

# The Storm and Stress (or Calm) of Early Adolescent Self-Concepts: Within- and Between-Subjects Variability

Lauren E. Molloy, Nilam Ram, and Scott D. Gest  
Pennsylvania State University

This study uses intraindividual variability and change methods to test theoretical accounts of self-concept and its change across time and context and to test the developmental implications of this variability. The 5-year longitudinal study of 541 youths in a rural Pennsylvania community from 3rd through 7th grade included twice-yearly assessments of self-concept (academic and social), corresponding external evaluations of competence (e.g., teacher-rated academic skills, peer-nominated “likeability”), and multiple measures of youths’ overall adjustment. Multiphase growth models replicate previous research, suggesting significant decline in academic self-concept during middle school but modest growth in social self-concept from 3rd through 7th grade. Next, a new contribution is made to the literature by quantifying the amount of within-subject variability (i.e., “lability”) around these linear self-concept trajectories as a between-subjects characteristic. Self-concept lability was found to associate with a general profile of poorer competence and adjustment and to predict poorer academic and social competence at the end of 7th grade above and beyond level of self-concept. Finally, there was substantial evidence that wave-to-wave changes in youths’ self-concepts correspond to teacher and peer evaluations of youths’ competence, that attention to peer feedback may be particularly strong during middle school, and that these relations may be moderated by between-subjects indicators of youths’ general adjustment. Overall, findings highlight the utility of methods sensitive to within-subject variation for clarifying the dynamics of youths’ self-system development.

*Keywords:* self-concept, intraindividual variability, peers, early adolescence

The development of self-cognitions in childhood and adolescence is of enduring interest to developmental scientists because of their key role in motivational structures and behavioral choices (e.g., Bandura, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Existing studies have often focused on the development of self-concept in terms of increasing cognitive capacities or normative trajectories (e.g., Dweck, 2002; Jacobs, Lanza, Osgood, Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002). Yet theoretical accounts of self-concept formation suggest that, beyond average trajectories, self-concept may also fluctuate. For instance, multiple theories of self-concept posit that individuals incorporate others’ evaluations of them into their own self-views, suggesting potential for within-subject variability across time and

contexts and between-subjects differences in this self–other correspondence (e.g., Cairns & Cairns, 1988; Cooley, 1922). Although some studies have examined predictors of short-term changes in self-concept (e.g., Gest, Rulison, Davidson, & Welsh, 2008), few have taken advantage of analytic methods sensitive to fluctuations across multiple measurement occasions. Moreover, recent research has demonstrated in several domains (e.g., cognition, affect, self-esteem) that quantification and study of the amount or structure of within-subject variability provides a more complete picture of individuals’ development (Nesselroade, 1991; Ram & Gerstorf, 2009). The purpose of this study is to delve into the developmental implications of within-subject variability in self-concept by matching theories of self-concept and its potential to change across time and context to analytic methods that are sensitive to such changes. In this study, we examine long-term trends in academic and social self-concepts from elementary to middle school, explore correlates and consequences of the amount of within-subject variability around these trends, and identify attributes of youths and their environment that may account for fluctuations in self-concept.

In the present study, we focus on self-concept (i.e., perceptions of one’s own competence) in two fundamental domains of development: academic and social (e.g., Dweck, 2002). Academic self-concept is critical in the development of academic motivation, contributing to school-related values, expectations, and achievement (e.g., Guay, Marsh, & Boivin, 2003). Social self-concept plays important roles in youths’ social skill development, social status, peer affiliations, and several internalizing and externalizing symptoms (e.g., Hawley, 2003; Prinstein & La Greca, 2002). More

---

This article was published Online First September 19, 2011.

Lauren E. Molloy, Nilam Ram, and Scott D. Gest, Human Development and Family Studies, Pennsylvania State University.

Data for this study were collected with support from a Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant provided to the participating school district by the U.S. Departments of Education, Health & Human Services, and Justice. Data analyses were supported by grants from the National Science Foundation (NSF/HSD: 0624150), the National Institute on Aging (RC1-AG035645), and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA: T32 DA017629). The authors would like to thank Kelly L. Rulison, Alice J. Davidson, and Janet A. Welsh for their critical contributions to this longitudinal study.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lauren E. Molloy, Human Development and Family Studies, Pennsylvania State University, 113 South Henderson, University Park, PA 16802. E-mail: lmolloy@psu.edu

broadly, as youths undergo major developmental and environmental transitions associated with early adolescence, academic and social self-cognitions are important in guiding the paths upon which youths embark (e.g., Bandura, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

### Self-Concept Trajectories

A number of studies have demonstrated, using linear growth curves or other approaches, a normative developmental decline from middle childhood into adolescence across multiple self-concept domains (e.g., math, language arts, sports, and social activities; e.g., Jacobs et al., 2002; Watt, 2004). Such changes are generally explained by increased cognitive abilities leading to increasingly realistic (and less idealistic) self-views (e.g., Dweck, 2002). Yet declines in self-concept may be especially pronounced during the transition to middle school, as several studies have demonstrated using piecewise linear growth curves (e.g., Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989; Wigfield, Eccles, Mac Iver, Reuman, & Midgley, 1991). The transition to middle school frequently involves a shift in instructional practices that are mismatched to early adolescents' developmental needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Eccles et al., 1993). Middle school introduces harsher evaluative feedback, less teacher support, and greater focus on performance goals rather than mastery, in turn breeding unfavorable social comparisons and poor motivation, engagement, and learning. These contrasts to elementary school are seen as key sources of the decline in self-concept during middle school (e.g., Mac Iver, Young, & Washburn, 2002; Urdan & Midgley, 2003).

### Self-Concept "Lability"

Beyond enduring, directional changes in self-concept, youths may also experience fluctuations in self-concept that are reversible and more rapid, resulting from shorter term processes (e.g., Nesselroade, 1991). To the extent that the patterns of within-subject variability differ across individuals, this can be an important between-subjects difference in itself worth exploring. For instance, one may measure and investigate "net within-subject variability," conceptualized as an individual's characteristic amount of lability (i.e., unstructured "ups and downs"), and typically operationalized as individually calculated standard deviations or variances, and then examined as a between-subjects variable (Ram & Gerstorf, 2009).

This idea of quantifying within-subject variability and examining its implications has recently received substantial attention in various domains (e.g., Ram & Gerstorf, 2009). For instance, higher lability in cognitive performance has been related to declines in general intelligence and memory (Ram, Rabbitt, Stollery, & Nesselroade, 2005), and greater lability in affect and psychological well-being has been linked to depression (Gable & Nezlek, 1998). In the self-system domain, global self-esteem lability has been identified as a risk factor for poorer mental health (e.g., Kim & Cicchetti, 2009; Roberts & Kassel, 1997) and linked to poorer overall self-worth and academic adjustment, including low motivation, maladaptive achievement goals, avoidance of challenges, and self-handicapping (Deci & Ryan, 1995; Newman & Wadas, 1997; Waschull & Kernis, 1996).

To date, though, little is known about youths' *domain-specific self-concept lability* or its relation to developmental correlates or outcomes in those domains. Given that level of self-concept tends to demonstrate reciprocal relations with actual performance and external feedback (e.g., Guay et al., 2003), an important question is raised about the meaning of *lability* in self-concept for performance and feedback. One study by Amorose (2001) found that lability in physical self-concept negatively predicted motivation toward physical activity. Similarly, day-to-day academic self-concept lability has predicted lower grades a year later (Tsai, 2008). Based upon these and related findings, it has been suggested that high lability (in the self-system and other domains) may be a marker of high vulnerability or reactivity to stressors, while stability may indicate resilience or robustness (e.g., Greve & Enzmann, 2003; Waschull & Kernis, 1996).

As previously described, between-subjects differences in lability may reflect an enduring characteristic of an individual child. As such, self-concept lability may be a marker of risk for academic and social adjustment and may relate to other between-subjects differences. For instance, externalizing symptoms (e.g., aggression) may elicit mixed feedback from peers, and internalizing symptoms (e.g., depression) may make youths particularly reactive to feedback or uncertain about their own abilities. Alternatively, high levels of lability may derive from the environment in which a child's self-views are developing. For instance, middle school introduces major shifts in the sources of external feedback and support, including a grade-level peer network instead of classroom-level and interaction with multiple teachers per day instead of just one (e.g., Feldlaufer, Midgley, & Eccles, 1988). As such, the middle school transition may make youths particularly vulnerable.

Likely driven by both internal and external sources, instability (i.e., lability) of self-concept may have important implications for the development of youths' competencies. Self-concept is meant to form a coherent meaning system with values, expectations, and achievement during early adolescence (Dweck, 2002); a labile self-concept may hinder this process. For instance, inconsistent self-concepts may make it difficult for youths to form sound, realistic expectations of what challenges they can handle or how to do so. Similarly, to the extent that labile self-concepts correspond to or reflect actual fluctuations in youths' engagement, interest, and performance (Deci & Ryan, 1995; Harter, 1999), these various levels of cognitive, affective, and behavioral inconsistency may impede long-term skill development (Kernis, 2003). Thus far, we can only extrapolate from related literature; the tendency for self-concept to become more or less labile during middle school and the meaning of short-term fluctuations in self-concept for youths' longer term skill development are largely unknown.

### Self-Other Correspondence

Why might self-concept vary from occasion to occasion? The historical *looking glass self* perspective (Cooley, 1922) still endorsed in modern theories argues that self-views are formed in part by internalizing others' perceptions of oneself (e.g., Crocker & Knight, 2005). In other words, self-concept fluctuations may result from inconsistency across time or context in the external feedback that youths receive about their academic and social competence. This process may be particularly relevant during early adoles-

cence: The cognitive capacity to incorporate others' perceptions into one's own self-concept develops at this time and coincides with a developmental peak in youths' concerns about how they are perceived (Bukowski, Sippola, & Newcomb, 2000; Dweck, 2002). Consistent with this notion, the majority of an adolescent sample in a study by Harter (1999) reported using a looking-glass-self orientation. From a developmental perspective, then, self-other correspondence that results from the incorporation of others' views into one's self-concept is particularly likely as youths begin adolescence.

As further support for looking-glass-self processes, two previous examinations of the data set used in the present study have demonstrated (at a between-subjects level) that changes in academic self-concept can be uniquely predicted by previous-wave teacher ratings of academic skill and peer nominations of academic ability, termed *peer academic reputation* (PAR; Gest, Domitrovich, & Welsh, 2005; Gest et al., 2008). Similarly, in other studies, changes in social self-concept have been predicted by teacher or parent ratings of youths' social competence and peer acceptance, as well as by indices of "likeability" and "social prominence" created from peers' reports of which classmates they like and dislike (Cillessen & Bellmore, 1999; Cole, 1991). The latter approach is viewed as the most ecologically valid assessment of youths' social status: Likeability, or *social preference*, refers to the frequency of "liking nominations" relative to the frequency of "disliking" nominations, and social prominence, or *social impact*, represents the degree to which a child elicits strong reactions from peers, whether positive or negative (e.g., Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982). These two key status dimensions have each been uniquely related to social self-concept (e.g., Newcomb & Bukowski, 1983; Lease, Musgrove, & Axelrod, 2002).

Typically, relations between self-concepts and external evaluations of youths' competence are viewed as reciprocal: While short-term changes in external feedback may drive changes in self-concept, it is also likely that fluctuations in feedback result from ups and downs in self-concept. For instance, longstanding theories of achievement motivation and supporting evidence suggest that academic self-concept predicts achievement in school through its effects on youths' values and self-expectations. When youths have low expectations for success, they are less likely to pursue challenges that may help to improve their skills (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1995; Eccles et al., 1983); in turn, skill development may suffer, as do teacher and peer perceptions of youths' skill level (Guay et al., 2003). Moreover, the normative grading systems typical of middle school heighten youths' awareness of how they measure up to their peers (e.g., Eccles et al., 1993; Mac Iver et al., 2002). To the extent that low self-concept manifests in youths' behaviors, peer perceptions of youths' competence are especially likely to match up with youths' self-concepts during this period. The power of self-concept to shape effort, achievement, and external feedback, then, provides another reason to expect covariation of these constructs over time. In sum, we expect self-other correspondence, likely resulting from bidirectional feedback loops between self-concept and observed competence, especially during middle school.

Though substantial evidence supports a link between self-concept and external indicators of competence, much potential also exists for between-subjects differences in the extent of self-other correspondence. Self-concept may manifest to varying degrees in

observable behaviors, and evaluative feedback is filtered through potentially biased perceptions of that feedback (e.g., Harter, 1999; John & Robins, 1994). One such bias is referred to as "contingent" self-esteem, in which youths' self-worth is highly dependent upon external validation (Crocker & Knight, 2005). Contingent self-esteem involves heightened sensitivity to feedback and a tendency to perceive feedback as inconsistent; the result is more unstable self-views, avoidance of challenges, and poorer mental health (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1995; Kernis, 2003). In other words, youths with this type of bias may be especially prone to self-concept lability and strong self-other correspondence. Alternatively, some youths may simply perceive others' reactions to them through consistently positive or negative lenses.

The final task, then, is to identify factors that may explain such biases, or between-subjects differences, in self-other correspondence. Some research has suggested that girls tend to evaluate themselves more harshly and are more likely than boys to view evaluative feedback as diagnostic of their ability (e.g., Pomerantz, Altermatt, & Saxon, 2002). Similarly, depression, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), and other mental health problems are frequently linked to biased and/or more labile self-views, which are likely to affect both the impact of external feedback on self-concept and the ways others perceive and react to them (e.g., Hoza et al., 2004; Ward, Sylva, & Gresham, 2010). Given the existing evidence, we expect between-subjects differences in self-other correspondence, accounted for in part by gender and mental health indices.

### The Present Study

In the present study, we use contemporary methods for examining within-subject change, variability, and covariation to answer three questions. First, do youths, on average, experience a decline in self-concept over the middle school transition? Replicating previous research, we expected a linear decline in academic and social self-concepts directly following entry to middle school. Second, does self-concept lability differ between elementary and middle school, and does it relate to youths' academic and social adjustment and overall mental health? We expected that self-concept lability would be greater following the transition to middle school. Further, we expected greater lability to be associated with a profile of poorer academic, social, and overall adjustment and for self-concept lability to be uniquely predictive of lower competence in seventh grade. Third, do short-term fluctuations in self-concept correspond with fluctuations in teacher and peer evaluations, and is self-other correspondence moderated by school level (elementary vs. middle school) and between-subjects differences? We expected self-other correspondence to be strongest during middle school and to be moderated by gender and "proxies" of mental health, including self-worth, loneliness, poor attention, victimization, and aggression.

### Method

Data were drawn from a 5-year (2001–2006) cohort-sequential longitudinal study investigating youths' peer networks and academic and social adjustment producing 10 waves of data (two assessments per year; see Gest et al., 2005, 2008, for a complete description of the procedures).

## Participants and Procedure

Participants were initially enrolled in third, fourth, or fifth grade in one elementary school located in a small, working-class community in central Pennsylvania (with all youths moving into the same middle school at the beginning of sixth grade). Beginning in the fall of 2001, all students were assessed in October and **May of each school year until they completed seventh grade.** Researchers sought parental consent at each assessment, providing parents with a form to sign and return if they did not want their child to participate. Students completed a survey lasting approximately 45 min in their classroom while supervised by the researchers.

Across waves, 92%–95% of students enrolled in the targeted grades provided data, yielding a sample of 541 students (251 girls). Attrition was minimal: Of the 541 students, 459 provided data at three or more waves. Because each cohort of students began contributing data at a different grade level (i.e., third, fourth, fifth), the number of waves of data varies per cohort (see Table 1 for sample sizes by cohort and grade level). Almost all students (99%) were Caucasian, reflecting demographics of the larger community. Distributions of standardized reading and math assessment scores for fifth graders at the school closely matched the distribution for fifth graders statewide. Rates of several social problems (such as poverty and school dropout) exceeded state averages. This profile is typical of rural communities (where nearly a third of U.S. children attend public school; Johnson & Strange, 2007).

## Measures

Self-report measures were used to assess youths' self-concepts and were examined in relation to corresponding peer and teacher evaluations of competence. Several proxies of mental health and overall adjustment were also derived from peer, teacher, and self-reports. Summary descriptives are provided in Table 2.

**Self-reports.** Students responded to items drawn from Harter's well-validated Self-Perception Profile for Children to assess academic self-concept, social self-concept, and general self-worth (Harter, 1982). Students chose which of two statements was "more true" for them, then indicated whether the statement was *sort of true* or *really true*. Items formed internally consistent composite scales within each wave.<sup>1</sup> The four statements corresponding to academic self-concept were "Feel very good at my school work," "Feel just as smart as other kids my age," "Almost always figure out the answers," and "Do very well in my class work" ( $M = 3.04$ – $3.19$  on the 1–4 scale;  $\alpha = .57$ – $.85$ ). The four social self-concept items were "Find it easy to make friends," "Have lots of friends," "Feel that most kids like me," and "Popular with others my age" ( $M = 3.02$ – $3.34$ ;  $\alpha = .65$ – $.84$ ). The four self-worth items were "Happy with the way they do things," "Happy with themselves most of the time," "Like the way they are leading their life," "Like the kind of person they are" ( $M = 3.21$ – $3.39$ ;  $\alpha = .59$ – $.82$ ). Raw data are plotted in Panels A and B of Figure 1, representing wave-to-wave changes in academic and social self-concepts. Students also responded to the following three items selected from the Illinois Loneliness Questionnaire (Asher, Hymel, & Renshaw, 1984) to assess loneliness: "I feel alone," "I feel lonely," and "I feel left out of things." Children indicated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not true at all*) to 5 (*always true*) how much each statement was true of themselves ( $M = 1.62$ – $1.93$ ;  $\alpha = .79$ – $.89$ , across waves).

**Teacher ratings.** Teachers rated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each of 32 statements describing students' adjustment on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Items assessing academic skills were expanded from a scale used in the Interpersonal Competence Scale–Teacher Form (Cairns, Leung, Gest, & Cairns, 1995) to assess four core curricular areas of competence: good at reading; good at math; good at writing; good at science ( $M = 3.26$ – $3.76$ ;  $\alpha = .86$ – $.93$ , across waves). Good reliability (internal consistency and stability) and convergent and discriminant validity of this expanded version of the scale were demonstrated in our previous examination of the measure (see Gest et al., 2005). Items assessing social engagement, aggression, and attention were all drawn from the well-validated and widely used Social Health Profile (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999). Social engagement items included "Is friendly," "Plays with others," "Avoids social contact" (reverse-scored), "Initiates interactions with peers," "Is helpful to others," "Has social contact with others" ( $M = 3.56$ – $4.24$ ;  $\alpha = .86$ – $.93$ ). Aggression items included "Teases classmates," "Breaks rules," "Harms others," "Has trouble accepting authority," "Fights" ( $M = 1.38$ – $1.62$ ;  $\alpha = .87$ – $.93$ ). Attention items included "Concentrates," "Completes assignments," "Is easily distracted" (reverse-scored), "Doesn't pay attention" (reverse-scored), "Stays on task" ( $M = 3.48$ – $3.80$ ;  $\alpha = .92$ – $.94$ ).

**Peer nominations.** Students were asked to identify classmates that they "like most" and "like least" and those that matched each of 12 behavioral descriptors. Following widely recommended practices used in the peer assessment literature (see Cillessen & Bukowski, 2000), students were provided with a class roster and were free to list as many or as few peers as they wished. In middle school, assessments were accompanied by a grade-level roster instead of a class roster, because students change classes throughout the day. Each item was standardized within classroom (or grade level in middle school) and gender to account for varying peer network size and sex distribution; nominations thus represented each student's relative standing in his or her peer network, allowing comparisons across classrooms and grade levels (see Coie et al., 1982; Gest et al., 2005).

Number of raw nominations received for "like most" ranged from 0 to 20, with an average of 3.6 nominations; number of nominations received for "like least" ranged from 0 to 67, with an average of 2.21. Following standard practice (see Coie et al., 1982), standardized peer nominations were used to compute two indices of social status. Social preference scores were calculated as the difference between the standardized "like most" and "like least" scores, representing how well liked a student was overall (e.g., do positive nominations outnumber negative?). To also account for the difference between neglected youths (i.e., no nominations of liking or disliking) and controversial youths (i.e., many nominations of each type), we also computed social impact scores as the sum of standardized "like most" and "like least" scores, to

<sup>1</sup> For all self-perception composite scores created from Harter's (1982) Self-Perception Profile for Children, alphas fell slightly below the standard .7 reliability cutoff at the waves when only one or two cohorts were providing data (third grade  $N$ s < 140; fall of fourth grade  $N = 234$ ).



Table 1

*Sample Sizes by Cohort (Beginning in Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grades, Respectively) and Semester in School*

Cohort	Third grade		Fourth grade		Fifth grade		Sixth grade		Seventh grade		Total per cohort at any wave
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	
1					141	141	150	146	149	141	166
2			150	150	160	161	164	164	163	163	185
3	152	152	147	148	145	148	156	156	163	158	190
Total per wave	152	152	297	298	446	450	470	466	475	462	541

represent youths' prominence in their networks. While raw nominations of one type (i.e., liking or disliking) cannot be usefully interpreted without the other, each composite score represents a conceptually meaningful and distinct aspect of social experience. Moreover, computing composite peer scores from oppositely highly skewed "like most" and "like least" scores produces indices that are relatively normally distributed and thus conform well to


standard assumptions of most analyses. Social preference scores ranged from  $-9.36$  to  $4.36$ , and social impact scores ranged from  $-3.15$  to  $7.71$ ; both, by definition, had a mean score of 0.

Peer academic reputation (PAR) scores were similarly calculated from four of the peer-nominated behavioral descriptor items: "Who is good at reading?" ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 2.27$ , range = 0–21), "Who is not good at reading?" ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 1.42$ , range =

Table 2

*Means (and Standard Deviations) of Academic and Social Self-Concepts and Self, Teacher, and Peer Reports Examined in Relation to Self-Concept*

Rater and wave	Academic self-concept	Social self-concept	Self-worth	Loneliness	
Child self-ratings					
Fall of third grade	3.09 (0.72)	3.07 (0.78)	3.22 (0.71)	1.72 (0.95)	
Spring of third grade	3.05 (0.73)	3.04 (0.74)	3.25 (0.69)	1.93 (1.14)	
Fall of fourth grade	3.11 (0.71)	3.14 (0.78)	3.28 (0.66)	1.64 (0.91)	
Spring of fourth grade	3.19 (0.74)	3.20 (0.78)	3.31 (0.67)	1.71 (1.02)	
Fall of fifth grade	3.11 (0.74)	3.21 (0.75)	3.34 (0.69)	1.66 (0.92)	
Spring of fifth grade	3.17 (0.73)	3.21 (0.78)	3.32 (0.72)	1.70 (0.96)	
Fall of sixth grade	3.18 (0.73)	3.28 (0.74)	3.38 (0.66)	1.62 (0.91)	
Spring of sixth grade	3.12 (0.77)	3.25 (0.74)	3.32 (0.71)	1.64 (0.90)	
Fall of seventh grade	3.13 (0.73)	3.28 (0.74)	3.39 (0.66)	1.64 (0.85)	
Spring of seventh grade	3.04 (0.77)	3.34 (0.70)	3.30 (0.69)	1.68 (0.89)	
	Academic skill	Social engagement	Aggression	Attention	
Teacher ratings of child					
Fall of third grade	3.66 (0.92)	4.06 (0.79)	1.42 (0.79)	3.74 (0.98)	
Spring of third grade	3.76 (1.00)	4.03 (0.76)	1.62 (0.92)	3.64 (1.05)	
Fall of fourth grade	3.70 (0.84)	4.08 (0.69)	1.38 (0.59)	3.80 (0.95)	
Spring of fourth grade	3.76 (0.93)	4.24 (0.67)	1.39 (0.58)	3.77 (0.98)	
Fall of fifth grade	3.47 (0.92)	3.92 (0.72)	1.51 (0.74)	3.59 (1.00)	
Spring of fifth grade	3.48 (0.92)	3.99 (0.75)	1.60 (0.78)	3.64 (0.98)	
Fall of sixth grade	3.71 (0.98)	4.24 (0.76)	1.46 (0.74)	3.80 (0.99)	
Spring of sixth grade	3.72 (0.99)	4.19 (0.82)	1.54 (0.74)	3.80 (0.98)	
Fall of seventh grade	3.26 (0.70)	3.56 (0.63)	1.60 (0.70)	3.51 (0.85)	
Spring of seventh grade	3.30 (0.83)	3.63 (0.66)	1.62 (0.77)	3.47 (0.91)	
	Peer academic reputation	Social preference	Social impact	Aggression	Victimization
Peer nomination scores					
Fall of third grade	0 (1.56)	0 (1.61)	0 (1.06)	0 (0.93)	0 (0.81)
Spring of third grade	0 (1.54)	0 (1.58)	0 (1.11)	0 (0.87)	0 (0.80)
Fall of fourth grade	0 (1.55)	0 (1.60)	0 (1.06)	0 (0.90)	0 (0.80)
Spring of fourth grade	0 (1.54)	0 (1.61)	0 (1.05)	0.01 (0.89)	0 (0.78)
Fall of fifth grade	0 (1.51)	0 (1.63)	0 (1.03)	0.01 (0.92)	0 (0.88)
Spring of fifth grade	0 (1.55)	0 (1.65)	0 (0.97)	0 (0.89)	0 (0.85)
Fall of sixth grade	0 (1.52)	0.01 (1.43)	0 (1.31)	0 (0.96)	0 (0.93)
Spring of sixth grade	0 (1.54)	−0.03 (1.50)	−0.01 (1.26)	0 (0.93)	−0.01 (0.88)
Fall of seventh grade	0 (1.43)	0 (1.53)	−0.02 (1.34)	0 (0.93)	0 (0.97)
Spring of seventh grade	0 (1.46)	0.03 (1.53)	0.01 (1.31)	0 (0.94)	0.01 (1.02)



*Figure 1.* All panels represent within-subject changes in academic self-concept (Panels A, C, and E) and social self-concept (Panels B, D, and F) from third through seventh grades for the same subsample of 50 youths, in the form of raw data (Panels A and B); two-phase linear growth curves, in which the bold lines represent the average linear growth trends, thin lines represent individuals' predicted linear growth trends, and the vertical line at the beginning of sixth grade represents the transition point tested (Panels C and D); and individuals' residuals around their linear growth curves (Panels E and F).

0–21), “Who almost always knows the right answer when the teacher asks a question?” ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 1.93$ , range = 0–23), and “Who almost never knows the right answer when the teacher asks a question?” ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 1.18$ , range = 0–16). Following standard practice (see Gest et al., 2005), the two negatively worded and two positively worded items were each averaged separately and standardized within classroom and gender. Consistent with the approach used to calculate social preference scores, composite PAR scores were computed as the difference between the positive and negative reputation scores, producing a nearly normally distributed index. PAR scores ranged from –7.48 to 6.82.

Victimization scores were derived from these peer nomination items: “Who gets hit or pushed a lot?” ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 0.63$ , range = 0–57) and “Who gets picked on a lot?” ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = .92$ , range = 0–59); and peer-nominated aggression scores were derived from these peer nomination items: “Who starts fights?” ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 1.26$ , range = 0–55) and “Who picks on other kids a lot?” ( $M_{\text{nominations}} = 1.16$ , range = 0–50). After standardizing nominations within class (or grade) and gender, items were averaged to create composite victimization (range = –1.36–10.55) and aggression (range = 1.34–6.97) scores.

## Data Analysis

To address our research questions about within-subject change and variability in self-concept we used a variety of analytic methods for examining longitudinal data, including multilevel models of change (i.e., growth models), intraindividual residual variances, and linear regression analyses. All models were fit to the data using SAS (e.g., Proc Mixed and Proc GLM). Incomplete data were treated according to standard missing at random assumptions in the growth curve models and analyses of self–other correspondence and as missing completely at random (MCAR) in the calculation of lability scores. Importantly, the main reason for missing data was the research design (e.g., not measuring all cohorts in third grade because access to participants was not available when the older students were in third grade), not because of participants’ characteristics, further justifying the MCAR treatment (Little & Rubin, 1987). Additional tests for possible cohort effects provided no evidence that the cohorts differed in a meaningful way during the overlapping spans of observation.

**Self-concept trajectories.** A two-phase growth model was used to address our first research question, which concerned long-term within-subject changes in self-concept and a hypothesized decline during middle school. Time—or semester in school (fall of third grade through spring of seventh grade)—was entered to examine linear and quadratic change. Interactions of a dichotomous middle school variable with both time variables were entered to test the possible difference of rates of change between the elementary and middle school years.

**Self-concept lability.** The second research question focused on correlates of academic and social self-concept lability. For each individual, we examined the residuals from the growth curves described earlier. Intraindividual standard deviations of these residuals were used to quantify each child’s self-concept lability (a new between-subjects difference variable). A  $t$  test was computed to determine whether self-concept lability differed between elementary and middle school. Overall lability scores were then correlated with individual mean levels of self-concept, correspond-

ing teacher and peer evaluations of competence, and the mental health proxy variables. Finally, lability scores were used in regression equations to predict academic and social competence at the end of seventh grade, after controlling for youths’ average self-concept.

**Self–other correspondence.** The third research question concerned self–other correspondence. To address this, teacher and peer evaluations of academic and social adjustment were added as time-varying predictors to the growth curve model described earlier. Self–other correspondence was quantified as the extent of association between the ongoing evaluations of competence and individuals’ self-concepts. Semester (fall or spring of third through seventh grade) and school-level (elementary or middle school) were interacted with the time-varying indices to examine change in correspondence over time. Last, gender, mean levels of external evaluations, and mental health indicators were examined as potential moderators of the self–other correspondence.

## Results

### Self-Concept Trajectories

The first task of the present study<sup>2</sup> was to identify the normative long-term developmental trends in academic and social self-concepts from middle childhood through early adolescence and to test whether the transition to middle school (at fall of sixth grade) coincided with a decline in youths’ self-concept trajectories. A growth curve (i.e., multilevel) model—in which academic and social self-concepts are modeled as a function of semester (i.e., linear and quadratic change over time), school level, and an interaction of school level with both time variables—was used to model between-subjects differences in within-subject change. Interaction of the school level with each of the time variables was included to capture potential differences in the rate of change in self-concept associated with the middle school transition. The model is effectively a two-phase growth model, with Level 1 specified as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Self-Concept}_{it} = & \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}(\text{grade}_{it}) + \beta_{2i}(\text{grade}_{it}^2) \\ & + \beta_{3i}(\text{middle school}_{it}) + \beta_{4i}(\text{grade}_{it} \times \text{middle school}_{it}) \\ & + \beta_{5i}(\text{grade}_{it}^2 \times \text{middle school}_{it}) + e_{it}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Self-Concept}_{it}$ , signifying child  $i$ ’s self-concept at time  $t$ , is a function of an individual-specific intercept parameter that captures their level of self-concept,  $\beta_{0i}$ , at  $\text{grade}_{it} = 0$ , here centered at fall of sixth grade (entry to middle school), individual-specific

<sup>2</sup> In a preliminary step, we used an “unconditional means” multilevel model (occasions nested within subjects) to compute the relative proportions of between-subject and within-subject variation (see e.g., Singer & Willett, 2003). The resulting intraclass coefficients—.53 for academic self-concept and .54 for social self-concept—suggest that the amount of variation in academic and social self-concept due to between-subject differences was 53% and 54%, respectively. With the remainder of the variance (47% and 46%, respectively) likely due to within-subject change and variability over time, further investigation was most certainly warranted.

slope parameters that capture associations between time and school context and self-concept,  $\beta_{1i}$  through  $\beta_{5i}$ , and residual error,  $e_{it}$ . Consistent with standard growth modeling procedures (McArdle, 2009; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Singer & Willet, 2003), individual specific intercepts and slopes from Level 1 were modeled at Level 2 as

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + u_{0i}, \\ \beta_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + u_{1i}, \\ \beta_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + u_{2i}, \\ \beta_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + u_{3i}, \\ \beta_{4i} &= \gamma_{40} + u_{4i}, \quad \text{and} \\ \beta_{5i} &= \gamma_{50} + u_{5i}.\end{aligned}$$

In these models,  $\gamma_{00}$  is the average intercept;  $\gamma_{10}$  and  $\gamma_{20}$  are the average linear and quadratic change, respectively;  $\gamma_{30}$  is the average main effect of middle school;  $\gamma_{40}$  and  $\gamma_{50}$  are the average linear and quadratic Time  $\times$  Middle School interaction effects, respectively; and  $u_{0i}$  through  $u_{5i}$  are individual-specific deviations from those means. After initial fitting, nonsignificant effects were trimmed for parsimony. According to standard assumptions of multilevel models, interindividual differences were assumed normally distributed, correlated with each other, and uncorrelated with the residual errors.

Using this two-phase linear growth model of development, we assessed evidence for an overall developmental trend in children's self-concept across the observation period, differences in this developmental trend between elementary and middle school, and the extent of interindividual differences in these trends. Parameter estimates and fit statistics for final models are presented in Table 3. All quadratic terms were nonsignificant<sup>3</sup> and were therefore trimmed from the final models. We discuss the specific parameters most relevant to interpretation of developmental changes here (see Panels C and D of Figure 1 for plots of the average linear trajectory as well as predicted individual linear trajectories for academic and social self-concepts among a subsample of 50 youths). In line with expectations and past research using piecewise growth curves, there was evidence of a significant (though modest) deflection from a flat to a downward trajectory in academic self-concept upon entry to middle school, as represented by the significant Time  $\times$  Middle School interaction ( $\gamma_{30} = -0.10, p < .01$ ). Further, there were significant interindividual differences in the extent of this deflection ( $\sigma_{u3}^2 = 0.12, p < .001$ ), with some individuals greatly affected by the transition and others less so. For social self-concept, there was a significant (though modest) linear increase, on average, across the full span of the study ( $\gamma_{10} = 0.06, p < .01$ ), with no significant effects of the transition to middle school on average developmental trajectory ( $\gamma_{30} = -0.01$ ). However, there were again significant interindividual differences in the extent of deflection to individuals' trajectories ( $\sigma_{u3}^2 = 0.12, p < .001$ ).

### Self-Concept Lability

The second task of the present study was to test whether self-concept lability differed between elementary and middle school and to examine relations between self-concept lability and external

indicators of youths' adjustment. In the previous analysis, we in essence extracted long-term linear trends associated with development and the middle school transition (see Figure 1, Panels C and D) from the raw within-subject changes in academic and social self-concepts (see Figure 1, Panels A and B). The "leftover," or residual, changes across time are shown in Panels E and F of Figure 1. We quantified the amount of within-subject variability in leftover changes for each child (for anyone who provided at least three waves of data) as the standard deviation of his or her residuals. We used this quantification to operationalize between-subjects differences in self-concept lability. Examples of between-subjects differences are highlighted by the purposively selected subsample of six relatively labile and six relatively stable youths shown in Figure 2.

To test whether lability was greater during middle school, we used the same approach described earlier to compute self-concept lability separately for elementary and middle school. Contrary to expectations, average academic self-concept lability scores from comparable samples<sup>4</sup> of elementary ( $M = 0.31, SD = 0.21$ ) and middle ( $M = 0.28, SD = 0.20$ ) school students did not significantly differ ( $t = 1.30, p > .05$ ; correlation between elementary and middle school academic self-concept lability scores was  $r = .15, p > .10$ ). However, social self-concept lability was, on average, greater in elementary school ( $M = 0.28, SD = 0.21$ ) than in middle school ( $M = 0.21, SD = 0.18$ ;  $t = 3.69, p < .05$ ; correlation between elementary and middle school social self-concept lability scores was  $r = .17, p < .05$ ).

Next, we examined whether between-subjects differences in self-concept lability (assessed over the full data stream: elementary and middle schools) were related to other indicators of youths' adjustment. Table 4 presents correlations between academic and social self-concept lability and (a) mean levels of academic and social adjustment and (b) mean levels on the mental health proxy indicators. Consistent with our hypotheses, greater lability in academic self-concept was associated with overall lower academic adjustment: mean academic self-concept ( $r = -.20, p < .001$ ), mean teacher-rated skills ( $r = -.17, p < .001$ ), and mean PAR ( $r = -.22, p < .001$ ). Moreover, correlations between academic self-concept lability and several of the mental health proxy variables—including self-worth ( $r = -.16, p < .001$ ), loneliness ( $r = .15, p < .01$ ), peer victimization ( $r = .15, p < .01$ ), and teacher-rated attention ( $r = -.15, p < .001$ )—suggest that academic self-concept lability is also a marker of poorer overall adjustment or mental health. Similarly, lability in social self-concept was

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that, when broken down into two separate time spans (elementary and middle schools), the number of data points available for examining growth trends within each phase precludes a sound test of nonlinear change (e.g., quadratic effects) within each separate school level.

<sup>4</sup> Because lability scores are computed as residual variances, the number of occasions entered into the computation may influence the range of lability scores through differences in the amount of possible variability. Therefore, staying conservative, we limited the statistical test to students with no more than four occasions of data in elementary school to match the maximum number of data points available in middle school. Consistent with our operationalization of lability elsewhere in the article, we also limited the statistical tests to students who provided no less than three data points during elementary and middle school.



Table 3  
Two-Phase Growth Curve Models for Academic and Social Self-Concepts Representing Development From Third to Seventh Grades and Across the Middle School Transition

Variable	Academic self-concept		Social self-concept	
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>
Fixed effects estimates				
Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	3.13*	0.04	3.22*	0.04
Grade in school, $\gamma_{10}$	0.03	0.02	0.06*	0.02
Middle school, $\gamma_{20}$	0.01	0.03	<0.01	0.03
Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\gamma_{30}$	-0.10*	0.03	-0.01	0.03
Random effects estimates				
Variance intercept, $\sigma_{u0}^2$	0.41*	0.03	0.41*	0.03
Variance grade in school, $\sigma_{u1}^2$	0.05*	0.01	0.05*	<0.01
Variance Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\sigma_{u3}^2$	0.12*	0.03	0.12*	<0.01
Covariance intercept, grade in school, $\sigma_{u0u1}$	0.08*	0.01	0.06*	0.01
Covariance intercept, Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\sigma_{u0u3}$	-0.13*	0.03	-0.12*	0.03
Covariance grade, Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\sigma_{u1u3}$	-0.06*	0.01	-0.05*	0.02
Residual variance, $\sigma_e^2$	0.22*	0.01	0.21*	0.01

Note. The subscripts for the coefficients reflect the final models, after nonsignificant terms have been trimmed. Therefore, the subscripts in the text of the Results section match the table, not the subscripts presented in the general equations.

\* $p < .05$ .

associated with lower mean social self-concept ( $r = -.28, p < .001$ ), teacher-rated social engagement ( $r = -.13, p < .001$ ), and social preference ( $r = -.21, p < .001$ ) and with lower self-worth ( $r = -.22, p < .001$ ), poorer attention ( $r = -.10, p < .05$ ), and higher levels of loneliness ( $r = .24, p < .001$ ) and peer victimization ( $r = .15, p < .01$ ).<sup>5</sup> Overall, as hypothesized, greater self-concept lability was associated with a profile of poorer adjustment.

Having established these associations, we tested whether between-subjects differences in amount of self-concept lability were predictive of between-subjects differences in teacher and peer evaluations of competence at the end of seventh grade (the final wave of the study) above and beyond prediction by mean self-concept. Specifically, we regressed each of these seventh-grade "outcomes" on the self-concept lability scores, controlling for individuals' mean self-concept. As shown in Table 5, academic self-concept lability was negatively predictive of teacher ratings of academic skills ( $B = -0.82, p < .01$ ) and PAR ( $B = -1.99, p < .001$ ) at the end of seventh grade, even after controlling for individuals' mean levels of academic self-concept ( $B = 0.13, p < .001$ , and  $B = 0.26, p < .001$ , respectively). Similarly, social self-concept lability negatively predicted social preference ( $B = -1.38, p < .001$ ), social impact ( $B = -0.87, p < .01$ ), and social engagement ( $B = -0.63, p < .001$ ) at the end of seventh grade, also after controlling for individuals' mean self-concept ( $B = 0.30, B = 0.10$ , and  $B = 0.06$ , respectively). Results provide further evidence that greater self-concept lability is associated with multiple indicators of poorer social and academic competence.


### Self-Other Correspondence

In our final analysis, we examined within-subject relations between self-concept and external evaluations of competence and how this correspondence was moderated by grade level,

school level, gender, and between-subjects differences in external evaluations of competence and multiple proxy indicators of mental health. To set up the model, we computed (a) time-invariant (person-level) mean or "overall" scores for each academic and social competence variable to represent between-subjects differences and (b) time-varying (occasion-level) deviation or "occasion-specific" scores to represent within-subject variation in indices of academic and social competence (see Hoffman & Stawski, 2009). Specifically, overall scores for teacher-rated academic skills and social engagement, as well as peer nomination-based PAR, social preference, and social impact, were computed as youths' intraindividual means across assessments and were centered at the sample means. Occasion-specific scores were then computed as individuals' deviations from their own mean (once again centered at the sample mean). Overall scores were also computed for self-worth, loneliness, attention, victimization, and teacher and peer evaluations of aggressive behavior.

All of these scores were introduced into the original two-phase linear growth model. Within-subject predictors were added at Level 1. For academic self-concept, occasion-specific academic skills and PAR were included to test whether wave-to-wave fluctuations in academic self-concept coincide with occasion-specific external feedback from teachers and peers. Similarly, for social self-concept, occasion-specific social engagement, social preference, and social impact were added to Level 1 to examine covariation of social self-concept with teacher and peer scores. Each occasion-specific score was then interacted with grade level and school level to test changes over time in self-other correspondence. Thus, Level 1 was specified as

<sup>5</sup> Associations of academic and social self-concept lability with teacher-rated and peer-nominated aggressive behaviors were also tested but were not significant ( $r_s < .06, p > .05$ ).



*Figure 2.* A subsample of six highly variable (Panels A and C) and six highly stable (Panels B and D) youths for academic self-concept (Panels A and B) and social self-concept (Panels C and D) were selected to depict the range of between-subjects differences in within-subject self-concept “lability.” These panels replicate the concept represented in Panels E and F of Figure 1 (individual residuals around their own linear growth curves) but display a handpicked subsample of youths who best demonstrate the between-subjects differences.

Table 4  
*Correlations of Self-Concept Lability With Mean Levels of Self-Concept, External Evaluations of Competence, and Mental Health Proxy Variables*

Variable	Academic competence				Social competence				Peer-nominated social impact iMean
	Self-concept iLability	Self-concept iMean	Teacher-rated academic skills iMean	Peer academic reputation iMean	Self-concept iLability	Self-concept iMean	Teacher-rated social engagement iMean	Peer-nominated social preference iMean	
Mean-level competence (iMean)									
Self-concept	-.20*	—			-.28*	—			
Teacher-rated	-.17*	.52*	—		-.13*	.31*	—		
Peer-nominated (PAR/social preference)	-.22*	.50*	.76*	—	-.21*	.43*	.47*	—	
Peer-nominated (social impact)					-.05	.10*	.18*	-.02	—
Mean-level mental health “proxy” (iMean)									
Self-worth	-.16*	.75*	.33*	.33*	-.22*	.69*	.29*	.27*	.08
Self-rated loneliness	.15*	-.45	-.20*	-.26*	.24*	-.60*	-.22*	-.36*	.01
Peer-nominated victimization	.15*	-.14*	-.19*	-.40*	.15*	-.35*	-.24*	-.69*	.40*
Peer-nominated aggression	.06	-.14*	-.22*	-.30*	.04	.01	-.08	-.34*	.50*
Teacher-rated aggression	.03	-.25*	-.40*	-.37*	.05	-.07	-.33*	-.39*	.23*
Teacher-rated attention	-.15*	.49*	.75*	.71*	-.10*	.21*	.52*	.48*	-.06

*Note.* Correlations are between lability and mean levels of self-concept and competence in the academic and social domains, as well as mental health. Bolded values highlight the correlations of self-concept lability with mean levels of self-concept, competence, and mental health variables. iMean = individual-level within-person mean across time; iLability = individual-level lability, calculated as the within-person standard deviation of residuals around each individual's own growth curve.

\*  $p < .05$ .

Table 5

*Regression Models Predicting Evaluations of Competence at the End of Seventh Grade From Self-Concept Mean and Lability*

Dependent variable and predictor variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>
Academic self-concept		
Teacher-rated academic skills		
Intercept	3.10*	0.15
Within-person mean academic self-concept	0.13*	0.04
Within-person lability in academic self-concept	<b>-0.82*</b>	0.25
Peer academic reputation		
Intercept	-0.30	0.25
Within-person mean academic self-concept	0.26*	0.06
Within-person lability in academic self-concept	<b>-1.99*</b>	0.40
Social self-concept		
Teacher-rated social engagement		
Intercept	3.61*	0.12
Within-person mean social self-concept	0.06	0.03
Within-person lability in social self-concept	<b>-0.63*</b>	0.18
Peer-nominated social preference		
Intercept	-0.62*	0.26
Within-person mean social self-concept	0.30*	0.07
Within-person lability in social self-concept	<b>-1.38</b>	0.40
Peer-nominated social impact		
Intercept	-0.07	0.23
Within-person mean social self-concept	0.10	0.06
Within-person lability in social self-concept	<b>-0.87*</b>	0.35

Note. Bolded values highlight the terms of greatest relevance to the research questions (i.e., the self-concept lability terms).

\*  $p < .05$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 SC_{it} = & \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}(\text{grade}_{it}) + \beta_{2i}(\text{middle school}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{3i}(\text{grade}_{it} \times \text{middle school}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{4i}(\text{occasion-specific teacher ratings}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{5i}(\text{occasion-specific peer nomination scores}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{6i}(\text{occasion-specific teacher ratings}_{it} \times \text{grade}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{7i}(\text{occasion-specific peer nomination scores}_{it} \times \text{grade}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{8i}(\text{occasion-specific teacher ratings}_{it} \times \text{middle school}_{it}) \\
 & + \beta_{9i}(\text{occasion-specific peer nomination scores}_{it} \\
 & \times \text{middle school}_{it}) + e_{it},
 \end{aligned}$$

such that  $\beta_{4i}$  represents the within-subject correspondence between self- and teacher perceptions of competence,  $\beta_{5i}$  (and an additional  $\beta_{6i}$  in the social self-concept model, to represent the second peer score) represent the self-peer correspondence in perceptions of competence, and  $\beta_{6i}$  through  $\beta_{9i}$  (with an additional  $\beta_{10i}$  and  $\beta_{11i}$  in the social self-concept model) represent the moderation of self-other correspondence by grade level and school level.

At Level 2, between-subjects predictors (gender and overall competence and mental health scores) were added to control for the role of between-subjects differences in explaining youths' levels of self-concept and to test for moderators of growth and the self-other correspondence. Thus, Level 2 was specified as

$$\beta_{0i} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{sex}_i) + \gamma_{02}(\text{overall teacher ratings}_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \gamma_{03}(\text{overall peer nominations}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{04-08}(\text{overall mental health scores}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{09-0,13}(\text{overall teacher ratings}_i \\
 & \times \text{overall mental health scores}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{0,14-0,18}(\text{overall peer nominations}_i \\
 & \times \text{overall mental health scores}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{0,19}(\text{sex}_i \times \text{overall teacher ratings}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{0,20}(\text{sex}_i \times \text{overall peer nominations}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{0,21-0,25}(\text{sex}_i \times \text{mental health scores}_i) + u_{0i},
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta_{1i} = & \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{sex}_i) + \gamma_{12}(\text{overall teacher ratings}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{13}(\text{overall peer nominations}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{14-18}(\text{overall mental health scores}_i) + u_{1i}, \\
 \beta_{5i} = & \gamma_{50} + \gamma_{51}(\text{sex}_i) + \gamma_{52}(\text{overall teacher ratings}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{53}(\text{overall peer nominations}_i) \\
 & + \gamma_{54-58}(\text{overall mental health scores}_i) + u_{5i},
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\beta_{6i} = \gamma_{60} + u_{6i}$$

...

$$\beta_{9i} = \gamma_{90} + u_{9i}.$$

In these Level 2 equations,  $\gamma_{00}$  through  $\gamma_{90}$  represent the sample mean of each coefficient described earlier,  $\gamma_{01}$  through  $\gamma_{51}$  represent the moderation of each effect by gender,  $\gamma_{02}$  through  $\gamma_{52}$  represent moderation of the effects by overall teacher ratings,  $\gamma_{03}$  through  $\gamma_{53}$  represent moderation by overall peer nominations, and  $\gamma_{04-08}$  through  $\gamma_{54-58}$  represent moderation by overall mental health scores. Last,  $u_{0i}$  through  $u_{9i}$  indicate that each of these coefficients was allowed to vary across individuals (under the usual multivariate normal assumptions).

The multilevel modeling approach described earlier allows us to focus on associations, or self-other correspondence, between within-subject changes in self-concepts and within-subject changes in external evaluations. In other words, because the across-time mean-level scores represent all of the between-subjects variation, the time-varying predictor variables are left to explain only within-subject variation (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). We were then also able to examine how between-subjects differences moderate the self-other correspondence. Given the large number of parameters, particularly interactions, all final models were—after thorough examination—trimmed down to highlight the significant fixed and random effects.

Parameter estimates and fit statistics for final, trimmed models for self-other correspondence in academic and social self-concepts are given in Table 6. As hypothesized, results suggest that, on average, academic self-concept covaried significantly as a function of occasion-specific teacher ratings ( $\gamma_{40} = 0.08$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Also consistent with hypotheses, covariation between academic self-concept and occasion-specific PAR was significantly



moderated by school level ( $\gamma_{60} = 0.06, p < .05$ ), such that there is a noteworthy positive correspondence between PAR and academic self-concept during middle school, while no covariation is evident during elementary school (see Panel A of Figure 3). In addition, the correspondence between PAR and academic self-concept was weakly but significantly moderated by overall teacher-rated academic skills ( $\gamma_{51} = 0.07, p < .01$ ) and attention ( $\gamma_{53} = -0.05, p < .05$ ). The former interaction suggests that highly academically skilled (but not lower skilled) youths experience a boost in academic self-concept on occasions when they have a high PAR. The latter interaction suggests that covariation between academic self-concept and PAR is strongest among youths with attention problems. In sum, self-peer correspondence emerges during middle school and is more prominent for some youths than others, while self-teacher correspondence is a relatively consistent phenomenon.

Similarly, as hypothesized, social self-concept significantly covaried with occasion-specific social preference ( $\gamma_{40} = 0.05, p < .001$ ), and among youths high in self-worth, social self-concept

covaried with occasion-specific social engagement ( $\gamma_{34} = 0.08, p < .05$ ). Also consistent with hypotheses, occasion-specific social impact positively related to social self-concept only during middle school ( $\gamma_{60} = 0.04, p < .05$ ; see bottom of Figure 3). An interaction between occasion-specific social impact and overall social preference ( $\gamma_{52} = -0.03, p < .01$ ) suggests that youths who tend to be low on social preference experience a boost in self-concept on occasions when they are also high on social impact, but this relation is reversed among youths high in social preference. Last, the difference in social self-concept between victimized and non-victimized youths appears to be greater on occasions when youths are high in social impact than when they are low in social impact ( $\gamma_{57} = -0.04, p < .05$ ). A significant random effect for occasion-specific social preference ( $u_{4i} = .01, p < .05$ ) suggests that there remain unaccounted-for between-subjects differences in the covariation between social self-concept and social preference. A visual, conceptual example of how significant between-subjects differ-


Table 6

*Multilevel Models Depicting Self-Concept Development in Third to Seventh Grades and Self-Other Correspondence*

Academic self-concept			Social self-concept		
Parameter	B	SE	Parameter	B	SE
Fixed effects estimates			Fixed effects estimates		
Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	3.12*	0.03	Intercept, $\gamma_{00}$	3.22*	0.02
Grade in school, $\gamma_{10}$	0.04*	0.02	Grade in school, $\gamma_{10}$	0.06*	0.01
Middle school, $\gamma_{20}$	-0.04	0.03	Middle school, $\gamma_{20}$	<0.01	0.02
Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\gamma_{30}$	-0.08*	0.03	Social engagement, $\gamma_{30}$	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.02</b>
Academic skills, $\gamma_{40}$	<b>0.08*</b>	<b>0.02</b>	Social preference, $\gamma_{40}$	<b>0.05*</b>	<b>0.01</b>
Peer academic reputation (PAR), $\gamma_{50}$	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	<b>0.02</b>	Social impact, $\gamma_{50}$	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	<b>0.02</b>
PAR $\times$ Middle School, $\gamma_{60}$	<b>0.06*</b>	<b>0.03</b>	Social Impact $\times$ Middle School, $\gamma_{60}$	0.04*	0.02
iMean academic skills, $\gamma_{01}$	0.16*	0.03	iMean social engagement, $\gamma_{01}$	0.09*	0.04
iMean self-worth, $\gamma_{02}$	0.71*	0.03	iMean social preference, $\gamma_{02}$	0.05*	0.02
iMean attention, $\gamma_{03}$	0.15*	0.04	iMean social impact, $\gamma_{03}$	<0.01	0.03
iMean aggression (teacher-rated), $\gamma_{04}$	0.08*	0.04	iMean self-worth, $\gamma_{04}$	0.59*	0.04
iMean Academic Skills $\times$ iMean Attention, $\gamma_{05}$	0.05*	0.03	iMean attention, $\gamma_{05}$	-0.10*	0.03
PAR $\times$ iMean Academic skills, $\gamma_{51}$	<b>0.07*</b>	<b>0.03</b>	iMean aggression (peer-nominated), $\gamma_{06}$	0.10*	0.03
PAR $\times$ iMean Attention, $\gamma_{53}$	<b>-0.05*</b>	<b>0.02</b>	iMean victimization, $\gamma_{07}$	-0.22*	0.05
Random effects estimates			iMean loneliness, $\gamma_{08}$	-0.21*	0.03
Variance intercept, $\sigma_{u0}^2$	0.09*	0.01	iMean Social Preference $\times$ iMean Self-Worth, $\gamma_{09}$	-0.04*	0.02
Variance grade in school, $\sigma_{u1}^2$	0.04*	0.01	iMean Social preference $\times$ iMean	-0.10*	0.02
Variance Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\sigma_{u3}^2$	0.08*	0.03	Victimization, $\gamma_{0,10}$		
Covariance intercept, grade in school, $\sigma_{u0u1}$	0.04*	0.01	iMean Social Impact $\times$ iMean Aggression	-0.05*	0.02
Covariance intercept, Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\sigma_{u0u3}$	-0.05*	0.02	(peer-nominated), $\gamma_{0,11}$		
Covariance grade, Grade in School $\times$ Middle School, $\sigma_{u1u3}$	-0.05*	0.01	iMean Social Impact $\times$ iMean Victimization, $\gamma_{0,12}$	-0.11*	0.03
			Social Engagement $\times$ iMean Self-Worth, $\gamma_{34}$	<b>0.07*</b>	<b>0.03</b>
			Social Impact $\times$ iMean Social Preference, $\gamma_{52}$	<b>-0.03*</b>	<b>0.01</b>
			Social Impact $\times$ iMean Victimization, $\gamma_{57}$	<b>-0.04*</b>	<b>0.02</b>
			Random effects estimates		
			Variance intercept, $\sigma_{u0}^2$	0.10*	0.02
			Variance grade in school, $\sigma_{u1}^2$	0.02*	<0.01
			Variance middle school, $\sigma_{u2}^2$	0.08*	0.04
			Variance social preference, $\sigma_{u4}^2$	<0.01*	<0.01
			Covariance intercept, grade in school, $\sigma_{u0u1}$	<0.01	0.01
			Covariance intercept, middle school, $\sigma_{u0u2}$	-0.05	0.03
			Covariance intercept, social preference, $\sigma_{u0u4}$	-0.02*	0.01
			Covariance grade, middle school, $\sigma_{u1u2}$	<0.01	0.01
			Covariance grade, social preference, $\sigma_{u0u4}$	<0.01	<0.01
			Covariance middle school, social preference, $\sigma_{u2u4}$	0.02*	0.01

*Note.* Bolded values highlight the terms of greatest relevance to the research questions. The subscripts for the coefficients reflect the final models, after nonsignificant terms have been trimmed. Therefore, the subscripts in the text of the Results section match the table, not the subscripts presented in the general equations.

\*  $p < .05$ .




**Figure 3.** Academic self-concept (Panel A) and social self-concept (Panel B) as a function of peer-nomination-based scores (peer academic reputation in Panel A and social impact in Panel B). Both graphs demonstrate significantly stronger within-subject covariation between peer nomination scores and self-concept during middle school (with little to no covariation evident in elementary school). The findings represented by these graphs are consistent with the idea that features of the middle school environment may heighten youths' awareness of and sensitivity to how they "measure up" to their peers and how their peers perceive them.

ences manifest in the data is shown in Figure 4. The individual in the Panel A is characterized by high self–other correspondence (i.e., covariation), and the individual in Panel B is characterized by low self–other correspondence. Overall, results of these final models suggest that self-concepts are more likely to accurately reflect external evaluations among well-adjusted youths.

### Discussion

Theories of self-concept development emphasize external feedback processes that likely fluctuate across time and contexts, yet existing empirical studies have more often focused on longer term developmental trends. In the present study, we extend previous research by focusing attention on the within-subject variability around youths' linear trajectories of academic and social self-concept development from third through seventh grades—a concept that has received little attention in the literature thus far. We began by replicating developmental trajectories identified in previous studies: We found, on average, a modest but significant decline in academic self-concept during middle school. The average developmental growth trend for social self-concept, on the other hand, slowly increased across time with no apparent deflection at the middle school transition. We then made a new contri-

bution to the literature by quantifying the amount of within-subject variability around individuals' linear trajectories—*self-concept lability*. Results did not substantiate the expected increase in lability during middle school. Consistent with hypotheses, however, greater academic and social self-concept lability was associated with a general profile of poorer competence and several "proxies" of poorer mental health. We also demonstrated the unique predictive utility of self-concept lability scores: Between-subjects differences in academic and social "success" at the end of seventh grade were negatively predicted by between-subjects differences in the respective domains of self-concept lability, even after accounting for mean self-concept. We additionally examined the within-subject covariation over time between self-concept and others' perceptions of youths' competence—*self–other correspondence*. In line with expectations, self–peer correspondence across both competence domains was strongest during middle school, while self–teacher correspondence appeared to be relatively consistent over time. Finally, moderation by several between-subjects differences suggests that self–other correspondence may be weaker among youths with poorer mental health.



**Figure 4.** Representation of significant between-subjects differences in covariation between social self-concept and peer-nominated social preference across the fall of third grade through spring of seventh grade. One example of a child whose social self-concept strongly covaries with his or her social preference score over time is seen in Panel A, and one child whose social self-concept does not covary with his or her social preference score over time is seen in Panel B.

### Self-Concept Trajectories

We began with a replication of previous findings, using two-phase growth models to extract normative trends in self-concept. Consistent with the existing literature (e.g., Midgley et al., 1989; Wigfield et al., 1991), the present study indicates a shift from a relatively flat trend in academic self-concept across elementary school to a slight downward trend during middle school. As noted earlier, middle school can present a stark contrast to elementary school, with sudden shifts in teaching practices and educational climate that fit poorly with early adolescents' developmental needs, tending to undermine motivation, learning, and self-concept (e.g., Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Feldlaufer et al., 1988). Contrary to hypotheses, we found, on average, a modest increase in social self-concept across waves. Possible explanations include the fact that the items used to assess and track changes in social self-concept in the present study prompt children to consider how many friends they have and how easy it is to make friends (Harter, 1982). Perhaps youths are better able to make friends as the pool of potential friends grows to an entire grade cohort in middle school.

### Self-Concept Lability

Beyond the long-term developmental trends noted earlier, both academic and social self-concepts exhibited substantial within- and between-subjects variability across the transitional years from elementary to middle school. Bringing attention to this heterogeneity, we quantified the amount of within-subject variability around youths' linear self-concept trajectories and explored the developmental correlates and consequences of this *lability*. The present study is among the first to consider academic and social self-concept lability over a span of multiple years and to examine its relation to actual competence in these domains.

Researchers exploring other domains of lability (e.g., self-esteem) have suggested that greater lability may represent a form of vulnerability, while stability indicates robustness (e.g., Greve & Enzmann, 2003; Roberts & Kassel, 1997). Our results correspond to the general notion of lability as a marker of risk: Both academic and social self-concept lability were associated with a profile of poorer competence and overall adjustment. Results did not support the hypothesis that self-concept lability would be greater during middle school. As expected, however, greater academic self-concept lability related to lower overall academic self-concept, teacher ratings of academic skills, and peer academic reputation (PAR); and social self-concept lability was negatively related to youths' overall social self-concept, teacher ratings of social engagement, and peer nomination-based social preference. Greater lability in both domains of self-concept also consistently related to indicators of poorer mental health. Last, self-concept lability showed unique predictive utility: Even after controlling for youths' average self-concept, between-subjects differences in self-concept lability negatively predicted between-subjects differences in academic and social competence at the end of seventh grade.

Taken together, the present findings consistently suggest that an unstable self-concept is maladaptive. One explanation for this result may be that self-concept lability reflects some type of psychological or environmental turmoil (e.g., Crocker & Knight, 2005). For instance, youths with depressive symptoms (e.g., low self-worth) may be prone to doubting and recalibrating their self-

concepts each time they are faced with new evaluative feedback; as such, recent successes or failures (e.g., a test grade) may tend to override previous demonstrations of ability. Similarly, certain behavioral problems such as aggression may elicit inconsistent feedback from peers (i.e., reinforcement by some but disliking from others), while youths with attention problems may struggle to maintain consistency in academic performance. These are just a few examples of ways in which poor mental health may generate a labile self-concept. More research will be needed to clarify the mechanisms that explain the relations observed in the present study and to consider additional explanations for the observed lability. For instance, future research should consider features of youths' environment—such as an unstable home life or school climate or changes over time in social and instrumental support from teachers and parents—that may account for some lability.

Alternatively, causality may go in the reverse direction: Fluctuations in self-concept may contribute over time to poorer competence and adjustment. Our findings that self-concept instability across the elementary and middle school years predicted lower competence at the end of seventh grade are consistent with similar research (e.g., Tsai, 2008; Waschull & Kernis, 1996) in suggesting that self-concept lability may temporally precede poorer competence. A labile self-concept translates to a lack of coherent, realistic, or self-assured views of one's abilities and what challenges one can handle effectively. As such, a labile self-concept may lead to inconsistent effort and avoidance of the challenges needed to build academic or social skills; longer term development of skills and problem-solving strategies are thus likely to suffer (Deci & Ryan, 1995; Kernis, 2003). More broadly, the present findings highlight the usefulness and importance of considering both level and lability as both cause and consequence in future examinations of self-concept and its relation to other constructs.

### Self-Other Correspondence

Previous analyses of the present data suggested reciprocal relations between self-concept and external feedback: Between-subjects differences in both teacher and peer feedback predicted later academic and social self-concepts, and vice versa (Gest et al., 2005, 2008). The present study strengthens this evidence by establishing relations at the within-subject level and across both academic and social domains of competence (e.g., Cillessen & Bellmore, 1999; Denissen, Zarrett, & Eccles, 2007). On average, youths reported an academic self-concept above or below their own average at waves when teachers' ratings of their academic skills were also above or below their own average. Similarly, semester-to-semester changes in social self-concept tracked occasion-specific levels of social preference. The present analyses do not allow us to determine the causal directionality of the relations between self-concepts and external feedback, but past research has suggested that the self-other correspondence observed in the present study is likely bidirectional. Self-concept has been found to be an important determinant of youths' effort and achievement in a particular domain and of how others will perceive them (e.g., Eccles et al., 1983; Guay et al., 2003). Conversely, past achievement and feedback experiences are believed to form the basis of youths' self-concepts. A common theme across theories of self-concept has been the idea of a looking-glass self: Individuals see themselves the way they believe others see them

(Cairns & Cairns, 1988; Cooley, 1922; James, 1890). This process may be particularly relevant during early adolescence, which marks a developmental peak in youths' interest in and anxiety about what peers think of them and a development of the cognitive capacity to accurately assess and incorporate external evaluations into self-views (Bukowski et al., 2000; Dweck, 2002).

It is likely that third variables unavailable to us in the present study would also help to explain the within-subject variability and covariation we have extracted. For instance, pubertal timing is known to influence self-perceptions and a variety of behavioral outcomes (e.g., Wiesner & Ittel, 2002) and thus may explain observed shifts in both self-concept and performance. Similarly, environmental factors are likely to influence levels of self-concept, achievement, and their covariation. The quality of relationships with peers, parents, or teachers (e.g., parents' disciplinary tendencies), teaching practices (e.g., opportunities for active learning, harsh grading), and school climate (e.g., students' feelings of safety and support in the school) are just a few examples of important factors likely to affect youths' social and academic development. Further work, such as experimental studies, will be necessary to obtain a more honed picture of when and how self-other correspondence processes unfold over time.

Consistent with the idea that features of the environment can impact the degree of self-other correspondence, two forms of self-peer correspondence were only evident during middle school: covariation between academic self-concept and PAR, and covariation between social self-concept and social impact. Entry to middle school introduces numerous changes that may heighten youths' attention to social comparisons and sensitivity to external feedback from peers, such as normative grading systems and increased emphasis on performance goals rather than mastery. Thus, youths are especially attuned to relative skill levels and assessing how their peers view them during middle school (e.g., Dweck, 2002). These processes likely converge to produce stronger self-peer correspondence during middle school, as seen in the present study.

Though there are numerous reasons to expect correspondence between self-concepts and external feedback, both historical and recent theories also highlight between-subject differences in this process, identifying a variety of biased "lenses" through which youths may perceive, interpret, and internalize evaluative information. For instance, youths may place particularly high value on particular evaluations, or tend to view evaluative information through a consistently negative lens (e.g., Crocker & Knight, 2005; John & Robins, 1994). The present study can be interpreted as further substantiating these ideas, providing evidence for several between-subject moderators of self-other correspondence. For instance, an interaction of occasion-specific social impact with overall social preference suggests that strong peer reactions—even when negative—are more beneficial to social self-concept than neglect (i.e., a lack of peer attention). In contrast, high social impact among well-liked youths appears to be "harmful"; this is consistent with some evidence suggesting that being highly prominent or "popular" in one's social network tends to elicit strong reactions from peers, both positive and negative (e.g., de Bruyn & Cillessen, 2010). Moreover, the present findings suggest an important role of mental health. Within-subject relations between academic self-concept and PAR were stronger among youths with attention problems, but these youths tended, on average, to have

less "accurate" self-perceptions of their academic skills (as rated by teachers). The within-subject correspondence between teacher ratings of social engagement and social self-concept was weaker among youths with low self-worth, and occasion-specific social impact seemed to have little effect on the low overall social self-concepts of victimized youths. Taken together, these findings suggest that poorly adjusted youths tend to have less "accurate" self-views, which in some cases may be negatively biased.

### Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

This study has several strengths that contribute to the literature on early adolescent self-concept development. The longitudinal design with high participation rates and low attrition, allowed us to examine *developmental* processes; and the relatively large number of assessments (up to 10 occasions) allowed us to go beyond the usual between-subject investigations. The present study thus strengthens results from previous research, demonstrating these relations within-subject with stricter tests that control for between-subject differences. Moreover, this study is among the first to apply within-subject variability methods (Ram & Gerstorf, 2009) to the study of youths' self-concept and to examine domain-specific self-concept *lability* in relation to corresponding domains of competence. Within-subject variability methods are typically applied to data collected at much faster time scales (i.e., multiple assessments obtained over minutes or days). Here, we extend previous work by applying this method to a period of months and years, reaching conclusions similar to those of other studies: greater lability is associated with poorer adjustment. These findings are unique in drawing attention to individual differences in youths' characteristic amount of lability around their longer-term self-concept trajectories, and highlighting self-concept lability as an important phenomenon worth continued consideration.

A strength of our homogeneous sample is the elimination of potential unobserved moderators that may blur the phenomena of interest. However, with a sample of students from only one rural, racially homogeneous school district, we cannot generalize our findings to the larger population. Future investigations should attempt to replicate our findings across more representative samples, both within and outside of rural communities, to learn more about how other individual, family, school, and community-level factors impact the self-concept development and lability processes explored here. For instance, youths attending schools in larger or more racially heterogeneous communities are likely encounter different factors (such as racial stereotypes; e.g., Steele & Aronson, 1995) that shape their self-concept.

Some aspects of the initial design of the study limited our ability to fully capture within-subject variability and potential correlates. For instance, the procedures used to obtain "peer evaluations of competence" required a shift in measurement from elementary classroom-level nominations to middle school grade-level nominations. Although this shift in measurement conceptually matches the actual shift in size of youths' "peer network" as they move into middle school, it raises concerns faced by many measures in developmental research as to whether the meaning of the measure remains consistent across this transition. Further, self-concept development is known to vary substantially across domains (e.g., Jacobs et al., 2002), including variations across specific school subjects (e.g., math, reading), but only the broad measures were



available here. Future work should examine if and how more fine-grained domains of self-concept lability are related, and/or are coupled to other factors. It is likely that occasion-specific changes in self-concept and the tendency for a youth's self-concept to be particularly labile could be more thoroughly explained by numerous individual and environmental variables to which we did not have access in the present data set. For instance, other individual differences (e.g., personality or more direct indices of mental health), relatively temporary developmental phases (e.g., level of a youth's physical or psychological maturation), and multiple features of the environment in which a child's self-views are developing (e.g., the stability of youths' home lives or school climate, consistency of support from teachers and parents, or significant life events such as parents' divorce) would undoubtedly help to account for some of the within- and between-subject variability observed in this study.

Having established the need for research to consider both long-term developmental changes and shorter-term "ups and downs" in self-concept, an important next step for future research will be to dig deeper into the within- and between-subject processes that account for self-concept lability. Self-concept lability may be largely a product of youths' environments (e.g., inconsistent teaching practices), it may represent an enduring characteristic of an individual (e.g., sensitivity to external events), or it may reflect a more temporary phase of development (e.g., late pubertal timing). To this end, a person-centered approach may be a useful future step, allowing us to identify "profiles" of youths who are more labile or more stable. For instance, a latent profile analysis could help us to pin down the risk factors associated with self-concept lability. Perhaps labile youths are consistently characterized by low self-esteem, internalizing symptoms (e.g., depression, anxiety), or behavior problems; or perhaps external stressors such as a chaotic home life or low socioeconomic status are the primary variables that distinguish labile youths from more stable youths. Our use of mental health "proxy" variables was a valuable first step in this direction, but more direct indices of mental health and environmental risk factors as well as focused person-oriented analyses will be needed to gain a clear picture of who these more labile youths are.

Last, in demonstrating the existence and consequences of within-subject variability, this study raises the possibility that fluctuations may be happening at an even faster timescale than is captured here. The timescale over which youths' self-concepts (as well as many other cognitive, affective, and behavioral variables) actually vary is a major gap in the current literature but will be an important question for future research (see Shiyko & Ram, *in press*). Such a task will require more frequent assessments of self-concept, as well as new measurement techniques that are sensitive both to shorter-term changes in self-concept and to the daily or weekly processes (for instance, specific types of social interactions) that may spur fluctuations.

## Conclusions

The transition from middle childhood into early adolescence is a particularly sensitive time in youths' self-concept development, as cognitive changes occur simultaneously with changes in the school environment. Yet it is also a time when youths' self-concepts are of particular importance, as they begin to form a

coherent meaning system with values and expectations, with implications for their motivations and engagement in school and social activities, their academic performance and peer affiliations, and their overall well-being. In the present study, we make a new contribution to the literature by examining within-subject variability around youths' overall trajectories of self-concept and the implications of this lability for academic and social adjustment. In doing so, we draw attention to the dynamic nature of self-concept highlighted in theoretical accounts. With greater attention to this dynamic nature, it will be important to continue to gain a more complete understanding of the processes that shape self-concept development over various time scales, and the developmental implications of changes in self-concept.

## References

- Amorose, A. J. (2001). Intraindividual variability of self-evaluations in the physical domain: Prevalence, consequences, and antecedents. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 23, 222–244.
- Asher, S. R., Hymel, S., & Renshaw, P. D. (1984). Loneliness in children. *Child Development*, 55, 1456–1464. doi:10.2307/1130015
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Bukowski, W. M., Sippola, L. K., & Newcomb, A. F. (2000). Variations in patterns of attraction of same- and other-sex peers during early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 147–154. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.36.2.147
- Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1988). The sociogenesis of self-concepts. In N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse (Eds.), *Persons in context: Developmental processes* (pp. 181–202). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Cairns, R. B., Leung, M., Gest, S. D., & Cairns, B. D. (1995). A brief method for assessing social development: Structure, reliability, stability, and developmental validity of the Interpersonal Competence Scale. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33, 725–736. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(95)00004-H
- Cillessen, A. H. N., & Bellmore, A. D. (1999). Accuracy of social self-perceptions and peer competence in middle childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45, 650–676.
- Cillessen, A. H. N., & Bukowski, W. M. (2000). Conceptualizing and measuring peer acceptance and rejection. In A. H. N. Cillessen & W. M. Bukowski (Eds.), *Recent advances in the measurement of acceptance and rejection in the peer system* (pp. 3–10). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 557–570. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.18.4.557
- Cole, D. A. (1991). Change in self-perceived competence as a function of peer and teacher evaluation. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 682–688. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.27.4.682
- Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1999). Initial impact of the fast track prevention trial for conduct problems: I. The high-risk sample. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 631–647. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.67.5.631
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. R. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology: Vol. 23. Self processes and development* (pp. 43–77). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cooley, C. H. (1922). *Human nature and the social order* (Rev ed.). New York, NY: Scribner.
- Crocker, J., & Knight, K. M. (2005). Contingencies of self-worth. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 200–203. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00364.x

- de Bruyn, E. H., & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2010). Associations of peer acceptance and perceived popularity with bullying and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 30, 543–566. doi:10.1177/0272431609340517
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31–49). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\_01
- Denissen, J. J., Zarrett, N. R., & Eccles, J. S. (2007). I like to do it, I’m able, and I know I am: Longitudinal couplings between domain-specific achievement, self-concept, and interest. *Child Development*, 78, 430–447. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01007.x
- Dweck, C. S. (2002). The development of ability conceptions. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 57–88). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/B978-012750053-9/50005-X
- Eccles, J. S., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J., & Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco, CA: Freeman.
- Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., Midgley, C., Reuman, D., Mac Iver, D., & Feldlaufer, H. (1993). Negative effects of traditional middle schools on students’ motivation. *Elementary School Journal*, 93, 553–574. doi:10.1086/461740
- Feldlaufer, H., Midgley, C., & Eccles, J. S. (1988). Student, teacher, and observer perceptions of the classroom environment before and after the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 8, 133–156. doi:10.1177/0272431688082003
- Gable, S. L., & Nezlek, J. B. (1998). Level and instability of day-to-day psychological well-being and risk for depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 129–138. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.129
- Gest, S. D., Domitrovich, C. E., & Welsh, J. A. (2005). Peer academic reputation in elementary school: Associations with changes in self-concept and academic skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97, 337–346. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.97.3.337
- Gest, S. D., Rulison, K. L., Davidson, A. J., & Welsh, J. A. (2008). A reputation for success (or failure): The association of peer academic reputation with academic self-concept, effort, and performance across the upper elementary grades. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 625–636. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.625
- Greve, W., & Enzmann, D. (2003). Self-esteem maintenance among incarcerated young males: Stabilization through accommodative processes. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27, 12–20. doi:10.1080/01650250143000562
- Guay, F., Marsh, H. W., & Boivin, M. (2003). Academic self-concept and academic achievement: Developmental perspectives on their causal ordering. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 124–136. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.124
- Harter, S. (1982). The Perceived Competence Scale for Children. *Child Development*, 53, 87–97.
- Harter, S. (1999). Symbolic interactionism revisited: Potential liabilities for the self constructed in the crucible of interpersonal relationships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45, 677–703.
- Hawley, P. H. (2003). Prosocial and coercive configurations of resource control in early adolescence: A case for the well-adapted Machiavellian. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 49, 279–309.
- Hoffman, L., & Stawski, R. (2009). Persons as contexts: Evaluating between-person and within-person effects in longitudinal analysis. *Research in Human Development*, 6, 97–120. doi:10.1080/15427600902911189
- Hoza, B., Gerdes, A. C., Hinshaw, S. P., Arnold, L. E., Pelham, W. E., Jr., Molina, B. S. G., . . . Wigal, T. (2004). Self-perceptions of competence in children with ADHD and comparison children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 72, 382–391. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.72.3.382
- Jacobs, J. E., Lanza, S., Osgood, D. W., Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Changes in children’s self-competence and values: Gender and domain differences across grades one through twelve. *Child Development*, 73, 509–527. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00421
- James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology, Vol. I*. New York, NY: Holt.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 206–219. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.206
- Johnson, J., & Strange, M. (2007). *Why rural matters 2007: The realities of rural education growth*. Available at <http://www.ruraledu.org/>
- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1–26. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1401\_01
- Kim, J., & Cicchetti, D. (2009). Mean-level change and intraindividual variability in self-esteem and depression among high-risk children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33, 202–214. doi:10.1177/0165025408098021
- Lease, A. M., Musgrove, K. T., & Axelrod, J. L. (2002). Dimensions of social status in preadolescent peer groups: Likability, perceived popularity, and social dominance. *Social Development*, 11, 508–533. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00213
- Little, R. J. A., & Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Statistical analysis with missing data* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Mac Iver, D. J., Young, E. M., & Washburn, B. (2002). Instructional practices and motivation during middle school (with special attention to science). In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 333–351). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/B978-012750053-9/50015-2
- McArdle, J. J. (2009). Latent variable modeling of differences and changes with longitudinal data. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 577–605. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163612
- Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 247–258. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.81.2.247
- Nesselroade, J. R. (1991). The warp and woof of the developmental fabric. In R. Downs, L. Liben, & D. Palermo (Eds.), *Visions of development, the environment, and aesthetics: The legacy of Joachim F. Wohlwill* (pp. 213–240). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Newcomb, A. F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1983). Social impact and social preference as determinants of children’s peer group status. *Developmental Psychology*, 19, 856–867. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.19.6.856
- Newman, L. S., & Wadas, R. F. (1997). When stakes are higher: Self-esteem instability and self-handicapping. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 12, 217–232.
- Pomerantz, E. M., Altermatt, E. R., & Saxon, J. L. (2002). Making the grade but feeling distressed: Gender differences in academic performance and internal distress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 396–404. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.396
- Prinstein, M. J., & La Greca, A. M. (2002). Peer crowd affiliation and internalizing distress in childhood and adolescence: A longitudinal follow-back study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12, 325–351. doi:10.1111/1532-7795.00036
- Ram, N., & Gerstorf, D. (2009). Time-structured and net intraindividual variability: Tools for examining the development of dynamic characteristics and processes. *Psychology and Aging*, 24, 778–791. doi:10.1037/a0017915
- Ram, N., Rabbitt, P., Stollery, B., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2005). Cognitive performance inconsistency: Intraindividual change and variability. *Psychology and Aging*, 20, 623–633. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.20.4.623

- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Roberts, J. E., & Kassel, J. D. (1997). Labile self-esteem, life stress, and depressive symptoms: Prospective data testing a model of vulnerability. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 21, 569–589. doi:10.1023/A:1021861503072
- Shiyko, M., & Ram, N. (in press). Conceptualizing and estimating process speed in studies employing ecological momentary assessment designs: A multilevel variance decomposition approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*.
- Singer, J. D., & Willet, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797–811. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797
- Tsai, Y. M. (2008). *Motivation in context: Intraindividual variability in day-to-day classroom learning* (Dissertation, Humboldt University, Berlin). Retrieved from <http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/tsai-yi-miau-2008-02-12/PDF/tsai.pdf>
- Urdan, T., & Midgley, C. (2003). Changes in the perceived classroom goal structure and pattern of adaptive learning during early adolescence. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28, 524–551. doi:10.1016/S0361-476X(02)00060-7
- Ward, S., Sylva, J., & Gresham, F. M. (2010). School-based predictors of early adolescent depression. *School Mental Health*, 2, 125–131. doi:10.1007/s12310-010-9028-3
- Waschull, S. B., & Kernis, M. H. (1996). Level and stability of self-esteem as predictors of children's intrinsic motivation and reasons for anger. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 4–13. doi:10.1177/0146167296221001
- Watt, H. M. G. (2004). Development of adolescents' self-perceptions, values, and task perceptions according to gender and domain in 7th-through 11th-grade Australian students. *Child Development*, 75, 1556–1574. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00757.x
- Wiesner, M., & Ittel, A. (2002). Relations of pubertal timing and depressive symptoms to substance use in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 22, 5–23. doi:10.1177/0272431602022001001
- Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., Mac Iver, D., Reuman, D. A., & Midgley, C. (1991). Transitions during early adolescence: Changes in children's domain-specific self-perceptions and general self-esteem across the transition to junior high school. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 552–565. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.27.4.552

Received February 16, 2010

Revision received May 17, 2011

Accepted June 8, 2011 ■

### E-Mail Notification of Your Latest Issue Online!

Would you like to know when the next issue of your favorite APA journal will be available online? This service is now available to you. Sign up at <http://notify.apa.org/> and you will be notified by e-mail when issues of interest to you become available!