

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRENGTHS AMONG BLACK  
WOMEN WHO HEAD HOUSEHOLDS

TROY LEE DANIELS

Bachelor of Science  
Freed-Hardeman College  
Henderson, Tennessee  
1979

Master of Education  
Mississippi State University  
Jackson, Mississippi  
1981

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
July, 1989

Thesis  
1989D  
D186p  
cop.2

SECRET

SECRET

SECRET

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRENGTHS AMONG BLACK  
WOMEN WHO HEAD HOUSEHOLDS

Thesis Approved:

*James W. Pratt*

Thesis Adviser

*Attha Wright*

*Ledya L. Laffney*

*Leta H. Perry*

*Noeman N. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My utmost gratitude is sincerely expressed to Dr. Jim Moran, Family Relations and Child Development Head, who has served as chairman of my doctoral advisory committee. His counsel, encouragement, and guidance have been a tremendous bulwark of support throughout this entire research project. Dr. Moran was solely responsible for the procurement of funds to make this research possible, in conjunction with the College of Home Economics and the Department of Family Relations and Development of Oklahoma State University.

To Dr. Bettye Gaffney, who also has been a very supportive member of my advisory committee, I express my appreciation. Retrospectively, the many constructive reactions made regarding the initial proposal of this project have been most fructiferous. I am also grateful to Dr. Gaffney for so many occasions that she sat quietly and calmly, listening to many of my frustrations and disappointments throughout this process.

I also wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Althea Wright, who taught me to appreciate family research and theory as one of her former students. I have valued greatly her meek and yet very professional methods of clarifying various issues pertaining to this research as an advisory committee member.

To Dr. Katye Perry, I express my deepest appreciation for her keen sense of insight and wealth of knowledge, particularly regarding the methodological issues relative to this research. She has also been a great source of inspiration to me and very supportive as an advisory committee member.

I also wish to acknowledge several professors who have provided me with academic and professional skills that have, to some relative degree, prepared me to complete this work. To Drs. John Rusco, Beulah Hirschlein, David Fournier, Beverly Crabtree, Godfrey Ellis, Esther Winterfeldt, Anna Gorman, John McCullers, and Lois Mickle, my sincere thanks.

To Mrs. Glenda Love and the managerial staff of Vernon Manor Apartments, I express my most humble gratitude. The use of office space, the scheduling and rescheduling of many of the residents for interviews were invaluable contributions to the expedition of the collection of data for this research.

To Linder Ruth, my wife, and Aleece, Troy II, and Justin Garfield, our three children, my deepest affection and love is expressed for the longsuffering, many sacrifices and many hardships for the past four years due to my many obligatory absences due to the completion of this research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
<b>MANUSCRIPT</b>	
Abstract .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Method .....	9
Subjects .....	9
Instruments .....	9
Procedure .....	12
Discussion .....	17
References .....	22
Table .....	27
 <b>APPENDICES</b> .....	
APPENDIX A - LITERATURE REVIEW .....	28
Introduction .....	29
The Historical Emergence of the Black Matriarchy .....	31
The Contemporary Black Matrifocal Family .....	41
Conceptual Framework of Psychological Strengths .....	51
Family of Origin Characteristics .....	53
Children .....	57
Age .....	59
Education .....	61
Counselor Orientation .....	63
Religiosity .....	65
Conclusion .....	67
References .....	69
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENTS .....	77
Depression Adjective Checklist .....	78
State-Trait Anxiety Inventories .....	80
Self-Esteem Inventory .....	83
Questionnaire .....	86
APPENDIX C - RAW DATA .....	89
APPENDIX D - SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES .....	94

	Page
APPENDIX E - SUMMARY TABLES .....	117
APPENDIX F - COVER LETTER AND CONSENT FORM FOR RESIDENTS .....	134
APPENDIX G - LETTER OF CORRESPONDENCE .....	137
APPENDIX H - BUDGET FOR PROJECT .....	139
APPENDIX I - ABBREVIATIONS FOR VARIABLES CODES .....	141
APPENDIX J - COMPOSITION TABLE OF VERNON MANOR APARTMENTS .....	143
APPENDIX K - APARTMENT NUMBERS OF VERNON MANOR APARTMENTS .....	145

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean Comparison by Religiosity, Number of Children, Education by Years, and Age on all Psychological Variables .....	27
2. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Years of Age by Self-Esteem .....	95
3. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Years of Age by Trait Anxiety .....	96
4. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Years of Age by State-Anxiety .....	97
5. Independent Groups t-Test for Below and Above Two Children by Self-Esteem .....	98
6. Independent Groups t-Test for Below and Above Two Children by Trait Anxiety .....	99
7. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Religiosity by Depression .....	100
8. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Years of Education by Depression .....	101
9. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Religiosity by Self-Esteem .....	102
10. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Years of Education by Trait-Anxiety .....	103
11. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Religiosity by Trait-Anxiety .....	104
12. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Education by Self-Esteem .....	105
13. Independent Groups t-Test for High and Low Years of Age by Depression .....	106



14. Multiple Regression for Time Living in State, Religiosity, Racial Background of High School Teacher, Age, and Time Living in Tulsa by State-Anxiety .....	107
15. Multiple Regression for Religiosity, Active Counseling, Number of Children, and Age by Self-Esteem .....	109
16. Multiple Regression for Religiosity, Active Counseling, Age, and Years of Education, by Trait Anxiety .....	112
17. Multiple Regression for Religiosity, Active Counseling, Age, Years of Education, Racial Background of Elementary School Teacher by Depression .....	114
18. Frequency Table for Main Source of Income .....	118
19. Frequency Table for Years of Education .....	119
20. Frequency Table for Marital Status .....	120
21. Frequency Table for Number of Children in Household .....	121
22. Frequency Table for Time Living in Apartments.....	122
23. Frequency Table for Time Living in Tulsa .....	123
24. Frequency Table for Religiosity .....	125
25. Frequency Table for Age .....	126
26. Frequency Table For Counseling Received.....	127
27. Frequency Table For Present Involvement in Counseling .....	128
28. Frequency Table For Racial Background in the Community .....	129

Table	Page
29. Analysis of Variance for Racial Background of the Community in High School by Self-Esteem .....	130
30. Analysis of Variance for Racial Background of Students in High School by Self-Esteem .....	131
31. Analysis of Variance for Racial Background of the Community by Trait-Anxiety .....	132
32. Analysis of Variance for Racial Background of Students in High School by Trait-Anxiety .....	133

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRENGTHS AMONG BLACK  
WOMEN WHO HEAD HOUSEHOLDS  
TROY LEE DANIELS  
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

## ABSTRACT

Fifty Black single women residing in a Federally subsidized multi-family unit in the southwestern United States were interviewed and administered four psychological inventories. The inventories measured self-esteem, depression, state and trait anxiety.

It was hypothesized that several personal and familial characteristics, based on the literature, would be predictors of the psychological status of the sample. Multiple Regression was used to analyze dependent and independent sets of factors. Findings suggest that Black single women who are primarily poor do possess psychological strengths resulting from their personal and familial characteristics. Further examinations of Black poor matrifocal families are needed in light of the increasing poverty rate and the paucity of studies found relative to this population.

Psychological Strengths Among Black Women  
Who Head Households

Previous research and literature reviews have consistently reflected the disorganization, dysfunctional, pathological, negativistic, and weaknesses of Black American families in previous decades (Frazier, 1968; Moynihan, 1965; Rainwater, 1966; Sarbin, 1970). The most salient focus has been the matrifocal family (Billingsley, 1968; Lewis, 1966). Yet, there appears no appreciable research regarding the positive aspects of the psychological status of these poor mother-centered families. Although Hays and Mindel (1973), Hill (1972), McAdoo (1978), and others have attempted to point to certain strengths of Black American families, these strengths have been primarily related to "extended family kinship ties", "social support systems", and "religion". Concomitantly, others (Crumidy & Jacobziner, 1966; Kamii & Radin, 1971; McAdoo, 1978; Symonds, 1969) have concentrated notably on racial differences, socioeconomic class comparisons, marital status comparisons (i.e., married compared to non-married), and other combinations of these. Very little interest has been devoted to the psychological status of poor matrifocal Black Americans families.

More recently, there does appear to be a marginal recognition in the literature concerning matrifocal families in the United States. This growing recognition of single-headed households occurs relatively simultaneous with the recent upsurge of divorce among white middle-class families

Bloom & Clement, 1984; Duffy, 1987). As a result of the upsurge of white middle-class divorce and the fact that more white American women are currently heading families, social scientists are for the first time in the history of this country, beginning to "legitimize" the matrifocal family. Moreover, the new matrifocal image appears to reflect a more positive character than the previous image of matrifocal families (Duffy, 1987). There is marginal evidence that the new image of mother-centered families or single women carries the notion of "personal growth", "individuality", and "personal autonomy" (Curran, 1983; Duffy, 1987).

However, there is little evidence that the Black matrifocal family is included in this new positive image (Staples, 1981). This may be largely due to the biases of researchers regarding the poor in general. It appears that poor Black women in the United States continue to be viewed and studied in terms of deficits, weaknesses, pathologies, and not strengths. The gamut of issues currently reported and studied tend to be, for example, unwed mothers (Colletta & Lee, 1983), mental dysfunction (Lindblad-Goldberg & Dukes, 1985), poverty and welfare (Dickinson, 1986; Wodarski, Parham, Lindsey & Blackburn, 1986). These issues that reflect the present interest of social scientists and educators tend to epitomize the monocle vision of both current and traditional perspectives of poor Black American women (Curran, 1983; Lewis, 1966).

Accordingly, researchers consistently ignore the positive characteristics of Black American families. Billingsley argued, "The Negro family as an institution has been virtually ignored by students of group life in America . . . When they have treated the Negro family, they have done so in a negativistic and distorted fashion" (1968, p. 197). In addition, Nobles (1976) contended that Black families have been studied with three major orientations: 1) The poverty-aculturated studies; 2) The pathological studies; and 3) The victim-oriented studies.

The previous and present foci of research on Black families in the United States have ubiquitous inimical effects on Black family life. Federal and State legislation and policy-making that directly or indirectly impact the Black family have been germinated from questionable and misleading reports from social scientists of the Black family (Nobles, 1976; McAdoo, 1978; Staples, 1973; Willie, 1970). Accordingly, Nobles (1976) argued, "The nature of the Black family has been seriously misunderstood; consequently, we know very little about the impact or consequence of the Black family dynamic has on the psychological development and mental health of its members" (p. 180). It is maintained that Black American women who share a similar history, experience, and social condition need to be studied and understood in that context. Neither the historical factors of slavery nor contemporary factors of racism and sexism have annihilated the viability of the Black American family.

Therefore, it appears logical to propose that Black women who head families bear certain psychological traits that need further study (Hill, 1972; Nobles, 1976).

A major aim of this research is to build on previous findings and speculations that relate to Black women who are primarily poor heads of households. It is hypothesized that Black women who are poor do possess certain psychological strengths and that traditional methods and aims have been biased so as to yield stereotypical rather than prototypical results (Belle, 1982; Nobles, 1976; Staples, 1973).

In that the Black experience of Black women is notably different from white and upper socioeconomic classes, they are more likely to possess a different perspective about the world and exhibit different responses (Fine, Schwebel, & Myers, 1985). Therefore, the psychological status of Black poor women is most likely to be understood by investigating this population within a Black epistemological context (Nobles, 1976; Scanzoni, 1971; Willie, 1970).

This research shall emphasize the examination of the relationships of personal and familial characteristics that are believed to be related to the psychological status among Black women who head households. Based on the literature, it appears that Black American families bear certain traits that signify general psychological strengths (Willie, 1970). In 1985 (U. S. State Department of Labor) over 43% of Black families were headed by Black women and over one-half of them were living below the poverty line. This seems to



indicate that this population possesses a unique character that students of family life know little about. (Nobles, 1976; Pettigrew, 1964). In light of the relevant literature, several factors were hypothesized to be related to the psychological status of Black matrifocal families. They are: family of origin traits, education, religiosity, number of children or dependents, counselee orientation, and age (Billingsley, 1968; Dillard, 1983; Duffy, 1986; Martin & Martin, 1978; Scanzoni, 1971; Staples, 1973). These personal and familial factors were hypothesized to be related to several psychological phenomena (anxiety, depression, & self-esteem). Black women who possess an optimal amount of characteristics will likely possess a higher level of psychological strengths than those who do not.

Anxiety, depression, and self-esteem are considered to be pervasive and generally hidden from subjective observation (Rowe, 1989; Sturgeon, 1979). Previous studies have repeatedly claimed that Black American families that are poor tended to possess psychological weaknesses. That is, disproportionately depressed, anxious, and lack normal self-esteem with little or no objectifiable or empirical data to substantiate these claims (Lewis, 1966; Rainwater, 1966; Sarbin, 1970). A chief assumption of this study is that objective techniques must be utilized to obtain more valid appraisals of the psychological status of this understudied population (Belle, 1982; Purkey, 1970). This study is not primarily aimed at the refutation of

research that has been conducted in this area. Since very few studies have focused on the psychological strengths of Black poor women, there is little need to address the scant work in this area. The previous models and designs that researchers have utilized appear weak. A chief notion of this study is that certain characteristics among Black matrifocal families are associated with specific psychological phenomena, and the theoretical model formulated from the literature plays an important role towards providing a comprehensive understanding of the poor Black matrifocal families in the United States. Furthermore, a chief reason as to why American Black families have been so often misunderstood is that very little attention has been devoted to theoretical development based on objective assessment techniques. Consequently, the Black American family has been misunderstood, misdiagnosed, and mistreated by the majority of social scientists (Lewis, 1966; Pettigrew, 1964; Nobles, 1976).

It was hypothesized that age, years of education, counselee orientation, religiosity, racial climate of community during childhood, and children would be predictors of specific psychological phenomena: self-esteem, anxiety, and depression. It was further hypothesized that a proportion of this sample would possess more optimal levels of self-esteem, depression, and anxiety if they reported: higher levels of education; fewer children or dependents; an appreciably higher level of interaction

relative to Black related experiences during childhood; older in age; reported higher levels of religiosity; and reported a higher counselee orientation than other women within the sample.

## METHOD

### Subjects

A quota sample (Johnson, 1959) of 50 Black single women was selected from 118 apartment numbers in a Federally subsidized multi-unit complex in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Of this sample: 1) 60% were never married; 2) 22% were separated; and 3) 18% were divorced.

Subjects' age range was 18 to 48 years, with a mean age of 30. Both mean and median years of education were 12., with a range of 9 to 16, and 4% of the sample reported college completion. Fifty-eight percent of these subjects reported Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) as a major source of income, 24% reported employment in primarily low paying service occupations (e. g., janitorial services), and 8% reported Social Security as a major source of income. The remaining 10% reported no major source of income. These latter subjects represented mostly new residents who were waiting on financial and material aid from relatives and welfare.

### Instruments

A questionnaire composed of 16 items was constructed by the researcher based on the aim of this investigation in conjunction with a panel of judges of the graduate faculty

at Oklahoma State University. Education completed, marital status, type of income, and number of children or dependents presently living in the household, were basic demographic questions asked from the questionnaire. In that this sample was primarily poor, categorical income types were more descriptive than actual income dollars. Each response was recorded during the interview by the researcher.

Questions that related to "Family of Origin" traits were asked relative to the racial climate of the community. For example, "What was mostly the racial background of your community that you grew up in?" The focus of such questions was to assess the extent of Black related experiences. The subjects were asked to respond to one of the following: 1) "Mostly White"; 2) "Mostly Mixed"; and 3) "Mostly Black". Similar questions were asked regarding the racial identification of public school teachers and students in public schools.

Religiosity was assessed on a four point scale from "Very religious" to "Not at all religious". Subjects were asked to subjectively rate themselves due to the axiological nature of religiosity or spirituality (Fine, et al., 1985).

The questionnaire also included questions regarding the subjects' "Counselor Orientation". These questions were designed to obtain information regarding the subjects' value of counseling, receptivity or proneness to counseling, and the possible experiences that subjects may have had in the

counseling process. One example is, "Would you talk to a counselor, psychologist, or some other professional about a special problem that you may have?" The subjects were asked to state "yes" or "no" for these type questions. The final question was, "What do you feel to be your strengths as a Black woman?" Each response was recorded.

Four psychological inventories were administered to each subject. The State and Trait Anxiety Inventories, developed by Spielberger (1983), describes the anxiety emotional states of subjects. Each scale (State and Trait) has 20 items. The State scale assesses the present emotional degree of anxiety. After each statement, the subject was instructed to select one of four responses (Not At All to Very Much So).

The Trait scale instructs the subject to select one of four responses ("Almost Never" to "Almost Always"). An example from this scale is, "I feel like a failure". This anxiety inventory has been widely used and possesses statistical reliability of stability coefficients of .90 with adults.

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (1983) assesses attitudes, values, and beliefs of people. The subjects were instructed to choose each statement which are "like me" or "unlike me". The adult form consists of 25 items. Cronbach alpha reliabilities are reported for Black Americans with a range from .79 (males) to .83 (females).

The Depression Adjective Checklist developed by Lubin

(1981) measures "mood" states. The checklist is composed of 32 items. Ten of them are negative, and 22 are positive. The subjects were to check all items that apply to them "now". Lubin (1981) also reported concurrent validity significant at the .01 level with subscales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Beck Depression Inventory.

#### Procedure

A list of apartment numbers, designated for single head of household residence was obtained from the managerial staff. Cover letters explaining the general nature and purpose of the study were mailed to 118 family units. Instructions in the letter indicated that each resident should return the bottom portion of the letter if they desired to participate in the study to the apartment office staff in the envelopes provided. Also, included in the letter was the statement that a \$10.00 participatory fee would be paid to each resident upon completion of the interview. Additionally, the letter stated that the investigator would contact them to set up an appropriate appointment time for an interview.

The management of the apartments provided office space to conduct the interviews. Subjects were scheduled as they returned their letters. The bottom section of the letter that subjects returned asked for: a) race; b) age; and c) marital status. This procedure provided screening out those residents who did not meet the criteria to be

participants in this study.

The general criteria were that subjects must be 18 to 54 years of age, single, and a Black American considered to be the head of the household. Of the 118 families contacted, 73 families responded. Three women were eliminated due to their inability to read. Two men also returned letters. This likely occurred due to incorrect apartment numbers. After the sample of 50 subjects had been interviewed, no other appointments were made.

Before starting the interviews, each subject was asked to read aloud a "consent form". This technique further aided in the screening process. Due to the nature of the interview, subjects needed to possess roughly an eighth grade reading level to complete the self-administered battery of psychological inventories.

After subjects demonstrated sufficient literacy to complete the entire interview, all questions were asked on the questionnaire form. After each response from the subjects, the investigator recorded them accordingly. The inventories were given after the completion of the questionnaire. The investigator asked the subjects to read with him the directions of each inventory. To further clarify the directions, each subject was asked if they understood the directions before answering the inventory. This was done with each inventory successively.

#### Variables

Two sets of factors (variables) were selected for this

study. The independent factors were: 1) education; 2) age; 3) the racial composition of the community; 4) number of children or dependents presently living with subjects; 5) counselee orientation; 6) and religious orientation. Education was measured by number of years of education completed. Age was also determined by years. Composition of community characteristics included the racial climate (proportion of races) that the subjects had experienced. That is, the predominant racial groups of students and teachers, and the general racial background that the subjects had grown up in.

Dependent factors were measured by the psychological inventories: 1) State Anxiety; 2) Trait Anxiety; 3) Self-esteem; and 4) Depression. Each completed inventory was hand scored by scoring keys provided by the authors and designers of the instruments.

Data collected on other selected variables indicated that the mean for number of dependents living with the subjects was 2.8. The mean and median years of education was 12. Eighty-four percent of the subjects indicated that they grew up in a Black community, 52% indicated that they had mostly Black teachers in elementary school and 32% had predominantly Black teachers in high school. Marital status indicated 60% of this sample had never been married, 22% were separated, and 18% were divorced.

Only 12% indicated "not at all religious". Twenty-six percent indicated "not too religious", while 62% indicated



"somewhat to very religious". Seventy-two percent indicated that they would be willing to seek counseling from a professional counselor, however, only 28% reported having ever received counseling, and over one-half of these counseling sessions have been "church" related. In addition, only 6% reported involvement in some ongoing counseling.

The Multiple regression backward model was used to analyze the relationship between two sets of factors: the six predictor factors were 1) education by years, 2) family of origin traits, 3) number of children, 4) religiosity, 5) counselee orientation, and 6) age by years. The criterion factors for the four separate regression analyses were 1) state anxiety, 2) trait anxiety, 3) depression, and 4) self-esteem. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (1983) was utilized to analyze these factors.

Statistical analyses, in order of contribution to the equation indicated that counselee orientation, religiosity, number of children, and age were predictors of trait anxiety. The Multiple R value was .50. The four-variable model accounted for 25% of the variance,  $F(4,45)=3.70$ ,  $p < .01$ . The analyses further revealed that the counselee orientation and number of children were positively related to trait anxiety, while religiosity and age were negatively related to trait anxiety in this sample. Analyses in order of contribution to the equation indicated that counselee orientation, racial background of elementary teachers, years of education, religiosity, and age were

predictors of self-esteem. The multiple R value was .46. This five-variable model accounted for 21% of the variance,  $F(5,44)=2.36$ ,  $p < .05$ . Education, religiosity, and age were positively related to self-esteem, while the racial background of elementary school teachers (i. e., more Black teachers), and counselee orientation were negatively related to self-esteem.

Subsequent analyses using the independent groups t-test indicated lower educated subjects (grades 9 to 12) were found to exhibit higher trait anxiety than subjects with higher levels of education (grades 12.5 to 16),  $t(49)=3.33$ ,  $p < .001$  (See Table 1). Higher levels of education were also shown to be associated with increased self-esteem,  $t(49)=3.17$ ,  $p < .005$ , and lower depression,  $t(49)=2.47$ ,  $p < .05$ . (See Table 1). However, state anxiety did not show a relationship as strong with education, although more educated subjects did evidence slightly lower state-anxiety scores,  $t(49)=1.84$ ,  $p < .06$ ). In each comparison, higher educated subjects demonstrated more positive psychological characteristics than subjects with lower educational levels.

---

Insert Table 1 About Here

---

Additionally, religiosity was related to self-esteem,  $t(49)=2.14$ ,  $p < .05$ , depression,  $t(49)=2.47$ ,  $p < .05$ , and trait anxiety  $t(49)=2.63$ ,  $p < .01$ . These differences indicate that subjects who reported higher levels of

religiosity and education also indicated lower depression and trait-anxiety scores, and higher self-esteem scores as dependent variable measures that are similar to the normative sample scores provided by Lubin (1983), and Spielberger (1983). Means for these and other variables are shown in Table 1.

#### DISCUSSION

Education and religiosity were the variables most associated with psychological phenomena in this sample. State anxiety was not an appreciably major correlate in this study. A rationale for the lack of significance of state anxiety with other dependent variables in this sample is that these Black women do not generally feel anxious or uneasy in daily interactions, but tend to possess trait anxiety. It is speculated that education and religiosity may also provide such persons with the feeling of more control over their environment, personal and divine security, and adaptive responses to an oppressive reality. These inferences are supported by Nobles (1976).

These women verbally stated that their strengths were children (62%), God, Jesus, or church (46%), parents (24%), determination/coping (22%), work (16%), belief in self (14%), skills (10%), physical health (8%), friends (6%), and helping others (4%). These reportings by this sample are similar, to some extent, to the findings and propositions of Stinnett, Walters, and Kaye (1984). Of the six qualities of family strengths suggested by Stinnett et al.,

(1984), at least three of them appear to be similar to the strengths that these women reported such as 1) high level of religious orientation, 2) commitment to the family, 3) and the ability to deal with crises or coping. However, a chief difference between the findings of Stinnett et al., and the findings in this study is that that their findings were based primarily on white, middle-class, and married subjects, whereas this sample was Black, poor, and single (1984).

The findings in this study also lend support to much of the literature regarding the personal and familial strengths of Black American families (Billingsley, 1968; Dillard, 1983; Idler, 1987; Staples, 1981). For instance, relatives (children & parents) were the most consistent reporting of strengths by this sample. Religious and divine themes were also stated by this sample as major sources of strength. These responses provide support to much of the literature regarding the emotional and social support from families (McAdoo, 1978) and the religious orientation of Black families (Billingsley, 1968; Dillard, 1983). In conjunction, relatives and divinity have been historical strengths and have likely been generationally transmitted to continue to buffer, alter, and escape the inimical oppressions in the contemporary United States (Nobles, 1976; Symonds, 1969). In addition, those women who reported a higher religious orientation, also reported more optimal psychological levels on all dependent factor measures

with the exception of state anxiety.

Only 28% of the women in this study reported that they had ever received counseling. Several possible explanations are suggested regarding this disparity. First, Blacks are not well represented in counseling settings (Staples, 1981). Secondly, according to Rossi (1986), Blacks may be likely to seek out relatives, friends, and children to express personal issues. This perspective is also suggested by Brown and Manela (1979). Although women tend to enter counseling more often than men (Greenspan, 1983), this practice was not evidenced by this sample.

Racial community characteristics were not appreciably related to psychological phenomena in this sample. There are several plausible explanations for this disparity. This trend may suggest that racial community characteristics of this sample are not as meaningful to Blacks as perhaps the literature has suggested. Also, due to integration, Blacks have lost control over many local institutions, such as public schools, civic organizations, and to some extent, Blacks may be losing control over their families.

There should be little doubt that Black poor matri-focal families need urgent and comprehensive study. The urgency heralded is not simply to accumulate new data but most importantly, to save lives. Although this study did find psychological strengths among poor Black American women, a major need, perhaps is to discover methods and means by which to tap these strengths for this population

to enhance these strengths.

Future studies need to be more comprehensive regarding larger samples to obtain more reliable evidence that may support these findings. That is, Black poor women clearly do possess psychological strengths. Such strengths found among Black women who are heads of households in this study are clearly related to some college education and a high religious orientation. There is also evidence that this sample perceive children as a source of strength. This finding appears to be uniquely related to Black American women. In addition, this finding supports the speculations of Rossi (1986), and Brown and Manela (1979). For many Black American women, especially those who are poor and unmarried, children may be one of the few resources who will provide emotional support. The socio-cultural context in which most Black American women live provides little opportunity for interaction with other social groups. This perhaps, has been long realized by many Black women who are poor. It may be that only recently that social scientists have begun to recognize that Black poor women have the least opportunities for marriage or stable heterosexual relationships, and children are more likely to provide emotional support.

The future psychological status of poor Black American matrifocal families will also depend heavily on the educational fiber and opportunities afforded by the American educational system. A diversified educational system

to meet the ongoing needs of low income and welfare dependent women must be a major focus of American education in the 90's. The way the American system responds to this crucial need will affect over one-half of all Black American children, and may be critical to the promotion toward the enhancement of self-esteem among this group.

## References

- Beauford, E. & Walker, M. (1980). Escape From Poverty: A Study of Social Structural and Psychological Factors that Facilitate Upward Mobility Among the Poor. Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D. C.
- Belle, D. (1982). Social Ties and Social Support. Lives in Stress: Women and Depression. Beverly Hills: Sage Press.
- Billingsley, A. (1968). Black Families in White America. New Jersey: Englewood-Cliffs.
- Bloom, B. L. & Clement, C. (1984). Marital and Sex Role Orientation and Adjustment to Separation and Divorce. Journal of Divorce, 7, 87-97.
- Brown, P. & Manela, R. (1979). Changing Family Roles: Women and Divorce. Journal of Divorce, 1, 315-327.
- Colletta, N. & Lee, C. (1983). The Impact of Support for Black Adolescent Mothers. Journal of Family Issues, 4, 107-127.
- Coopersmith, S. (1983). Self-Esteem Inventories. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Crumidy, P. & Jacobziner, H. (1966). A Study of Young Married Mothers Who Kept Their Babies. American Journal of Public Health, 8, 1242-1251.
- Curran, D. (1983). Traits of a Healthy Family. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.



- Dickinson, N. (1986). Which Welfare Work Strategies Work? Social Work, 37, 266-272.
- Dillard, J. (1983). Multicultural Counseling. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Duffy, M. E. (1987). Strategies for Change: The One Parent Family. Family Community Health, 10, 11-12.
- Fine, M., A. Schwebel, & L. Myers (1985). The Effects of World View on Adaptation to Single Parenthood Among Middle-Class Adult Women. Journal of Family Issues, 6, 107-127.
- Frazier, E. F. (1968). The Free Negro Family. New York: The University Press.
- Gerstel, N. , Reissman, C. & Rosenfield, S. (1985). Explaining the Symptomatology of Separated and Divorced Women and Men: The Role of Material Conditions and Social Networks. Social Forces, 64, 84-101.
- Greenspan, M. (1983). A New Approach to Women and Therapy. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- Hays, W. & Mindel, C. (1973). Extended Kinship Relations in Black and White Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 2, 52-57.
- Hill, R. (1972). The Strengths of Black Families. New York: Emerson Hall Publishers, Inc.
- Idler, E. L. (1987). Religious Involvement and the Health of the Elderly: Some Hypotheses and an Initial Test. Social Forces, 66, 226-238.

- Johnson, P. (1959). Development of Sample Survey as a Scientific Methodology. Journal of Experimental Education, 27, 167-176.
- Kamii, C. & Radin, N. (1971). Class Differences in the Socialization Practices of Negro Mothers. In R. Staples (Ed.), The Black Family. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Lewis, O. (1966). The Culture of Poverty. Scientific American, 215, 19-25.
- Lindblad-Goldberg, M. & Dukes, J. (1985). Social Support in Black Low-income, Single-parent Families. Normative & Dyfunctional Patterns. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 55, 42-58.
- Lubin, B. (1981). Manual for Depression Adjective Checklist. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Services.
- Martin, E. & Martin, J. (1978). The Black Extended Family. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- McAdoo, H. (1978). Factors Related to Stability in Upward Black Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 12, 761-776.
- Moore, R. (1986). The Androgynous Black Parent: One Answer to the Single Parent Dilemma. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development.
- Moynihan, D. P. (1965). The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington, D. C., United States Printing Office.

- Nobles, W. (1976). A Formulative and Empirical Study of Black Families. Report submitted to the United States Printing Office.
- Pettigrew, T. (1964). A Profile of the Negro American. New York: Van Nostrand Company.
- Purkey, W. W. (1970). Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Rainwater, L. (1966). Cruible of Identity: The Lower-Class Negro Family. Daedalus, 95, 172-216.
- Rossi, A. S. (1986). Sex and Gender in an Aging Society. Daedalus, 115, 141-169.
- Rowe, C. J. (1989). An Outline of Psychiatry. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Sarbin, T. (1970). The Culture of Poverty, Social Identity, and Cognitions Outcomes. Psychological Factors in Poverty. Chicago: Marham Publishing.
- Scanzoni, J. (1971). The Black Family in Modern Society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Spielberger, C. (1983). State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Staples, R. (1973). The Black Woman In America. Chicago: Nelson Hall Publishers.
- Staples, R. (1981). The World of Black Singles. Wesport: The Greenwood Press.
- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. (1983). Chicago: Marketing Department, SPSS, Inc.

- Stinnett, N., Walters, J. & Kaye, E. (1984). Relationships in Marriage and the Family. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Sturgeon, W. (1979). Depression. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Symonds, J. (1969). Culture Differences and Social Class in the Negro Community. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged. Department of HEW, Washington, D. C.
- U. S. Department of Labor. (1985). Facts on U. S. Working Women. Fact Sheet NO. 85-86.
- Willie, C. (1970). The Family Life of Black People. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Wodarski, J., Parham, T., Lindsey, E. & Blackburn, B. (1986). Reagan's AFDC Policy Changes: The Georgia Experiences. Social Work, 37, 273-279.

Table 1

Mean Comparisons by Religiosity, Number of Children, Education,  
and Age on all Psychological Variables

Predictors Variables	<u>n</u>	Criterion Variables			
		State Anxiety	Trait Anxiety	Depression	Self-Esteem
Religiosity					
Low	19	40.89	40.89	10.21	57.26
High	31	37.29	39.51**	6.16**	68.35*
Children					
Above Two	24	37.88	42.26	6.61	67.50
Below Two	26	39.50	43.04	8.87	60.50
Education					
9 to 12 Yrs	31	40.83	46.45	9.25	58.19
Above 12 Yrs	19	35.10	36.42***	5.15**	73.84**
Age					
Below 30	25	39.20	44.40	8.84	61.60
Above 30	25	38.12	40.88	6.56	66.68

$p < .05^*$

$p < .01^{**}$

$p < .001^{***}$

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A -

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction  
The Historical Emergence of the Black  
Matriarchy  
The Contemporary Black Matrifocal Family  
Conceptual Framework of Psychological  
Strengths  
    Family of Origin Characteristics  
    Children  
    Religiosity  
    Education  
    Counselor Orientation  
    Age  
Conclusion  
References

### Literature Review

The majority of previous research efforts and literature reviews have consistently and systematically depicted the American Black matrifocal family as naive, disorganized, dysfunctional, pathological and psychologically deficient (Frazier, 1968; Gehlbach, 1966; Moynihan, 1965; Rainwater, 1966; Sarbin, 1970). This morbid perception may be largely attributed to a confluence of historical and contemporary factors.

In this review of literature, an effort is put forth to note some of the major and marginal historical and contemporary factors that appear to be related to the present general psychological status among poor Black women who households. In that there is a paucity of research and literature relative to the psychological strengths of poor matrifocal families, it is thought that a review of literature should reflect a broad range of pertinent information encapsulating the thesis of the reality of Black experiences (Nobles, 1976; Scanzoni, 1971).

The possible cumulative effects of Black Americans, and Black women particularly, psychologically are likely to be most adequately understood and explained by examining Black experiences historically and in contemporary society. The manifold excruciating, inhumane, and debilitating conditions in which Black Americans have historically undergone may offer some insight into the current Black matrifocal psychological status (Willie, 1970).



Parenthetically, it is unlikely that social scientists can understand the full impact of historical antecedents that Black Americans have experienced. Furthermore, the residual effects of historical factors are inextricably tied to the present psychological status of Black American families (Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951).

It appears that all families, institutions, and major social systems are, to some relative degree, evolutionary caricatures of historic experiences. Hence, it appears most appropriate to submit a tenable ground on which to construct a reasonable thesis that the psychological strengths of poor Black matrifocal families are embedded within their personhood contextually (Nobles, 1976). And this context has historical and contemporary parameters that define the extent to which Black American families may be understood.

This review draws widely from Black experiences and attempts to edit salient and marginal aspects of Black families in the United States. Accordingly, a myriad of experiences shared by Black Americans appear to be important determinants relative to their psychological status (Nobles, 1976; Scanzoni, 1971; Willie, 1970).

This review is divided into three major subdivisions: 1) the historical emergence of the Black matriarchy; 2) the contemporary Black matrifocal family; 3) and, conceptual framework of psychological strengths.

### The Historical Emergence of the Black Matriarchy

A historical account of the lives of Black Americans clearly indicates an era of systematic and dramatic disruption of the Black American family structure by external sources (Berlin, 1974; DuBois, 1961; Frazier, 1948; Nobles, 1976; Scanzoni, 1971; Staples, 1973). The genesis of this thread of family structure disruption appears to have been activated during the period of the violent and barbarous abduction of African people (Dubois, 1961; Frazier, 1948). Family structural disruption is maintained by contemporary racial, social, economic, and political oppressions (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1951; Scanzoni, 1971; Staples, 1973).

There appears to be reliable and substantial evidence that the Black African family was stable, intact, and viable prior to the debilitating impact of mass abduction on the coasts and inlands of West Africa (DuBois, 1928; Frazier, 1948). There may be, however, reason for further speculation relative to the various types of familial structures due to some depreciable reports concerning the mass abduction of African people from their native villages and general environment (Bennett, 1962; Dubois, 1961; Frazier, 1948). It is noted, however, by Frazier (1948) that the patriarchal institution of the family appeared to have been most dominant.

Not only was the family organization of the Black Africans disrupted, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) strongly contend that the "culture was smashed" (p. 39). After Blacks were abducted, traded, or sold en masse, there was little

possibility of maintaining a stable culture in chains. African ties with social and familial institutions were drastically destroyed. Furthermore, much of the Africans' sense of uniqueness was lost (Frazier, 1948; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951). In addition, this process provided the necessary conditions for slavery as an institution to work.

Blacks also lost essential relational ties. African families were uprooted and reimplanted in a foreign country. Thus, any possibility of transmitting cultural mores, norms, language, folkways, and familial structural patterns appear to be extremely unlikely (Bennett, 1962; Frazier, 1948). Therefore, the matrifocal family system in the United States is not likely to be an aboriginal type family structure with African origins, it is rather an adaptive function in response to the psychological, racial, political, social, and economic oppressions (Berlin, 1974; Billingsley, 1968; Frazier, 1948; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; Pettigrew, 1964).

Moreover, those Black Americans who share an African origin have undergone dynamic emotional and psychological adjustments to survive an inimical, onerous, social, and political system in the United States (Billingsley, 1968; Pettigrew, 1964; Staples, 1973; Willie, 1970). The poor matrifocal system among Black Americans is conceptualized as a response and adaptation to American white institutions.

The gradual emergence of Black matrifocal families appears to be in a state of augmentation resulting from a

myriad of cumulative historical factors. Additional discussion depicts some of the key social and political issues that seem to promote and foster the Black matriarchy. The first census in the United States in 1790 indicated that the Black American population was 757,181 of which 697,624 were considered slaves (Frazier, 1948). Although there was no breakdown by sex according to the census, there appears to be substantial evidence that during the initial settlement of Blacks on American soil, there was a disproportionate number of Black males (Frazier, 1948).

According to several historians and social scientists (Bennett, 1962; DuBois, 1961; Frazier, 1948), Black men interracially married due to the scarcity of Black women. Another reason for this imbalanced ratio is that Black men were usually more marketable, and secondly, typically stronger physically to endure the Mid-Atlantic voyage from Africa to the United States. These factors are initially a starting place that provide some theoretical foundation relative to the understanding of how the Black matriarchy possibly gradually emerged to the present status, and to a degree, remains in this status.

DuBois (1961), Frazier (1948), and Bennett (1962) provide a graphic description of the excruciating conditions of African women who were frequently severed from their families, more particularly their husbands. Also, women with young children, (infants who were ill or disabled)

were, in some instances forced to leave them in Africa (Bennett, 1962; Haley, 1976; Frazier, 1948). Other African women who were pregnant during the Middle Passage had "to give birth to children in the scalding perspiration from the human cargo" (Frazier, 1948; p. 35).

There were rare instances that the husband was sold to the same slave buyer as the wife. In addition, when African couples were abducted together, there was only a minor chance for them to remain together as a family unit after having reached the harbors of the United States. The slave auction played an additional role in further familial separation.

Many Black women, after having been brought to the United States, were commonly used as "breeders" resulting from forced sexual cohabitation. It appeared to be a common function of Black mothers to re-enter the labor force with the men shortly after gestation. Some Black women were somewhat more fortunate to continue domestic house duties after childbirth. Frazier (1948) and Bennett (1962) remark that Black mothers were not only responsible for nursing, caring, and attending to their own children but also responsible for their owner's children.

Subsequently, this pattern and function of the Black woman developed an extraordinary attachment to children. Maslow's (1951) notion of a need of belongingness may be an appropriate model as an additional lens viewing the Black mother/child bond. This appears to be more plausible considering the frequent historical absence of the Black father.

Further, it seems that the Black mother and her children (relatives, fictive kin) were more likely to remain together as a family unit than the father-husband with children. Frazier (1948) cites several advertisements from the City Gazette, a Charleston, South Carolina newspaper in 1825 where it appeared to be a common practice for slave owners to sell or trade Black mothers and their children as a unit or a matrifocal family and not Black men. Simultaneously, the Black slave-fathers were often sold to a different slave owner and in other instances the slave-father would make escapes to find refuge in a slave-free state, contemplating a return to reclaim his family (Bennett, 1961; Frazier, 1948; Haley, 1976; Nobles, 1976).

Black women during slavery appeared to have provided the owner with several domestic and conjugal functions. First, they provided the services of a nurse and caretaker for their owner's children and this included breastfeeding (Frazier, 1948). Secondly, Black women were often used as chattel in the reproduction of offspring as an agricultural business venture (Bennett, 1961; Haley, 1976). Additionally, these women were usually sexually abused.

Whether many of the Black women passively accepted or remonstrated these experiences, the psychological and social consequences may lie beneath the threshold of scientific excavation. Nobles (1976) comments, "the nature of the Black family has been seriously misunderstood . . . we know little about the impact or consequence of the Black dynamic has on the psychological development and mental

health of its members" (p. 180). Black women, during the slave era in the United States encountered systematic and severe physical, social, economic, and psychological abuse (Bennett, 1962, Frazier, 1948; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951).

The remarkable strengths of Black families to survive may seem quite resilient. Accordingly, Black families, comparatively speaking, with other ethnic groups and minorities have fared quite well (Billingsley, 1968). Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) point to the fact that Black Americans historically lost all cultural heritage and had to recreate institutions, culture, identity, and family organization. They also argue that Black Americans differ in this respect when compared to Jewish Americans. Jewish culture and heritage was not destroyed, but, rather it was "transplanted to an environment" (1951, p. 41). Similarly, Native Americans who once freely roamed this country were primarily passive victims of an oppressive American social and economic system. Some (Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951) have suggested that Native Americans could be possibly approaching extinction due to ongoing economic, social, and psychological abuse in the United States.

Bennett (1962) indicated that during slavery many wives of slave owners sought divorce from their husbands because of the husband's sexual relations with Black women. Paradoxically, the practice of master-slave mistress status appeared to have played a licentious effect on the sexual behavior of white women. According to Bennett (1962) and

others (Frazier, 1948; Haley, 1976), white women who were free were active sexually with Black men who were slaves. Obviously, this practice was not sanctioned by the ruling class of white racists in Colonial America. However, these sexual practices condoned by a segment of white women appeared to be social statements to white men and Black women of resentment, anger, and rage. In conjunction, Haley (1976) suggests that Black women were sometimes verbally abused by white women or encouraged to marry a Black man or sold as quickly as possible.

These and other historical factors of slavery appeared to have accentuated the Black matrifocal status. The cumulative social status, for example, that Black women ascribed resulting from mothering their owner's children, also played a significant role in the emergence of Black mother-centered families in the United States (Bennett, 1962; DuBois, 1961; Frazier, 1948; Haley, 1976; Willie, 1970). The slave owners almost always gave special attention and interest to their half-black children (Frazier, 1948). This phenomenon provided additional impetus toward shaping and the crystallization of the Black matrifocal image.

However, this condition of Black women appeared to have created an awkward social position among the Black race at large (Bennett, 1962; DuBois, 1961; Frazier, 1948). This new social position produced, to some appreciable degree, racial and social isolation. In some instances Black women during slavery could not completely identify with



either race. Black women who bore racially mixed children were more likely esteemed by their white slave owners, and stigmatized and isolated by the general Black masses (Bennett, 1962; DuBois, 1961; Frazier, 1948). Black women who had borne a white man's child undoubtedly was placed in an awkward social and conjugal position. It was difficult to marry within their race due to the stigmatism of having borne a white man's child. Furthermore it was illegal and imprudent in most cases for a Black woman to marry a white man. In addition to the scarcity of Black eligible men, most Black women had very little opportunity for legal marriage and these factors also aided in paving the way towards the shaping of the Black matrifocal family (Haley, 1976).

Most Black women with children were "adopted" by the slave-owner and the family was engineered to become a matrifocal unit (Bennett, 1962; Frazier, 1948). In conjunction, this practice laid a foundation for the Black caste system due to the spectrum of skin pigmentation of white/Black offspring (Haley, 1976; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951).

Ostensibly, many historical factors appear to be related to the emergence of the Black matriarchy. Regrettably, these factors have not been taken into consideration by many social scientists who have attempted to study the Black American family (Gehblach, 1966; Lewis, 1966; Sarbin, 1970). Researchers such as these have attempted to examine Black families without an epistemology. Consequently, they have studied the most conspicuous consequence of Black

adaptations to a rigid oppressive system and not the process of Black familial structural development.

Thus far, an attempt has been made to summarize some of the major historical factors that influenced and molded, to some extent, the Black matrifocal family. It would be impractical to attempt to exhaust the voluminous works relative to the many aspects of slavery. These facts are presented to provide a broader understanding of the Black matrifocal family relative to its origin of development.

Based on this section of review of literature, it appears that slavery has profoundly impacted the social, economic, and psychological status of Black American families (Nobles, 1976; Staples 1973). Therefore, it is necessary to understand the historical factors of Black American families to scientifically assess them (Hill, 1972; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; Staples, 1973; 1981).

In an attempt to summarize some historical factors that confluenced the emergence of the Black matriarchy, a brief catena is presented.

1. Blacks were initially brutally severed from their family of origin by slave traders from Africa.
2. Black women, in many instances, were forced to leave their children in Africa that were infants or sickly.
3. Many Black African families suffered and died on voyages en route to the United States, and caused further familial separation and psychological impairment.
4. Blacks from various African tribes were unable to communicate effectively which augmented a lack of cohesion, transmission of cultural norms, language, customs, and institutions.

5. There was a disproportionate number of Black males over females during the initial settlement of slaves in the United States.
6. Black women were sexually exploited by slave-owners.
7. The white slave-owners provided the Black slave-mistress and his children with provisions to live as a type of "adopted family".
8. The slave auction often separated Black men from their wives and children, in addition to run-a-ways, and murders of Black men.
9. Black women and children were more often sold, or traded together than Black men with children.

Theoretically, the Black matrifocal family in the United States has been transmitted via previous generations. The possible cumulative effects of slavery may continue to be manifested among Black American families. This manifestation may be seen, not only in the matrifocal family, but also in the psychological status or functioning of this structure (Staples, 1973; 1981).

The residual effects of the manifold historical factors may be found in the current Black matrifocal family. These residual effects on the Black American family are likely to be further understood by examining the present condition and psychological status of Blacks. What appears to be likely transmitted, in conjunction to the matrifocal familial structure, is the psychological fiber of this population. A chief assumption regarding strengths in general is the ability to suffer. Without question, Black American families have systematically demonstrated this ability for the past four hundred years in the United States (DuBois, 1961).

### The Contemporary Black Matrifocal Family

The most salient and contemporary factor that systematically describes the majority of Black women who head households in the United States is poverty (Beauford & Walker, 1980; Gilbert, 1984; Limmer, 1978; Lindblad-Goldberg & Dukes, 1985; Osmond & Grigg, 1975). The historical factors related to slavery of Black American families are inextricably connected the present economic conditions of Black matrifocal families (Bennett, 1962; Willie, 1970). Such conditions as inequitable wages, racism, denial of American freedom, social and political injustices, discriminatory legislation, and other inimic conditions have thwarted the development of Black families in the United States (Bennett, 1962; DuBois, 1961; Hill, 1972; Scanzoni, 1971; Staples, 1981).

Although slavery has been abolished over 120 years in the United States, the aftermath of slavery is clearly identified by ongoing racial oppression (Billingsley, 1968; Pettigrew, 1964). Moynihan (1965) poignantly expressed,

The Negro situation is commonly perceived by whites in terms of visible manifestations of discrimination and poverty, in part, because of the Negro protest no doubt, because these are the facts which involve the actions and attitudes of the white community as well. It is more difficult, however, for whites to perceive the effect that three centuries of exploitation have had on the fabric of Negro society itself. Here the consequences of the historic injustices done to Negro Americans are silent and hidden from view (p.5).

This view of American economic political and social conditions that Black families experience, as expressed by Moynihan (1965) somewhat encapsulates the saga of Black families in the United States. The prototypical conditions of slavery appear to continue manifestation in contemporary society in the United States.

The United States Department of Labor (1985) indicated that in 1970, 28.3% of all Black families were maintained by women. By 1984, 43.7% of all Black American families were headed by women. In conjunction, the United States Department of Labor (1985) issued statistics that over 53% of all Black women heading households fell below the poverty line. Accordingly, Whalen (1978) reported that 68% of all Black women have incomes less than \$5000 annually and that 78% of all aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) are single parent head of families. At the same time, the United States Department of Commerce (1979) reported the poverty level to be \$6191 annually.

There is systematic and substantial evidence that poverty and welfare are disproportionately a woman's issue, more specifically, Black women (Lindblad-Goldberg & Dukes, 1985; Wodarski, Parham, Lindsey, & Blackburn, 1986). The matrifocal issues regarding poverty and welfare dependence are exacerbated by historical and contemporary reality of Black women (Billingsley, 1968; Bennett, 1962; Nobles, 1976; Scanzoni, 1971; Staples, 1973).

According to Wodarski, Parham, Lindsey, and Blackburn (1986), "In 1982, the number of persons living in poverty

reached the highest level in this country since 1965." The current economic conditions continue to further augment the present social and economic condition of Black families. Poverty has become and continues to remain an intricate debilitating phenomenon for most Black American families.

Although poverty, to a large extent, has been transmitted from previous generations, the crucial and current factors sustaining poverty appear to be related to the social, economic, and political climate in which Black Americans must function (Billingsley, 1968; Frazier, 1948; Osmond and Grigg, 1975; Scanzoni, 1971; Willie, 1970).

For Black Americans to escape poverty and welfare, opportunities for social and economic development must be a high priority on Federal, State, and Local legislative agendas. Attempts have been made to improve employment and training opportunities, but no appreciable amount of social programs targeted for Black Americans seem to have been effective (Dickinson, 1986; U. S. Department of Labor, 1985a). A recent report from the United States Department of Labor (1985b) indicated that major federal policy for equal employment opportunity for women needs further clarification and implementation. Some of these issues that relate to legislation include: more opportunities for women in services and apprenticeships; anti-discriminatory practices for pregnant workers; equity in salaries; child care for working parents; and vocational education (1985). These issues are crucial for Black matrifocal families

to obtain basic skills to exit from poverty and welfare in the United States. Black poor women who head families need massive support from Federal, and State levels of government to root out sexism and racism (Thompson, 1974). The fact that nearly 44% of Black American families are headed by women and disproportionately poorer than any other single familial structure in the United States must be viewed as political, social, and economic oppression (Pettigrew, 1964; Staples, 1981; Whalen, 1978).

The overwhelming odds against Black single women who head families have a remarkable similarity of the gamut of historical factors of slavery. Poor Black families appear to typify slave status due to the historical racial, social, and political dynamics of contemporary societal operations. This population continues to be controlled by oppressive and rigid systems; they continue to be mainly dependent on the state for sustenance and housing; they possess the least skills; they lack effective advocates for equality; they are typically sexually exploited; and they generally share a commonality of powerlessness economically and socially (Billingsley, 1968; Dickinson, 1986; Hill, 1972; Nobles, 1976; Sarbin, 1970; Scanzoni, 1971). The contemporary factors of racism are powerful determinants of poverty (Whalen, 1978).

When considering the overwhelming environmental factors that most Black Americans must encounter, clearly some degree of psychological strengths are essential for survival against the ominous effects of American racism.

Billingsley (1968) remarks,

Racism is deeply imbedded within the institutional fabric of American society. All of the major institutions including the political, economic, educational, social, and others have systematically excluded the Negro people in varying degrees from equal participation in the rewards of these institutions. None of them work as effectively in meeting the needs of Negro families as they do white families (p. 152).

The major institutions in American society must develop and implement strategies that will suppress racism and diminish poverty. The solutions toward the eradication of racism, sexism, and poverty are complex and costly. The indifference to these elements is more costly in terms of the loss of human lives and a lower quality of life for all American citizens. For example, Yankauer (1950) studied a New York City population in 1947 and found that among non-whites, the neonatal mortality rate was 52.7 per 1000 live births. Over the past forty years, the situation remains the same, and the Black infant mortality rate is still significantly higher than the national average (Salkind & Ambrose, 1985). Impoverished living conditions of poor Blacks reaches all levels, including those never given the chance for life.

Similarly, several social scientists conclude that poverty affects the mental health status of all races (Hill, 1972; Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951). The effects of poverty are far reaching and devastating for Black American families. Gehblach (1966) reported that the life expectancy for Black Americans is substantially shorter than for white Americans.



Various medical disorders, such as pulmonary tuberculosis, hypertension, diabetes and other medical conditions have been traditionally higher among Black American families than among whites (Gove, Hughes, & Styles, 1977).

However, when some conditions are controlled by socioeconomic status (Willie, 1970), there appears to be no appreciable differences among racial groups, specifically Black and white families. Hence, poverty is clearly a major correlate of physical and psychological pathologies. Black women who are divorced, widowed, separated, or never married appear to be at risk. For instance, Osmond and Grigg (1975) interviewed 561 subjects in four states who were married, divorced, separated, and widowed and concluded low income is highly correlated with marital dissolution.

Recently, Kniesner (1986) completed a 15 year analysis of family structure and concluded that separation, divorce, widowhood, and childbearing are key factors for women entering poverty. Kniesner (1986) further concluded that the poverty rate of female-headed families is 350% higher than intact families where the husband is present and that Black women have a divorce rate two times that of white women.

The manifold factors that influence and sustain poverty appear to affect Black matrifocal families dramatically more than other racial and ethnic groups in this country. Black females who head households in the United States clearly are at risk, primarily the poor (Kniesner, 1986; Osmond & Grigg, 1975; Staples, 1973).

The previous sections of this review suggest that the contemporary and historical factors relating to the emergence of the Black matrifocal family are real and not simply assumptions. Sufficient ground has been established to propose and develop a theoretical model towards the understanding of the psychological status of Black poor women who head households.

The study of the emergence of the Black matrifocal family in America provides a broader understanding and appreciation of the unique nature of Black American woman. There is little doubt that the historical and evolutionary factors that attribute to the emergence of Black matrifocal family have been explored by contemporary research efforts (Hays & Mindel, 1973; Hill, 1972; McAdoo, 1978; Moynihan, 1965).

From most past efforts, at explaining Black families, a distorted misrepresentation of Black American women has usually been the result. Previous research and literature reviews have consistently reflected the negative, dysfunctional, disorganization, and weaknesses of Black American families (Frazier, 1948; Lewis, 1966; Rainwater, 1966; Sarbin, 1970) with the most salient focus being the Black matrifocal family. Billingsley (1968) comments, "the Negro family as an institution has been virtually ignored by students of group life in America . . . When they have done so, it has been done in a negativistic and distorted fashion" (p. 197).

Similarly, Nobles (1976) contends that the Black family has been studied with three major orientations: 1) The Poverty-Acculturated studies; 2) The Pathological studies; 3) And the Victim-Oriented studies. In each orientation Blacks have not been studied to determine strengths. The previous trends of research efforts epitomizes the monocle vision that has likely hindered objective views of Black American families. Additionally, bias-free research is virtually impossible to locate, and the previous work found relative to Black family life may be distorted that much of what has been found, at best, is confounded with experimental designs problems. There is an emphasis that systematically identify weaknesses (Nobles, 1976). Simultaneously the identification of weaknesses have notably been based on bi-racial comparisons and socio-economic differences. These comparisons do not reflect the epistemological context of Black American families and subsequently, do not present an accurate appraisal of Black American families (Crumidy & Jacobziner, 1966; Demo & Parker 1987; Hays & Mindel, 1973).

Also, there appears no appreciable research regarding the psychological strengths of poor Black matrifocal families. Although Hays and Mindel (1973), Hill (1972), McAdoo (1978), and others have attempted to acknowledge certain strengths of Black American families, these strengths have primarily been related to "extended family kinship ties", "social support systems", and "religion".

Concomitantly, others (Crumidy & Jacobziner, 1966; Demo & Parker, 1987; Sarbin, 1970; Symonds, 1969) have concentrated notably on racial differences, socioeconomic class comparisons, marital status (i. e., married compared with non-married), and some combination of these. In that the Black experience of Black women is different from that experience of their white counterpart, Black women are more likely to possess a different perspective about the world in which they live (Fine, Schwebel, & Myers, 1985). It is, therefore, logical to assume that the matrifocal family differs in response to society and cannot be adequately understood outside of it's own reality (Billingsley, 1968; Nobles, 1976).

The historical and contemporary factors of slavery and racism have had a most debilitating and lasting effect on Black American families. However, these onerous social conditions have not annihilated the viability of the Black family in the United States (Frazier, 1948; Hill, 1972; Nobles, 1976; Staples, 1973). These factors have undoubtedly forced the Black family structure to develop a resilient fiber that appears to be pronounced in the matrifocal family (Kardiner & Ovesey, 1951; Staples, 1973).

Thus, it is logical to assume that Black women who head families bear certain psychological characteristics due to a unique personal and familial structure. Conceivably, psychological characteristics are likely to be found by investigating Black families within their epistemological

context sharing a similar history and occupying a similar social condition.

Smith (1977) has argued that research on Black Americans has been disproportionately distorted, misrepresented, and racist. In addition, Copeland (1977) has accused the white middle class structure of negative stereotyping Black Americans as a convention to ignore the critical psychological issues of Black women.

Summarily, the Black matrifocal family has existed for over four hundred years in the United States. It has undergone unyielding oppression, which appears to have had an impact in fostering its unique structure. Research that has been targeted at this population has thus far noted the weaknesses and differences based on bi-racial and socioeconomic differences rather than studying the process of adaptation. A cardinal tenet that undergirds this thesis is that Black poor women who share a similar history, experience, and social condition need to be studied and understood within that context. A review of literature suggests that several factors have been found to be related to the psychological status of Black Americans.

The theoretical rationale for this research is formulated on the premise that an admixture of findings and speculations are germane to understanding of Black women. It appears to be most relevant to provide a conceptual framework for "psychological strengths". Due to the exploratory nature of this work, it is admitted that such a concept as

"psychological strengths" may be construed in a myriad of ways. In an attempt to define and clarify this concept, general trappings and notions of this phenomenon are found in various works of research and writings.

#### Conceptual Framework of Psychological Strengths

Jones and Rice (1987) more recently suggested a model composed of three major factors that are determinants of "health" which encompasses: 1) the physical health; 2) the mental health; 3) and the social wellbeing of individuals. According to Jones and Rice (1987), "health" is understood by combining these three areas. They also suggest that the absence of disease or illness does not indicate that person is healthy or strong (p.4).

Curran (1983), in Traits of a Healthy Family, also suggests that the absence of disease is not indicative of strong families. Curran (1983) argues that many "pseudo-mutual" families may appear to be strong, but lack the dynamics that compose strong families.

In a similar vein, many individuals and families who appear to be healthy psychologically, in fact, may not be. Accordingly families that possess the external traits that project health and strength may in fact be disorganized, weak, fragile, and entropic (Curran, 1983). Additionally, American culture, to some extent has translated external wealth to psychological health (Curran, 1983). In that many Americans equate the mental well-ness and psychological

health or strength by economic power depicts the paucity of knowledge regarding strengths of families.

It is suggested that Black poor women who head households possess certain psychological strengths, among others. Although this assumption is empirically based (Frazier, 1948; Hill, 1972) much of the previous literature does not reflect this assumption. The chief reason for this lack of understanding appears to be related to the fallacy of poor people in general. What may be considered by society at large as unhealthy, may in fact be healthy in response to an unhealthy system (Hill, 1972). Succintly, Black poor women who head families are not to be understood as being weak psychologically because they occupy a lower social position (Hill, 1972; Staples, 1981). Hill states, "Many forms of deviation may, in fact, be normal, healthy responses to particular social environments" (1972; p. 21). He continues, "Strengths are those traits which facilitate the ability of the family to meet the needs of its members and the demands made upon it by systems outside the family unit. They are necessary for the survival and maintenance of effective family networks" (Hill, 1972; p. 3).

Black poor women in the United States have demonstrated strengths for several hundred years. They have continued to meet the needs of their families with little appreciable assistance from outside institutions and fathers of children (Frazier, 1948; Nobles, 1976). The literature suggests several factors that further aid in understanding

the psychological strengths of this population. Theoretically, psychological strengths refer to those abilities, qualities, attributes, and psychic characteristics that are resources for adaptation and survival (Billingsley, 1968; Coopersmith, 1983; Hill, 1972; Staples, 1981).

It is contended that Blacks, to some extent have acquired the necessary qualities, attributes, and psychic characteristics via the Black experience. The reality of Black Americans has played a vital role towards the development of such resources.

Six factors have been identified and selected from the literature that appear to be related to the psychological status of Black families in the United States:

1. Family of Origin in the Black Community
2. Education
3. Religion or Spiritual Orientation
4. Age
5. Number of Children or Dependents
6. Counselee Orientation

A discussion of each of these factors relative to psychological phenomena will conclude this literature review. Although there are many types of psychological phenomena, this discussion will be primarily confined to these three phenomena: 1) anxiety; 2) depression; 3) and self-esteem.

Family of origin in the black community. Taylor (1976), in a comprehensive study of Black high school students



found that Blacks tend to have higher levels of self-esteem, especially if they had been raised in a Black community and attended predominantly Black populated public schools. Similarly, Moore (1986) compiled a list of positive experiences taken from 25 biographies of famous Black Americans and 25 interviews from successful Black educators, lawyers, physicians, and other professionals. Of the 11 common experiences shared by these 50 Black prominent Americans, two of them bear special attention to this study. Moore found: 1) that these Blacks were taught primarily by Black teachers in public schools; 2) and they were indoctrinated by parents and teachers of the Black community that education was a realistic way to escape poverty and oppression.

Billingsley (1968) suggests that the Black American community with its Black role models, such as teachers, ministers, and similar models have been major sources of strength for Black Americans. These type of models, within the Black community appear to have provided aspiration and hope to Black Americans that enabled them to dream beyond their "estateless" inheritance.

The interaction among Black people within the Black community seemed to have provided a relative sense of stability, security, and emotional support for younger Black Americans. The notion of Black enterprise and business likely transmitted some relative degree of control and strength to younger Blacks (Moore, 1986; Taylor, 1976).

Such experiences provided the resources to function in the Black community as well as provide a place of refuge.

It appears that some relative degree of strengths psychologically were procured by Black Americans who were members of Black communities and shared a level of control of the community affairs (Billingsley, 1968; Frazier, 1948). The various social and civic organizations and institutions such as the YMCA, YWCA, Masonic Temples, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and similar groups seem to have been the pivotal organizations and institutions of Black Americans where Blacks obtained strengths in achievements. The Black church or religion of Black Americans is perhaps the most influential among such organizations and will be discussed more thoroughly later in this review (Bennett, 1962; Billingsley, 1968; Martin, 1978).

Martin and Martin (1978) suggest that the various organizations and institutions of Black Americans were extensions of the Black family. This observation can be explained by the coalition of relatives and non-relatives who attempted joint business ventures, or teachers, nurses, ministers, brickmasons, barbers, and other similar vocational endeavors were aided by someone closely connected to the family (Billingsley, 1968; Nobles, 1976; Martin & Martin, 1978).

Additional benefits were gained as a result of being in a predominately Black community (Billingsley, 1968).

According to some scholars and authors (Billingsley, 1968; Nobles, 1976; Staples, 1973) of the Black American family, older members of the Black community generally passed on knowledge and techniques to the next generation. This knowledge is believed to have played important roles towards the development of personal and familial identity (Martin & Martin, 1978). Additionally, psychological and emotional support were mediated through the Black community and provided networks for building and maintaining psychic resources. These resources become vital to Black American women, particularly when adverse economic conditions threaten the welfare and stability of the Black matrifocal family.

Billingsley (1968) examines three biographies of prominent Black Americans. He attributes this prominence of these Black Americans to the nurturance of the Black family and the Black community. Billingsley (1968) briefly traces the history of the Poindexter, Hughes, and King families. He comments regarding the inimical circumstances that one Black encountered, "These are the tremendous psychological resilience of the man" (p. 103).

The commonality that these Black Americans share who have been raised in a predominately Black community is that they seemed to have obtained unique social and psychological resources via the Black community experience. Also, it appears to be impossible for these types of experiences to have been acquired in any other setting (Hill, 1972).

Children. Several studies indicate negative psychological effects of women relative to the number of children or number of dependents (Lindblad-Goldberg & Dukes, 1985). For example, Lindblad-Goldberg and Dukes (1985) studied 126 urban Black matrifocal families. They found no significant difference between clinic mothers and non-clinic mothers in terms of previous events leading to the mother's single status. However, clinic mothers tended to have more biological children than non-clinic mothers. It is suggested that clinic mothers gave more emotional support to their children than they received (Rossi, 1986).

Amato and Partridge (1987) reported that large numbers of children tend to increase depressive effects among divorced, widowed, and married. These effects are likely the result related to the cumbersome task of parenting with limited resources. This problem is pronounced among poor Black matrifocal families (Belle, 1982).

Questions are often raised as to why this population continues to give birth to children, especially in light of social and economic conditions of most Black matrifocal families in this country. Rossi (1986) proposes that often Black women have out-of-wedlock children resulting from a personal choice. Children are preferred over a spouse. Belle (1982) suggests that Black women do not try to mimic white middle class standards regarding maternity and therefore the pattern appears to be ethnic and not white. This appears to be particularly true regarding lower class Black

women in the United States (Belle, 1982; Rossi, 1986).

Lindblad-Goldberg and Dukes (1985) suggest that the trend of Black women giving birth to children out of marriage is not dysfunctional, but rather a method of sustaining a social support system. The gains and losses of poor Black mothers bearing children in general, is yet unclear. Children on one hand appear to mediate and buffer emotional stress and tension (Lindblad-Goldberg & Dukes, 1985). They also appear to create stress and tension for many mothers (Rossi, 1986).

The potential resource of children to some parents has substantial support (Belle, 1982). Some parents tend to rely on children for social and economic support in the later years (Belle, 1982). Conversely, evidence also suggest that children do cause tension, anxiety, and frustrations to parents, particularly when the number of children exceeds the adequacy of income (Gerstel, Riessman & Rosenfield, 1985). In addition, Broman (1988) found that non-parents reported higher levels of life satisfaction than parents.

In summary, it appears that children of Black mothers do play a vital role relative to their emotional status. During the younger years, children are more stressful for parents. The mothers may conceptualize this trying period of sacrifice as an investment in their personal future. This contextual norm among Black poor women may be granted more understanding and appreciation considering when most

Black lower-class women have lesser chances for marriage or stable heterosexual relationships (Staples, 1981).

Age. The ubiquitous influence of age may be related to the psychological status of Black matrifocal families. The maturation of women over time is likely to be an attribute of primarily poor Black women (Amato & Partridge, 1987; Eichorn & Clausen, 1981; Moody, 1986) in the United States.

In the investigation conducted by Eichorn and Clausen (1981), women were studied beginning at the teenage years up to the early 50's. These authors found that over this particular period of time, the women became more assertive and more analytical. Such acquired attributes suggest that, in this sample, women developed psychological traits that were likely dormant or previously non-existent. It may be speculated that women become more androgynous over time. Androgyny is associated with optimal levels of self esteem (Bem, 1981; MacDonald, et al., 1987). In addition, Amato and Partridge (1987) discovered that the age of mothers tends to be related to the general health among all marital statuses. Moody (1986) asserts that older women often become more interested in personal growth than credentials and degrees that tends to preoccupy younger Black women.

As age increases there appears to be a burgeoning effect on the lifestyles of Black women. They have likely gone through experiences, accumulated more wisdom, and learned beneficial lessons from old mistakes, which leads

to better choices. Older women appear have more interest in personal and psychological development than younger women (Gibson, 1986; Moody, 1986).

Several researchers (Beauford & Walker, 1980; Gibson, 1986; MacDonald, et al., 1987) report that age is related to the psychological status of women. Gibson (1986) suggests that Black Americans who are older tend to experience fewer personal problems, fewer interpersonal problems, and less likely to experience a nervous breakdown. In conjunction, older Black Americans are less likely to commit suicide than younger Blacks and more likely to use prayer as a coping source to mediate tension (Gibson, 1986). Additionally, Black women have the lowest suicide rate of all races, socioeconomic and ethnic groups in the United States (Staples, 1981).

Broman (1988), in a sample of 2107 Black Americans found that older Blacks tended to be more satisfied with life than those who were younger. Although there was no breakdown of marital status or income types, the study, however, adds additional insight. Older women appear more adjusted to the social, economic, and political system in the United States. New methods of adapting to poverty, sexism and racism among older women are considered appreciable gains over young Black women. Accordingly, older women typically have completed much of their child bearing, attained more experiences in relationships and have likely established a larger and more stable support systems (Beauford & Walker, 1980; Hill, 1972; Scanzoni, 1971; Staples, 1981).

Education. Jeffries (1982-3) points out that during the past decade that the "most significant growth among Blacks in education was at the college level" (p. 10). He also stated that there was a 93% increase in enrollment, largely the result of Black women in the United States. Although more Black women are attending college at a higher rate than in the history of this country. Jeffries (1982-3) maintains that Black American are still underrepresented.

Purkey (1970) stated that educational achievements foster self-esteem. Education may also be viewed as having an ubiquitous positive effect on the family life of Black Americans. A direct consequence of education for most minorities is that it fosters the acculturation process into larger Anglo-oriented society (Staples, 1981). In addition, education provides persons with more personal and social options, employment opportunities, and enhances the ways in which individuals and groups may manipulate the environment, vis-a-vis, more control. In addition, Gilbert (1984) compared college and welfare samples of women and concluded that those women without college experience reported lower levels of self-esteem and less ego strengths than those who had some college experience. Broman (1988) found that Black Americans (N=2107) who were separated and better educated tended to report higher levels of life satisfaction than those who were poorly educated. Various findings throughout the literature suggest that education has had major positive impacts in the lives of Black Americans (Gilbert, 1984).



These impacts have not only been manifested in terms of social and economic gains, but they appear to have been also manifested in terms of psychological growth and development in many Black American families (Beauford & Walker, 1980; Jeffries, 1982-3; Purkey, 1970). Beauford and Walker (1980) found among 943 poor families in Georgia that alienation, powerlessness, helplessness, and dependency were negatively related to education. Higher educational attainments, at least at or above the high school level appears to be an important determinant of psychological well-ness (Demo & Parker, 1987; Jeffries, 1982-3). Education has been an important and reliable predictor of mental health, socioeconomic status, employment, and other important factors family life (Demo & Parker, 1987; Gilbert, 1984; Jeffries, 1982-3; Purkey, 1970; Scanzoni, 1971).

Education appeared to have played a chief role in the remediation of issues and problems related to the poor (Amato & Partridge, 1987; Beauford & Walker, 1980; Ensimer, 1980). According to Gilbert (1984) and Ensimer (1980) it appears that the higher the educational level of women, the less likely they will develop poor self-images and enter or remain in poverty. Jeffries (1982-3) argued, "If Blacks are to escape from poverty, economic distress, and social ostracism, they must become seriously involved in the education process" (p. 11). These researchers and authors convincingly argue that the most effective tool against many of the socioeconomic conditions in the United States is through the utilization of a modern need-centered psychoeducational program.

Counselee Orientation. Greenspan (1983), in A New Approach to Women and Therapy catalogued and indicated that most patients, and clients in the United States are women. Greenspan (1983) states that women represent about two-thirds of all adult counselees. Similarly, about 12 million of them who visit their medical physicians are referred to mental health professionals. Further, roughly 84% of all patients who seek treatment from private mental health professionals are women (Greenspan, 1983).

Greenspan (1983) attributes this plethora of women patient population to the sexist culture in America. She maintains that the symptoms are, primarily socially related. Perennially, women have been the larger sector of society who receive counseling in Western culture (Pakizegi, 1985; Schaef, 1981). Schaef strongly argues that women have "taught to be sick" by a white male oriented system (1981). Parenthetically, women often report more symptoms than do men, which may be indicative of openness regarding their personal affairs. There appears to be evidence, however, that women do discuss their personal affairs more often than men, subsequently leading to greater proportions of symptom reduction (Rossi, 1986). Rossi (1986) suggests that women seek out confidants such as relatives, friends, and children to express their more personal concerns. However, this assessment is likely more applicable to Blacks than whites. Whites tend to seek out more professionals than Black Americans (Colletta & Lee; 1983; Dillard, 1983).

In a longitudinal investigation, Bloom and Caldwell (1981) found more psychological maladjustments among women during premarital separation than men. However, during the post-separation period, men were more psychologically impaired than women, and more likely to be at a higher risk than women. These authors assert that women are more likely to admit more of their symptoms than men, and in conjunction seek counseling more often than men.

If these findings and speculations are accurate, women are more likely to seek counseling and more likely to benefit from the experience than men. Brown and Manela (1979) suggest that although women may need professional counseling, but may find self-help groups focused on their specific needs. Black Americans may elect this option first before seeking professional help (Dillard, 1983; Staples, 1981).

Interestingly, Gilbert (1984) developed a model to treat primarily poor women. She suggests that counseling may include "rap sessions", this informal type of counseling model is essentially "group therapy". Gilbert argues that mothers who are on welfare can learn and implement techniques that lead to reduction in tension, anxiety, and depression. In a similar vein, welfare women should be counseled to cope "with separation and surviving on welfare" (1984, p. 52). Although Black family dynamics appear to be changing, professional therapy has not been the traditional means by which most Black Americans have sought the alleviation of psychological symptoms. They have more often sought relatives, children or religious leaders (Dillard, 1983).

Religiosity. Religion has traditionally played a vital role in the lives of most Black American families. It has been found to be a major source of strength for many Blacks in the United States (Billingsley, 1968; Dillard, 1983; Symonds, 1969). Symonds (1969) suggests that Blacks tend to participate in religious activities to escape the rigors of an oppressive reality. Similarly Dillard comments

Religion is one of the fundamental strengths of American Blacks. Religion plays a significant role in the lives of most Black people, with the church functioning as the central meeting place in the community--the place to attain the emotional inspiration needed for adaptation to social and economic conditions (1983; p. 146).

Hill (1972) attributes religion as a strength that Black Americans relied heavily upon throughout American history. From slavery to the civil rights' movements in the decades of the 50's and 60's, religion and religious practices have provided Blacks with psychological benefits. Hill (1972) states, "religion served as a stimulant" (p. 146).

Interestingly, Idler (1987) found that religious involvement to be associated with decreases in physical and psychological risk factors. For example, Idler (1987) discovered that among an elderly sample, those who reported higher levels of religious involvement also reported higher levels of physical and mental health. Idler (1987) suggests that those persons who refrain from alcohol consumption, sexual coitus, tobacco usage, and similar behaviors tend to possess higher levels of health and depressive symptoms are markedly decreased.

In addition, Curran (1983) obtained data from 551 respondents relative to family strengths. Among 56 traits reported by these respondents, sharing religion ranked number 10. Curran points to the fact that many organized and non-organized religious groups acquire strengths as a result of some level of belief. A similar finding is reported by Stinnett, Walters and Kaye (1984).

Scanzoni (1971) argues that religion is not as widely practiced by Blacks today as was traditionally. However, religion appears to remain an intricate aspect of most Black Americans (Thompson, 1974). Scanzoni (1971) believes that religion has served the Black community as an instrument to create social cohesion and mutual support. Perhaps the first institution that Blacks have actually controlled was the Black church. This control likely yielded psychological benefits by the way of achieving recognition, power, and a sense of autonomy.

Thompson (1974) remarks, "Since perennially, the Black community has been powerless, next to the family the Black church has had the greatest influences in the social, cultural, and psychological maturation of Blacks" (p. 124). The ubiquitous and lasting effects of religious influence in the lives of Black Americans have affected most Blacks directly or indirectly (Bennett, 1962; Fraizer, 1948; Nobles, 1976; Staples, 1973; 1981). Religion seems to continue to provide Blacks with sources of hope, aspiration, escape from oppression, and provides most Blacks with vehicles for psychic development and expression.

## Conclusion

An attempt has been made to demonstrate that Black women who are primarily poor and head households do possess certain familial and personal characteristics that are related to specific psychological strengths, according to the literature. It must be pointed out that the historical experiences that Blacks have encountered have been influential and catalytic regarding the structural process and development of Black American families that have African origins (Bennett, 1962; DuBois, 1961).

Furthermore, the conditions of previous generations of Black Americans have been largely transmitted onto the contemporary Black family in the United States. Stages of transmissibility of personal and familial characteristics are clearly evidenced by a myriad of Black experiences in African and American antecedents. It is observed that the matrifocal structure is, in part, the result.

The historical issues that have thwarted family life are continuing to further fragment Black American families. Issues, such as poverty, racism, sexism, and other social and political injustices that Black families experience must be viewed as oppression. An oppressive environment in which Blacks must function continues to limit their familial development and undermines the ideology of the American family. In conjunction, Black matrifocal families that are poor, and lack availability to necessary assistance are at the greatest disadvantages, and will suffer the

greatest losses than any other major social and ethnic group in the United States (Nobles, 1976).

In addition, the literature has provided evidence that Black Americans who are poor do acquire certain psychological strengths through their family of origin, religiosity, children, age, education, and counselee orientation. These strengths may be viewed in terms of adaptations (Billingsley, 1968) to an inimical environment as opposed to weaknesses, pathologies and disorganization (Sarbin, 1970). Social and economic deprivity have perennially been the chief experiences of most Black families in the United States. Research has demonstrated, however, that certain strengths are found among the most deprived Black Americans. The Black poor matrifocal family in the United States continues to herald this fact by their continued existence and marginal gains with no appreciable acknowledgement from social scientists or students of family life (Billingsley, 1968; Hill, 1972; Staples, 1973; 1981; Willie; 1970).

## References

- Amato, P. & Partridge, S. (1987). Widows and Divorcees with Dependent Children: Material, Personal, Family, and Social Well-Being. Family Relations, 36, 316-320.
- Beauford, E. & Walker, M. (1980). Escape From Poverty: A Study of Social Structural and Psychological Factors that Facilitate Upward Mobility Among the Poor. Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D. C.
- Belle, D. (1982). Social Ties and Social Support. Lives in Stress: Woman and Depression. Beverly Hills: Sage Press.
- Bem, S. (1974). The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bennett, L. (1962). Before the Mayflower. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company.
- Berlin, I. (1974). Slaves without Masters. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Billingsley, A. (1968). Black Families in White America. New Jersey: Englewood-Cliffs.
- Bloom, B. L. & Clement, C. (1984). Marital and Sex Role Orientation and Adjustment to Separation and Divorce, Journal of Divorce, 7, 87-97.
- Broman, C. L. (1988). Satisfaction among Blacks: The Significance of Marriage and Parenthood. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 45-51.
- Brown, P. & Manela, R. (1979). Changing Family Roles: Woman and Divorce. Journal of Divorce, 1, 315-327.



- Colletta, N. & Lee, D. (1983). The Impact for Black Adolescent Mothers, Journal of Family Issues, 4, 107-127.
- Coopersmith, S. (1983). Self-Esteem Inventories. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Copeland, E. (1977). Counseling Black Women with Negative Self-Concepts, Personal and Guidance Journal, 55, 397-400.
- Crumidy, P. & Jacobziner, H. (1966). A Study of Young Married Mothers Who Kept Their Babies. American Journal of Public Health, 8, 1242-1251.
- Curran, D. (1983). Traits of a Healthy Family. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Demo, D. H. & Parker, K. (1987). Academic Achievement and Self-Esteem among Black and White College Students. The Journal of Social Psychology, 127, 345-355.
- Dickinson, N. (1986) Which Welfare Work Strategies Work? Social Work, 37, 266-272.
- Dillard, J. (1983). Multicultural Counseling. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1961). The Souls of Black Folk. Greenwich, Conn: Fawcett Publications, Inc.
- Eichorn, D. & Clausen, J. A. (1981). Present and Past in Middle Life. New York: Academic Press.
- Ensiminger, M. (1980). Welfare: Its Relationship to Social Origins, Personal and Family Characteristics. Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.

- Fine, M., Schwebel, A., & Myers, L. (1985). The Effects of World View on Adaptation to Single Parenthood Among Middle-Class Adult Women. Journal of Family Issues, 6, 107-127.
- Frazier, E. F. (1948). The Free Negro Family. New York: The University Press.
- Gove, W. R., Hughes, M., & Styles, C.B. (1977). The Effect of Children and Employment on the Mental Health of Married Men and Women. Social Forces, 56, 66-76.
- Gehblach, S. (1966). The Culture of Poverty among American Negroes. Institute for Research on Exceptional Children. University of Illinois.
- Gerstel, N., Reissman, C. K., & Rosenfield, S. (1985). Explaining the Symptomatology of Separated and Divorced Women and Men: The Role of Material Conditions and Social Networks. Social Forces, 64, 84-101.
- Gibson, R. C. (1986). Blacks in an Aging Society. Daedalus, 115, 349-471.
- Gilbert, C. (1984). Educating Welfare Women in College. De Anza College, University of Minnesota.
- Greenspan, M. (1983). A New Approach to Women and Therapy. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- Haley, A. (1976). Roots: The Saga of an American Family. New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Hays, W. & Mindel, C. (1983). Extended Kinship Relations in Black and White Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 2, 52-57.

- Hill, R. (1972). The Strengths of Black Families. New York: Emerson Hall, Publishers.
- Idler, E. L. (1987). Religious Involvement and the Health of the Elderly: Some Hypotheses and an Initial Test. Social Forces, 66, 226-238.
- Jeffries & Associates, Inc. (1982-83). Facts about Blacks. Los Angeles: Jeffries & Associates, Inc., Publication.
- Jones, W. & Rice, M. (1987). Health Care Issues in Black America. New York: Breenwood Press.
- Kardiner, A. & Ovesey, L. (1951). The Mark of Oppression. Cleveland: Merdan Books.
- Kniesner, T. (1970). Family Structure, Race, and the Feminization of Poverty. Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
- Lewis, O. (1966). The Culture of Poverty. Scientific American. 215, 19-25.
- Limmer, R. (1978). How Well are we Housed? Female Headed Households. Washington, D. C. Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Lindblad-Goldberg, M. & Dukes, J. L. (1985). Social Support Black Low-income, Single-parent Families. Normative and Dysfunctional Patterns. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 55, 42-58.
- Lubin, B. (1981). Manual for Depression Adjective Checklist. San Diego: Edits.
- Maslow, A. (1951). Motivation & Personality. New York: Harper & Row.

- MacDonald, N. E., Ebert, P. D. & Mason, S. E. (1987).  
Marital Status and Age as Related to Masculine and  
Feminine Personality Dimension, and Self-Esteem.  
Journal of Social Psychology, 127, 289-298.
- Martin, E. & Martin, J. (1978). The Black Extended Family.  
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- McAdoo, H. (1978). Factors Related to Stability in  
Upward Mobile Black Families. Journal of Marriage  
and the Family, 40, 761-776.
- Moody, H. R. (1986). Education in an Aging Society.  
Daedalus, 115, 191-210.
- Moore, R. (1986). The Androgynous Black Parent: One  
Answer to the Single Parent Dilemma. Paper presented  
at the Annual Convention of the American Association  
for Counseling and Development.
- Moynihan, D. P. (1965). The Negro Family: The Case for  
National Action. Washington, D. C., United States  
Printing Office.
- Nobles, W. (1976). A Formulative and Empirical Study of  
Black Families. Report submitted to the United States  
Department of HEW, Office of Child  
Development (Contract 90-C-255).
- Osmond, M. & Grigg, C. (1975). Family Linked Character-  
istics of Poverty. Presented at the Annual Meeting  
of the American Sociological Association, San  
Francisco.
- Pakizegi, B. (1985). Internalization of Sexism, Racism and

- Classism in Damaged Parenting: A Developmental Dialectical Model. Paper presented at the Association for Women in Psychological Conference. New York: March, 1985.
- Pettigrew, T. (1964). A Profile of the Negro American. New York: Van Nostrand Company.
- Purkey, W. W. (1970). Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Rainwater, L. (1966). Crucible of Identity: The Lower-Class Negro Family. Daedalus, 95, 172-216.
- Rossi, A. S. (1986). Sex and Gender in an Aging Society. Daedalus, 115, 141-169.
- Salkind, N. J. & Ambrose, S. R. (1987). Child Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sarbin, T. (1970). The Culture of Poverty, Social Identity, and Cognitions Outcomes. Psychological Factors in Poverty. Chicago: Marham Publishing.
- Scanzoni, J. (1971). The Black Family in Modern Society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schaef, A. W. (1981). Women's Reality. Minneapolis: Winston Press, Inc.
- Smith, E. (1977). Counseling Black Individuals: Some Stereotypes. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 6, 390-396.
- Spielberger, C. (1983). State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Staples, R. (1973). The Black Women in America. Chicago: Nelson Hall Publishers.
- Staples, R. (1981). The World of Black Singles. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.
- Stinnett, N., Walters, J. & Kaye, E. (1984). Relationships in Marriage and the Family. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Symonds, J. (1969). Culture Differences and Social Class in the Negro Community. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged, Department of HEW, Washington, D. C.
- Taylor, R. (1976). Black Youth and Psychological Development, Journal of Black Studies, 6, 353-372.
- Thompson, E. (1980). The Value of Employment to Mothers of Young Children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 551-566.
- United States Department of Labor (1985a). Advances for Women Through Federal Legislation During the United Nations Decade for Women, 1976-1987. Facts on United States Working Women.
- United States Department of Labor (1985b). Black Women in the Labor Force, Facts on United States Working Women.
- United States Department of Labor (1980). Brief Highlights of Major Federal Laws on Sex Discrimination in Employment, Women's Bureau, Washington, D. C.
- Whalen, M. (1978). Women, the Poorer Sex. National Council on Women, Work, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.

Willie, C. (1970). The Family Life of Black People.

Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing  
Company.

Wodarski, J., Parham, T., Lindsey, E., & Blackburn, B.

(1986). Reagan's AFDC Policy Changes: The Georgia  
Experience, Social Work, 273-279.

**APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENTS**

Depression Adjective Checklist  
State-Trait Anxiety Inventories  
Self-Esteem Inventory  
Questionnaire



### The Depression Adjective Checklist

The Depression Adjective Checklist (DACL) was developed by Lubin (1981). The DACL is designed to be a self-administered instrument that measures "mood" states. Reliability coefficients are reported by Lubin to range from .83 to .92 for males and .80 to .93 for females (p. 10).

The DACL is composed of 32 items. Twenty-two items are positive adjectives and ten of them are negative. The DACL has been used by a diversified sampling of subjects, e.g., normal male and female, and psychiatric patients. Also, Lubin reported concurrent validity significant at the .01 level with subscales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Beck Depression Inventory (p. 25).

Lubin further states that the DACL is suitable for subjects with at least an eighth grade reading level. Lubin also reported that education and depression is consistently inversely related (from 8 to 19 years of education, respectively).

# CHECK LIST

DACL FORM C

By Bernard Lubin

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Highest grade completed in school \_\_\_\_\_

**DIRECTIONS:** Below you will find words which describe different kinds of moods and feelings. Check the words which describe How You Feel Now -- Today. Some of the words may sound alike, but we want you to check all the words that describe your feelings. Work rapidly and check all of the words which describe how you feel today.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Cheerless   | 17. <input type="checkbox"/> Buoyant     |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Animated    | 18. <input type="checkbox"/> Tormented   |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Blue        | 19. <input type="checkbox"/> Weak        |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Lost        | 20. <input type="checkbox"/> Optimistic  |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Dejected    | 21. <input type="checkbox"/> Low         |
| 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy     | 22. <input type="checkbox"/> Deserted    |
| 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Discouraged | 23. <input type="checkbox"/> Burdened    |
| 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Bad         | 24. <input type="checkbox"/> Wonderful   |
| 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Despondent  | 25. <input type="checkbox"/> Crushed     |
| 10. <input type="checkbox"/> Free       | 26. <input type="checkbox"/> Somber      |
| 11. <input type="checkbox"/> Despairing | 27. <input type="checkbox"/> Interested  |
| 12. <input type="checkbox"/> Uneasy     | 28. <input type="checkbox"/> Joyless     |
| 13. <input type="checkbox"/> Peaceful   | 29. <input type="checkbox"/> Crestfallen |
| 14. <input type="checkbox"/> Grim       | 30. <input type="checkbox"/> Lucky       |
| 15. <input type="checkbox"/> Distressed | 31. <input type="checkbox"/> Chained     |
| 16. <input type="checkbox"/> Whole      | 32. <input type="checkbox"/> Pessimistic |

### The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), developed by Spielberger (1983) has been widely used in research and in clinical settings. Spielberger states that the STAI has been used in over 2,000 studies that include, "medicine, dentistry, education, psychology, and other social sciences" (1983, p. 2).

The instrument is designed to assess state and trait anxiety levels. According to Spielberger, state anxiety is described as an "emotional state . . . at a given moment in time and at a particular level of intensity" (p. 1). Trait anxiety is understood and defined by inherent predispositions within the personality. It is relative to one's world view, likely stemming from childhood.

Spielberger (1983) reported reliability coefficients based on a sample of 210 females from ages 19 to 39 at .93 for state-anxiety and .92 for trait-anxiety. On two other samples of adults with age range of 40 to 49 years of age; and ages 50 to 69 years of age, both state and trait reliability coefficients ranged from .89 to .94.

The questionnaire consists of 40 statements. Items are designed to elicit reports from respondents as to how they feel "right now" (state) and how they "generally feel" (trait). Spielberger also reported correlations of the STAI and the Mooney Problem Checklist on two samples. Among several problem area, "Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment" and the STAI was significantly correlated at .01 and .05 levels.

# SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by Charles D. Spielberger  
in collaboration with  
R. L. Gorsuch, R. Lushene, P. R. Vagg, and G. A. Jacobs

STAI Form Y-1

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ S \_\_\_\_\_

Age \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ T \_\_\_\_\_

**DIRECTIONS:** A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then blacken in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement to indicate how you feel *right now*, that is, *at this moment*. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe your present feelings best.

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I feel calm .....                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. I feel secure .....                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. I am tense .....  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. I feel strained .....                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. I feel at ease .....                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. I feel upset .....                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes ..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. I feel satisfied .....                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. I feel frightened .....                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. I feel comfortable .....                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. I feel self-confident .....                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. I feel nervous .....                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. I am jittery .....                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. I feel indecisive .....                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. I am relaxed .....                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. I feel content .....                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. I am worried .....                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. I feel confused .....                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. I feel steady .....                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. I feel pleasant .....                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

VERY MUCH SO  
MODERATELY SO  
SOMEWHAT  
NOT AT ALL

## SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

STAI Form V-2

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then blacken in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement to indicate how you *generally* feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel.

ALMOST NEVER  
SOMETIMES  
ALMOST ALWAYS  
OFTEN

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. I feel pleasant .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. I feel nervous and restless .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. I feel satisfied with myself .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. I feel like a failure .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. I feel rested .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27. I am "calm, cool, and collected" .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28. I feel that difficulties are piling up so that I cannot overcome them .....                      | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. I worry too much over something that really doesn't matter .....                                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. I am happy .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31. I have disturbing thoughts .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32. I lack self-confidence .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33. I feel secure .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34. I make decisions easily .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35. I feel inadequate .....  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36. I am content .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37. Some unimportant thought runs through my mind and bothers me .....                               | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38. I take disappointments so keenly that I can't put them out of my<br>mind .....                   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39. I am a steady person .....   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40. I get in a state of tension or turmoil as I think over my recent concerns<br>and interests ..... | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

### Self-Esteem Inventory

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) (1983) has been widely used over 20 years. The SEI assesses attitudes, values, and beliefs according to the author. The adult form consists of 25 items composed of short statements which ask subjects to choose the statements that are "like me or unlike me."

The SEI is self-administered in design and is suited to be used in an interview. It has been extensively used with a cross section of children but not as widely with adults. The author (1983) states that "all socioeconomic groups are represented" (p. 12).

Using Cronbach Alpha, Coopersmith reports reliability ranges from .78 to .85 on an adult population with an age range from 20-34 years of age. Cronbach Alpha reliabilities are reported for Blacks: .79 for males and .83 for females. Coopersmith (1983) reports construct validity based on two large samples of 7600 school children, grades 4 through 8. He reports concurrent validity based upon previous research using the SEI and the SRA Achievement Series; the SEI and the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, and obtained significant correlation coefficients at .01 levels. Coopersmith reports predictive validity with the SEI and subscales of the Miller's Analogy Test that indicated a correlation at the .01 level.

ADULT FORM

SEI

# Coopersmith Inventory

Stanley Coopersmith, Ph.D.  
University of California at Davis

Please Print

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: M \_\_\_ F \_\_\_

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Directions

On the other side of this form, you will find a list of statements about feelings. If a statement describes how you usually feel, put an X in the column "Like Me." If a statement does not describe how you usually feel, put an X in the column "Unlike Me." There are no right or wrong answers. Begin at the top of the page and mark all 25 statements.

	x4 =	
--	------	--



Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.  
577 College Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306

- | Like<br>Me               | Unlike<br>Me             |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Things usually don't bother me.                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. I find it very hard to talk in front of a group.             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. I'm a lot of fun to be with.                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. I get upset easily at home.                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. I'm popular with persons my own age.                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. My family usually considers my feelings.                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. I give in very easily.                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. My family expects too much of me.                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. It's pretty tough to be me.                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Things are all mixed up in my life.                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. People usually follow my ideas.                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. I have a low opinion of myself.                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. There are many times when I would like to leave home.       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. I often feel upset with my work.                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. I'm not as nice looking as most people.                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. If I have something to say, I usually say it.               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 20. My family understands me.                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 21. Most people are better liked than I am.                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 22. I usually feel as if my family is pushing me.               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 23. I often get discouraged with what I am doing.               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 24. I often wish I were someone else.                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 25. I can't be depended on.                                     |



## THE STRENGTH OF BLACK FAMILIES

The interviewer will ask the participants to respond to the following questions:

- 1) What is your date of birth?    Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 2) What is your marital status? How long in this status?
  - 1) Single, never married                    a) \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2) Married, but separated                    a) \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) Divorced                                    a) \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) Legally separated                        a) \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5) Widowed                                    a) \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 3) What is your highest level of education completed?
  - 1) 0-8 years    \_\_\_
  - 2) 9-12 years    \_\_\_
  - 3) 13-14 years    \_\_\_
  - 4) 15-16 years    \_\_\_
  - 5) Above 16    \_\_\_
  
- 4) What was mostly the racial background of your community that you grew up in?
 

a) Mostly White \_\_\_\_\_ (1)    b) Mostly Mixed \_\_\_\_\_ (2)    c) Mostly Black \_\_\_\_\_ (3)
  
- 5) During your school years, what race were most of the teachers that taught you in elementary school: a) Mostly White \_\_ (1)    b) Mostly Mixed \_\_ (2)
 

c) Mostly Black \_\_ (3)

Highschool? a) \_\_\_ b) \_\_\_ c) \_\_\_\_\_ (same code)

6) The school(s) that you attended, what was the race of most of the students in elementary school?

a) Mostly White\_\_ (1) b) Mostly Mixed \_\_ (2) c) Mostly Black\_\_ (3) in High School?

a) \_\_\_\_ b) \_\_\_\_ c) \_\_\_\_

7) What is your MAIN source of income that supports you and your family?

a) AFDC or ADC\_\_ b) Social Security\_\_ c) Child Support\_\_

d) Employment\_\_ What is your occupation? \_\_\_\_\_ (if applicable)

8) What is your religious preference or denomination?

a) \_\_\_\_\_

9) When you think about being religious or spiritual, how religious or spiritual would you say that you are?

Very Religious      Somewhat Religious      Not too Religious      Not at all Religious  
4                                      3                                      2                                      1

(Circle one)(Code by weight)

10) Tell me the ages of all the people living in this apartment with you, and their relationship to you. (example: son, nephew, brother)

	<u>Relationship</u>	<u>Age</u>
1)	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____
3)	_____	_____
4)	_____	_____
5)	_____	_____
6)	_____	_____
7)	_____	_____

11) How long have you lived in this :

12) There are times in our lives that we need professional advice about personal problems. Would you go to a counselor, therapists, psychologist, or some other professional to talk about a special problem?

a) No     <sub>1</sub>      b) Uncertain     <sub>2</sub>      c) Yes     <sub>3</sub>

13) Have you ever received counseling for some personal problem?

a) No     <sub>1</sub>                      Yes     <sub>2</sub>

14) Are you presently receiving counseling?

a) No     <sub>1</sub>                      Yes     <sub>2</sub>

15) If presently receiving counseling, how long have you been in counseling?

a) Weeks           b) Months           c) Years     

(Estimate the number of sessions)     

16) What do you feel to be your strengths as a Black woman?

(Summarize and record the general theme)

a) \_\_\_\_\_

b) \_\_\_\_\_

c) \_\_\_\_\_

d) \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C - RAW DATA

V1A	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8	V9	V10	V11	V12	V13	V14	V15	V16	V17	V18	V19	V20	V21	V22	V23	V24
1	31	1	13	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	3	2	6	15	29	1	1	1	0	4	24	30	92
2	35	3	14	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	4	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	17	26	44	52
3	48	1	12	3	3	3	3	3	0	1	3	0	6	41	41	1	1	1	0	6	35	33	72
4	33	1	13	3	3	2	3	2	1	3	4	5	1	21	32	2	2	1	0	1	25	37	84
5	29	4	11	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	5	5	21	2	2	2	0	7	32	50	60
6	35	3	14	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	4	2	13	13	30	2	1	1	0	4	50	52	48
7	38	2	12	3	3	2	3	2	4	7	4	4	1	6	36	2	2	1	0	2	45	37	84
8	18	1	12	3	1	1	3	2	1	6	4	1	9	9	18	1	2	1	0	22	60	66	28
9	36	2	12	3	3	1	3	2	4	6	3	7	7	12	33	2	2	2	0	24	61	64	36
10	26	2	11	3	3	2	3	3	1	4	1	7	1	10	25	2	1	1	0	15	59	65	44
11	23	2	13	3	3	3	1	3	2	1	1	4	5	23	23	2	1	1	0	12	46	46	76
12	33	3	11	3	3	1	3	1	4	1	2	0	2	27	32	1	1	1	0	10	35	40	48
13	39	3	16	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	12	7	19	2	1	1	0	5	29	36	72
14	28	1	11	3	1	1	3	3	1	4	2	4	1	27	27	2	1	1	0	8	52	47	64
15	24	1	14	3	2	1	3	1	4	1	3	1	2	23	23	2	1	1	0	2	36	40	64
16	28	1	10	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	26	26	2	2	1	0	14	40	50	40
17	33	1	12	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	4	2	2	10	31	2	1	1	0	9	55	39	76
18	34	3	13	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	3	3	8	14	14	1	1	1	0	0	23	25	99
19	27	2	13	3	3	3	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	23	23	2	1	1	0	5	32	32	72
20	19	1	13	3	2	2	3	3	1	5	1	2	1	18	18	2	1	1	0	4	33	40	72
21	28	1	9	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	4	1	27	27	2	1	1	0	3	23	35	92
22	32	1	11	3	3	1	3	2	4	1	4	4	1	30	30	2	1	1	0	3	34	32	88
23	36	1	11	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	2	5	35	35	2	1	1	0	9	37	57	28
24	45	3	10	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	43	43	2	1	1	0	2	23	20	76
25	25	2	12	3	1	3	2	2	1	5	2	1	0	5	21	2	1	1	1	22	36	48	44
26	31	1	11	2	1	2	2	3	0	1	4	1	15	15	17	2	2	1	0	0	29	27	72
27	23	1	13	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	4	3	21	21	1	1	1	0	1	33	38	88
28	35	1	9	2	3	2	3	3	1	1	3	3	6	34	34	2	2	1	0	7	46	51	52
29	41	3	16	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	41	41	2	1	1	0	3	38	40	88
30	21	2	12	3	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	0	21	21	2	2	1	1	16	51	54	56
31	20	1	11	3	2	3	3	3	0	7	1	3	5	19	19	1	1	1	0	6	26	47	56
32	20	1	13	3	3	3	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	27	27	2	1	1	0	11	42	25	52
33	26	1	14	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	0	24	24	2	2	1	0	2	32	25	88
34	27	1	13	3	3	2	3	2	1	7	3	3	3	20	20	1	1	1	0	2	30	25	88
35	20	1	12	3	3	2	3	2	1	7	2	3	0	6	11	2	1	1	0	8	42	45	48
36	21	1	12	3	2	1	3	2	4	1	3	0	1	20	20	1	1	1	0	12	42	61	52
37	32	1	11	3	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	3	1	32	32	2	2	1	0	3	25	32	56
38	43	3	12	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	4	2	2	24	41	2	2	2	0	7	34	57	60
39	31	2	11	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	3	2	1	3	25	2	2	1	0	5	38	45	68
40	29	3	13	3	2	2	3	2	1	6	4	3	0	28	28	1	1	1	0	2	29	35	76
41	35	1	13	3	3	2	3	2	0	1	4	2	2	35	35	2	1	1	0	4	62	41	76
42	43	2	10	2	1	3	2	3	1	7	3	7	2	32	42	1	1	1	0	5	27	39	76
43	33	1	12	3	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	17	17	2	1	1	0	15	55	42	64
44	28	1	11	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	3	1	27	27	2	1	1	0	4	40	42	88
45	33	1	12	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	2	4	2	31	31	2	1	1	0	12	53	62	52
46	22	1	10	3	3	2	2	2	4	1	3	5	1	27	27	2	1	1	0	14	47	57	36
47	35	1	13	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	3	4	0	27	27	2	2	1	0	7	44	40	48
48	27	2	11	3	3	2	2	3	4	1	2	5	1	15	25	1	1	1	0	9	45	52	48
49	24	1	13	3	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	17	23	23	1	1	1	0	12	33	41	68
50	25	1	10	3	2	2	2	2	1	5	2	2	2	5	5	2	1	1	0	8	39	44	40

NUMBER OF CASES READ = 50 NUMBER OF CASES LISTED = 50

0130 5113 011113413026 0015 029 011104243092  
0234 6314 033332114011 501 501 5011117264452  
0347 7112 033333013006 0041 041 011106353372  
0432 9113 033232134051 0021 032 022101253784  
0528 5211 031123112025 005 0021 022207325060  
0635 1314 0333334240213 013 030 021104505248  
0737 9212 033232474040 506 0036 022102453784  
0818 2112 031132164019 009 0018 012122606628  
0935 6212 033132463077 0012 033 022224616436  
1025 8211 033233141070 5010 025 021115596544

1123 3213 0333132110405 023 023 021112464676  
1232 6311 0331314120002 027 032 011110354048  
1339 3315 5333331130312 007 019 021105293672  
1417 8111 031133142040 5027 027 021108524764  
1524 1114 032131413011 5023 023 021102364064  
1627 6110 031113111030 5026 026 022114405040  
1732 5112 0111110140202 010 031 021109553976  
1834 0313 0111114230308 014 014 011100232599  
1926 6213 0333231130101 023 023 021105323272  
2018 9113 0322331510201 018 018 021104334072  
2127 8109 0322221120401 027 027 021103233592  
2231 6111 0331324140401 030 030 021103343288  
2336 0111 033333112024 5035 035 021109375728  
2444 6310 0333334340403 043 043 021102232076  
2525 0212 031322152010 2505 021 021122364844  
2631 0111 0212230140115 015 017 022100292772  
2722 6112 5311112140403 021 021 011101333888  
2834 8109 0232331130306 034 034 022107465152  
2941 4316 033333113030 7541 041 021103384088  
3021 2212 031323112020 2521 021 022116515456

3119 5111 0323330710305 019 019 011106264756  
3219 5113 0333231130202 027 027 021111422552  
3325 6114 031131113010 2524 024 022102322588  
3426 6113 0332321730303 020 020 011102302588  
3520 2112 033232172030 2506 011 012108424548  
3620 8112 0321324130001 020 020 011112126152  
3732 2111 033233123030 5032 032 022103253256  
3842 5312 033232214021 5024 041 022207345760  
3930 5211 0122311130201 003 025 022105384568  
4029 0313 032232164030 2528 028 011102293576  
4135 2113 0332320140202 035 035 021104624176  
4242 5210 0213231730702 032 042 011105273976  
4332 5112 031111151020 5017 017 021115554264  
4427 6111 033333112030 5027 027 021104404288  
4533 1112 0332332120402 031 031 021112536252  
4622 1110 0332224130501 027 027 021114475736  
4734 6113 011213113040 1027 027 022107444048  
4826 6211 0332234120501 015 025 011109455248  
4924 0113 0313331120117 023 023 011112334168  
5024 8110 032222152021 5005 005 021108394440



## APPENDIX D - SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF AGE BY SELF-ESTEEM

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	322.5800	322.5800	.9512	.3343
WITHIN GROUPS	48	16277.4400	339.1133		
TOTAL	49	16600.0200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
BELOW 30	25	61.6000	18.6548	3.7310
ABOVE 30	25	66.6800	18.1721	3.6344
TOTAL	50	64.1400	18.4059	2.6030

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF AGE BY TRAIT ANXIETY

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	154.8800	154.8800	1.2067	.2775
WITHIN GROUPS	48	6160.6400	128.3467		
TOTAL	49	6315.5200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
BELOW 30	25	44.4000	11.4091	2.2818
ABOVE 30	25	40.8800	11.2484	2.2497
TOTAL	50	42.6400	11.3529	1.6055

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF AGE BY STATE-ANXIETY

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	14.5800	14.5800	.1192	.7314
WITHIN GROUPS	48	5872.6400	122.3467		
TOTAL	49	5887.2200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
BELOW 30	25	39.2000	9.5960	1.9192
ABOVE 30	25	38.1200	12.3535	2.4707
TOTAL	50	38.6600	10.9612	1.5501

GROUPS t-TEST FOR BELOW AND ABOVE  
TWO CHILDREN BY SELF-ESTEEM

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	611.5200	611.5200	1.8359	.1818
WITHIN GROUPS	48	15988.5000	333.0937		
TOTAL	49	16600.0200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
BELOW 2	24	60.5000	16.4845	3.3649
ABOVE 2	26	67.5000	19.7368	3.8707
TOTAL	50	64.1400	18.4059	2.6030

GROUPS t-TEST FOR BELOW AND ABOVE  
TWO CHILDREN BY TRAIT ANXIETY

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	7.4463	7.4463	.0567	.8129
WITHIN GROUPS	48	6308.0737	131.4182		
TOTAL	49	6315.5200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
BELOW 2	24	43.0417	11.1764	2.2814
ABOVE 2	26	42.2692	11.7220	2.2989
TOTAL	50	42.6400	11.3529	1.6055

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
RELIGIOSITY BY DEPRESSION

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	193.1486	193.1486	6.1181	.0170
WITHIN GROUPS	48	1515.3514	31.5698		
TOTAL	49	1708.5000			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
LOW	19	10.2105	4.8141	1.104
HIGH	31	6.1613	6.0504	1.087
TOTAL	50	8.1859	5.432	1.095

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF EDUCATION  
BY DEPRESSION

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	198.0382	198.0382	6.2933	.0155
WITHIN GROUPS	48	1510.4618	31.4680		
TOTAL	49	1708.5000			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
LOW	31	9.2581	6.1317	1.1013
HIGH	19	5.1579	4.6099	1.0576
TOTAL	50	7.7000	5.9049	.8351



GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
RELIGIOSITY BY SELF-ESTEEM

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	1449.2390	1449.2390	4.59	.0372
WITHIN GROUPS	48	15150.7810	315.6413		
TOTAL	49	16600.0200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
LOW	19	57.2632	16.7090	3.833
HIGH	31	68.3548	18.3715	3.300
TOTAL	50	62.8090	17.5389	3.566

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF EDUCATION  
BY TRAIT-ANXIETY

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	1185.2110	1185.2110	11.0890	.0017
WITHIN GROUPS	48	5130.3090	106.8814		
TOTAL	49	6315.5200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
LOW	31	46.4516	11.6300	2.0888
HIGH	19	36.4211	7.7195	1.7710
TOTAL	50	42.6400	11.3529	1.6055

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
RELIGIOSITY BY TRAIT-ANXIETY

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	796.0939	796.0939	6.9233	.0114
WITHIN GROUPS	48	5519.4261	114.9880		
TOTAL	49	6315.5200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
LOW	19	47.7368	7.723	1.772
HIGH	31	39.5161	12.173	2.186
TOTAL	50	43.6264	9.948	1.979

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF EDUCATION  
BY SELF-ESTEEM

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	2884.6550	2884.6500	10.0955	.0026
WITHIN GROUPS	48	13713.3650	285.7368		
TOTAL	49	16598.0200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
LOW	31	58.1935	17.7039	3.1797
HIGH	19	73.8421	15.4785	3.5510
TOTAL	50	64.1400	18.4059	2.6030

GROUPS t-TEST FOR HIGH AND LOW  
YEARS OF AGE BY DEPRESSION

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB
BETWEEN GROUPS	1	64.9800	64.9800	1.8978	.1747
WITHIN GROUPS	48	1643.5200	34.2400		
TOTAL	49	1708.5000			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
BELOW 30	25	8.8400	6.0600	1.2120
ABOVE 30	25	6.5600	5.6353	1.1271
TOTAL	50	7.7000	5.9049	.8351

## LISTWISE DELETION OF MISSING DATA

EQUATION NUMBER 1    DEPENDENT VARIABLE    V22    STA ANX SCOR

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 1    METHOD: ENTER

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER	1..	V16	TIM/LIV/OK
	2..	V7	RAC/BACGR/TE/HIG
	3..	V12	RELIGIOUSITY
	4..	V2	AGE
	5..	V15	TIM/LIV/TUL

MULTIPLE R	.39311	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.15453		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.05846	REGRESSION	5	909.76594	181.95319
STANDARD ERROR	10.63597	RESIDUAL	44	4977.45406	113.12396
		F *	1.60844	SIGNIF F *	.1778

## ----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V16	.630243	.207431	.507488	2.193	.0337
V7	-2.117588	1.997825	-.153613	-1.060	.2950
V12	-1.667925	1.727360	-.149219	-.966	.3395
V2	-.412749	.295582	-.268314	-1.396	.1696
V15	-.331001	.201789	-.318907	-1.640	.1081
(CONSTANT)	50.468236	7.502108		6.727	.0000

END BLOCK NUMBER 1    ALL REQUESTED VARIABLES ENTERED

## \* \* \* \* \* M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N \* \* \* \* \*

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V22 STA ANX SCOR

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 2. METHOD: BACKWARD

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 6.. V12 RELIGIOUSITY

MULTIPLE R	.36962	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.13662	REGRESSION	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.05987	RESIDUAL	4	804.29276	201.07319
STANDARD ERROR	10.62798		45	5082.92724	112.95394
		F =	1.78013	SIGNIF F =	.1495

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V16	.604100	.285938	.486437	2.113	.0402
V7	-1.837554	1.975178	-.133299	-.930	.3572
V2	-.502237	.280466	-.326486	-1.791	.0801
V15	-.307763	.200198	-.296518	-1.537	.1312
(CONSTANT)	48.174765	7.110834		6.775	.0000

----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V12	-.149219	-.144050	.358710	-.966	.3395

\* \* \* \* \*

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 7.. V7 RAC/BACGR/TE/HIG

MULTIPLE R	.34643	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.12001	REGRESSION	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.06262	RESIDUAL	3	706.53092	235.51031
STANDARD ERROR	10.61243		46	5180.68908	112.62368
		F =	2.09113	SIGNIF F =	.1144

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V16	.630728	.284085	.507878	2.220	.0314
V2	-.546006	.276087	-.354939	-1.978	.0540
V15	-.339688	.196947	-.327276	-1.725	.0913
(CONSTANT)	45.751032	6.606708		6.925	.0000

----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V12	-.125441	-.121232	.361316	-.819	.4169
V7	-.133299	-.137370	.361921	-.930	.3572

\*\*\*\*\* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \*\*\*\*\*

LISTWISE DELETION OF MISSING DATA

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V24 SELFEST SCOR

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 1. METHOD: ENTER

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER

1..	V12	RELIGIOUSITY
2..	V19	COONSELING NOW
3..	V6	RAC/BACGR/TE/ELEM
4..	V4	YRSED
5..	V2	AGE

MULTIPLE R	.46020	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE		
R SQUARE	.21178		DF	SUM OF SQUARES
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.12221	REGRESSION	5	3515.54713
STANDARD ERROR	17.24455	RESIDUAL	44	13084.47287
				MEAN SQUARE
				703.10943
				297.37438

F = 2.36439 SIGNIF F = .0551

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V12	2.840849	2.828593	.151355	1.004	.3207
V19	-15.845789	10.505431	-.206530	-1.508	.1386
V6	-3.907199	2.841683	-.191797	-1.375	.1761
V4	2.812120	1.732350	.225245	1.623	.1117
V2	.635708	.397256	.246102	1.600	.1167
(CONSTANT)	28.888923	24.737385		1.168	.2492

END BLOCK NUMBER 1 ALL REQUESTED VARIABLES ENTERED.



\*\*\*\*\* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \*\*\*\*\*

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V24 SELFEST SCOR

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 8.. V19 COUNSELING NOW

MULTIPLE R	.34679	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.12026		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.08283	REGRESSION	2	1996.40046	998.20023
STANDARD ERROR	17.62712	RESIDUAL	47	14603.61954	310.71531

F = 3.21259 SIGNIF F = .0492

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----						----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----					
VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T	VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V4	3.305005	1.710543	.264724	1.932	.0594	V6	-.188108	-.192455	.920871	-1.330	.1900
V2	.543109	.353913	.210254	1.535	.1316	V19	-.203919	-.212543	.955719	-1.475	.1470
(CONSTANT)	8.198627	22.731465		.361	.7200	V12	.151109	.143086	.788794	.981	.3319

\*\*\*\*\*

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 9.. V2 AGE

MULTIPLE R	.27602	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.07619		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.05694	REGRESSION	1	1264.68545	1264.68545
STANDARD ERROR	17.87418	RESIDUAL	48	15335.33455	319.48614

F = 3.95850 SIGNIF F = .0523

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----						----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----					
VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T	VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V4	3.446009	1.732013	.276018	1.990	.0523	V2	.210254	.218436	.997115	1.535	.1316
(CONSTANT)	22.787887	20.937311		1.088	.2819	V6	-.116018	-.120481	.996244	-.832	.4096
						V19	-.152912	-.158827	.996670	-1.103	.2757
						V12	.213590	.215336	.938973	1.512	.1373

END BLOCK NUMBER 2 POUT = .100 LIMITS REACHED.

\*\*\*\*\* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \*\*\*\*\*

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V24 SELFEST SCOR

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 2. METHOD: BACKWARD

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 6.. V12 RELIGIOUSITY

MULTIPLE R	.44013	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.19371		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.12204	REGRESSION	4	3215.59024	803.89756
STANDARD ERROR	17.24621	RESIDUAL	45	13384.42976	297.43177
		F =	2.70280	SIGNIF F =	.0422

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----					----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----						
VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T	VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V19	-15.865997	10.506425	-.206794	-1.510	.1380	V12	.151355	.149703	.757425	1.004	.3207
V6	-3.897739	2.841942	-.191332	-1.372	.1770						
V4	3.239038	1.679551	.259440	1.929	.0601						
V2	.787246	.367522	.304767	2.142	.0376						
(CONSTANT)	27.064451	24.672973		1.097	.2785						

\*\*\*\*\*

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 7.. V6 RAC/BACGR/TE/ELEM

MULTIPLE R	.40001	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.16001		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.10522	REGRESSION	3	2656.11307	885.37102
STANDARD ERROR	17.41058	RESIDUAL	46	13943.90693	303.12841
		F =	2.92078	SIGNIF F =	.0439

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----					----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----						
VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T	VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V19	-15.645441	10.605319	-.203919	-1.475	.1470	V6	-.191332	-.200308	.885111	-1.372	.1770
V4	3.130385	1.693672	.250737	1.848	.0710	V12	.150668	.146004	.788791	.990	.3275
V2	.649858	.356977	.251580	1.820	.0752						
(CONSTANT)	23.678114	24.783097		.955	.3444						

## \* \* \* \* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \* \* \* \*

## LISTWISE DELETION OF MISSING DATA

EQUATION NUMBER 1    DEPENDENT VARIABLE..    V23    TRA ANX SCOR

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 1.    METHOD:    ENTER

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER	1..	V12	RELIGIOUSITY
	2..	V19	COUNSELING NOW
	3..	V13	NO CHILD
	4..	V2	AGE

MULTIPLE R	.49751
R SQUARE	.24752
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.18063
STANDARD ERROR	10.27652

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
REGRESSION	4	1563.20859	390.80215
RESIDUAL	45	4752.31141	105.60692

F =            3.70054            SIGNIF F = .0109

## ----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V12	-2.581581	1.653012	-.222989	-1.562	.1254
V19	16.971164	6.282452	.358618	2.701	.0097
V13	.942975	.897470	.139684	1.051	.2990
V2	-.325708	.232313	-.204426	-1.402	.1678
(CONSTANT)	38.918347	8.624697		4.512	.0000

END BLOCK NUMBER 1    ALL REQUESTED VARIABLES ENTERED.

## \* \* \* \* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \* \* \* \*

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V23 TRA ANX SCOR

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 2. METHOD: BACKWARD

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 5.. V13 NO CHILD

MULTIPLE R	.47860	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.22906		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.17878	REGRESSION	3	1446.62094	482.20698
STANDARD ERROR	10.28813	RESIDUAL	46	4868.89906	105.84563
		F =	4.55576	SIGNIF F =	.0071

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----						----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----					
VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T	VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V12	-2.844731	1.635774	-.245719	-1.739	.0887	V13	.139684	.154743	.786540	1.051	.2990
V19	17.685273	6.252636	.373707	2.828	.0069						
V2	-.284667	.229265	-.178667	-1.242	.2207						
(CONSTANT)	40.278823	8.536579		4.718	.0000						

\* \* \* \* \* . . . . .

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 6.. V2 AGE

MULTIPLE R	.45080	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.20322		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.16931	REGRESSION	2	1283.43840	641.71920
STANDARD ERROR	10.34725	RESIDUAL	47	5032.08160	107.06557
		F =	5.89370	SIGNIF F =	.0048

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----						----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----					
VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T	VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V12	-3.650045	1.510327	-.315280	-2.417	.0196	V13	.108345	.119768	.973658	.818	.4175
V19	16.208522	6.173752	.342502	2.625	.0116	V2	-.178667	-.180079	.809422	-1.242	.2207
(CONSTANT)	35.533092	7.676992		4.629	.0000						

END BLOCK NUMBER 2 POUT = .100 LIMITS REACHED.

\*\*\*\*\* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \*\*\*\*\*

LISTWISE DELETION OF MISSING DATA

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V21 DEPRESS SCORE

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 1. METHOD: ENTER

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 1.. V12 RELIGIOUSITY  
 2.. V19 COUNSELING NOW  
 3.. V6 RAC/BACGR/TE/ELEM  
 4.. V4 YRSED  
 5.. V2 AGE

MULTIPLE R	.45009	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.20258		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.11197	REGRESSION	5	346.11447	69.22289
STANDARD ERROR	5.56447	RESIDUAL	44	1362.38553	30.96331
		F =	2.23564	SIGNIF F =	.0674

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V12	-1.523645	.912730	-.253034	-1.669	.1022
V19	6.688042	3.389891	.271717	1.973	.0548
V6	-.008193	.916954	-.001254	-.009	.9929
V4	-.118996	.558995	-.029710	-.213	.8324
V2	-.178746	.128186	-.215695	-1.394	.1702
(CONSTANT)	11.620348	7.982256		1.456	.1526

END BLOCK NUMBER 1 ALL REQUESTED VARIABLES ENTERED.

## \* \* \* \* \* MULTIPLE REGRESSION \* \* \* \* \*

EQUATION NUMBER 1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. V21 DEPRESS SCORE

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 2. METHOD: BACKWARD

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 6.. V6 RAC/BACGR/TE/ELEM

MULTIPLE R	.45009	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.20258		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.13170	REGRESSION	4	346.11200	86.52800
STANDARD ERROR	5.50230	RESIDUAL	45	1362.38800	30.27529

F \* 2.85804 SIGNIF F \* .0341

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V12	-1.523672	.902528	-.253038	-1.688	.0983
V19	6.688506	3.351625	.271735	1.996	.0521
V4	-.119220	.552191	-.029766	-.216	.8300
V2	-.179033	.122701	-.216041	-1.459	.1515
(CONSTANT)	11.613213	7.853474		1.479	.1462

----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V6	-.001254	-.001347	.757425	-.009	.9929

\* \* \* \* \*

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 7.. V4 YRSED

MULTIPLE R	.44917	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.20176		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.14970	REGRESSION	3	344.70072	114.90024
STANDARD ERROR	5.44498	RESIDUAL	46	1363.79928	29.64781

F \* 3.87551 SIGNIF F \* .0149

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V12	-1.571563	.865731	-.260992	-1.815	.0760
V19	6.737178	3.309200	.273713	2.036	.0475
V2	-.178046	.121338	-.214851	-1.467	.1491
(CONSTANT)	10.233570	4.517974		2.265	.0283

----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V4	-.029766	-.032168	.788791	-.216	.8300
V6	-.002595	-.002790	.759122	-.019	.9852

• • • • MULTIPLE REGRESSION • • • •

EQUATION NUMBER 1    DEPENDENT VARIABLE..    V21    DEPRESS SCORE

VARIABLE(S) REMOVED ON STEP NUMBER 8..    V2    AGE

MULTIPLE R	.40545	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE			
R SQUARE	.16439		DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.12884	REGRESSION	2	280.86506	140.43253
STANDARD ERROR	5.51137	RESIDUAL	47	1427.63494	30.37521
		F =	4.62326	SIGNIF F =	.0147

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
V12	-2.075249	.804463	-.344640	-2.580	.0131
V19	5.813539	3.288395	.236188	1.768	.0836
(CONSTANT)	7.265337	4.089082		1.777	.0821

----- VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION -----

VARIABLE	BETA IN	PARTIAL	MIN TOLER	T	SIG T
V2	-.214851	-.211457	.809422	-1.467	.1491
V4	-.022272	-.023542	.933068	-.160	.8738
V6	-.051019	-.055354	.981186	-.376	.7086

END BLOCK NUMBER 2    POUT =    .100 LIMITS REACHED.

APPENDIX E - SUMMARY TABLES



MAIN SOURCE INCOME

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
OTHER	0	5	10.0	10.0	10.0
AFDC	1	29	58.0	58.0	68.0
SOC SEC	2	4	8.0	8.0	76.0
EMPLOYMENT	4	12	24.0	24.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	1.700	STD ERR	.194	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.374	VARIANCE	1.888
KURTOSIS	-.703	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	.915
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	4.000	MINIMUM	.000
MAXIMUM	4.000	SUM	85.000		

## YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
	9	2	4.0	4.0	4.0
	10	5	10.0	10.0	14.0
	11	12	24.0	24.0	38.0
	12	12	24.0	24.0	62.0
	13	1	2.0	2.0	64.0
	14	12	24.0	24.0	88.0
	13	4	8.0	8.0	96.0
	16	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
	16	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	12.000	STD ERR	.208	MEDIAN	12.000
MODE	11.000	STD DEV	1.474	VARIANCE	2.173
KURTOSIS	.402	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	.299
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	7.000	MINIMUM	9.000
MAXIMUM	16.000	SUM	600.000		

## MARITAL STATUS

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NEVER MARRIED	1	30	60.0	60.0	60.0
SEPARATED	2	10	20.0	20.0	80.0
DIVORCED	3	9	18.0	18.0	98.0
LEGALLY SEPARATED	4	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	1.620	STD ERR	.121	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	-.855	VARIANCE	.730
KURTOSIS	-.192	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	1.040
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	3.000	MINIMUM	1.000
MAXIMUM	4.000	SUM	81.000		

## NUMBER OF CHILDREN LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
	0	3	6.0	6.0	6.0
	1	8	16.0	16.0	22.0
	2	13	26.0	26.0	48.0
	3	11	22.0	22.0	70.0
	4	9	18.0	18.0	88.0
	5	3	6.0	6.0	94.0
	7	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.780	STD ERR	.238	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.682	VARIANCE	2.828
KURTOSIS	.581	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	.711
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	7.000	MINIMUM	.000
MAXIMUM	7.000	SUM	139.000		

TIME LIVING IN APARTMENT  
BY YEARS

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
	0	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
	0	5	10.0	10.0	12.0
	1	7	14.0	14.0	26.0
	1	1	2.0	2.0	28.0
	1	9	18.0	18.0	46.0
	2	4	8.0	8.0	54.0
	2	6	12.0	12.0	66.0
	3	3	6.0	6.0	72.0
	5	1	2.0	2.0	74.0
	5	3	6.0	6.0	80.0
	6	3	6.0	6.0	86.0
	7	1	2.0	2.0	88.0
	8	1	2.0	2.0	90.0
	9	1	2.0	2.0	92.0
	12	1	2.0	2.0	94.0
	13	1	2.0	2.0	96.0
	15	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
	17	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	3.202	STD ERR	.565	MEDIAN	1.500
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	3.998	VARIANCE	15.985
KURTOSIS	3.493	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	1.962
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	16.900	MINIMUM	.100
MAXIMUM	17.000	SUM	160.100		

TIME LIVING IN CITY  
BY YEARS

VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
2	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
3	1	2.0	2.0	4.0
5	3	6.0	6.0	10.0
6	2	4.0	4.0	14.0
7	1	2.0	2.0	16.0
9	1	2.0	2.0	18.0
10	2	4.0	4.0	22.0
12	1	2.0	2.0	24.0
13	1	2.0	2.0	26.0
14	1	2.0	2.0	28.0
15	3	6.0	6.0	34.0
17	1	2.0	2.0	36.0
18	1	2.0	2.0	38.0
19	1	2.0	2.0	40.0
20	2	4.0	4.0	44.0
21	3	6.0	6.0	50.0
23	4	8.0	8.0	58.0
24	2	4.0	4.0	62.0
26	1	2.0	2.0	64.0
27	7	14.0	14.0	78.0
28	1	2.0	2.0	80.0
30	1	2.0	2.0	82.0
31	1	2.0	2.0	84.0
32	2	4.0	4.0	88.0

## TIME LIVING IN CITY (cont.)

	34	1	2.0	2.0	90.0
	35	2	4.0	4.0	94.0
	41	2	4.0	4.0	98.0
	43	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	20.910	STD ERR	1.494	MEDIAN	22.000
MODE	27.000	STD DEV	10.561	VARIANCE	111.527
KURTOSIS	-.650	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	.009
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	41.500	MINIMUM	1.500
MAXIMUM	43.000	SUM	1045.500		

RELIGIOUSITY

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT AT ALL RELIGIOUS	1	6	12.0	12.0	12.0
NOT TOO RELIGIOUS	2	13	26.0	26.0	38.0
SOMEWHAT RELIGIOUS	3	18	36.0	36.0	74.0
VERY RELIGIOUS	4	13	26.0	26.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.760	STD ERR	.139	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	.981	VARIANCE	.962
KURTOSIS	-.880	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	-.302
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	3.000	MINIMUM	1.000
MAXIMUM	4.000	SUM	138.000		



AGE					
MEAN	29.978	STD ERR	1.008	MEDIAN	29.750
MODE	26.600	STD DEV	7.125	VARIANCE	50.772
KURTOSIS	-.310	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	.395
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	29.500	MINIMUM	18.200
MAXIMUM	47.700	SUM	1498.900		

COUNSELING RECEIVED

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALUE PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NO	1	36	72.0	72.0	72.0
YES	2	14	28.0	28.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	1.280	STD ERR	.064	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.454	VARIANCE	.206
KURTOSIS	-1.021	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	1.011
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	1.000	MINIMUM	1.000
MAXIMUM	2.000	SUM	64.000	MINIMUM	1.000

COUNSELING NOW						
	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT	
NO	1	47	94.0	94.0	94.0	
YES	2	3	6.0	6.0	100.0	
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0		
MEAN	1.060	STD ERR	.034	MEDIAN	1.000	
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.240	VARIANCE	.058	
KURTOSIS	13.124	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	3.821	
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	1.000	MINIMUM	1.000	
MAXIMUM	2.000	SUM	53.000			

RACIAL BACKGROUND IN COMMUNITY

	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
WHITE	1	5	10.0	10.0	10.0
MIXED	2	3	6.0	6.0	16.0
BLACK	3	42	84.0	84.0	100.0
	TOTAL	50	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	2.740	STD ERR	.089	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	.633	VARIANCE	.400
KURTOSIS	3.558	S E KURT	.662	SKEWNESS	-2.250
S E SKEW	.337	RANGE	2.000	MINIMUM	1.000
MAXIMUM	3.000	SUM	137.000		

VARIABLE V24  
BY VARIABLE V5

SELFEST SCOR  
RAC/BACGR/COMM

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	911.6771	455.8386	1.3656	.2652
WITHIN GROUPS	47	15688.3429	333.7945		
TOTAL	49	16600.0200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
Grp 1	5	76.6000	20.1941	9.0311	48.0000	99.0000	51.5262 TO 101.6738
Grp 2	3	66.6667	12.8582	7.4237	52.0000	76.0000	34.7248 TO 98.6086
Grp 3	42	62.4762	18.2973	2.8233	28.0000	92.0000	56.7743 TO 68.1780
TOTAL	50	64.1400	18.4059	2.6030	28.0000	99.0000	58.9091 TO 69.3709

VARIABLE V24  
BY VARIABLE V9

SELFEST SCOR  
RAC/BACGR/STU/HIG

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	1009.9912	504.9956	1.5224	.2287
WITHIN GROUPS	47	15590.0288	331.7027		
TOTAL	49	16600.0200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
Grp 1	8	74.3750	16.6127	5.8735	48.0000	99.0000	60.4865 TO 88.2635
Grp 2	16	61.5000	22.0968	5.5242	28.0000	92.0000	49.7255 TO 73.2745
Grp 3	26	62.6154	15.9175	3.1217	28.0000	92.0000	56.1862 TO 69.0446
TOTAL	50	64.1400	18.4059	2.6030	28.0000	99.0000	58.9091 TO 69.3709

VARIABLE V23  
BY VARIABLE V5

TRA ANX SCOR  
RAC/BACGR/COMM

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PRUB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	322.1486	161.0743	1.2631	.2922
WITHIN GROUPS	47	5993.3714	127.5185		
TOTAL	49	6315.5200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
Grp 1	5	35.8000	8.1056	3.6249	25.0000	45.0000	25.7358 TO 45.8642
Grp 2	3	39.0000	12.0000	6.9282	27.0000	51.0000	9.1900 TO 68.8100
Grp 3	42	43.7143	11.5215	1.7778	20.0000	66.0000	40.1239 TO 47.3046
TOTAL	50	42.6400	11.3529	1.6055	20.0000	66.0000	39.4135 TO 45.8665

VARIABLE V23  
BY VARIABLE V9      TRA ANX SCOR  
                         RAC/BACGR/STU/HIG

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	408.4815	204.2408	1.6251	.2078
WITHIN GROUPS	47	5907.0385	125.6817		
TOTAL	49	6315.5200			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
Grp 1	8	36.7500	7.5546	2.6709	25.0000	45.0000	30.4342 TO 43.0658
Grp 2	16	45.5000	12.2909	3.0727	25.0000	66.0000	38.9506 TO 52.0494
Grp 3	26	42.6923	11.3869	2.2332	20.0000	65.0000	38.0930 TO 47.2916
TOTAL	50	42.6400	11.3529	1.6055	20.0000	66.0000	39.4135 TO 45.8665



APPENDIX F - COVER LETTER AND  
CONSENT FORM FOR RESIDENTS



# Oklahoma State University

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74076-0337  
241 HOME ECONOMICS WEST  
(405) 624-5057

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY RELATIONS  
AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT  
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

Dear Resident:

Your help is urgently needed. The Oklahoma State University Department of Family Relations and Child Development is conducting an important study on the STRENGTH OF BLACK FAMILIES.


You have been selected to participate in this very important study. All information collected from the many families participating in this study will be strictly confidential and no names are to be given, and no names shall appear on any information collected.

This vital information that you and many others throughout Northeast Oklahoma report will be solely used for research purposes and to STRENGTHEN BLACK FAMILIES. Also we want to pay you a fee of \$10.00 for your interest and cooperation if you should decide to take part in this study. The interview and questions will take about an hour to complete.

Participation is voluntary and you can choose not to participate. However, if you would like to take part in this study, we encourage you to fill out the bottom portion of this letter and enclose it in the envelope provided for you and return your sealed envelope to the Senior Manager (Mrs. Glenda Love) or one of the other staff persons in the Central Office of the Apartment Complex. Only personnel from Oklahoma State University has access to your decision that will appear on the bottom portion of this letter.

If you should have any questions about this research, you may call the Department Head of Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University at 405-624-6897 or Troy Daniels at 918-428-1476.

If you should indicate an interest to participate in this research, a staff member from Oklahoma State University will contact you to set up the best time possible for you to conduct an interview with you.

Sincerely,  
  
Troy K. Daniels  
Principal Investigator

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Age:    /    /     
MO DAY YEAR

Race: \_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status: \_\_\_\_\_

Please place a check mark to indicate your decision.

I would like to participate in this research

I would not like to participate in this research



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY RELATIONS  
AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT  
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078-0337  
241 HOME ECONOMICS WEST  
(405) 624-5057

VOLUNTEER CONSENT FORM

As a participant in this research on the STRENGTH OF BLACK FAMILIES,  
I KNOWINGLY AND WILLFULLY volunteer to participate in this research.  
Further, I also understand that this research is strictly confidential  
and will only be used for research and educational purposes.  
I further acknowledge that I will receive a \$10.00 (ten dollar) fee  
for my participation in this research upon completion of this interview.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



Celebrating the Past . . . Preparing for the Future

APPENDIX G - LETTER OF  
CORRESPONDENCE

# North Central Church Of Christ

Minister  
Troy L. Daniels, M.Ed.

Office: 918 / 428-4641

Mrs. Glenda Love, Senior Manager  
c/o Vernon Manor Apartments  
550 East 32nd Street North  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74106

November 19, 1987

Re: Research Project

Dear Mrs. Glenda Love:

Permit me to express my gratitude to you for your invaluable time and effort regarding the research strategy which we discussed on November 12, 1987.

Issues involving Black women have long been an interest of mine. Hopefully, as a result of the expected cooperation from the Vernon Manor residents, important and useful information may be disseminated to other institutions and agencies that shall enable optimal living conditions for all disadvantaged citizens of North Tulsa.

I will be contacting you by phone within a few days to discuss other preliminary planning for residents to participate in this very timely project.

Sincerely,

Troy L. Daniels

APPENDIX H - BUDGET FOR  
PROJECT

## An Estimated Budget For This Project

Participatory Fee	\$500.00
Testing Material	30.00
Printing Cost	150.00
Postage	25.00
Computer Usage	200.00
Envelopes	20.00
Automobile Use	30.00
Telephone Use	15.00
Misc.	30.00
Total	\$1000.00

APPENDIX I - ABBREVIATIONS FOR  
VARIABLE CODES



APPENDIX I - ABBREVIATIONS FOR  
VARIABLE CODES

```

1  O 00000080  TITLE 'PSYCHOLOGICAL STRENGTHS OF BLACK WOMEN'
2  O 00000090  DATA LIST RECORDS=1
3  O 00000100  /1 V1A 1-4 V2 5-8 V3 9 V4 10-13 V5 14 V6 15 V7 16 V8 17
4  O 00000110  V9 18 V10 19 V11 20 V12 21 V13 22-23 V14 24-27 V15 28-31
5  O 00000120  V16 31-35 V17 36 V18 37 V19 38 V20 39-42 V21 43-44
6  O 00000130  V22 45-46 V23 47-48 V24 49-50

```

THE ABOVE DATA LIST STATEMENT WILL READ 1 RECORDS FROM FILE INLINE

VARIABLE	REC	START	END	FORMAT	WIDTH	DEC
V1A	1	1	4	F	4	0
V2	1	5	8	F	4	0
V3	1	9	9	F	1	0
V4	1	10	13	F	4	0
V5	1	14	14	F	1	0
V6	1	15	15	F	1	0
V7	1	16	16	F	1	0
V8	1	17	17	F	1	0
V9	1	18	18	F	1	0
V10	1	19	19	F	1	0
V11	1	20	20	F	1	0
V12	1	21	21	F	1	0
V13	1	22	23	F	2	0
V14	1	24	27	F	4	0
V15	1	28	31	F	4	0
V16	1	31	35	F	5	0
V17	1	36	36	F	1	0
V18	1	37	37	F	1	0
V19	1	38	38	F	1	0
V20	1	39	42	F	4	0
V21	1	43	44	F	2	0
V22	1	45	46	F	2	0
V23	1	47	48	F	2	0
V24	1	49	50	F	2	0

END OF DATALIST TABLE.

```

7  O 00000140  VARIABLE LABELS
8  O 00000150  V1A 'ID NUMBER' V2 'AGE'
9  O 00000160  V3 'MAR STA' V4 'YRSED'
10 O 00000170  V5 'RAC/BACGR/COMM' V6 'RAC/BACGR/TE/ELEM'
11 O 00000180  V7 'RAC/BACGR/TE/HIG' V8 'RAC/BACGR/STU/FLEM'
12 O 00000190  V9 'RAC/BACGR/STU/HIG' V10 'MAIN SOURCE INCOME'
13 O 00000200  V11 'RELIGIOUS PREF' V12 'RELIGIOUSITY' V13 'NO CHILD'
14 O 00000210  V14 'TIM/LIV/APT' V15 'TIM/LIV/TUL' V16 'TIM/LIV/OK'
15 O 00000220  V17 'COUNSELING WILLING' V18 'COUNSELING RECIEVED'
16 O 00000230  V19 'COUNSELING NOW' V20 'COUNSELING LENGTH'
17 O 00000240  V21 'DEPRESS SCORE' V22 'STA ANX SCOR'
18 O 00000250  V23 'TRA ANX SCOR' V24 'SELFEST SCOR'
19 O 00000260  VALUE LABELS
20 O 00000270  V3 (1) NEVER MARRIED (2) SEPERATED (3) DIVORCED/
21 O 00000280  V5 (1) WHITE (2) MIXED (3) BLACK/
22 O 00000290  V6,V7,V8,V9 (1) WHITE (2) MIXED (3) BLACK/
23 O 00000300  V10 (1) AFDC (2) SOC SEC (3) OTHER (4) EMPLOYMENT/
24 O 00000310  V11 (1) BAPTIST (2) MED (3) PENTE (4) JEWIT (5) CH CHRI
25 O 00000320  (6) HOLI (7) OTHER/
26 O 00000330  V16,V17,V18 (1) NO (2) YES/
27 O 00000340  MISSING VALUES V1A TO V2, V12, V20 TO V24 (999)
28 O 00000350  LIST

```

THERE ARE 493360 BYTES OF MEMORY AVAILABLE.  
THE LARGEST CONTIGUOUS AREA HAS 493360 BYTES.

960 BYTES OF MEMORY REQUIRED FOR LIST PROCEDURE.  
168 BYTES HAVE ALREADY BEEN ACQUIRED.  
792 BYTES REMAIN TO BE ACQUIRED.

APPENDIX J - COMPOSITION TABLE  
OF VERNON MANOR RESIDENTS

## COMPOSITION OF VERNON MANOR APARTMENT RESIDENTS

<u>Type of Families</u>	<u>Number of Families</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Black Women Heads (age:18 - 54)	118	62.1
Black Elderly (age: 55 -older)	34	17.9
Black Married	25	13.2
Black Men Heads	8	4.2
Single Black Handicapped	3	1.6
White Women Heads	2	1.0
Total	190	100

---

APPENDIX K - APARTMENT NUMBERS  
OF VERNON MANOR RESIDENTS

## LIST OF SUBJECTS' APARTMENT NUMBERS

VERNON MANOR APARTMENTS			525A
550 EAST 32nd STREET NORTH			525B
TULSA, OK. 74106			525C
		585D	525D
		587B	526B
		587C	526C
MANAGER'S OFFICE 428-2589		587D	
	514C		
542D	514D	501A	
545A	515A	501B	526D
545B	515B	501C	527D
545C	515C	501D	529B
545D			529C
	515D	502B	529D
546A	517A	502C	
546B	517B	502D	530B
546C	517D		530D
546D	518A	503D	533C
547A		505A	533D
547B	518C	505C	534A
	518D	506A	534B
547C	519A		
547D	519B	506D	534C
551A	519C	507A	535A
551C	519D	509A	535B
551D		509D	535C
553A	521A	510A	535D
	521B		538A
553B	521C	510B	
553C	522A	510C	538C
553D	522B	511A	538D
555B		513A	539C
559C	522C	513C	541A
577B	522D		541B
577C	523A	513D	541C
	523B	514A	
577D	523C	514B	541D
579A	523D		542A
555C	523E		

VITA <sup>2</sup>

TROY L. DANIELS

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: PSYCHOLOGICAL STRENGTHS AMONG BLACK WOMEN WHO  
HEAD HOUSEHOLDS

Major Field: Home Economics

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Greer, South Carolina, January  
29, 1951 to Garfield and Dora Daniels.

Education: Graduated from Linclon High School of Taylors,  
South Carolina, in May, 1968; received the Bachelor  
degree in Bible from Freed-Hardeman College in  
1979; received the Master of Education degree in  
Community Counseling from Mississippi State  
University in 1981; post graduate work in Counseling  
and Allied Services at The University of Tulsa in  
1983; completed the requirements for the Doctor of  
Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in  
July, 1989.

Professional Experience: Minister for the church of  
Christ from 1979 to 1988; Psychiatric therapist for  
the Tulsa Psychiatric Center in Tulsa, Oklahoma and  
Star Community Mental Health from 1983 to 1986;  
research and teaching assistant, Department of  
Family Relations and Child Development,  
Oklahoma State University from 1986 to 1988;  
presently the chairman of the Home and Consumer  
Economics Department at Freed-Hardeman College,  
Henderson, Tennessee.