

EMOTIONAL DEPENDENCY, DATING
AND SELF-CONCEPT

By

ROBERT NEIL WEINBERGER

Bachelor of Arts

C. W. Post College

Brookville, New York

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1974

Thesis
1974
W423e
cop. 2

MAR 28 1975

EMOTIONAL DEPENDENCY, DATING
AND SELF-CONCEPT

Thesis Approved:

H. Stephen Caldwell

Thesis Adviser

Kenneth P. Sandoz

Barbara J. Weiner

D. N. Duran

Dean of the Graduate College

903476

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My gratitude is expressed to my committee chairman, Dr. Kenneth Sandvold, and my committee members, Dr. Steve Caldwell and Dr. Barbara Weiner, for their help and assistance throughout my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem of Definition	2
Review of the Literature	4
The Importance of Dependency in the Psychotherapeutic Relationship	4
The Relevance of Past Social Experiences to the Development of Dependent Behavior	5
Animal Studies	5
Human Studies: Field Dependence/ Independence Studies	5
Human Studies: Studies Involving Experimentally-Manipulated Reinforce- ment (Success/Failure)	6
Psychometric Measurement and Assessment of Emotional Dependency	8
Summary and Conclusions	10
Statement of the Problem	11
II. HYPOTHESES	12
Major Hypotheses	12
Description of the Instruments	12
Independent Variable	12
Dependent Variables	13
Tennessee Self Concept Scale	13
Self-Rating Questionnaire	16
Specific Hypotheses	16
III. METHODOLOGY	19
Subjects	19
Procedure	19
Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis	20
IV. RESULTS	23
Comparison: Independent Females vs. Dependent Females	23
Comparison: Male vs. Female Independents	29
Other Comparisons	34

Chapter	Page
V. DISCUSSION	35
Comparison: Independent Females vs. Dependent Females	35
Comparison: Male vs. Female Independents	40
Other Comparisons	44
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX A	50
APPENDIX B	52
APPENDIX C	55
APPENDIX D	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Selection Order and Tests of Significance of Statistically Significant Variables Discriminating Among Female Independent and Female Dependent Groups on the FIRO-B	25
II. Mean Scores of Each Variable which was a Significant Contributor to Either of the Two Prediction Systems, the Mean Scores for Each Variable Significantly Differentiating the Groups When Considered Separately, and the Means and Standard Deviations for the Norm Groups for Pertinent Variables on the <u>Tennessee Self Concept Scale</u> (TSCS)	26
III. Proportion of Statistical Classifications of <u>Ss</u> with Independent and Dependent Profiles Matching Their Original FIRO-B Grouping	27
IV. Frequency Distributions of Probabilities of Classification for Female Independent and Dependent Groups on the FIRO-B	27
V. Selection Order and Tests of Significance of Statistically Significant Variables Discriminating Among Male and Female Independent Groups on the FIRO-B	31
VI. Proportion of Statistical Classification of Male and Female Independent <u>Ss</u> Matching Their Original Sex Grouping	31
VII. Frequency Distributions of Probabilities of Classification for Male and Female Independents on the FIRO-B	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A trend in psychological literature has emphasized the role of faulty interpersonal behavior in the psychoneurotic and personality disorders (Lorr, Bishop, and McNair, 1965). Indeed, to Horney (1945), Fromm (1947), and Sullivan (1947), the milder behavior disorders represent mainly problems in relating to people. A similar view has been taken by Leary (1957) and his colleagues.

Extreme emotional dependency has been seen as a problem in relating to people. Arthur G. Nikelly (1971, p. 140) has said that, "despite its universality, emotional dependency is a dimension of behavior that has not been given proper consideration." A number of other authors seem to agree that dependency--although often camouflaged by a variety of symptoms and traits--is found in nearly every behavioral manifestation from marital conflicts, underachievement, and obesity to drug addiction, alcoholism, homosexuality, and psychosomatic ailments (i.e., anxiety, tension, insomnia, nausea, blushing, fainting, migraine, ulcers, arthritis, cosmetic defects) (Leary, 1957; Nikelly, 1971; Sechrest & Wallace, 1967; Smith, 1972).

The overall research in the area of emotional dependency is extremely limited. Psychometric measurement of the construct is in a state of pandemonium, with widely-differing techniques claiming to measure the

same hypothetical variable but showing, in fact, very little correlation with each other.

The present study attempts to bring some order to one aspect of the construct, the measurement of dependency. After a brief discussion of the problem of definition, the present literature review will explore three aspects of the research approaches to the problem of dependency. The first aspect will deal with the importance of dependency in the psychotherapeutic relationship. The second will deal with the relevance of past social experiences in the development of dependent behavior in both animal and human subjects. Studies dealing with human subjects will be reviewed in terms of (a) field dependence/independence studies, and (b) other research in which success and failure have been experimentally induced. And thirdly, there will be a review of the literature on the psychometric measurement and assessment of dependency.

The Problem of Definition

Each of us is dependent. It seems inherently relieving to be freed of the responsibility from some problem. Dependence on others is likely to increase, rather than decrease, no matter what our efforts, simply as a result of the grossly-expanding technology that characterizes our society today. We are, in truth, dependent for our very survival on countless other persons every day. This being the case, problems must arise when we attempt to delineate the discrepancy between a widespread negative attitude toward dependency and the same-time inescapable fact of our dependency. Some hold that emotional dependency is appropriate as long as others are not unduly controlled

or adversely affected (Nikelly, 1971). Others have felt that the answer lies, first, in just how discriminating we are with our dependencies and, second, in what we give in return for what we get (Sechrest & Wallace, 1967). The essential problem here is one of categorical subjectivity. When we are not even sure of just what dependency is, how can we begin to make a subjective value judgment as to its maturity and degree which would inevitably slant our view of it as either normal or abnormal?

The issue inherent here is one concerning a definition of emotional dependency. Sears (1953) has suggested that dependency is not a unitary concept. Symonds (1971) has described the emotionally dependent individual as one who values himself so little that he will readily and desperately give up his own genuine growth for whatever he gets in return. Mehrabian (1970, p. 417) views dependency as the "sum of affiliative tendency and sensitivity to rejection." Ring and Wallston (1968, p. 148) see the dependent person as one who is "passive, conventional, approval-seeking (and) is dictated almost completely by the nature of the interpersonal situation (in which he is found)." Lah-tinen (1964, p. 3689) defines dependency as "a subjective feeling of lacking the resources to obtain a certain goal." Kagan and Moss (1962) have emphasized the importance of differentiating dependent behavior with respect to the goal object. Bernardin and Jessor (1957, p. 63) describe dependents as "those who rely on others for help and approval." Bergler (1955) equates "hyperdependency" with interpersonal masochism. Fromm (1947) has described the dependent individual as a "receptive, nonproductive character" who believes the "source of all good" to be outside himself and who, consequently, seeks support in an indiscriminate

manner from virtually anyone who is willing to provide it. And lastly, Horney (1945) has identified the dependent individual as a "compliant" or "moving-toward-people" personality type. In sum, one can easily see that definitions of dependency vary widely and do not always--or even often--imply a cause.

While it is not the intent of the present study to give a precise definition of dependency, it does seem that the ultimate scientific value of any theory dealing with causal factors is contingent in some degree upon the experimental evaluation of variously assigned social causes. In order to do so, it is first necessary to obtain measures of dependency sufficiently sensitive and objective to provide reliable quantitative indices of individual differences. Again, a major goal of the present study is represented by an attempt to bring some order to the measurement of the construct of dependency.

Review of the Literature

The Importance of Dependency in the Psychotherapeutic Relationship

Nikelly (1971, p. 140) has asserted that:

If the client's dependency is not overcome in therapy, its by-products (indecision, anxiety, obsessional thinking, depression) will not dissipate easily. Experience indicates that dependency should be explored and handled as the main underlying etiological factor from which neurotic symptoms may emanate and personal difficulties develop. The client's realization of his dependency becomes the first target in therapy rather than the secondary symptoms which caused him to seek therapy.

Winder, Ahmad, and Bandura (1962) empirically demonstrated the importance of dependency in the psychotherapeutic relationship, showing that the therapist's rate of approach to the client's dependency

expressions was related to continuation, as opposed to termination, in therapy. Alexander and Abeles (1968) suggested that the development of an intense and dependent relationship early in therapy often leads the client to make ever-increasing demands which the therapist is unable to meet, and which can then lead to early termination and unsuccessful outcome.

In sum, the way in which the therapist handles a client's dependency expressions within the context of the therapeutic relationship has been shown empirically to effect the future course of therapy.

The Relevance of Past Social Experiences to the Development of Dependent Behavior

Animal Studies. A number of animal studies have reported a significant influence of experimentally-controlled social experiences on the development of dominant or subordinate behavior in the rat (Barnett, 1963; Grant and Chance, 1958; Monroe, 1966; Seitz, 1954). For example, Seitz (1954) found that rats which had been raised in small litters tended to be significantly more submissive in competition for food than those that had been raised in large litters. Hence, we see that, in rat studies, social experiences have been demonstrated as having a significant influence on the development of subsequent dominant and submissive behavior.

Human Studies: Field Dependence/Independence Studies. Research in this area has fostered the idea that sensitivity in interpersonal relations relates empirically to field dependence, and that insensitivity in interpersonal relations relates empirically to field

independence (Linton and Graham, 1959; Witkin, et al., 1962). Mausner and Graham (1970) found that they could predict convergence in judgment for field dependent Ss on the basis of prior reinforcement on a psychophysical task.

Human Studies: Studies Involving Experimentally-Manipulated Reinforcement (Success/Failure). A widely-reported finding in this area of research is that Ss positively reinforced in initial judgments will maintain their judgmental responses in social interaction, whereas negatively reinforced Ss will converge toward coacting observers (Lanzetta & Kanareff, 1961; Mausner, 1954; Rosenberg & Hall, 1958). Hence, a finding regularly reproduced in many settings, is that there exist lawful relationships between prior reinforcement and subsequent behavior in social interactions.

Research indicates that various other behaviors including suggestibility, degree of imitation, degree of fantasy, discrimination, learning, clinical depression, and lowered self-esteem have been demonstrably predictable by experimentally manipulating a S's previous experiences with success and failure (Butterfield & Zigler, 1965; Kanaereff & Lanzetta, 1960; Kelman, 1950; Lahtinen, 1964).

Gador-Donath, Blanka, and Kereszty (1965), in analyzing the dependency needs of 193 adolescent and postadolescent females through 481 letters written by them, found that one of the three most frequent themes was that of previous interpersonal relationships. Hill and Dusek (1969), in a study partially designed to measure the effects of social reinforcement and pretraining with success vs. failure on children's achievement expectations, found: (a) following experimentally-

manipulated social reinforcement, expectations increased, the effect being stronger for girls than for boys, and (b) following nonreinforcement, achievement expectations remained stable for both sexes. Hence, the facilitating effects of social reinforcement tended to be stronger for girls than for boys. V. J. Crandell (1963) has suggested that perhaps girls are more likely to be influenced by external evaluation of their performance, whereas boys are more likely to rely on their own subjective assessment of their performance. Hill and Dusek (1969) suggested that these unexpected sex differences in the effects of social reinforcement be recognized and investigated more systematically.

Lish (1970), in a study concerned with failure and social exposure upon self-esteem and depression, found that Ss exposed to an experimental situation in which their competence was threatened (failure) reported significantly lower self-esteem and greater concomitant depression than Ss exposed to an experimental situation in which their competence was assured (success). It is interesting to note that lowered self-esteem, as measured by the Barron Ego Strength Scale, has a high negative correlation ($r = -.67$) with dependency, as measured by the Navran Dependency Scale (Nelson, 1959); further, that lowered self-esteem, which is negatively correlated with depression (Nelson, 1959), has been associated with dependency by a number of other authors (Leary, 1957; Ryan, 1960; Shutz, 1958).

In summarizing, research has indicated that lawful relationships do exist between experimentally-induced success and failure, or prior reinforcement, and subsequent behavior in social interactions. Further

the facilitating effects of social reinforcement tended to be stronger for females than for males.

Psychometric Measurement and Assessment of
Emotional Dependency

Detection of the dependent individual may be obscured for various reasons. Overtly, the dependent individual can be seen to "control" the person or persons on whom he ostensibly depends. Furthermore, he may often initially exhibit signs of self-confidence or superior strength, only later to lapse suddenly into tearful and fearful behavior. The dependent person wants to see others as protective and tends to force them into playing a dominant role so he may obtain an apparent sense of security. He can maintain a false feeling of control over others when his dependency needs are not met, or he can conveniently blame others for his undesirable condition without realizing his own role in creating the circumstances.

Nelson (1959) said that dependency, as a construct, has high consistent conceptual status but--after finding no correlation between the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and objective situations--no experimental validity. Research has shown that the more direct the measure of dependent behavior, the greater its concurrent and construct validity; the magnitude of the validity correlations dropping as a function of the indirectness of the test (Zuckerman, et al., 1961). For example, the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) and the Rorschach had no significant correlation with each other or with any other techniques and had only negligible loadings on a factor called dependency (Zuckerman, et al., 1961). The EPPS, although propoorted as a tool in

the measurement of dependency (Bernardin & Jessor, 1957; Zuckerman, 1958), has--due to its ipsative scoring procedure--been discounted on statistical grounds (Hicks, 1970). The EPPS and the TAT were unable to predict dependent behavior either within or across situations even when the situation in which the behavior was to occur was known (Diener, 1967). The Performance Style Test's "c" scale, which indicates dependency, has been called "somewhat anomolous" by its very own authors (Ring & Wallston, 1968). An attempt to develop an empirically derived MMPI scale for dependency failed when experienced clinicians could not reliably rate dependency from case history summaries (Navran, 1954). Hence, thus far we have seen a lack of empirically sound instrumentation for the clinical detection or prediction of emotional dependency. Further, we see that Self-Ratings of a direct nature, as opposed to the more subtle test devices presented, have shown the highest correlations with the overt behavioral measures.

The psychometric dilemma being what it is, one might be tempted to conclude that the low correlations between the instruments cited and/or their failure in predicting dependent behavior is due to the situations' accounting for virtually all the variance in the prediction of dependent behavior. It is interesting to note, however, that dependency, as measured by the Navran Dependency Scale, does have a high negative relationship ($r=-.67$) with ego-strength as measured by the Barron Ego-Strenth Scale on the MMPI (Nelson, 1959). Ryan (1960, p. 7) also describes the dependent person as one with lowered ego-strength, with a self-concept of "worthlessness and inadequacy." It may be recalled that Lish (1970) found that failure facilitated lowered self-esteem

and heightened depression, both of which have been associated with dependency (Leary, 1957; Ryan, 1960).

In sum, psychometric research has shown that, first, the more direct the instrument, the greater its validity; and, second, ego-strength or self-concept has a high negative correlation with dependency.

Summary and Conclusions

From the available information, four rather broad generalizations may be made:

- (1) Emotional dependency seems to represent an aspect of behavior worthy of investigation.
- (2) There exist lawful relationships between prior social experiences in interpersonal relationships and subsequent behavior in social interaction, the effect perhaps being stronger for girls than for boys.
- (3) Concerning the measurement of behavior, the more direct the instrument the greater its validity, with Self-Ratings having the highest correlations with overt behavioral criterion.
- (4) Emotional dependency and ego strength or self-concept have a high negative correlation.

Among the major questions to be answered regarding dependency are those dealing with the influence of perceived social experience on the development of this behavior and those dealing with further psychometric description of the dependent personality type. It is questions of this sort that provide the basis for this study.

Statement of the Problem

As prevalent and important as dependency seems to be, there still exists much doubt as to its etiology as well as much chaos in its measurement. Dependency assessment has used peer nominations, objective tests, and projective tests. It has used widely-differing techniques all claiming to measure the same hypothetical variable but, in fact, not correlating with each other in any meaningful way. A test must measure something more general than itself. One cannot know just who the dependent person is until a valid profile which reliably describes him can be found.

CHAPTER II

HYPOTHESES

Major Hypotheses

Two general hypotheses were put forth: (1) Ss who obtained an "expressed control" score of 0-3 and a "wanted control" score of 7-9 on the FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relationships Orientation - Behavioral) (Shutz, 1958) would tend to elicit a self-concept profile on the TSCS (Tennessee Self Concept Scale) (Fitts, 1965) which differed significantly from that obtained by Ss who obtained an "expressed control" score of 0-3 and a "wanted control" score of 0-3 on the FIRO-B; (2) Ss who obtained an "expressed control" score of 0-3 and a "wanted control" score of 7-9 on the FIRO-B would tend to report a history of dating experiences which differed significantly from the report of Ss who obtained an "expressed control" score of 0-3 and a "wanted control" score of 0-3 on the FIRO-B.

Description of the Instruments

Independent Variable

The FIRO-B (see Appendix A) is a nonprojective, 54-item questionnaire which measures three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationships: expression of ("expressed") and desire for ("wanted") Inclusion, Control, and Affection measured on a scale from 0-9. It is the Control

area which is the concern of the present study. According to Shutz, (1958), the "expressed control" area proports to measure the extent to which a person assumes responsibility, makes decisions, or dominates people. The "wanted control" area reflects the extent to which an individual wants others to control and make decisions for him.

Dependent Variables

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

In view of the high negative relationship between ego strength and dependency, the hypothesis concerning the differing self-concept of the two control groups was tested with the Tennessee-Self Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965) (see Appendix B). The TSCS has uncovered significant correlations between the self-concept of an individual and other aspects of his life. Its author maintains that "each individual's self-concept provides a kind of central, or core, set of data which enables us to understand and predict many aspects of his behavior" (Fitts & Hamner, 1961, p. 1). The clinical and research form of the TSCS was standardized on 626 normals and several hundred psychiatric patients. It consisted of 100 self-descriptive statements to each of which the S responded on a five-point scale which ranged from "completely false" to "completely true." The TSCS yielded 29 separate scales measuring various aspects of self concept. The major areas were:

Positive Scores. The individual's general level of self-esteem is reflected in the Total Positive (TOT P) score. This is partitioned into a 3 x 5 matrix of sub-scores. The three rows of the matrix measure the person's internal frame of reference, the S's concept of what he is,

how he feels about himself, and what he does. The five column scores represent an external frame of reference and reflect his concept of his physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self.

Variability Scores. These scores reflect the consistency of the self-concept across the various dimensions. A high degree of variability or inconsistency is found in persons who tend to show compartmentalization of certain areas. This results in poor integration of the self-concept. Variability scores are shown for total variability as well as that for rows (internal reference) and columns (external reference).

Distribution Scores. The responses to each item on the TSCS are noted by the numerals from one to five. A "5" response indicates a "completely true" answer, while a "1" response indicates "completely false." Uncertain individuals may use an excess of "middle" or "3" responses, while others qualify their responses consistently ending with an excess of "4" or "2" responses. Extreme responses of "5" or "1" indicate still a different pattern.

Self Criticism: (SC). This scale is based on ten items from the MMPI L, or Lie, Scale. It reflects the person's openness or admission of derogatory facts about himself. Low scores may indicate a deliberate effort to distort the other scores on the TSCS.

Conflict Scores. The items in the Scale are couched to yield a balance of positively and negatively expressed statements. Some Ss may describe themselves by affirming positive attributes, but may be

unwilling to deny negative ones; or conversely, deny negative qualities but be unwilling to affirm the positive. Both these tendencies of overdenying negative attributes or overaffirming the positive are reflected in the Net Conflict (Net C) Score, which measures both the amount of conflict as well as its direction. However, sometimes these scores may be variable and cancel each other out. As a result, in addition to the Net C Score, the items pertaining to this issue are also summed nonalgebraically to give a Total Conflict (TOT C) score. "High scores indicate confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self-perception" (Fitts, 1965, p. 4).

Empirical Scales. Several empirically-derived scales are included. These include the Personality Disorder (PD) scale, Psychosis (Psy) scale, and Neurosis (N) scale which are used in psychological diagnostic categories, the General Maladjustment (GM) scale, the Defensive Positive (DP) scale, and the Personality Integration (PI) scale. The DP scale is a more subtle measure of defensiveness than the SC scale, the GM scale measures adjustment-maladjustment on a continuum, and the PI scale indicates an overall level of adjustment.

Other Scales. The Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) is a score reflecting the deviant features across all other scores. It differentiates psychiatric patients from non-patients with about 80% accuracy (Fitts and Hamner, 1969). The True/False Ratio (T/F) is a measure of general response set.

Reliability on the individual scales of the TSCS, as given in the Manual, ranged from .60 to .92 based on a test-retest with 60 college students over a two-week period.

Self-Rating Questionnaire

It may be that--as self-rating showed the highest correlation with peer ratings based on behavioral criterion--a test's predictive value may be related to some additional variable based on a self-rating (S-R) (Nelson, 1959). Due to the apparent responsivity of dependency to the effects of previous experience, the hypothesis concerning the differing reports of dating experiences between the two control groups was tested by a Self-Rating (S-R Questionnaire) (see Appendix C).

Specific Hypotheses

A variety of specific hypotheses were put forth: Ss with "expressed control" of 0-3 and "wanted control" of 7-9 on the FIRO-B will obtain significantly lower scores on the following scales of the TSCS than would Ss with "expressed control" of 0-3 and "wanted control" of 0-3 on the FIRO-B:

- (1) Self-Criticism (SC) suggesting a defensive stance.
- (2) Total Positive (TOT P) suggesting doubt as to self-worth, an undesirable self-image, lack of confidence, anxiety, unhappiness, and depression.
- (3) Row 1 P (Identity) indicating a poor basic self-identity.
- (4) Row 2 P (Self-Satisfaction) suggesting a low degree of self-acceptance or self-satisfaction.
- (5) Row 3 P (Behavior) indicating a poor perception of self-functioning.
- (6) Column A (Physical Self) indicating a poor self-view of the S's physical appearance, body, health, sexuality, and skills.

- (7) Column C (Personal Self) indicative of a lowered sense of personal worth apart from others.
- (8) Column E (Social Self) indicating feelings of inadequacy with people in general.
- (9) Distribution (D) suggesting defensiveness along with insecurity in the S's self-perception.
- (10) True/False Ratio (T/F) indicating the S's source of identity--stemming from what he is not rather than from what he is.
- (11) Defensive Positive (DP) suggesting probable inefficiency of defenses.
- (12) General Maladjustment (GM)
- (13) Personality Disorder (PD)
- (14) Neurosis (N)
- (15) Personality Integration (PI)

Ss with "expressed control" of 0-3 and "wanted control" of 7-9 on the FIRO-B would obtain significantly higher scores on the following scales of the TSCS than would Ss with "expressed control" of 0-3 and "wanted control" score of 0-3 on the FIRO-B:

- (16) Column B (Moral-Ethical Self) suggesting a high degree of satisfaction with religious endeavors.
- (17) Column D (Family Self) reflecting feelings of adequacy, feelings of worth, and value as a family member.
- (18) Variability (Total V) reflecting a self-concept so variable from one area to another that it reflects little unity or integration.
- (19) Total Conflict (Tot C) indicating confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self-perception.

(20) Number of Deviant Signs (NDS), an index of psychological disturbance.

A number of specific hypotheses were also put forth concerning the Self-Rating Questionnaire (S-R): Ss with "expressed control" of 0-3 and "wanted control" of 7-9 on the FIRO-B would obtain significantly different profiles on the S-R Questionnaire items which follow than Ss with "expressed control" of 0-3 and "wanted control" of 0-3:

- (21) "0-3, 7-9" Ss would report less time in between relationships (S-R2)
- (22) "0-3, 7-9" Ss would report more satisfactory relationships (S-R4), but less meaningful ones (S-R5).
- (23) "0-3, 7-9" Ss would report having ended less relationships themselves (S-R6).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Eighty Ss were used in the present study. In order to control for age, and amount of previous dating opportunity, only unmarried upper-classmen from a Southwestern university were used.

Four groups were investigated. The first group consisted of six male Ss who scored 0-3 in "expressed control" and 7-9 in "wanted control" on the FIRO-B. The second group consisted of 15 male Ss who had scored 0-3 in "expressed control" and 0-3 in "wanted control" on the same instrument. The two additional groups consisted of 15 females, each group of which had obtained the profiles described above, respectively.

Procedure

All Ss were asked to voluntarily complete the FIRO-B during regularly-scheduled class times. Initial instructions to all Ss upon taking the FIRO-B were as follows:

I am Bob Weinberger, a graduate student in clinical psychology. At the present time I am doing some research concerning how people relate to each other. I need Ss and your professor has agreed to give everyone who participates ___ extra credit points. There is one questionnaire to fill out right now. About a week later, I will come back and based on your profile, choose a certain number of you who will then

have the option of meeting with me outside regular class time to fill out some additional questionnaires. If you should be chosen, the total time needed to fill out all the questionnaires involved will be less than 45 minutes, and any information gathered by the tests will be strictly confidential. The only restriction is that you are a junior or a senior and are not married, separated, or divorced.

Not less than one week after completing the FIRO-B, the Ss chosen, after initial screening for FIRO profile, age, sex, grade level, and marital status, were asked to meet outside of regularly-scheduled class time in order to take the TSCS and the S-R Questionnaire. Ss were given extra class credit for their time.

Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis

A 2 X 2 experimental design was used. The two independent variables were groups (dependent, independent FIRO-B profile) and sex (male, female). Two step-wise linear discriminant function analyses were computed to examine differences among two of the groups of Ss (male vs. female independents, female dependents vs. female independents). The predictor variables were the scores of the TSCS and the S-R Questionnaire.

The analyses provided a discriminant function for each group based on a weighting system maximizing the variance between groups while minimizing the within groups variance. Each S received a discriminant function score and then was assigned to that group whose mean discriminant function was closest to that score.

The analyses also indicated the order of selection of the variables in forming the discriminant function. Each variable selected was one which contributed most to the prediction system already containing the

other variables selected. An F-test with $g-1$, and $n-g-p$ df was used at each step to determine whether the predictor contributed significantly to accounting for the remaining variance (n = total number of S_s ; g = number of groups; p = number of predictors).

After this initial phase of the analysis, those variables which met certain specifications were included in the final "best" prediction system. Several criterion were followed in choosing this final system:

- (1) In selecting the final prediction system, an attempt was made to keep the number of misclassifications at a minimum.

- (2) To avoid the problem of shrinkage, the number of final predictor variables used was limited to the first few variables selected in the initial phase of the analysis.

- (3) At each step in the initial analysis, an F statistic was computed to test the significance of each variable in the prediction at that step, given the contribution of the other variables in the system at that time. The significance of any one variable was subject to change at each step as other variables were added to the system (Weiner, 1969). It seemed desirable that each variable in the final system be significant at the $p < .10$ level.

After the final prediction system was determined, then the proportion of S_s statistically assigned to the same groups as their sex or FIRO-B scores would have them assigned was computed for each of the group comparisons. In addition, the probability of a S being assigned to each particular group was computed. These data then gave a practical indication of how well the discriminant classification system had matched the original independent variable (FIRO-B) classification.

A series of t -tests between the group means for all 48 variables was also computed for each variable considered separately.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Comparison: Independent Females vs. Dependent Females

Before examining the data from the discriminant function analysis, it seems appropriate to look at the findings in regard to the primary hypotheses. One original hypothesis assumed that the independent and the dependent (female) groups on the FIRO-B would manifest significantly different self-concepts on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), and the other assumed that these two groups would report significantly different dating histories on a Self-Rated (S-R) Questionnaire.

The general self-portrait presented by both groups will be described. The dependent females, scoring approximately one standard deviation below the mean of the norm group (Fitts, 1965), were more defensive and insecure about their self perception (low Dist D), chose significantly less "completely false" responses (Dist 1), and maintained a poorer view of their general physical appearance, body, health, sexuality, and skills (low Col A - Physical Self) than the norm group described in the TSCS manual. The mean for the independent females approximated the norm group mean on these variables.

The independent females, compared to the norm group, had a higher degree of self-acceptance and self-satisfaction (high Row 2 - Self Satisfaction), a higher sense of personal worth apart from others (high Col C - Personal Self), and more feelings of adequacy with people in general (high Col E - Social Self). The independents scored more than one standard deviation above the mean on Row 2, and approximated one standard deviation above the mean on Col C and Col E, whereas the dependent groups' mean was very similar to the norm group mean on all these variables.

Differences between the two groups' self-concepts will be discussed in the context of the discriminant function analysis, as well as in the context of individual comparisons among means with each variable considered separately.

As a result of the discriminant function analysis for differentiating independent from dependent females, a prediction system with three variables was formed. These variables were, in order of selection, Question 6 of the Self-Rating Questionnaire (S-R 6), Dist 4 of the TSCS, and Question 11 of the Self-Rating Questionnaire (S-R 11). (See Appendix C for the questions on the S-R Questionnaire and Appendix D for a listing of each of the TSCS variables.) The F values to enter these variables in the discriminant functions, as well as the F values for the final prediction system, are given in Table I.

The mean of the dependent group was significantly higher than that of the independent group on the distribution of "partially true" responses (Dist 4) and on S-R 11, but was significantly lower on S-R 6. (See Table II for a listing of the mean scores of each variable which was a significant contributor to either of the two prediction systems,

the mean scores of each variable significantly differentiating the groups when considered separately, and the means and standard deviations of the norm groups on the TSCS.) All three variables were significant at the $p < .05$ level in the final prediction system.

TABLE I
SELECTION ORDER AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF
STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES
DISCRIMINATING AMONG FEMALE
INDEPENDENT AND FEMALE
DEPENDENT GROUPS ON
THE FIRO-B

Variable	df	F Value to Enter	Final Prediction System	
			df	F
S-R 6	1,28	16.0000***	1,26	18.4507***
Dist 4	1,27	7.3288**	1,26	8.3108***
S-R 11	1,26	4.3864*	1,26	4.3864*

* $p < .05$

** $p < .025$

*** $p < .01$

The proportions of Ss from the original groups statistically classified the same as their original FIRO-B grouping are given in Table III, and the probabilities of classification in the group chosen are shown in Table IV.

In addition to the discriminant function analysis, a series of t-tests between the group means for all of the 48 variables, when considering each variable separately, indicated that 16 of the 48 variables significantly differentiated the two groups at the $p < .05$ level (see Table II). Regarding the TSCS variables, the female dependents tended to doubt their self-worth and regard their self-image as

TABLE II

MEAN SCORES OF EACH VARIABLE WHICH WAS A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTOR TO EITHER OF THE TWO PREDICTION SYSTEMS, THE MEAN SCORES FOR EACH VARIABLE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING THE GROUPS WHEN CONSIDERED SEPARATELY, AND THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE NORM GROUPS FOR PERTINENT VARIABLES ON THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE (TSCS)

Variable	Female Independent	Female Dependent	Male Independent	Norm	Standard Deviation
ToT P	367.59985	337.19995***	337.59985**	345.57	30.70
Row 1	126.20000	120.86665	118.20000**	127.10	9.96
Row 2	118.33333	107.26666**	107.59999	103.67	13.79
Row 3	123.06667	109.06667***	111.79999**	115.01	11.22
Col A	69.79999	64.66666**	65.53333	71.78	7.67
Col C	71.73332	64.06667***	66.53333	64.55	7.41
Col D	77.66666	68.86665***	70.79999***	70.83	8.43
Col E	75.53333	68.79999***	67.39999*** (***)	68.14	7.86
Dist D	118.46666	97.86665*	106.26666 (***)	120.44	24.19
Dist 1	19.53333	11.00000**	14.80000	20.63	9.01
Dist 4	25.39999	30.59999* (***)	25.26666	24.36	7.55
ToT C	23.33333	27.73332	29.59999**	30.10	8.21
Col ToT V	20.46666	23.13333	24.53333*	29.03	9.12
N	89.66666	81.26666**	82.86665	84.31	11.10
PD	80.39999	73.73332	70.73332**	76.39	11.72
GM	101.53333	92.20000***	93.59999***	98.80	9.15
S-R 5	1.06667	1.46667**	1.46667** (**)		
S-R 6	2.00000	1.46667*** (**)	1.73333** (#)		
S-R 8	1.00000	1.26667*	1.40000***		
S-R 11	1.66667	1.93333 (*)	1.80000		
S-R 17	1.86667	1.46667**	1.80000		

*p < .05 **p < .025 **p < .01 #p < .10

Asterisks in parentheses refer to significance levels for the discriminant function analyses; asterisks without parentheses reflect significance when each variable was considered separately. Note that the comparisons are between the Female Independents and each of the other groups.

TABLE III
 PROPORTION OF STATISTICAL CLASSIFICATION
 OF Ss WITH INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT
 PROFILES MATCHING THEIR ORIGINAL
 FIRO-B GROUPING

<u>Original Groups</u>	Proportion of Correct Classifications
p (female independent classified female independent)	.93
p (female dependent classified female dependent)	.80

TABLE IV
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROBABILITIES
 OF CLASSIFICATION FOR FEMALE
 INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT
 GROUPS ON THE FIRO-B

Probability of Classification	Frequency			
	I-I	I-D	D-D	D-I
.95 - 1.00	7	0	6	0
.90 - .94	2	0	3	0
.85 - .89	1	0	0	0
.80 - .84	0	0	0	0
.75 - .79	1	0	1	1
.70 - .74	0	0	1	0
.65 - .69	0	0	0	2
.60 - .64	0	0	0	0
.55 - .59	1	0	0	0
.50 - .54	2	1	1	0
Totals	14	1	12	3

I-I: independents classified independents (correct classification)
 I-D: independents classified dependents (misclassification)
 D-D: dependents classified dependents (correct classification)
 D-I: dependents classified independents (misclassification)

The two frequency distributions of the probabilities of correct classification (I-I and D-D) were negatively skewed.

significantly less desirable (lower ToT P); experienced a significantly poorer sense of self-functioning (lower Row 3 - Behavior); experienced significantly more feelings of inadequacy and worthlessness as a family member (lower Col D - Family Self); scored significantly lower on a General Maladjustment (GM) scale designed inversely to differentiate psychiatric patients from nonpatients; scored significantly lower on an inversely designed Neuroticism (N) scale indicating high similarity to neurotic patients from which the scale was derived; scored significantly lower on the distribution of #1 ("completely false") responses (Dist 1) indicating a lack of certainty in their self-perception; scored significantly higher on the distribution of #4 ("partially true") responses (Dist 4) indicating uncertainty and defensiveness in their self-perception; scored significantly lower on the total distribution of responses across the five available choices (Dist D) indicating defensiveness and insecurity; experienced a significantly poorer view of their general physical appearance, body, health, sexuality, and skills (lower Col A - Physical Self); reported less self-satisfaction (lower Row 2 - Self Satisfaction); reported less of a sense of personal worth apart from others (lower Col C - Personal Self); and, finally, reported feeling less adequate with people in general (lower Col E - Social Self) than did the female independents. Regarding the S-R variable, the female dependents, in reporting their dating partners as the ones responsible for ending the majority of their past dating relationships, significantly differed from the independents, who unanimously reported ending the majority of their past dating relationships themselves (S-R 6). Further, the dependents regarded their past dating relationships as significantly less meaningful (S-R 5) and also thought their

partners regarded the relationships as less meaningful than did the independents who unanimously reflected the opposite (S-R 8). And lastly, in the context of their most recent or current relationship, the dependents thought their partners considered them to be dependent, while the independents thought their partners considered them to be independent (S-R 17).

Comparison: Male vs. Female Independents

Before examining the data from the discriminant function analysis or looking at individual comparisons among the means of the two groups on each of the variables, the general self-portraits presented by both groups will be described.

The female independents, compared to the norm group described in the TSCS Manual, presented themselves with a high degree of self-acceptance and self-satisfaction (high Row 2 - Self Satisfaction), a high sense of personal worth apart from others (high Col C - Personal Self), and feelings of adequacy with people in general (high Col E - Social Self). The females independents scored more than one standard deviation above the mean on Row 2 while the Row 2 mean for the male independents was very similar to the norm group mean. A tendency toward being one standard deviation above the norm group mean for the females was also seen on Col C and Col E, as well as a tendency toward being one standard deviation below the norm group mean on Col ToT V (Column Total Variability), whereas the males approximated the norm group means for all these variables.

The male independents, on the other hand, seem to question their basic identity (low Row 1 - Identity) and hold a rather poor view of

their own physical appearance, body, health, sexuality, and skills (low Col A - Physical Self). The males tended toward one standard deviation below the mean of the standardization group on these variables, whereas the females approximated the norm group means.

Further differences between the two groups' will be discussed in the context of the discriminant function analysis, as well as in the context of individual comparisons among means with each variable considered separately.

As a result of the discriminant function analysis for differentiating male from female independents, a prediction system with four variables was formed. These variables were, in order of selection, Col E and Dist D of the TSCS, Question 5 (S-R 5) and Question 6 (S-R 6) of the Self-Rating Questionnaire (see Appendix C for the questions on the S-R Questionnaire and Appendix D for a listing of each of the TSCS variables). The F values to enter these variables in the discriminant functions, as well as the F values for the final prediction system, are given in Table V.

The means for the females were significantly higher than that of the males on Col E (Social Self), Dist D (Distribution of Responses) and S-R 6, but was significantly lower than the males on S-R 5. (See Table II for a listing of the mean scores of each variable which was a significant contributor to either of the two prediction systems, the mean scores of each variable significantly differentiating the groups when considered separately, and the means and standard deviations of the norm groups on the TSCS.) The first two predictors were significant at the $p < .01$ level, the third at the $p < .025$ level, and the fourth at the $p < .10$ level in the final prediction system.

TABLE V

SELECTION ORDER AND TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE
OF STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES
DISCRIMINATING AMONG MALE AND
FEMALE INDEPENDENT GROUPS ON
THE FIRO-B

Variable	df	F Value To Enter	Final Prediction System	
			df	F
Col E	1,28	9.8991***	1,25	17.5932***
Dist D	1,27	9.5393***	1,25	14.5390***
S-R 5	1,26	8.6497***	1,25	7.0511**
S-R 6	1,25	4.0698#	1,25	4.0698#

**p < .025

***p < .01

#p < .10

The proportions of Ss from the original groups statistically classified the same as their original FIRO-B grouping are given in Table VI, and the probabilities of classification in the group chosen are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VI

PROPORTION OF STATISTICAL CLASSIFICATION
OF MALE AND FEMALE INDEPENDENT
Ss MATCHING THEIR ORIGINAL
SEX GROUPING

<u>Original Groups</u>	Proportion of Correct Classifications
p (male independent classified male independent)	.93
p (female independent classified female independent)	1.00

TABLE VII
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROBABILITIES OF
 CLASSIFICATION FOR MALE AND FEMALE
 INDEPENDENTS ON THE FIRO-B

Probability of Classification	Frequency			
	M-M	M-F	F-F	F-M
.95 - 1.00	7	0	9	0
.90 - .94	2	0	3	0
.85 - .89	2	1	0	0
.80 - .84	1	0	0	0
.75 - .79	1	0	0	0
.70 - .74	0	0	1	0
.65 - .69	0	0	0	0
.60 - .64	1	0	0	0
.55 - .59	0	0	2	0
.50 - .54	0	0	0	0
Totals	14	1	15	0

M-M: independent males classified male (correct classification)
 M-F: independent males classified female (misclassification)
 F-F: independent females classified female (correct classification)
 F-M: independent females classified male (misclassification)

The two frequency distributions of the probabilities of correct classification (M-M and F-F) were negatively skewed.

In addition to the discriminant function analysis, a series of t-tests between the two groups' means for all of the 48 variables, when considering each variable separately, indicated that 12 of the 48 variables significantly differentiated the two groups at the .05 level or less (see Table II). Regarding the TSCS variables, the males tended to doubt their self-worth and regard their self image as significantly less desirable (low ToT P); experience a significantly poorer sense of self-functioning (low Row 3 - Behavior); experience significantly more feelings of inadequacy and worthlessness as a family member (low Col D - Family Self); experience more confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self-perception (high ToT C); experience a self-concept significantly more variable with respect to its external frame of reference, reflecting compartmentalization with little unity or integration (high Col ToT V); score significantly lower on an inversely designed Personality Disorder (PD) scale designed to differentiate this broad diagnostic category; scored significantly lower on an inversely designed General Maladjustment (GM) scale designed to differentiate psychiatric patients from nonpatients; scored significantly lower on Row 1 (Identity); and lastly, scored significantly lower on Col E (Social Self) than did the female independents.

Regarding the S-R variables the males regarded their past dating relationships as significantly less meaningful than did the females (S-R 5); they thought their partners regarded the relationships as less meaningful than thought the females, who--unanimously--reported their partners regarding the relationships as meaningful (S-R 8); and the males, although reporting their own responsibility for ending the majority of their past dating relationships, significantly differed from the

females, who--unanimously--reported ending the majority of their past dating relationships themselves (S-R 6).

Other Comparisons

A series of t-tests on all 48 predictor variables between dependent male (n=6) vs. dependent female groups (n=15) and between dependent male (n=6) and independent male groups (n=15) were generally nonsignificant. The only significant variable found to differentiate dependent from independent males was Col ToT V ($F = 5.1963$; $df = 1,19$, $p < .05$). The only significant variable found to differentiate dependent males from dependent females was S-R 11 ($F = 6.2837$; $df = 1,19$; $p < .025$).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Comparison: Independent Females vs.

Dependent Females

All of the reported findings, which were hypothesized with the exception of the more specific Distribution responses, were significant in the predicted direction except for Col D (Family Self). This latter finding, contrary to the original prediction, suggests that the dependent female regards herself as less adequate as a family member than does the independent female. This finding may perhaps be better understood in terms of the effects of past, familial experience; a dimension not investigated within the context of the present study.

Although the hypotheses concerning the empirically derived Neuroticism (N) and General Maladjustment (GM) scales--that dependent females were more similar to neurotics and were less adjusted than were the independent females, respectively--were supported, some of the more specific hypotheses were not sufficiently strong to be detected by dichotomizing the Ss on the basis of their FIRO-B "control" scores. The hypotheses that the dependents would score lower than the independents on Row 1 (Identity), Defensive Positive (DP), Personality Disorder (PD), and Personality Integration (PI); the hypotheses that the dependents would score higher than the independents on Total Variability (ToT V), Total Conflict (ToT C), and the Number of Deviant Signs (NDS)

did not prove statistically significant, but the means of the two groups on these variables all differed in the predicted direction.

Concerning the S-R Questionnaire, both of the reported findings which had been hypothesized (S-R 5 and S-R 6) were significant in the predicted direction. It is interesting to note that S-R 17 involving the "interperception" of dependency/independency proved significant in differentiating the two groups while the same question, S-R 15, phrased in a more direct manner ("In this relationship, do you consider yourself to be dependent or independent?") proved insignificant. The failure of the less subtle question to achieve significance may be due not to a failure in self-perception, but rather to the defensiveness displayed by the dependents on the Distribution responses.

The data did not support the more specific hypotheses concerning the amount of time spent in between relationships (S-R 2) or the degree of satisfaction with them (S-R 4). However, it may be that the lack of significance here has little implication for the effects of success or failure--satisfaction or dissatisfaction--per se. It may be more accurate in future research to view these effects from the perspective of change in experience from success to failure or from failure to success, rather than in more absolute terms. In any case, it seems that satisfaction and meaningfulness--although not necessarily exclusive--did, in the present study, seem to represent separate dimensions of interpersonal experience, the latter achieving statistically significance and the former not. It seems likely that differences in the meaningfulness of a relationship may, in some fashion, interact with perceived satisfaction or dissatisfaction, this being a function, perhaps, of differences in past experience. It seems logical to assume that

during the course of his or her dating relationships, the S certainly makes interpersonal judgments and evaluations; but, unless we know what his or her expectations might be and, therefore, upon what those judgments are based, we cannot reliably predict his or her behavior. For example, if success-oriented Ss have in the past been involved more frequently than failure-oriented Ss in dating situations in which they have perceived satisfaction, satisfaction would be a more familiar experience to them and, hence, may prove more, or less, meaningful. Similarly, failure-oriented Ss may have had more experiences with situations involving failure than success-oriented Ss. Hence, failure would be a more familiar experience to them, and therefore, prove more, or less, meaningful. In this regard, caution should be taken in generalizing results to situations in which individuals experience a stable series of success or failure, or in cases where change occurs between success or failure and a situation which cannot be construed as either.

Before looking at the results of the discriminant function analysis, a certain correspondence between the experimental methodology and the present statistical methods warrants comment. The purpose of this study is not an etiological analysis of emotional dependency. However, some comment must be made regarding the possibility of future research in this area. The author's procedure for holding constant, or partialling out, the significant variance of one stage of interpersonal development--freshmen and sophomore college years--in order to identify the predictors of dependency/independency, in retrospect, seems not to deal with the problem of confounding later with prior determinants in validating the effects of either. In view of the nebulous and possible significant effects of early childhood-familial experiences, which have not

been considered in the present study, it seems that statistical confounding of later with earlier determinants is an inherent possibility in the present design. As a result, the effects of interpersonal dating experiences and of possibly significant childhood-familial experiences cannot be isolated from one another; we do not know if both are operating or only one--and if one, which; we do not know if satisfaction-dissatisfaction or meaningfulness-unmeaningfulness merely comprise the precipitating circumstance for the expression of emotional dependency, or should be considered symptoms of some more fundamental deficiency perhaps more inherent in the individual. Perhaps future psycho-social studies interested in the genesis of emotional dependency should look more deeply than at the relatively immediate conditions which may have precipitated emotional dependency, for it may well be that it is the effects of early experience on our expectations that is most decisive in shaping later dependent or independent behavior. Techniques as refined as those in the present study, as well as others such as multiple regression and canonical correlation might help narrow the gap between the effects of earlier, familial experience and later interpersonal experience, both by accommodating a wider band of stages along with the possibility of some behavioral measures, and by identifying a greater number of determinants within these stages. Traditionally, the predictive emphasis from reports involving longitudinal research has been upon over-time consistencies of the same specific behaviors (i.e., dependency, aggression), but the model used in the present study, as well as those suggested, would depart radically from such assessment of the persistence of phenotypic traits, considering one variable at a time, and, rather, would focus on a series of possible etiological

factors. After all, psychological health, as an inherently complex process, does seem to require such a global assessment; and accordingly, the prediction of such a construct demands that we ask what combinations of experience and behaviors, at which developmental periods, predict psychological health at maturity.

According to the discriminant function analysis, the most important variable for evaluating personality differences between the female dependents and independents is who-- the S or her partner--ended the majority of her past dating relationships (S-R 6). As predicted, the dependent group reported their partners as responsible for ending the majority of relationships, whereas the independent group unanimously reflected the opposite. The second predictor variable was the distribution of #4 responses (Dist 4) on the TSCS with the dependents choosing this "mostly true" response significantly more often than the independents. This may, perhaps, be best understood in terms of their uncertainty and defensiveness manifest in an acquiescent social desirability set. The first two predictors, in combination with each other, were effective in (statistically) classifying 100% of the independent group. The third predictor variable was whether the S considered most of her dates as having been dependent or independent (S-R 11). The dependent group saw their dating partners as more independent than did the independent group. It is interesting to note that the third predictor was not significant in differentiating the two groups outside the prediction system.

These three variables comprised the system most effective in statistically predicting membership among the two groups, correctly classifying 26 of the 30 original group Ss.

A final note concerning the present statistical method and its relation to the results of this study are in order. The statistical differences between both the female independent vs. female dependent groups and the male vs. female independent groups have been made very apparent. However, a few words of caution must be said before generalizing the very powerful statistical differentiation of groups to a more applied clinical and behavioral differentiation of the same. Although these differences are dramatically consistent when plotted on a profile score sheet, it must be pointed out that there is not a single group mean which deviates from the TSCS norm group mean by significantly more than one standard deviation. This observation, then, leads to the question of just exactly how different--behaviorally--the Ss involved are regardless of their sex or FIRO-B grouping. That is, if all Ss are consistently within normal ranges ($T = 40-60$), can the obtained statistical differences really be assumed to differentiate these normal individuals in any practically meaningful way? This question is offered as a word of caution, for, on the other hand, it may well be that the observed psychometric differences--as consistent yet as small as they are--do, in reality, have disproportionately large behavioral counterparts. This is certainly grounds for further research.

Comparison: Male vs. Female Independents

According to the discriminant function analysis, the most important variable for evaluating personality differences between the male and female independents was their sense of adequacy and worth in social interaction with other people in general (Col E - Social Self). The males reported feeling much less adequate in this respect than did

the females. The second predictor variable was the summary score of the Ss' distribution of answers across the five available choices on the TSCS (Dist D), a measure of certainty in self-perception. The males were significantly more defensive and guarded than were the females, suggesting apparent uncertainty in their self-perception. It is interesting to note that the second predictor variable--Dist D--was not significant in differentiating the two groups outside the prediction system.

The third predictor variable was how meaningful the S reported his or her past dating relationships to be (S-R 5). The males regarded their past dating relationships as significantly less meaningful than did the females. The males' report of having experienced less meaningful relationships than the females' was not particularly unusual in light of their own feelings of interpersonal inadequacy (Col E) and lowered self-esteem (ToT P). Viewed in terms of a Frommian sense of interpersonal immaturity, the males sampled may be seen as, or see themselves as, "having nothing to give, only to take." Along these lines, the obtained sex differences between the independent males and females might be regarded as a reflection of a difference in maturity levels, reminiscent of Ryan's (1960) distinction between the "mature" and "immature rebel" (independent). This difference may be due either to the nature of the college population sampled, or, perhaps, to a major ego difference--in terms of maturity--which exists throughout adult life. Empirically, this notion acquires some support in the males' statistically differentiating themselves from the females on both the Personality Disorder (PD) and the General Maladjustment (GM) scales of the TSCS. The males were generally not as well adjusted as

the females on the GM scale and the PD diagnostic category associates them with a deeply-engrained pattern of rebelliousness and immaturity. Deutsch (1944) has elaborated on the corresponding adolescent ego and behavioral changes for the boy in terms of a turning toward reality and mastery of the outside world; and for the girl, as a turning toward affectivity without the undue regression and rebellion more characteristic of the less mature, male independent. Perhaps it is this very acceptance of their new (adult) behavioral role about which the mystic "women mature faster than men" holds. In the more mature, female independent, potentially threatening feelings of overt passivity can be explored and sustained, rather than abruptly curtailed, if she has the assurance of being in command of herself as reflected in her self-concept. This paradox of self-assured passivity in the healthy women, in fact, forms the central theme of Deutsch's feminine psychology (1944).

Who was responsible for ending the majority of past dating relationships (S-R 6)--the S or partner--was the final predictor variable. The males reported significantly less occasions of their ending past relationships themselves than did the females, who unanimously reported themselves ending the majority of their past dating relationships. These four variables comprised the system most effective in statistically predicting membership among the two groups, correctly classifying 29 of the 30 original group Ss.

In retrospect, the males were significantly more likely to manifest a sense of social inadequacy, uncertainty in their self-concept, report less meaningful relationships, and report less responsibility for ending the majority of their past dating relationships than their female

partners. From this, it is possible that the males tend to see themselves in terms of failing to display the characteristics stereotypically associated with the masculine role; namely, the display of self-assured, dominant, assertive behavior, and full independence in the context of a heterosexual relationship, thereby lending further credence to their sense of social inadequacy.

The obtained sex differences in the present study may be attributed to a variety of reasons, one of which has already been discussed in terms of degree of maturity, and another of which may simply involve the sex of the E. It is possible that some male or female Ss, in the presence of a male E, would take more effort to present a desirable picture of their past dating history than would others. The curious, and almost uncanny, degree of similarity between the male independent group and the female dependent group, however, deserves some further consideration. Aside from the maturity hypothesis, it may well be that male independents are, in fact, not nearly as independent as they often report themselves to be. It may be that, as women in our culture are offered the socially acceptable choice of reporting either dependence or independence, males are not yet afforded the same socially acceptable luxury. The realization that independent males--or males who report they are independent--are simply not as psychologically secure with that status as are their female counterparts is a point not offering much support to any doctrine of male chauvinism. In fact, the only one of the three groups investigated which profiled themselves as particularly healthy psychologically, as compared with the norms and the other groups, was the female independent group. This can be seen as a point in favor of the contemporary women's liberation movement:

that female independence and psychological health, defined in terms of the self-concept, do seem to coincide with each other to a great degree.

Other Comparisons

The failure to detect a great deal of significant differences between the dependent male group and the dependent female or independent male groups may be attributed to a variety of reasons. The most obvious reason seems to be the lack of a substantive number of Ss to fill the dependent male category (n=6). As already discussed, it may be that the males in our society do not have the socially accepted option of reporting their dependency. Consequently, it may be that the male independent group sampled is actually comprised of a mixture of truly independent males and others who are either unaware of their actual state of dependence or are unwilling to report it, in which case the lack of separation between groups would be understandable.

Any of the above hypotheses are offered as hypotheses for future testing. The results are also taken to be a further indication of the fruitfulness of this area, as well as the necessity for considering sex-role variation in attempts to identify factors operative in the genesis of emotional dependency. Future research dealing with the evaluation of various social causes should evaluate such conditions as discussed earlier (i.e., intrafamilial childhood experiences).

A final note, one which has been explicit in the approach from the start, is in order. It is assumed that the healthiness of behavior at a given point in development can be assessed by its aftermath in adulthood. A major goal of the present study was to bring some order

to the assessment, or measurement, of emotional dependency; to provide a valid profile, a psychometric description of the dependent individual. The "control" area of the FIRO-B was highly effective in differentiating Ss on the basis of their self-concepts, thereby providing both construct and concurrent validity to that instrument. It was thought that the predictive value of a test could be significantly supplemented by additional variables based on self-report. In both classification systems derived from the discriminant function analyses, this held true. If further research can establish an inventory of reliably observable health-predictive signs, the clinician will have available to him an invaluable aid to personality evaluation. By identifying pathogenic cues prospectively, rather than retrospectively, and quite apart from their current statistical or adaptive status, it should become possible to offer a more practical definition of psychologically healthy behavior during the developmental years.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J., and N. Abeles. Dependency changes in psychotherapy as related to interpersonal relationships. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32 (6), 685-689.
- Barnett, J. Dependency conflicts in the young adult. Psychoanalytic Review, 1971, 58 (1), 111-125.
- Barnett, S. A. The rat: A study in behavior. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1963.
- Bergler, E. On pseudo-dependence. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 1955, 29, 239-247.
- Bernardin, A. C., and R. Jessor. A construct validation of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule with respect to dependency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 63-67.
- Butterfield, E., and E. Zigler. The effects of success and failure on the discrimination learning of normal and retarded children. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70 (1), 25-31.
- Crandell, V. Reinforcement effects of adult reactions and nonreactions on children's achievement expectations. Child Development, 1969, 40 (2), 547-557.
- Diener, R. G. Prediction of dependent behavior in specified situations from psychological tests. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20 (1), 103-108.
- Fitts, W. H. Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Fitts, W. H., and W. T. Hamner. The self concept and delinquency. Nashville Mental Health Center Monograph No. 1, Nashville, 1961.
- Fitzgerald, B. J. Some relationships among projective tests, interview and sociometric measures of dependent behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 199-203.
- Fromm, E. Man for himself. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1947.
- Gador-Donath, B., and Z. Kereszty. Some educational, psychological aspects of dependency needs directed toward grown-ups on the basis of letters written by adolescent girls. Pszichologiai Tanulmányok, 1965, 8, 156-169.

- Grant, E. C., and M. R. A. Chance. Rank order in caged rats. Animal Behavior, 1958, 6, 183-194.
- Hicks, L. E. Some properties of ipsative, normative, and forced-choice normative measures. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 74 (3), 167-184.
- Hill, K. T., and J. B. Dusek. Children's achievement expectations as a function of social reinforcement, sex of subject, and test anxiety. Child Development, 1969, 40 (2), 547-557.
- Horney, K. Our inner conflicts. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1945.
- Kagan, J., and H. A. Moss. Birth to Maturity: A study in psychological development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.
- Kanareff, V. T., and J. T. Lanzetta. Effects of success-failure experiences and probability of reinforcement upon acquisition and extinction of an imitative response. Psychological Reports, 1960, 7, 151-166.
- Kelman, H. C. Effects of success and failure on suggestibility in the autokinetic situation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 267-285.
- Lahtinen, P. M. The effect of rejection and failure on children's dependency. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25 (6), 3688-3689.
- Lanzetta, J. T., and V. T. Kanareff. The effect of congruent and conflicting social and task feedback on the acquisition of an imitative response. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1961, 62 (4), 322-328.
- Leary, T. Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957.
- Linton, H., and E. Graham. Personality correlates of persuasibility. In Hovland, C. I., and I. L. Janis (eds.), Personality and persuasibility. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Lish, J. The influence of oral dependency, failure, and social exposure upon self-esteem and depression. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 30 (12-B), 5692.
- Lorr, M., P. Bishop and D. McNair. Interpersonal types among psychiatric patients. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70 (6), 468-472.
- Mausner, B., and J. Graham. Field dependence and prior reinforcement as determinants of social interaction in judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 486-493.

- Mausner, B. Effect of prior reinforcement on the interaction of observer pairs. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 65-68.
- Mehrabian, A. The development and validation of measures of affiliative tendency and sensitivity to rejection. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970, 30 (2), 417-428.
- Monroe, B. D. The influence of successful and unsuccessful social experiences on dominant-subordinate behavior of the rat. Unpublished Masters thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1967.
- Navran, L. A rationally derived MMPI scale to measure dependence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1954, 18, 192.
- Nelson, J. W. Dependency as a construct: An evaluation of some data. Dissertation Abstracts, 1959, 19 (3), 2149.
- Nikelly, A. G. The dependent adolescent. Adolescence, 1971, 6 (22), 139-144.
- Ring, K., and K. Wallston. A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 147-154.
- Rosenberg, S., and R. L. Hall. The effects of different social feedback conditions upon performance in dyadic teams. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 271-277.
- Sears, R. R., J. W. M. Whiting, V. Nowlis, and P. S. Sears. Some child-rearing antecedents of aggression and dependency in young children. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1953, 47, 135-234.
- Sechrest, L., and J. Wallace. Psychology and human problems. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1967.
- Seitz, P. F. D. The effects of infantile experiences upon adult behavior in animal subjects: I. Effects of litter size during infancy upon adult behavior in the rat. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1954, 110, 916-927.
- Shutz, W. C. FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of Interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart, 1958. (FIRO-B Manual, Clinical Interpretation of the FIRO-B, by L. R. Ryan, Consulting Psychologists Press, 1960).
- Smith, J. The relation of marital satisfaction to dependency needs in self, mate and parents. Dissertation Abstracts, 1972, 33 (4-B), 1807.
- Sullivan, H. S. The study of psychiatry. Psychiatry, 1947, 10, 355-371.

- Symonds, A. Phobias after marriage: Women's declaration of dependence. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1971, 31 (2), 144-152.
- Weiner, B. J. Statistical analysis. In A Comparison of the toy play characteristics of organic mentally retarded and normal children. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1969.
- Winder, C. L., F. Z. Ahmad, A. Bandura, and L. C. Rau. Dependency of patients, psychotherapist responses, and aspects of psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.
- Witkin, H. A., R. B. Dyke, H. F. Faterson, D. R. Goodenough, and S. A. Karp. Psychological differentiating. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Zuckerman, M. The validity of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule in the measurement of dependency-rebelliousness. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958, 14, 379-382.
- Zuckerman, M., E. E. Levitt, and B. Lubin. Concurrent and construct validity of direct and indirect measures of dependency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25 (4), 316-323.

APPENDIX A

FIRO-B

For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as honest as you can.

1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. I try to be with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. I try to include other people in my plans. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. I let other people decide what to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. I let other people control my actions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. I join social groups. | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. I try to have people around me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. I try to have close relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. I try to get close and personal with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity. | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. When people are doing things together I tend to join them. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 14. I am easily led by people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. I try to be included in informal social activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 15. I try to avoid being alone. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 16. I try to participate in group activities. |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 17. I try to be friendly to people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 23. I try to get close and personal with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 18. I let other people decide what to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> 24. I let other people control my actions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant. | <input type="checkbox"/> 25. I act cool and distant with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20. I let other people take charge of things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 26. I am easily led by people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21. I try to have close relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 22. I let other people strongly influence my actions. | |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 28. I like people to invite me to things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 38. I like people to act friendly toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 32. I like people to act close toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 40. I like people to act distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 34. I like people to include me in their activities. | |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 48. I like people to include me in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 42. I like people to invite me to things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 49. I like people to act close and personal with me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 43. I like people to act close toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 44. I try to have other people do things I want done. | <input type="checkbox"/> 51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 45. I like people to invite me to join their activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 52. I like people to act distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 54. I take charge of things when I'm with people. |

APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: On the separate answer sheet, fill in your name, sex, age, grade and today's date. Then code the appropriate letter or number according to the sample below. Be sure your marks are heavy and completely fill the spaces.

SAMPLE:

SEX	
Male	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Female	<input type="radio"/>

The statements in this inventory are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. Erase completely any answer you wish to change and mark your new answer.

RESPONSES	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and Partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	C	M		M	C
	F	F	PF - PT	T	T
	1	2	3	4	5

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked Time Started and record the time. When you have finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked Time Finished. Erase any stray marks on your answer sheet.

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. I have a healthy body..... | 1 |
| 2. I am an attractive person..... | 2 |
| 3. I consider myself a sloppy person..... | 3 |
| 4. I am a decent sort of person..... | 4 |
| 5. I am an honest person..... | 5 |
| 6. I am a bad person..... | 6 |
| 7. I am a cheerful person..... | 7 |
| 8. I am a calm and easy going person..... | 8 |
| 9. I am a nobody..... | 9 |
| 10. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble..... | 10 |
| 11. I am a member of a happy family..... | 11 |
| 12. My friends have no confidence in me..... | 12 |
| 13. I am a friendly person..... | 13 |
| 14. I am popular with men..... | 14 |
| 15. I am not interested in what other people do..... | 15 |
| 16. I do not always tell the truth..... | 16 |
| 17. I get angry sometimes..... | 17 |
| 18. I like to look nice and neat all the time..... | 18 |
| 19. I am full of aches and pains..... | 19 |
| 20. I am a sick person..... | 20 |
| 21. I am a religious person..... | 21 |
| 22. I am a moral failure..... | 22 |
| 23. I am a morally weak person..... | 23 |
| 24. I have a lot of self-control..... | 24 |
| 25. I am a hateful person..... | 25 |
| 26. I am losing my mind..... | 26 |
| 27. I am an important person to my friends and family..... | 27 |
| 28. I am not loved by my family..... | 28 |
| 29. I feel that my family doesn't trust me..... | 29 |
| 30. I am popular with women..... | 30 |
| 31. I am mad at the whole world..... | 31 |
| 32. I am hard to be friendly with..... | 32 |
| 33. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about..... | 33 |
| 34. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross..... | 34 |
| 35. I am neither too fat nor too thin..... | 35 |
| 36. I like my looks just the way they are..... | 36 |
| 37. I would like to change some parts of my body..... | 37 |
| 38. I am satisfied with my moral behavior..... | 38 |
| 39. I am satisfied with my relationship to God..... | 39 |
| 40. I ought to go to church more..... | 40 |

41. I am satisfied to be just what I am.....	41
42. I am just as nice as I should be	42
43. I despise myself	43
44. I am satisfied with my family relationships	44
45. I understand my family as well as I should	45
46. I should trust my family more	46
47. I am as sociable as I want to be	47
48. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it	48
49. I am no good at all from a social standpoint.....	49
50. I do not like everyone I know	50
51. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.....	51
52. I am neither too tall nor too short	52
53. I don't feel as well as I should	53
54. I should have more sex appeal.....	54
55. I am as religious as I want to be	55
56. I wish I could be more trustworthy	56
57. I shouldn't tell so many lies	57
58. I am as smart as I want to be	58
59. I am not the person I would like to be	59
60. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.....	60
61. I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).....	61
62. I am too sensitive to things my family say	62
63. I should love my family more	63
64. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people	64
65. I should be more polite to others	65
66. I ought to get along better with other people.....	66
67. I gossip a little at times	67
68. At times I feel like swearing	68
69. I take good care of myself physically	69
70. I try to be careful about my appearance	70
71. I often act like I am "all thumbs"	71
72. I am true to my religion in my everyday life	72
73. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong	73
74. I sometimes do very bad things	74
75. I can always take care of myself in any situation.....	75
76. I take the blame for things without getting mad	76
77. I do things without thinking about them first	77
78. I try to play fair with my friends and family	78
79. I take a real interest in my family	79
80. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living).....	80
81. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view	81
82. I get along well with other people	82
83. I do not forgive others easily	83
84. I would rather win than lose in a game.....	84
85. I feel good most of the time	85
86. I do poorly in sports and games	86
87. I am a poor sleeper.....	87
88. I do what is right most of the time.....	88
89. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead	89
90. I have trouble doing the things that are right	90
91. I solve my problems quite easily.....	91
92. I change my mind a lot	92
93. I try to run away from my problems	93
94. I do my share of work at home	94
95. I quarrel with my family	95
96. I do not act like my family thinks I should	96
97. I see good points in all the people I meet	97
98. I do not feel at ease with other people	98
99. I find it hard to talk with strangers	99
100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.....	100

APPENDIX C

SELF-RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

SELF-RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

Identification No. _____ Class _____
 Grade _____ Date _____
 Sex _____ Re: dating, interperceptions
 Marital Status _____

The purpose of the following questionnaire is to seek information regarding the totality of your dating experience; that is, the effect upon you of all your dating experiences considered in sum.

NOTE: With the exception of specified questions at the end, please omit your most recent or current dating partner from consideration. Quantitative answers may be approximated.

I understand that this questionnaire is for research purposes and is completely optional, and that any specific information which I supply will be strictly confidential.

 Student initials

1. Approximately how many dates have you had? _____
2. Approximately how many dating relationships have you had? _____
3. On the average, how much time (in weeks) has there been in between relationships; from the end of one until the beginning of another?

4. Have your prior dating relationships been generally satisfactory ("1") or unsatisfactory ("2") to you? Please respond by number. _____
5. Have your prior dating relationships been generally meaningful ("1") or not meaningful ("2") to you? Please respond by number. _____
6. Who ended the majority of past dating relationships: your partner ("1") or yourself ("2")? Please respond by number. _____
7. In your opinion, have your dates generally regarded the relationships as satisfactory ("1") or unsatisfactory ("2")? _____
8. In your opinion, have your dates generally regarded the relationships as meaningful ("1") or not meaningful ("2")? _____
9. In most of your dating relationships, would you consider yourself as having been dependent ("1") or independent ("2")? _____

10. Do you think your dating partners usually consider you to be dependent ("1") or independent ("2")? _____
11. In your relationships, would you consider your dates as having been mostly dependent ("1") or mostly independent ("2")? _____

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING SECTION FOR YOUR MOST RECENT OR CURRENT DATING RELATIONSHIP.

12. How long (in months) has this relationship been going on? _____
13. Do you consider this relationship satisfactory ("1") or unsatisfactory ("2") for you? _____
14. Do you consider this relationship meaningful ("1") or not meaningful ("2") for you? _____
15. In this relationship, do you consider yourself to be dependent ("1") or independent ("2")? _____
16. In this relationship, do you consider your partner to be dependent ("1") or independent ("2")? _____
17. In this relationship, do you think your date would consider you to be dependent ("1") or independent ("2")? _____
18. Do you think your partner regards this relationship as satisfactory ("1") or unsatisfactory ("2")? _____
19. Do you think your partner regards this relationship as meaningful ("1") or not meaningful ("2")? _____

APPENDIX D

VARIABLES COMPRISING THE SUBSCALES OF THE
TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE (TSCS)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>TSCS Scale</u>
SC	Self-Criticism
ToT P	Total Positive
Row 1	Identity
Row 2	Self Satisfaction
Row 3	Behavior
Col A	Physical Self
Col B	Moral-Ethical Self
Col C	Personal Self
Col D	Family Self
Col E	Social Self
Tot V	Total Variability
Col ToT V	Column Total Variability
Row ToT V	Row Total Variability
Dist D	Distribution (of responses)
Dist 1	Distribution of #1 responses
Dist 2	Distribution of #2 responses
Dist 3	Distribution of #3 responses
Dist 4	Distribution of #4 responses
Dist 5	Distribution of #5 responses
T/F	True-false ratio
ToT C	Total Conflict
Net C	Net Conflict
Psy	Psychosis Scale
N	Neurosis Scale
PD	Personality Disorder Scale
DP	Defensive Position
PI	Personality Integration
NDS	Number of Deviant Signs

2

Vita

Robert Neil Weinberger

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: EMOTIONAL DEPENDENCY, DATING AND SELF-CONCEPT

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Scranton, Pennsylvania, April 25, 1950,
the son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Weinberger.

Education: Graduate of Central High School, Scranton, Pennsylvania
in June, 1967; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from
C. W. Post College in 1971, with a major in psychology;
enrolled in the psychology program in clinical, Oklahoma
State University, 1972-1974.

Professional Experience: Youth Counselor for Florida State
Division of Youth Services, 1971-1972; teaching assistant
at OSU, 1972-1974; psychological associate at Payne County
Guidance Center, 1972-1973; psychological associate at OSU
Psychological Services Center, 1973-1974.