

This dissertation has been  
microfilmed exactly as received

69-16,576

SWANSON, Bernice Marian, 1924-  
PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS: A CHILD'S  
ACCEPTANCE BY OTHERS, OF OTHERS,  
AND OF SELF.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1969  
Psychology, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS: A CHILD'S ACCEPTANCE  
BY OTHERS, OF OTHERS, AND OF SELF

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
BERNICE MARIAN SWANSON  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1969

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS: A CHILD'S ACCEPTANCE  
BY OTHERS, OF OTHERS, AND OF SELF

APPROVED BY

John J. Parker

Laurel J. Bertach

Donald O. McPhee

Richard E. Sweeney

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Harry J. Parker, Doctoral Committee Chairman. His guidance, leadership, and inspiration have fostered not only my educational and professional growth but have enabled me to experience the desirable type of working relationship which may be engendered between individuals working sincerely for, and in cooperation with one another.

The excellent knowledge and advice contributed by Drs. Richard E. Sternlof, Ronald O. McAfee, and Donald J. Bertoch, members of my doctoral committee, further aided in successful completion of this research.

I am also indebted to the following school systems in Oklahoma and individuals in them, for their cooperation in providing subjects used in this investigation: Oklahoma City Public Schools, particularly Mr. Earl Martin; Tulsa Public Schools, particularly Paul I. McCloud, Director of Research and Dr. George Truka, Director of the Tulsa Education Foundation; Putnam City Schools; and Moore Public Schools.

Mrs. Ora Lee Parker's genuine cooperation and warm support in editorial and clerical assistance were invaluable.

I wish to particularly express my love and appreciation to my husband, Louis, for continued encouragement, understanding, and patience given me throughout my studies and the completion of this research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES .....	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Need for the Study	
Background of the Study	
Null Hypotheses	
Summary	
II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	17
Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Others	
Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Self	
Acceptance of Others and Acceptance of Self	
Self Acceptance of Atypical Populations	
Summary and Conclusions	
III. METHOD.....	41
The Sample	
The Family Relations Test	
California Test of Personality	
Sense of Personal Worth Scale	
Administration of the Instruments	
Statistical Treatment of the FRT	
Data	
Statistical Treatment of the SPWS	
Data	
Statistical Treatment of Combined	
Data	

## III.

Statistical Treatment of the  
Data Related Specifically  
to the Null Hypotheses

## IV. RESULTS..... 71

Validity of the Family Relations  
Test

Reliability of the Family  
Relations Test

Statistical Results Concerning  
Feelings of Acceptance by  
and Acceptance of Family  
Figures

Summary

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS..... 111

Differences in Feelings Concerning  
Acceptance by and Acceptance of  
Family Figures

Relationships between Acceptance  
by Others and Acceptance of  
Others

Acceptance of Self

Summary of Findings

Implications

## BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 123

## APPENDICES..... 134

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table	Page
1. Percentiles, Standard Scores, and Frequency Data on the Sense of Personal Worth Scale for all Samples Combined.....	69
2. Reliability Coefficients for the Three Samples Combined on the Family Relations Test.....	74
3. Frequency Data for Mild and Strong Feelings with all Samples.....	78
4. Significant Chi Square Values for Differences Among All Samples on the Family Relations Test Variables.....	80
5. Significant Chi Square Values for Differences Between Learning Disordered and Normal Samples, on Mild and Strong Feelings on the Family Relations Test.....	83
6. Frequency Data for Mild and Strong Feelings Combined for All Samples.....	85
7. Significant Chi Square Values for Differences Among All Samples on Mild and Strong Feelings Combined from the Family Relations Test.....	87
8. Significant Chi Square Values for Differences Between Learning Disordered and Normal Samples on Mild and Strong Feelings Combined from the Family Relations Test.....	90



Table	Page
9. Family Relations Test Variable Correlations between Outgoing and Incoming Feelings for All Family Figures.....	97
10. Mean and Variance for Acceptance of Self as Measured by the Sense of Personal Worth Scale.....	100
11. Analysis of Variance for Acceptance of Self as Measured by the Sense of Personal Worth Scale.....	100
12. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test to Determine Significant Differences Among Groups on SPWS Acceptance of Self.....	100
13. Correlation between Family Relations Test Variable and Sense of Personal Worth Scale for the Emotionally Disturbed Sample.....	103

#### Figure

1. Classification of Family Relations Test Attitude Areas.....	58
---	----

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS: A CHILD'S ACCEPTANCE  
BY OTHERS, OF OTHERS, AND OF SELF

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The importance of research in parent-child relations has been increasingly recognized by those concerned with the behavior of the child as an individual and as a member of society. Child psychologists, educational psychologists, and other specialists have generally accepted parental influences as interpenetrating in their effects on numerous aspects of the child's development, including emotional stability, relationships with others, and concept of self.

The present study employed a phenomenal approach, using three divergent samples of children: normal (Nor); learning disordered (LD); and emotionally disturbed (ED). The study was planned as a means to assess perception of attitude areas existing within the family constellations of the three samples. The research had four basic purposes. It was designed to investigate relationships

between the child's feelings of: (1) acceptance by others and acceptance of others; (2) acceptance by others and acceptance of self; and (3) acceptance of others and acceptance of self. Additionally an attempt was made to determine if significant differences existed among samples in feelings regarding: (1) acceptance by and acceptance of family members; and (2) acceptance of self.

From the phenomenological approach such attitude areas involved: (1) the feelings an individual imagined others had for him (imagined acceptance of others); (2) the feelings an individual experienced toward others (experienced acceptance of others); and (3) the individual's experienced feelings toward self (self concept). (See Appendix I for definitions.)

The first part of the problem to be tested was based on the theory expressed by Bene and Anthony (1957b), authors of the Family Relations Test. They stated that: "The feelings children have toward others are closely related to the feelings they believe others have toward them [p. 13]." Rogers (1951) also advanced this postulate in his theory of personality and behavior. Rogers stated that an individual's acceptance of others was positively and significantly correlated with his acceptance by others. Thus, the initial part of the problem was to investigate, within the family constellation, this question: Is there a significant relationship between a child's imagined

acceptance by others and experienced acceptance of others?

The second part of the problem was suggested by an additional postulate of Rogers (1951) that ". . . the person who accepts himself thoroughly, will necessarily improve his relationship with those with whom he has personal contact [p. 522]." Stated another way, the second part of the problem was: Is there a significant relationship between the child's experienced acceptance of self and his imagined acceptance by either or both parental figures?

The third part of the problem stemmed from the Rogerian postulate that an individual's acceptance of self will affect, or be related to, his acceptance of others. An attempt was made, in this investigation, to answer the following question pertinent to this theory: Will a child's experienced acceptance of either <sup>self</sup> of both parental figures be significantly related to his experienced acceptance of self?

The fourth part of the problem was to learn if dissimilar samples of children (Nor, LD, ED) reflected differences in dimensions of feelings indicating: (1) acceptance by others; (2) acceptance of others; and (3) acceptance of self. Did significant differences exist between samples regarding expressed feelings involving acceptance by and acceptance of other family figures?

Did significant differences exist between samples regarding expressed feelings measuring the child's acceptance of self?

### Need for the Study

The acknowledged complexity of familial interaction has necessitated that a large number of dimensions be employed to measure and describe the psychological atmosphere of the home, which might be reflective of attitudes or behaviors present in parent-child relationships. The difficulty of dealing either conceptually or in research with such a large number of variables has stimulated attempts to identify some of the basic dimensions or attitude areas. (See Appendix II for a tabular summary of some of the major parent-child dimensions uncovered through factor analysis.)

Relationships between child behavior and certain parental dimensions have been reported in the literature (see Chapter II). However, the usefulness of these, and other possible dimensions, needs to be explored further in parent-child research. More data are needed to determine the relationship which exists between acceptance by others and acceptance of others. Until further substantive research has been accomplished, the counselor, therapist, and others directly involved with a child may not unequivocally employ the concept of such a relationship and its

implications for influencing individual and interpersonal behavior.

Additionally, differences found to exist between children from dissimilar samples (Nor, LD, ED) in their feelings toward family figures and toward self, have significance for deeper understanding of present familial behavior within the different samples. This understanding has additional implications for the counselor, therapist, and others in possibly anticipating and influencing the future behavior of the child and of the significant figures included in his environment.

It was upon this basis that subjects for the present study were selected as potentially capable of providing a means to measure differences among diverse samples. The contemporary concern of educators to understand the atypical child in educational settings adds further impetus to selection of the present samples.

#### Background of the Study

Several influences may be seen as stimulating recognition of the need for greater understanding of parent-child relations, as these relations are reflected in behavior within the family or are generalized to behavior outside the family constellation. According to Medinmus (1967), Freudian-inspired research contributed to this trend, with its emphasis on the importance of

the child's relationships with his parents during the early years and the effect of these relationships on later personality and behavior. Additionally, Horney (1937) acknowledged the dependency of the child on his parents and their pervasive influences:

After the first two or three years of life there is a decided change from the prevailing biological dependence to a kind of dependence that includes the mental, intellectual and spiritual life of the child. This continues until the child matures into early adulthood and is able to take life into his own hands ...[p. 85].

Other personality theorists have been concerned with studying the development of the individual in relation to influences exerted by the interpersonal relations. Erickson (1950), trained in both cultural anthropology and psychoanalysis, viewed the developmental process as consisting of stages. Erickson felt that each stage had a crisis rooted in the demands of society. Sullivan (1953) conceptualized development not only in stages, but as an interpersonal dynamic which affects or is effected by significant others in the environment. He interpreted personality as being observable only within the confines of interpersonal relationships.

Attention has been focused on the importance of parent-child relations by the mental hygiene movement. This movement, according to Medinnus (1967), has emphasized the need to identify antecedents of current mal-

adaptive behavior, to accomplish the prevention of personal maladjustment and antisocial behavior.

Parent-child research has been conducted in a variety of ways. Medinnus (1967) noted interview methods as the most frequently used. The early Fels research (Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1945; 1949) was cited as representative of such a method, using mothers as informants. Sewell, Mussen, and Harris (1965) employed interview ratings of 38 child training practices in 162 families with five and six year old children. Schaefer, Bell, and Bayley (1959) conducted a longitudinal study of maternal behavior and personality development. They included descriptive characterizations based on interviews with 34 mothers of children nine to fourteen years of age. Sears, Macoby, and Levin (1957) reported one of the more comprehensive studies, using interview techniques with several hundred mothers. Yarrow (1963) reviewed methods by which data in parent-child research have been obtained. He concluded that the classical form of study involved interrogation of the mother, through interview or inventory.

Observation techniques are not new in psychology. However, Yarrow (1963) reported that the use of observation as a major approach to parent-child relations was relatively new. A considerable number of studies using observations with parents and children were considered to



have been done successfully. Schaefer, et al. (1950) derived information from interviews, with fairly extensive descriptions of maternal behaviors recorded from notes made by observers during 10 to 20 testing sessions of the children. Studies by Barker and Wright (1954), and Rosen and D'Andre (1959) were cited in the literature as examples of research demonstrating the feasibility of employing observations in the home for research not longitudinal in nature.

Less frequently employed research methods in parent-child relations have included: the use of case studies; variations in the interview and inventory methods (i.e., rating scales); and laboratory controlled, experimental situations as opposed to naturalistic observational techniques. Additionally, a number of projective techniques used for investigation of the dynamics of personality, have included analysis of interpersonal relationships and parent-child relations (Thematic Apperception Test, Morgan & Murray, 1935; Children's Apperception Test, Bellak & Bellak, 1948; The Blacky Pictures, Blum, 1950; Symonds' Adolescent Fantasy Test, Symonds, 1949; and Make-a-Picture Story, Schneidman, 1948).

In addition to the preceding techniques (interviews, observations, case studies, rating scales, and tests of personality dynamics), a number of instruments have been designed specifically to assess relationships

between the members of a family as perceived or interpreted from the child's phenomenological viewpoint. This is termed the phenomenal approach to parent-child studies. Howells and Likorish (1963) developed the Family Relations Indicator, a technique based on gaining associative responses by a child to a series of 20 pictures portraying family scenes. Howells and Likorish (1963), in their review of currently available techniques, stated:

There are...five tests designed to explore the relationships between the members of a family, but only one of these was a picture test of the "association" type, Rabin and Haworth (1960). The test devised by Travis and Johnston is little more than a simple collection of pictures (Buros, 1953). The Family Pictures produced by Cummings (1952) consists of a set of faces to which the child gives his reactions. Family Drawings by Hulse (1951) is a graphic expression of the child's relationships and depends for its success upon the child's ability to draw adequate pictures and the examiner's skill in interpreting them correctly. The Family Relations Test by Anthony and Bene (1957) is a variation of the "forced choice" technique, in so far as the child is presented with a number of statements which he must then ascribe to members of the family. The other test specifically relating to the family is A Test of Family Attitudes, by Jackson (1953). This consists of only eight pictures which are drawn with blurred outlines, some of which are highly structured. Although the responses to the test are "associative," there is also a standard list of questions for each picture ...[p. 287].

Further recognition of the theoretical importance of the child's perception of parental behavior in relation to understanding various aspects of personality develop-

ment is reflected in the development of various assessment instruments: Parental Authority Love Statements (PALS: Williams, 1958); the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR; Roe & Siegelman, 1963); the Revised Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCRR; Parker, 1967); and the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (BPB; Bronfenbrenner, 1961).

Adler (1938) was probably among the first to observe the importance of the phenomenological field on behavior, as reflected in his statement: "It is very obvious that we are influenced not by 'facts' but by our interpretation of facts [p. 26]." Adler continued:

In a word, I am convinced that a person's behavior springs from his ideas. We should not be surprised at this, because our senses do not receive actual facts, but merely a subjective image of them -- a reflection of the external world.... As a matter of fact, it has the same effect on me whether a poisonous snake is actually approaching my foot or whether I merely believe that it is a poisonous snake [pp. 19-20].

Snygg and Combs (1949) emphasized the phenomenal field as the determinant of behavior, with all experiences being considered phenomenal in character. "All behavior, without exception, is completely determined by and pertinent to the phenomenal field of the behaving organism [Snygg & Combs, 1949, p. 15]." Rogers (1951) included among his postulates regarding personality theory, the proposition that "An organism reacts to the field as it

-- is experienced and perceived: perceptual field, is, for the individual 'reality' [p. 484]."

Rapaport (1950), in assaying certain theoretical problems implicit to testing devices, challenged the typical assumption that projective techniques measure only fantasy rather than actual experiences:

The distinction between projective and non-projective tests is apparently based on the "structured" v.s. "unstructured" character of the test material and the problem situation.... In non-projective tests the questions asked of the tasks set have a unique and verifiable answer or solution.... In projective tests an objectively verifiable single answer is lacking: the subjects' answer will correspond to an intrapsychic determiner rather than to an external criterion of validity.... We have already argued that no such sharp distinction does obtain for any test. To reinforce this reservation we might add that projective tests too elicit responses which approximate "objective verifiability," whereas responses to nonprojective tests may have some projective characteristics...in so far as they reflect something about the personality [p. 185].

Concerning problems of methods in parent-child research, Yarrow (1963) concluded that:

Even most charitably, research in parent-child relations cannot be viewed as a field in which methodology is exemplary and in which evidence is firm and consistent. But even most critically or despairingly, this field cannot be dismissed as unimportant in behavioral or developmental theory. Despite or because of these facts, how parents bring up their children and how parental characteristics are infused into child personality are questions that continue to inspire research [p. 7].

Wylie (1965) stated that recently ". . . there has been a marked proliferation of self theories, traceable

to a number of influences [p. 2]." Freud's assignment of greater importance to ego development and functioning; the neo-Freudians' emphasis on the importance of the self picture and the ego ideal; and the Gestalt psychologists' interjection of phenomenological methods and theories into general psychology are all facts which Wylie (1965) stated resulted in the assignment of ". . . importance to a phenomenal and/or non-phenomenal self concept with cognitive and motivational attributes [p. 2]."

Staines (1958) wrote that there was both empirical and theoretical foundation for the importance of the self in psychological thinking. He felt that the frequency of self-reference in everyday life, as well as in clinical records, was evidence of ". . . the importance of the self-picture and of self-acceptance and rejection [p. 97]."

Staines concluded that:

A theoretical analysis of the concept of the self shows it to be a learned structure, growing mainly from comments made by other people and from inferences drawn by children out of their experience in home, school, and other social groups.... The self is empirically a matter of prime importance in that a great deal of behavior is concerned with maintaining and enhancing the established pattern of the self as it appears to the person, as he thinks it ought to be, and as he thinks other people believe it to be [p. 97].

The notion of the "self" is highly complex.

Diggory (1966) presented a comprehensive, critical analysis of all major ideas about "self" and "ego" from

Descartes to the present. Diggory wrote that ". . . despite differences of opinion about the meaning of 'self' and 'ego' . . . [p. 59]," these terms have been emphasized by many writers as being ". . . somehow intimately connected with motivated, or directed, or purposive behavior [p. 60]." Hamacheck's (1965) review of the literature concerned with the self revealed the self as influenced by growth, teaching, learning, and perception.

Wylie (1961), in a thorough survey of pertinent literature concerned with the self-concept construct, acknowledged that the word "self" in psychological writing has been used in various ways. She proposed that "Two chief meanings emerge, . . .: the self as subject or agent, and the self as the individual who is known to himself. . . . The words 'self-concept' have come into common use to refer to the second meaning [p. 1]."

Snygg and Combs (1949) in their approach to understanding an individual's behavior, emphasized the phenomenal self as representing ". . . all those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual experiences as part or characteristic of himself [p. 58]." The phenomenal self is further subdivided into the self concept, or ". . . those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual has differentiated as definite and fairly stable characteristics of himself [Snygg & Combs, p. 112]."

Rogers (1951) assigned the phenomenal self concept an integral part in his personality theory. He suggested that the individual's self concept was a major factor influencing his behavior. With respect to research in client-centered therapy, Rogers (1951) wrote:

Much of our theory construction has revolved about the construct of the self...and in terms of the dynamics of an interpersonal relationship [p. 12].

In all of this research the central construct is the concept of the self, or the self as a perceived object in the phenomenal field. If a definition seems useful, it might be...a definition along these lines. The self-concept, or self-structure, may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment...[p. 136].

It was within these latter meanings of "self concept" (Wylie, 1961; Snygg & Combs, 1949; Rogers, 1951) that this present study was concerned, and that the term "self concept" was used.

There has been an increase in literature dealing with parent-child interaction and the self concept, with parent-child relations, and with the increased recognition of the importance of investigating the nature of an individual's perception of himself. None the less, Wylie (1961) cited the paucity of studies dealing with the relationship between parent-child interaction and the child's self concept. Therefore, further research to determine the

extent and nature of any relationships which may exist between these variables is clearly indicated.

### Null Hypotheses

The desirability of further study in these areas led to a testing of the following null hypotheses:

One. No significant difference existed among dissimilar samples in feelings concerning acceptance by and acceptance of family figures.

Two. No significant relationship existed between acceptance by others and acceptance of others.

Three. No significant difference existed among dissimilar samples in acceptance of self.

Four. No significant relationship existed between acceptance by parental figures and acceptance of self.

Five. No significant relationship existed between acceptance of parental figures and acceptance of self.

### Summary

Chapter I has presented the statement of the problem, and has discussed the need for the study as well as the background of the study. The null hypotheses to be tested in this investigation were formulated.

Chapter II will focus on a review of the literature. Chapter III will describe the investigative procedures. Chapter IV will report and analyze the results



of the research. Chapter V will summarize the investigation, present the conclusions, and discuss the need for further research.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A survey of the literature revealed comparatively little empirical evidence directly pertinent to the characteristics of the samples and variables with which the present study was concerned. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to assess studies with similar hypotheses which dealt with samples relevant to subjects included in this study.

#### Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Others

Few writers have investigated the relationship existing between phenomenal acceptance of others and acceptance by others, as interdependent variables. Such studies have confined the samples used to older youth or adults. A study by McIntyre (1952) involved such a relationship, but was not approached entirely from a phenomenological viewpoint. McIntyre administered the Phillips (1951) questionnaire on attitudes toward self and others to 315 male college dormitory students. An additional sociometric questionnaire, measuring actual acceptance by others, was also administered. McIntyre concluded, with

regard to the variables of acceptance by others and acceptance of others, that differences between mean scores of the highly and poorly accepted groups on the acceptance-of-others scale were not significant and could be attributed to chance. McIntyre made no attempt to measure the subjects' phenomenal viewpoint regarding acceptability by others.

Fey (1955), in a revaluation essentially repeating McIntyre's design, hypothesized that acceptance by others was, in part, a function of the relationship between expressed attitudes of self acceptance and of acceptance of others. Fifty-eight third-year medical students were subjects for this study. Fey prepared scales to measure expressed attitudes of self acceptance and of acceptance of others. He also included a measure of estimated acceptability to others. At the conclusion of the questionnaire, a fourth measure was obtained which indicated actual acceptance by others: a sociometric score was used to reflect choice by classmates. Fey's analysis of data, related to acceptance by others and acceptance of others, revealed that individuals with high acceptance-of-others scores tended to feel accepted by others, with the reported correlation of .43. Individuals with high acceptance-of-others scores also tended toward being accepted by them ( $r = .20 \pm .10$ ). Fey's original hypothesis that acceptance by others is, in part, a function of the relation-

ship between attitudes of acceptance of others and self acceptance was not unequivocally resolved.

The Bonney Sociometric Technique (Bonney, 1943) and two measures of self acceptance: the Sense of Personal Worth Scale from the California Test of Personality (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1942-53), and the Who-Are-You Test (Bugental & Zelan, 1950) were employed by Zelan (1954a; 1954b) with approximately 145 sixth grade children. The latter two instruments yielded scores of self acceptance and will be considered separately in a later section of this review. However, the sociometric device gave scores of peer status and acceptance of peers. Peer acceptance correlated .59 with acceptance of others. Zelan (1954a) concluded that this positive correlation suggested that liking others and being liked by others are reciprocal characteristics.

The hypothesis that parental acceptance of others might generalize to other individuals has been explored by a number of investigators (Bender, 1950; Escalona, 1948; Peterson, Becker, Hellmer, Shoemaker, & Quay, 1959). Cox (1962) selected Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; Morgan & Murray, 1936-43) cards to obtain an estimate of children's attitudes toward parent figures. The TAT cards were administered to 243 literate, ten to eleven year old boys, living with parents. Four measures of peer group relationships were used in this study, with peer group

acceptance assessed in terms of sociometric choices by other classmates. In addition, three scales concerning playground behavior were rated by peers. These comprised reputations for aggression, dependence, and maturity. The ratings of attitude toward parent figures were significantly correlated with the peer group measures. A correlation of .42 with sociometric status was reported, and a correlation of .62 was reported with reputed immaturity. Scores on the other two reputation measures (of aggression and of dependence) were associated with particular kinds of TAT ratings. Data indicated reputed aggression was high in boys who rejected one or both parental figures. Reputed dependence was high for boys who were attached to "mother figures." Cox (1962) concluded some support was evidenced for a positive correlation between a child's attitudes toward his parents and the quality of his interpersonal relationships with other individuals.

#### Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Self

Diggory's (1966) review of major ideas concerning the self acknowledged that contradictory ideas and evidence still remain regarding situations in which self-related actions were specifically evaluated. Parker (1966) challenged the utilization of the self-report as a direct measure of the self concept. He theorized that the self

concept must be apparent through some form of inference based on the individual's behavior, other than ". . . what the individual is willing and able to say about himself when he is asked to declare his position [p. 691]." Many of the views, however, have emphasized the social context within which consensus or evaluation of self operates. Wylie (1961) included a review of studies involving social interaction, other than parent-child, and the self concept. Such studies involved sex and role as related to self concept (i.e., religious affiliation, social status, etc.); peer interaction and the self concept; self concepts and friendship choice; and other variables deemed relevant to differential patterns of self-esteem.

A number of investigators have correlated self-regard with acceptance by others, through the use of sociometric indices. Such investigations have assumed that high regard by others maintains or enhances self-regard. Coopersmith (1959) used 102 fifth and sixth grade children as subjects and obtained a partial  $r$  of .29 ( $p < .01$ ) between self-esteem and sociometric status. Sociometric status was calculated through children's choices of persons wanted as friends. Self-esteem was measured through an inventory devised by Coopersmith.

Zelan's (1954a; 1954b) investigations yielded correlations of .30 and .39 between peer acceptance as

measured on the Bonney Sociometric Test (1943) and the Who-Are-You Test (Bugental & Zelan, 1950), and the Sense of Personal Worth Scale from the California Test of Personality (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953) respectively. Both correlations were significant at the .01 level. Zelan interpreted such findings to suggest that a child who had positive feelings about himself was better able to devote his energies to the group activities and to cooperate more fully with others.

McIntyre's (1952) previously cited study specifically related to acceptance by others and acceptance of self. This study revealed the mean scores on the acceptance-of-self scale of the highly accepted group of subjects and the poorly accepted group of subjects were not significant. Only chance relationship between acceptance of self and actual acceptance by others was indicated. Fey's (1955) revaluation included the subject's phenomenal or estimated feelings regarding acceptance by others in relation to acceptance of self. The data indicated that individuals with high self-acceptance scores tended to feel accepted by others ( $r = .71$ ), but actually to be neither more nor less accepted by others ( $r = .07$ ) than subjects with low self-acceptance scores.

Wylie (1961) stated that "All personality theorists who are concerned with constructs involving the self accord great importance to parent-child interaction in

the development of the self concept [p. 121]." Wylie (1961) commented that empirical investigations which included theoretically relevant parent variables and relevant child variables to substantiate the existence or extent of the relationship between parent acceptance and self acceptance were lacking in the literature.

Varied approaches have been utilized to test this purported relationship between the phenomenal self and parent-child interaction. A study by Jourard and Remy (1955) was concerned with exploring a hypothesized relationship among parental attitudes, self attitudes, and security. They used a 40-item body-cathexis scale and a 40-item self-cathexis (traits of self) scale, as basic materials. The attitudes of a person toward his body and self were compared to his concept of how his parents evaluated his body and self. A study was also made of the relation between these two factors and a measure of security. A secure person was defined as one who believed his parents evaluated him positively, and who evaluated himself positively. Ninety-nine undergraduate university students, both male and female, filled out one body-cathexis scale and one self-cathexis scale, and indicated how he believed his parents felt about these items. Significant correlations (ranging from  $r$ 's of .65 to .77) were found between the subject's self-cathexis and body-cathexis scores, and between the subject's scores and the



subject's perception of parental evaluation of their selves (Ss') and bodies. Jourard and Remy concluded that self appraisals covary with a person's perception or belief concerning his parents' appraisals of him.

Helper (1958) used 53 eighth and ninth grade children and their parents, to study the degree of correlation between parental evaluations of children and children's self evaluations. Children and parents rated the items (42 adjectival rating items) independently. Each subject and parent rated the items as he ordinarily thought (actual self concept or child concept). A "Favorability" score was computed by summing actual ratings on 15 items, for which there was high agreement among raters as to desirability. This resulted in a Self-Favorability score and a Child-Favorability score. The Self-Acceptance or Child-Acceptance score was derived from the actual-ideal discrepancies for the remaining 31 items. Rank difference correlations between Parental Favorability and Parental Acceptance scores and the corresponding self-evaluative scores in children were low. Parental acceptance was more consistently related to children's self acceptance than to children's self-favorability (.37 on Father's Acceptance' .27 on Mother's Acceptance), for all subjects. Helper concluded that the data seemed to point to the existence of a slight, but real, tendency toward similarity between parents' evaluations of their children and the children's self evaluations.

Mussen and Jones (1957) investigated several propositions concerning aspects of personality structure, specifically: self conceptions, basic interpersonal attitudes, and underlying motivations. The TAT protocols of 16 adolescent boys designated as late-maturers, and 17 early-maturers were analyzed. The data revealed that more late-maturing boys indicated feelings of inadequacy and negative self concepts, i.e., they scored high in the TAT "Negative characteristics" variable. Later-maturing boys were found more likely to have strong feelings of being rejected, and told stories in which the hero was rejected by parents or authority figures. In contrast, relatively few of the early-maturing boys felt inadequate or rejected by parents. Mussen and Jones (1957) hypothesized that these feelings of rejection may have stemmed from different sources, with the parents in some cases even verbalizing that they were disappointed in their physically retarded son. The boy, perceiving this attitude, interpreted it as rejection. In other cases, parental reluctance to allow late-maturing boys their independence may have led to considerable tension within the family. Thus, the boys' feelings of rejection may have been a reflection of an ongoing parent-child conflict.

Heilbrun and Orr (1966) proposed that failure influenced goal-setting in a "rejected" group more than in an "accepted" group, because of lower self-esteem

generated by the child-rearing history. Sixty-one males of college age rated perceived maternal child-rearing behavior, using scales of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (Zuckerman, Ribback, Monashkin, & Norton, 1958). A similar index was obtained from selected TAT cards. As predicted, those subjects who rated their mothers as "rejecting" were less stable and less positive in their responses to two tasks (discrimination and gambling) employed to test the authors' hypothesis.

Gildston (1967) used a population of 110 white adolescents living with both parents as her subjects. She hypothesized that stutterers within this population would: (1) show less self acceptance than non-stutterers; (2) show lower levels of perceived parental acceptance than non-stutterers; and (3) show a greater disparity between paternal and maternal acceptance, with a higher degree of perceived maternal rejection. The Hilden Q-sort (1954) was selected to measure the test variables of self-acceptance by the correlation between the way a subject saw himself (actual self) and the way he would like to be (ideal self). Perceived maternal and paternal acceptance were similarly measured by the correlation between the way the subject sorted the cards as he thought his mother (father) saw him and felt he really was (mother actual; father actual), and the way he thought his mother (father) would like him to be (mother ideal; father ideal).

Results of Gildston's (1967) study indicated that self acceptance was significantly lower for stutterers than for non-stutterers. A significant difference between the experimental and control groups was also reflected in perceived parental acceptance. Stutterers perceived their parents as less accepting than did non-stutterers, although there was no difference between perceived maternal and paternal acceptance for either group. Gildston concluded that the predicted relationship between self acceptance and perceived parental acceptance was confirmed and coincided with theories of Sullivan (1947) regarding existing relationships between acceptance of self and acceptance by others.

#### Acceptance of Others and Self Acceptance

Many theorists have contended that the level of self regard should be correlated positively with the degree of regard a person has for others (Adler, 1938; Horney, 1937; Fromm, 1956). Berger (1952) wrote that ". . . such a relationship might supply social psychology with a principle which would be helpful in understanding and explaining problems of social conflict and hostility [p. 778]." Rogers (1951) observed that during therapy, as a person begins to accept himself, he becomes capable of experiencing this attitude toward others. Sheerer (1949) studied changes in acceptance of self and changes

in the acceptance of others, by ten adults during client-centered therapy. Sheerer hypothesized that there was a positive correlation between the extent to which an individual expressed acceptance of and respect for self, and the extent to which he expressed acceptance of and respect for others. Her investigation utilized 51 statements revealing some self evaluation, and 50 statements revealing evaluative attitudes toward others. These were extracted from recorded client statements, rated by judges of a five-point scale. Pearson product moment  $r$ 's, found between these attitudes, were in the .50's and .60's.

A similar study by Stock (1949) used ten cases conducted according to the principles of non-directive therapy. Stock's investigation indicated that a definite relationship existed between the way the individual thought of himself, and the way he felt about other persons. A Pearson  $r$  of .66 was found to exist for such a relationship. An individual who held negative feelings toward himself tended to hold negative feelings toward other people in general. As his feelings about himself changed to objective or positive, his feelings about others changed in a similar direction.

Berger (1952) developed a group instrument which used 36 items for the self-acceptance scale, and 28 items for the acceptance-of-others scale. Definitions of the variables were essentially those used by Sheerer (1949).

Subjects in Berger's study included seven different groups of college-age subjects. Correlations for the different groups ranged from .36 to .69 on the measured variables.

Phillips (1951) converted Sheerer's (1949) descriptions to a questionnaire form. Twenty-five items on the questionnaire referred to self-attitudes, and 25 to attitudes of others. Correlations between the two scales ranged from .51 to .71, when administered to over 200 high school and college students. The results indicated relationships substantially above that expected by chance.

A correlation of .40 was obtained by McIntyre (1952) between the variables of acceptance-of-self and acceptance-of-others. While this correlation was somewhat lower than those reported by Phillips (1951), McIntyre concluded that a significant relationship existed between the measured variables. Fey's (1955) data with respect to acceptance-of-self and acceptance-of-others revealed that subjects with high self-acceptance scores tended also to accept others ( $r = .43$ ).

Omwake (1954) administered three tests measuring acceptance of self and acceptance of others to 113 college students, who took them anonymously. These tests included the Scale for Self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others (Berger, 1952); the Questionnaire on Attitudes Towards the Self and Others (Phillips, 1951); and the Index of Adjustment and Values (Bills, Vance, & McLean

1951). Correlations of .37, .39, and .41 indicated that there was a consistent tendency for self attitudes to be reflected in attitudes towards others, as measured by these inventories.

Divergent findings concerning positive correlations between self acceptance and acceptance of others were produced by one study. In the previously cited studies by Zelan (1954a; 1954b), an unexpected lack of any relationship was found with Acceptance-of-Others on the Bonney Sociometric Test (Bonney, 1943), correlating .08 with the Who-Are-You Test (Bugental & Zelan, 1950), and .10 with the California Test of Personality, Personal Worth Scale (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1942-53). Neither of these correlations proved significant. The author, however, offered an interpretation for this lack of relationship between the two variables. He indicated that it perhaps resulted from an awareness and discrimination by participating children regarding external behavior cues, but a corresponding lack of awareness and discrimination regarding cues comprising the basis for more subtle social relationships.

#### Self Acceptance of Atypical Populations

Literature measuring self acceptance in samples considered atypical, in one or more aspects, was also reviewed. Various criteria have been employed to define

"self acceptance" or "self-regard." Various criteria have also been used to serve as a conceptual or operational definition regarding "adjustment," in studies which purport to measure relationships between adjustment and self-regard.

Studies involved with the measurement of adjustment using the discrepancy between ideal-self and self concept presume the validity of this procedure (Brophy, 1959; Lipsitt, 1958; and Smith, 1959). Rogers (1958), however, did not consider the use of discrepancy scores a valid technique. McAfee and Cleland (1965) used 60 educable mentally retarded males, who met criteria for differentiating them into adjusted and maladjusted groups of 30 subjects each. They concluded that use of the discrepancy between self concept and ideal-self was not a feasible technique for estimating psychological adjustment in a retarded population. Also, high phenomenal self-regard or increases in reported self acceptance or self-ideal congruence might reflect a person's denial or repression of existing problems (Block & Thomas, 1955; Hillson & Worchel, 1957; Loevinger & Ossorio, 1959).

Despite the complexities involved in measuring self-related actions (Diggory, 1966; Parker, 1966), and difficulties involved in defining "adjustment," Wylie (1961) reported that "It is generally conceded theoretically that a low degree of phenomenal self-regard should



be indicative of, or an aspect of, or perhaps even a cause of, 'maladjustment' [p. 203]." Wylie (1961) reviewed 18 studies in which the level of reported self-regard was correlated with varying degrees of diagnosed pathology. The majority of studies of this type have compared normal subjects with schizophrenics, neurotics, or both. Studies which involved adult subjects classified by two groups only (adjusted, maladjusted) included investigations by: Sarbin and Roseberg (1955); Rogers and Dymonds (1954); Wahler (1958); Wahl (1956); Kogan, Quinn, Ax, and Ripley (1957); Tolor (1957); McQuitty (1950); Tamkin (1957); Rogers (1958); and Epstein (1955). The comparison of three adult groups, wherein an adjusted group was compared with two or more maladjusted groups, was reported by: Hillson and Worchel (1957); Friedman (1955); Chase (1957); Zuckerman, Baer, and Monashkin (1956); Zuckerman and Monashkin (1957); Chodorkoff (1954); and Worchel (1957). Leary's (1957) data were perhaps the most extensive of any which compared self concept measures to patterns of diagnosed maladjustment.

In summarizing studies relating degree of pathology to level of self-regard, Wylie (1961) tentatively concluded that despite some contradictions, some general trends were apparent. In nine studies, significantly lower self-regard was found in diagnosed neurotics and/or mixed patient groups than was found in normal, non-patient

groups, with much overlap between groups. Varying results were found in comparisons of self-regard between psychotics and normal persons. Wylie (1961) concluded that "Certainly as one goes from normals through neurotics to psychotics a clear linear downward trend in self-regard is not found [p. 216]," indicating that ". . . qualitative differences in maladjustment patterns may be as important a variable as 'degree of maladjustment' [p.217]."

Some projective measures, thought to reveal various measures of adjustment, have been used by several investigators in relation to measures of self-esteem. Bills (1954) obtained a significant correlation between Rorschach signs of depression and "self-ideal" discrepancies. Lafon (1954) used two groups of female undergraduates, who differed in stability of self concept, as subjects. He found some trend in the data toward correlation between Rorschach scores believed to measure adjustment, and phenomenal self-esteem. Dymonds (1954) used the TAT indices with records rated on a seven-point scale ranging from indications of "severe disturbance" to "well integrated, happy person." He found a Q-adjustment score on the Butler and Haigh (1954) items which correlated .63 with TAT adjustment ratings on 35 subjects in pretherapy. Grummon and John (1954), however, found no correlation between self-ideal r's (Butler & Haigh, 1954) and TAT records scored on the basis of psychoanalytically derived

scales of "mental health." A significant correlation was obtained by Crandall and Bellugi (1954) between adjustment scores obtained from Rotter's (1950) Incomplete Sentences Blank and favorability of self concept as revealed on a specially devised adjectival instrument.

Five studies (Berger, 1955; Block & Thomas, 1955; Rosen, 1956a and 1956b; Engel, 1959; Zuckerman & Monashkin, 1957) employed different types of subjects and supported the contention that reported self-regard and certain clinical scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Hathaway & McKinley, 1947) correlated negatively, while self regard and K correlated positively. Different measures of self-regard were employed, and only certain scales (D; Pt; Sc; and Si) were significant in all five studies.

Other groups manifesting certain behaviors considered to be indicative of maladjustment have been investigated regarding self concept. Walsh's (1956) study of marked academic underachievers is one example. This study indicated differences were found in the self concepts of high and low achieving boys, matched for superior intelligence and other relevant variables. Adequate achievers less frequently depicted negative feelings presumably related to concept of self, and displayed through use of the Driscoll Play Kit (Driscoll, 1952).

Wylie (1961) reported numerous studies which purported to measure self-esteem and levels of adjustment, as indicated by various behavioral criteria (i.e., grade point averages, number of health center visits, etc.). She pointed out the ". . . problem of lack of correlation between indices. . . [p. 227]" and the complexity involved in using various behavioral criteria for measuring adjustment in these investigations. Wylie (1961) concluded that investigations using an external criterion of adjustment, involving groups showing extreme and rather obviously differentiable total patterns, were most apt to obtain predicted associations between levels of self-regard and adjustment, although ". . . there is much overlap in level of self-regard between groups [p. 234]."

A study by Gorlow, Butler, and Guthrie (1963) was concerned with self acceptance in atypical populations. In this study self attitudes were viewed as a major determinant of the behavior and perceptions of 164 institutionalized female retardates. The subjects were administered the Laurelton Self-Attitude Scale (LSAS; Gorlow, Butler, & Guthrie, 1963), with scores related to a wide range of measures included in the areas of achievement, early experience, and personality. Small but significant positive correlations were observed between self acceptance and measures of intelligence, school achievement,

success in the institutional training program, and success in parole. Guthrie, Butler, and Gorlow (1963) also investigated personality differences among mentally retarded girls (ages 14 to 18) who were institutionalized, as compared to retarded girls who attended special classes in the community. The LSAS was again used, as well as a Hostility Scale and a Social Value Scale. The authors noted, from the data obtained, that the institutionalized girls held a much more negative set of self attitudes than girls who remained at home.

Snyder (1966) hypothesized that there would be a significant personality difference between better and poor achievers within the mildly retarded categories. Snyder used 170 retardates (ages 14 through 18) who were homogeneous as to control variables of sex, intelligence, and socio-economic status but who differed significantly in academic achievement. Using the LSAS (abbreviated form) and the personal and social adjustment scores from the California Test of Personality (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953), Snyder found that both scales gave strong evidence that the two groups were not similar in general personality adjustment. Tests of significance revealed evidence of personality superiority of the better achievers over that of the poor achievers. Snyder concluded that retardates, with more favorable self attitudes coupled with a relatively more adequate over-all adjustment,

generally would attain more academically than their less well-adjusted peers.

Meyerowitz (1962) investigated special class placement on the self concept of 120 children entering the first grade, who had been identified as having Binet IQ's of 60 to 85. Half of these children were assigned, randomly, to special classes. The other half were likewise assigned to regular classes. A control group of 60 "normal" children were identified to match the retarded sample with regard to occupation of father, income, and area of residence. These three groups were tested with the Illinois Index of Self Derogation (Meyerowits, 1962), which had been developed for this study. At the end of their first year of schooling, significant differences were found between the three groups. The educable mentally handicapped children were found to be more derogatory of themselves. Of these two groups, those who remained in the regular classroom were less derogatory than the experimental special class group. Meyerowitz concluded that even during the first year of school, significant differences can be shown between self concept in educable mentally handicapped children and normal children.

Fine's (1967) recent preliminary study suggested a more positive self-evaluation of educable mentally retarded children, as they ranked themselves in terms of reading, arithmetic, general ability, and effort as com-

pared to the classmates and all children their age in other classes. Fine's study involved 42 special class educable retardates (ages 9 to 13) who completed a simplified questionnaire in relation to ranking themselves on the above categories. The retardates, as a group, tended to rate themselves as being "as good as" or "better than" both their classmates and other children their age in school. Fine acknowledged that such self-perceptions suggested inaccuracy and unrealism if one acknowledges that retardates, by definition, are considerably less able than other children their own ages but may reflect the minimized focus on academic achievement and the emphasis on social adjustment and class factors usually stressed by the special class teacher.

Studies of self attitudes in other atypical populations were even less prevalent in the literature, and thus presented an uncertain picture. In relation to self concepts of stutterers, for example, Fiedler and Wepman (1951) used a Q-sort technique with ten subjects. Results indicated the self concept of stutterers showed no characteristic difference from that of the non-stutterers. On the other hand, previously cited reports by Berger (1952) and Gildston (1967), indicated significant differences in self acceptance, with stutterers scoring lower.

The self concept of the deaf child has been explored only recently. Craig (1965) used a perceptual

sociometric instrument adapted for the deaf, and developed to determine experimentally whether or not deaf children's self concept was different from that of normally-hearing children. The measure compared predicted sociometric ratings with actual sociometric ratings, to give an index of perceived self. Forty-eight subjects were used: three groups of 16 each from a residential deaf school, from day classes for the deaf, and from normal hearing classes. Results indicated that the deaf groups were significantly less accurate than the hearing groups in perception of self, as rated by peers. In self acceptance the deaf institutionalized ranked themselves significantly higher than did the non-institutionalized groups, either deaf or non-deaf. Various factors were cited by Craig (1965) to account for the increased acceptance of self by the institutionalized group. The factors included greater identification with similarly handicapped peers, rather than comparison with non-handicapped or non-institutionalized groups.

#### Summary and Conclusions

Analysis of the research literature revealed a dearth of existing experimental evidence which might be considered directly equated in terms of the characteristics of the samples involved in the present study, and the variables to be considered. It was thus necessary



to consider studies which: (1) employed hypotheses similar to those of the present study but related to different samples; or (2) to consider studies which employed samples considered relevant to subjects in the present study.

The literature reviewed revealed: (1) difficulties involved in methodology (use of indices, nature of designs); (2) difficulties in definition of terminology employed; and (3) ambiguity in results. Such factors attested to the need for eliminating over-inclusiveness of theoretical constructs, and in this connection the investigative procedures employed in the current study will be described in Chapter III.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### The Sample

Three sample groups of Caucasian prepubescent males (ages six and one-half through twelve) were used in this study. All subjects resided in the State of Oklahoma. They were living with their natural parents at the time of this study, and had one or more siblings. Each sample met specific criteria for inclusion in the study.

Sample I: normal children. Subjects in Sample I, the normal group (Nor), consisted of 35 boys who: (1) on the basis of previous intellectual evaluation indicated average or above intelligence; (2) had never been referred for maladaptive behavior; and (3) represented children considered by school personnel to be reasonably well-adjusted individuals.

The criteria of average or above-average intelligence was met by including only those who recorded intelligence quotients of 90 or above, as measured on one of the following standardized instruments for evaluating intelligence: California Test of Mental Maturity (Sullivan,

Wallace, & Tiegs, 1954-59); and Lorge-Thorndike Test of Intelligence (Lorge & Thorndike, 1954). The acceptance of the judgment of school personnel for determining the inclusion of the subjects in a sample of well-adjusted children was based on the summary of studies which indicated increased agreement between teachers and mental hygienists concerning symptoms of child maladjustment (Hunter, 1957).

7      Sample II: learning disordered children. Subjects in Sample II, learning disordered children (LD), consisted of 35 boys who: (1) had been seen as outpatients in a clinical or diagnostic setting; (2) on the basis of previous intellectual evaluation indicated at least average intellectual capacity or the potential for such capacity; (3) were cognitively able, as judged by diagnostic or clinical opinion, to respond to the reading level or the oral receptive level required by the testing situation; and (4) represented children diagnosed as exhibiting learning disorders due to neurological dysfunction.

The criterion of at least average intellectual capacity or the potential for such functioning was met by including only those males who met such eligibility requirements necessary for placement in classes for children with learning disorders, as set forth by the Oklahoma State Department of Education (Division of Special Educa-

tion and the Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, 1968), as follows:

A child shall be eligible for placement only when on the basis of individual evaluation by a qualified psychological examiner or a medical doctor, who meets the following criteria:

1. Normal or potentially normal intelligence (IQ 90 or above).... If a child cannot score in the normal range on any of the tests used, but the examiner feels the potential is present he may make a special recommendation stating his reasons for suggesting such placement...[p. 72].

Individual psychological instruments used to assess intellectual capacity of the subjects included the Stanford Binet Test of Intelligence (Terman & Merrill, 1937); the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (Wechsler, 1949); and the Columbia Mental Maturity Test (Burgemeister, Blum, & Lorge, 1954-59).

The criterion for the presence of neurological impairment was met by including only those children whose records indicated evidence of such impairment in accordance with further placement requirements:

2. There must be some evidence of specific learning disabilities whose etiology can be inferred from psychological or neurological tests; this evidence should be available to support the inference of the presence of some neurological dysfunction [Division of Special Education and the Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, 1968, p. 72].

Children with learning disorders due primarily to emotional disorders were excluded from Sample II, in addition concordance with Oklahoma State Department of

Education requirements for school placement (Division of Special Education and the Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, 1968), as follows:

Children whose major problem is emotional in nature are not eligible for placement in a class for children with learning disabilities [p. 72].

Sample III: emotionally disturbed children. Subjects in Sample III, emotionally disturbed children (ED), consisted of 11 males who: (1) are, or had been, outpatients in a clinical or diagnostic setting; (2) on the basis of previous individual intellectual evaluation indicated average or above-average intelligence (intelligence quotients of 90 or above); (3) had been diagnosed by a qualified physician or psychological examiner as exhibiting emotional disorders without evidence of neurological dysfunction; and (4) met the following definition set forth by the Oklahoma State Department of Education (Division of Special Education and the Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, 1968):

The emotionally disturbed child is defined as one who, because of breakdown in the family constellation or because of economic, social or other conflicts, has failed to mature socially and emotionally within the limits imposed by society [p. 81].

The assessment of the subjects' intellectual capacities had been previously measured by use of an individual psychological instrument. The Stanford Binet Test of Intelligence (Terman & Merrill, 1937); the Wechsler Intelli-

gence Scale for Children (Wechsler, 1949); or the Leiter International Performance Scale (Arthur, 1925-55) was used to obtain this measure.

Descriptive characteristics of the subjects. Data regarding means, standard deviations, and ranges were computed for the three samples in relation to the subjects' chronological ages and intelligence quotients (see Appendix III and Appendix IV). Information relating to sibling position and sex classification was also tabulated (see Appendix V). These data revealed that in the distribution according to sibling position (older siblings, younger siblings), between-group comparisons were relatively consistent. In relation to sibling position and sex differences, the LD sample revealed a comparatively higher number of older male siblings and fewer older female siblings, than did the other two samples. The Nor sample revealed a comparatively higher number of younger male siblings and a lesser number of younger female siblings, than did the other two samples. Such differences were not interpreted as being of sufficient magnitude to affect data related to hypotheses as investigated in the present study.

Means, standard deviations, and ranges according to the number of siblings represented were computed, and revealed relative consistency between samples (see Appendix VI).

Representativeness of study samples. The total number of 81 males, comprising the three study samples, was derived from populations fulfilling the criteria as outlined. Representativeness of the samples was, therefore, limited due to these criteria. In addition, the examiner was dependent on referral sources (school administrators, classroom teachers, psychologists, and psychiatrists) for cooperation in making eligible subjects available for inclusion in this study. In this respect Bene and Anthony (1957) noted that:

...the test has to do with intensive and intimate feelings, and the parents of many children might have objected to such an invasion of their private lives [p. 555].

The question of the willingness of the parents for their child to participate was handled individually by the referral sources. Some sources requested parental permission before allowing child participation; other sources made no contact for parental permission.

In the majority of cases, information regarding the age and attained educational level of parents represented in this study was not included in records available through referral sources. No attempt was made to secure this information, due to its personal nature. Information which was available concerning the socio-economic level of families, as revealed by recorded parental occupations (see Appendix VII) was not considered of sufficient

definitiveness to permit valid classification and statistical treatment.

An attempt was made, however, to control for representativeness of subjects in regard to socio-economic level of families represented. School personnel, who comprised referral sources for the Nor and LD samples, provided this investigator access to schools believed to represent distinctly varied socio-economic levels. Two types of classrooms were utilized: centralized and decentralized. Decentralized classes in district-oriented schools were considered to provide representativeness. Socio-economic levels were considered to be varied on the basis of differences in geographic locations of schools, and differences in physical settings of neighborhoods (type of housing, extent of privacy, etc.). Centralized facilities for educating children with learning disabilities were considered to provide representativeness, since children were assigned to such classes irrespective of familial factors involving place of residence, parental occupation, and other socio-economic factors.

Children in the ED sample represented clinic populations, within which clinical services were made available regardless of the status of the family. Sliding fee scales and referral for clinical services by various agencies served to reduce non-representativeness of children's families included in this sample.



Some lack of representativeness was believed to exist in samples, however, since subjects were derived from major urban areas or adjacent cities where psychological and medical identification of subjects (according to criteria) was complete and made available. However, between-group comparisons were believed to present no substantial skewness in factors related to socioeconomic levels of families represented.

#### The Family Relations Test

Rationale for use. A measure of familial relationships as perceived existing by the child, was analyzed from the child's responses on the Family Relations Test (FRT; Bene & Anthony, 1957b). This instrument was selected since it was felt to possess validity and internal consistency reliability in the psychological assessment of family feelings. It was felt that children would reveal their feelings as they were experienced and perceived, including attitude areas reflecting acceptance by others and of others.

The FRT was devised to obtain a measure of ". . . the child's emotional relations with his family. . . family relationships and family tensions as they are directly experienced by the child [Bene & Anthony, 1957a, p. 541]." The authors pointed out the need for a test that:

...would indicate objectively, reliably, and rapidly the direction and intensity of the child's feelings towards the various members of his family, and of no less importance, his estimate of their reciprocal regard for him [Bene & Anthony, 1957a, p. 541].

Meyer (1963) wrote, with reference to the FRT, that:

Over the past ten years there has been a flood of new tests. Many are variations of tests already in use and some are highly specialized techniques. One of the tests offered during this period, but which has not been widely adopted in this country, is the test that this author has found most useful in its own right and as a supplement to projective techniques, especially when the latter is meager ...[p. 309].

The theoretical assumptions underlying the construction of the FRT (Bene & Anthony, 1957b) included acknowledgment by the authors that there need not necessarily be a high correspondence between the feelings the child attributed to the various members of the family, and the feelings actually held by the family members. Bene and Anthony (1957b) stated, regarding interpretation of the child's test responses:

...For clinical purposes, however, it is his "psychic reality," his own idiosyncratic concept of his emotional environment, that has operational value, and is likely to be more relevant to the aetiology of his symptoms than the "objective" reality assessed through careful social enquiry [p. 543].

In this latter respect, writers such as Green and Parker (1965) have stated ". . . the critical parent-child

relationship is the one perceived and internalized by the child [p. 379]."

It was assumed, in this study, that the test responses regarding familial relationships were drawn from the immediate experiences within the family, as they were experienced and imagined by the child. As such, the responses represented operational validity in understanding the nature of the child's feelings toward and from other family members.

Description of the FRT. The FRT consists of 20 relatively ambiguous cardboard figures, representing people of various ages from babyhood to old age. The child is permitted to select figures to represent each member of his family, including himself. Also included is a figure standing for "Nobody," which serves to accommodate those items which are not felt to apply to any of the family members chosen. Figures are attached to cardboard boxes which are slotted at the top.

Two forms are available for the test, a form for younger children and a form for older children. The test version for older children, suggested for use with children ages seven to fifteen, was utilized in this investigation. It contains a total of 86 cards on which 68 statements are printed, reflecting several categories as previously defined and reflecting the attitude areas concerning selected family figures, as follows:

## OUTGOING FEELINGS

Positive Mild  
 Positive Strong  
 Negative Mild  
 Negative Strong

## INCOMING FEELINGS

Positive Mild  
 Positive Strong  
 Negative Mild  
 Negative Strong

The remaining 18 items represent three additional groups of feelings: Maternal Overprotection; Paternal Overindulgence; and Maternal Overindulgence. These attitude areas were not included in the present study.

After selecting the figures to represent his own family, the child places the card in the box behind the figure for which the statement is most appropriate. Upon conclusion of the test, scoring is accomplished by tallying on a score sheet the items assigned by cards to the various role figures, including items assigned to "Nobody." A separate record sheet is available for evaluation of the results, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Analysis is made quantitatively by determining the number of items assigned to the several family roles. Qualitative analysis is determined by noting the various degrees and directions of affect assigned various family figures.

Validity of the FRT. Tests of construct validity for the FRT were conducted by the test authors, although their approach to validity is not to be evaluatively considered in the current study.

Two sets of subjects, using the form designed for older children, provided data supportive of validity. The subjects consisted of out-patients in the children's department of a large hospital in south-east London, and those referred there specifically for child guidance services. The ages of the children ranged from seven to fifteen, with a mean age of eleven years. Most of the children came from working-class or lower middle-class homes. They had intelligence quotients ranging from 67 to 144, with a mean of 98 and a standard deviation of 16. No information was provided regarding the descriptive title or type of tests which determined the intelligence quotients.

Validity of the FRT was tested by comparing the test results of the first set of subjects and their relevant psychiatric and case history material. Three specific questions were used with the first set of subjects: (1) Did the children's test responses reflect feelings their parents were reported to have toward them? (2) Did the feelings of the children expressed toward their siblings correspond with those they supposedly had toward them? (3) Did the children's test responses correctly reflect conflict situations with siblings?

The first question, relating to correlation with parental feelings, was investigated by using the test results of 10 children whose fathers had been described

in case history material as hostile, punitive, or cruel. Over 66 per cent of the children under study assessed their fathers' feelings toward them as Negative. With regard to children's assessment of their mothers' feelings toward them, 16 mothers were subdivided into two sample groups. From case study material, the first sample group of mothers seemingly offered normal acceptance of the child. The second group displayed covert, over-compensating rejection of the child. In the children's assessment of incoming feelings from others, a significant difference was noted between the two subdivided groups. This resulted in the authors theorizing that the two samples could not have been taken from the same population.

The second question dealt with outgoing feelings with respect to the children's immediately older siblings. Investigation revealed 64 per cent agreement between the reported feelings and feelings expressed in the test. The authors concluded this agreement was significantly different from chance.

The third question dealt with conflict situations between siblings, and was measured with respect to sibling jealousy. Children's test responses reflected full agreement with case history material on all but one of fourteen cases examined.

Validity of the FRT was further tested by examining the correspondence between test results of the second set of subjects and questionnaire material obtained from their mothers. Comparison of the questionnaire material with test responses of 34 cases was made by a psychologist who was not directly involved with the test or the validation procedure. Of the compared cases, 47 per cent showed "good agreement;" 38 per cent showed "partial or fair agreement;" and 15 per cent indicated "poor agreement." The authors (Bene & Anthony, 1957a) concluded that ". . . the test can give an estimate of children's family relationships, which is roughly in agreement with the account given by their mothers [p. 553]."

The need for further validation was indicated, however, due to the small number of children used for validation purposes and to the fact that no norms have been established for a normal population or for a population of children within the United States. In order to establish content validity of the FRT in connection with the present investigation, a panel of 20 judges (two psychiatrists, fifteen psychologists, and three social workers) was employed. All of the 68 items used in this study, along with descriptions of the categories which Bene and Anthony (1957b) had assigned each respective item, were submitted for judgment. Agreement was sought

regarding the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the items for the designated category. Data obtained in connection with establishing of content validity are presented and discussed in Chapter IV.

Reliability of the FRT. Bene and Anthony (1957a) stated that "None of the usual methods of assessing the reliability of a test are quite suitable for the Family Relations Test [p. 554]." The authors did not consider test-retest methods applicable, due to changes which may occur in the home environment and in the maturation of the child. Nor did the authors consider the split-half method suitable for the test, since the items within any area were not sufficiently homogeneous and the number of choices the child could make with regard to each item varied from case to case.

An attempt was made, however, to use a modified form of the split-half method and was described by Bene and Anthony (1957a) as follows:

...The test consists of 86 items, each of which could be allotted to Nobody, Self, Father, Mother, various numbers of siblings, and Others in the family. Out of this, by a combination of items, three types of scores were used:

Positive Feelings, to and from, combined...34 items  
Negative Feelings, to and from, combined...34 items  
Overprotection and overindulgence combined.18 items

Separate reliability coefficients were obtained for each of these scores for each of the people in the family, regarding each score as if it were the result of a separate test. Within each score two sub-scores were computed, for the odd and for the



even number items respectively. (This was done only where the score reached or exceeded 6). Thus, for each subject, we have two separate sub-scores for positive feelings in relation to Father, two separate sub-scores in relation to Mother, and so on. The number of subjects who gave 6 or more items to the self, second or third mentioned siblings, and others in the family were too small to warrant computation of a coefficient [p. 554].

To correct for halving the length of the test, the authors used the Spearman-Brown formula (statistical results are reproduced in Appendix VIII). The authors concluded that the results seemed to indicate the FRT to be reasonably reliable (Bene & Anthony, 1957a).

Reliability of the instrument needed to be determined for the present study. Reliability estimates were computed for the present study by using a form of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique based on the Kuder-Richardson 21 formula, suggested by Ebel (1965; p. 328). The following formula was used to obtain reliability estimates for all samples, based upon combined scores (16 for each subject):

$$r = \frac{k}{n-1} \left( 1 - \frac{n\sum Q^2 - \sum T^2}{n\sum x^2 - (\sum X)^2} \right)$$

- $k$  = the number of items
  - $n$  = the number of students
  - $\sum Q^2$  = the sum of squares of  $k$  times  $n$  individual questions scores
  - $\sum T^2$  = the sum of squares of the  $k$  question total scores
  - $\sum x^2$  = the sum of square of the  $n$  student total scores
  - $\sum X$  = the sum of the  $n$  student total scores
- [Ebel, 1965; p. 328]

The 16 possible scores obtained for all subjects represented eight attitude areas for Outgoing Feelings, and eight for Incoming Feelings (Father, Positive and Negative; Mother, Positive and Negative; Siblings, Positive and Negative; and Denial, Positive and Negative). Thus, each subject could be treated as though he had the possibility of obtaining 16 scores derived from 68 items on the FRT. Bene and Anthony (1957a) indicated that the usual methods of establishing reliability were not pertinent to the FRT. They did, none the less, offer some evidence of its reliability (pp. 554-555).

Guilford (1965) and Ebel (1965) indicated that estimation of the reliability of an instrument could be determined by knowledge of variance in terms of items. The assumptions for an ANOVA application are the same as those for the Kuder-Richardson formulae 20 and 21. That is, the instruments and their items measure one common factor and item difficulties are very nearly equal. The nature of an ANOVA approach is that variances at different sources can be examined and implications for the meaning of the coefficients can be made more explicit.

Ebel (1965) pointed out that the Kuder-Richardson formula 21 had the limitation of underestimating reliability, especially when items varied in response or difficulty. Ebel (1965) stated: "If a test includes many items or questions on which the average score is near

perfect or near zero, this underestimate could be quite large [p. 319]." Results and discussions of reliability procedures used in the present study are found in Chapter IV.

Scoring of the FRT. The two major attitude areas explored in this study, Imagined Acceptance by Others and Experienced Acceptance by Others (see Figure 1), were hand-scored quantitatively and qualitatively. Results from eight of the eleven attitude areas included in the FRT (Bene & Anthony, 1957b), were used in this procedure. Items measuring the three remaining attitude areas of the FRT (Maternal Overprotection; Paternal Overindulgence; and Maternal Overindulgence) were not used in this study.

FIGURE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF FAMILY RELATIONS TEST  
ATTITUDE AREAS

Major Attitude Areas	Test Items	FRT Attitude Areas
Imagined Acceptance by Others	40-47	Incoming Positive Mild Feelings
	50-57	Incoming Positive Strong Feelings
	60-67	Incoming Negative Mild Feelings
	70-77	Incoming Negative Strong Feelings
Experienced Acceptance by Others	00-09	Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings
	10-17	Outgoing Positive Strong Feelings
	20-29	Outgoing Negative Mild Feelings
	30-37	Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings

The total number of items used for any one person indicated the measure of emotional involvement the child had with that person. A comparatively higher score indi-

cated the child had greater involvement with that individual within the attitude area, or qualities of feelings which the score included. A comparatively lower score indicated less, or possibly no, involvement with that family figure.

If items were assigned singly to an individual family member, the initial possible range of scores for Outgoing Positive Mild and Outgoing Negative Mild attitude areas was from zero to ten. The remaining six attitude areas had an initial possible range of zero to eight. However, Bene and Anthony (1957b) indicated that the child could assign a single item to more than one family member. In this event, these ranges were extended according to the number of figures to whom multiple assignment of an item was made.

In addition to scores on the original eight variables, scores on four attitude areas were tabulated. This resulted from a combination of the original eight variables as follows: (1) Outgoing Feelings, Positive, Mild and Strong Combined; (2) Outgoing Feelings, Negative, Mild and Strong Combined; (3) Incoming Feelings, Positive, Mild and Strong Combined; and (4) Incoming Feelings, Negative, Mild and Strong Combined.

If items were assigned singly to an individual, the initial possible range of scores for both Positive and Negative Outgoing Feelings, Mild and Strong Com-

bined, was from zero to eighteen, respectively. The initial possible range for scores for both Positive and Negative Outgoing Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined, was from zero to sixteen. These initial possible ranges could also be increased by the child's assignment of an items to more than one figure. The interpretation of higher and lower scores again applied; higher scores indicated greater involvement with a family figure and lower scores lesser involvement within these four attitude areas.

California Test of Personality  
Sense of Personal Worth Scale

Description of the Sense of Personal Worth Scale, California Test of Personality. The degree of the child's self acceptance was obtained through an analysis of responses on the Sense of Personal Worth Scale (SPWS) from the California Test of Personality (CTP; Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953). The authors described the CTP as measuring ". . . more or less specific tendencies to feel, think, and act [p.3]," within the various components designed to measure evidences of personal security and adjustment. Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs (1953) stated the following in regard to the SPWS subtest:

SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH -- An individual possesses a sense of being worthy when he feels he is well regarded by others, when he feels that others have faith in his future success, and when he be-

believes that he has average or better than average ability. To feel worthy means to feel capable and reasonably attractive [p. 3].

The Primary Version, Form AA, designed for grade kindergarten to three, was used with subjects of chronological ages equivalent to these grade placements (ages six, seven, and eight). The Elementary Version, Form AA, was used with subjects of chronological ages average for fourth, fifth, and sixth grade placement.

Validity of the SPWS. Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs (1953) referred to several sources concerning validity of the CTP. A summary of investigations made at Syracuse University by the California Test Bureau (1949) found the CTP ". . . correlated more closely with the clinical findings than any other personality test [p. 5]." A study by Jackson (1946) measured the effectiveness of various types of evaluating techniques (interview, experience rating, teacher rating, parent rating) and concluded the over-all results suggested that the personal, social, or total adjustment were more positively identified by the CTP.

Reliability of the SPWS. The coefficients of reliability, number of cases, and standard errors of measurement, as computed for the SPWS by Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs (1953), in terms of raw scores for the various levels are found in Appendix IX. These reliability coefficients were computed with the Kuder-Richardson for-

mula. The authors concluded the instrument revealed reasonable reliability.

Scoring of the SPWS. The eight items comprising the primary version of the SPWS (Form AA), and the twelve items comprising the elementary version (Form AA) were hand-scored by the present investigator. Equivalent percentile ratings and standard scores used in this study were provided by Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs (1953, pp. 28-29). These data are presented in Appendix X.

#### Administration of the Instruments

The FRT and SPWS were individually administered to each of the 81 children in the study. Testing was conducted by this investigator, and was completed in a single session for each child. The only variation permitted was that some children preferred to read the statements themselves, and others preferred to have them read by the examiner. The need for such variation to appropriately meet a child's indicated or observed preference in responding to items was acknowledged as an acceptable procedure in the test administration (Bene & Anthony, 1957a).

With respect to the effect of the sex of the examiner upon the subject, Bene and Anthony (1957a) compared results on the FRT obtained by male and female psychologists. They found that ". . . none of the differences between the means obtained by the male and the female

psychologists was found to be statistically significant [p. 554]."

#### Statistical Treatment of FRT Data

Scores were calculated for each subject according to the degree and type of involvement with father, mother, siblings, and the figure "Nobody". Scores derived for the eight individual variables and the four combined variables, previously described, were used for statistical analysis. The hypothetical distribution of items, as theorized by Bene and Anthony (1957a), included substantially reduced expectations for involvement with the self figure. In addition, feelings concerning self as set forth in stated null hypotheses for this investigation were measured by responses on an additional instrument, the SPWS. Therefore, scores concerning the self figure as revealed on the FRT did not warrant varied statistical analysis applied to other figures.

Means, standard deviations, and ranges. Tables were prepared for the means, standard deviations, and ranges of pertinent FRT subtest data for the three study samples. These data and their significance in relation to the first null hypothesis formulated for this study are discussed in Chapter IV.

Tests for differences among frequencies for study samples. The Chi Square test for multiple samples (Siegel,



1956) was computed to determine the extent to which the three samples revealed discrete differences in categories concerning involvement with particular family members, as measured by FRT subtests. These data provided additional statistical information for the first null hypothesis, as discussed in this study.

Subtest intercorrelations. Feelings of acceptance by others were measured by positive and negative incoming feelings (mild and strong combined) on the FRT. Feelings of acceptance of others were evidenced by positive and negative outgoing feelings (mild and strong combined) on the FRT. Spearman rank correlation coefficients (Siegel, 1956) were computed to determine the degree of relationship between these two major attitude areas. These were computed for each study sample and according to the figures with whom the subjects were involved (i.e., mother, father, siblings, nobody). This coefficient was employed due to the small sample size of the ED group ( $N = 11$ ), and because assumptions for parametric statistics (i.e., normal distribution; random sampling) could not be applied to the LD and ED samples (Guilford, 1965).

Using the same statistics, more definitive analysis of the feelings involved in any such relationship was obtained for each sample. This was accomplished by determining the degree to which positive and negative

incoming feelings (mild feelings of acceptance by others) were related to positive and negative mild outgoing feelings (mild feelings of acceptance of others). Similar analysis was applied to determine the degree to which strong feelings of acceptance by others were related to strong feelings of acceptance of others. These measures provided statistical information for the second null hypothesis of this study.

#### Statistical Treatment of SPWS Data

Each subject's score on the SPWS was also used for statistical analysis. Total scores, expressed in percentile ranks, were used for all subjects. These data and their significance in relation to the third null hypothesis used in this study, are presented in Chapter IV.

A completely randomized design for ANOVA tests of significance was computed to determine the extent to which the three samples revealed discrete differences regarding acceptance of self. If the F value and ANOVA were significant, Duncan's new multiple range test (Steel & Torrie, 1961) was employed to determine wherein significant differences among the groups were found in relation to the third null hypothesis formulated for this study.

#### Statistical Treatment of Combined FRT and SPWS Data

Feelings of acceptance by others (parental figures)  
and feelings of acceptance of others (parental figures)

were revealed by the FRT. Feelings of self-esteem were reflected by the SPWS. Spearman rank correlation coefficients (Siegel, 1956) were computed to determine the degree of relationship among these categories of feelings. These measures provided statistical information for the fourth and fifth null hypotheses in this study.

Statistical Treatment of the Data Related  
Specifically to the Null Hypotheses

Null hypothesis one. Support for the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed among the dissimilar study samples, in feelings concerning acceptance by family members and acceptance of family members, would be obtained if no statistically significant differences were revealed among the samples in the mean scores and variances. These scores reflected the degree and quality of involvement with certain family figures (i.e., positive mild toward father, mother, siblings, and nobody).

To test the proposition of no existing differences between samples, in degree and quality of involvement with certain family figures, the Chi Square test for multiple samples (Siegel, 1956) was computed using the following formula:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

where  $O_{ij}$  = observed number of cases categorized in the  $i$ th row of  $j$ th column

$E_{ij}$  = number of cases expected under  $H_0$  to be categorized in  $i$ th row of  $j$ th column

$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k$  directs one to sum over all cells [p. 220].

Null hypothesis two. Support for the null hypothesis that no significant relationship existed between acceptance by others and acceptance of others would be obtained if no statistically significant correlations were revealed between the various attitude areas comprising Outgoing Feelings and the related areas comprising Incoming Feelings. These feelings are expressed concerning the same family member on the FRT. The following basic formula for computing the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient ( $r_s$ ) was used (Siegel, 1956):

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^N d_i^2}{N^3 - N} \quad [\text{p. 204}]$$

To test null hypothesis two ( $p = .05$ ) that the variables under study were not associated in the samples, and that observed values of  $r$ 's differed from zero only by chance, obtained  $r$ 's were tested for significance. The

following formula for computing significance (Student's  $t$ ) was employed:

$$t = r_s \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - r_s^2}}$$

[Siegel, 1956, p. 212].

Null hypothesis three. Support for the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed among dissimilar study samples regarding acceptance of self would be indicated if no statistical differences in calculated scores on the SPWS were found for the three samples. Percentile ratings of self-esteem on the SPWS were converted into equivalent standard scores, as set forth for interpretation of this instrument (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953), and are presented in Table 1.

To test the null hypothesis of no difference among the various study samples,  $F$  ratios were computed (see Chapter IV). The following formula for Analysis of Variance was used (Guilford, 1965):

$$F = \frac{MS_b}{MS_w} \quad [p. 273].$$

The use of this parametric technique was justified on the basis that distribution of data in terms of standard scores (Table 1) revealed that scores (over 60%) for the three study samples were more within the middle range (standard scores 40 to 60). If the  $F$  value and

TABLE 1

PERCENTILES, STANDARD SCORES, AND FREQUENCY DATA  
ON THE SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH SCALE  
FOR ALL SAMPLES COMBINED  
(N = 81)

Percentile	Standard Scores	Frequency
98	70	7
90	63	22
80	58	17
60	53	5
50	50	8
40	47	4
30	45	9
20	42	4
10	37	2
05	33	2
02	30	0
01	27	1

ANOVA were significant, Duncan's new multiple range test (Steel & Torrie, 1961) was calculated.

Null hypotheses four and five. Null hypotheses four and five were based upon positive (acceptance by and acceptance of) and negative attitude areas of the FRT subtests, in relation to feelings of self-esteem or self acceptance on the SWPS. If no significant relationship existed between acceptance of self and acceptance of others (parental figures), the various attitude areas of positive behavior concerning acceptance of others on the FRT (outgoing mild; outgoing strong; outgoing mild and strong combined) would not operate in conjunction with a higher self acceptance score on the SWPS. Similarly, if no relationship existed between acceptance by others and

acceptance of self, the various attitude areas of positive behavior concerning acceptance by others on the FRT (incoming mild; incoming strong; incoming mild and strong combined) would not coincide with higher self acceptance scores on the SPWS. This proposition would also be supported if the various dimensions of negative behavior on the FRT, representing attitudes or feelings of non-acceptance of and by parental figures (outgoing and incoming mild, strong, and combined feelings), did not coincide with a lowered self acceptance score.

Accordingly, data from FRT subtests indicating the type of parent-child relationships existing in the three sample groups on the FRT were correlated with self acceptance scores on the SPWS. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient, as previously described, was used to determine the degree of relationship. The formula for computing significance, previously set forth, was used to test for significance of  $r_s$ .

#### Summary

In this chapter the selection of the sample, the instruments employed, administration and scoring of the FRT and the SPWS, and the statistical treatment have been discussed. Chapter IV contains an analysis of all the data obtained to support or to reject the null hypotheses formulated in Chapter I.

—

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Validity of the Family Relations Test

An attempt was made to establish content validity of the FRT. The 68 items used in this investigation were submitted to the panel of 20 judges (identified in Chapter III) with a description and definition of the four attitude areas explored by these items (Bene & Anthony, 1957). The judges independently assigned each item to one of the four attitude areas, or discarded the item assuming its inappropriateness for exploring any of the designated attitude areas. (See Appendix XI for inter-judge agreement on the content validity of FRT items.)

The assignment of an item, by the judges, to a different attitude area than that assigned by the test's authors constituted a discrepancy or a disagreement by the rater concerning the intensity of the feeling represented (i.e., mild v.s. strong feelings). Items within the Positive attitude areas were thus reversed in some cases according to Mild and Strong feelings believed represented. Items within Negative attitude areas were similarly reversed.



A total of 68 items was rated (34 exploring Positive attitude areas and 34 exploring Negative attitude areas). Of these 68 items, 58 received at least two-thirds inter-judge agreement concerning appropriateness for exploring their designated attitude areas. Percentage of agreement on the ten items which did not receive two-thirds inter-judge agreement indicated that Item 72 received only 15 per cent agreement concerning its appropriateness for measuring feelings of hate and hostility (Strong, Negative feelings). Eighty per cent of the judges placed this item ("This person in the family makes me feel silly [Bene & Anthony, 1957b, p. 7],") in the attitude area reflecting feelings of unfriendliness and disapproval (Mild, Negative feelings). Five per cent of the judges discarded the item as unsuitable for any of the designated attitude areas. Item 77 ("This person in the family does not love me enough [Bene & Anthony, 1957b, p. 7],") was considered appropriate by only 35 per cent of the judges for measuring Strong, Negative feelings. This item was assigned by 65 per cent of the judges to the attitude area reflecting feelings of unfriendliness and disapproval (Mild Negative). The remaining eight items not receiving at least two-thirds inter-judge agreement, reflected agreement which ranged from 55 to 65 per cent among the panel of judges.

It should be noted that in the comparison of inter-judge agreement with respect to items measuring Positive or Negative attitude areas, all of the items purportedly measuring Positive feelings (feelings of friendly approval or sensualized feelings) received at least two-thirds agreement among judges. The ten items which received less than two-thirds agreement represented one item designated by the test's authors (Bene & Anthony, 1957b) to measure feelings of unfriendliness or disapproval (Mild Negative Feelings), and nine items designed to measure feelings of hate and hostility (Strong Negative Feelings). Thus, comparatively greater agreement was noted among judges on items intended to reflect Positive Feelings (feelings of friendly approval or sensualized feelings) than was noted on items measuring Negative attitude areas, particularly items representing feelings of hate and hostility (Strong Negative Feelings). However, over-all analysis of the data comprising percentages of agreement among judges concerning content validity of items included in the FRT seemed to justify reasonable confidence in the test.

#### Reliability of the Family Relations Test

Bene and Anthony (1957b) indicated that none of the usual methods for assessing reliability were quite suitable for the FRT (see Chapter III). As a consequence, the reliability coefficients were not of the magnitude ordinarily expected of objective paper-and-pencil tests.

An analysis of variance form of the Kuder-Richardson formula 21, employed with the three groups, provided the results presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE THREE SAMPLE  
GROUPS ON THE FAMILY RELATIONS TEST

Sample Populations	N	Reliability Coefficients	p
Normals	35	.556	<.001
Learning Disordered	35	.360	<.05
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.478	

All of the coefficients were low and clearly suggested that the FRT did not lend itself to the precise and usual means of determining reliability. Further, an examination of score profiles for each subject revealed that lack of response was indeed possible in terms of the purpose of the FRT. Thus the wide variation, or lack of response, in a given area would affect the reliability coefficient obtained and produce the underestimate discussed in Chapter III.

While the reliability criterion represents an important element of any objective instrument used in psychological services, the purpose of the FRT was not jeopardized because it failed to report high level coefficients. Discussion in this chapter will bear out the diagnostic

value of the instrument, regardless of the comparatively low reliability coefficients obtained for the groups.

With respect to the ED group, the number of subjects clearly denied interpretive significance of the reliability obtained. As noted, the coefficient was not statistically significant; hence, it could be obtained by chance.

It was believed that these data on reliability tended to bear out the discussion of Bene and Anthony (1957a), and their view that the FRT has applications which would not be affected by reliability measures.

Statistical Results Concerning Feelings  
of Acceptance by and Acceptance  
of Family Figures

Null hypothesis one. It was theorized that no significant differences existed among dissimilar samples in feelings concerning acceptance by and acceptance of family members, as these feelings were represented by the various attitude areas and figures on the FRT. Therefore null hypothesis one was formulated.

To provide data for calculating differences existing among the dissimilar samples and for descriptive purposes, means, standard deviations, and ranges were computed for pertinent FRT attitude areas. These data provide information relating to significant observed values (see Appendices XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII).

In order to test the proposition of no existing differences among samples, the Chi Square test for multiple samples was computed. These data provided statistical information for the first null hypothesis. The .05 level was used to establish significance of the Chi Square values and to accept or reject the statistical null hypothesis. Data comprising results which were significant at or beyond the .05 level, are reported in Tables 3 through 8.

Actual scores were classified into three levels (Low, Medium, and High) for purposes of calculating Chi Square values. These levels were applied to scores in relation to Father, Mother, Siblings, and the Nobody figure. The eight attitude areas involved were:

Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings  
 Outgoing Positive Strong Feelings  
 Outgoing Negative Mild Feelings  
 Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings

Incoming Positive Mild Feelings  
 Incoming Positive Strong Feelings  
 Incoming Negative Mild Feelings  
 Incoming Negative Strong Feelings

Low scores were defined as including those individuals whose scores were 0-1. Medium scores were defined as including those individuals whose scores were 2-3. High scores were defined as including those individuals whose scores were four or higher. Chi Square values were computed for each of the eight attitude areas, which yielded 32 tests. A three-by-three contingency

table was constructed for each of the attitude areas, with one row in the table for each of the three samples (Nor, LD, and ED), and one column for each of the three scoring classifications (Low, Medium, and High). The entries in the contingency table were the number of children belonging in the sample group indicated by the row, with a score in the range indicated by the column to each subtest of the data.

A partitioned Chi Square analysis was applied. The total Chi Square for the table had four degrees of freedom  $[(3-1) \times (3-1)]$ . This total Chi Square was partitioned into four separate single degree of freedom Chi Squares. This represented an effort to determine the nature of the differences among the three groups, with respect to the relative distribution of the within group scores (Low, Medium, and High classifications).

Data which reached or exceeded the .05 level of significance in regard to differences among dissimilar samples in feelings concerned with acceptance by and acceptance of family members (null hypothesis one) are presented in Table 3 and Table 4. Some restraint must be used in interpretation, as suggested in Cochran (1954), when expected values may be less than five.

TABLE 3

## FREQUENCY DATA FOR MILD AND STRONG FEELINGS WITH ALL SAMPLES

FRT Attitude Area	Father			Mother			Siblings			Nobody		
	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>
Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings:												
Normals	4	11	20	8	8	19				27	3	5
Learning Disordered	6	9	20	6	12	17				30	4	1
Emotionally Disturbed	7	2	2	6	1	4				3	6	2
Outgoing Positive Strong Feelings:												
Normals										14	10	11
Learning Disordered										19	12	4
Emotionally Disturbed										5	4	2
Outgoing Negative Mild Feelings:												
Normals												
Learning Disordered												
Emotionally Disturbed												
Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings:												
Normals							17	8	10			
Learning Disordered							24	7	4			
Emotionally Disturbed							3	5	3			
Incoming Positive Mild Feelings:												
Normals												
Learning Disordered												
Emotionally Disturbed												

TABLE 3 -- Continued

FRT Attitude Areas	Father			Mother			Siblings			Nobody		
	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>
Incoming Positive Strong Feelings:												
Normals										9	14	12
Learning Disordered										14	17	4
Emotionally Disturbed										2	4	5
Incoming Negative Mild Feelings:												
Normals												
Learning Disordered												
Emotionally Disturbed												
Incoming Negative Strong Feelings:												
Normals												
Learning Disordered												
Emotionally Disturbed												

a = Low = 0-1  
 b = Medium = 2-3  
 c = High = 4 or above



TABLE 4

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES AMONG ALL SAMPLES  
ON ALL FAMILY RELATIONS TEST VARIABLES

Sample	Scoring Categories	Low	Medium	Low + Medium	High
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild: Assigned to Father Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium	8.41**			
Emotionally Disturbed	Low + Medium to High			5.77*	
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild: Assigned to Mother Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium	5.55*			
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild: Assigned to Nobody Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium		15.41**		
Outgoing Negative Feelings, Strong: Assigned to Sibling Figures					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium		3.87*		

\*Significant Chi Square at .05; with 1 d.f. = 3.84.

\*\*Significant Chi Square at .01; with 1 d.f. = 6.64.

As evidenced in the frequency data (Table 3) and Chi Square values (Table 4), relatively more children in the ED group gave low scores on Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings toward Father. The frequency of responses in Low and Medium categories revealed the ED sample having significantly less feeling ( $\chi^2 = 8.41 < .005$ ) than the Nor and LD samples. When High and Medium scores are examined, the ED sample again revealed significantly fewer Outgoing Positive feelings ( $\chi^2 = 5.77 < .025$ ) than the Nor and LD samples. The ED children thus exhibited comparatively fewer feelings of friendly approval as measured by items involving Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings toward the Father figure. Examination of the distribution revealed that a comparative majority of the scores for the Nor and LD samples fell into the Medium or High scores. These data suggested the existence of more positive attitudes in terms of "experienced" feelings of friendly approval toward father for the Nor and LD children.

In addition, a significantly higher frequency of ED children scored Low when compared to Medium scores within this same attitude area (Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings) in relation to the Mother figure ( $\chi^2 = 5.55 < .05$ ). In assignment of these feelings to the figure, Nobody, which served to accomodate those items not felt to apply

to anyone in the family, the sample of ED children also revealed a significant difference from the Nor and LD samples. The ED children fell into the Medium classification when comparing Low to Medium scores, on Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings expressed as non-existent in the family and represented by the figure Nobody; the Nor and LD groups scored in the Low category more frequently ( $\chi^2 = 15.41 < .01$ ).

On Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings expressed toward Siblings, the ED sample scored predominantly within the Medium category, as compared to the Nor and LD samples who fell in the Low category ( $\chi^2 = 3.87 < .05$ ). These data indicated the ED children experienced comparatively more feelings representing hate and hostility toward siblings, than did the Nor and LD children.

Significant differences at the .05 level (see Table 5) were observed in appraising responses of the group of Nor children and the group of LD children in relation to the figure Nobody, in the attitude areas of Outgoing Positive Strong ( $\chi^2 = 4.22$ ) and Incoming Positive Strong ( $\chi^2 = 4.76$ ), respectively. These items were concerned with the more "sexualized" or "sensualized" feelings associated with close physical contact and manipulation (Bene & Anthony, 1957b). The LD children indicated comparatively less denial of these feelings existing within the family constellation, than did the Nor

TABLE 5

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEARNING  
DISORDERED AND NORMAL SAMPLES, ON MILD AND STRONG  
FEELINGS ON THE FAMILY RELATIONS TEST

Sample	Scoring Categories	Low	Medium	Low + Medium	High
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Strong: Assigned to Nobody Figure					
Learning Disordered	Low + Medium to High			4.22*	
Incoming Positive Feelings, Strong: from Nobody Figure					
Learning Disordered	Low + Medium to High			4.76*	

\* Significant Chi Square at .05; with 1 d.f. = 3.84.

sample. The LD sample scored predominantly in the Low plus Medium classification as compared to High scores for the Nor sample.

Additional data relating to the first null hypothesis resulted from combinations of the eight attitude areas in relation to Father, Mother, Siblings, and the figure Nobody. Scores were computed for the following four attitude areas:

Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined  
Outgoing Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined  
Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined  
Incoming Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined

For purposes of calculating Chi Square values, actual scores were again classified into three levels (Low, Medium, and High). Low scores were defined as including those individuals whose scores were 0-2. Medium scores were defined as including those individuals whose scores were 3-6. High scores were defined as including those individuals whose scores were seven or higher. Sixteen Chi Square values were computed. Using these definitions for Low, Medium, and High categories, a three-by-three contingency table was constructed and a partitioned Chi Square analysis as previously described was applied. Data which reached or exceeded the .05 level of significance are presented in Tables 6, 7, and 8.

As evidenced in these data, differences existed in the Low to Medium categories. Children in the ED group

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY DATA FOR MILD AND STRONG FEELINGS COMBINED FOR ALL SAMPLES

FRT Variables	Father			Mother			Siblings			Nobody		
	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>	L <sup>a</sup>	M <sup>b</sup>	H <sup>c</sup>
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined:												
Normal	5	15	15	2	15	18				15	11	9
Learning Disordered	5	15	15	2	14	19				24	7	4
Emotionally Disturbed	7	2	2	3	3	5				2	7	2
Outgoing Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined:												
Normal							17	4	14			
Learning Disordered							19	11	5			
Emotionally Disturbed							2	5	4			
Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined:												
Normal	4	15	16	1	14	20				18	15	2
Learning Disordered	6	15	14	2	15	18				24	11	0
Emotionally Disturbed	5	3	3	3	3	5				2	6	3
Incoming Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined:												
Normal										3	4	28
Learning Disordered										8	8	19
Emotionally Disturbed										2	3	6

a = Low = 0-2; b = Medium = 3-6; c = High = 7 or above.

scored with greater frequency than the other two samples in the Low category, involving the Father figure on Outgoing Positive ( $X^2 = 11.53 < .01$ ) and Incoming Positive ( $X^2 = 5.16 < .05$ ) Mild and Strong Feelings Combined (see Table 7). Significant differences were also indicated in the Low category, when compared to the Medium category, on these attitude areas (Outgoing Positive and Incoming Positive, Mild and Strong Combined). This combination of items represented attitudes of friendly approval and the more sensualized feelings in relation to the Mother figure. Significant Chi Square values were found on Outgoing Positive Mild and Strong Feelings toward Mother ( $X^2 = 5.48 < .05$ ); and on Incoming Positive Mild and Strong Feelings ( $X^2 = 7.10 < .01$ ).

The combination of Mild Outgoing Negative Feelings (representing experienced feelings of unfriendliness or disapproval) and Strong Outgoing Negative Feelings (representing experienced feelings of hate and hostility) expressed toward Siblings was calculated. Data in the Low and Medium classifications revealed a significantly higher frequency ( $X = 4.34 < .05$ ) of Medium scores for the ED children than for the Nor and LD children, in these combined attitude areas.

Denial of feelings, or attitudes not felt to apply to anyone in the family, represented by assignment of items to the figure Nobody was investigated. Data

TABLE 7

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES AMONG ALL SAMPLES  
ON MILD AND STRONG FEELINGS COMBINED,  
FROM THE FAMILY RELATIONS TEST

Sample	Scoring Categories	Low	Medium	Low + Medium	High
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: Assigned to Father Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium	11.53**			
Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: from Father Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium	5.16*			
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: Assigned to Mother Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium	5.48*			
Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: from Mother Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium	7.10**			
Outgoing Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: Assigned to Sibling Figures					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium		4.34*		



TABLE 7 -- Continued

Sample	Scoring Categories	Low	Medium	Low + Medium	High
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: Assigned to Nobody Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low to Medium		7.07**		
Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: from Nobody Figure					
Emotionally Disturbed	Low + Medium to High				9.78**

\*Significant Chi Square at .05 level; with 1 d.f. = 3.84.

\*\*Significant Chi Square, at .01 level; with 1 d.f. = 6.64.

revealed that in the attitude area of Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined (representing expression toward others of friendly approval and sensualized feelings), the majority of scores for the ED group differed significantly ( $X^2 = 7.07 < .01$ ) from the Nor and LD samples, by falling within the Medium classification. The latter two groups (Nor and LD) fell into the Low classification.

Denial of imagined feelings from others, of friendly approval and sensualized feelings, was revealed by assignment of items to the figure Nobody. In the attitude area of Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined, the ED sample revealed relatively more scores in the High category when compared with scores in the Low plus Medium classification ( $X^2 = 9.78 < .01$ ). The majority of the children in the Nor and LD samples fell into the Low or Medium categories.

A statistically significant difference ( $X = 5.69 < .05$ ) was observed between the responses of the group of Nor children and the responses of the group of LD children with feelings expressed toward Siblings (see Table 8). Mild Outgoing Negative Feelings (representing experienced feelings of unfriendliness or disapproval) and Strong Outgoing Negative Feelings (representing hate and hostility) toward Siblings were combined. The distribution

TABLE 8

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEARNING  
DISORDERED AND NORMAL SAMPLES ON MILD AND STRONG  
FEELINGS COMBINED, FROM THE  
FAMILY RELATIONS TEST

Sample	Scoring Categories	Low	Medium	Low + Medium	High
Outgoing Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: Assigned to Sibling Figures.					
Learning Disordered	Low + Medium to High			5.69*	
Incoming Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined: From Nobody Figure					
Learning Disordered	Low + Medium to High			5.11*	

\*Significant Chi Square at .05 level; with 1 d.f. = 3.84.

of the scores revealed that LD children scored relatively more frequently in the Low plus Medium classification as compared to more frequent scores in the High category for the Nor sample.

A significant difference ( $\chi^2 = 5.11 < .05$ ) was also noted in the attitude area reflecting denial of Incoming Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined, as perceived existing in the family. As these feelings were represented by assignment to the Nobody figure, the LD sample scored with relatively greater frequency in the Low plus Medium classification as compared to more frequent scores in the High category for the Nor sample.

An analysis of all the data relating to the first null hypothesis indicated significant differences existed among dissimilar populations in feelings concerning Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Others, as these feelings were represented among the various attitude areas and figures on the FRT. Therefore, the statistical null hypothesis of no existing differences was rejected at the .05 or greater level of significance.

The ED sample revealed significant differences by scoring in categories comparatively classified as lower on two of the attitude areas comprising Positive feelings expressed toward others in the family constellation. The areas included Outgoing Mild Feelings (representing feelings of friendly approval) toward the Father and

Mother figures respectively. In addition, on attitude areas comprising a combination of these Positive Mild Feelings and the more sensualized feeling represented by Outgoing Positive Strong items, the ED children again scored comparatively lower in relation to the Father and Mother figures, respectively. These attitude areas representing Positive Feelings expressed toward others were interpreted as comprising Acceptance of Others (parental figures).

The ED children additionally revealed a significantly lower frequency of scores for the attitude areas representing a combination of imagined feelings of friendly approval and sensualized feelings directed toward the child (Incoming Positive Mild and Strong Feelings Combined) from the Father and Mother figures. These attitude areas involving imagined Positive Feelings directed toward the child were interpreted as comprising Acceptance by Others (parental figures).

Further, the ED sample scored comparatively higher on certain of the attitude areas involving Negative Feelings. These included Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings toward Siblings (representing expressed feelings of hate and hostility), and Outgoing Mild and Strong Feelings Combined toward Siblings (representing a combination of attitude areas reflecting unfriendliness and disapproval, and hate and hostility). These negative attitude areas

emanating from the child were interpreted as comprising low Acceptance of Others (Siblings).

A pattern of lower Acceptance by and of Others was thus perceived by the children in the ED sample. This was further corroborated by comparatively higher scores recorded for this sample in the Denial of Positive Feelings existing within the family constellation. More frequent assignment to the figure Nobody was exhibited by the ED sample, on items in attitude areas comprising Positive Feelings emanating from the child (Outgoing Positive Mild and Outgoing Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined). In addition, the emotionally disturbed group indicated a greater denial of items comprising imagined Positive Feelings directed toward the child (Incoming Positive Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined).

Accordingly, a more "negative climate" of feelings existing within the family constellation was experienced or imagined by the ED sample. Such results could not be interpreted, however, as inferring cause-effect sequences (i.e., more negative family feelings experienced and understood; emotional disturbances). In this respect the comparatively lowered feelings concerning Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Others (family figures) by the ED sample in this investigation is interpreted as having implications for therapy with the ED child. Therapy may involve attempts at changing or alleviating negative

feelings experienced by the ED child, in order to enable him to more adequately cope with familial and societal expectations concerning his behavior.

The LD sample revealed less denial of feelings representing the more sensualized positive attitude areas existing within the family constellation. Comparatively lower scores were expressed in relation to the figure Nobody, on Outgoing Positive Strong and Incoming Positive Strong Feelings. In addition, these children indicated less predominance in scores reflecting attitude areas involving feelings of unfriendliness and disapproval, and hate in hostility in relation to Sibling figures. This sample indicated a strong tendency toward lower scores on Outgoing Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined, toward Siblings. The comparative absence of these feelings was interpreted as comprising more Acceptance of Others(Siblings) by the LD sample. In summary, less denial of these positive attitude areas was interpreted as comprising more Acceptance of Others within the family constellations of the LD sample.

However, in assessing imagined feelings involving combined attitude areas of incoming feelings of unfriendliness and disapproval, and hate and hostility (Incoming Negative Feelings, Mild and Strong Combined), these children revealed less denial concerning the existence of

these feelings. The comparatively lower assignment of items in these negative attitude areas to the figure Nobody, provided some discrepancy in analyzing the "climate" of feelings experienced and imagined by this sample. In an interpretation of such discrepancy, the LD group represented children diagnosed as having some neurological dysfunction who exhibited variance between their apparent potential and their practices when carrying out some of the essential cognitive and learning processes. These children were also recognized as exhibiting additional ambivalence within the emotional sphere (Lehtinen, 1967). It might be expected that such emotional lability would be reflected within the child's interpretation of family feelings.

Null hypothesis two. The second null hypothesis stated that feelings of Acceptance by Others and feelings of Acceptance of Others, as measured by the FRT, would not be significantly related. Spearman correlation coefficients were computed between the various categories, representing the following attitude areas:

Outgoing Positive Mild and Incoming Positive Mild  
Feelings  
Outgoing Positive Strong and Incoming Positive Strong  
Feelings  
Outgoing Positive Mild and Strong Combined and In-  
coming Positive Mild and Strong Combined

Correlation coefficients were calculated for each of the three study samples for these attitude areas, as



they were experienced and expressed concerning five representative figures: Father, Mother, Siblings, Nobody, and Father and Mother (Parental Figures) Combined. Forty-five Spearman correlation coefficients were thus calculated.

Correlation coefficients were also calculated for relationships existing between attitude areas involving Negative Feelings (or the absence of feelings of Acceptance of Others and Acceptance of Others) in relation to the same figures (Father, Mother, etc.), as follows:

Outgoing Negative Mild and Incoming Negative Mild  
Feelings  
Outgoing Negative Strong and Incoming Negative  
Strong Feelings  
Outgoing Negative Mild and Strong Combined and In-  
coming Negative Mild and Strong Combined

This resulted in the calculation of an additional 45 correlation coefficients and a total of 90 Spearman correlation coefficients, in relation to the second null hypothesis. The observed values of coefficients were tested for significance using the formula previously described for Student's  $t$ .

Significant correlation coefficients were found for 69 of the 90 attitude areas and within all of the three study samples. These data are presented in Table 9. Therefore, the second null hypothesis was not supported and the null hypothesis of no existing relationship between Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Others was rejected at the .05 or greater level of significance.

TABLE 9

FAMILY RELATIONS TEST VARIABLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OUTGOING  
AND INCOMING FEELINGS FOR ALL FAMILY FIGURES

FRT Variable	N.	Father	Mother	Siblings	Nobody	Parental Figures Combined
		$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$
Outgoing and Incoming Positive Mild Feelings:						
Normals	35	.59**	.80**	.61**	.24	.83**
Learning Disordered	35	.62**	.28	.47*	.44**	.49**
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.75**	.75**	.54**	.58*	.85**
Outgoing and Incoming Positive Strong Feelings:						
Normals	35	.73**	.52**	.36**	.51**	.71**
Learning Disordered	35	.50**	.48**	.37*	.76**	.57**
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.43	.64*	.57**	.58*	.44
Outgoing and Incoming Positive Feelings Combined:						
Normals	35	.75**	.83**	.61**	.63**	.85**
Learning Disordered	35	.72**	.44**	.49*	.74**	.67**
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.71*	.82**	.49**	.65*	.72**
Outgoing and Incoming Negative Mild Feelings:						
Normals	35	.45**	.58**	.65**	.63**	.53**
Learning Disordered	35	.51**	.30	.35*	.69**	.51**
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.59**	.20	.21	.42	.23

TABLE 9 -- Continued

FRT Variable	N	Father	Mother	Siblings	Nobody	Parental Figures Combined
		$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$
Outgoing and Incoming Negative Strong Feelings:						
Normals	35	.22	.10	.54**	.55**	.22
Learning Disordered	35	.11	.36*	.75**	.82**	.13
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.30	.35	.37*	.37	.01
Outgoing and Incoming Negative Feelings Combined:						
Normals	35	.51**	.44**	.73**	.74**	.49**
Learning Disordered	35	.62**	.32*	.66**	.85**	.61**
Emotionally Disturbed	11	.47	.15	.53**	.60*	.16

\* Significant at the .05 level.

\*\* Significant at the .01 level.

The number of significant relationships between Outgoing and Incoming Feelings was greater within the attitude areas reflecting positive involvement. Significant relationships were recorded for 41 of 45 positive attitude areas. Within the attitude areas reflecting negative involvement, however, comparatively fewer relationships were observed. Of the 45 negative attitude areas, 28 were revealed to have significant relationships existing between Outgoing and Incoming Feelings. Within these latter (Negative) attitude areas, only four correlations were found in the ED sample. These findings were interpreted as coinciding with the view held by Bene and Anthony (1957b) that: "Experience has demonstrated that the crucial emotional difficulty for the clinic child is more often in the expression of hostile than of loving feelings [p. 547]."

Statistical Results Concerning Feelings of  
Self Acceptance, Acceptance by  
and of Family Figures

Null hypothesis three. The third null hypothesis stated that no significant difference existed among the three study samples in Acceptance of Self as measured by the California Test of Personality, Sense of Personal Worth Scale. To test this null hypothesis of no difference, means, variances, and F values were computed. The formula for Analysis of Variance was set forth in Chapter

III. If the F value and ANOVA were significant, Duncan's new multiple range test was calculated. These data are presented in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

TABLE 10

MEAN AND VARIANCE FOR ACCEPTANCE OF SELF AS MEASURED  
BY THE SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH SCALE

Group	N	Mean	S2
Normal	35	71.82	630.44
Learning Disordered	35	63.94	804.05
Emotionally Disturbed	11	46.81	1201.35

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ACCEPTANCE OF SELF AS MEASURED  
BY THE SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH SCALE

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Between groups	5307.45	2	2653.72	3.40	<.05
Within groups	60786.49	78	779.31		
Total	66093.94	80			

TABLE 12

DUNCAN'S NEW MULTIPLE RANGE TEST TO DETERMINE  
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS  
ON SPWS ACCEPTANCE OF SELF

	Normal	Learning Disordered	Emotionally Disturbed
Normal			*****
Learning Disordered			*****
Emotionally Disturbed			

\*\*\*\*\*  
Means significant

As evidenced from the data the ED sample differed significantly from the other two sample groups (Nor and LD). The ED children gave significantly lower scores regarding Feelings of Personal Worth (Acceptance of Self) as measured by the SWPS. Therefore, null hypothesis three was rejected.

Results of this study were thus interpreted as providing additional support for Wylie's (1961) statement that "It is generally conceded theoretically that a low degree of phenomenal self-regard would be indicative of, or an aspect of, . . . 'maladjustment [p. 203]." The findings were also in agreement with results of research previously reported in the review of the literature (see Chapter II) in which the level of reported self-regard correlated with various degrees of maladjustment or pathology.

Null hypotheses four and five. The fourth and fifth null hypotheses stated that feelings of Acceptance by Parental Figures (null hypothesis four), and feelings of Acceptance of Parental Figures (null hypothesis five) as measured by the FRT and feelings of Self Acceptance as measured by the SPWS would not be significantly related. Spearman correlation coefficients were computed between scores on the various attitude areas on the FRT (representing imagined feelings of acceptance by the

mother and father figures, singly and in combination), and scores of self acceptance on the SPWS, as follows:

Incoming Positive Mild Feelings  
Incoming Positive Strong Feelings  
Incoming Positive Mild and Strong Combined

Spearman correlation coefficients were computed between scores on the various attitude areas of the FRT (representing experienced feelings of acceptance of the mother and father figures, singly and in combination), and scores of self acceptance on the SPWS, as follows:

Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings  
Outgoing Positive Strong Feelings  
Outgoing Positive Mild and Strong Combined

Spearman correlation coefficients were calculated for relationships existing between attitude areas involving negative feelings (or the absence of feelings of acceptance by others and acceptance of others) in relation to parental figures (father, mother, singly and combined), as follows:

Incoming Negative Mild Feelings  
Incoming Negative Strong Feelings  
Incoming Negative Mild and Strong Combined

Outgoing Negative Mild Feelings  
Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings  
Outgoing Negative Mild and Strong Combined

A total of 106 correlation coefficients were calculated and the observed values were tested for significance using the formula previously described for Student's *t*.

TABLE 13

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY RELATIONS TEST VARIABLE AND  
SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH SCALE FOR THE  
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED SAMPLE

FRT Variable	Father	Mother	Father and Mother Combined
	$r_s$	$r_s$	$r_s$
Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings	.17	-.79**	-.58*
Outgoing Positive Strong Feelings	.16	-.10	-.21
Outgoing Positive Feelings, Combined	.17	-.60*	-.48
Incoming Positive Mild Feelings	.32	-.44	-.32
Incoming Positive Strong Feelings	.26	-.26	-.30
Incoming Positive Feelings, Combined	.31	-.41	-.34
Outgoing Negative Mild Feelings	-.76**	.47	-.15
Outgoing Negative Strong Feelings	.13	-.03	-.38
Outgoing Negative Feelings, Combined	-.84**	.35	-.50
Incoming Negative Mild Feelings	-.57*	.36	-.03
Incoming Negative Strong Feelings	-.24	.58*	.04
Incoming Negative Feelings, Combined	-.51	.46	.04

\* Significant at .05 level = 1.83.

\*\* Significant at .01 level = 2.82.



These data and their relation to null hypothesis four, and null hypothesis five are presented in Table 13.

Analysis of data resulted in rejection of the fourth null hypothesis of no existing relationship between feelings of Acceptance by Others (Parental Figures) and Acceptance of Self. Significant correlations were found for the sample of ED children. A negative correlation of  $-.57$  ( $t = -2.10$ ;  $<.05$ ) was recorded between Incoming Negative Mild Feelings (reflecting unfriendly and disapproving behavior perceived) from Father and feelings of Self Acceptance within the ED sample. A correlation of  $.58$  ( $t = 2.18$   $<.05$ ) was recorded for Incoming Negative Strong Feelings for Mother and feelings of Self Acceptance. Maslow's (1941) discussion of reaction formation and denial might be applicable in the interpretation of a positive correlation existing for the ED children between Incoming Negative Strong Feelings from Mother on the FRT (representing imagined feelings of hostility directed toward the child), and feelings of Self Acceptance. Maslow (1941) stated in regard to reaction formation:

..."I do not desire something which is objectionable; on the contrary I intensely desire the opposite".... With these reaction patterns they (people) protect themselves against the dangers apparent...but also considerably enhance their evaluation of themselves [p. 161].

With regard to denial, Maslow (1941) stated:

...I will not acknowledge my fears, my conflict, my self-contempt, my feelings of being disapproved.... On the contrary, I will evaluate myself highly...[p. 162].

However, since these devices would represent defense or coping mechanisms having contradictory aspects in relation to an individual's needs and goals, such attempts could prove inadequate and unrealistic (Maslow, 1941). As such, the positive correlation observed between feelings of hate and hostility directed toward the child from the mother and the child's acceptance of self might not represent total variance with the over-all previously indicated lowered self acceptance of children in the ED sample.

Although null hypothesis four was rejected because of the data interpreted for the ED sample, this null hypothesis was supported in relation to the samples of Nor and LD children. Findings for the Nor and LD samples, supporting the null hypothesis of no existing relationship between Acceptance by Parental Figures and Acceptance of Self, were in conflict with previous investigations reviewed which indicated existing relationships (Jourard & Remy, 1955; Helper, 1958; Heilbrun & Orr, 1966; Gildston, 1967).

This finding may have resulted from the instruments employed for the assessment of such relationship. The present investigator felt that perhaps the one subtest from the CTP, namely the SPWS, was not sufficiently discriminating to provide valid results with respect to the correlations under consideration (between acceptance of self and acceptance by others).

A further interpretation might be related to the subjects themselves. The willingness or ability of a subject to introspect is believed, by the present investigator, to vary among individuals. All subjects in the ED sample had been, or were being seen in a therapeutic situation. They were perhaps more "honest" in reflecting upon their feelings than were the Nor or LD children. Such a phenomenon could arise from experiences in a therapeutic situation. Additionally, the emotional lability of the LD children could have contributed to the lack of a relationships as measured in this one investigation. Further, the children in the Nor sample might have been more "aware" of desired responses on the SPWS. Thus, their responses might not have sufficiently reflected self-recognition or actual self-feelings.

In general, findings for all samples related to null hypothesis four were supportive of Wylie's (1961) conclusion. Wylie (1961) indicated that empirical studies

completed which can theoretically substantiate the existence or extent of such a relationship (between feelings of Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Self) are lacking in number, and in the inclusion of relevant parent variables and relevant child variables.

Significant correlation coefficients were found only within the ED sample, in relationships existing between Acceptance of Others and Acceptance of Self. The null hypothesis of no existing relationships between feelings of Acceptance of Others (Parental Figures) and Acceptance of Self was thus rejected in relation to the sample of ED children. It was, however, supported for the samples of Nor and LD children.

Data in Table 13 revealed that negative correlation coefficients existed between Outgoing Negative Mild Feelings ( $r = -.76$ ;  $t = -3.59 < .01$ ), and Outgoing Negative Mild and Strong Combined ( $r = -.84$ ;  $t = -4.71 < .01$ ) with feelings of Self Acceptance with regard to the Father figure.

Data regarding involvement with the Mother figure revealed negative correlation coefficients ( $r = -.79$ ;  $t = -3.89 < .01$ ) for Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings and Outgoing Positive Mild and Strong Combined ( $r = -.60$ ;  $t = -2.29 < .05$ ) in relation to the Mother figure with feelings of Acceptance of Self. In addition, a negative

correlation coefficient was observed in Outgoing Positive Mild Feelings toward Parental Figures Combined with feelings of Self Acceptance ( $r = -.58$ ;  $t = -2.14$  .05). These latter correlation coefficients were in contrast to theoretical propositions regarding positive relationships existing between acceptance of self and acceptance of others. However, null hypothesis one provided information that the ED sample experienced less positive climates of interpersonal relationships existing within the family constellation. In this respect, Horney (1937) stated ". . . the more difficult are his experiences in the family, the more will a child be inclined to develop . . . a distrustful or spiteful attitude toward everyone [p. 88]."

The ED sample also revealed significantly lower scores on Acceptance of Self, as revealed from data relating to null hypothesis three. In Roger's (1951) discussion of acceptance of self and acceptance of others, he viewed the individual with less acceptance of self as reacting to an interpretation of experiences which are viewed ". . . defensively as potential threats, rather than for what they really are. Thus in interpersonal relationships, words or behaviors are experienced and perceived as threatening, which are not so intended [p. 520]."

These data for the Nor and LD samples supported the null hypothesis of no existing relationship between Acceptance of Parental Figures and Acceptance of Self. Thus these data did not coincide with the theoretical position of a relationship existing between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others (Rogers, 1951; Horney, 1937; Fromm, 1956). In addition, the finding of no existing relationship did not support investigations (Berger, 1952; Phillips, 1951; McIntyre, 1952; Omwake, 1954) reviewed, which indicated such a relationship. However, such studies were not confined to acceptance of parental figures.

These results tended to support Zelan's (1954a; 1954b) studies in which no significant correlation was found between the Sense of Personal Worth Scale or the Who-Are-You Test (Bugental & Zelan, 1950) measuring acceptance of self and the Bonney Sociometric Test (Bonney, 1943) measuring acceptance of others.

Since the present investigator also employed the SPWS, the present finding of no significant correlation between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others may not be an unexpected result. Additionally, the rationale for lack of relationships (Acceptance of Self and Acceptance by Others) presented for the fourth null hypothesis might also apply to the fifth null hypothesis.

Summary

Chapter IV presented data which pertained to the specific null hypotheses. The results were discussed and interpreted. Chapter V will present a summary of conclusions and present implications arising from this current research.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The present study investigated parent-child relations as represented in feelings of acceptance by and of others and of self in the family constellation of dissimilar samples (normal, learning disordered, and emotionally disturbed children). Acceptance by and of others were measured by attitude areas in the Family Relations Test (Bene & Anthony, 1957b); acceptance of self was measured by the Sense of Personal Worth Scale, California Test of Personality (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953). Relationships and differences concerning acceptance of self, acceptance by others, and acceptance of others were investigated.

#### Differences in Feelings Concerning Acceptance by and Acceptance of Family Figures

Acceptance by others. The present study employed the Family Relations Test (Bene & Anthony, 1957b) to measure Acceptance by Others within the family constellation. Analysis of the data resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed in



such feelings among dissimilar samples (Normal, Learning Disordered, and Emotionally Disturbed children). Acceptance by Others, as measured by Incoming Positive and Negative feelings, revealed the ED sample displayed significantly fewer feelings categorized as positive from father and mother. The ED children also exhibited higher scores in their denial of positive feelings from others (incoming or imagined feelings existing within the family constellations). The interpretation of these findings was that the ED children had feelings of less acceptance by others within the family constellations, than did the Nor and LD children.

The group of LD children differed significantly in that they acknowledged more Positive Strong or sensualized feelings from others in the family constellation. However, they also gave higher acknowledgment to Negative (Mild and Strong Combined) attitudes from others involving feelings of unfriendliness and disapproval, and hate and hostility. Some ambivalence was thus present in their perceptions of feelings comprising Acceptance by Others. This ambivalence in feelings was interpreted as stemming from the emotional lability frequently attributed to children represented in the LD sample (Lehtinen, 1967).

Acceptance of others. Acceptance of Others was measured by the Outgoing Positive and Negative feelings

revealed on the FRT. Analysis of the data resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed in such feelings among dissimilar samples (Nor, LD, ED). The ED sample expressed significantly fewer feelings categorized as positive toward parental figures (singly and in combination), than did the Nor and LD samples. The ED sample also recorded a greater degree of negative feelings toward sibling figures, than did the other two samples. The ED sample indicated comparatively more denial of positive feelings expressed (outgoing) toward others existing within the family. The interpretation of these findings was that the ED children had feelings of less acceptance of others within the family constellations, than did the Nor and LD children.

The group of LD children differed significantly from the other samples in that they expressed less denial of positive strong feelings toward others in the family constellations. They also recorded fewer negative feelings (mild and strong combined) toward siblings. These findings were interpreted as indicating that LD children had comparatively more Acceptance of Others within the family constellations, than did the Nor and ED children.

Relationships between Acceptance by  
Others and Acceptance of Others

The present study provided support for the Rogerian theory of personality that an individual's acceptance of others would be positively and significantly correlated with his acceptance by others. Support was also provided for Bene and Anthony's (1957b) propositions that "feelings children have toward others are closely related to the feelings they believe others have toward them [p. 13]." Analysis of the data concerning Acceptance by Others and Acceptance of Others resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant relationship existed in such feelings. Statistically significant relationships were found within all three of the sample groups for 69 of the 90 measured dimensions. The ED sample, however, revealed comparatively fewer relationships within negative attitude areas than did the Nor and LD samples. This latter finding was interpreted as coinciding with the viewpoint that "The crucial emotional difference for the clinic child is more often in the expression of hostile than of loving feelings [Bene & Anthony, 1957b; p. 547]."

Acceptance of Self

The present study used the Sense of Personal Worth Scale from the California Test of Personality (Thorpe,

Clark, & Tiegs, 1953) to measure feelings of Acceptance of Self. Analysis of the data concerning self acceptance resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant differences existed in such feelings among dissimilar samples. Results revealed that the sample of ED children has significantly lower feelings of personal worth than the Nor and LD samples. Less Acceptance of Self, as a person who is ". . . well regarded by others . . . believes he has average or better than average. . . [Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953, p. 3]" was indicated by children within the ED sample. These findings were interpreted as providing support for Wylie's (1961) statement that a low degree of phenomenal self-regard is theoretically conceded as ". . . indicative of, or an aspect of, . . . maladjustment [p. 203]."

Acceptance by parental figures and acceptance of self. The proposition that feelings of Acceptance by Others would be related to feelings of self acceptance was studied through correlations between attitude areas representing acceptance by parental figures on the FRT and acceptance of self on the SPWS. Analysis of the data resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant relationship existed between acceptance by parental figures and acceptance of self. Significant relationships were observed only within the sample of ED

children. In relation to the father, the ED group revealed a negative correlation between feelings from the father figure reflecting the attitude area relating to unfriendliness and disapproval (Incoming Negative Mild) and Acceptance of Self on the SPWS. In relation to mother, the ED group revealed a positive correlation between the attitude area expressing hate and hostility (Incoming Negative Strong) and feelings of self regard or self acceptance. This latter finding was interpreted from the viewpoint of defense mechanisms being operant in these variables.

The lack of any relationship between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance by Others for the Nor and LD children was offered in terms of the possibility that these children were less able to reflect actual feelings concerning self (as measured by the SPWS). The emotional lability of the LD children and the possibility of the Nor children's sensitivity to "right" answers were offered as an explanation for the lack of a significant relationship between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance by Others.

Acceptance of parental figures and acceptance of self. The proposition that feelings of Acceptance of Others would be related to feelings of self acceptance was studied through correlations between attitude areas representing acceptance of parental figures on the FRT and Acceptance of Self on the SPWS. Significant relation-

ships were found only within the sample of ED children. Analysis of the data resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant relationship existed between Acceptance of Self and acceptance of parental figures.

Negative correlations were found within two of the six dimensions representing attitude areas toward the father figure in relation to Acceptance of Self. These two correlations were evidenced within negative attitude areas (Mild; Strong and Mild Combined) expressed toward the father figure. These correlations could be interpreted as showing directional support for the theoretical proposition.

With relation to the mother figure, significant correlations were observed within two of the six dimensions expressing attitude areas toward mother and were expressed within two of the three positive areas (Mild; Mild and Strong Combined). These correlations were in a negative direction. They seemed to refute the proposition of positive correlations between level of self acceptance and degree of acceptance a person has for others, as revealed by the ED children. Interpretation of these relationships involving the mother figure was offered in terms of certain theoretical positions (Horney, 1937; Rogers, 1951) which did not seem to invalidate the original proposition.

The lack of any relationship between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others for the Nor and LD children was offered in terms of the rationale for lack of relationship (Acceptance of Self and Acceptance by Others) presented for the fourth null hypothesis. Additionally, no significant correlation was found between self acceptance and a measure of acceptance of others in a previous investigation (Zelan, 1954) in which the SPWS was used to measure self acceptance.

#### Summary of Findings

Findings of this study resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that no significant difference existed in feelings concerning acceptance by and acceptance of family figures among samples. Significant differences were observed in the samples of ED children and LD children in certain areas.

The null hypothesis that no significant relationship existed between acceptance by others and acceptance of others was rejected. Significant correlations were found within all three of the samples.

The null hypothesis that no significant differences existed among samples in Acceptance of Self was rejected. The ED sample revealed significantly lower feelings of self acceptance than did the Nor and LD samples.

Additionally, significant relationships were found to exist within the ED sample concerning acceptance by or acceptance of parental figures and Acceptance of Self. These findings resulted in rejection of the null hypotheses that no relationship existed between acceptance by parental figures and self acceptance, or between acceptance of parental figures and self acceptance.

#### Implications

Results of this investigation, as well as the review of literature, validated the appropriateness of the hypotheses formulated. The associations and differences in feelings concerning family figures and self among children from diverse samples have implications for the counselor, therapist, and others for greater understanding of the individual child, as these feelings may be reflected behaviorally in parent-child relations. Additionally, such understanding has implications for possibly anticipating and influencing the future behavior of the child as a member of society, as these feelings or attitudes may generalize to interpersonal relationships outside the family constellation.

This investigation was effective in differentiating children designated as ED from Nor and LD children in a majority of the attitude areas studied. Such findings have implications for therapeutic attempts, as discussed



in Chapter IV, which may be employed in dealing with ED children. Additionally, in problem-child cases, the usual practice has been to see the mother and child in therapy situations, with this practice employed because of the assumption that the mother-child relationship is the most important in child development. Findings from this study, however, point also to the importance of the father-child relationship. This latter finding suggests a need to consider in more detail the role of the father in reflecting the child's attitudes concerning acceptance by and of others and acceptance of self.

In addition, certain associations and significant differences were found within the sample of LD children when compared to the samples of Nor and ED children. Research has lagged in investigating parent-child relations or feelings concerning self in relation to LD children, although it is possible that they may represent as much as ten per cent of the general population.

LD children have also been acknowledged as showing deviations of behavior and intellect of such a nature as to require special resources for management and education if their maximum potential is to be realized. The relationships and differences revealed in this study have implications for further understanding of this segment of the population. However, further research is indicated concerning attitude areas investigated in this study, as

well as other areas which may be relevant to greater understanding of the learning disordered child's educational and behavioral disabilities.

Further implications may be made with respect to the use of the FRT as a research tool for exploration of a child's emotional relations with his family.

Evidence of the FRT's validity which was examined in this study through the use of judge's ratings on content validity of items, revealed reasonable confidence in the instrument for attitude areas comprising measurement of Positive Feelings (feelings of friendly approval and sensualized feelings), and also for Mild Negative Feelings (feelings of unfriendliness or disapproval). However, inter-judge agreement on items purportedly measuring the attitude area of Strong Negative Feelings (hate and hostility) was considered meagre and implied a need for further investigation of the FRT's validity in measuring this latter area.

Reliability evidence as examined in this study was not impressive from a statistical point of view. Reliability coefficients obtained were low for the Nor and LD samples and failed to reach a significant level for the sample of ED children. As such, they failed to reflect the diagnostic value of the FRT believed represented in significant findings which were observed in relation to null hypotheses included in this study. In view of sig-

nificant findings obtained, further use of the FRT would appear warranted for investigating a definite rationale related to its specific purpose.

Child development research may always be in need of more adequate devices to assess psychological aspects of the home environment and a description and evaluation of a home's impact upon the child. Horney (1942) acknowledged that the child's growth may be stunted or furthered by the ". . . kind of relationship which is established between the child and his parents or others around him, including other children in the family . . . [p. 43]." The present investigator concluded that this investigation was successful in discriminating certain of these psychological aspects or relationships by qualitatively and quantitatively measuring the child's feelings concerning family members, as well as feelings concerning self.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Adler, A. Social interest: A challenge to mankind. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1938.
- Barker, R. G., & Wright, H. F. Midwest and its children. New York: Row-Peterson, 1954.
- Bender, L. Anxiety in disturbed children. In P. H. Hock and J. Zubin (Eds.). Anxiety. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1950.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Parental attitudes and behavior. J. C. Glidwell (Ed.). New York: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.) The fourth mental measurements year book. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1953.
- Butler, J. M., & Haigh, G. V. Changes in the relations between self-concepts and ideal concepts consequent upon client-centered counseling. In C. R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond, Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Diggory, J. C. Self-evaluation: Concepts and studies. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Dymond, Rosalind F. Adjustment changes over therapy from thematic test ratings. In C. R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond, Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Ebel, R. L. Measuring educational achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1950.
- Fromm, E. The art of loving. New York: Harpers, 1956.

- Grummon, D. L., & John, Eve S. Changes over client-centered therapy evaluated in psychoanalytically based thematic apperception scales. In C. R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond, Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.
- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1954.
- Hamachek, D. E. The self in growth, teaching, and learning: selected readings. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Horney, Karen. The neurotic personality of our time. New York: W. W. Norton, 1937.
- Leary, T. Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1957.
- Maslow, A. H., & Mittelmann, B. Principles of abnormal psychology: the dynamics of psychic illness. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.
- Medinnus, G. R. Readings in the psychology of parent-child relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- Rabin, A. I., & Haworth, M. R. Projective techniques with Children. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1960.
- Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy: newer concepts in practice. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R., & Dymond, Rosalind F. (Eds.) Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Sears, R. R., Macoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row-Peterson, 1957.
- Siegel, S. Non-parametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

- Snygg, D., & Combs, A. Individual behavior: a new frame of reference for psychology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Steel, R. G., & Torrie, J. H. Principles and procedures of statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Sullivan, H. S. Conceptions of modern psychiatry. Washington, D. C.: William White Foundation, 1947.
- Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton, 1953.
- Symonds, P. M. The psychology of parent-child relationships. New York: D. Appleton Century, 1939.
- Walsh, Anne M. Self-concepts of bright boys with learning difficulties. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1956.
- Wylie, Ruth C. The self-concept: a critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

#### Monographs

- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, Joan, & Breese, F. H. - Patterns of parent behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1945, 58 (No. 3).
- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, Joan, & Breese, F. H. The appraisal of parent behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1949, 63 (No. 4).
- Brophy, A. Self: role and satisfaction. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1949, 59.
- Lafon, F. E. Behavior on the Rorschach test and a measure of self-acceptance. Psychological Monographs, 1954, 68 (10, No. 381).
- Parker, H. J., Green, L. B., Lambert, B. Geraldine, & Porter, Janet B. Parent-child relations research status, measurement, and predictive value. Monograph Series Number One: Studies in the Assessment of Parent-Child Relationship. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Medical Center, 1967.

Articles and Periodicals

- Bene, Eva, & Anthony, J. A technique for the objective assessment of the child's family relationships. Journal of Mental Science, 1957, 103, 541-555. (a)
- Berger, E. M. The relationships between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.
- Berger, E. M. The relationship among acceptance of self, acceptance of others, and Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory scores. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 279-284.
- Bills, R. E. Self-concepts and Rorschach signs of depression. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 135-137.
- Block, J., & Thomas, H. Is satisfaction with self a measure of adjustment? Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 254-259.
- Bonney, M. E. Personality traits of socially successful and socially unsuccessful children. Journal of Educational Research, 1943, 34, 449-472.
- Bugental, J. F. T., & Zelan, S. L. Investigation into the self-concept. The W-A-Y technique. Journal of Personality, 1950, 18, 483-498.
- Chase, P. H. Self-concepts in adjusted and maladjusted hospital patients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 495-497.
- Chodorkoff, B. Adjustment and the discrepancy between the perceived and ideal self. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1954, 10, 266-268.
- Cochran, W. G. Some methods for strengthening the common Chi Square tests. Biometrics, 1954, 10, 417-451.
- Coopersmith, S. A method for determining types of self-esteem. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 87-94.
- Cox, F. N. An assessment of children's attitudes toward parent figures. Child Development, 1962, 33, 821-830.

- Craig, Helen B. A sociometric investigation of the self-concept of the deaf child. American Annals of the Deaf, 1965, 110, 456-478.
- Crandall, V. J., & Bellugi, Ursula. Some relationships of interpersonal and intrapersonal concepts to personal-social adjustment. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 224-232.
- Cummins, J. D. Family pictures: a projection test for children. British Journal of Psychology, 1952, 43, 53-60.
- Engel, Mary. The stability of the self-concept in adolescence. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 211-215.
- Epstein, S. Unconscious self-evaluation in a normal and a schizophrenic group. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 65-70.
- Fey, W. F. Acceptance of others and its relations to acceptance of self and others: a revaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 274-276.
- Fiedler, F. E., & Wepman, J. M. An exploratory investigation of the self-concept of stutterers. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1951, 16, 110-114.
- Fine, M. J. A self-evaluation of school related behavior of educable mentally retarded children -- a preliminary report. Exceptional Children, 1967, 324.
- Friedman, I. Phenomenal, ideal and projected conceptions of self. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 611-615.
- Gildston, Phyllis. Stutterers' self-acceptance and perceived parental acceptance. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 1, 59-64.
- Gorlow, L., Butler, A., & Guthrie, G. M. Correlation of self-attitudes of retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 67, 549-555.
- Green, L. B., & Parker, H. J. Parental influence upon adolescent occupational choice: a test of an aspect of Roe's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, No. 4, 379-383.



- Guthrie, G. M., Butler, A., & Gorlow, L. Personality differences between institutionalized and non-institutionalized retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 67, 543-548.
- Heilbrun, A. B., Jr., & Orr, Helen K. Perceived maternal childrearing history and subsequent motivational effects on failure. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1966, 109, 75-89.
- Helper, M. M. Parental evaluation of children and children's self-evaluations. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 190-194.
- Hildren, A. H. Q-sort correlation: stability and random choice of statements. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 45-50.
- Hillson, J. S., & Worchel, P. Self-concept and defensive behavior in the maladjusted. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 83-88.
- Howells, J. G., & Lickorish, J. R. The family relations indicator: a projective technique for investigating intra-family relationships designed for use with emotionally disturbed children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 33, 286-296.
- Hulse, W. C. The emotionally disturbed child draws his family. Quarterly Journal of Child Behavior, 1951, 3, 152-174.
- Hunter, E. C. Changes in teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior over the last thirty years. Mental Hygiene, 1957, 41, 3-11.
- Jackson, J. The relative effectiveness of paper-pencil test interview, and ratings as techniques of personality evaluation. Journal of Social Psychology, 1946, 23, 35-54.
- Jourard, S. M., & Remy, R. M. Perceived parental attitudes, the self, and security. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1955, 19, 364-366.
- Kogan, W. S., Quinn, R., Ax, A. F., & Ripley, H. S. Some methodological problems in the quantification of clinical assessment by Q array. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 57-62.

- Lipsett, L. A self-concept scale for children and its relationship to the children's form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale. Child Development, 1958, 29, 462-472.
- Loevinger, Jane, & Ossorio, A. Evaluation of therapy by self-report: a paradox. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 392-394.
- McAfee, R. O., & Cleland, C. C. The discrepancy between self-concept and ideal-self as a measure of psychological adjustment and educable mentally retarded males. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1965, 70, 63-68.
- McIntyre, C. J. Acceptance by others, and its relation to acceptance of self and others. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 624-626.
- McQuitty, L. L. A measure of personality integration in relation to the concept of self. Journal of Personality, 1950, 18, 461-482.
- Meyerowitz, J. H. Self-derogations in young retardates and special class placement. Child Development, 1962, 33, 443-451.
- Meyer, M. M. The Family Relations Test. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1963, 27, 309-314.
- Mussen, P. H., & Jones, Mary C. Self-conceptions, motivations, and interpersonal attitudes of late and early-maturing boys. Child Development, 1957, 28, 243-256.
- Omwake, Katherine. Relationships between acceptance of self and acceptance of others shown by three personality inventories. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 443-446.
- Parker, J. The relationship of self report to inferred self concept. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1966, 26, 691-700.
- Peterson, D. R., Becker, W. C., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quarry, H. C. Parental attitudes and child adjustment. Child Development, 1959, 30, 119-130.
- Phillips, E. L. Attitudes toward self and others: a brief questionnaire report. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 79-81.

- Rapaport, D. The theoretical implications of diagnostic testing procedures. Congres International de Psychiatrie, 1950, 2, 241-271. (Reprinted from Psychoanalytic Psychiatry and Psychology: Clinical and Theoretical Papers, Austin Riggs Center, Volume I, Edited by R. P. Knight, M.D.)
- Roe, Anne, & Siegelman, M. A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34, 355-368.
- Rogers, A. H. The self concept in paranoid schizophrenia. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958, 14, 365-366.
- Rosen, B. C., & D'Andrade, R. The psychosocial origins of achievement motivation. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 185-217.
- Rosen, E. Self-appraisal and perceived desirability and perceived social desirability of personality traits. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 151-158.
- Sarbin, T. R., & Rosenberg, B. G. Contributions to role-taking theory: a method for obtaining a qualitative estimate of the self. Journal of Social Psychology, 1955, 42, 71-81.
- Schaefer, E. S., Bell, R. Q., & Bayley, Nancy. Development of a maternal behavior research instrument. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1959.
- Sewell, W. H., Mussen, P. H., & Harris, C. W. Relationship among child training practices. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 137-148.
- Sheerer, Elizabeth R. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others in ten counseling cases. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 169-175.
- Smith, G. Six measures of self-concept discrepancy and instability: their interrelations, reliability, and relations to other personality measures. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 22, 101-112.
- Snyder, R. T. Personal adjustment, self attitudes and anxiety differences in retarded adolescents. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1966, 71, 33-41.

- Staines, J. W. The self-picture as a factor in the classroom. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 97-111.
- Stock, Dorothy. An investigation into the interrelations between the self-concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 176-180.
- Tamkin, A. S. Selective recall in schizophrenia and its relation to ego strength. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 345-349.
- Tolor, A. Self-perceptions of neuropsychiatric patients on the W-A-Y test. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1957, 13, 403-406.
- Wahl, C. W. Some antecedent factors in the family histories of one hundred nine alcoholics. Quarterly Journal Studies of Alcohol, 1956, 17, 643-654.
- Wahler, H. J. Social desirability and self rating of intakes, patients in treatment and controls. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 22, 357-363.
- Williams, W. W. The PALS tests: a technique for children to evaluate both parents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 487-495.
- Worchel, P. Adaptability screening of flying personnel, development of a self-concept inventory for predicting maladjustment. School of Aviation Medicine, United States Air Force Report No. 56-62, 1957.
- Yarrow, Marian R. Problems of methods in parent-child research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 215-226.
- Zelan, S. L. Acceptance and acceptability: an examination of social reciprocity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 316-325. (a)
- Zelan, S. L. The relationship of peer acceptance, acceptance of others and self-acceptance. Procedures of the Iowa Academy of Science, 1954, 61, 446-449. (b)
- Zuckerman, M., Baer, M., & Monashkin, I. Acceptance of self, parents, and people in patients and normals. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1956, 12, 327-332.
- Zuckerman, M., & Monashkin, I. Self-acceptance and psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 145-148.

Other Sources

- Arthur, Grace. Leiter International Performance Scale; Arthur Adaptation, 1952-1955. Chicago: C. H. Stoetling Co., 1955.
- Bellak, L., & Bellak, S. S. The Children's Apperception Test (CAT). New York: C. P. S. Company, 1948.
- Bene, Eva, & Anthony, J. Manual for the Family Relations Test, an objective technique for exploring emotional attitudes in children. London: The National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1957. (b)
- Blum, G. S. The Blacky Pictures: a technique for the exploration of personality dynamics. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950.
- Burgemeister, Bessie B., Blum, Lucille H., & Lorge, I. Columbia Mental Maturity Scale, Revised Edition, 1954-1959. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1959.
- Escalona, S. E. Some considerations regarding psychotherapy with psychotic children. Menninger Clinic Bulletin, 1948, 12.
- Guthrie, G. M., Butler, A., & Gorlow, L. Laurelton Self-Attitude Scale. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1961.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Princeton, New Jersey: Psychological Corporation, 1942-1947.
- Jackson, L. A Test of Family Attitudes. London: Methuen, 1952.
- Lorge, I., & Thorndike, R. L. Lorge-Thorndike Test of Intelligence. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1954.
- Lehtinen, Laura. Have you ever know a perceptually handicapped child? Springfield, Illinois: Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, Inc., Reprint Fund for Perceptually Handicapped Children of Illinois, 1967.
- Morgan, C. D., & Murray, H. A. Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936-1943.

Oklahoma State Department of Education, Division of Special Education and the Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission. A program of education for exceptional children in Oklahoma. Bulletin S. E., No. 7, 1968.

Parker, H. J. Revised Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. Unpublished questionnaire, University of Oklahoma, 1967.

Rotter, J. B., & Rafferty, J. E. Incomplete Sentences Test. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1950.

Schneidman, E. S. Make a Picture Story. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1948.

Sullivan, Elizabeth T., Wallis, W., & Tiegs, E. W. California Test of Mental Maturity. Los Angeles, California: California Test Bureau, 1949.

Symonds, P. M. Adolescent fantasy: an investigation of the picture story method of personality study. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Terman, L., & Merrill, Maud. Stanford-Binet Scale, Revised edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1937.

Thorpe, L. P., Clark, W. W., & Tiegs, E. W. California Test of Personality. Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, 1942-1953 (1953 revision).

Wechsler, D. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1949.

Zuckerman, M., Ribback, Beatrice B., Monashkin, I., & Norton, J. H. Normative data and factor analysis on the parental attitude research instrument. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22.

## APPENDIX I

## DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this study or as suggested by the authors of the instruments used, the following definitions of terms (three of which have been abstracted from Webster, 1964), will be assumed by the investigator:

- (1) "outgoing" - emanating from the child.
- (2) "incoming" - directed toward the child.
- (3) "experience" - the effect upon the judgment or feelings produced by personal and direct impressions (Webster).
- (4) "experienced" - verbal form of noun "experience" and used in this study to denote experience as emanating from the child.
- (5) "imagination" - a mental image, conception, or notion (Webster).
- (6) "imagine" - to represent or picture to oneself; to suppose or think to be (Webster).
- (7) "imagined" - past tense verbal form derived from noun "imagination," and used in this study to denote imagination of feelings directed toward the child.
- (8) "acceptance" - favorable reception; approval.
- (9) "positive" - attitude areas ranging from mild to strong, the milder areas having to do with feelings of friendly approval and the stronger areas with the more "sexualized" or "sensualized" feelings associated with close physical contact and manipulation.

## APPENDIX I -- Continued

- (10) "positive mild" - attitude area associated with feelings of friendly approval.
- (11) "positive strong" - attitude area associated with "sexualized" or "sensualized" feelings associated with close physical contact and manipulation.
- (12) "negative" - attitude areas ranging from mild to strong, the milder area relating to unfriendliness and disapproval and the stronger area expressing hate and hostility.
- (13) "negative mild" - attitude area relating to unfriendliness and disapproval.
- (14) "negative strong" - attitude area expressing hate and hostility.



## APPENDIX II

MAJOR PARENT-CHILD DIMENSIONS<sup>a</sup>

Investigators		Psychological Dimensions
Symonds (1939)	Dimensions:	Acceptance-Rejection Dominance-Submission
Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese (1945)	Syndromes:	Democracy in the home Acceptance of child Indulgence
Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese (1949)	Clusters:	Warmth Adjustment Restrictiveness Clarity Interference
Roff (1949) <sup>b</sup>	Factors:	Concern for child Democratic guidance Permissiveness Parent-child harmony Sociability-adjustment of parents Activeness of home Nonreadiness of sugges- tion
Lorr & Jenkins (1953) <sup>c</sup>	Factors:	Dependence-encouraging Democracy of child training Organization and effec- tiveness of control
Milton (1958) <sup>d</sup>	Factors:	Strictness or nonper- missiveness of parent behavior General family inter- action or adjustment Warmth of the mother-child relationship Responsible child-training orientation Parents' attitude toward aggressiveness and punitiveness

## APPENDIX II --- Continued

Investigators	Psychological Dimensions
Schaefer (1959)	Dimensions: Autonomy-control Love-hostility
Zuckerman, Ribback, Monashkin, & Norton (1958)	Factors: Authoritarian-control Hostility-rejection

<sup>a</sup>Medinnus (1967), p. 86.

<sup>b</sup>Based on Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese (1945) data.

<sup>c</sup>Based on Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese (1945) data and Roff's (1949) factor analysis.

<sup>d</sup>Based on the Pattern Data (Sears, Macoby, & Levin, 1957). Source: Adapted from Johnson & Medinnus (1965), p. 284.

## APPENDIX III

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES OF SUBJECTS  
ACCORDING TO CHRONOLOGICAL AGE IN MONTHS

Samples	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Range
Normals	35	125.28	15.06	85-143
Learning Disordered	35	120.34	15.42	93-143
Emotionally Disturbed	11	114.81	20.77	78-144

## APPENDIX IV

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES OF SUBJECTS  
ACCORDING TO INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS

Samples	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Range
Normals	35	106.28	10.12	90-126
Learning Disordered	35	99.82	8.82	90-128
Emotionally Disturbed	11	104.45	11.80	90-129

## APPENDIX V

SIBLING POSITION AND SEX CLASSIFICATION  
FOR ALL SAMPLES

Position	Male	Female	Total Number of Siblings
Older Siblings			
Normals	16	17	33
Learning Disordered	24	14	38
Emotionally Disturbed	6	7	13
Younger Siblings			
Normals	22	11	33
Learning Disordered	17	15	32
Emotionally Disturbed	6	6	12
Twin Siblings			
Normals	1	0	1
Learning Disordered	0	0	0
Emotionally Disturbed	0	0	0

## APPENDIX VI

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR SUBJECTS  
ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

Samples	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Range
Normals	35	1.91	1.03	1 - 5
Learning Disordered	35	2.00	.80	1 - 3
Emotionally Disturbed	11	2.27	1.10	1 - 4

## APPENDIX VII

OCCUPATIONAL LISTING FOR THE PARENTS OF CHILDREN  
IN THE THREE SAMPLESNormal Sample

1. Electric Wholesale
2. Obstretician
3. Southwestern Telephone
4. Hardware -- Oklahoma City
5. Plasterer
6. Transport Insurance Company
7. Geologist
8. Dowell Company
9. Doctor
10. Office of the Governor
11. None listed
12. City National Bank
13. Community Action Program
14. Display Man
15. Butcher
16. Cement Truck Driver
17. Tinker Air Force Base
18. Union State Life Insurance
19. Airplane Designer, Tinker
20. Welder
21. Own Business (Chain-Saw)
22. Truck Driver
23. School Teacher
24. Serviceman, Dulaney  
Distributing Company
25. Machinist
26. Fire Department
27. Works for 7-11 Store
28. Mailman
29. Computer Operator
30. Truck Driver
31. Plumbing Supply House:  
Manager
32. Salesman
33. Teacher
34. Carpenter
35. Construction

Learning Disordered Sample

1. Hoover Equipment
2. Self-employed
3. Electric Autolite  
and Battery Company
4. Board of Education  
Delivery Service
5. Self-employed
6. Accounting
7. F.A.A. -- Will Rogers
8. Insurance
9. TV Announcer
10. Engineer, Sunray  
Oil Company
11. Plumbing Contractor
12. Aero-Commander
13. OG&E Supervisor
14. District Manager,  
Skelly
15. Manager, Post Office
16. Pilot -- Sargeant  
in Air Force
17. Apartment House  
Builder
18. Interior Decorator
19. Bakery Company --  
Manager
20. Architectural  
Engineer
21. Fife Manufacturing  
Company
22. Superintendent,  
Wilson and Co.
23. Dentist
24. Plumber
25. Supreme Court Judge
26. Engineer
27. Attorney
28. Design Specialist--  
General Electric
29. Accountant
30. Electrical Tech-  
nician

## APPENDIX VII -- Continued

Learning Disordered Sample (continued)

31. Policeman
32. Dentist
33. Owner, Furniture Store
34. Machinist
35. Owner, Janitor Supply

Emotionally Disturbed Sample

1. Texaco Dealer
2. Mechanic
3. Tow Motor Driver
4. Accountant
5. Manager
6. Division Controller, Kerr McGee
7. Geophysicist
8. Painter
9. Geophysicist
10. Full-time Student
11. Car Salesman

## APPENDIX VIII

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ODD AND EVEN NUMBERED ITEMS  
WHERE TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS PER PERSON  
AND AREA REACHED OR EXCEEDED SIX

	N	r	Corrected r
Positive feelings to and from combined			
Father	48	.66	.79
Mother	76	.65	.79
First mentioned sibling	34	.82	.90
Negative feelings to and from combined:			
Father	31	.71	.83
Mother	11	.64	.78
First mentioned sibling	31	.52	.68
Overprotection and overindulgence	17	.67	.80

## APPENDIX IX

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR CALIFORNIA TEST OF  
PERSONALITY, SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH SCALE\*

Primary Version**				Elementary Version**			
Form AA or BB		Both Forms		Form AA or BB		Both Forms	
r	S.E. Meas.	r	S.E. Meas.	r	S.E. Meas.	r	S.E. Meas.
.82	0.75	.90	1.12	.79	1.49	.88	2.25

\*Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953, p. 4.

\*\*N = 255

## APPENDIX X

PERCENTILE AND STANDARD SCORES FOR THE CALIFORNIA  
TEST OF PERSONALITY, SENSE OF  
PERSONAL WORTH SCALE<sup>a</sup>

Primary Version			Elementary Version		
Raw Score	Percentile	SS	Raw Score	Percentile	SS
1	1	27	1	1	27
2	2	30	2	2	30
3	10	37	3	5	33
4	20	42	4	10	37
5	30	45	5	20	42
6	50	50	6	30	45
7	80	58	7	40	47
8	90	63	8	50	50
			9	60	53
			10	80	58
			11	90	63
			12	98	70

<sup>a</sup> Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953, pp. 28-29.



## APPENDIX XI

AGREEMENT AMONG TWENTY JUDGES, BY PER  
CENT, ON CONTENT VALIDITY OF FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST ITEMS

Item	Definition	Assignment of Items to Areas by Judges		
		Different Area %	Dis-card %	Same Area %
Mild Positive Feelings: Affectionate; having to do with feelings of friendly approval				
00	This person in the family is very nice	05	00	95
01	This person in the family is very jolly	05	20	75
02	This person in the family always helps the others	00	10	90
03	This person in the family has the nicest ways	15	10	75
04	This person in the family never lets you down	20	05	75
05	This person in the family is lots of fun	05	05	90
06	This person in the family deserves a nice present	05	00	95
07	This person in the family is a good sport	00	10	90
08	This person in the family is very nice to play with	05	00	95
09	This person in the family is very kind-hearted	00	10	90
40	This person in the family is kind to me	05	00	95
41	This person in the family is very nice to me	00	00	100
42	This person in the family likes me very much	10	00	90
43	This person in the family pays attention to me	10	00	90
44	This person in the family likes to help me	10	00	90
45	This person in the family likes to play with me	25	00	75
46	This person in the family really understands me	10	00	90
47	This person in the family listens to what I have to say	05	05	90

## APPENDIX XI -- Continued

Item	Definition	Assignment of Items to Areas by Judges		
		Different Area %	Dis-card %	Same Area %
Strong Positive Feelings: "Sexualized" or "Sensualized" feelings associated with close physical contact and manipulation				
10	I like to cuddle this person in the family	05	00	95
11	I like to be kissed by this person in the family	05	00	95
12	I sometimes wish I could sleep in the same bed with this person in the family	05	00	95
13	I wish I could keep this person near me always	10	00	90
14	I wish this person in the family would <u>care</u> for me more than for anybody else	10	00	90
15	When I get married I want to marry somebody who is just like this person in the family	15	00	85
16	I like this person in the family to tickle me	10	05	85
17	I like to hug this person in the family	10	00	90
50	This person in the family likes to kiss me	05	00	95
51	This person in the family likes to hug me	00	00	100
52	This person in the family likes to cuddle me	05	05	90
53	This person in the family likes to help me with my bath	05	00	95
54	This person in the family likes to tickle me	15	05	80
55	This person in the family likes to be in bed with me	10	00	90
56	This person in the family always wants to be with me	25	00	75
57	This person in the family cares more for me than for anybody else	15	00	85

## APPENDIX XI -- Continued

Item	Definition	Assignment of Items to Areas by Judges		
		Different Area %	Dis-card %	Same Area %
Mild Negative Feelings: relating to unfriendliness and disapproval				
20	This person in the family is sometimes a bit too fussy	00	10	90
21	This person in the family nags sometimes	05	00	95
22	This person in the family sometimes spoils other people's fun	20	05	75
23	This person in the family is sometimes quick-tempered	00	10	90
24	This person in the family is sometimes bad-tempered	25	05	70
25	This person in the family sometimes complains too much	00	00	100
26	This person in the family is sometimes annoyed without good reason	15	00	85
27	This person in the family sometimes grumbles too much	00	00	100
28	This person in the family is sometimes not very patient	05	15	80
29	This person in the family sometimes gets too angry	25	05	70
60	This person in the family sometimes frowns at me	05	05	90
61	This person in the family likes to tease me	25	10	65
62	This person in the family sometimes tells me off	15	05	80
63	This person in the family won't play with me when I like it	30	00	70
64	This person in the family won't always help me when I am in trouble	30	00	70
65	This person in the family sometimes nags me	05	00	95

## APPENDIX XI -- Continued

Item	Definition	Assignment of Items to Areas by Judges		
		Different Area %	Dis-card %	Same Area %
66	This person in the family sometimes gets angry with me	10	00	90
67	This person in the family is too busy to have time for me	30	00	70

Strong Negative Feelings: Hostile;  
expressing hate and hostility

30	Sometimes I would like to kill this person in the family	00	00	100
31	Sometimes I wish this person in the family would go away	30	05	65
32	Sometimes I hate this person in the family	10	00	90
33	Sometimes I feel like hitting this person in the family	25	00	75
34	Sometimes I think I would be happier if this person was not in our family	35	10	55
35	Sometimes I am fed-up with this person in the family	35	00	65
36	Sometimes I want to do things just to annoy this person in the family	45	00	55
37	This person in the family can make me feel very angry	05	00	95
70	This person in the family hits me a lot	20	05	75
71	This person in the family punishes me too often	35	00	65
72	This person in the family makes me feel silly	80	05	15
73	This person in the family makes me feel afraid	25	05	70
74	This person in the family is mean to me	10	10	80

## APPENDIX XI -- Continued

Item	Definition	Assignment of Items to Areas by Judges		
		Different Area %	Dis- card %	Same Area %
75	This person in the family makes me feel unhappy	40	00	60
76	This person in the family is always complaining about me	45	00	55
77	This person in the family does not love me enough	65	00	35

## APPENDIX XII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES ON THE FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST FOR OUTGOING POSITIVE ATTITUDES  
CHILDREN EXPRESSED TOWARD FAMILY FIGURES,  
INCLUDING "NOBODY" FIGURES

Family Figures	N	Positive Outgoing Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Normal Sample										
Father	35	4.42	2.64	0-10	2.00	1.84	0-7	6.42	4.00	0-16
Mother	35	4.02	2.74	0-9	3.25	1.78	0-7	7.28	3.93	1-16
Older Female Siblings	17	1.82	1.70	0-6	.58	1.06	0-3	2.41	2.45	0-9
Younger Female Siblings	11	1.63	2.06	0-7	.90	2.07	0-7	2.54	3.95	0-14
Older Male Siblings	16	2.68	2.72	0-9	.93	.99	0-3	3.62	3.38	0-10
Younger Male Siblings	22	2.77	2.89	0-9	1.86	2.12	0-5	4.63	4.75	0-14
Nobody Figure	35	1.22	1.88	0-6	2.68	2.17	0-8	3.91	3.45	0-14
Learning Disordered Sample										
Father	35	3.94	2.23	0-19	1.79	1.41	0-5	5.74	3.09	0-11
Mother	35	3.51	2.02	0-8	3.62	1.78	0-8	7.14	3.05	1-16
Older Female Siblings	14	1.85	1.35	0-5	1.14	1.46	0-4	3.00	2.18	0-7
Younger Female Siblings	15	1.06	.88	0-3	.66	1.11	0-4	1.73	1.53	0-6
Older Male Siblings	24	2.45	2.06	0-8	1.00	1.06	0-3	3.45	2.70	0-11

## APPENDIX XII -- Continued

Family Figures	N	Positive Outgoing Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Learning Disordered Sample (Continued)										
Younger Male Siblings	17	1.94	2.35	0-9	.64	.86	0-3	2.53	3.08	0-12
Nobody Figure	35	.65	1.25	0-6	1.65	1.90	0-8	2.31	2.66	0-11
Emotionally Disturbed Sample										
Father	11	1.72	2.19	0-7	1.18	1.53	0-4	2.90	3.67	0-11
Mother	11	2.90	2.70	0-7	2.90	2.42	0-6	5.81	4.16	0-12
Older Female Siblings	7	2.00	1.82	0-5	1.00	1.00	0-2	3.00	2.76	0-7
Younger Female Siblings	6	.83	.98	0-2	.50	.54	0-1	1.33	1.50	0-3
Older Male Siblings	6	2.33	1.36	0-4	1.33	1.03	0-3	3.66	1.50	1-5
Younger Male Siblings	6	1.00	1.09	0-3	1.16	.75	0-2	2.16	1.72	0-5
Nobody Figure	11	3.00	2.68	0-9	2.54	2.42	0-8	5.54	4.98	1-17

## APPENDIX XIII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES ON THE FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST FOR OUTGOING NEGATIVE ATTITUDES  
CHILDREN EXPRESSED TOWARD FAMILY FIGURES,  
INCLUDING "NOBODY" FIGURES

Family Figures	N	Negative Outgoing Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Normal Sample										
Father	35	1.14	1.59	0-6	.17	.38	0-1	1.31	1.84	0-7
Mother	35	.60	.91	0-3	.14	.35	0-1	.74	1.12	0-4
Older Female Siblings	17	2.23	2.51	0-8	1.52	2.60	0-8	3.76	4.76	0-15
Younger Female Siblings	11	1.90	1.57	0-4	2.00	2.19	0-5	3.90	3.47	0-9
Older Male Siblings	16	2.62	2.41	0-7	2.68	2.46	0-7	5.31	4.37	0-12
Younger Male Siblings	22	2.00	2.30	0-8	1.36	1.49	0-4	3.36	3.57	0-12
Nobody Figure	35	3.45	2.93	0-10	4.57	2.09	0-8	8.02	4.68	0-18
Learning Disordered Sample										
Father	35	1.74	2.20	0-9	.31	.79	0-3	2.05	2.41	0-9
Mother	35	.54	1.09	0-5	.08	.28	0-1	.62	1.21	0-5
Older Female Siblings	14	1.85	1.83	0-6	.78	1.12	0-4	2.64	2.64	0-10
Younger Female Siblings	15	2.40	2.35	0-9	1.33	2.12	0-8	3.73	4.16	0-17
Older Male Siblings	24	2.16	2.27	0-9	2.08	2.37	0-8	4.25	2.05	0-17



## APPENDIX XIII -- Continued

Family Figures	N	Negative Outgoing Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Learning Disordered Sample (Continued)										
Younger Male Siblings	17	2.70	2.64	0-8	1.88	2.68	0-8	4.58	4.71	0-17
Nobody Figure	35	2.77	2.75	0-10	4.54	2.55	0-8	7.31	4.87	0-17
Emotionally Disturbed Sample										
Father	11	1.27	1.27	0-4	.63	1.02	0-3	1.90	1.81	0-6
Mother	11	.72	.90	0-2	.36	.50	0-1	1.09	1.04	0-3
Older Female Siblings	7	1.42	2.14	0-5	1.00	1.15	0-3	2.42	2.37	0-6
Younger Female Siblings	6	.50	.83	0-2	.16	.40	0-1	.66	.81	0-2
Older Male Siblings	6	2.50	2.81	0-6	2.83	2.48	0-7	5.33	3.82	1-9
Younger Male Siblings	6	1.16	1.32	0-3	1.16	2.04	0-5	2.33	2.87	0-7
Nobody Figure	11	3.36	3.20	0-10	4.27	2.00	1-8	7.63	5.02	1-18

## APPENDIX XIV

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES ON THE FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST FOR INCOMING POSITIVE ATTITUDES  
CHILDREN EXPRESSED TOWARD FAMILY FIGURES,  
INCLUDING "NOBODY" FIGURES

Family Figures	N	Positive Incoming Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Normal Sample										
Father	35	5.05	4.08	0-25	1.62	1.47	0-5	6.11	3.20	0-13
Mother	35	4.94	2.04	1-8	2.80	1.56	0-6	7.74	3.05	1-13
Older Female Siblings	17	1.29	1.82	0-7	.47	1.00	0-4	1.76	2.61	0-11
Younger Female Siblings	11	1.45	2.33	0-7	.81	1.47	0-5	2.27	3.66	0-12
Older Male Siblings	16	1.68	2.08	0-7	.56	.72	0-2	2.25	2.56	0-9
Younger Male Siblings	22	2.77	2.89	0-7	2.27	2.02	0-6	5.00	3.75	0-12
Nobody Figure	35	.14	.42	0-2	2.77	1.76	0-7	2.91	1.90	0-7
Learning Disordered Sample										
Father	35	3.48	2.00	0-7	2.05	1.39	0-5	5.54	2.84	0-11
Mother	35	3.62	2.07	0-7	2.91	1.63	0-6	6.54	2.98	0-11
Older Female Siblings	14	1.35	1.54	0-5	1.00	1.35	0-5	2.35	2.73	0-10
Younger Female Siblings	15	1.86	1.76	0-5	.73	1.16	0-4	2.60	2.55	0-8

## APPENDIX XIV -- Continued

Family Figures	N	Positive Incoming Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Learning Disordered Sample (Continued)										
Older Male Siblings	24	2.54	1.93	0-7	1.00	1.10	0-4	3.54	2.50	0-9
Younger Male Siblings	17	1.94	1.88	0-6	1.70	1.44	0-5	3.64	2.87	0-9
Nobody Figure	35	.25	.56	0-2	1.77	1.26	0-4	2.02	1.56	0-6
Emotionally Disturbed Sample										
Father	11	3.09	2.58	0-7	1.18	1.32	0-4	4.27	3.58	0-11
Mother	11	3.90	2.50	1-7	2.18	1.40	0-5	6.09	3.53	1-10
Older Female Siblings	7	2.57	2.50	0-6	1.42	1.39	0-3	4.00	3.41	0-8
Younger Female Siblings	6	1.66	2.42	0-6	1.16	1.16	0-3	2.83	3.54	0-9
Older Male Siblings	6	1.00	.63	0-2	.66	.51	0-1	1.66	.81	1-3
Younger Male Siblings	6	3.33	3.01	0-6	2.50	1.37	0-4	5.83	3.97	0-9
Nobody Figure	11	1.45	1.69	0-6	3.00	1.48	1-5	4.45	2.62	1-10

## APPENDIX XV

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES ON THE FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST FOR INCOMING NEGATIVE ATTITUDES  
CHILDREN EXPRESSED TOWARD FAMILY FIGURES,  
INCLUDING "NOBODY" FIGURES

Family Figures	N	Negative Incoming Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Normal Sample										
Father	35	1.45	1.48	0-6	.31	.58	0-2	1.77	1.64	0-6
Mother	35	.85	1.33	0-6	.08	.37	0-2	.94	1.37	0-6
Older Female Siblings	17	1.64	1.32	0-4	.94	1.59	0-6	2.58	2.69	0-10
Younger Female Siblings	11	1.54	1.50	0-4	1.18	.75	0-2	2.72	1.84	0-5
Older Male Siblings	16	2.37	1.78	0-6	2.12	2.12	0-6	4.50	3.52	0-11
Younger Male Siblings	22	1.36	1.55	0-5	.72	1.16	0-4	1.95	2.17	0-7
Nobody Figure	35	3.25	2.09	0-8	5.71	2.26	0-8	8.97	3.83	0-16
Learning Disordered Sample										
Father	35	1.65	1.18	0-4	.85	1.37	0-5	2.45	2.20	0-8
Mother	35	.77	.80	0-3	.22	.54	0-2	1.00	.97	0-3
Older Female Sibling	14	.85	1.09	0-3	.78	1.18	0-4	1.64	1.90	0-7
Younger Female Siblings	15	1.20	1.61	0-6	.86	1.12	0-4	2.06	2.40	0-10

## APPENDIX XV -- Continued

Family Figures	N	Negative Incoming Feelings								
		Mild			Strong			Combined		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	R
Learning Disordered Sample (Continued)										
Older Male Siblings	24	2.62	2.12	0-7	1.83	2.18	0-7	4.45	4.04	0-13
Younger Male Siblings	17	1.41	1.41	0-5	1.76	2.33	0-7	3.17	3.46	0-10
Nobody Figure	35	2.45	2.20	0-8	4.37	2.61	0-8	6.82	4.36	0-16
Emotionally Disturbed Sample										
Father	11	.72	.78	0-2	.63	1.02	0-3	1.36	1.56	0-5
Mother	11	1.09	1.13	0-4	.27	.64	0-2	1.36	1.43	0-4
Older Female Siblings	7	1.28	1.38	0-4	1.14	.89	0-2	2.42	1.90	0-6
Younger Female Siblings	6	.50	.83	0-2	.66	.81	0-2	1.16	1.32	0-3
Older Male Siblings	6	3.00	2.68	0-7	2.33	2.73	0-7	5.33	4.71	0-11
Younger Male Siblings	6	1.50	.83	1-3	1.50	1.22	1-4	3.00	2.00	2-7
Nobody Figure	11	3.18	2.56	0-7	4.09	2.70	0-7	7.27	4.81	0-14

## APPENDIX XVI

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES ON THE FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST FOR ATTITUDES CHILDREN EXPRESSED  
TOWARD COMBINED PARENTAL FIGURES

FRT Outgoing Attitude Areas	Parental Figures Mother and Father Combined		
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Range
Positive Feelings, Mild:			
Normals	8.45	4.89	2-19
Learning Disordered	7.45	3.13	1-15
Emotionally Disturbed	4.63	4.41	0-14
Positive Feelings, Strong:			
Normals	5.25	3.31	0-14
Learning Disordered	5.42	2.30	0-12
Emotionally Disturbed	4.09	3.08	0-10
Positive Feelings, Combined:			
Normals	13.71	7.41	2-32
Learning Disordered	12.88	4.61	3-26
Emotionally Disturbed	8.72	6.73	0-20
Negative Feelings, Mild:			
Normals	1.74	1.89	0-6
Learning Disordered	2.28	2.43	0-9
Emotionally Disturbed	2.00	1.54	0-6
Negative Feelings, Strong:			
Normals	.31	.63	0-2
Learning Disordered	.40	.88	0-3
Emotionally Disturbed	1.00	1.09	0-3
Negative Feelings, Combined:			
Normals	2.05	2.36	0-8
Learning Disordered	2.68	2.79	0-9
Emotionally Disturbed	3.00	1.78	0-6

## APPENDIX XVII

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES ON THE FAMILY  
RELATIONS TEST FOR ATTITUDES CHILDREN IMAGINED  
FROM COMBINED PARENTAL FIGURES

FRT Incoming Attitude Area	Parental Figures Mother and Father Combined		
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Range
Positive Feelings, Mild:			
Normal	10.00	5.35	3-23
Learning Disordered	7.11	3.46	1-13
Emotionally Disturbed	7.00	4.85	1-14
Positive Feelings, Strong:			
Normals	4.42	2.60	0-11
Learning Disordered	4.97	2.07	1-10
Emotionally Disturbed	3.36	2.06	1-7
Positive Feelings, Combined:			
Normals	13.85	5.80	3-25
Learning Disordered	12.08	4.79	5-21
Emotionally Disturbed	10.36	6.53	2-21
Negative Feelings, Mild:			
Normals	2.31	2.54	0-12
Learning Disordered	2.42	1.35	0-5
Emotionally Disturbed	1.81	1.25	0-4
Negative Feelings, Strong:			
Normals	.40	.84	0-4
Learning Disordered	1.08	1.50	0-5
Emotionally Disturbed	.90	1.13	0-3
Negative Feelings, Combined:			
Normals	2.71	2.65	0-12
Learning Disordered	3.45	2.41	0-10
Emotionally Disturbed	2.72	1.95	0-6