# PROJECTIVE RESPONSE CHANGES IN GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Edward J. Daly

1966

ABSTRACT

PROJECTIVE RESPONSE CHANGES
IN GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

by Edward J. Daly

Story completions were used to assess two aspects of attitude change in participants in a twelve to fifteen week period of group psychotherapy. The people in therapy were the parents of clinic-referred children. A control group was drawn from the parents of children on the Clinic waiting list.

The aspects of attitude change investigated were essentially those postulated in a previous study (Maizlish and Hurley, 1963) and evaluated then by means of a questionnaire. These aspects were personal resourcefulness, and an open and accepting psychological orientation. They were evaluated separately for husband-wife and spouse-child interactions.

While the test-retest reliabilities were modest, and there were individual shifts over time in each group, these changes were observed in less than half of the story scores in each group. The others were unchanged. Inter-story reliabilities were also quite restricted, ranging from 0.13 to 0.55.

While an analysis of variance revealed no significant treatment effects, there was: (1) a significant increase across all Ss in ratings on personal resourcefulness toward the spouse; (2) a significant improvement by waiting-list fathers in scores on psychological orientation toward the spouse; and (3) suggestive evidence that these fathers improve their scores on psychological orientation toward the child, while their wives lose ground. This interesting trend is seen, to a lesser extent, in the sexes in the therapy group. Consistent with expectations based on other observations, the initial means on this dimension run from waiting-list fathers at the low end, to therapy mothers at the other extreme. This pattern of husbands scoring lower than their wives was also observed on the dimension of personal resourcefulness toward the child.

Perhaps the most salient finding was that the Ss scored significantly higher in attitudes toward the child than in those toward their spouses. This difference attained significance in 6 out of 8 possible comparisons, and there is some indication of even more-pervasive significance. An attempt is made to explain and to correlate these findings, and suggestions are given for future work in this area.

Approved: _____
Committee Chairman

Date: _____

# PROJECTIVE RESPONSE CHANGES IN GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

By

Edward J. Daly

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1966

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work would not have been completed in this way without Dr. Hurley's sensitive encouragement, Dr. Andrews' ready support, and Dr. Allen's interest in the application of statistics to clinical research.

To them, to Mary Sue Faaborg who was the co-rater, and to my wife, Marie, who was a constant source of aid, are extended my deep appreciation for a valuable learning experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

The literature reports (Maizlish & Hurley, 1963) that improvement occurs in the behavior of children referred for therapy after their mothers and fathers, not the children themselves, have entered into a twelve to fifteen week program of group psychotherapy. Such changes in symptomatic behavior have been assesed by a follow-up interview with parents (Williams, 1964).

Moreover, Maizlish and Hurley reported the subjective observation of therapeutic gains among the parents themselves, and demonstrated that significant gains do occur. Their instrument was a 55-item questionnaire administered before and after the course of therapy. This questionnaire was designed to measure the extent of "positive attitude," which they defined as:

> including at least the following: A more open and accepting psychological orientation toward either one's self or others; a heightened sense of responsibility in interpersonal relationships; and an increased adaptability and/or personal resourcefulness.

While they found significant differences between the questionnaire scores before and after therapy, they could find none between similar scores attained by parents before and after a college course in child psychology.

Clients who participated in the Maizlish and Hurley groups also wrote completing statements to a set of short stories, again, both before and after therapy. These stories dealt with problem situations involving either a child and one parent or a child and both parents.

The present study is an analysis of a group of these story completions. As such it constitutes an independent attempt to assess the extent of the change in positive attitude with therapy. Such evidence is useful for two reasons. First, it is more certain that a change in attitude has occurred if it can be found by more than one device. Then too, story completions have good face validity for the parent of a disturbed child. They have been seen as less threatening (Mills, 1954) than more common projective devices, and are probably less threatening than the 55-item questionnaire. They might also reveal other "feelings that are consciously or unconsciously concealed by the subject when tested with a direct method" (Fielding, 1951), a statement which is allied to that of Stone and Dellis (1960), which holds that "the more highly structured the test, the more likely . . . data gained (come) from a more conscious level of personality."

While story-completion tests have no norms, are not standardized, and are extremely subjective in interpretation, the literature reports that they have been used in clinical evaluations in general (Ellis, 1952; Ungricht, 1955), with the handicapped (Fielding, 1951), and with college students

(Mills,1954). All these studies are based on the assumption that the dynamics of personality can be revealed by an analysis of the written completions of unfinished ego-involving stories.

This study is concerned with the development of a technique for this assessment.

The major hypothesis of the present study, however, is that an analysis of the story completions will reveal an increase during therapy in positive attitude as defined by Maizlish and Hurley. That is, increases in score are expected in the areas of psychological orientation, responsibility in interpersonal relations, and personal resourcefulness.

# CHAPTER II

## METHOD

### Subjects

The experimental group in this study was composed of mothers and fathers of disturbed children who were referred for treatment to the Psychological Clinic of Michigan State University. The 16 Ss constituted an exhaustive sample of sets of parents who had completed the stories both before and after group therapy during the two years preceding June, 1964.

Referral to the Clinic was usually made through the teachers of the children, frequently through a "visiting teacher." A few of the cases were "self-referred."

As a control for the effects of the program of group therapy, sets of the completions were obtained from 16 parents of children on the Clinic waiting list before and after a twelve-week period in the summer of 1965. These Ss found their way into this study by the process of elimination. From the waiting list, all those referrals were chosen in which both parents resided with the child. This is consistent with the requirements for inclusion in the therapy groups. Sets of the stories were mailed to these 64 individuals with a covering letter which asked for their help in a research project and which urged the husband-wife pairs to

complete the stories independently of one another. After repeated telephone calls, 31 sets of completions were returned.

Duplicate sets of the stories were mailed to these respondents twelve weeks after the first set was mailed, and, again after telephoned reminders, 18 sets of completions were returned, of which 16 were from pairs of parents. These 16 were selected for comparison with the 16 paired mates in the therapy group.

Only four sets of completions were returned both times by the control Ss without telephoned reminders.

While it is evident that some process of self-selection was operating, perhaps those who did not respond would not have elected to enter therapy, either.

The Ss ranged widely in socio-economic status: they represented occupations ranging from janitorial, through the trades, to professional areas. Most of the women were housewives. Religious preference was either Protestant or Catholic, with a slight preference for the former. Although data were not available for the entire sample, there appeared to be no significant difference between the two groups in these variables or in the median level of education.

Two-thirds of the children referred were oldest children, and of the total, 73 per cent were boys.

## Stories

The six stories used in this study were obtained from the Merrill Palmer Institute, Detroit, Michigan (see Appendix I). They depict situations commonly encountered in or near the home, and their completions were specified as a detailed description of what the S would do and say in each situation.

In the battery there are four dyadic stories involving the S and his child, and two triadic stories involving the reaction of the S to his spouse's behavior toward the child.

Story 1 concerns a child, forbidden to ride his tricycle in the living room, who persists in riding it there. It was designed (Sigel, 1966) to reveal the parent's method of resolving continued willful non-compliance on the part of the child.

In Story 2, the child chases his ball into the street, where he has been forbidden to play. Here the non-compliance may be only in the mind of the parent, and not in that of the child. The danger from non-compliance is, however, great and real.

Story 3 lets the parent handle the case of a child who seems afraid to ride the playground slide. It was designed to uncover the degree of orientation of the parent toward the child's emotional life, and his method of dealing with this perceived divergence in a public place.

In Story 6, the child interferes with his parents' hasty preparations for an evening out. The reaction here

is to a child who is unresponsive to his parent's needs and interests.

The same conflict, in a three-person situation, is encountered in Story 4. Here the mate has been curt and rejecting to a child who has imposed on his relaxation activity.

In Story 5, the parent overhears his mate disciplining the child.

Both of the triadic stories were designed to elicit the respondent's behavior toward the mate as well as toward the child.

## Procedure

All the available completions of these stories were typewritten on cards and were coded in such a way as to conceal both the time at which they were written and the identity of the parent. Each completion was evaluated in terms of several statements, to each of which was assigned a score of 0, 1, 2, or 3, according to a coding manual designed for this purpose (see Appendix Ia). The scores were meant to reflect the extent to which the completion showed the quality in question. The original statements were: (1) This completion represents an open and accepting psychological orientation toward others; (2) This completion represents a sense of responsibility in interpersonal situations; and (3) This completion represents personal adaptability and/or resourcefulness.

In the process of rating the completions, however, it became evident that it was extremely difficult to infer whether or not S had a sense of responsibility in interpersonal relationships. Further confounding this judgement was the apparent fact that S's attitude toward his child might differ from that toward his mate.

Consequently, the statements used in this study were: (1) This completion represents an open and accepting psychological orientation toward the child; (2) This completion represents an open and accepting psychological orientation toward the mate; (3) This completion represents personal resourcefulness toward the child; and (4) This completion represents personal resourcefulness toward the mate.

Only the triadic stories were used in conjunction with the statements regarding the spouse, whereas all six stories were used in evaluating the statements regarding the child.

# CHAPTER III

## RESULTS

### Reliabilities

The reliability of the story completions used as the evaluative instrument in this study can be expressed in three different ways. These are the interscorer, test-retest, and interstory reliability coefficients.

In order to assess the interscorer reliabilities, the coding instructions were first explained to a fellow graduate student in Clinical Psychology, and then one completion by each S was selected at random for scoring by this associate and by E. Since, however, the main analysis in this study was performed on sums of the scores on combinations of the stories rather than on the individual story scores, the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula provides a more meaningful index of the interscorer reliabilities on the instruments as a whole.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Table 1 shows that, for the most part, these coefficients are above 0.78. In one case the coefficient is low: there is very little variance in the scores on resourcefulness toward the mate. Eight of the eleven stories evaluated

were given zero scores by both judges. The negative correlation coefficient, then, is largely a function of the remaining three scores.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

Separate test-retest reliabilities were determined on the story sums of the therapy group and the control group. Table 2 shows generally higher correlations for the former than for the latter, with a range from 0.11 to 0.74. If there were no changes in the groups or if there were uniform changes these coefficients should have been higher. That they were not indicates that there were non-uniform changes in the scores of both groups. However, in each group more individual story scores were the same after the time period than were changed, and some sets of initial and final stories were identical. While these facts could be interpreted as supporting Anastasi's (1961) contention that retests on story completions show "no more than recall of original responses," the low test-retest coefficients argue against this position.

A better measure, then, of the reliability of the instrument, is given by the interstory correlations shown in Table 2. Two correlations are shown for each sum of story scores on each of the major dimensions. The first, which was estimated by analysis of variance (Winer, 1962),

is the average correlation between any two story scores. The second, which was obtained by the Spearman-Brown formula, is the correlation expected between the story sums and those which the same population would obtain on an alternate set of similar stories. While most of the latter coefficients are significantly different from zero, they indicate that the story ratings account for only about one-quarter of the variance present.

## Correlations Between Dimensions

An over-all product-moment correlation of 0.34, which is significant at the 0.05 level, was found between the scores on the dimension of psychological orientation and the scores on personal resourcefulness.

## Hypothesis Testing

The general hypothesis of improvement in positive attitude during therapy was tested by an analysis of variance. The model (Winer, 1962) is that for a three-factor experiment with repeated measures on one factor, and with the scores of the married couples nested. The three factors were treatment situation, sex, and time.

These analyses were performed on four different sums of the story scores. They were the sums of the six story scores on psychological orientation and on resourcefulness toward the child, and the sums of the scores on Stories 4 and 5 on psychological orientation and on

resourcefulness toward the mate. Summaries of the analyses are shown in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6.

---

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

---

On the dimension of personal resourcefulness, as is shown in Tables 3 and 4, the only significant results were in the area of resourcefulness toward the mate. Table 3 shows an effect over time. That is, as a whole, the Ss tended to increase their scores during the 12-week time period. However, there were no significant differences apparent by sexes or groups, even though in each of these cases the means after the time period are higher than those at the beginning (See Appendix III).

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

On the dimension of psychological orientation toward the mate, Table 5 shows that there was a significant interaction effect between sex and group across time. The control males, who had scored the lowest of any group initially, improved their scores significantly ($t = 2.21$, $p < 0.05$ two-tailed) over the test period. The decline in score of their mates during this time did not reach significance, and neither did the slight changes in the scores of the therapy group.

---

Insert Table 6 about here

---

On the dimension of psychological orientation toward the child, as is shown in Table 6, the only significant differences found were those between the sexes. These differences were also found in the initial scores. While the interaction of sex with time did not quite reach significance, the men tended to improve their scores, and the women tended to lower theirs. It is apparent in Table 7, that the men in general scored lower than their mates, that the improvement in mean scores of the control males is much greater than that of the control females, and that there is a similar tendency in the experimental group. The interaction of sex, group, and time is not significant either, although there was a substantial difference between the initial scores of the control males and the therapy females ($t = 2.84$, $p < 0.02$ two-tailed). However, the tendency of this interaction toward significance gives some support to the similar but significant interaction found in psychological orientation toward the mate.

---

Insert Table 7 about here

---

## Other Findings

A general pattern emerged from the comparison of attitude toward the child with that toward the mate. In order to minimize dependence, the sums of the mate scores on Stories 4 and 5 were compared with one-third of the sums of the child scores on all six stories.

The means of both the therapy group and the control group showed a more open and accepting psychological orientation and greater resourcefulness toward the child than toward the mate.

---

Insert Table 8 about here

---

As Table 8 shows, the difference was significant in six of the eight subgroups tested. When a direct comparison was made between the scores attained toward spouse and toward child on the same two stories, all but one group out of eight showed significantly better attitudes toward the child than toward the spouse. This difference reached the 0.06 level of significance (two-tailed) in the eighth group, the control mothers. It seemed reasonable to examine this comparison since, in real life, S actually does make choices between his spouse and his child in triadic interactions with them.

# CHAPTER IV

## DISCUSSION

Three findings of this study are preeminent: the instrument reliability is marginal; any significant effects were found at least in the control group; and no significant differences were found between the therapy group and the control group. That is, it developed that this study was without a control group, in the usual sense of the term.

In view of the limited instrument reliability, it is difficult to generalize from the instrument to the dimension in question, and this must be kept in mind when the data are interpreted. However, there is some consistency in the findings.

While there were no significant group differences, it can be said that over a 12-week period, even peripheral contacts with the Ss by the Clinic are accompanied by higher ratings on personal resourcefulness toward the mate. In the case of the non-therapy group at least, this is consistent with the Hawthorne effect.

It can also be anticipated that, given evidence of such attention by the Clinic, the fathers who have children on the Clinic waiting list will improve their score on psychological orientation toward the mate. There are also suggestions that these men will improve their scores on

psychological orientation toward the child, while their mates will lose ground. This is true, to a lesser extent, of the sexes in therapy. However, it must be remembered that the control males are initially the lowest-scoring group.

It can also be predicted as a result of the significant differences found in this study, that the parents of clinic-referred children will score higher in psychological attitude toward the child than they will toward the mate.

It has not been established, however, that contacts with the control group over the 12-week period are a necessary condition of its improvements in scores. Nor can it be said that these findings are not representative of the "normal" population.

In order to correlate these findings, perhaps one should view all the Ss in this study on a continuum of involvement with other members of their families. Typically, the father who comes into group therapy is not very involved with his family, and there is little significant communication between the mates. Even the elements of marital disharmony are often concealed. For example, in the course of a recent therapy session, all four husbands revealed that, while they could become angry with their children, they could not "get mad at" their wives.

While it is reasonable to expect a person to interact differently with his mate than with his child, the areas of psychological orientation and resourcefulness might be expected to be the more fully developed in the marital relationship. That the reverse was almost uniformly true in this study, and to a significant degree, is indicative of course, of a focus on the child as a problem. However, since it occurred in the control group, it also indicates that trouble in the interaction between the parents of children who are referred to this Clinic can be assumed with considerable confidence. Therefore, it is probably even more important that therapy concentrates on the marital relationship than that it focuses on the parent-child interaction.

In fact, the pattern of family interaction is strongly reminiscent of the findings of Vogel & Bell (1960), who report that the emotionally disturbed child is often "selected" by the parents as a scapegoat for the marital conflicts which they cannot express to one another.

In addition to the fact that the parents in Vogel's disturbed families could not express anger to one another overtly, they shared another characteristic: they avoided contact with one another. Of the four men in the recent group therapy session, one closeted himself in his room to study immediately after work, the second spent four evenings each week-and occasional weekends-with the Boy

Scouts, one worked late and had many evening meetings, and the fourth fell asleep on the sofa immediately after supper.

Thus, to a great extent, the marital interaction of such families is limited, and the mother falls heir to any emotional involvement with the child. At the beginning of this study, as the means in Table 7 show, there seems to be a regular progression of such involvement with the child, from waiting-list-father to therapy-father to waiting-list-mother to therapy-mother. This pattern suggests that the parents become more open and accepting with the child as they become more involved with Clinic activities. While this neat progression of means is not found in the area of resourcefulness, there remains the general pattern of mothers scoring higher than their husbands, which was also found by Maizlish and Hurley.

In the area of psychological orientation toward the mate, it must be remembered that all the scores are very low. The fathers entering therapy showed the highest mean scores, and the waiting-list fathers showed the lowest. However, the waiting-list parents are not so naive with regard to the relationship between the child's problems and their own as this datum might lead one to believe. The typical intake interview in this Clinic is rather interpretive, and is geared toward indicating avenues of immediate relief. It is possible, then, that the first letter to the waiting-list simply reminded the fathers that they still were not involved with their families.

By the time he enters therapy, the father has been told repeatedly that his marital relationship has a bearing on the child's behavior, and the relatively high score may represent an over-reactive attempt to "put his house in order." He is motivated by the prospect of facing both other parents and a therapist. By the same token, the mother entering therapy may score low because she has gained support for some of her grievances toward her husband.

That these scores changed over the 12-week period has been established. It has also been shown that changes occurred mostly in the control group. In the case of both dimensions, the control mothers fell in relative position while the control fathers tended to improve their positions, occasionally even at the expense of the fathers in therapy. Again, this could mean that the waiting-list fathers were impelled by the first letter to become involved, and that the time for action was upon them. As the lowest scorers originally, they were in position to make large gains. Why their wives regressed in score can also be explained. Something was wrong, and in some way it had to do with their interaction with mate and child. The pattern of this interaction could be perceived as under attack, and this perception could have led to either more-guarded responses or simply to an attempt to do something different from what they had done before.

The scores of the males and females in the therapy group tended to show the same cross-trends, although to a smaller degree.

There are several possible ways to reconcile the improvements in positive attitude found by Maizlish and Hurley with the absence of significant treatment effects in the present study. The first, and perhaps the most important, has to do with the different levels of awareness tapped by the questionnaire and by the story completions. It is possible that learning is reflected in the questionnaire responses, but that the concepts have not yet been integrated into the personality, and so are not fully reflected in the story completions. That such integration occurs eventually has been evidenced by follow-up studies of similar therapy groups (Williams, 1964).

It is also possible that a more sensitive instrument-perhaps one with more levels-might find such changes. The instrument used was able to find rating changes on less than half the story completions.

Another conjecture is that the element of positive attitude which could not be measured in this study, that of responsibility in interpersonal relationships, is the factor responsible for most of the change reported by Maizlish and Hurley. Then, too, the stories focus on only one aspect of the questionnaire used in that study, and in fact, of the questions which showed the greatest gains for

the therapy group, only one, a statement on strictness, is relevant to the story responses.

Under these circumstances perhaps it was presumptuous to hope for better agreement between the two studies. However, the results of the present study do suggest several directions for future work.

## Suggestions for Futher Work

The possibility of finding treatment effects in a subsequent study could be enhanced in three ways. First, larger samples could be used. Second, the final sets of story completions could be collected after a longer interval of time. Third, a less-sophisticated control group could be used. Such a group might be composed of parents of children whom the teachers suspect might later be referred to the Clinic. The practical considerations here are the withholding of therapy from the control group and the withholding of additional help from the therapy group during the somewhat extended duration of the study.

The reliability of the measuring instrument could be improved by including more stories in the battery and by obtaining longer completions. Some of the present responses contained little more than one sentence. An interviewer could undoubtedly elicit longer stories by dictation from the S. This device would probably also eliminate much of the factor of self-selection in the control group, and might permit the use of more extended rating scales.

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY

Story completions were used to assess two aspects of attitude change in participants in a twelve to fifteen week period of group psychotherapy. The people in therapy were the parents of clinic-referred children. A control group was drawn from the parents of children on the Clinic waiting list.

The aspects of attitude change investigated were essentially those postulated in a previous study (Maizlish & Hurley, 1963) and evaluated then by means of a questionnaire. These aspects were personal resourcefulness, and open and accepting psychological orientation. They were evaluated separately for husband-wife and spouse-child interactions.

While the test-retest reliabilities were modest, and there were individual shifts over time in each group, these changes were observed in less than half of the story scores in each group. The others were unchanged. Inter-story reliabilities were also quite restricted, ranging from 0.13 to 0.55.

While an analysis of variance revealed no significant treatment effects, there was: (1) a significant increase across all Ss in ratings on personal resourcefulness toward

the spouse; (2) a significant improvement by waiting-list fathers in scores on psychological orientation toward the spouse; and (3) suggestive evidence that these fathers improve their scores on psychological orientation toward the child, while their wives lose ground. This interesting trend is seen, to a lesser extent, in the sexes in the therapy group. Consistent with expectations based on other observations, the initial means on this dimension run from waiting-list fathers at the low end, to therapy mothers at the other extreme. This pattern of husbands scoring lower than their wives, was also observed on the dimension of personal resourcefulness toward the child.

Perhaps the most salient finding was that the Ss scored significantly higher in attitudes toward their spouses. This difference attained significance in 6 out of 8 possible comparisons, and there is some indication of even more-pervasive significance. An attempt is made to explain and to correlate these findings, and suggestions are given for future work in this area.

TABLE 1.--Interscorer reliabilities.

| | N | Single Story | Story Sums[a] |
|---|---|---|---|
| Psychological Orientation | | | |
| 1,2,3,4,5,6 (child) | 34 | 0.72** | 0.94 |
| 4,5 (child) | 11 | 0.66* | 0.80 |
| 4,5 (mate) | 11 | 0.65* | 0.79 |
| Personal Resourcefulness | | | |
| 1,2,3,4,5,6 (child) | 34 | 0.81** | 0.96 |
| 4,5 (child) | 11 | 0.93** | 0.96 |
| 4,5 (mate) | 11 | -0.13[b] | -0.30 |

[a]Coefficients by Spearman-Brown prophecy formula.

[b]Eight of the 11 stories were rated 0 by both judges.

*$p < 0.05$.

**$p < 0.01$.

TABLE 2.--Instrument reliabilities.

| | Test-Retest[b] | | | Interstory[a] (N=32) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 2-Story | | Total[c] | |
| | Therapy (N=16) | Non-Therapy (N=16) | Total (N=32) | Before | After | Before | After |
| Psychological orientation | | | | | | | |
| 1,2,3,4,5,6 (child) | 0.40 | 0.21 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.54** | 0.40** |
| 4,5 (mate) | 0.49* | 0.11 | 0.30 | 0.07 | 0.37* | 0.13 | 0.54** |
| Personal resourcefulness | | | | | | | |
| 1,2,3,4,5,6 (child) | 0.74** | 0.31 | 0.55** | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.55** | 0.49** |
| 4,5 (mate) | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.34* | 0.15 | 0.51** | 0.26 |

[a]Coefficients by analysis of variance.

[b]Product-moment correlation coefficients.

[c]Coefficients by Spearman-Brown prophecy formula.

*$p < 0.05$.

**$p < 0.01$.

TABLE 3.--Summary of analysis of variance on personal resourcefulness toward mate.

| Source | SS | | d.f. | | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | | 42.00 | | 31 | | |
| Between Couples Total | | 20.00 | | 15 | | |
| A (Groups) | | 0.06 | | 1 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| Couples in $A_1$ | 8.22 | | 7 | | | |
| Couples in $A_2$ | 11.72 | | 7 | | | |
| Couples in A | | 19.94 | | 14 | 1.42 | |
| Within Couples Total | | 22.00 | | 48 | | |
| B (Sex) | | 0.00 | | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| A x B | | 0.56 | | 1 | 0.56 | 1.02 |
| B x Couples in $A_1$ | 4.47 | | 7 | | | |
| B x Couples in $A_2$ | 2.97 | | 7 | | | |
| B x Couples in A | | 7.74 | | 14 | 0.55 | |
| C (Time) | | 1.56 | | 1 | 1.56 | 4.88* |
| A x C | | 0.00 | | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| C x Couples in $A_1$ | 2.97 | | 7 | | | |
| C x Couples in $A_2$ | 1.47 | | 7 | | | |
| C x Couples in A | | 4.44 | | 14 | 0.32 | |
| B x C | | 0.06 | | 1 | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| A x B x C | | 0.26 | | 1 | 0.26 | 0.47 |
| B x C x Couples in $A_1$ | 2.46 | | 7 | | | |
| B x C x Couples in $A_2$ | 5.22 | | 7 | | | |
| B x C x Couples in A | | 7.68 | | 14 | 0.55 | |

*$p < 0.05$.

TABLE 4.--Summary of analysis of variance on personal resourcefulness toward child.

| Source | SS | d.f. | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 459.94 | 31 | | |
| Between Couples Total | 153.94 | 15 | | |
| A (Groups) | 2.25 | 1 | 2.25 | 0.21 |
| Couples in $A_1$ | 118.97 | 7 | | |
| Couples in $A_2$ | 32.72 | 7 | | |
| Couples in A | 151.69 | 14 | 10.84 | |
| Within Couples Total | 306.00 | 48 | | |
| B (Sex) | 6.25 | 1 | 6.25 | 0.42 |
| A x B | 0.04 | 1 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| B x Couples in $A_1$ | 150.98 | 7 | | |
| B x Couples in $A_2$ | 56.73 | 7 | | |
| B x Couples in A | 207.71 | 14 | 14.84 | |
| C (Time) | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.23 |
| A x C | 0.06 | 1 | 0.06 | 0.01 |
| C x Couples in $A_1$ | 29.97 | 7 | | |
| C x Couples in $A_2$ | 31.97 | 7 | | |
| C x Couples in A | 61.94 | 14 | 4.42 | |
| B x C | 0.06 | 1 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| A x B x C | 3.98 | 1 | 3.98 | 2.24 |
| B x C x Couples in $A_1$ | 8.23 | 7 | | |
| B x C x Couples in $A_2$ | 16.73 | 7 | | |
| B x C x Couples in A | 24.96 | 14 | 1.78 | |

TABLE 5.--Summary of analysis of variance on psychological orientation toward mate.

| Source | SS | | d.f. | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | | 261.99 | | | |
| Between Couples Total | | 91.74 | 15 | | |
| A (Groups) | | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 0.20 |
| Couples in $A_1$ | 70.97 | | 7 | 10.12 | |
| Couples in $A_2$ | 19.50 | | 7 | 2.79 | |
| Couples in A | | 90.47 | 14 | 6.45 | |
| Within Couples Total | | 170.25 | 48 | | |
| B (Sex) | | 0.02 | 1 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| A x B | | 2.63 | 1 | 2.63 | 0.53 |
| B x Couples in $A_1$ | 29.22 | | 7 | 4.18 | |
| B x Couples in $A_2$ | 39.88 | | 7 | 5.70 | |
| B x Couples in A | | 69.10 | 14 | 4.93 | |
| C (Time) | | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 0.43 |
| A x C | | 0.01 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| C x Couples in $A_1$ | 24.97 | | 7 | 3.57 | |
| C x Couples in $A_2$ | 16.50 | | 7 | 2.36 | |
| C x Couples in A | | 41.47 | 14 | 2.96 | |
| B x C | | 4.51 | 1 | 4.51 | 1.97 |
| A x B x C | | 19.14 | 1 | 19.14 | 8.35* |
| B x C x Couples in $A_1$ | 8.22 | | 7 | 1.17 | |
| B x C x Couples in $A_2$ | 23.88 | | 7 | 3.42 | |
| B x C x Couples in A | | 32.10 | 14 | 2.29 | |

*$p < 0.05$.

TABLE 6.--Summary of analysis of variance on psychological orientation toward child.

| Source | SS | d.f. | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 561.73 | 31 | | |
| Between Couples Total | 218.48 | 15 | | |
| A (Groups) | 26.26 | 1 | 26.26 | 1.92 |
| Couples in $A_1$ | 67.22 | 7 | | |
| Couples in $A_2$ | 125.00 | 7 | | |
| Couples in A | 192.22 | 14 | 13.72 | |
| Within Couples Total | 343.25 | 48 | | |
| B (Sex) | 47.26 | 1 | 47.26 | 6.53* |
| A x B | 0.14 | 1 | 0.14 | 0.02 |
| B x Couples in $A_1$ | 43.47 | 7 | | |
| B x Couples in $A_2$ | 57.88 | 7 | | |
| B x Couples in A | 101.35 | 14 | 7.24 | |
| C (Time) | 0.14 | 1 | 0.14 | 0.02 |
| A x C | 0.14 | 1 | 0.14 | 0.02 |
| C x Couples in $A_1$ | 29.47 | 7 | | |
| C x Couples in $A_2$ | 73.00 | 7 | | |
| C x Couples in A | 102.47 | 14 | 7.32 | |
| B x C | 19.14 | 1 | 19.14 | 4.26 |
| A x B x C | 9.77 | 1 | 9.77 | 2.18 |
| B x C x Couples in $A_1$ | 29.97 | 7 | | |
| B x C x Couples in $A_2$ | 32.87 | 7 | | |
| B x C x Couples in A | 62.84 | 14 | 4.49 | |

*$p < 0.05$.

TABLE 7.--Mean scores on psychological orientation toward child. (Summed over 6 stories)

| Group | Means | |
|---|---|---|
| | Before | After |
| Therapy Mothers | 12.75 | 12.62 |
| Control Mothers | 12.25 | 10.38 |
| Therapy Fathers | 10.62 | 11.12 |
| Control Fathers | 8.75 | 10.62 |

TABLE 8.--Comparison of response toward child with response toward mate. (t-values)

| Subjects | Psychological Orientation | | Personal Resourcefulness | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before | After | Before | After |
| Therapy Males | 0.81 | 0.96 | 3.36*** | 2.62* |
| Therapy Females | 3.46** | 1.45 | 4.11*** | 3.78*** |
| Control Males | 2.53* | 0.58 | 5.22*** | 4.82*** |
| Control Females | 1.01 | 1.87 | 4.86*** | 3.67*** |

Two-tailed tests on Σ1,2,3,4,5,6 child + 3 vs Σ4,5M.

*p < 0.05.

**p < 0.02.

***p < 0.01.

## REFERENCES


Anastasi, Anne. Psychological testing. (2nd ed.) New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Ellis, Katherine. A new approach to the interpretation of stories as projective documents. Dissert. Abstr., 1952, 12, 100-101.

Fielding, B. B. A "story completion" for use with the physically handicapped. J. proj. Tech., 1951, 15, 299-306.

Maizlish, I. L. and Hurley, J. R. Attitude changes of husbands and wives in time-limited group psychotherapy. Psychiatric quart. Suppl., Part 2, 1963, State Hospitals Press, Utica, N. Y.

Mills, Eugene S. A story completion test for college students. J. clin. Psychol., 1954, 10, 18-22.

Sigel, I. E. Personal communication. May 17, 1965.

Stone, H. K. and Dellis, N. P. An exploratory investigation into the levels hypothesis. J. proj. Tech., 1960, 24, 333-340.

Ungricht, Jean. Der "Sohn-Aufsatz" als psychodiagnostiches Hilfsmittel. Schweiz. Z. Psychol. Anwend., 1955, 14, 27-45.

Vogel, E. F. and Bell, N. W. The emotionally disturbed child as a family scapegoat. Psychoanal. and Psychoanalytic Rev., 1960, 47, 2, 21-25.

Williams, Lois Q. A follow-up study of children's behavior changes as related to their parents' participation in group therapy. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1964.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX I

## STORIES AND INSTRUCTIONS

## APPENDIX I

## STORIES AND INSTRUCTIONS

These are the instructions and the stories which were used in this study.

### What Would You Do?

Parents manage their children differently in various situations. Each parent has his own ideas and his own way of handling these. We are interested in finding out your way of dealing with some situations.

We will present you with some everyday happenings involving a parent and a 3½-year-old child. We would like you to describe in detail how you would settle each situation, even if it has never happened between you and your child.

Tell exactly how YOU would act and exactly what YOU would say.

Remember, the best answer is to tell your own way of handling the situation.

(After each dyadic story the instructions given were: "In the space below please tell in detail exactly what you would say or do to settle the situation. Write the exact words you would use in talking to the child." After each triadic story, the instructions were: "In the space below tell how you would feel and what you would think about this situation; what you would do and say about it, and how you would act.")

1. I noticed that Norman was riding his tricycle in the living room. I went in and told him:

"Don't ride the tricycle in the living room. Ride it on the porch if you want to."

Norman rode out on the porch and I went back to what I was doing. A few minutes later, Norman was riding around the living room again. I went into the living room right away and told him:

"I don't want you to ride the tricycle in the living room again. You can use it on the porch."

After about 10 minutes I heard Norman riding the tricycle in the living room again. I knew he wasn't deliverately being disobedient, there is actually more room in the living room than on the porch. But I just do not think bicycles should be ridden in the living room so I _____

2. It was a nice day and Jay was playing outside. As I was about to call him for lunch, I saw he was running into the street after a ball. There were no cars in the street at the time, though there usually is heavy traffic. We had warned him many times not to go into the street by himself. This was the first time he had ever run into the street alone. I _____

_____

3. I took Alvin to the public playground. All the children were climbing up and down a very interesting slide. I took Alvin over to the slide and he watched the children. Then I asked him:

"Would you like to go up on the slide?"

He said he didn't want to. It seemed to me that he was frightened by the slide. I didn't particularly care whether he used the slide or not, but I wanted to do something about his fear of the slide, so I _____

4. Jimmy wanted to show his (father) (mother) something he had done at school. My (husband) (wife) was annoyed at him and said, "Can't I get a minute's peace around here? I'm trying to read the paper." Jimmy was quite taken back by this and went to his room. I _____

5. My (husband) (wife) had gotten after Bob for not taking care of a job. I could hear them arguing about it and could tell that both were becoming angry. Finally my (husband) (wife) slapped Bob and told him, "Go to your room and stay out of my sight until you learn to act better." I knew my (husband) (wife) felt (he) (she) was right, but I didn't think this would be good for either of them. I _____

6. We were going out for the evening for the first time in months. We promised some friends we'd meet them at a certain place about thirty minutes from our house. It was important that we should not be late. Furthermore, at this late hour we had no way of getting in touch with our friends; we had only thirty minutes to get ready. We were not dressed and the sitter could not come until it was time for us to leave, so we had to really move fast to get to our friends on time. Carl kept interrupting and getting in the way. We knew if we paid much attention to him we'd never get there on time and the evening would be ruined. It wasn't that he was upset about our going, he thought that was an exciting thing, and he was very fond of the sitter, but he just kept interrupting and getting underfoot until I thought something must be done so I _____

## APPENDIX Ia

## CODING INSTRUCTIONS FOR STORIES

In the absence of other indicators, it is assumed that in the stories themselves, each person means exactly what he says. No inferences should be drawn about the relative strength of the feelings expressed: They are assumed to be either black or white.

Each variable should be evaluated in terms of the specific story situation. For example, one might be "closed" to the story situation, but resourceful (make attempts to substitute, explain, etc.). In the triadic stories, the subject's response is scored both with regard to the child and with regard to the mate.

### An Open and Accepting Psychological Attitude

This quality encompasses sensitivity to the other person: Evidence of a general insight into his needs and an acceptance of their validity to him. This does not imply that one must accept his position in the sense of agreeing with it. One may disagree completely, and if he does so, it is desirable that he voice that disagreement openly. However, a person having the stated quality will disagree in a way which is not destructive to the other person. A person whose orientation is open and accepting will express his opinions freely, openly, and without malice, and will listen attentively and respectfully to those of another.

In the scoring, credit is given for the response with the highest rating.

A score of 3 is given for total acceptance, or for a reasoned objection together with evidence of understanding. For example, in the tricycle story, such a response might be, "I know that you want to be in the living room with me, but you and I have agreed that the living room is not the proper place for tricycle riding. Let's put the tricycle away for now and find something to play with in the living room." A similar response in the "going out" story is, "I know that you want to share our excitement. Please help us by finding some shoes for mommy to wear."

A score of 2 is given for implied or tacit acceptance of some kind of need or for evidence of concern for the other person. For example, such a score would be given for simply returning the child and tricycle to the porch (tacit acceptance of tricycle riding need), or, in the street and ball story, for simply reminding him that playing in the street is hazardous.

Acceptance of some kind of need is shown in the "going out" story by such minimal involvement of the child as getting things ready for the sitter, or watching for the sitter.

Sometimes intervention, in the triadic stories, can be construed as concern for another person.

A score of 1 is given for an attempt at reason (thus implying awareness that other people prefer explanations), but from one's own viewpoint. For example, such a score would be given for, "Take that tricycle out to the porch. In another minute you'll be knocking over a lamp." A similar statement is, "You know that I don't allow you to play in the street."

A score of 0 is given for threats, punishments, or restructuring the situation. Thus statements defined as evidencing complete lack of an accepting psychological orientation are: "Keep that tricycle out of my way," or, "If you ride that tricycle in here once more I'll take it away."

Restructuring includes putting the tricycle away, sending the child to his room, etc. That is, the other's need is not recognized, or is not confronted constructively.

Because subjects were not instructed explicitly to indicate what they would say to the mate or to the child in the triadic stories - but only asked what they would say and do - the response may not be sufficiently complete to indicate whether acceptance of either other was communicated to that person. If it seems that the other's action is totally accepted, a score of 3 is given. If it sounds like "lip-service" "2" or less is scored, depending on other evidence of attitudes toward the other. If anger is felt, but not expressed, the score is "0".

Personal Resourcefulness

Personal resourcefulness is meant to include adaptability to a situation and ingenuity in coping with it. No points are given for even unlimited patience by itself. That is, only the external manifestations of resourcefulness are being scored.

Thus a score of 3 is given for such unusual suggestions as, "I'd like you to sit on my lap while I ride down the slide," or, "Daddy doesn't ride his car in the living room. Let's ride your 'trike' around the block and park it in the garage next to daddy's car."

A score of 2 is given for such substitutive responses as, "It's dangerous to play in the street. Come in and have a glass of pop," or, "Put your 'trike' away and play with your blocks."

A score of 1 is given for any attempt at explanation. That is, the approach is credited as implying some degree of resourcefulness.

A score of 0 is given for simple insistence on one's point of view, for warning, or for, "Go to your room!"

## APPENDIX Ib

## INTERSCORER RELIABILITY OF STORIES

| Story | Psychological Orientation | | Resourcefulness | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rater 1 | Rater 2 | Rater 1 | Rater 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 4c | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4c | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4c | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4c | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4c | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 4c | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 4c | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4c | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4c | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4m | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4m | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 4m | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4m | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4m | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4m | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4m | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4m | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4m | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 5c | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5c | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5m | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 5m | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

# APPENDIX II

# COMPLETION SCORES

APPENDIX III

OPEN AND ACCEPTING PSYCHOLOGICAL ORIENTATION
COMPLETION SCORES (BEFORE, AFTER)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4c | 4m | 5c | 5m | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Therapy Group | | | | | | | | |
| M-1 | 0,0 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 1,1 | 3,3 | 1,1 |
| M-2 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,2 | 3,2 | 0,3 | 0,1 |
| M-3 | 0,0 | 3,3 | 2,0 | 3,3 | 0,0 | 2,2 | 3,0 | 0,0 |
| M-4 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 0,0 | 2,3 | 3,0 | 0,0 |
| M-5 | 1,1 | 1,3 | 0,0 | 3,3 | 1,0 | 3,2 | 1,0 | 3,2 |
| M-6 | 0,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 1,3 | 1,2 | 2,2 |
| M-7 | 0,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 1,2 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 3,3 |
| M-8 | 2,1 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 0,1 | 1,3 |
| F-1 | 0,0 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 2,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 0,0 | 3,2 |
| F-2 | 2,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,0 | 2,0 | 2,2 | 1,1 |
| F-3 | 1,0 | 0,0 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,0 | 2,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| F-4 | 1,0 | 2,3 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 0,0 | 3,3 | 0,0 | 3,1 |
| F-5 | 1,2 | 2,3 | 0,3 | 3,3 | 1,1 | 3,2 | 2,1 | 0,2 |
| F-6 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 1,2 | 3,3 | 2,2 |
| F-7 | 1,1 | 3,1 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 0,2 | 2,2 |
| F-8 | 2,1 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 1,3 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 2,2 |
| Control Group | | | | | | | | |
| M-1 | 0,0 | 0,2 | 3,3 | 2,3 | 2,3 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 2,2 |
| M-2 | 0,1 | 1,2 | 2,2 | 3,3 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 2,0 |
| M-3 | 0,0 | 2,2 | 1,2 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 0,3 |
| M-4 | 0,0 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 2,2 |
| M-5 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 2,3 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 1,3 | 0,3 | 0,3 |
| M-6 | 0,0 | 2,0 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 3,3 | 1,1 | 2,0 |
| M-7 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 2,1 | 3,3 | 0,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,1 |
| M-8 | 1,0 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 1,1 | 2,3 | 3,0 | 2,2 |
| F-1 | 1,0 | 2,1 | 3,0 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 3,1 | 0,1 | 1,1 |
| F-2 | 0,0 | 2,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,0 | 2,0 | 2,2 |
| F-3 | 0,0 | 2,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,1 |
| F-4 | 1,1 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 2,2 | 1,0 | 3,1 |
| F-5 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 1,1 |
| F-6 | 0,1 | 2,2 | 3,2 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 3,0 | 1,0 | 2,1 |
| F-7 | 0,1 | 0,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 2,1 | 3,3 | 1,2 |
| F-8 | 3,3 | 3,2 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,1 | 3,2 | 1,2 | 3,3 |

PERSONAL RESOURCEFULNESS
COMPLETION SCORES (BEFORE, AFTER)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4c | 4m | 5c | 5m | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Therapy Group | | | | | | | | |
| M-1 | 0,1 | 2,2 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 2,1 |
| M-2 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 1,3 | 2,2 | 0,1 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 0,1 |
| M-3 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 2,0 | 2,0 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| M-4 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,0 |
| M-5 | 1,2 | 0,2 | 2,1 | 2,1 | 1,0 | 2,1 | 1,1 | 2,2 |
| M-6 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 0,3 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,2 | 2,2 |
| M-7 | 0,2 | 3,2 | 3,2 | 2,2 | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 3,0 |
| M-8 | 2,1 | 1,1 | 0,2 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| F-1 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 1,3 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 2,2 |
| F-2 | 0,2 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,0 |
| F-3 | 1,0 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 2,1 |
| F-4 | 1,0 | 1,3 | 3,3 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 3,1 |
| F-5 | 2,3 | 1,3 | 1,3 | 2,0 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 1,1 | 2,2 |
| F-6 | 3,3 | 2,3 | 3,3 | 0,1 | 1,0 | 1,2 | 0,2 | 2,2 |
| F-7 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 2,1 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| F-8 | 2,2 | 1,1 | 3,3 | 2,1 | 1,0 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| Control Group | | | | | | | | |
| M-1 | 0,0 | 0,2 | 0,1 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 2,2 |
| M-2 | 0,0 | 2,1 | 3,2 | 2,2 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| M-3 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 3,3 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 2,0 |
| M-4 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 0,2 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 2,2 |
| M-5 | 1,1 | 1,2 | 2,3 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 0,2 |
| M-6 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 3,3 | 1,2 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,1 | 2,2 |
| M-7 | 0,1 | 2,1 | 3,1 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 1,2 |
| M-8 | 2,1 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 2,1 | 1,1 | 1,0 | 1,1 | 2,2 |
| F-1 | 1,0 | 2,0 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 0,1 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| F-2 | 0,0 | 3,2 | 2,0 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 2,2 |
| F-3 | 1,0 | 1,1 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 2,2 |
| F-4 | 1,1 | 1,1 | 3,3 | 2,2 | 0,1 | 1,0 | 1,0 | 2,2 |
| F-5 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 1,1 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 1,2 |
| F-6 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 2,2 | 1,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 1,0 | 2,2 |
| F-7 | 0,1 | 2,2 | 3,3 | 2,2 | 0,0 | 0,1 | 0,0 | 2,2 |
| F-8 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 2,0 | 1,1 | 0,1 | 1,2 | 3,3 |

# APPENDIX III

## SUMMARY OF COMPUTATIONS

Statistics on Responses Concerning Psychological Orientation

| Responses (N=8) | Means | | Variances | | Pearson r | Slope b |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before | After | Before | After | Before vs After (N=8) | After÷Before |
| Stimuli 1,2,3,4,5,6(Child) | | | | | | |
| Therapy Couples | 23.38 | 23.75 | 9.70 | 17.93 | 0.41 | 0.56 |
| Males | 10.62 | 11.12 | 6.84 | 5.56 | 0.45 | 0.41 |
| Females | 12.75 | 12.62 | 6.78 | 5.12 | 0.15 | 0.17 |
| Control Couples | 21.00 | 21.00 | 36.00 | 20.57 | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| Males | 8.75 | 10.62 | 9.07 | 8.27 | 0.14 | 0.13 |
| Females | 12.25 | 10.38 | 11.64 | 12.27 | 0.36 | 0.37 |
| Stimuli 4,5(Mate) | | | | | | |
| Therapy Couples | 5.00 | 5.62 | 3.28 | 19.12 | 0.52 | 1.79 |
| Males | 3.00 | 2.75 | 2.86 | 6.50 | 0.26 | 0.37 |
| Females | 2.00 | 2.88 | 2.86 | 6.12 | 0.78* | 1.14 |
| Control Couples | 4.50 | 5.00 | 5.42 | 4.86 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Males | 1.25 | 3.12 | 2.50 | 3.27 | -0.36 | -0.41 |
| Females | 3.25 | 1.88 | 4.78 | 4.41 | 0.75* | 0.72 |

* $p < 0.05$

Statistics on Responses Concerning Personal Resourcefulness

| Responses (N=8) | Means | | Variances | | Pearson r | Slope b |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Before | After | Before | After | Before vs After (N=8) | After:Before |
| Stories 1,2,3,4,5,6(Child) | | | | | | |
| Therapy Couples | 14.38 | 15.00 | 13.55 | 24.00 | 0.60 | 0.83 |
| Males | 7.12 | 6.88 | 12.12 | 10.70 | 0.69* | 0.65 |
| Females | 7.25 | 8.12 | 8.78 | 12.40 | 0.83** | 0.99 |
| Control Couples | 15.25 | 15.62 | 13.93 | 4.55 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| Males | 7.12 | 7.75 | 4.12 | 3.36 | 0.20 | 0.18 |
| Females | 8.12 | 7.88 | 8.40 | 3.34 | 0.38 | 0.26 |
| Stories 4,5(Mate) | | | | | | |
| Therapy Couples | 1.25 | 1.88 | 1.64 | 1.55 | 0.56 | 0.54 |
| Males | 0.62 | 1.12 | 0.84 | 0.41 | 0.09 | 0.06 |
| Females | 0.[illegible] | 0.75 | 0.55 | .73 | 0.43 | 0.51 |
| Control Couples | 1.12 | 1.75 | 1.84 | 1. 3 | 0.73* | 0.80 |
| Males | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.57 | 0.78 | 0.70* | 0.82 |
| Females | 0.62 | 1.00 | 0.55 | 1.14 | 0.36 | 0.52 |

* $p < 0.05$

** $p < 0.01$