DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 160 95 TM 006 783

AUTHOR Evertson, Carolyn M.; And Others
TITLE Relationships of Grade, Sex, and Teacher Rankings to Coder Ratings on a Checklist of Student Behaviors.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO UTR&D-R-75-25
PUB DATE 75
CONTRACT NIE-C-74-0089; OEC-6-10-108
NOTE 56p.; For related documents, see ED 121 739 and TM 006 777 ; Not available in hard copy due to print quality

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Age Differences; *Behavior Rating Scales; Bias; *Classroom Observation Techniques; Classroom Research; Codification; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; *Elementary School Teachers; Interaction Process Analysis; Reliability; *Sex Differences; Statistical Data; Student Behavior; Student Characteristics; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Student Attribute Study

ABSTRACT

Findings from the Student Attribute Study, a two-year investigation designed to identify student characteristics and behaviors related to teacher expectations and attitudes are reported. Children in grades two through five who received consistent teacher rankings over a two-year period on one or more of 13 bi-polar scales describing student characteristics were identified. At the end of the second year, classroom observers completed a behavior check list on the target students they observed. Check list items were analyzed by grade and sex as well as for high, medium, or low teacher rankings on the 13 scales. The results revealed more overt classroom misbehavior attributed to boys than girls. Although few interpretable grade effects appeared, they generally supported the idea that sassing and other negative behaviors decrease with age. In general, the check list data support other data from the study showing that students ranked high on teacher concern but low on the other 12 scales were described more negatively by coders than students ranked favorably by the teachers. Although there were obvious halo effects in the teacher rankings, the rankings were generally accurate. (Author/MV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150160

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM SP

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. PS

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

UTR&D

The University of Texas at Austin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY CERIC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

TM006783

Relationships of Grade, Sex, and Teacher Rankings to Coder Ratings on a Checklist of Student Behaviors

Carolyn M. Evertson,

Jere E. Brophy,

Linda M. Anderson,

John Crawford,

and

Michael C. Baum

Report No. 75-25

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

This project was supported by the National Institute of Education Contract OEC 6-10-108, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, and by Contract NIE-C-74-0089, Correlates of Effective Teaching. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Abstract

This paper reports findings from one set of data from the Student Attribute Study, a two-year investigation designed to identify student characteristics and behaviors related to teacher expectations and attitudes. Children in grades two through five were identified who received consistent teacher rankings over a two-year period on one or more of 13 bi-polar scales describing student characteristics. At the end of the second year, classroom observers completed a behavior checklist on the target students they observed. Checklist items were analyzed by grade and sex as well as for high, medium, or low teacher rankings on the 13 scales. Findings revealed more overt classroom misbehavior attributed to boys than girls. Although few interpretable grade effects apeared, they generally supported the idea that sassing and other negative behaviors decrease with age. In general, the checklist data support other data from the study showing that students ranked high on teacher concern but low on the other 12 scales were described more negatively by coders than students ranked favorably by the teachers. Although there were obvious halo effects in the teacher rankings, the rankings nevertheless were generally accurate.

The present paper will report information from a subset of data from the Student Attribute Study. This study was designed to: a) identify students seen by their teachers as consistent on certain personal attributes believed to be related to the formation of teacher expectations and attitudes; b) observe these consistent students systematically to determine how teachers' perceptions of them affect teacher-student interaction in the classroom; and c) identify differences in patterns of interactions with students seen as consistently high versus consistently low on different scales.

Since the publication of Rosenthal's and Jacobson's (1968) Pygmalion in the Classroom, several investigators have established that teacher attitudes can function as self-fulfilling prophecies affecting the ways teachers interact with students and the achievement levels of students. Considerable information also has been accumulated about the mechanisms that mediate such effects, i.e., the ways teachers systematically treat students differentially based on the teachers' attitudes and expectations for them (Brophy & Good, 1974). However, relatively little information exists about how these attitudes and expectations are formed initially. Some information in impression formation exists from social psychology, but much of it deals with adults rather than students and teachers in the classroom. The Student Attribute Study was designed to investigate the characteristics of students which lead teachers to form certain expectations and attitudes toward them.

In the first year, teachers in first through fourth grade in four elementary schools ranked their students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year on 13 bi-polar scales: (calm vs. restless, careful vs. careless, persistent vs. needs prodding, mature vs. immature, cooperative vs. uncooperative, creative vs. uncreative, high probable achiever vs. low probable achiever, would like to keep vs. would like to have removed, needs special attention vs. needs no special attention, stands out vs. hardly noticeable, looks you in the eye vs. averts eyes, attractive vs. unattractive, and happy vs. unhappy).

The second year, teachers in second through fifth grades ranked these same students on the same scales. Using these rankings, students were identified who were perceived consistently on one or more scales across time and by both teachers. In the latter part of the second year, these consistent students, whose teacher rankings were unknown to classroom coders, were observed in their classrooms by observers (coders) who used a multi-faceted, low inference coding system designed specifically for the study (Brophy, King, Evertson, Baum, Crawford, Mahaffey, & Sherman, Note 1).

The system provided for recording dyadic contacts between individual students and the teacher in several contexts (small group vs. general class; public vs. private; teacher initiated vs. student initiated). The system took into account some aspects of quality as well as quantity of interactions.

Other data from the study include teacher and coder adjective descriptions of the target students. At the end of the second year, teachers were interviewed about the students in their classes who were identified for

observation, and were asked to give three phrases or adjectives describing the most salient characteristics of these students. Coders also gave similar descriptions of the students they observed. In addition, they filled out a behavior checklist on the students. Data from the interviews and from the descriptions of salient attributes are reported in Baum, Brophy, Evertson, Anderson, and Crawford (Note 2), and Anderson, Brophy, Evertson, Baum, and Crawford (Note 3).

This report will present data from the behavior checklist. It will examine differences across each of the 13 bipolar scales and grade and sex differences in coder ratings on these checklists. The checklists required coders to rate the degree to which a given attribute was characteristic of a particular student on a 3-point scale (1 = "not at all"; 2 = "somewhat"; and 3 = "typical"). If coders could not rate a student, they circled "5," and "no data" was recorded. The checklist included items such as "short-attention span," "dislikes school," "academic peer leader," "disrupts," "plays aggressively with peers," "has fun with peers," and "aloof and socially reserved." In all, 44 attributes were rated.

Two coders alternated visits to each classroom until each had completed five 2½-hour observations on classes containing several target students. Each target student then was rated by both coders, and the two scores were added together for each of the 44 attribute scores. In cases where one coder could not rate the student on a given behavior, the rating by the other coder was doubled. Thus, scores always ranged from two through six. This procedure seemed appropriate because intercoder reliabilities were high on all but four of the 44 scales. The four

exceptions (fearfulness and chronic anxiety; willingness to help peers; dependency on teacher; and physically robust vs. frail) were deleted from further analyses.

Obtaining reliability estimates proved to be somewhat of a problem. Since each scale contained only three points, percent agreement figures would be artificially high. On the other hand, Pearson correlations are attentuated by such range restrictions, thereby reducing the chances for significant relationships. We decided to use the Pearson r's to assess intercoder agreement, since this provided a more conservative estimate. Reliabilities on the remaining 40 scales exceeded the .05 level.

Data Analyses

Two-way sex (boys vs. girls) by grade (second, third, fourth, and fifth) analyses of variance were conducted on the 40 behavior checklist items. One-way F-tests using position in the teacher rankings (high, medium, low) as classifying variables also were computed for each of the checklist items. These findings will be discussed following the sex X grade data. Because N's generally were high for all comparisons, only findings which exceeded the .01 level of significance will be discussed.

Cell N's differed from item to item, since some pairs of coders were not able to rate target students on all items. However, the data analyses programs made appropriate adjustments for unequal cell N's within separate analyses.

Insert Table 1 about here

Sex Differences

Fifteen of the 40 items showed significant sex differences at the .01 level. The most striking findings for the sex data were the coders' perceptions of girls as more self-conscious, easily embarrassed, and hypersensitive, but making constructive use of their classroom time. Alternately, boys were seen as disruptive, boisterous, disliking school, having short attention spans, irresponsible, lazy in performing tasks, negative, destructive to property, restless, picked on by teachers, and playing aggressively with peers.

Thus, even though girls were described as passive and somewhat introverted, they also were seen as using their time constructively Girls were seen in many ways as "playing the good student role," whereas boys were described more frequently as rowdy, boisterous, and generally mischievous, showing behaviors clearly not associated with the "good student role." However, they were seen as less inhibited and as having a good time with peers.

Grade Differences

There were significant grade differences for 11 of the 40 items, although only a few of these are interpretable (those showing linear upward or downward trends and those showing a sharp increase or decrease followed by a leveling off). These will be discussed first. The remaining

grade differences have essentially U-shaped patterns indicating high means for second and fifth grades but sharp decreases for one or both of the grades in between. Although these patterns were statistically significant, we offer no interpretations for them.

Attention span and physical maturity increased with grade level. Negativism or tendency to do the opposite of what is requested decreased as students got older, as did impertinence and sassing the teacher. This suggests that students become somewhat more cooperative and better socialized to the student role as they get older, at least within this age range.

Interactions

No sex x grade interactions were significant at the .01 level. However, two were significant at the .05 level which might bear mentioning since these patterns appear in other data from this study. Boys received higher ratings for attention seeking show-off behavior until the fifth grade, when this behavior became more typical of girls. This same pattern held for ratings of boisterous, rowdy behavior. Such behavior became less typical of boys and more typical of girls at the later grades. One explanation for these effects is earlier maturity in girls. Several investigators have found that, at the early grades, the student role and the socializing factors influencing girls are more compatible for girls than boys, but with increasing age, the male role becomes more compatible and the female role less compatible with the student role.

Relationship of Teacher Rankings to Items on the Behavior Checklist

In addition to the analyses grade and sex differences in the coders' behavioral checklists of target students, analyses of their relationships with teacher rankings on the 13 bipolar scales also were completed. One-way F-tests comparing coder ratings on the checklist items, using consistent teacher rankings (high, medium, or low) as classifying variables, showed that high and low ranking students were perceived consistently by coders as well.

The scales were grouped into general common sense categories: general ability and work habits (careful vs. careless, persistent vs. needs prodding; cooperative vs. uncooperative; creative vs. not creative; high achiever vs. low achiever; and calm vs. restless); teacher attitudes of affiliation (wants-to-keep vs. wants to have removed) and concern (needs speical attention vs. needs no special attention); and personal attributes (stands out vs. hardly noticeable; looks teacher in the eye vs. averts eyes; attractive vs. unattractive; and happy vs. unhappy). The relationships among these will be discussed in this order.

Insert Table 2 about here

Calm, Good Self Control vs. Restless, Highly Active

Students whom teachers ranked as restless were seen by coders as seeking attention more, disruptive, boisterous, disliking school, having short attention spans, inattentive to what peers said, easily confused, lazy in performance of school tasks, irresponsible, uncooperative in peer

situations, suggestible, destructive to property, negativisitic, impertinent, irritable, picked on by teachers, restless, and aggressive in playing with peers. Most of these relationships are not surprising, although restless students also were seen as having more fun with peers.

Calm students were rated by coders as using their time constructively, as academic peer leaders, and as teacher favorites. Again, none of these perceptions is surprising. However, calm students also were rated as self-conscious and easily embarrassed; as having fixed emotional expressions, as lacking emotional reactivity, as shy with peers, and as preferring solitary activities. So, calm students were viewed as more passive and less outgoing than their restless counterparts.

Careful, Deliberate Worker vs. Careless, Hasty Worker

Students that teachers ranked as careful were seen by coders as aloof and socially reserved, though popular with peers; as using their time constructively; as social and academic peer leaders; and as teacher favorites. The students ranked as careless, were seen very similarly to those ranked as restless, except that the restless students also were seen as inattentive, destructive, and aggressive with peers. Students ranked at the middle and high end of the "careful" scale also were rated as having less self confidence than those ranked low (careless).

Tries Hard, Persistent Worker vs. Gives Up Easily, Needs to be Prodded

The persistent students were viewed the same as the careful students on the previous scale: popular with peers; using time constructively; academic and social peer leaders; and teacher favorites. Students who

needed prodding (according to the teachers) had similar ratings to those of the "restless" and "careless" students, except that the students who needed prodding also were seen as preoccupied and in a world of their own and as lacking self confidence.

Mature vs. Immature

Mature students were rated similarly to the high groups on the scales discussed previously, except that, in addition, mature students were seen as preferring solitary activities. The less mature students were seen similarly to the low ranked students on the other scales, except they also were rated as being hypersensitive and as having their feelings easily hurt. Also, while the low persistent students were rated as lacking self-confidence, the low mature students were not.

Cooperative, Compliant vs. Uncooperative, Defiant

Cooperative nominees also were rated similarly to other students ranked high on the previous scales: popular with peers; aloof and socially reserved; using time constructively; academic peer leaders; and teacher favorites. In addition, the highly cooperative, compliant students were rated as shy and bashful with peers. Students ranked in the middle of this scale were seen as self-conscious and easily embarrassed. Finally, the students ranked as uncooperative were rated as attention seeking, disruptive, boisterous, etc., the same as low students on all of the previously discussed scales (except that the uncooperative, defiant students also were rated as using profane language significantly more).

Creative, Imaginative vs. Not Creative or Imaginative

Highly creative students were rated similarly to the other high groups: popular with peers; academic peer leaders; teacher favorites; and using time constructively. However, these creative students were not seen as aloof, shy, or preferring solitary activities as many other highly ranked students were. Low creative students, on the other hand, were seen as disliking school; having short attention spans; lazy; irresponsible; and suggestible. This pattern is similar to the ones for students ranked low on the previous scales. However, these students also were described as self-conscious, lacking in emotional reactivity, preoccupied, shy and bashful with peers, lacking in self-confidence, depressed, clumsy, and sluggish and lethargic, suggesting that coders saw low creative students as passive, introverted, and lacking in self-esteem, rather than as troublesome or restless.

Probable Highest Achiever vs. Probable Lowest Achiever

High achievers were described similary to the high creative students, except that high achievers also were seen as social peer leaders (For high creative students, social peer leadership was significant at the .05 level, however). Low achievers were seen similarly to low creative students, in that both types were rated as self-conscious, preoccupied, disliking school, etc. However, low achievers were seen differently from low creative students in that they were rated as disruptive, boisterous, easily confused, hypersensitive, negativistic, picked on by teachers, restless, and aggressive with peers. Low achievers not only were rated high on some of

the checklist items describing passive and non-coping behaviors, but also on those describing aggressive behaviors. This suggests that the low achievers are composed of at least two different types of students.

Would Like to Keep for Another Year for the Sheer Joy of it (Attachment) vs. Would Like to Have Removed from My Class (Rejection) and Concerns Me a Great Deal, I Would Like to be Able to Devote More Attention to (Concern) vs. Doesn't Require Special Attention (Low Concern) (Conc

Attachment students were rated similarly to the low concern students, with one exception: low concern students also were given high ratings for peer social leadership. Otherwise, the popularity, teacher favoritism, and constructive time use items were applied to these students. Rejection and high concern students also were similar on 13 of the descriptors: disruptive, boisterous, dislike for school, easily confused, lack of attention, lack of self-confidence, suggestible, irresponsible, negativisitic, picked on, restless, and aggressive. The high concern students also were viewed as attention-seeking, inattentive to peers, uncooperative in peer situations, destructive to property, impertinent, using profane language, irritable, and having physical complaints such as headaches.

Stands Out, Very Noticeable (Salient) vs. Hardly Noticeable (Non-Salient)

The students ranked as salient were seen disparately by the coders. Apparently, salience meant different things to different coders. High salient students were seen as teacher favorites, as popular, and as using time constructively. However, in addition, certain negative attributes also were used to describe them. They were seen as attention seeking, disruptive, boisterous, impertinent, irritable, and aggressive in playing

with peers. These are behaviors likely to be noticed by observers. Non-salient students were described with adjectives denoting withdrawal, passivity, or introversion: lack of emotional reactivity, preoccupied and in a dream world, shy, preferring solitary activities, self-conscious, lacking self confidence, easily confused, hypersensitive, depressed, aloof, suggestible, and sluggish. To some extent, the non-salient students were viewed similarly to the non-creative ones, although they were characterized more by terms denoting inactivity rather than overt acting out.

Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eyes; Attractive vs. Unattractive; and Happy vs. Unhappy

High ranking students on the remaining three scales were rated essentially the same. All were viewed as popular, as social and academic leaders, as teacher favorites, and as using time constructively. Students ranked at the bottom of these scales also were seen similarly: as preoccupied, having short attention spans, lacking in self-confidence, easily confused, lazy in school, and irresponsible. Descriptors used for students who avert eyes and for those who are unattractive are primarily those indicating inactivity (inattentive to peers, clumsy, disliking school, etc.). However, the unhappy students were rated as showing more overt problematic behavior. In contrast to the other low ranked students, they were seen as disruptive, boisterous, uncooperative, destructive, impertinent, restless, and aggressive with peers. Thus, unhappy students were described as showing more troublesome disruptive behaviors than those in the unattractive and averts eyes groups.

Discussion

In viewing the findings from this data set, it should be noted that the behavior problems checklist was added to the package of instruments used in the Student Attribute Study chiefly to focus on the more negative aspects of student behavior. While some items did describe positive behavior, 75% focused on behavior problems. It was felt that this instrument would be useful for determining the types of negative behaviors attributable to students ranked low on many of these scales. No doubt the focus of the checklist provided a "negative set" for coders, which could have produced a degree of negative "halo."

Behavior problems which coders attributed to boys were mostly of an overt nature. They described boys as disruptive, boisterous, restless, aggressive in playing with peers, but also as having more fun with peers. Other evidence also supports the finding that boys are generally more salient in the classroom and more overtly troublesome than girls (Brophy & Good, 1974). Girls were described as self-conscious, easily embarrassed and as hypersensitive (although they were also rated as making more constructive use of their time). So, while they did not "act out," any behavior problems they may have had were viewed as more covert and passive in nature.

As with the other data sets, we see general halo effects, especially in the teacher rankings and the coder ratings. Girls are perceived as better behaved than boys. Findings from the behavioral data show that girls initiated more interactions with teachers, but boys were contacted more by the teacher (we suspect this was a device teachers used to control boys' mis-

behavior), so the difference in observer perceptions between boys and girls is probably real. It is also true that these sex differences are probably not as neat and simple as the ranking and rating data show. The differences are no doubt more pronounced and overgeneralized compared to the real differences in the behavioral data (Baum, Brophy, Evertson, Crawford, and Anderson, Note 4). Nevertheless, there are real differences.

The few interpretable grade differences revealed nothing surprising. Increase in attention span and increase in physical maturity with age are attributable to cognitive and physical maturation, although students also become less impertinent with age. This suggests that socialization may affect their behavior such that in some areas students learn to behave more appropriately, at least within this age range.

Certain checklist items were used to describe students ranked at either extreme of all 13 teacher rankings. Students ranked high on the concern scale and low on the other scales were described uniformly as having short attention spans, disliking school, easily confused, lazy in the performance of school tasks, irresponsible, and restless and unable to sit still. Students ranked at the high ends of most scales were described uniformly as using time constructively, as academic and social peer leaders, and as teacher favorites.

There were some exceptions to these typical patterns. Calm students were seen by coders as easily embarrassed and self conscious, a description reserved for students ranked low on the creative scale, as low achievers, as non-noticeable, as unhappy, and as averting their eyes. Calm and cooperative students also were described as shy, socially reserved, and preferring

solitary activities. Calm, careful, and cooperative students were rated as aloof by coders, even though immature, low creative, and less salient students also were described this way.

One item, "picked on by teacher," may actually be invalid, since, when looks at the other, more provocative, behaviors, it is probable that the students are picking on the teacher rather than vice versa. Also, frequently coders could not judge whether the teacher's behavior toward a student was the result of past provocation, since coders frequently did not see preceding events from days or even weeks before.

In many studies combining creativity and achievement, findings reveal that these two aspects of ability are closely related. Only two of the 362 students were ranked consistently as low in achievement but highly creative by the teachers. The coder ratings bear out the close relationship between creativity and achievement. Low creative students were seen as having fixed emotional expressions, as shy, as aloof and socially reserved, and as clumsy with poor coordination. Low achievers were seen as disruptive, boisterous, inattentive to what peers say, negative, impertinent, irritable, aggressive with peers, and picked on by teachers. The low creative and low achievement groups were identical on all other ratings, however; they both were rated as self-conscious, preoccupied, having short attention spans, etc.

The high creative and high achieving students were seen as popular with peers, as peer leaders academically, as teacher favorites and as social leaders. The similarity in ratings between these two groups might be explained by the likelihood that 1) creativity is difficult to measure and to discriminate from academic ability; 2) coders may have inferred creativity from achievement; and 3) they frequently did not have enough evidence to

judge these two attributes. Coders did not see work samples, as a general rule, although they did get some idea of work habits and ability from samples of students' work displayed in the classrooms.

In general, the coder data support the accuracy of the teacher data, despite halo effects. There is little doubt that these perceptions are based on real phenomena confirming the student's unique contribution to classroom climate and to teacher-student interaction.

Reference Notes

1. Brophy, J., King, C., Evertson, C., Baum, M., Crawford, J., Mahaffey, L., & Sherman, G. Manual for the Student Attribute Coding System (Res. Rep. 74-2). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1974.

2. Baum, M., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Anderson, L., & Crawford, J. Grade and Sex Differences in Adjective Descriptions of Elementary School Children Given by Their Teachers and by Classroom Observers (Res. Rep. 75-22). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

3. Anderson, L., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Baum, M., & Crawford, J. Relationships between Teacher and Observer Adjective Descriptions and Teacher Perceptions of Student Characteristics (Res. Rep. 75-24). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

4. Baum, M., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Crawford, J., & Anderson, L. Sex and Grade Differences in the Interactions and Classroom Behaviors of Children in Grades Two through Five (Res. Rep. 75-18). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

References

Brophy, J. & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Footnotes

The authors wish to thank the following people, all of whom played key roles in one or more aspects of the Student Attribute Study: Connie Anderson, Bucky Evertson, Carol Greenhalgh, Janet Honea, Carol King, Jane Ogden, Georgia Reed, Dr. Kathleen Senior, Gael Sherman, Mike Tebeleff, Ann Turney, and Cicely Wynne, who collected data as classroom coders; Jim Blackwell, John Brozovsky, Paul Cockreham, Mary Jane Leahy, and Wally Washington, who assisted in data preparation or analysis; Gwen Newman, Barbara Shovens, and Sidney Weaver, who assisted in manuscript and table preparation.

Table 1

Relationships between Grade and Sex and Observers' Ratings of Student Behavior[1]

1. Attention-seeking, "showoff" behavior.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.38	3.30	3.53	3.00
	sd	1.23	1.09	1.40	1.00
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.03	2.79	2.66	3.28
	sd	1.24	1.09	1.06	1.39
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.49		
Between	7	3.60		
Sex	1	10.58	7.30	**
Grade	3	.37	.25	
G X S	3	4.51	3.11	*
Within	354	1.45		

2. Has fun with peers.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	4.94	4.98	4.93	4.80
	sd	1.15	.95	1.05	1.15
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	4.41	4.38	4.55	4.83
	sd	.90	.99	1.14	1.14
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.15		
Between	7	2.38		
Sex	1	10.95	9.72	**
Grade	3	.34	.30	
G X S	3	1.56	1.38	
Within	354	1.13		

3. Self-consciousness, easily embarrassed.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.94	2.43	2.80	2.68
	sd	1.04	.93	.96	.80
	N	34	46	75	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.28	3.07	3.07	2.93
	sd	1.21	1.08	1.18	1.31
	N	36	41	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	358	1.18		
Between	7	2.67		
Sex	1	10.90	9.45	**
Grade	3	1.96	1.70	
G X S	3	.64	.55	
Within	351	1.15		

4. Fixed expression, lack of emotional reactivity.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.94	2.61	2.68	2.84
	sd	1.28	.83	1.00	1.07
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.00	2.74	2.68	2.52
	sd	1.20	.89	1.05	1.12
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.09		
Between	7	1.07		
Sex	1	.09	.08	
Grade	3	1.68	1.54	
G X S	3	.79	.72	
Within	354	1.09		

5. Disruptiveness, tendency to annoy and bother others.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.68	3.43	3.24	2.84
	sd	1.43	1.36	1.12	.94
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.78	2.57	2.51	2.76
	sd	1.03	.80	.93	.99
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.30		
Between	7	7.06		
Sex	1	32.42	27.33	***
Grade	3	2.82	2.37	
G X S	3	2.85	2.40	
Within	354	1.19		

6. Boisterousness, rowdiness.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.47	3.30	3.29	2.80
	sd	1.42	1.17	1.22	1.04
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.49	2.29	2.40	2.72
	sd	.84	.46	.85	.88
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.19		
Between	7	8.20		
Sex	1	43.41	41.20	***
Grade	3	.71	.68	
G X S	3	3.94	3.74	*
Within	354	1.05		

7. Preoccupation; "in a world of his own," daydreaming.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.32	2.65	2.97	3.04
	sd	1.15	.77	1.02	.98
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.14	2.45	2.93	2.72
	sd	.98	.59	1.00	1.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.98		
Between	7	3.11		
Sex	1	2.74	2.92	
Grade	3	6.10	6.50	***
G X S	3	.25	.26	
Within	354	.94		

8. Shyness, bashfulness with peers.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.88	2.53	2.79	2.64
	sd	1.12	.94	1.04	.81
	N	34	45	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.19	2.81	3.05	2.86
	sd	1.02	.86	1.20	1.25
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	1.12		
Between	7	1.73		
Sex	1	5.62	5.06	*
Grade	3	2.13	1.91	
G X S	3	.02	.02	
Within	353	1.11		

9. Preference for solitary activities.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.09	2.78	3.08	3.08
	sd	1.16	.89	1.13	1.04
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.30	2.86	3.12	3.07
	sd	1.02	1.05	1.20	1.28
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.22		
Between	7	1.00		
Sex	1	.49	.40	
Grade	3	2.01	1.64	
G X S	3	.17	.14	
Within	354	1.23		

10. Dislike for school.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.24	2.53	2.91	3.13
	sd	1.35	1.14	1.12	1.46
	N	33	43	74	23
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.39	2.03	2.26	2.88
	sd	.77	.16	.72	1.07
	N	36	40	69	26

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	343	1.13		
Between	7	6.99		
Sex	1	23.49	23.40	***
Grade	3	7.27	7.24	***
G X S	3	1.20	1.19	
Within	336	1.00		

11. Popular with peers.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	4.26	4.38	4.26	4.24
	sd	1.08	.96	1.14	1.05
	N	34	45	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	4.49	3.98	3.75	4.21
	sd	1.30	1.00	1.31	1.21
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	1.34		
Between	7	2.09		
Sex	1	2.56	1.93	
Grade	3	1.80	1.35	
G X S	3	2.23	1.68	
Within	353	1.33		

12. Short attention span.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.64	3.09	3.07	2.57
	sd	1.43	1.21	1.09	.79
	N	33	46	75	23
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.97	2.63	2.59	2.73
	sd	1.32	1.00	.90	1.12
	N	37	40	73	26

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	352	1.31		
Between	7	4.95		
Sex	1	9.70	7.88	**
Grade	3	5.86	4.76	**
G X S	3	2.46	2.00	
Within	345	1.23		

13. Lack of self-confidence.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.94	2.47	2.78	2.64
	sd	1.25	1.04	1.05	1.08
	N	33	45	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.05	2.58	2.93	2.83
	sd	1.25	.95	1.07	1.23
	N	37	38	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	355	1.22		
Between	7	1.57		
Sex	1	1.57	1.29	
Grade	3	3.11	2.56	
G X S	3	.03	.02	
Within	348	1.21		

14. Inattentiveness to what peers say.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.33	2.48	2.53	2.75
	sd	1.34	.86	.79	1.07
	N	33	42	75	24
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.43	2.49	2.38	2.72
	sd	1.14	.75	.72	.92
	N	37	41	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	353	.95		
Between	7	6.19		
Sex	1	.02	.02	
Grade	3	14.22	16.89	***
G X S	3	.20	.24	
Within	346	.84		

15. Easily confused.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.91	2.52	2.50	2.32
	sd	1.23	.90	.79	.69
	N	33	44	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.75	2.36	2.51	2.48
	sd	1.20	.96	.86	.69
	N	36	39	70	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	351	.86		
Between	7	1.47		
Sex	1	.10	.12	
Grade	3	2.92	3.43	*
G X S	3	.47	.55	
Within	344	.85		

16. Hypersensitivity, feelings easily hurt.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.45	2.27	2.45	2.44
	sd	.83	.62	.83	.65
	N	33	44	75	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.81	2.66	2.49	2.66
	sd	.88	.99	.90	.90
	N	37	41	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	356	.72		
Between	7	1.10		
Sex	1	4.83	6.81	**
Grade	3	.47	.67	
G X S	3	.49	.69	
Within	349	.71		

17. Laziness in school and in performance of other tasks.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.88	2.63	2.88	2.84
	sd	1.22	.93	1.03	.99
	N	33	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.49	2.24	2.58	2.55
	sd	.84	.48	.93	.69
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	.87		
Between	7	1.97		
Sex	1	9.31	10.98	**
Grade	3	1.44	1.69	
G X S	3	.06	.07	
Within	353	.85		

18. Irresponsibility, undependability.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.18	3.02	2.87	2.68
	sd	1.31	1.20	1.08	.99
	N	33	45	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.54	2.36	2.36	2.45
	sd	.96	.62	.69	.63
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	359	.97		
Between	7	3.83		
Sex	1	20.54	22.40	***
Grade	3	1.33	1.45	
G X S	3	.77	.84	
Within	352	.92		

19. Depression, chronic sadness.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.30	2.11	2.24	2.28
	sd	.77	.31	.51	.54
	N	33	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.19	2.12	2.23	2.48
	sd	.46	.33	.59	.95
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	.32		
Between	7	.55		
Sex	1	.04	.14	
Grade	3	.94	2.94	*
G X S	3	.34	1.06	
Within	353	.32		

20. Uncooperativeness in peer situations.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.82	2.42	2.37	2.44
	sd	.95	.78	.71	.71
	N	33	45	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.59	2.40	2.27	2.38
	sd	.86	.83	.67	.62
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	359	.59		
Between	7	1.12		
Sex	1	.77	1.32	
Grade	3	2.21	3.80	*
G X S	3	.15	.27	
Within	352	.58		

21. Aloofness, social reserve.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.82	2.65	2.76	3.16
	sd	1.03	.74	1.14	.80
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.43	2.98	2.67	3.31
	sd	1.19	.84	.91	1.11
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.03		
Between	7	3.49		
Sex	1	4.83	4.93	*
Grade	3	4.81	4.91	**
G X S	3	1.71	1.75	
Within	354	.98		

22. Suggestible, easily led by others.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.12	2.85	2.95	2.56
	sd	.96	1.05	1.02	.77
	N	33	46	74	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.30	2.81	2.94	3.15
	sd	1.29	.86	.95	1.17
	N	37	42	72	27

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	355	1.05		
Between	7	2.04		
Sex	1	2.53	2.46	
Grade	3	2.34	2.27	
G X S	3	1.59	1.54	
Within	348	1.03		

23. Clumsiness, awkwardness, poor muscular coordination.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.18	2.24	2.38	2.20
	sd	.46	.87	.80	.50
	N	33	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.14	2.12	2.41	2.21
	sd	.35	.33	.81	.49
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	.45		
Between	7	.45		
Sex	1	.08	.19	
Grade	3	.94	2.09	
G X S	3	.09	.19	
Within	353	.45		

24. Destructiveness in regard to his own/or other property.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.59	2.29	2.30	2.12
	sd	.96	.59	.83	.33
	N	34	45	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.08	2.00	2.10	2.10
	sd	.28	.00	.50	.31
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	.37		
Between	7	1.40		
Sex	1	5.10	14.52	***
Grade	3	.76	2.16	
G X S	3	.81	2.31	
Within	353	.35		

25. Negativism, tendency to do the opposite of requested.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.88	2.48	2.46	2.40
	sd	1.22	.72	.82	.71
	N	33	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.43	2.19	2.18	2.21
	sd	.93	.40	.56	.41
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	.59		
Between	7	2.07		
Sex	1	7.17	12.72	***
Grade	3	2.23	3.96	**
G X S	3	.22	.39	
Within	353	.56		

26. Impertinence, sassing.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.88	2.70	2.37	2.32
	sd	1.17	.96	.73	.56
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.65	2.17	2.23	2.38
	sd	1.06	.44	.66	.62
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.67		
Between	7	2.49		
Sex	1	3.46	5.46	*
Grade	3	3.46	5.45	**
G X S	3	1.18	1.87	
Within	354	.63		

27. Sluggishness, lethargy.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.24	2.22	2.39	2.52
	sd	.50	.59	.65	.71
	N	34	46	76	26
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.22	2.12	2.47	2.31
	sd	.53	.40	.87	.66
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.43		
Between	7	.76		
Sex	1	.32	.75	
Grade	3	1.38	3.23	*
G X S	3	.28	.65	
Within	354	.43		

28. Profane language, swearing, cursing.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.32	2.09	2.07	2.20
	sd	.64	.35	.25	.50
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.19	2.02	2.01	2.03
	sd	.62	.15	.12	.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.14		
Between	7	.48		
Sex	1	.85	6.47	*
Grade	3	.77	5.84	***
G X S	3	.06	.45	
Within	354	.13		

29. Irritability, hot tempered, easily aroused to anger.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.71	2.65	2.53	2.36
	sd	1.03	1.14	.89	.57
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.49	2.29	2.26	2.52
	sd	.96	.74	.71	.74
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.76		
Between	7	1.04		
Sex	1	2.38	3.14	
Grade	3	.60	.79	
G X S	3	1.03	1.37	
Within	354	.76		

30. Often has physical complaints, e.g., headaches, stomach ache.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.12	2.02	2.07	2.00
	sd	.48	.15	.47	.00
	N	33	46	75	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.17	2.05	2.06	2.14
	sd	.57	.22	.29	.59
	N	35	42	71	28

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	354	.15		
Between	7	.14		
Sex	1	.21	1.37	
Grade	3	.18	1.15	
G X S	3	.08	.54	
Within	347	.15		

31. Constructive use of time.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.84
	sd	1.42	1.37	1.18	1.31
	N	33	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	4.57	5.02	4.79	4.76
	sd	1.42	1.02	.88	.79
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	1.45		
Between	7	5.55		
Sex	1	18.72	13.63	***
Grade	3	3.33	2.42	
G X S	3	3.38	2.46	
Within	353	1.37		

32. Peer leadership academically.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.24	3.43	3.00	3.52
	sd	1.26	1.44	1.19	1.53
	N	34	46	74	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.89	3.78	3.08	3.66
	sd	1.54	1.35	1.21	1.45
	N	37	41	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	358	1.84		
Between	7	4.12		
Sex	1	7.28	4.07	*
Grade	3	5.85	3.27	*
G X S	3	1.33	.74	
Within	351	1.79		

33. Teacher favoritism.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.55	2.65	2.51	3.12
	sd	.87	.90	.81	1.27
	N	33	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.92	2.62	2.62	3.07
	sd	1.09	.88	.83	1.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	360	.91		
Between	7	2.29		
Sex	1	.76	.85	
Grade	3	4.34	4.91	**
G X S	3	.75	.85	
Within	353	.88		

34. Picked on by teacher.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.76	2.20	2.55	2.32
	sd	1.16	.50	.85	.63
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.22	2.02	2.15	2.17
	sd	.58	.15	.43	.38
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.46		
Between	7	2.32		
Sex	1	7.93	18.68	***
Grade	3	2.05	4.82	**
G X S	3	.73	1.71	
Within	354	.43		

35. Social leadership among peers.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.47	3.54	3.21	3.36
	sd	1.26	1.41	1.12	1.19
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	3.35	2.98	3.00	3.10
	sd	.82	1.02	1.12	1.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.34		
Between	7	1.79		
Sex	1	6.55	4.91	*
Grade	3	1.24	.93	
G X S	3	.74	.56	
Within	354	1.33		

36. Restlessness, inability to sit still.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.50	3.30	3.26	2.84
	sd	1.48	1.24	1.22	1.18
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.92	2.57	2.53	2.93
	sd	1.19	.77	.85	.96
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.31		
Between	7	4.76		
Sex	1	18.74	15.10	***
Grade	3	1.83	1.48	
G X S	3	3.03	2.44	
Within	354	1.24		

37. Aggressive play with peers.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	3.62	3.35	3.22	3.48
	sd	1.39	1.20	1.27	1.23
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.46	2.14	2.42	2.79
	sd	.84	.35	.85	1.05
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.34		
Between	7	12.09		
Sex	1	72.87	64.68	***
Grade	3	2.61	2.32	
G X S	3	1.31	1.16	
Within	354	1.13		

38. Physical characteristic (short).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.62	.70	.79	.60
	sd	.74	.96	.90	1.04
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.73	.55	.79	.21
	sd	1.02	.80	1.25	.49
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.94		
Between	7	1.42		
Sex	1	.88	.95	
Grade	3	2.08	2.24	
G X S	3	.95	1.02	
Within	354	.93		

39. Physical characteristic (skinny).

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.35	.24	.54	.36
	sd	.81	.74	1.03	.76
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.35	.31	.63	.41
	sd	.82	.68	1.24	1.05
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.91		
Between	7	.63		
Sex	1	.22	.24	
Grade	3	1.38	1.50	
G X S	3	.03	.03	
Within	354	.92		

40. Physically immature.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.18	.85	.63	.60
	sd	1.22	1.17	.94	.87
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.05	.55	.60	.31
	sd	1.35	.83	1.01	.89
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1.13		
Between	7	3.20		
Sex	1	2.70	2.49	
Grade	3	6.23	5.73	**
G X S	3	.34	.32	
Within	354	1.09		

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 2

Relationships between High, Medium, and Low Rankings on the 13 Scales and Coder Ratings of Student Behavior

Behavior Checklist Items	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Persistent vs. Needs Prodding				Mature vs. Immature				Cooperative vs. Uncooperative			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
1. Attention-seeking, show-off behavior	2.39	3.06	3.98	**	2.83	3.05	3.74	**	2.77	3.20	3.50	**	2.63	3.21	3.45	**	2.58	3.10	3.90	**
2. Fun with peers	4.42	4.69	5.04	**	4.78	4.56	4.83		4.81	4.69	4.78		4.61	4.74	4.84		4.65	4.66	5.04	
3. Self-conscious, easily embarrassed	3.22	2.98	2.55	**	2.88	3.05	2.68		2.79	2.88	2.89		2.89	2.93	2.90		2.95	3.07	2.52	**
4. Fixed expression, lack of emotional reactivity	3.12	2.84	2.30	**	2.77	2.90	2.45	*	2.78	2.76	2.74		2.99	2.65	2.65		2.97	2.88	2.48	*
5. Disruptiveness, tendency to annoy and bother	2.16	3.03	3.84	**	2.45	2.99	3.57	**	2.45	3.05	3.50	**	2.42	3.02	3.42	**	2.32	2.91	4.00	**
6. Boisterousness, rowdiness	2.16	2.77	3.68	**	2.52	2.80	3.47	**	2.46	2.87	3.33	**	2.40	2.92	3.24	**	2.32	2.78	3.79	**
7. Preoccupation, in a world of his own, day dreams	3.07	2.97	2.71		2.64	3.04	2.84	*	2.71	2.85	3.26	**	2.86	2.94	2.85		2.85	3.09	2.98	
8. Shyness, bashfulness with peers	3.35	2.93	2.39	**	2.93	3.01	2.62		2.91	2.79	2.87		3.03	2.88	2.76		3.08	3.01	2.50	**
9. Preference for solitary activities	3.57	3.03	2.64	**	3.09	3.08	2.64	*	3.09	3.03	2.96		3.36	3.07	2.63	**	3.25	3.19	2.81	

Behavior Checklist Items	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Persistent vs. Needs Prodding				Mature vs. Immature				Cooperative vs. Uncooperative			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
10. Dislike for school	2.21	2.63	2.89	**	2.22	2.74	2.79	**	2.31	2.53	3.19	**	2.34	2.67	2.87	**	2.26	2.67	3.11	**
11. Popular with peers	4.36	4.10	4.05		4.57	3.94	3.95	**	4.47	4.11	3.81	**	4.54	4.10	3.95	**	4.54	3.95	3.96	**
12. Short attention span	2.25	3.05	3.59	**	2.37	2.90	3.75	**	2.40	2.83	3.77	**	2.39	2.76	3.56	**	2.24	3.02	3.71	**
13. Lack of self-confidence	2.75	3.02	2.64		2.42	3.03	2.96	**	2.47	2.73	3.17	**	2.53	2.86	3.18	**	2.47	2.97	2.81	*
14. Inattentiveness to what peers say	2.57	2.60	3.07	**	2.64	2.58	2.82		2.68	2.52	3.06	**	2.61	2.66	2.78		2.59	2.53	3.20	**
15. Easily confused	2.31	2.72	2.79	**	2.26	2.55	2.93	**	2.28	2.40	3.15	**	2.23	2.39	3.10	**	2.21	2.54	2.90	**
16. Hypersensitivity feelings easily hurt	2.47	2.65	2.45		2.41	2.63	2.59		2.36	2.50	2.56		2.38	2.58	2.69	**	2.53	2.58	2.50	
17. Laziness in school, and performance of tasks	2.15	2.73	2.96	**	2.25	2.66	3.03	**	2.24	2.63	3.11	**	2.28	2.59	2.82	**	2.17	2.66	3.10	**
18. Irresponsibility, undependability	2.09	2.75	3.16	**	2.23	2.65	3.33	**	2.22	2.60	3.35	**	2.24	2.61	3.19	**	2.15	2.63	3.48	**
19. Depression, chronic sadness	2.25	2.33	2.09		2.08	2.33	2.16	*	2.13	2.29	2.20		2.17	2.24	2.24		2.15	2.98	2.17	
20. Uncooperativeness in peer situations	2.15	2.46	2.70	**	2.21	2.43	2.69	**	2.24	2.47	2.62	*	2.18	2.50	2.43	*	2.15	2.38	2.79	**
21. Aloofness, social reserve	3.46	2.87	2.43	**	3.09	2.89	2.53	**	3.03	2.86	2.70		3.24	2.83	2.74	**	3.40	2.89	2.50	**
22. Suggestible, easily led by others	2.61	3.16	3.11	**	2.76	3.01	3.30	**	2.74	2.81	3.38	**	2.64	2.89	3.47	**	2.65	3.08	3.19	**

Behavior Checklist Items	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Persistent vs. Needs Prodding				Mature vs. Immature				Cooperative vs. Uncooperative			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
23. Clumsiness, awkwardness, poor coordination	2.16	2.34	2.32		2.12	2.39	2.19	*	2.14	2.33	2.37		2.14	2.29	2.21		2.11	2.45	2.31	*
24. Destructive to own and others' property	2.01	2.21	2.41	**	2.06	2.20	2.35	*	2.05	2.15	2.43	**	2.11	2.23	2.26		2.06	2.14	2.52	**
25. Negativism, tends to do opposite of requested	2.01	2.44	2.70	**	2.12	2.33	2.66	**	2.12	2.38	2.67	**	2.14	2.41	2.52	**	2.08	2.34	2.79	**
26. Impertinence, sassing	2.10	2.38	2.89	**	2.23	2.40	2.67	**	2.21	2.41	2.69	**	2.21	2.45	2.61		2.17	2.34	3.00	**
27. Sluggishness, lethargy	2.28	2.49	2.14	**	2.16	2.45	2.24	*	2.22	2.36	2.37		2.28	2.34	2.19		2.22	2.51	2.23	*
28. Profane language	2.00	2.13	2.16	*	2.01	2.11	2.14		2.01	2.10	2.17	*	2.04	2.08	2.16		2.03	2.06	2.21	**
29. Irritability, hot tempered, easily angered	2.06	2.42	2.93	**	2.18	2.48	2.74	**	2.18	2.54	2.70	**	2.15	2.50	2.65	**	2.17	2.40	3.00	**
30. Often has physical complainsts, headaches	2.02	2.09	2.07		2.10	2.02	2.02		2.08	2.05	2.06		2.04	2.04	2.03		2.06	2.05	2.04	
31. Constructive use of time	5.29	4.46	3.73	**	5.08	4.40	3.79	**	5.09	4.55	3.76	**	5.18	4.55	3.82	**	5.32	4.50	3.65	**
32. Peer leader academically	4.25	3.08	2.57	**	4.08	3.11	2.52	**	4.14	3.27	2.44	**	4.21	3.31	2.52	**	4.31	3.19	2.69	**
33. Teacher favoritism	3.10	2.57	2.43	**	3.13	2.49	2.43	**	3.05	2.64	2.28	**	2.97	2.69	2.40	**	3.14	2.64	2.40	**
34. Picked on by teacher	2.03	2.23	2.79	**	2.08	2.25	2.74	**	2.06	2.21	2.70	**	2.10	2.25	2.66	**	2.08	2.24	2.83	**
35. Social leadership among peers	3.30	3.13	3.20		3.45	3.07	3.02	*	3.51	3.13	2.89	**	3.38	3.22	2.97		3.49	3.06	3.06	*

Behavior Checklist Items	Calm vs. Restless				Careful vs. Careless				Persistent vs. Needs Prodding				Mature vs. Immature				Cooperative vs. Uncooperative			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
36. Restless; inability to sit still	2.26	3.00	3.77	**	2.45	2.88	3.81	**	2.42	3.02	3.69	**	2.38	2.94	3.61	**	2.28	2.30	4.06	**
37. Aggressive play with peers	2.28	2.83	3.61	**	2.52	2.80	3.52	**	2.53	2.85	3.48	**	2.50	2.89	3.48	**	2.32	2.74	3.94	**
38. Short-tall	.51	.71	.71		.86	.65	.67		.78	.70	.59		.92	.56	.53	*	.65	.66	.35	
39. Skinny-fat	.36	.59	.23		.45	.54	.29		.45	.46	.44		.29	.53	.18	*	.20	.52	.25	
40. Physically immature-physically mature	.55	.79	.75		.70	.74	.55		.64	.80	.63		.86	.70	.56		.72	.62	.50	

Behavior Checklist Items	Creative vs. Not Creative				High Achiever vs. Low Achiever				Would Like to Keep vs. Remove From Class				Requires special Attention vs. Does Not				Stands out vs. Not Noticeable			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
1. Attention-seeking, show-off behavior	3.07	3.01	2.92		2.96	3.06	3.22		2.69	2.98	3.69	**	3.07	3.09	2.83		3.75	3.09	2.30	**
2. Fun with peers	4.78	4.80	4.32	*	4.83	4.69	4.57		4.63	4.51	4.82		4.62	4.66	4.73		5.18	4.69	3.95	**
3. Self-conscious, easily embarrassed	2.68	2.91	3.62	**	2.64	2.95	3.15	**	2.86	2.94	3.03		3.00	2.92	2.81		2.35	2.84	3.90	**
4. Fixed expression, lack of emotional reactivity	2.59	2.67	3.34	**	2.69	2.71	2.85		3.03	2.76	2.82		3.02	2.72	2.79		2.26	2.67	3.45	**
5. Disruptiveness, tendency to annoy and bother	2.83	2.84	2.97		2.63	2.91	3.32	**	2.42	2.93	3.79	**	3.27	3.05	2.41	**	3.33	3.02	2.40	**
6. Boisterousness, rowdiness	2.67	2.82	2.74		2.59	2.81	3.13	**	2.34	2.71	3.72	**	3.07	2.87	2.43	**	3.09	2.85	2.30	**
7. Preoccupation, in a world of his own; day dreams	2.44	2.94	3.50	**	2.61	3.02	3.17	**	2.90	2.95	3.41	*	3.33	2.85	2.59	**	2.39	2.76	3.78	**
8. Shyness, bashfulness with peers	2.72	2.87	3.47	**	2.69	2.90	3.08		3.06	2.97	2.77		3.13	2.86	2.78		2.32	2.80	3.85	**
9. Preference for solitary activities	2.91	3.03	3.37		2.94	3.16	3.01		3.27	3.20	3.05		3.20	2.97	3.05		2.70	2.94	3.93	**
10. Dislike for school	2.21	2.61	3.24	**	2.29	2.74	2.87	**	2.29	2.54	3.53	**	2.93	2.58	2.22	**	2.45	2.58	2.73	
11. Popular with peers	4.54	4.14	3.62	**	4.57	4.05	3.87	**	4.49	3.92	3.71	**	3.84	4.03	4.63	**	4.63	4.14	3.46	**
12. Short attention span	2.55	2.71	3.61	**	2.49	2.69	3.68	**	2.39	2.74	3.97	**	3.51	2.90	2.41	**	2.75	3.07	2.79	
13. Lack of self-confidence	2.50	2.77	3.76	**	2.33	2.77	3.37	**	2.54	2.85	3.36	**	3.21	2.86	2.35	**	2.23	2.84	3.63	**

Behavior Checklist Items	Creative vs. Not Creative				High Achiever vs. Low Achiever				Would Like to Keep vs. Remove From Class				Requires Special Attention vs. Does Not				Stands Out vs. Not Noticeable			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
14. Inattentiveness to what peers say	2.69	2.53	2.97		2.57	2.61	2.90	*	2.61	2.45	3.50	**	2.90	2.61	2.59		2.89	.267	2.66	
15. Easily confused	2.28	2.39	3.41		2.21	2.39	3.14	**	2.28	2.45	3.38	**	3.09	2.49	2.20	**	2.33	2.58	3.03	**
16. Hypersensitivity, feelings easily hurt	2.43	2.46	2.81	*	2.25	2.51	2.70	**	2.40	2.53	2.72		2.59	2.55	2.37		2.39	2.44	3.05	**
17. Laziness in school, and performance of tasks	2.37	2.54	3.08	**	2.35	2.58	3.01	**	2.25	2.64	3.41	**	2.86	2.71	2.21	**	2.46	2.63	2.67	
18. Irresponsibility, undependability	2.31	2.59	3.30	**	2.28	2.60	3.20	**	2.21	2.62	3.59	**	3.16	2.70	2.16	**	2.46	2.69	2.56	
19. Depression, chronic sadness	2.07	2.22	2.49	**	2.07	2.27	2.35	**	2.15	2.31	2.44	*	2.30	2.29	2.08	*	2.0	2.26	2.51	**
20. Uncooperativeness in peer situations	2.30	2.38	2.57		2.26	2.43	2.52		2.22	2.32	2.87	**	2.54	2.53	2.22		2.51	2.49	2.21	
21. Aloofness, social reserve	2.89	2.83	3.26	*	2.92	2.94	2.85		3.25	2.86	2.92		2.91	2.82	3.05		2.54	2.73	3.50	**
22. Suggestible, easily led by others	2.66	2.87	3.81	**	2.67	2.83	3.49	**	2.70	2.82	3.42	**	3.44	2.89	2.65	**	2.77	2.94	3.39	**
23. Clumsiness, awkwardness, poor coordination	2.04	2.20	2.38	**	2.18	2.31	2.28		2.07	2.34	2.36	*	2.32	2.30	2.08		2.18	2.32	2.41	
24. Destructive to own and others' property	2.11	2.20	2.22		2.08	2.23	2.25		2.04	2.19	2.47	**	2.30	2.23	2.03	*	2.18	2.18	2.15	
25. Negativism, tends to do opposite of requested	2.26	2.41	2.49		2.17	2.35	2.59	**	2.10	2.31	2.82	**	2.59	2.43	2.16	**	2.37	2.46	2.18	

Behavior Checklist Items	Creative vs. Not Creative				High Achiever vs. Low Achiever				Would Like to Keep vs. Remove From Class				Requires Special Attention vs. Does Not				Stands Out vs. Not Noticeable			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
26. Impertinence, sassing	2.31	2.41	2.34		2.28	2.37	2.56	*	2.18	2.26	2.95	**	2.56	2.43	2.19	*	2.51	2.43	2.10	**
27. Sluggishness, lethargy	2.06	2.30	2.50	**	2.19	2.38	2.46	*	2.22	2.42	2.46		2.40	2.36	2.11	*	2.09	2.33	2.50	**
28. Profane language	2.02	2.17	2.08		2.05	2.08	2.15		2.01	2.09	2.28	**	2.20	2.14	2.00	*	2.07	2.10	2.00	
29. Irritability, hot tempered, easily angered	2.43	2.43	2.39		2.23	2.44	2.54	*	2.12	2.38	2.92	**	2.51	2.51	2.21		2.65	2.53	2.18	**
30. Often has physical complaints, headaches	2.09	2.03	2.05		2.05	2.04	2.11		2.02	2.02	2.21	**	2.09	2.05	2.06		2.16	2.09	2.06	
31. Constructive use of time	4.89	4.67	3.95	**	5.02	4.61	3.97	**	5.12	4.52	3.38	**	3.86	4.49	5.08	**	4.63	4.44	4.82	
32. Peer leader academically	4.06	3.38	2.49	**	4.23	3.17	2.54	**	4.19	3.18	2.31	**	2.60	3.07	4.17	**	3.93	3.22	2.89	**
33. Teacher favoritism academically	2.94	2.67	2.30	**	3.05	2.65	2.39	**	3.06	2.55	2.23	**	2.27	2.51	2.94	**	3.00	2.61	2.41	**
34. Picked on by teacher	2.19	2.27	2.45		2.11	2.34	2.56	**	2.10	2.23	2.79	**	2.56	2.29	2.03	**	2.30	2.27	2.20	
35. Social leadership, among peers	3.35	3.21	2.76	*	3.56	3.14	2.90	**	3.49	3.01	2.87	*	2.82	3.11	3.70	**	3.96	3.14	2.43	**
36. Restlessness, inability to sit still	2.69	2.78	3.26	*	2.59	2.90	3.42	**	2.39	2.85	4.00	**	3.24	3.05	2.44	**	3.12	3.04	2.58	*
37. Aggressive play with peers	2.59	2.86	3.00		2.58	2.87	3.28	**	2.46	2.76	3.35	**	3.11	2.89	2.48	**	3.02	2.86	2.33	**
38. Short-tall	.76	.68	.92		.75	.64	.64		.90	.64	.46		.60	.57	.67		.56	.59	.78	
39. Skinny-fat	.28	.38	.26		.40	.45	.40		.34	.48	.31		.40	.35	.25		.35	.32	.60	
40. Phsically immature-physically mature	.83	.66	.89		.81	.58	.68		.91	.71	.77		.71	.63	.67		.88	.52	.60	

Behavior Checklist Items	Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eye				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Happy vs. Unhappy			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
1. Attention-seeking, show-off behavior	3.63	2.86	3.14	*	3.15	3.07	3.17		3.06	2.98	3.35	
2. Fun with peers	5.06	4.62	4.31	**	5.06	4.77	4.23	**	5.04	4.57	4.54	*
3. Self-conscious, easily embarrassed	2.60	3.03	3.41	**	2.75	2.84	3.17		2.61	3.16	2.97	*
4. Fixed expression, lack of emotional reactivity	2.34	2.78	2.79		2.65	2.67	3.04		2.49	2.84	2.89	
5. Disruptiveness, tendency to annoy and bother	3.00	2.81	3.14		2.83	2.94	3.19		2.61	2.83	3.43	**
6. Boisterousness, rowdiness	2.71	2.63	3.17	*	2.67	2.93	2.98		2.55	2.73	3.27	**
7. Preoccupation, in a world of his own, day dreams	2.49	2.99	3.34	**	2.63	2.84	3.49	**	2.49	3.04	3.38	**
8. Shyness, bashfulness [illegible]	2.46	3.01	3.41	**	2.62	2.86	3.26	**	2.53	3.02	3.00	*
9. Preference for solitary activities	2.66	3.18	3.21	*	3.00	3.06	3.28		2.80	3.18	3.27	
10. Dislike for school	2.18	2.49	3.04	**	2.43	2.72	3.00	*	2.22	2.62	3.09	**
11. Popular with peers	4.60	3.99	3.62	**	4.79	4.10	3.35	**	4.78	4.08	3.70	**
12. Short attention span	2.57	2.66	3.69	**	2.58	2.81	3.61	**	2.27	2.92	3.62	**
13. Lack of self-confidence	2.46	2.84	3.61	**	2.42	2.74	3.53	**	2.27	2.98	3.14	**
14. Inattentiveness to what peers say	2.86	2.53	3.03		2.74	2.51	3.36	**	2.53	2.57	3.31	**

Behavior Checklist Items	Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eye				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Happy vs. Unhappy			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
15. Easily confused	2.29	2.44	2.97	**	2.31	2.45	3.23	**	2.20	2.71	2.86	*
16. Hypersensitivity, feelings easily hurt	2.49	2.50	2.86		2.41	2.51	2.72		2.31	2.60	2.81	*
17. Laziness in school, and performance of tasks	2.26	2.55	3.10	**	2.33	2.64	3.11	**	2.25	2.63	3.16	**
18. Irresponsibility, undependability	2.34	2.56	3.14	**	2.38	2.59	3.20	**	2.18	2.69	3.27	**
19. Depression, chronic sadness	2.09	2.31	2.45		2.10	2.21	2.37	*	2.08	2.22	2.38	*
20. Uncooperativeness in peer situations	2.43	2.35	2.62		2.37	2.38	2.72	*	2.24	2.38	2.81	**
21. Aloofness, social reserve	2.69	2.89	2.76		2.85	2.90	2.72		2.88	2.92	2.78	
22. Suggestible, easily led by others	2.91	2.91	3.34		2.73	2.77	3.46	**	2.75	3.10	3.22	
23. Clumsiness, awkwardness, poor coordination	2.06	2.22	2.34		2.02	2.27	2.54	**	2.08	2.38	2.43	*
24. Destructive to own and others' property	2.20	2.13	2.34		2.17	2.24	2.17		2.02	2.19	2.49	**
25. Negativism, tends to do opposite of requested	2.23	2.34	2.59		2.33	2.41	2.30		2.18	2.37	2.62	*
26. Impertinence, sassing	2.49	2.36	2.69		2.44	2.42	2.43		2.27	2.40	2.84	**
27. Sluggishness, lethargy	2.06	2.41	2.45	*	2.12	2.29	2.66	**	2.12	2.42	2.41	*

Behavior Checklist Items	Looks You in the Eye vs. Averts Eye				Attractive vs. Unattractive				Happy vs. Unhappy			
	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p	High	Medium	Low	p
28. Profane language	2.00	2.30	2.28	*	2.06	2.12	2.11		2.00	2.15	2.16	
29. Irritability, hot tempered, easily angered	2.54	2.41	2.48		2.46	2.40	2.47		2.33	2.43	2.78	*
30. Often has physical complaints, headaches	2.11	2.05	2.19		2.10	2.03	2.09		2.04	2.03	2.06	
31. Constructive use of time	4.77	4.79	3.97	**	4.94	4.60	3.89	**	5.08	4.45	3.68	**
32. Peer leader academically	4.00	3.21	2.52	**	3.94	3.24	2.53	**	4.22	3.11	2.62	**
33. Teacher favoritism	3.23	2.57	2.31	**	3.13	2.63	2.26	**	3.35	2.63	2.32	**
34. Picked on by teacher	2.23	2.19	2.66	**	2.25	2.33	2.47		2.12	2.22	2.65	**
35. Social leadership, among peers	3.69	3.06	2.62	**	3.65	3.24	2.62	**	3.78	3.04	2.81	**
36. Restlessness, inability to sit still	2.77	2.94	3.31		2.81	2.91	3.40	**	2.51	2.88	3.62	**
37. Aggressive play with peers	2.69	2.69	3.14		2.62	3.06	2.98		2.53	2.92	3.19	**
38. Short-tall	.69	.64	.66		.65	.65	.66		.63	.82	.51	
39. Skinny-fat	.37	.48	.41		.23	.45	.60		.39	.47	.30	
40. Physically immature-physically mature	.77	.76	.83		.83	.65	.62		.73	.71	.73	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$