

# Development and Validation of Self-Esteem Scale Adapted for Chinese and Pakistani Adolescents

Mona Aeysha Khalid<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Abiodullah<sup>2</sup>, Afzal Tanveer<sup>3</sup>, Tariq Mahmood<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup>Department of Science Education, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan

<sup>4</sup>Department of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: mei3na4@gmail.com

**How to cite this paper:** Khalid, M. A., Abiodullah, M., Tanveer, A., & Mahmood, T. (2023). Development and Validation of Self-Esteem Scale Adapted for Chinese and Pakistani Adolescents. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 11, 239-260.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.114018>

**Received:** February 4, 2023

**Accepted:** April 16, 2023

**Published:** April 19, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

## Abstract

Self-evaluation is defined as the relative goodness people attach to themselves or what they believe others attach to them. It is a socially constructed ideal or multifaceted social construct on which we base our evaluations. This study aimed to determine the validity, reliability, and factor structure of the self-esteem scale developed for Pakistani and Chinese adolescents. The findings revealed that overall, Chinese global self-esteem was higher than Pakistani global self-esteem. Pakistani boys' self-esteem was lower than Pakistani girls' self-esteem in all domains. Chinese girls' social self-acceptance was significantly higher than Chinese boys' self-esteem, and for other domains, there was no significant gender difference. Girls don't differ significantly between both countries with respect to competence in social and academic fields and acceptance in physical and academic fields. Additionally Chinese prefer to express their self-esteem in competency terms and Pakistanis value acceptance terms to express their self-esteem. This study would help policy makers to design an intervention based on the information provided in this paper that would help Pakistani adolescents feel esteemed in academic and social fields.

## Keywords

Self-Esteem, Self Concept, Adolescents, Self-Evaluations, Self Image

## 1. Introduction

Self-esteem as an overall self-evaluation of an individual's image, worth, and bo-

dily functions, could provide a strong foundation for building up self-identity. It is the way one feels about one's self and is one of the factors that are related to psychological adjustment as well as self-acceptance and self-competence. According to Rogers (1959), a positive self-concept is a major determinant of psychological adjustment. Self-concept is basically a cognitive aspect of personality which is influenced by the affective aspects like self-esteem. Self-esteem could also be described as people's evaluations of their own self-worth to the extent to which they value themselves as being nice, and competent. Most young people begin to make self-evaluations about their body, social skills, talents, accomplishments, and other personality aspects at the beginning of early adolescence (Aronson et al., 1997; Amato & Booth, 1997; Michelle & Borba, 1982). Our reflected appraisals and social comparisons together shape our self-evaluation and these evaluations further lead our lives to the pattern we adopt for living as a worthwhile or unworthy individual in society. In this process self strategically manages three operational functions: the discrepancy between what we want others to think we are, who we think we are, and what we really are. Self-acceptance in various domains always helps in the development of self-esteem (Wiener, 1999). Earlier theorists considered it as unidimensional (Rosenberg, 1979; Coopersmith, 1967) and later studies revealed existence of more than two factors of self-esteem (Brooks & Jane, 1991).

There is a lot of ideas in history about self-esteem and self-concept. The two terms have been evaluated in studies randomly without any clear definition and distinction made by researchers. Self-esteem is the evaluative component of self-concept (Demo, 1985) and shows the positivity of our overall attitudes if we evaluate ourselves as an object whereas self-concept is the group of ideas that a person uses to tell about himself. Theorists have noted that the evaluation of self-esteem may affect the structure of self-concept (Rogers, 1951). Agreeing with the views of Demoulin (1999) we can describe self-concept as a sum or total of all experiences we are exposed to and when we assign negative or positive weights to those experiences, self-esteem develops.

Self-esteem has been accepted in terms like self-attitude, self-affection, self-regard, self-worth, self-respect, self-acceptance, self-image, self-concept, self-evaluation, identity, and ego (Diggs & Socha, 1999). Freud (1927) proposed that one's sense of self could be developed by a dynamic relationship between the compressed instinctual needs and the limitations of the external world. According to Cooley (1902) and Mead (1934) self is formed from the internalization of reflected appraisals. It can be imagined as an object and subject simultaneously (Aho, 1998). Each self-scheme includes a cognitive component (what I believe), an affective (what I feel) and motivational (what I wish to do) component (Walters, 2000).

Self-esteem can also be explained in terms of "trait" and "state" self-esteem; the latter can vary with events, situations, appraisals, and feelings (Schlenker, 1980) whereas former is stable, enduring and consistent; Demo, 1985). Demoulin (1999) argues that self-esteem is a stable construct that could change due to

shifts in life. He mentioned that high self-esteem that is not positive in its nature, could not produce success that's why many intelligent students may have low self-concept. Indeed healthy and high self-concept taken together could only be considered as a way toward success. Harter (1990) argued that self-esteem is somewhat stable in developmental periods but less stable between developmental periods especially from middle childhood to adolescence. Her view was similar to Rosenberg's (1981) view that self-esteem is overall a stable construct but during early adolescence it may decrease for a number of reasons. However some studies reveal that self-esteem remains stable throughout adolescence (Paterson et al., 1995).

Earliest theorists like James (1890), Cooley (1902) and Mead (1934) have emphasized the role of culture in the development of self. They argued that people from different cultures vary not only from behavioral aspects rather they differ in descriptions and evaluations regarding their particular experiences. In addition self-esteem has always been associated with psychological, physical and health factors (Brennan & O'Loidean, 1980; Rosenberg, 1965) and delinquent behaviors (Kaplan, 1975; Rosenberg et al., 1978). Further, it has always played a significant role in understanding psychopathology (Frank, 1996).

It is very crucial to understand various stages of development in the study of self-esteem (Lerner, 1997). Self-consciousness with several other behavioral changes occurs during second year of childhood (Astinon et al., 1999). Three components of development: quality of the attachment relationships, expressive self, and self-feelings are internalized as the individual matures in preadolescence (Diggs & Socha, 1999; Gurewich et al., 1999). Here comes self-definition and a sense of relatedness as two dimensions of integrated self-identity. As they grow from 14 to 18, first they learn how to gain self-esteem in their families and then learn how to gain it from peers then they maintain a certain level of self-esteem on their own in adulthood (Holmes, 1995). Therefore early adolescence is very critical age for the development of self-esteem compared to younger and adults (Holmes, 1995; Cohen & Cohen, 1996). It is a time to gain maintenance and strengthen self-esteem, self-regulation, autonomy and self-direction (Chubb et al., 1997; Hetherington et al., 1994; Polce-Lynch et al., 2001; Schwartzberg, 1998). Therefore, in the present research children aged 11 to 14 have been selected to study self-esteem.

### 1.1. Researches in China and Pakistan

Overall in China and Pakistan, self-esteem has gained very less importance in the field of research. So far no comprehensive theory has been established about self-esteem in both countries and terms "self-esteem" and "self-concept" have been interchangeably used by many researchers. In fact existing status of research, theory as well as method, needs much more improvement for the purpose of developing an indigenous measure of self-esteem.

Rafiq (1991) studied self-concept of Pakistani male and female adolescents. It showed that gender identity in the spontaneous self-concept of females appears

in higher proportions than males. He used an unstructured method to assess self-concept. [Cheema \(1992\)](#) compared self-esteem between normal and physically handicapped children. It showed that female physically handicapped had lower self-esteem than male handicapped children. [Sabir \(1999\)](#) compared academic self-concept and achievement among university students. So far no comprehensive measure has been established to evaluate early adolescents self-esteem.

[Shek \(2002\)](#) utilized Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale on Chinese adolescents and showed that family functioning was significantly related to adolescents self-esteem. Another cross sectional study by [Chou \(2000\)](#) on Chinese adolescents, with Rosenberg Self-Esteem inventory, revealed that friend intimacy was positively associated with self-esteem. [Watkins et al. \(1997\)](#), to investigate age and gender differences for 10 and 13 years old children indicated that older girls tended to report significantly lower self-esteem than both younger girls and older boys in the areas of physical abilities, academics and general self-concept.

Due to wide cultural differences, most of the researches generalizability could not be valid to other cultures as most of the samples were collected from China, Europe or America and instruments used for Chinese are mostly western. However, their results guided me in developing an innate measure of self-esteem relative to both cultures i.e. China and Pakistan.

## 1.2. Rationale and Scope of Present Research

The present research is conceptualized by the definitions of [Rosenberg \(1965\)](#) and [Coopersmith \(1967\)](#). In the process of development of the construct, cultural differences have also been considered as culture has a clear influence over the interpersonal nature of self-esteem ([Cooley, 1902](#); [Mead, 1934](#)). Moreover, self-image is also a big factor in the major studies of self-esteem ([Kammer et al., 2000](#)). Hence, the American girls' self-esteem and self-worth are feelings related to their body satisfaction ([Eisler & Hersen, 2000](#)) compared to eastern cultures. That's why exclusive body measures would not be considered in our scale. Further, socioeconomic level which affects one's self-concept and determines one's sense of powerlessness ([Lassiter, 1995](#)) would also be examined. This research would also explore differences in the structure of family and their influence on self-esteem of children.

There is a wide range of definitions about self-esteem leading to variations in the procedures for assessment and measurement of self-esteem ([Crandall, 1973](#); [Wylie, 1979](#)). In Pakistan and China, so far no work has been carried out towards construct validation of self-esteem scale for early adolescents and problems related to the interchangeable use of terms: self-concept and self-esteem could not be easily avoided. Thus only a valid and reliable measure of self-esteem based on solid theory and improved methodology could change the present status of research. Therefore, the present study is designed to develop and validate an indigenous measure of self-esteem, namely "Perceptual Self-Esteem Scale" to achieve a reliable and legitimate understanding of the construct.

### 1.3. Definition

Self-Esteem as a sum of individual's self-evaluations, determines one's self-worth, self-efficacy and self-identity, earned through experience, and can be standardized with reference to degree and direction of appraisals, social comparisons and unique psychological attributes.

### 1.4. Hypothesis

1) Self-esteem scale would include certain dimensions related to early adolescents general, physical, social, and academic domains being representative of both cultures.

2) Generally girls would carry lower level of self-esteem than boys due to their distinct physical, psychological and social characteristics.

3) Adolescents coming from only-child families would be of high self-esteem than others.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

In this cross cultural survey design, a sample of 388 adolescents from Chinese schools and 224 adolescents from Pakistani schools were randomly selected. Pakistani students aged 11 to 13, consisted of boys (58) and girls (166) and Chinese sample was consisted of boys (165) and girls (223); as [Stevens \(1996\)](#) and [Hair Jr. et al. \(1998\)](#) suggested 50 to 100 participants for a 10-item measure.

In Chinese sample, adolescents mean age is 12. Most families (76.5%) belong to one child and their mean income is from 3000 - 4000 RMB per month. On average (91.5%) of mothers belong to working class and fathers (55.2%) belong to government jobs. 8.5% women are house wives. Both parents have received university education (60%).

In Pakistani sample, boys' mean age is 12 and girls' mean age is 13. Pakistani families mean size is 3 - 5 (three to five children per family) and mean income is from 20,000 - 30,000/Rs per month. 90.7% women are house wives, rest are government employed. Mostly fathers (29.5%) belong to private jobs. Father mean education is middle (41%) and mother mean education is primary (31%).

### 2.2. Procedure

At first, 94 items were developed being more relevant, expressive, and related to the nature of self-esteem. Then after administering the scale, 47 items were deleted due to irrelevancy and inconsistency and 50 items were carefully selected. This is a Likert type scale with five response categories from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There are 21 positive and 29 negative statements. Perceptual Self-esteem scale (see Appendix A & Appendix B) was given to selected samples separately in China and Pakistan and after getting data filled, principal component factor analyses through varimax rotation was applied.

### 2.3. Findings

Overall, 4 factors were extracted on the basis of standard meticulous comparison with similar items in relevant factors in both countries data.

The resultant factors are as follows:

- 1) Self-Competence.
- 2) Social Self-Acceptance.
- 3) Social & Academic Self Competence.
- 4) Physical & Academic Self-Acceptance.

Four factors in Pakistani sample revealed 28% of variance and in Chinese sample 31% of total variance. Eigenvalues ranged from 3 to 10.3 and from 3 to 9 in Pakistani and Chinese sample respectively. There were 19 items in first factor, 12 in second and third and 7 items in fourth factor. The 50 items were positively correlated with the total score of self-esteem in both samples.

From **Table 1**, it is evident that students who admit their self-esteem, mostly state their feelings in competency terms, then they tend to evaluate their social selves by the acceptance of their own feelings, then they accept/view their selves in purely physical and academic terms and lastly they express their competency in exclusively social and academic fields. Additionally boys give least importance to be physically and academically accepted and girls put least value on being socially and academically competent.

**Table 2** suggests that students who admit their self-esteem, mostly state their feelings in competency terms, then tend to evaluate their potential in social and academic terms, after that express themselves in socially acceptable terms and lastly value viewing themselves in exclusively physical and academic fields by accepting their selves positively. It is also evident that there is no big difference in the pattern of preferences between boys and girls regarding self-esteem dimensions.

**Table 1.** Correlations between four subscales and total scores of self-esteem scale in Pakistani sample.

	Self-Esteem	Self-competence	Social self-acceptance	Social & academic self-competence	Physical & Academic self-acceptance
SE	1	0.840****	0.783****	0.667****	0.697****
SC.		1	0.505****	0.304****	0.515****
SSA.			1	0.438****	0.450****
S & ASC				1	0.336****
P & ASA					1
SE (boys)	1	0.779****	0.771****	0.792****	0.574****
SE (girls)	1	0.887****	0.763****	0.560****	0.761****

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

**Table 2.** Correlations between four subscales and total scores of self-esteem scale in Chinese sample.

	Self-Esteem	Self-competence	Social self-acceptance	Social & academic self-competence	Physical & Academic self-acceptance
SE	1	0.935****	0.881****	0.904****	0.727****
SC.		1	0.741****	0.753****	0.636****
SSA.			1	0.785****	0.501****
S & ASC				1	0.596****
P & ASA					1
SE (boys)	1	0.945****	0.912****	0.903****	0.752****
SE (girls)	1	0.928****	0.861****	0.905****	0.717****

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

## 2.4. Reliability Measures

The scale was proved internally highly consistent and reliable in both studies as Cronbach's alpha was 0.92 in Chinese sample and 0.80 in Pakistani sample. The split half reliability coefficient in Chinese sample was 0.89 and 0.85; and in Pakistani sample was 0.75 and 0.65.

**Table 3** shows alpha reliability for four subscales of self-esteem scale.

**Table 4** represents mean and standard deviation of self-esteem scale and its subscales for both samples.

**Table 5** depicts percentile scores of self-esteem scale separately in each category for both samples.

An analysis of the above **Table 5** indicates that girls' percentile scores in all categories of percentiles are higher than boys' percentile scores in Pakistani sample. It means if a boy and a girl acquire same level of self-esteem, they can be considered as two different zones to analyze and interpret their self-esteem results. In Chinese sample, there is no big difference of self-esteem between boys and girls. Therefore, their scores of self-esteem would not be interpreted differently while comparing same gender participants' scores. Overall in Chinese sample, percentile scores of self-esteem are higher than percentile scores of Pakistanis.

## 2.5. Difference of Self-Esteem between China and Pakistan

**Table 6** explains difference of self-esteem and its related domains between both countries.

From **Table 6** we can see that mean score of Chinese self-esteem is significantly higher than Pakistanis. Consequently our assumption that Chinese would carry higher score of self-esteem has been supported.

## 2.6. Difference of Self-Esteem among Boys and Girls

From **Table 7**, we can see that mean score of boys is lower than girls for Pakistani

**Table 3.** Alpha reliability of four subscales.

Factors	Self-competence.	Social self-acceptance.	Social & Academic self-competence	Physical & Academic self-acceptance
Subscale: total number of items	19	12	12	7
Alpha Coefficient	0.80****	0.68****	0.73****	0.43****

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

**Table 4.** Mean and standard deviation for self-esteem scale and its subscales (both samples).

	China N = 388					Pakistan N = 224				
	SE	SC	SSA	S & ASC	P & ASA	SE	SC	SSA	S & ASC	P & ASA
Min	104	31	27	24	10	130	44	27	27	11
Max	239	95	60	60	32	226	86	57	60	32
Mean	194.9	74.3	47.92	49	23.67	178.93	64	43.94	47.96	23.03
S. D	22.89	9.82	6.07	6.41	3.53	18.49	8.93	5.73	5.85	3.74

**Table 5.** Percentile scores (both samples).

	Valid	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	95
Pk (B)	58	146	157.60	160	164.20	169	177.40	181.60	189	192.80	202.80
Pk (G)	166	156.70	165	171	176.60	183.50	188.20	192.90	196	204.30	211.65
Ch (B)	165	164.20	176.20	185	190	197	204	208	213.80	223	227.40
Ch (G)	223	163.40	179	185	190	197	204.40	209	215	222	225

**Table 6.** Difference of self-esteem (both samples).

Factors	Pakistan Mean	China Mean	Pakistan SD	China SD	t-test t
SE	178.93	194.70	18.49	22.89	9.30****
SC	67.37	77.10	9.40	10.33	12.66****
SSA	73.23	79.87	9.55	10.12	7.98****
S & ASC	79.93	81.68	9.76	10.69	2.06*
P & ASA	65.79	67.63	10.68	10.10	2.12*

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

**Table 7.** Difference of Mean scores between boys and girls on self-esteem scale and its four subscales for Chinese and Pakistani sample.

Gender	China N (boys) = 165 N (girls) = 223					Pakistan N (boys) = 58 N (girls) = 166					
	SE	A	B	C	D	SE	A	B	C	D	
M	B	194.10	78.30	78.60	80.94	68.57	170.88	66.50	67.54	73.89	65.26



**Continued**

<i>M</i>	G	195.14	77.78	80.81	82.23	66.93	181.83	67.68	75.22	82.13	66.06
<i>SD</i> boys	B	23.71	10.75	10.12	10.90	9.91	18.82	9.05	9.82	11.40	10.77
<i>SD</i> girls	G	22.30	10.03	10.04	10.52	10.20	17.56	9.56	8.66	8.04	10.64

sample and mean score of Chinese girls is higher than boys in Chinese sample. After applying t-test, it is evident that girls' self-esteem in Pakistani sample is significantly higher than boys' self-esteem ( $t = 3.99, p < 0.000$ ). In Chinese sample, difference of self-esteem between boys and girls is not significant ( $t = 0.44, ns$ ). Accordingly, boys' "self-competence", is lower than girls in Pakistani sample but the difference is not significant ( $t = 0.81, ns$ ). In Chinese sample, girls' mean score is lower than boys' but difference is non-significant. For "social self-acceptance", in Pakistani sample, girls' mean score is higher than boys' and difference is significant ( $t = 5.57, p < 0.000$ ). Similarly in Chinese sample girls' "social self-acceptance" is higher than boys' with a significant difference ( $t = 2.15, p < 0.05$ ). For the "social and academic self-competence" girls' mean score is higher than boys' in Pakistani sample and difference is significant ( $t = 5.04, p < 0.000$ ). Likewise in Chinese sample girls' mean score is higher than boys' but difference is not significant ( $t = 1.17, ns$ ). For the factor "physical and academic self-acceptance" girls' mean score in Pakistani sample is higher than boys' and the difference is not significant ( $t = 0.485, ns$ ). Conversely in Chinese sample, girls' mean score is lower than boys with no significant difference ( $t = 1.59, ns$ ).

### 2.7. Difference of Self-Esteem between Only Child and More than One Child Families Children

The independent sample t-test revealed that all categories of family differ significantly with respect to self-esteem between Pakistan and China: family size = 1, ( $t = -2.3, p < 0.05$ ), family size = 2 ( $t = -4.6, p < 0.000$ ) and for family size = 3 ( $t = -2.1, p < 0.05$ ). **Table 8** points up that there is significant difference between only child and other family types.

**Table 9** represents mean and standard deviation of "family size" and "self-esteem" in both samples.

To elaborate further, in China family size is negatively and in Pakistan it is positively related with self-esteem. It means in Pakistan big families children tend to enjoy high self-esteem as compared to small families whereas in China children from small families tend to enjoy high self-esteem than others. This result reflects cultural norms about families in both regions. As in Pakistan average family size is from 3 to 4 children and in China it is only child family.

### 2.8. Reliability and Validity Measures

The alpha coefficient of Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale ( $r = 0.91, p < 0.000$ ) is highly satisfactory. **Campbell and Fish (1959)** suggested that high correlations between different measures of the same trait based on different methods could

**Table 8.** Difference of self-esteem between one child and more than one child families for whole data.

	Mean One child	Mean (other families)	<i>SD</i> One child	<i>SD</i> Other families	<i>t</i>
SE	194.95	182.98	23.32	20.39	6.75****
A	78.20	70.07	10.40	10.55	9.60****
B	79.70	75.21	10.33	10.02	5.47****
C	81.69	80.40	10.94	9.77	1.54
D	68.06	65.86	10.09	10.49	2.65**

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

**Table 9.** Mean and SD (family size).

Country		N	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Pakistan	family	192	2.74	0.824
	SE	224	178.93	18.49
China	family	286	1.30	0.58
	SE	388	194.70	22.89

provide with convergent validity. In this study Rosenberg self-esteem scale was given to 389 respondents and scores were compared with self-esteem scores. The self-esteem scores were highly positively and significantly related with Rosenberg self-esteem scores ( $r = 0.6$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ). Additionally the scores of four subscales were also significantly and positively related with Rosenberg self-esteem scores. Thus, the highly positive and significant correlation coefficients provided the evidence for convergent and discriminant validity of self-esteem scale. **Table 10** illustrates the significant correlations of Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale with Self-Esteem Scale and its four subscales.

Mean and standard deviation for Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale is ( $M = 190$ ;  $SD = 27.07$ ) whereas mean and standard deviation for Self-Esteem Scale is ( $M = 194$ ;  $SD = 22.8$ ). The difference of mean and standard deviation between both samples is not so high which predicts for convergent validity of Self-Esteem Scale.

### 3. Discussions

The factor analysis varimax rotation supported self-esteem being a multidimensional construct for early adolescents with four dimensions namely: self-competence, social self-acceptance, social and academic self-competence, and physical and social self-acceptance. This scale is highly reliable with internally consistent measures and significant correlation coefficients between factors. These findings are consistent with other findings which indicate that self-esteem is a multidimensional construct (Shek, 1997; Piers & Harris, 1964; Owens, 1994). Though some regard it as unidimensional construct (Hensley & Roberts, 1976; Marsh, 1990) as competence can be measured by assessing school competence, the

**Table 10.** Convergent validity of self-esteem scale and its four sub-scales.

	RSES	SE	SC	SSA	S & ASC	P & ASA
RSES	1	0.622****	0.577****	0.547****	0.584****	0.348****
SE		1	0.922****	0.867****	0.892****	0.682****
SC			1	0.734****	0.743****	0.633****
SSA				1	0.785****	0.501****
S & ASC					1	0.596****
P & ASA						1

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ , \*\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$ .

ability to interact with peers, and unknown people (Belle, 1999). Likewise acceptance in one's social, physical and general domain cannot be exactly separated from each other. Therefore while assuming self-esteem as a multidimensional construct, its non-specificity could not be ignored (Tafarodi & Swann, 1995; Verkuyten, 2003). In reality there are a lot of sources of efficacy and self-worth that offer complexities of evaluation (Baumeister, 1989) among children however, older and more experienced children would be likely to differentiate more accurately between domains of self-competence and self-acceptance (Oosterwegel & Oppenheimer, 1993). This view leads us towards the importance of global self-esteem.

The first factor "self-competence" is the combination of self-feelings comprised of one's ability, skill, performance, intellect, self-control, and self-attitudes related to one's social, physical, academic, and psychological domains of life (Tafarodi & Swann, 1995). Second factor, "social self-acceptance", is the grouping of one's attitudes about one's social structure. It is a reflection of one's value in one's family, friends, and in the gathering of unknown people. Third factor, "social and academic self-competence" reflects two kinds of thoughts: one is related to one's own feelings about one's ability to do something and other is related to others feelings for the individual to do the same or any other task in one's social or academic environment. They reflect two types of judgments, formal is the reflection of comparison of our skills with those better than us and later is the comparison of our abilities with the persons worse than us (Tafarodi & Swann, 1995). Fourth factor, "Physical and academic self-acceptance", a combination of few (seven) items in which the individual admits his or herself as fit and smart in physical and academic fields, also assumes he or she would be liked by his or her fellow beings as well. It is related with one's acceptance of self attributes and self-appraisals which generate feeling of pride (shame) and popularity (infamy) among friends.

Boys' and girls' internalize different social lessons that lead to gender differentiated behaviors in early adolescence (Polce-Lynch et al., 1998; Hill & Lynch, 1983). In Pakistani sample, girls' self-esteem is higher than boys' self-esteem whereas in Chinese sample no significant difference befalls between self-esteem

of boys and girls. In this regard, Wylie (1974) has found no gender difference in self-esteem; some researchers (Chan & Lee, 1993; Lerner, 1997; Dusek & Flaherty, 1981) reported girls' higher self-esteem than boys' and some (Harter, 1999; Wade et al., 1989; Brack & Ingersoll, 1988) documented girls' lower self-esteem than boys.

In the context of Pakistani culture, girls' higher self-esteem shows that they being competent in their academic and social fields are socially accepted by their society. It could be due to their role conformity as most girls adopt the ways accepted by significant others in a Pakistani culture like performing house chores, caring and helping others at home. On the other side, boys could not reach the expectation level of significant others because they are too young to fulfill the requirements of our culture that is to protect, support, and enhance the status of family in general. Moreover, most of Pakistani girls are not so much educated so the girls going to school may feel pride due to their knowledge compared to their counterparts. It has also been observed that in grade 6 and 7, boys become weaker academically, demonstrate more emotional problems (Blyth & Simmons, 1987; Buchanan & Seligman, 1995) and show decline in concentration and roughness in schools (Kagan & Coles, 1972). Moreover, our sample might be consisted of later developing girls and boys as researches indicate that early development is related to high self-esteem for boys and low self-esteem for girls (Klaus & Hamilton, 1996; Schwartzberg, 1998).

In Chinese sample, the factor "social self-acceptance" comes up with a significant difference between girls' and boys' self-esteem whereas other factors have no significant gender differences. It reveals that Chinese girls feel more socially acceptable than Chinese boys. Behind this, a general tendency to control emotions among Chinese boys (Kilmartin, 1994; Polce-Lynch et al., 1994; Tseng & Wu, 1985) could be one of the reasons. Additionally, Chinese boys' self-esteem is relatively higher than girls' self-esteem in "self-competence" and "physical & academic self-acceptance" domains. It is natural for boys to be more competent and accepted than girls who feel a little low due to the biological changes related to this time frame (Thomas & Daubman, 2002; Schmidt & Padilla, 2003).

On the whole there is no significant difference between boys' and girls' self-esteem on "physical & academic self-acceptance" which implies, girls are not so much concerned with their body, as media don't encourage them to be extraordinarily fit like western societies. Self-image in most of the studies is associated with females (Polce-Lynch et al., 1994; Wood, 1997) except few ones (Polce-Lynch et al., 1998).

The enhanced level of Chinese self-esteem could be due to Chinese culture which is famous for its familism providing a base for socialization, Confucianism (Lassiter, 1995), and self-concepts for specific relations (Tyler & John, 1999); all its ingredients are relevant to our definition of self-esteem.

We have also assessed family size influence on self-esteem of children. Consistent with other studies (Boer & Dunn, 1992), only child families children tend to preserve high self-esteem than others in the whole data. Studies reveal that

children from only child families receive more positive statements from others like parents, friends, neighbors and relatives than children having siblings, which lead to establish high self-esteem (Boer & Dunn, 1992). So we can say that only children in China or Pakistan are not at risk rather their small family would contribute positively towards their self-esteem.

Conclusively, Self-esteem is a combination of four independent, distinct but interrelated domains namely self-competence, social self-acceptance, social and academic self-competence, and physical and academic self-acceptance. Chinese prefer to express their self-esteem in competence terms, then social and academic competency terms then socially acceptable terms. Pakistanis express themselves in competency terms then they value more their socially accepted behaviors and then they regard physically and academically accepted traits. Chinese don't think highly of their physical traits and Pakistanis give least importance to be socially and academically competent. In other words for Chinese competence and for Pakistanis acceptance plays a significant role in the development of self-esteem. Therefore, Perceptual Self-Esteem Scale is a valid scale to measure self-esteem for early adolescents. It provides us with great reliability and consistency measures along with construct, convergent and discriminant validity.

#### 4. Limitations and Future Recommendations

There are few limitations in this study which need to be discussed:

1) In this study age range is limited (11 to 13), so self-esteem differences in various age groups could not be evaluated. As Byrne and Shavelson (1996) have put emphasis on the developmental factors, future researches could focus on interpreting self-esteem differences in different age groups.

2) Our sample was homogeneous and its homogeneity might influence its dimensionality and reliability. One of the solutions to this problem is to test this scale with non-homogeneous samples that may have high scores of self-esteem in certain situations.

3) The effect of social desirability (Marsh et al., 1987) has not been studied in the present research due to the fact that we wanted to measure self-esteem as an indigenous construct; however it should be carefully examined in future researches.

4) This study could not explore gender differences in the structure of self-esteem as Byrne and Shavelson (1987) have observed invariance across genders in different self-esteem factors. Future researches could concentrate on gender specific structure of self-esteem.

5) Due to homogeneous samples and limited sample size, generalizability of results could not be valid to other cultures rather it would need vigilance and caution to interpret its own findings.

#### 5. Conclusion

Conclusively, Chinese being more competent in social, academic and physical

domains, more accepted in these fields by their family and society, well-adjusted and well-esteemed than Pakistanis, living in a culture which is more appropriate and suitable to enhance their self-esteem, could lead their nation in future towards high goals and lofty aims for the betterment of their selves, and advancement of their country and world as well. Concerned authorities in Pakistan need to pay more attention towards children's low self-esteem and Pakistanis especially boys must strive for healthy and high self-esteem if they are to be successful and happy in their lives. This scale would be of great help to teachers, parents, counselors and professionals, to assess children's self-esteem and take required measures accordingly. Ending up with the last sentence: to build esteem is a process and reward at the same time which promises success, happiness and health in the future.

### Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

### References

- Aho, J. A. (1998). *The Things of the World: A Social Phenomenology*. Praeger Publishers.
- Amato P. R., & Booth, A. (1997). *A Generation at Risk: Growing up in an Era of Family Upheaval*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674020191>
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert R. M. (1997). *Social Psychology*. Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Astington, J. W., Olson, D. R., & Zelazo, P. D. (1999). *Developing Theories of Intention: Social Understanding and Self-Control*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1989). *Masochism and the Self*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Belle, D. (1999). *The After-School Lives of Children: Alone and with Others while Parents Work*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601964>
- Blyth, D. A., & Simmons, R. G. (1987). *Moving into Adolescence: The Impact of Pubertal Change and School Context*. Aldine de Gruyter.
- Boer, F., & Dunn, J. (1992). *Children's Sibling Relationships: Developmental and Clinical Issues*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brack, C. J., Orr, D. P., & Ingersoll, G. (1988). Pubertal Maturation and Adolescent Self-Esteem. *Journal of Adolescent Health Care*, 9, 280-285. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-0070\(88\)90250-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-0070(88)90250-1)
- Brennan, T. G., & O'Loideain, D. S. (1980). A Comparison of Normal and Disturbed Adolescent Offer Self-Image Questionnaire Responses in an Irish Cultural Setting. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 9, 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02088376>
- Brooks, J. B. (1991). *The Process of Parenting*. Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Buchanan, G. M., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1995). *Explanatory Style*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Byrne, B. M., & Shavelson, R. J. (1996). On the Structure of Social Self-Concept for Pre-, Early, and Late Adolescents: A Test of the Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 599-613. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.599>

- Byrne, B. M., & Shavelson, R. J. (1987). Adolescent Self-Concept: Testing the Assumption of Equivalent Structure across Gender. *American Educational Research Journal*, *24*, 356-385. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312024003365>
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and Discriminant Validation by Multitrait and Multimethod Matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56*, 81-105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046016>
- Chan, D. W., & Lee, H. C. (1993). Dimensions of Self-Esteem and Psychological Symptoms among Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *22*, 425-440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537722>
- Cheema, S. T. (1992). *A Comparative Study of Self-Esteem of Normal and Physically Handicapped Children*. MSc. Thesis, Government College for Women.
- Chou, K.-L. (2000). Intimacy and Psychosocial Adjustment in Hong Kong Chinese Adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *161*, 141-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221320009596701>
- Chubb, N. H., Fertman, C. I., & Ross, J. L. (1997). Adolescent Self-Esteem and Locus of Control: A Longitudinal Study of Gender and Age Differences. *Adolescence*, *32*, 113-129.
- Cohen, P., & Cohen, J. (1996). *Life Values and Adolescent Mental Health*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human Nature and the Social Order*. Scribner's.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The Antecedents of Self-Esteem*. Freeman.
- Crandall, R. (1973). The Measurement of Self-Esteem and Related Constructs. In J. P. Robinson, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes* (2nd ed., pp. 45-192). Institute for Social Research.
- Demo, D. H. (1985). The Measurement of Self-Esteem: Refining out Methods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*, 1490-1502. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.6.1490>
- Demoulin, D. F. (1999). A Personalized Development of Self-Concept for Beginning Readers. *Education*, *120*, 14.
- Diggs, R. C., & Socha, T. J. (1999). *Communication, Race, and Family: Exploring Communication in Black, White, and Biracial Families*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dusek, J. B., & Flaherty, J. F. (1981). The Development of the Self-Concept during the Adolescent Years. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *46*, 1-67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166004>
- Eisler, R. M., & Hersen, M. (2000). *Handbook of Gender, Culture, and Health*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Frank, I. C. (1996). *Building Self-Esteem in At-Risk Youth: Peer Group Programs and Individual Success Stories*. Praeger Publishers.
- Freud, S. (1927). Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *8*, 133-142.
- Gurewich, J. F., Tort, M., & Fairfield, S. (1999). *Lacan and the New Wave in American Psychoanalysis: The Subject and the Self*. Other Press.
- Hair Jr., J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Harter, S. (1990). Adolescent Self and Identity Development. In S. S. Feldman, & G. R. Elliot (Eds.), *At the Threshold: The Developing Adolescent*. Harvard University Press.
- Harter, S. (1999). *The Construction of the Self: A Developmental Perspective*. Guilford Press.



- Hensley, W. E., & Roberts, M. K. (1976). Dimensions of Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. *Psychological Reports, 38*, 583-584. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1976.38.2.583>
- Hetherington, E. M., Reiss, D., & Plomin, R. (1994). *Separate Social Worlds of Siblings: The Impact of Nonshared Environment on Development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hill, J. P., & Lynch, M. E. (1983). The Intensification of Gender-Related Role Expectations during Early Adolescence. In J. Brooks-Gunn, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *Girls at Puberty: Biological and Psychosocial Perspectives* (pp. 201-208). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0354-9\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0354-9_10)
- Holmes, G. R. (1995). *Helping Teenagers into Adulthood: A Guide for the Next Generation*. Praeger Publishers.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of Psychology*. Holt. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10538-000>
- Kagan, J., & Coles, R. (1972). *Twelve to Sixteen: Early Adolescence*. W. W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Kammer, K. A., Keefer, B., Schooler, J. E., & Jack, G. (2000). *The Truth to Your Adopted or Foster Child: Making Sense of the Past*. Bergin & Garvey.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1975). *Self-Attitudes and Deviate Behavior*. Goodyear Publishing Company.
- Kilmartin, C. T. (1994). *The Masculine Self*. Macmillan.
- Klaus, H., & Hamilton, S. F. (1996). *Social Problems and Social Contexts in Adolescence: Perspectives across Boundaries*. Aldine De Gruyter
- Lassiter, S. M. (1995). *Multicultural Clients: A Professional Handbook for Health Care Providers and Social Workers*. Greenwood Press.
- Lerner, R. M. (1997). *Concepts and Theories of Human Development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Marsh, H. W. (1990). Two-Parent, Stepparent, and Single-Parent Families: Changes in Achievement, Attitudes, and Behaviors during the Last Two Years of High School. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 327-340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.2.327>
- Marsh, H. W., Antill, J. K., & Cunningham, J. D. (1987). Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny: Relations to Self-Esteem and Social Desirability. *Journal of Personality, 55*, 661-683. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1987.tb00457.x>
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. University of Chicago Press.
- Michelle, B., & Borba, C. (1982). *Self-Esteem: A Classroom Affair* (Vol. 2). HarperCollins Publishers.
- Oosterwegel, A., & Oppenheimer, L. (1993). *The Self-System: Developmental Changes between and within Self-Concepts*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Owens, T. J. (1994). Two Dimensions of Self-Esteem: Reciprocal Effects of Positive Self-Worth and Self-Deprecation on Adolescent Problems. *American Sociological Review, 59*, 391-407. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095940>
- Paterson, J., Pryor, J., & Field, J. (1995). Adolescent Attachment to Parents and Friends in Relation to Aspects of Self-Esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24*, 365-376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537602>
- Piers, E. V., & Harris, D. B. (1964). Age and Other Correlates of Self-Concept in Children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 55*, 91-95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044453>
- Polce-Lynch, M., Kliewer, W., & Myers, B. J. (1994). *Gender Differences in Early Adoles-*



- cent Self-Esteem: The Mediating Role of Body Image*. Ph.D. Thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Polce-Lynch, M., Myers, B. J., Kilmartin, C. T., Forssmann-Falck, R., & Kliewer, W. (1998). Gender and Age Patterns in Emotional Expression, Body Image, and Self-Esteem: A Qualitative Analysis. *Sex Roles, 38*, 1025-1048.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018830727244>
- Polce-Lynch, M., Myers, B. J., Kliewer, W., & Kilmartin, C. (2001). Adolescent Self-Esteem and Gender: Exploring Relations to Sexual Harassment, Body Image, Media Influence, and Emotional Expression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30*, 225-244.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010397809136>
- Rafiq, N. (1991). *Spontaneous Self-Concepts of Pakistani Male and Female Adolescents*. MSc. Thesis, Quaid\_a\_Azam University.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory*. Houghton-Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1959). A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A Study of Science* (Vol. 3). McGraw-Hill.
- Rosenberg, F. R., Rosenberg, M., & McCord, J. (1978). Self-Esteem and Delinquency. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7*, 79-291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537978>
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400876136>
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self*. Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1981). The Self-Concept: Social Product and Social Force. In M. Rosenberg, & R. H. Turner (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives* (pp. 593-624). Basic Books.
- Sabir, F. (1999). *Academic Self-Concept and Achievement among University Students as Related to Their Psychological Adjustment*. MSc. Thesis, Quaid\_a\_Azam University.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression Management*. Brooks/Cole.
- Schmidt, J. A., & Padilla, B. (2003). Self-Esteem and Family Challenges: An Investigation of Their Effects on Achievement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32*, 37-46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021080323230>
- Schwartzberg, A. Z. (1998). *The Adolescent in Turmoil*. Praeger Publishers.
- Shek, D. T. L. (2002). Family Functioning and Psychological Well-Being, School Adjustment, and Problem Behavior in Chinese Adolescents with and Without Economic Disadvantage. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 163*, 497-502.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221320209598698>
- Shek, D. T. L. (1997). Family Environment and Adolescent Psychological Well-Being, School Adjustment, and Problem Behavior: A Pioneer Study in a Chinese Context. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 158*, 113-128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221329709596656>
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tafarodi, R. W., & Swann Jr., W. B. (1995). Self-Liking and Self-Competence as Dimensions of Global Self-Esteem: Initial Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 65*, 322-342. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6502\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6502_8)
- Thomas J. J., & Daubman, K. A., (2002). The Relationship between Friendship Quality and Self-Esteem in Adolescent Girls and Boys. *Sex Roles, 45*, 53-65.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013060317766>

- Tseng, W.-S., & Wu, D. Y. H. (1985). *Chinese Culture and Mental Health*. Academic Press.
- Tyler, T. R., Kramer, R. M., & John, O. P. (1999). *The Psychology of the Social Self*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Verkuyten, M. (2003). Positive and Negative Self-Esteem among Ethnic Minority Early Adolescents: Social and Cultural Sources and Threats. *Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 32, 267-277. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023032910627>
- Wade, T. J., Thompson, V., Tashakkori, A., & Valente, E. (1989). A Longitudinal Analysis of Sex by Race Differences in Predictors of Adolescent Self-Esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10, 717-729. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(89\)90118-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(89)90118-9)
- Walters, G. D. (2000). *The Self-Altering Process: Exploring the Dynamic Nature of Lifestyle Development and Change*. Praeger Publishers.
- Watkins, D., Dong, Q., & Xia, Y. (1997). Age and Gender Differences in the Self-Esteem of Chinese Children. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 374-379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224549709595448>
- Wiener, V. (1999). *Winning the War against Youth Gangs: A Guide for Teens, Families, and Communities*. Greenwood Press.
- Wood, J. T. (1997). *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender and Culture*. Wadsworth.
- Wylie, R. C. (1974). *The Self-Concept: A Review of Methodological Considerations and Measuring Instruments* (Vol. 1). University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1979). *The Self-Concept: Theory and Research on Selected Topics* (Vol. 2). University of Nebraska Press.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Perceptual Self-Esteem Scale

S/No	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I have confidence in me.					
2	I think people make a good image of me.					
3	I think i am a hard working student.					
4	I am not interested in study.*					
5	I think I cannot do any work in a right way.*					
6	I don't like to say sorry to anyone.*					
7	I think I am of no use.*					
8	I am not hard working student.*					
9	All people enjoy my company.					
10	Many people dislike me.*					
11	I think I am good fellow being.					
12	I don't do anything without permission of my parents.					
13	I do not like myself.*					
14	I think i am a capable student.					
15	I think I am beautiful.					
16	I am proud of my marks in exams					
17	I am not smart child.*					
18	I think I am best out of all of my friends.					
19	I want everybody like me.*					
20	My friends always miss my company.					
21	I do not think that I have anything to be proud of.*					
22	I feel that people like to be with me.					
23	I do not want to meet others because of my appearance.*					
24	In spite of all deficiencies, i am still a good person.					
25	When I meet strangers they often like me.					
26	I sometimes tease/insist my parents.*					
27	I am fond of learning.					
28	I could never follow my time table.*					
29	I feel irritated when someone passes remarks on me.*					
30	I feel that my family members don't give me any importance in my home.*					
31	I always take care of everybody.					
32	I don't think I am important.*					
33	I am ready to face various circumstances.					

**Continued**

- 
- 34 I don't think I am competent.\*
- 35 I do not give up when I fail.
- 36 I feel I am not smart.\*
- 37 I have no hope to me.\*
- 38 I feel inferior in dignity\*.
- 39 I am satisfied with me.
- 40 I feel all others are better than me.\*
- 41 I am an intelligent student.
- 42 I cannot reproduce in front of others.\*
- 43 I get neither high nor less marks.
- 44 I feel shy meeting with people.\*
- 45 I don't have lot of merits/qualities.\*
- 46 I want to die.\*
- 47 I am scared of going to hospital.\*
- 48 I am always worried about what is wrong and what is right.\*
- 49 I don't know what I want to become in my life.\*
- 50 I always make my mind to do something  
but could not do accordingly.\*
- 

**Appendix B: Four Dimensions of Self-Esteem****Physical and academic self acceptance**

S/No	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I do not like myself.*					
2	I think i am a capable student.					
3	I think I am beautiful.					
4	I am proud of my marks in exams					
5	I am not smart child.*					
6	I think I am best out of all of my friends.					
7	I want everybody like me.*					

---

**Social and academic self competence**

S/No	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I have confidence in me.					
2	I think people make a good image of me.					

---

**Continued**

- 
- 3 I think i am a hard working student.
  - 4 I am not interested in study.\*
  - 5 I think I cannot do any work in a right way.\*
  - 6 I don't like to say sorry to anyone.\*
  - 7 I think I am of no use.\*
  - 8 I am not hard working student.\*
  - 9 All people enjoy my company.
  - 10 Many people dislike me.\*
  - 11 I think I am good fellow being.
  - 12 I don't do anything without permission of my parents.
- 

**Social self acceptance**

S/No	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	My friends always miss my company.					
2	I do not think that I have anything to be proud of.*					
3	I feel that people like to be with me.					
4	I do not want to meet others because of my appearance.*					
5	In spite of all deficiencies i am still a good person.					
6	When I meet strangers they often like me.					
7	I sometimes tease/insist my parents.*					
8	I am fond of learning.					
9	I could never follow my time table.*					
10	I feel irritated when someone passes remarks on me.*					
11	I feel that my family members don't give me any importance in my home.*					
12	I always take care of everybody.					

---

**Self competence**

S/No	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I don't think I am important.*					
2	I am ready to face various circumstances.					
3	I don't think that I am competent.*					
4	I do not give up when I fail.					

---

**Continued**

---

- 5 I feel I am not smart.\*
  - 6 I have no hope to me.\*
  - 7 I feel inferior in dignity\*.
  - 8 I am satisfied (happy) with me.
  - 9 I feel all others are better than me.\*
  - 10 I am an intelligent student.
  - 11 I cannot reproduce in front of others.\*
  - 12 I get neither high nor less marks.
  - 13 I feel shy meeting with people.\*
  - 14 I don't have a lot of merits/qualities.\*
  - 15 I want to die.\*
  - 16 I am scared of going to hospital.\*
  - 17 I am always worried about what is wrong and what is right.\*
  - 18 I don't know what I want to become in my life.\*
  - 19 I always make my mind to do something but could not do accordingly.\*
-