy. Thus, these children must have contributed to this nonsignificant result, a result which is not consistent with Harter's (1985a). Among these children, children 2, 26, 49, and 50 were, as described in an earlier section of this chapter, identified as the study's outliers. As described in Chapter 4, these outliers were not excluded from the analyses for Hypothesis 3, because the analyses yielded the nonsignificant results either with or without them. Children 8, 17, and 26 were younger than eight years of age. It is not clear whether their data indicated their inability to understand the intent of the measures which had been developed for children 8 and older. In summary, one cannot rule out the possibility of a significant relationship between the mean competence/importance discrepancy and global self-worth, based solely on the results from these analyses. Future studies should further explore this relationship in children exposed to family violence.

Hypothesis 4

Children with high social support will have significantly higher senses of global self-worth than children with low social support.

The analyses supported Hypothesis 4. The pattern of results indicated that a combination of mother and sibling support was the most significant contributor to self-
worth for children in the present study. A combination of mother, sibling, and teacher support was found to be the second most significant contributor to children’s self-worth. This finding does not, however, rule out the possibility that non-kin adult support can be a significant contributor to children’s self-worth for a number of reasons. The results from the zero-order correlation (see Table 10) indicated a significant relationship between non-kin adult support and children’s self-worth. There may not have been sufficient statistical power to detect this significant link in the regression analysis. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1989), a cases-to-IV (independent variable) ratio of 40 to 1 is reasonable if backward elimination is to be used. In the analysis presented above, however, the cases-to-IV ratio was 8 to 1.

Hypothesis 5

A combination of children’s social support and the mean of the discrepancy between children’s perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance will be significantly related to their senses of global self-worth.

The analyses supported Hypothesis 5. Thus, the present study clearly supported Harter’s (1985a; 1985b; 1990a) model of self-worth in which the mean of competence/importance discrepancy scores impacts children’s self-worth together with children’s social support. Of the two predictors, children’s social support was found to be the stronger contributor to children’s global self-worth.

Hypothesis 6

Mothers’ education level will be significantly positively related to their satisfaction with support.

The analysis failed to support Hypothesis 6. Mothers’ education level was related nonsignificantly and negatively to their satisfaction with support. The negative
relationship between mothers’ education level and their satisfaction with support, though nonsignificant, was surprising. This finding indicates that the higher the level of education the mothers had, the less satisfied they were with supports. This may have been because mothers with a higher level of education had different expectations from social service systems. Another speculation is that those mothers who had a higher level of education may have been different from other mothers in terms of their beliefs about parenting and child development, and might have been feeling isolated in transition houses and/or counseling programs. Future studies should explore this relationship between education level of mothers who experienced marital violence and their satisfaction with support as well as their beliefs about parenting and child development with a larger sample.

Hypothesis 7

Mothers’ satisfaction with support is a significant predictor of their children’s social support, holding constant the effects of mothers’ education level.

The analysis failed to support Hypothesis 7. Contrary to prediction, mothers’ satisfaction with support was not related significantly to children’s social support when the effect of mothers’ education level was taken into account. This may have been due to the relatively small sample size. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1989), a cases-to-IV ratio of 20 to 1 is reasonable if hierarchical regression is to be used, though a bare minimum requirement is to have a cases-to-IV ratio of 5 to 1. In this analysis presented above, the cases-to-IV ratio was 17.5 to 1.

The pattern of findings indicated that mothers with low levels of satisfaction with support might have children with high levels of perceived support from their mothers and
siblings. Likewise, mothers with high levels of satisfaction with support might have children with low levels of perceived support from their mothers and siblings. There may have been those mothers who were very supportive of their children regardless of their own traumatic situations. Future studies should explore this nonsignificant relationship between mothers' satisfaction with support and children's perceived social support in families who exposed to violence, once again with a larger sample.

Hypothesis 8

Children's social support and discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance are the two strongest among four independent variables (children's social support, discrepancy between children's perceptions of competence and their ratings of importance, their mothers' satisfaction with support, and their mothers' education level) as predictors of children's global self-worth.

The analyses supported Hypothesis 8. The pattern of results indicated that a combination of (a) children's social support, (b) the mean competence/importance discrepancy score (c) mothers' satisfaction with support, and (d) mothers' education level was a significant predictor of children's self-worth. Of the four predictors, children's social support was found to be the strongest contributor to children's global self-worth, followed by the mean competence/importance discrepancy score. Thus, the present study clearly supported Harter's (1985a; 1985b; 1990a) model of self-worth in which the mean of competence/importance discrepancy scores impacts children's self-worth together with children's social support.
Hypothesis 9

Children's social support is a significant predictor of their global self-worth, holding constant the effects of their mothers' education level and their satisfaction with support.

The analyses failed to support Hypothesis 9. Contrary to prediction, children's social support was not related significantly to children's global self-worth when the effect of mothers' satisfaction with support and education level were taken into account. This finding does not, however, rule out the possibility of this prediction being supported for a number of reasons. The results from the multiple regressions for Hypotheses 5 and 8 indicated that children's social support was a significant predictor of their global self-worth. The sample size may have been relatively small for this analysis. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1989), a cases-to-IV ratio of 20 to 1 is reasonable if hierarchical regression is to be used, though a bare minimum requirement is to have a cases-to-IV ratio of 5 to 1. In this analysis presented above, the cases-to IV ratio was 11 to 1. Thus, future studies should explore this hypothesis with a larger sample.

Suggestions for Improvement of the Present Study

First, larger numbers of families are needed if the study is replicated. As described in earlier section of this chapter, several nonsignificant results of the present study may have been due to its relatively small sample sizes.

Second, the use of comparison groups is called for. The present study examined low-income families who were/had been receiving services free of charge. Little is known about self-worth and social support of children from high income, violent families.
Future Directions

The present study examined specific aspects of global self-worth and social support in children exposed to family violence using Harter’s (1985a; 1985b; 1990a) model of self-worth and social support.

The results have implications for the development of educational and intervention/prevention programs. The results suggest that academic success is the major concern for children exposed to family violence; however, the majority of them felt they were not competent in this domain. Thus, tutoring these children in core subjects may constitute a component of an effective intervention/prevention program.

The development of a training program for teachers is called for. Teachers should actively participate in education of children exposed to family violence. The study informs us that support from teachers and close friends are less significant contributors to children’s self-worth than support from mothers, siblings and non-kin adults. This may have been due to frequent changes of schools experienced by those children, as well as a lack of training about family violence and its effects on children on the teacher’s part. As Jaffe, Hastings, and Reitzel (1992) wrote, teachers should be competently dealing with those children exposed to family violence. Also, it is hoped that teachers will be able to foster friendships between those children exposed to family violence and their peers.

The present study revealed that the higher the level of education the mothers had, the less satisfied they were with supports. This finding makes one speculate that assaulted mothers with a higher level of education may be different from mothers with a lower level of education. Thus, exploring how these mothers differ, especially in terms of their beliefs about parenting and child development, is a potentially interesting area of research.
Ethnic-racial group differences should be taken into consideration. Specifically, it would be interesting to examine whether the mechanism of children’s global self-worth and social support differs from one ethnic group to another. There were several ethnic groups among the families in the present study. The sample size of the study, however, was not large enough to allow one to explore ethnic differences.

Given that most of the research on children exposed to family violence is focused on identifying current symptoms and problems in the child (Graham-Bermann, 1998), the present study has provided evidence for the importance of assessing factors that may contribute to these children’s self-worth. The present study confirmed Harter’s (1985a; 1985b; 1990a) model in which social support and the competence/importance discrepancy are the two major determinants of children’s self-worth. Other theory-driven research is called for in order to identify other protective factors for children exposed to family violence.
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APPENDIX A

The Letter to the Transition House and/or Community Organization
Dear

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education, in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, working under the supervision of Dr. Marion Porath. I am writing to ask you for your support with a research project I am conducting with Dr. Porath, as partial fulfillment of my Masters degree (the thesis).

The purpose of this project is to gather information about self-concept of and social support for children who have been exposed to family violence. The literature on social support describes that stressful life events will decrease children's self-concept; however, social support buffers life stress and contributes to socio-emotional adjustment. In addition, parents' education levels, their social support, and their children's social support are found to be related. This project involves: (a) having children complete two questionnaires regarding how they like themselves and how people around them interact with them, and (b) having their mothers complete a questionnaire regarding their social support and education level. Specifically, information from this research has the potential to impact on development of intervention programs for children in transition houses and transition house staff training. The reason for my interest in these children is from my experience of working with them as a child care giver in a second stage transition house in Vancouver.
Consent Form

We, ____________________________, consent to participate in this study.

We are interested/ we are not interested (circle one) in receiving a summary of the research findings.

Signature: ________________________ Date: ____________________
APPENDIX B

The Letter to the Mother
September 3, 1997

Dear [Name],

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education, in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, working under the supervision of Dr. Marion Porath. I am writing to ask for your and your child’s participation in a research project I am conducting with Dr. Porath. This research will further broaden our knowledge of how children feel about themselves and how they feel people in their lives support them.

The project involves having your child complete two questionnaires which ask how he/she feels about his/her school work, friends, school behaviors, and general well-being, and how people around him/her interact with and support him/her. These questionnaires will take your child approximately 35 minutes to complete. In order for us to better understand the relationships between your child’s sense of support and your own, you are also requested to complete a questionnaire which asks how satisfied you are with support you get from people around you. This will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. The sessions for you and your child to complete these questionnaires will be held in the transition house where you currently stay. I will work with your child during his/her session.

[Your Signature]
[Your Name]
Consent Form

I, __________________, consent/ do not consent (circle one) to participate in this study.

I, __________________, consent/ do not consent (circle one) to my child’s/children’s participation in this study.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: _________________
APPENDIX C

The Letter to the Child
Consent Form

I, ________________________, would like to be in the study.

Signature: ________________________ Date: ______________
APPENDIX D

The Demographic Information Form for the Mother

Date of Birth: 

Language Spoken at Home: 

Education Levels (check one)

( ) Less than high school diploma
( ) High school diploma
( ) Some post secondary education
( ) University degree
APPENDIX E

Social Support Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS:

The following questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, list the people you know, excluding yourself, whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. Give the persons' initials or their relationship to you (see example).

For the second part, circle how satisfied you are with the overall support you have.

If you have had no support for a question, check the words “No one,” but still rate your level of satisfaction.

Do not list more than nine persons per question.

Please answer all the questions as best as you can. All your responses will be kept confidential.

(adapted from Sarason, Sarason, Shearin, & Pierce, 1987)
EXAMPLE:

Whom can you talk with frankly, without having to watch what you say?

No one

(1) T.N. (sister)
(2) L.M. (friend)
(3) R.S. (friend)
(4) T.N. (mother)
(5) L.M (employer)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)

How satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very satisfied</th>
<th>fairly satisfied</th>
<th>a little satisfied</th>
<th>a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 (a). Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

No one

(1)
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)

1 (b). How satisfied?

very satisfied fairly satisfied a little satisfied a little dissatisfied fairly satisfied very dissatisfied
dissatisfied dissatisfied
dissatisfied

2 (a). Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or tense?

No one

(1)
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)

2 (b). How satisfied?

very satisfied fairly satisfied a little satisfied a little dissatisfied fairly satisfied very dissatisfied
dissatisfied dissatisfied
dissatisfied
3 (a). Who accepts you totally, including both your worst and your best points?

   No one

   (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  (6)  (7)  (8)  (9)

3 (b). How satisfied?

   very  fairly  a little  a little  fairly  very
   satisfied  satisfied  satisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied

4 (a). Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?

   No one

   (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  (6)  (7)  (8)  (9)

4 (b). How satisfied?

   very  fairly  a little  a little  fairly  very
   satisfied  satisfied  satisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied
5 (a). Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are feeling generally down-in-the dumps?

No one

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j)

5 (b). How satisfied?

very fairly a little a little fairly very
satisfied satisfied satisfied dissatisfied dissatisfied dissatisfied

6 (a). Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset?

No one

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j)

6 (b). How satisfied?

very fairly a little a little fairly very
satisfied satisfied satisfied dissatisfied dissatisfied dissatisfied
APPENDIX F

The Demographic Information Form for the Child

Date of Birth: ________________    Gender: ( ) male ( ) female

Language Spoken at Home: ________________

How many brothers do you have?: ________________

How old are they?: ________________

How many sisters do you have?: ________________

How old are they?: ________________
APPENDIX G

WHAT I AM LIKE
Instructions to the child

I have some sentences here, and, as you can see from the top of your sheet where it says "What I am like," I am interested in what you are like, what kind of a person you are like. This is **not** a test. There are no right or wrong answers.

First let me explain how these questions work. There is a sample question at the top. I'll read it out loud and you follow along with me. (Examiner reads sample question.) This question talks about two kinds of kids, and we want to know which kids are most like you.

(1) So, what I want you to decide first is whether you are more like the kids on the left side who would rather play outdoors, or whether you are more like the kids on the right side who would rather watch T.V. Don't mark anything yet, but first decide which kind of kid is most like you, and go to that side of the page.

(2) Now, the second thing I want you to think about is to decide whether that is only **sort of true for you**, or **really true for you**. If it's only sort of true, then put an X in the box under sort of true; if it's really true for you, then put an X in that box, under really true.

(3) For each sentence you only check **one** box. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, another time it will be on the other side of the page, but you can only check **one box** for each sentence. You **don't** check both sides, just the **one** side most like you.

(4) OK, that one was just for practice. Now we have some more sentences which I'm going to read out loud. For each one, just check one box, the one that goes with what is true for you, what you are most like.

(adapted from Harter, 1985a)
Sample Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True</th>
<th>Sort of True</th>
<th>Really True</th>
<th>Sort of True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for Me</td>
<td></td>
<td>for Me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] [ ] Some kids would rather play outdoors in their spare time
- BUT
- [ ] [ ] Other kids would rather watch T.V.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids feel that they are very good at their school work</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids find it hard to make friends</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids do very well at all kinds of sports</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids are happy with the way they look</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids often do not like the way they behave</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids are often unhappy with themselves</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids feel like they are just as smart as other kids their age</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids have a lot of friends</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids wish they could be a lot better at sports</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids are happy with their height and weight</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids wish their height or weight were different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids usually do the right thing</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids often don’t do the right thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids don’t like the way they are leading their life</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids do like the way they are leading their life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids are pretty slow in finishing their school work</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids can do their school work quickly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids would like to have a lot more friends</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have as many friends as they want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids think they could do well at just about any new sports activity they haven’t tried before</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids are afraid they might not do well at sports they haven’t ever tried.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids wish their body was different</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids like their body the way it is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids usually act the way they know they are supposed to</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids often don’t act the way they are supposed to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids are happy with themselves as a person</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids are often not happy with themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Some kids often forget what they learn</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids can remember things easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Some kids are always doing things with a lot of kids</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids usually do things by themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Some kids feel that they are better than others their age at sports</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids don’t feel they can play as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Some kids wish their physical appearance (how they look) was different</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids like their physical appearance the way it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Some kids usually get in trouble because of things they do</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids usually don’t do things that get them in trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Some kids like the kind of person they are</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids often wish they were someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Some kids do very well at their classwork</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids don’t do very well at their classwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Some kids wish that more people their age liked them</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids feel that most people their age do like them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>In games and sports some kids usually watch instead of play</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids usually play rather than just watch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Really True for Me
Sort of True for Me
Really True for Me
Sort of True for Me

28. □ □ Some kids wish something about their face or hair looked different
BUT Other kids like their face and hair the way they are.

29. □ □ Some kids do things they know they shouldn’t do
BUT Other kids hardly ever do things they know they shouldn’t do.

30. □ □ Some kids are very happy being the way they are
BUT Other kids wish they were different.

31. □ □ Some kids have trouble figuring out the answers in school
BUT Other kids almost always can figure out the answers.

32. □ □ Some kids are popular with others their age
BUT Other kids are not very popular.

33. □ □ Some kids don’t do well at new outdoor games
BUT Other kids are good at new games right away.

34. □ □ Some kids think that they are good looking
BUT Other kids think that they are not very good looking.

35. □ □ Some kids behave themselves very well
BUT Other kids often find it hard to behave themselves.

36. □ □ Some kids are not very happy with the way they do a lot of things
BUT Other kids think the way they do things is fine.
APPENDIX H

HOW IMPORTANT ARE THESE THINGS TO HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF AS A PERSON?

Instructions to the Child

I have some sentences here and, as you can see from the top of your sheet where it says "How important are these things to how you feel about yourself as a person?" I am interested in what kinds of things are important to you in order to feel good about yourself. This is **not** a test. There are no right or wrong answers.

First let me explain how these questions work. There is the first question at the top. I'll read it out loud and you follow along with me. (Examiner reads the first question.) This question talks about two kinds of kids, and I want to know which kids are most like **you**.

(1) So, what I want you to decide first is whether you are more like the kids on the left side who would rather think it is important to do well at schoolwork in order to feel good as a person, or whether you are more like the kids on the right side who would rather think it is not important to do well at schoolwork. Don't mark anything yet, but first decide which kind of kid is most like **you**, and go to that side of the sentence.

(2) Now, the second thing I want you to think about is to decide whether that is only **sort of true for you**, or **really true for you**. If it's only sort of true, then put an X in the box under sort of true; if it's really true for you, then put an X in that box, under really true.

(3) For each sentence you only check one box. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, another time it will be on the other side of the page, but you can only check one box for each sentence. You don't check both sides, just the one side most like you.

(4) Now, we have some more sentences which I'm going to read out loud. For each one, just check one box, the one that goes with what is true for you, what you are most like.

(adapted from Harter, 1985a)
HOW IMPORTANT ARE THESE THINGS TO HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF AS A PERSON?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids think it is important to do well at schoolwork in order to feel good as a person</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids don’t think that having a lot of friends is all that important</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids think it’s important to be good at sports</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids think it’s important to be good looking in order to feel good about themselves</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids think that it’s important to behave the way they should</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kids don’t think that getting good grades is all that important to how they feel about themselves</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. □ □ Some kids think it’s important to be popular  
   BUT Other kids don’t think that being popular is all that important to how they feel about themselves.

8. □ □ Some kids don’t think doing well at athletics is important to how they feel about themselves as a person  
   BUT Other kids feel that doing well at athletics is important.

9. □ □ Some kids don’t think that how they look is important  
   BUT Other kids think that how they look is important.

10. □ □ Some kids don’t think that how they act is all that important  
    BUT Other kids think it’s important to act the way you are supposed to.
APPENDIX I

PEOPLE IN MY LIFE
Instructions to the Child

I have some sentences here and, as you can see from the top of your sheet where it says "People in My Life," I am interested in several kinds of people in your life. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers.

First let me explain how these questions work. There is a sample question at the top. I'll read it out loud and you follow along with me. (Examiner reads sample question.) This question talks about two kids, and I want to know which kids are most like you.

(1) So, what I want you to decide first is whether you are more like the kids on the left side who would rather do fun things with a lot of other people, or whether you are more like the kids on the right side who would rather do fun things with just a few people. Don't mark anything down yet, but first decide which kind of kid is most like you, and go to that side of the page.

(2) Now, the second thing I want you to think about is to decide whether that is only sort of true for you, or really true for you. If it's only sort of true, then put an X in the box under sort of true; if it's really true for you, then put an X in that box, under really true.

(3) For each sentence you only check one box. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, another time it will be on the other side of the page, but you can only check one box for each sentence. You don't check both sides, just the one side most like you.

(4) OK, that one was just for practice. Now we have some more sentences which I'm going to read out loud. For each one, just check one box, the one that goes with what is true for you, what you are most like.

(adapted from Harter, 1985b)
PEOPLE IN MY LIFE
(for Children with Brothers or Sisters)

Sample Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some kids like to do fun things with a lot of other people

BUT

Other kids like to do fun things with just a few people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have mothers who don’t really understand them</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have mothers who really do understand them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have brothers or sisters who like them the way they are</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have brothers or sisters who wish they were different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have grown-ups in this place who don’t really understand them</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have grown-ups in this place who really do understand them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids don’t have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have a close friend who they can tell problems to</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids don’t have a close friend who they can tell problems to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have grown-ups in this place who don’t seem to want to hear the children’s problems</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have grown-ups in this place who do want to listen to the children’s problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kids have mothers who don’t act like what their children do is important</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have mothers who do act like what their children do is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Some kids have brothers or sisters that they can become friends with</td>
<td>BUT Other kids don't have brothers or sisters that they can become friends with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Some kids have grown-ups in this place who care about the children's feelings</td>
<td>BUT Other kids have grown-ups in this place who don't seem to care very much about the children's feelings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Some kids don't have a teacher who helps them to do their very best</td>
<td>BUT Other kids do have a teacher who helps them to do their very best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Some kids have a close friend who really understand them</td>
<td>BUT Other kids don't have a close friend who understands them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Some kids have grown-ups in this place who like them the way they are</td>
<td>BUT Other kids have grown-ups in this place who wish the children were different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Some kids have mothers who care about their feelings</td>
<td>BUT Other kids have mothers who don't seem to care very much about their children's feelings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Some kids have brothers or sisters who sometimes make fun of them</td>
<td>BUT Other kids don't have brothers or sisters who make fun of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>![Circle] ![Circle] Some kids do have a teacher who cares about them</td>
<td>BUT Other kids don't have a teacher who cares about them.</td>
<td>![Circle] ![Circle]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Some kids don't have a close friend who they like to spend time with. BUT Other kids do have a close friend who they like to spend time with.

23. Some kids don't have grown-ups who help them to do their very best. BUT Other kids do have grown-ups who help them to do their very best.

24. Some kids have mothers who like them the way they are. BUT Other kids have mothers who wish their children were different.

25. Some kids don't get asked to play in games by their brothers or sisters very often. BUT Other kids often get asked to play in games by their brothers or sisters.

26. Some kids don't have grown-ups in this place who are fair to them. BUT Other kids do have grown-ups in this place who are fair to them.

27. Some kids don't have a teacher who cares if they feel bad. BUT Other kids do have a teacher who cares if they feel bad.

28. Some kids don't have a close friend who really listens to what they say. BUT Other kids do have a close friend who really listens to what they say.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Some kids don’t have grown-ups in this place who care if they feel bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Some kids have mothers who don’t seem to want to hear about their children’s problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Some kids often spend time being alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Some kids have a teacher who treats them like a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Some kids don’t have a close friend who cares about their feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Some kids have grown-ups in this place who treat them like a person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEOPLE IN MY LIFE
(for Children without Brothers or Sisters)

Sample Item

Really  Sort of  
True    True
for Me   for Me

☐ ☐ Some kids like to do fun things with a lot of other people

BUT

☐ ☐ Other kids like to do fun things with just a few people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Some kids have mothers who don’t really understand them</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have mothers who really do understand them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some kids have grown-ups in this place who don’t really understand them</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have grown-ups in this place who really do understand them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some kids have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids don’t have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some kids have a close friend who they can tell problems to</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids don’t have a close friend who they can tell problems to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Some kids have grown-ups in this place who don’t seem to want to hear the children’s problems</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have grown-ups in this place who do want to listen to the children's problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Some kids have mothers who don’t act like what their children do is important</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other kids have mothers who do act like what their children do is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Really True Sort of True for Me for Me

7. Some kids have grown-ups in this place who care about the children's feelings

8. Some kids don't have a teacher who helps them to do their very best

9. Some kids have a close friend who really understand them

10. Some kids have grown-ups in this place who like them the way they are

11. Some kids have mothers who care about their feelings

Really True Sort of True for Me for Me

Other kids have grown-ups in this place who don't seem to care very much about the children's feelings.

Other kids do have a teacher who helps them to do their very best.

Other kids don't have a close friend who understands them.

Other kids have grown-ups in this place who wish the children were different.

Other kids have mothers who don't seem to care very much about their children's feelings.
12. Some kids do have a teacher who cares about them. BUT Other kids don't have a teacher who cares about them.

13. Some kids have a close friend who they can talk to about things that bother them. BUT Other kids don't have a close friend who they can talk to about things that bother them.

14. Some kids have grown-ups in this place who don't act like what the children do is important. BUT Other kids have grown-ups in this place who do act like what the children do is important.

15. Some kids have mothers who treat their children like a person who really matters. BUT Other kids have mothers who don't usually treat their children like a person who matters.

16. Some kids have grown-ups who help them if they are upset and have a problem. BUT Other kids don't have grown-ups in this place who help them if they are upset and have a problem.

17. Some kids don't have a teacher who is fair to them. BUT Other kids do have a teacher who is fair to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td>Some kids don’t have a close friend who they like to spend time with.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td>Some kids don’t have grown-ups who help them to do their very best.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td>Some kids have mothers who like them the way they are.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td>Some kids don’t have grown-ups in this place who are fair to them.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td>Some kids don’t have a teacher who cares if they feel bad.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
<td>Some kids don’t have a close friend who really listens to what they say.</td>
<td><img src="" alt=" " /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Some kids don’t have grown-ups in this place who care if they feel bad</td>
<td>BUT Other kids do have grown-ups in this place who care if they feel bad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Some kids have mothers who don’t seem to want to hear about their children’s problems</td>
<td>BUT Other kids have mothers who do want to listen to their children’s problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Some kids have a teacher who treats them like a person</td>
<td>BUT Other kids don’t have a teacher who treats them like a person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Some kids don’t have a close friend who cares about their feelings</td>
<td>BUT Other kids do have a close friend who cares about their feelings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Some kids have grown-ups in this place who treat them like a person</td>
<td>BUT Other kids don’t have grown-ups in this place who treat them like a person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Scatterplot of Mean Competence/Importance Discrepancy with Children’s Global Self-Worth
APPENDIX K-1

Scatterplot of Athletic Competence with Importance in this Domain

![Scatterplot](image-url)
APPENDIX K-2

Scatterplot of Social Acceptance with Importance in this Domain
APPENDIX K-3

Scatterplot of Scholastic Competence with Importance in this Domain
APPENDIX K-4

Scatterplot of Physical Appearance with Importance in this Domain
APPENDIX K-5

Scatterplot of Behavioral Conduct with Importance in this Domain
APPENDIX L

Scatterplot of Competence across Five Domains with Children’s Global Self-Worth