

Republic of Trinidad & Tobago

Ministry of Education Central Guidance & Special Education Units



Secondary Assessment Tools

Marley W. Watkins & Frank C. Worrell
The Pennsylvania State University

Tracey E. Hall
Center for Applied Special Technology

Republic of Trinidad & Tobago Ministry of Education

**Central Guidance Unit
Special Education Units**

Secondary Assessment Tools

Marley W. Watkins
Frank C. Worrell
The Pennsylvania State University

Tracey E. Hall
Center for Applied Special Technology

The CEDAR School Psychology Clinic
125 CEDAR Building
Department of Educational and School Psychology and Special Education
College of Education
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802-3108

Acknowledgements

This project was supported by individuals and departments in the United States, as well as in Trinidad and Tobago. Listed below are some of the individuals and groups that contributed to the project's successful completion. The instruments were provided by the Department of Educational and School Psychology and Special Education of The Pennsylvania State University, and were administered by Guidance Officers assigned to secondary schools from the Central Guidance Unit. The data on the secondary students reported in this manual were collected under the auspices of a grant to the Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education by UNICEF (Fund # BARA/1999/0358). The production of this actual Manual was supported by a grant to the Ministry of Education by the Organization of American States (Fund # TT/AE/138101941). Both grants were administered by the Central Guidance and Special Education Units.

Ministry of Education, Republic of Trinidad and Tobago

- Central Guidance Unit staff
- Department of Research and Evaluation (DERE)
- Dr. Janet Stanley-Marcano, Director, DERE
- Office of the Permanent Secretary
- Participating schools and teachers
- Secondary School Guidance Officers
- Special Education Unit

Organization of American States (OAS)

- OAS Office, Trinidad and Tobago

The Pennsylvania State University

- College of Education
- Department of Educational and School Psychology and Special Education (ESPSE)
- International Office
- Robert L. Hale, Department Head, ESPSE
- School Psychology Program faculty and graduate students

UNICEF

- UNICEF Office, Trinidad and Tobago

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Sample and Instrumentation	1
Sample	1
Instruments	1
Depression	4
Anxiety	4
Fears	4
Self-Concept	4
Scales	5
Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale (RADS)	5
RADS Administration	7
RADS Scoring	7
RADS Interpretation	7
Revised Child Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)	10
RCMAS Administration	10
RCMAS Scoring	10
RCMAS Interpretation	13
Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents-II (FSSC-II)	15
FSSC-II Administration	15
FSSC-II Scoring	15
FSSC-II Interpretation	17
Self Description Questionnaire-II (SDQ-II)	18
SDQ-II Administration	21
SDQ-II Scoring	21
SDQ-II Interpretation	21
References	25
Appendix: Copies of Scales	26
Administrative Copy of the FSSC-II	
Administrative Copy of SDQ-II	
Scoring Copy of the SDQ-II	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Secondary Sample by Educational Region	2
Table 2	Secondary Sample by Age	2
Table 3	Secondary Sample by Gender	2
Table 4	Secondary Sample by Grade	3
Table 5	Secondary Sample by Ethnic Background	3
Table 6	Secondary Sample by Parent Educational Level	3
Table 7	Pattern Coefficients for RADS Items	6
Table 8	RADS Total Scores by Demographic Variables	8
Table 9	Conversion of RADS Raw Scores to Percentiles	9
Table 10	Pattern Coefficients for RCMAS Items	11
Table 11	Coefficient Alpha Estimates for RCMAS Composite Scores	12
Table 12	RCMAS Total Scores by Demographic Variables	12
Table 13	Conversion of RCMAS Raw Scores to Percentiles	14
Table 14	FSSC-II Average Fear/Intensity Scores	16
Table 15	Most Commonly Endorsed Fears in Trinidad and Tobago, the United States, and Australia	16
Table 16	Conversion of FSSC-II Raw Fear/Intensity Scores to Percentiles	17
Table 17	Pattern Coefficients for SDQ-II Items	19
Table 18	Coefficient Alpha Estimates for SDQ-II Composite Scores	20
Table 19	SDQ-II Factor Raw Scores by Demographic Variables	20
Table 20	Conversion of SDQ-II Raw Scores to Percentiles	23

Secondary Normative Sample and Instrumentation

Sample

The secondary school sample consisted of students in Forms 1 through 5. A list of all secondary schools compiled by the Educational Planning Division of the Ministry of Education (1998) and provided by the Central Guidance Unit was used to identify a representative sample of secondary students from the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Given that not all secondary schools contain all grade levels (i.e., Assisted and traditional government schools contain Forms 1-5, Junior Secondary schools contain Forms 1-3, Senior Comprehensive schools contain forms 4-5), selection of schools occurred by grade level. That is, all schools which served students in Form 1 were identified and six were selected at random for participation.

To ensure gender balance, if a single-gender school was selected, then the next random draw at that form was from schools that exclusively served the other gender. The same selection process was repeated for Forms 2-5. Guidance Officers then obtained a classroom list for each form at each school. If there was only one classroom at a chosen form, then that classroom was automatically selected for participation. If there were multiple classrooms at a chosen form, Guidance Officers used a table of random numbers to randomly select one classroom to participate.

Results of this sampling are presented in Table 1 by educational district. Unfortunately, Guidance Officers were unable to obtain data from 3 of the 30 classrooms scheduled to be sampled. Thus, only 27 classrooms were actually included in the final sample. Not including these 3 classrooms resulted in an under-representation of students from the St. Andrew/St. David and Tobago educational divisions. However, the final sample of 897 students appeared to be distributed across the other six educational divisions in proportions relatively equivalent to the population.

The distributions of students across age, gender, grade, ethnic background, and parental education level are presented in Tables 2 through 6, respectively. Numbers differ slightly from table to table due to nonresponse to demographic questions. As seen in Tables 3, 4, and 5, sampling at the classroom level and the lack of representation of the two small districts also resulted in some deviations from the population figures. For example, males are underrepresented and females are overrepresented in the sample. Similarly, students of East Indian and Mixed descent are overrepresented in the sample relative to their percentage in the population whereas students of African descent are underrepresented. Nonetheless, the sample can still be considered fairly representative of the population.

Instruments

Four instruments were used to obtain information about students' self-reported depression, anxiety, fears, and self-esteem. These instruments were precompiled into packets that randomized their administration order and were distributed in the second trimester of the 1999-2000 academic year. Student responses were anonymous.

Table 1*Secondary Sample Characteristics*

Division	Population		Norm Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
St. George West	31,948	30.4	302	33.7
St. George East	14,255	13.5	142	15.8
St. Andrew/St. David	3,859	3.7	0	0.0
Caroni	10,913	10.4	128	14.3
Nariva/Mayaro	2,287	2.2	34	3.8
Victoria	26,197	24.9	188	21.0
St. Patrick	12,711	12.1	103	11.5
Tobago	3,059	2.9	0	0.0
Total	105,229		897	

Table 2*Secondary Sample by Age*

Age	Number	Percent
11	19	2.1
12	107	11.9
13	164	18.3
14	195	21.7
15	206	23.0
16	158	17.6
17	39	4.3
18	4	0.4

Table 3*Secondary Sample by Gender*

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	401	44.7
Female	490	54.6

Table 4*Secondary Sample by Grade*

Form	Number	Percent
1	210	23.4
2	143	15.9
3	165	18.4
4	234	26.1
5	145	16.2

Table 5*Secondary Sample by Ethnic Background*

Ethnic Background	Number	Percent
African	198	22.1
East Indian	380	42.4
Mixed	288	32.1
Other	22	2.5

Table 6*Secondary Sample by Parent Educational Level*

Highest level completed	Number	Percent
Primary	61	6.8
Form 3	25	2.8
Form 5	205	22.9
Form 6	160	17.8
University	197	22.0
Unknown	249	27.8

Guidance Officers assigned to the secondary schools supervised administration of the packets and they answered any questions that students had as the instruments were administered.

Depression

The Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale (RADS) was developed by William Reynolds and published by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. (PAR) in 1987. According to Reynolds (1987), “the RADS is designed to assess symptomatology associated with depression, and not to provide a diagnosis of a specific and definitive depressive disorder” (p. 1). To assess the symptoms associated with depression, 30 self-report items were developed, refined, and standardized on 2,460 adolescents from one high school and two junior high schools in an urban/suburban community in the midwestern United States.

Anxiety

The Revised Child Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985) was published by Western Psychological Services. The RCMAS, subtitled *What I Think and Feel*, is a 37-item self-report scale designed to “assess the level and nature of anxiety in children and adolescents” (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, p. 5). It was standardized on 4,972 children between the ages of 6 and 19 years selected from 13 states and 80 school districts in the United States.

Fears

The Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents-II (FSSC-II) was designed as a measure of self-reported fears. Based on previous fear surveys, the FSSC-II has been administered to large samples of American and Australian students (Burnham & Gullone, 1997; Gullone & King, 1992).

Self-Concept

The Self-Description Questionnaire-II (SDQ; Marsh, 1990) was published by Herbert Marsh of the University of Western Sydney, Australia. The full SDQ contains 102 items that address three areas of academic self-concept, seven areas of nonacademic self-concept, and general self-concept in junior high school and high school students (grades 7-10). It was standardized on 5,495 students from schools in metropolitan Sydney, Australia.

Scales

Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale

Of the original 897 participants, 123 skipped one or two items, 3 missed three items, 4 omitted four items, and 6 skipped more than five items. Participants who skipped more than two items are not included in subsequent analyses. The one or two items omitted by 123 participants were estimated via multiple imputation methods operationalized in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2000). Thus, the final RADS sample contained 884 adolescents.

To determine the dimensionality of the RADS, a principal axis factor analysis with communalities initially estimated by squared multiple correlations was conducted. Both scree (Cattell, 1966) and parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) criteria suggested that three factors be extracted. To ensure that these criteria did not inaccurately signal too few factors, four factors were initially extracted. Given the theoretical expectation that dimensions would be correlated, Promax rotation was employed. However, the fourth factor was comprised of three items that only accounted for 1.7% of the variance. Further, the correlation between factors I and III exceeded .70. When three factors were extracted, the third factor accounted for 3.3% of the variance. Pattern coefficients for the three factor solution are presented in Table 7 (actual RADS response sheets are available from PAR). Factor intercorrelations were moderate (i.e., I/II = .66, I/III = .45, II/III = .30).

Unfortunately, the third factor is composed of only three items. This is insufficient for reliable and valid measurement. For example, the internal consistency reliability (alpha coefficient) of the third factor was .69 for the total sample. In contrast, the alpha coefficients for factors I and II were .89 and .82. Further, the third factor did not replicate across samples (e.g.,

males & females, ethnic groups). The coefficient of congruence for the third factor never reached .90 for comparisons across gender, ethnic background, or grade level. In contrast, factor comparisons for the first two factors ranged from .92 to .97 across those demographic dimensions.

Although adequate for screening purposes, even the two major factors *are not sufficiently stable* for individual decisions (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 2001). In contrast, the coefficient alpha for all 30 items for the total sample was .91. Stability of the total scale did not significantly vary across gender (.89 for boys vs. .92 for girls), ethnic background (.91 for all three major groups), and grade level (.88, .92, .92, .90, and .93 for forms 1-5, respectively).

Additionally, the unrotated first principal component was very similar to that reported for the American norm sample (congruence coefficient = .99). Therefore, the overall scale appears to be measuring a construct in Trinidadian adolescents that is almost identical to the construct measured in the United States sample.

Reynolds (1987) asserted that the RADS was developed as a unitary measure of

Table 7*Pattern Coefficients for the Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale Items*

No.	Item	I	II	III
1.	I feel happy	.431	.055	.225
2.	I worry about school	.059	.370	.003
3.	I feel lonely	.353	.288	-.009
4.	I feel my parents don't like me	.761	-.137	-.087
5.	I feel important	.626	-.063	.054
6.	I feel like hiding from people	.348	.207	.041
7.	I feel sad	.244	.436	.070
8.	I feel like crying	.345	.366	-.016
9.	I feel that no one cares about me	.822	-.024	-.025
10.	I feel like having fun with other students	-.121	.031	.765
11.	I feel sick	-.189	.635	.073
12.	I feel loved	.705	-.156	.147
13.	I feel like running away	.642	-.002	-.017
14.	I feel like hurting myself	.694	-.047	-.040
15.	I feel that other students don't like me	.328	.242	.045
16.	I feel upset	.025	.664	-.043
17.	I feel life is unfair	.253	.367	-.022
18.	I feel tired	-.072	.590	-.079
19.	I feel I am bad	.392	.099	-.098
20.	I feel I am no good	.668	-.039	-.016
21.	I feel sorry for myself	.376	.231	-.032
22.	I feel angry about things	.165	.398	-.087
23.	I feel like talking to other students	.093	-.047	.595
24.	I have trouble sleeping	.152	.243	-.004
25.	I feel like having fun	-.028	-.013	.647
26.	I feel worried	.021	.637	.061
27.	I get stomachaches	-.176	.615	.004
28.	I feel bored	.133	.341	.011
29.	I like eating meals	.157	-.006	.242
30.	I feel like nothing I do helps any more	.541	.151	.023

Note. Bold text indicates an item that is reverse-scored. Italics indicate a salient ($\geq .32$) loading.

depression and argued that the factors found in the U.S. normative sample were consistent with broad categories of depressive symptomatology, but were not clinically useful as scales. This is also true for the Trinidad normative sample – *the overall scale is the only reliable and valid measure*.

Administration

Instructions for administering the RADS are found in Reynolds (1987) and on the RADS protocol. The RADS can be administered individually or in small groups in about 10-15 minutes. It should **not** be introduced as a depression survey, only as a questionnaire designed to assess the adolescent's feelings about himself or herself. It should be stressed that there are no right or wrong answers.

Scoring

Several items are reverse-scored so it is important to use the scoring key that accompanies the PAR version of the test. The items that are reversed-scored are indicated by bold text in Table 7. Using the scoring key, all 30 items are summed to a total raw score. Raw scores for the Trinidad sample are provided in Table 8. It is apparent from a review of this table that scores did not differ across demographic categories with the exception of gender. Females reported more depression symptomatology than males. This finding is consistent with the results of Reynolds (1987) in the U.S. sample. Consequently, raw score to percentile conversions can be accomplished by using either the total group scores or gender specific scores. Those normative conversions are presented in Table 9.

Interpretation

Following the instructions of Reynolds (1987), responses on the RADS must be reviewed to detect invalid responding. First, scores cannot be calculated if a respondent

completed fewer than 24 of the items. If 25 through 29 items were completed, then the score should be prorated ($RADS\ score \times 30 \div number\ of\ items\ completed$) to obtain an estimate of the total RADS score. Of course, any prorated estimate must be used with caution. Second, unusual response patterns might signal invalid responses—for example, endorsing all the items with the same response. Finally, several items have similar meanings and should, therefore, result in similar responses. This is most apparent for item pairs 1 and 7, and 9 and 12. As noted by Reynolds (1987), “reading problems, confusion, illness, interruptions during assessment, contrary attitudes, or any combination of these factors may underlie an invalid protocol” (p. 7).

Once responses to the RADS are determined to be valid, the total RADS score can be compared to the normative group via Table 9 to compare the adolescent's self-reported depression symptom endorsement with other adolescents in Trinidad. As with all tests, the standard error of measurement (SEM) should be consulted to ensure that imprecision of the obtained score is not ignored. For the RADS, the SEM is around 4.5 raw score points.

Unfortunately, there is no validity research with the RADS in Trinidad so it is not possible to identify clinical cut-off

Table 8*RADS Total Scores by Demographics*

Category	Mean	SD
Ethnicity		
African	61.8	14.7
East Indian	61.7	14.6
Mixed	62.2	14.9
Gender*		
Male	58.8	13.7
Female	64.2	15.2
Grade Level		
Form 1	62.0	13.3
Form 2	60.0	14.7
Form 3	60.6	15.2
Form 4	61.9	14.4
Form 5	64.7	16.9
Total	61.8	14.8

* $p < .05$

scores as was done in the U.S. However, greater significance might be attached to scores above the 84th percentile and scores above the 94th percentile should be given strong consideration. Nevertheless, a high score on the RADS is “not equivalent to a diagnosis of depression” (Reynolds, 1987, p. 2); rather, it indicates that further attention is warranted.

Following normative interpretation, individual RADS items can be inspected to identify any specific concerns for an adolescent examinee. These may be used to guide follow-up interviews or to select additional assessment instruments. Given the limited reliability of single items, this type of clinical interpretation should be undertaken only with considerable caution.

Table 9*Conversion of RADS Raw Scores to Percentile Ranks*

Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls	Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls
30	1	1	1	81	89	94	86
31	1	1	1	82	90	94	87
32	1	1	1	83	91	95	88
33	1	1	1	84	92	95	89
34	1	2	1	85	92	95	90
35	2	3	1	86	93	96	91
36	3	4	2	87	94	97	92
37	3	5	3	88	95	97	93
38	4	6	3	89	95	98	93
39	5	7	4	90	96	98	94
40	6	8	5	91	96	98	94
41	7	9	6	92	96	98	95
42	9	11	7	93	97	98	95
43	10	13	7	94	97	98	96
44	12	15	8	95	97	98	96
45	13	17	10	96	97	98	97
46	15	19	11	97	98	99	97
47	16	22	12	98	98	98	98
48	18	25	14	99	98	98	98
49	20	27	15	100	98	98	98
50	22	29	16	101	99	99	98
51	25	32	20	102	99	99	98
52	28	35	22	103	99	99	99
53	30	38	24	104	99	99	99
54	32	41	26	105	99	99	99
55	35	43	28	106	99	99	99
56	37	45	31	107	99	99	99
57	40	48	34	108	99	99	99
58	43	51	37	109	99	99	99
59	46	53	40	110	99	99	99
60	50	57	44	111	99	99	99
61	53	60	47	112	99	99	99
62	56	63	50	113	99	99	99
63	58	66	52	114	99	99	99
64	60	68	54	115	99	99	99
65	62	71	56	116	99	99	99
66	66	73	60	117	99	99	99
67	68	76	63	118	99	99	99
68	71	78	66	119	99	99	99
69	74	80	69	120	99	99	99
70	76	82	71	121	99	99	99
71	77	84	72	122	99	99	99
72	79	85	74	123	99	99	99
73	80	86	75	124	99	99	99
74	81	88	76	125	99	99	99
75	83	89	78	126	99	99	99
76	84	90	80	127	99	99	99
77	85	90	81	128	99	99	99
78	86	91	82	129	99	99	99
79	87	92	83	130	99	99	99
80	88	93	84				

Revised Child Manifest Anxiety Scale

Of the original 897 participants, 68 skipped one item, 14 missed two items, 2 skipped three items, 4 omitted four items, 1 missed five items, and 2 omitted six items. Participants who omitted more than two items are not included in subsequent analyses. The one or two items omitted by 82 participants were estimated via multiple imputation methods operationalized in SPSS. Thus, the final RCMAS sample contained 888 adolescents.

To determine the dimensionality of the RCMAS, a principal axis factor analysis with communalities initially estimated by squared multiple correlations was conducted. Both scree (Cattell, 1966) and parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) criteria suggested that five factors be extracted. This finding is in accord with the structure of the U.S. norm sample (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). Given the theoretical expectation that anxiety symptom classes would be correlated, Promax rotation was used.

The resulting factor loading matrix is presented in Table 10. It accounted for 27.4% of the variance and, to a great extent, corresponded with the item-factor relationships reported by Reynolds and Richmond (1985). For example, Table 10 shows that 32 of the 37 items loaded on the same factors in the Trinidad sample as in the U. S. sample. Two items (numbers 1 and 9) failed to load saliently on any factor. Reynolds and Richmond (1985) also found that item 1 misbehaved. In this sample, three of the original Worry/Oversensitivity items

loaded on the Physiological factor. However, the overall similarity of item-factor relationships between the U.S. and Trinidad samples suggests that these small deviations from the U.S. factor structure are not important. When the first principal factor of the U.S. and Trinidad samples were statistically compared, the congruence coefficient was .89. This is close to what is generally accepted as indicating factor loading invariance. Given these similarities, the U. S. factor structure was adopted for the Trinidad sample.

The internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) of each factor as well as total anxiety and lie scale scores are presented in Table 11. It is clear from a review of this table that the reliability of the factors, while consistent with the U.S. sample, are too low for making screening decisions about individuals (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 2001). Thus, the total anxiety scale is preferred (Merrell, 2003). Descriptive statistics for the total anxiety and lie scales are presented in Table 12. As in the U.S. sample, female students reported greater levels of anxiety than did male students.

Administration

Instructions for administering the RCMAS are found in Reynolds and Richmond (1985) and on the RCMAS form. It can be administered individually or in small groups.

Scoring

There are two scores for each child: the total anxiety scale comprised of 28 items.

Table 10*Pattern Coefficients for RCMAS Items*

No. Item	Worry	Lie 1	Physio	Social	Lie 2
1. I have trouble making up my mind	.213	-.116	.044	.231	.025
2. Get nervous when things do not go right*	.387	-.048	-.010	.016	.055
3. Others seem to do things easier than I can*	.072	.020	-.039	.473	-.031
4. I like everyone I know*	-.050	.482	.025	-.051	.110
5. Often I have trouble getting my breath*	-.151	-.022	.440	.094	.055
6. I worry a lot of the time	.223	.019	.373	.080	.000
7. I am afraid of a lot of things*	.278	.020	.264	.006	.046
8. I am always kind*	.027	.733	-.077	.070	-.053
9. I get angry easily	.196	-.209	-.001	.089	.010
10. Worry about what my parents will say*	.413	.036	-.010	.111	.054
11. Others do not like the way I do things*	.225	-.036	-.137	.481	.040
12. I always have good manners*	.094	.522	-.055	-.087	-.025
13. It is hard for me to get to sleep at night.*	-.196	.031	.407	.203	-.013
14. Worry about what other people think of me*	.477	-.005	-.085	.159	-.044
15. Feel alone even when there are people*	.061	.103	.222	.313	-.050
16. I am always good*	-.039	.594	-.002	-.016	.052
17. Often I feel sick in my stomach*	.081	-.029	.484	-.160	.039
18. My feelings get hurt easily*	.589	-.013	-.056	.017	-.038
19. My hands feel sweaty*	.012	.034	.287	-.079	-.008
20. I am always nice to everyone*	.003	.744	.062	.011	-.053
21. I am tired a lot*	-.103	-.011	.439	.169	-.037
22. I worry about what is going to happen*	.530	.018	.026	.018	.011
23. Other people are happier than I*	.002	-.051	-.011	.512	.009
24. I tell the truth every single time*	-.072	.273	.062	.003	.140
25. I have bad dreams*	.184	-.053	.317	-.150	-.019
26. Feelings get hurt easily when I am fussed at*	.594	.000	-.095	-.109	-.093
27. Someone will tell me do things wrong way*	.307	.090	-.041	.327	.017
28. I never get angry*	.000	-.012	-.011	.022	.660
29. I wake up scared some of the time*	.189	.031	.272	-.018	.013
30. I worry when I go to bed at night	.156	.014	.412	.082	.009
31. Hard for me to keep mind on schoolwork*	-.075	-.051	.143	.419	-.070
32. I never say things I shouldn't*	.024	.074	.001	-.008	.492
33. I wiggle in my seat a lot*	-.12	-.049	.311	.110	-.046
34. I am nervous	.310	.001	.389	-.108	-.063
35. A lot of people are against me*	.048	-.020	.034	.442	.062
36. I never lie*	-.015	.006	-.005	-.024	.765
37. Worry about something bad happening*	.593	-.009	.066	.000	.079

Note. Italics indicate a salient ($\geq .25$ loading) pattern coefficient. * Corresponds to U. S. normative sample factor.

Table 11*Coefficient Alpha for RCMAS Composites*

Category	Physio	Worry	Social	Lie	Total Anxiety
Ethnicity					
African	.45	.78	.66	.67	.83
East Indian	.60	.79	.71	.75	.86
Mixed	.62	.78	.71	.69	.86
Gender					
Male	.57	.78	.69	.72	.85
Female	.55	.77	.69	.70	.84
Grade Level					
Form 1	.57	.76	.69	.74	.85
Form 2	.51	.78	.67	.64	.85
Form 3	.64	.81	.72	.75	.87
Form 4	.52	.78	.68	.68	.84
Form 5	.60	.82	.70	.72	.85
Total sample	.58	.79	.69	.71	.85

Table 12*RCMAS Total Scores by Demographics*

Category	Total Anxiety		Lie Scale	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ethnicity				
African	12.2	5.6	2.7	2.1
East Indian	12.7	6.0	3.0	2.3
Mixed	12.7	6.1	2.7	2.1
Gender				
Male	11.1	5.8	3.0	2.3
Female	13.7	5.8	2.7	2.1
Grade Level				
Form 1	13.0	5.9	3.0	2.4
Form 2	11.7	5.8	2.4	2.0
Form 3	11.9	6.2	3.0	2.3
Form 4	12.5	5.6	2.8	2.1
Form 5	13.5	6.1	2.9	2.2
Total	12.6	5.9	2.8	2.2

* p < .05

and the lie scale composed of 9 items. Raw scores for each scale are the number of *Yes* answers. Thus, total anxiety raw scores can range from 0-28 and lie scale scores can range from 0-9. Raw score to percentile conversions are presented for each scale for the total group and by gender in Table 13.

Interpretation

Scores on the RCMAS must be interpreted cautiously and in the context of other information about the adolescent. Some adolescents may not express anxiety that they actually experience while others may express more anxiety than they actually feel. The lie scale score reflects the adolescent's endorsement of ideal behaviors that are generally not characteristic of anyone. Thus, a high score on the lie scale may reflect an invalid self-report due to a variety of reasons: self-delusion, faking good, high need for acceptance, etc.

A high lie scale score probably invalidates the total anxiety score. If not invalid, the total anxiety score should be compared to the norms in Table 13. Greater significance is attached to scores above the 84th percentile and scores above the 94th percentile should be given strong consideration. The total anxiety SEM is around 2 raw score points and should be considered for interpretation. Following normative interpretation, individual item responses can be explored with adolescent to better understand their responses and situation.

Table 13*Conversion of RCMAS Raw Scores to Percentile Ranks***Total Anxiety Scale**

Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls
0	1	1	1
1	1	2	1
2	3	4	2
3	5	8	3
4	8	12	5
5	12	16	7
6	15	21	10
7	20	26	15
8	25	32	20
9	30	38	24
10	35	46	29
11	41	52	33
12	47	58	40
13	54	65	45
14	59	71	51
15	65	76	57
16	70	80	63
17	75	83	69
18	80	86	75
19	84	89	80
20	88	92	84
21	91	94	88
22	94	96	93
23	96	98	95
24	97	99	96
25	98	99	98
26	99	99	99
27	99	99	99
28	99	99	99

Lie Scale

Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls
0	18	16	20
1	34	34	35
2	46	45	47
3	62	58	65
4	75	73	77
5	87	84	89
6	93	93	94
7	97	97	98
8	99	99	99
9	99	99	99

Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents-II

The Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents-II (FSSC-II) is an 80-item measure of self-reported fear. The FSSC-II is a revision and modernization of the Fear Survey Schedule for Children (Scherer & Nakamura, 1968) and the Fear Survey for Children-Revised (Ollendick, 1983). Localized versions of the FSSC-II have been administered to large samples of American and Australian students (Burnham & Gullone, 1997; Gullone & King, 1992). For use in Trinidad, two of the original FSSC-II items were changed to address culture and language differences: cyclones to tornadoes/hurricanes and dingoes to dogs.

Of the 897 adolescents from Trinidad, 654 responded to all 80 FSSC-II items. Of the remaining 243 adolescents, 191 omitted one or two items, 26 skipped three items, 13 missed four items, and 13 omitted five or more items.

It has generally been found that fear endorsements may cluster into four or five major groupings. For example, the responses of the U. S. students studied by Burnham and Gullone (1997) separated into (a) fear of death and danger, (b) fear of the unknown, (c) animal fears, (d) school/medical fears, and (e) fear of failure and criticism. However, FSSC-II responses are typically considered clinically on an item-by-item basis. That is, the number and type of fears endorsed by an adolescent. Consequently, subsequent analyses are based on actual item endorsements without missing data imputation. Based on these responses, internal consistency reliability estimates based on all items were $\geq .94$ for all sub-groups.

A total fear/intensity score was computed for each student by summing across all 80 items and counting each “not scared” response as 1, each “scared” response as 2, and each “very scared” answer as 3. To account for missing item

responses, this sum was then divided by the number of valid item responses to create an average score. Average fear/intensity scores for the Trinidad sample are provided in Table 14. Females and Form 1 students reported significantly greater fear/intensity scores than did other students. These results parallel those found by Burnham and Gullone (1997) in the U.S. sample of adolescents.

The most common fears endorsed as “very scared” by students from Trinidad are listed in Table 15. For comparison, results from the Australian and American samples are also provided in that table. It is apparent from Table 15 that there is considerable congruence between adolescents’ fears in Trinidad, the U.S., and Australia. In fact, at least 8 of the most common fears in Trinidad were among the most common in the other countries.

Administration

Instructions for administering the FSSC-II are found on the FSSC-II protocol in the Appendix. It can be administered individually or in small groups.

Scoring

Typically, quantitative scores are not computed for the FSSC-II. Rather, the number and type of things the adolescent is

Table 14*FSSC-II Average Fear/Intensity Scores*

Category	Mean	SD
Ethnicity		
African	1.78	.32
East Indian	1.77	.31
Mixed	1.73	.32
Gender*		
Male	1.63	.32
Female	1.85	.29
Grade Level		
Form 1*	1.88	.31
Form 2	1.75	.34
Form 3	1.74	.29
Form 4	1.71	.31
Form 5	1.68	.32
Total	1.75	.32

Table 15

Most Common Fears with Highest Percentage Endorsement of the “Very Scared” Response Choice in Trinidad, the United States, and Australia

Item	<u>Trinidad</u>		<u>U. S.</u>		<u>Australia</u>	
	% Endorsement	Rank	% Endorsement	Rank	% Endorsement	Rank
AIDS	78.5	1	73.2	1	74.3	1
Being kidnapped	62.9	2	56.7	7	58.7	5
Not being able to breathe	60.3	3	65.0	4	63.4	2
Threatened with gun	58.0	4	59.2	5	61.0	3
Taking drugs	56.9	5	---	6	60.0	-
Myself dying	55.9	6	59.2	3	64.0	4
Family member dying	54.3	7	54.0	2	64.8	7
Hit by car	53.1	8	54.7	9	52.4	6
Nuclear war	52.0	9	50.7	8	53.5	9
Murderers	49.1	10	51.8	-	---	7
Falling from high place	44.6	14	50.3	-	---	10
Sharks	44.9	13	---	10	51.5	-

Table 16*Conversion of FSSC-II Raw Fear/Intensity Scores to Percentile Ranks***FSSC-II**

Percentile	Total Raw	Boys Raw	Girls Raw
1	1.06	1.01	1.18
5	1.22	1.13	1.37
10	1.31	1.23	1.47
15	1.39	1.29	1.55
20	1.47	1.33	1.60
25	1.53	1.38	1.66
30	1.58	1.45	1.70
35	1.63	1.49	1.75
40	1.68	1.55	1.79
45	1.73	1.58	1.82
50	1.77	1.63	1.85
55	1.81	1.68	1.90
60	1.85	1.73	1.93
65	1.90	1.77	1.96
70	1.94	1.83	2.00
75	1.98	1.89	2.04
80	2.01	1.93	2.09
85	2.08	1.96	2.16
90	2.16	2.03	2.22
91	2.18	2.03	2.24
92	2.20	2.05	2.26
93	2.22	2.09	2.28
94	2.25	2.10	2.30
95	2.28	2.14	2.33
96	2.31	2.16	2.34
97	2.33	2.27	2.40
98	2.40	2.31	2.45
99	2.50	2.50	2.53

“very scared” of are identified. If an overall fear/intensity score is desired, sum across all 80 items and count each “not scared” response equal to 1, each “scared” response as 2, and each “very scared” answer as 3. To account for any missing responses, this sum should then be divided by the number of items the adolescent answered to create an average score. Raw score fear/intensity to percentile conversions are presented in Table 16.

information about the adolescent. Some adolescents may not identify fears that they actually experience while others may endorse more fears than they actually feel. FSSC-II responses are typically interpreted clinically on an item-by-item basis.

Interpretation

As with other self-report instruments, scores on the FSSC-II must be interpreted cautiously and in the context of other

Self Description Questionnaire-II

The original SDQ-II contains 102 items tapping 11 areas of self-concept. However, only two school self-concepts and the general self-concept were retained for norming in Trinidad and Tobago. The final instrument contained 10 items that assessed mathematics self-concept, 10 that tapped English/verbal self-concept, and 10 that measured general self-concept.

Of the original 897 participants, 167 skipped one or two items and 27 omitted three or more items. Participants who skipped more than two items are not included in subsequent analyses. The one or two items omitted by 167 participants were estimated via multiple imputation methods operationalized in SPSS. Thus, the final SDQ-II sample contained 870 adolescents.

The structure of the SDQ-II was determined through principal axis factor analysis with communalities initially estimated by squared multiple correlations. Both scree (Cattell, 1966) and parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) criteria suggested that four factors should be retained for rotation. Consequently, four factors were extracted and subjected to Promax rotation. However, a single item loaded on the fourth factor. A more satisfactory solution was obtained when three factors were extracted and rotated with Promax.

As illustrated in Table 17, one item loaded weakly and equivalently on two factors, but the other 29 items coalesced into a structure identical to that reported by Marsh (1990) for the Australian normative sample. That is, 10 items grouped into a math scale, 9 into a verbal scale, and 10 into a general self scale. This solution accounted for 40.8% of the total variance and factor intercorrelations were low (i.e., I/II = -.05, I/III = .31, II/III = .37).

The coefficients of congruence for all three factors across gender and ethnicity

were strong and supportive of factorial invariance (i.e., .90 to .99, median of .98). Thus, the three factors appear to be measuring the same construct for boys and girls as well as for students of African, East Indian, and Mixed ancestry.

Given that the factor structure of the SDQ-II among students from Trinidad is very similar to that reported for Australian students, the normative structure of three factors was adopted for the Trinidad sample. Internal consistency reliability (alpha) coefficients are presented in Table 18 for these three factors across gender, ethnicity, and grade categorizations. The coefficients in Table 18 indicate that the SDQ-II factors are sufficiently reliable for screening decisions and, in some instances, might be adequate for making individual decisions (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 2001). That is, all exceed .80 and some exceed .90.

Mean performance of students on the SDQ-II factors across gender, ethnicity, and grade levels is presented in Table 19. Boys and girls exhibited significant mean differences on the math and verbal self-concept scales. Boys reported higher self-concept on the math scale while girls expressed higher self-concept on the verbal scale. These findings are consistent with previous research on gender differences (Wilgenbusch & Merrell, 1999).

Table 17*Pattern Coefficients for the Self Description Questionnaire-II Items*

No.	Item	Math	Verbal	General
1.	Mathematics is one of my best subjects.	.864	.011	-.110
2.	Overall, I have a lot to be proud of.	-.044	.000	.624
3.	I'm hopeless in English classes.	-.020	.587	.097
4.	I often need help in mathematics.	.655	-.044	.078
5.	Overall, I'm no good.	.024	-.016	.561
6.	I look forward to English classes.	.068	.542	-.104
7.	I look forward to mathematics classes.	.630	.086	-.059
8.	Most things I do, I do well.	.041	.126	.448
9.	I do badly on tests that need a lot of reading	-.012	.427	.187
10.	I have trouble understanding mathematics.	.539	-.037	.163
11.	Nothing I do ever seems to turn out right.	.059	.022	.647
12.	Work in English language classes is easy	-.011	.697	-.001
13.	I enjoy studying mathematics.	.804	.097	-.103
14.	Overall, most things I do turn out well.	.085	.106	.556
15.	I am not very good at reading.	-.071	.280	.223
16.	I do badly in tests of mathematics.	.724	-.060	.043
17.	I don't have much to be proud of.	-.071	-.059	.699
18.	English is one of my best subjects.	.032	.813	-.175
19.	I get good marks in mathematics.	.768	-.056	.008
20.	I can do things as well as most people.	.053	.118	.400
21.	I hate reading.	.022	.434	.098
22.	I never want to take another math course.	.569	.070	.068
23.	I feel that my life is not very useful.	.019	-.015	.625
24.	I get good marks in English.	-.006	.754	-.024
25.	I have always done well in mathematics.	.686	-.050	-.002
26.	If I really try I can do almost anything	-.007	.028	.385
27.	I have trouble expressing myself writing	.020	.368	.131
28.	I hate mathematics.	.750	-.020	.042
29.	Overall, I'm a failure.	-.019	-.086	.703
30.	I learn things quickly in English classes.	-.064	.717	.047

Note. Italics indicate a salient ($\geq .32$) loading.

Table 18*Coefficient Alpha for SDQ-II Composites*

Category	Math	Verbal	General
Ethnicity			
African	.90	.83	.84
East Indian	.91	.85	.86
Mixed	.91	.81	.80
Gender			
Male	.89	.81	.82
Female	.91	.84	.84
Grade Level			
Form 1	.88	.80	.74
Form 2	.89	.81	.86
Form 3	.89	.83	.86
Form 4	.91	.85	.82
Form 5	.94	.87	.89
Total sample	.91	.83	.83

Table 19*SDQ-II Factor Raw Scores by Demographics*

Category	Math		Verbal		General	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ethnicity						
African	40.4*	13.8	46.7	10.3	50.9	8.7
East Indian	44.3*	12.6	45.2	10.6	50.2	9.2
Mixed	42.0	13.0	45.7	9.7	50.2	8.2
Gender						
Male	44.6*	12.1	44.5*	10.1	50.7	8.3
Female	41.1*	13.6	46.4*	10.4	50.1	9.1
Grade Level						
Form 1	45.7	11.4	44.6	10.1	49.9	7.7
Form 2	42.8	12.4	45.8	9.5	50.8	9.0
Form 3	43.8	12.2	47.1	9.8	51.1	8.8
Form 4	39.4*	13.4	45.7	10.7	50.6	8.4
Form 5	42.7	13.1	44.5	11.2	49.1	10.4
Total	42.7	13.1	45.5	10.3	50.3	8.8

* Significant at $p \leq .05$

In raw score points, boys scored 3.5 points higher than girls on the math scale and girls scored 1.9 points higher than boys on the verbal scale. On average, students of African descent scored about 4 raw score points lower on the math self-concept scale than did students of East Indian ancestry. Scores on the math self-concept scale also dipped for students in Form 4. Although there is no theoretical or empirical reason to expect the ethnic, gender, or grade level to differences to be of clinical significance, (Crain & Bracken, 1994), separate gender norms are reported for mathematics and English and separate mathematics norms are reported by ethnicity. Separate norms for grade level were not computed, as only one grade level differed from the others.

Administration

The SDQ-II can be administered individually or in groups. Instructions are provided on the SDQ-II protocol as well as in the SDQ-II manual. Instructions and items can be read aloud if deemed necessary.

The read aloud procedure begins by reciting the instructions found on the SDQ-II protocol. Second, the examiner says, "I will read the sentences aloud. The reason for reading them aloud is to be sure that everyone spends the same amount of time on each item and that everyone finishes at the same time. We will be going quite fast, and you will have to mark your answer immediately. Then listen to the next sentence. If you fall behind, leave out the sentences you have not done. Listen to the sentence I am reading and answer that one. I will allow you time at the end to go back to any sentences that you have left out."

Third, the examiner reads each sentence number followed by the sentence in a clear, strong voice at a pace of approximately six to eight sentences per minute. Finally, after all sentences have been read the examiner

says, "Now I will give you a minute or two to go back to any sentences which you left out. Be sure you have *one*, and only one, answer for each sentence. Please do this now. When you have completed all the sentences, put your paper face up on your desk and wait quietly for the rest to finish. If there are any questions about completing the sentences, hold up your hand, and I will come to you."

Scoring

Several items are reverse-scored so it is important to use the scoring key in this manual. Once reversed, item scores range from 1 to 6 with higher scores representing more positive self-concept. Given the discrete nature of mathematics, verbal, and general self-concept, item scores should be summed for each dimension. Thus, each adolescent will have a total raw score for mathematics, verbal, and general self-concept. There are 10 items for each scale so raw scores can range from 10 to 60. Raw score to percentile conversions are presented for each scale for the total group and by gender in Table 20, as well as by ethnicity for ethnic groups.

Interpretation

As with other instruments, scores on the SDQ-II must be interpreted cautiously and in the context of other information about the adolescent. The pattern of responses should be examined to determine if the student responded appropriately (i.e., not randomly or carelessly). For example, a comparison of positively and negatively worded items might reveal that the student was not paying attention to item content. If one item is missing on a scale, it is permissible to substitute the student's average response to the other nine items of that scale (rounded to the nearest whole number). If more than one item is missing for any scale, that scale should not be scored nor interpreted.

Because half of the self-concept scores fall between the 25th and 75th percentiles, scores in this range are unremarkable. A few raw score points can cause a large percentile difference at the upper end of the scales so interpretation at the high end of the SDQ-II scales is discouraged. In contrast, scores at the low end of the scale are generally interpretable as deficits. As with all tests, interpretation of scores must take into account the standard error of measurement (SEM). With the SDQ-II, the SEM is around 4 raw score points for each self-esteem scale. Thus, each obtained raw scale score must be bracketed by ± 4 points to understand its probable range.

Table 20*Conversion of SDQ-II Raw Scores to Percentile Ranks***Math Self-Concept**

Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls
10	1	1	1
11	1	1	1
12	1	1	1
13	2	1	2
14	2	1	3
15	3	1	4
16	4	2	5
17	5	3	6
18	6	4	7
19	6	5	8
20	6	5	8
21	7	6	9
22	8	7	10
23	9	7	11
24	10	8	13
25	12	9	15
26	13	10	16
27	16	12	19
28	17	14	21
29	18	15	22
30	19	16	24
31	21	16	26
32	23	17	27
33	25	19	30
34	27	20	33
35	29	22	36
36	31	23	37
37	33	25	39
38	35	26	41
39	36	28	43
40	38	30	45
41	40	32	47
42	43	33	50
43	44	35	52
44	45	38	54
45	49	41	56
46	51	43	57
47	53	46	58
48	55	50	60
49	60	54	64
50	63	59	66
51	66	63	68
52	69	68	71
53	73	72	74
54	76	75	77
55	80	80	81
56	84	84	85
57	87	87	88
58	90	90	90
59-60	93-99	92-99	92-99

Math Self-Concept

Raw Score	African	E. Indian	Mixed
10	1	1	1
11	2	1	1
12	2	1	1
13	3	1	1
14	5	1	2
15	6	1	3
16	8	2	4
17	10	2	6
18	10	3	7
19	10	5	7
20	10	5	7
21	10	6	8
22	11	8	9
23	11	9	10
24	12	10	11
25	14	11	12
26	16	12	15
27	20	14	17
28	23	15	18
29	25	16	19
30	27	18	20
31	29	19	21
32	30	20	22
33	31	22	24
34	33	24	29
35	35	25	32
36	36	26	34
37	38	28	36
38	40	30	38
39	43	31	39
40	45	33	41
41	46	35	44
42	48	37	46
43	50	38	49
44	54	40	50
45	58	42	51
46	60	45	52
47	62	48	55
48	65	51	57
49	68	54	62
50	70	57	66
51	72	61	69
52	74	65	72
53	77	69	75
54	80	73	78
55	83	77	83
56	87	82	87
57	89	86	89
58	91	89	91
59-60	93-99	91-99	93-99

Verbal Self-Concept

Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls
10	1	1	1
11	1	1	1
12	1	1	1
13	1	1	1
14	1	1	1
15	1	1	1
16	1	1	1
17	1	1	1
18	1	1	1
19	1	2	1
20	2	2	2
21	3	2	3
22	3	3	3
23	3	4	3
24	4	4	4
25	5	4	5
26	5	5	6
27	6	6	6
28	7	8	7
29	8	9	9
30	10	10	10
31	11	11	11
32	12	12	12
33	13	14	13
34	15	16	14
35	16	17	15
36	18	20	16
37	20	23	18
38	23	26	19
39	24	28	22
40	26	31	24
41	29	34	26
42	32	38	29
43	35	41	31
44	38	44	34
45	42	48	38
46	47	53	43
47	51	56	47
48	54	59	50
49	56	62	52
50	60	66	56
51	64	69	60
52	69	73	66
53	73	77	69
54	77	82	73
55	81	86	77
56	85	89	82
57	88	91	87
58	91	93	90
59-60	93-99	95-99	91-99

General Self-Concept

Raw Score	Total	Boys	Girls
10	1	1	1
11	1	1	1
12	1	1	1
13	1	1	1
14	1	1	1
15	1	1	1
16	1	1	1
17	1	1	1
18	1	1	1
19	1	1	1
20	1	1	1
21	1	1	1
22	1	1	1
23	1	1	2
24	2	1	2
25	2	1	3
26	2	1	3
27	3	2	3
28	3	2	3
29	3	3	4
30	4	3	4
31	4	3	5
32	4	4	5
33	5	4	6
34	6	4	7
35	7	5	8
36	7	6	9
37	8	7	9
38	10	8	10
39	11	10	12
40	12	11	14
41	14	12	16
42	16	14	17
43	18	16	19
44	20	19	21
45	22	22	23
46	25	25	26
47	27	27	28
48	30	30	30
49	34	34	34
50	38	38	40
51	43	41	45
52	48	46	49
53	53	52	54
54	58	58	58
55	64	63	64
56	70	70	70
57	76	77	79
58	83	83	83
59-60	86-99	86-99	86-99

References

- Barrett, P. T., & Kline, P. (1982). Factor extraction: An examination of three methods. *Personality Study and Group Behaviour*, 3, 84-98.
- Burnham, J. J., & Gullone, E. (1997). The Fear Survey Schedule for Children-II: A psychometric investigation with American data. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 35, 165-173.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245-276.
- Crain, R. M., & Bracken, B. A. (1994). Age, race, and gender differences in child and adolescent self-concept: Evidence from a behavioral-acquisition, context-dependent model. *School Psychology Review*, 23, 496-511.
- Gullone, E., & King, N. J. (1992). Psychometric evaluation of a revised fear survey schedule for children and adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 33, 987-998.
- Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 30, 179-185.
- Marsh, H. W. (1990). *Self Description Questionnaire-II manual*. University of Western Sydney, Campbelltown, Australia: Author.
- Merrell, K. W. (2003). *Behavioral, social, and emotional assessment of children and adolescents* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ollendick, T. H. (1983). Reliability and validity of the Revised Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSSC-R). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 32, 635-638.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Richmond, B. O. (1985). *Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS) manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1987). *Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale (RADSD) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (2001). *Assessment* (8th ed). New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Scherer, M. W., & Nakamura, C. Y. (1968). A Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSS-FC): A factor analytic comparison with manifest anxiety (CMAS). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 6, 173-182.
- SPSS. (2000). SPSS 10.0 for Macintosh. Chicago: Author.
- Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education. (September, 1998). *Data on secondary schools in Trinidad and Tobago 1997/1998* (Educational Planning Division). Port of Spain: Author.
- Velicer, W. F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41, 321-327.
- Wilgenbusch, T., & Merrell, K. W. (1999). Gender differences in self-concept among children and adolescents: A meta-analysis of multidimensional studies. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 101-120.

Appendix

The appendix contains an administration copy of the Fear Survey Schedule for Children and Adolescents-II, an administration copy of the Self-Description Questionnaire-II, and a scoring version of the SDQ-II. As the Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale and the Revised Child Manifest Anxiety Scales are copyrighted instruments, they are not included here. Administration copies of these two instruments can be obtained from Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., and Western Psychological Services, respectively.

Self-Rating Questionnaire

Below are written a list of things and situations that make some people scared. Read each one carefully and mark an ✖ in front of the words that best describe how scared you are. There are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item even if some are hard to decide. Make sure that you have only one answer for each. Remember, find the words that best describe how scared you are.

1. Being teased	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
2. Roller coaster or carnival rides	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
3. Being alone	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
4. Being put down or criticized by others	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
5. Mice	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
6. Losing my friends	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
7. Being in closed places	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
8. Going to the doctor	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
9. Getting bad marks at school	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
10. Our country being invaded	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
11. Darkness	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
12. Nuclear war	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
13. Taking dangerous/bad drugs	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
14. Having to talk in front of my class	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
15. Violence on television	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
16. Spiders	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
17. Murderers	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
18. My parents criticizing or putting me down	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
19. Being in a fight	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
20. Being kidnapped	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
21. Getting a serious illness	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
22. Meeting someone for the first time	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
23. Fire	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
24. Having an operation	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
25. Someone in my family dying	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
26. Making mistakes	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
27. My parents arguing	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
28. Tornadoes/hurricanes	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
29. Myself dying	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
30. Being hit by a car or truck	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
31. Being sent to the principal	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
32. Ghosts or spooky things	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
33. Being threatened with a gun	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
34. Forest fires or bush fires	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
35. Not being able to breathe	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
36. Getting punished by my father	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
37. Failing a test	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
38. Drunk people	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared

39. Snakes	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
40. My parents separating or getting divorced	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
41. Getting an electric shock	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
42. Someone in my family having an accident	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
43. Getting lost in a crowd	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
44. Having no friends	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
45. Someone in my family getting sick	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
46. Strange looking people	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
47. Getting punished by my mother	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
48. A burglar breaking into our house	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
49. Having bad dreams	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
50. Being alone at home	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
51. Rats	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
52. Going to a new school	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
53. Earthquakes	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
54. Getting an injection from a nurse or doctor	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
55. Bees	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
56. Sitting for a test	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
57. Being bullied	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
58. Getting my school report	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
59. Thunder	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
60. Lizards	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
61. AIDS	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
62. Haunted houses	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
63. Tigers	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
64. Dead people	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
65. Getting lost in a strange place	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
66. Thunderstorms	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
67. Cemeteries/graveyards	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
68. Dogs	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
69. The sight of blood	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
70. Looking foolish	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
71. Flying in a plane	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
72. Strangers	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
73. Having to go to hospital	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
74. Falling from high places	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
75. Sharks	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
76. Riding in a car or bus	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
77. Going to the dentist	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
78. Having to go to school	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
79. Gangs	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared
80. Deep water or the ocean	☐ Not Scared	☐ Scared	☐ Very Scared

Self-Description Questionnaire

This questionnaire asks you to describe yourself. It is not a test. There are no right answers, and everyone will have different answers. Be sure that your answers show how you feel about yourself. Please do not talk about your answers with anyone else.

Read each sentence and decide your answer. There are six possible answers for each question ranging from "false" to "true." There are six boxes next to each sentence, one for each of the possible answers. Choose your answer to a sentence and put an ✖ in the box under the answer you choose. Answer every sentence even if some are hard to decide. Make sure that you have only one answer for each sentence. Do not leave out any of the sentences.

Mo						More
6. I look forward to English classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I look forward to mathematics classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Most things I do, I do well.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I do badly on tests that need a lot of reading ability.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I have trouble understanding anything with mathematics in it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Nothing I do ever seems to turn out right.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Work in English language classes is easy for me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. I enjoy studying mathematics.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Overall, most things I do turn out well.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. I am not very good at reading.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. I do badly in tests of mathematics.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. I don't have much to be proud of.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. English is one of my best subjects.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. I get good marks in mathematics.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. I can do things as well as most people.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. I hate reading.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. I never want to take another mathematics course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. I feel that my life is not very useful.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. I get good marks in English.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. I have always done well in mathematics.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. If I really try I can do almost anything I want to do.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. I have trouble expressing myself when I try to write something.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. I hate mathematics.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. Overall, I'm a failure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. I learn things quickly in my English classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Self-Description Questionnaire

This questionnaire asks you to describe yourself. It is not a test. There are no right answers, and everyone will have different answers. Be sure that your answers show how you feel about yourself. Please do not talk about your answers with anyone else.

Read each sentence and decide your answer. There are six possible answers for each question ranging from "false" to "true." There are six boxes next to each sentence, one for each of the possible answers. Choose your answer to a sentence and put an ✖ in the box under the answer you choose. Answer every sentence even if some are hard to decide. Make sure that you have only one answer for each sentence. Do not leave out any of the sentences.

		False	Mostly False	More False Than True	More True Than False	Mostly True	True
M	Mathematics is one of my best subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
G	Overall, I have a lot to be proud of.	1	2	3	4	5	6
V	I'm hopeless in English classes.	6	5	4	3	2	1
M	I often need help in mathematics.	6	5	4	3	2	1
G	Overall, I'm no good.	6	5	4	3	2	1
V	I look forward to English classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
M	I look forward to mathematics classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
G	Most things I do, I do well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
V	I do badly on tests that need a lot of reading ability.	6	5	4	3	2	1
M	I have trouble understanding anything with mathematics in it.	6	5	4	3	2	1
G	Nothing I do ever seems to turn out right.	6	5	4	3	2	1
V	Work in English language classes is easy for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
M	I enjoy studying mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5	6
G	Overall, most things I do turn out well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
V	I am not very good at reading.	6	5	4	3	2	1
M	I do badly in tests of mathematics.	6	5	4	3	2	1
G	I don't have much to be proud of.	6	5	4	3	2	1
V	English is one of my best subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
M	I get good marks in mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5	6
G	I can do things as well as most people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
V	I hate reading.	6	5	4	3	2	1
M	I never want to take another mathematics course.	6	5	4	3	2	1
G	I feel that my life is not very useful.	6	5	4	3	2	1
V	I get good marks in English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
M	I have always done well in mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5	6
G	If I really try I can do almost anything I want to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
E	I have trouble expressing myself when I try to write something.	6	5	4	3	2	1
M	I hate mathematics.	6	5	4	3	2	1
G	Overall, I'm a failure.	6	5	4	3	2	1
E	I learn things quickly in my English classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6