



144  
504  
THS

PERCEIVED EXPERIENTIAL CORRELATES OF  
APPERCEPTIVELY MEASURED AFFECTS  
AND SELF-EVALUATIONS IN THE  
LATE ADOLESCENT FEMALE

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Charles J. Brainerd

1968

THESIS



PERCEIVED EXPERIENTIAL CORRELATES OF APPERCEPTIVELY  
MEASURED AFFECTS AND SELF-EVALUATIONS IN  
THE LATE ADOLESCENT FEMALE

By

Charles J. Brainerd

Abstract of Master's Thesis  
Completed Fall Term, 1968

This paper advances an experiential approach to the study of apperceptive expressions of affect and self-evaluation. The present study scores apperceptive stories for the pleasantness-unpleasantness of hero-related emotional expressions and for the positivity-negativity of hero-related outcomes. These two procedures provide the measures of apperceptive affects and evaluations. It was suggested on the basis of both theory and previous research literature that these measures of affect and self-evaluation would be related to three characteristic experiences deriving from the parent-child relation. These experiences were the Ss reports of themselves as being rejected, neglected, and loved by their parents.

The Ss were 66 late adolescent females and the apperceptive stimuli were eight new TAT-like pictures designed especially for the social-age group under consideration. Both halves of the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire were administered to the Ss as a means of assessing the antecedent experiences of interest. Six specific relations were predicted:

- (1) A negative relation between pleasantness of apperceptive affect and experiences of parental rejection.
- (2) A negative relation between pleasantness of apperceptive affect and experiences of parental neglect.
- (3) A positive relation between pleasantness of apperceptive affect and experiences of parental love.

- (4) A negative relation between positivity of apperceptive self-evaluations and experiences of parental rejection.
- (5) A negative relation between positivity of apperceptive self-evaluations and experiences of parental neglect.
- (6) A positive relation between positivity of apperceptive self-evaluations and experiences of parental love.

The apperceptive measures reached acceptable levels of reliability and each of the predicted relations was confirmed at a reasonably high level of significance. The results were discussed in relation to the strengths and weaknesses of possible explanations of the data.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

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

PERCEIVED EMOTIONAL CORRELATES OF AFFECTEFFECTIVELY  
MEASURED AFFECTS AND SELF-EVALUATIONS IN  
THE LATE ADOLESCENT FEMALE

By

Charles J. Brainerd

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1963

G 52116  
1-21-11

## CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Method.....	17
Results.....	25
Discussion.....	29
References.....	35
List of Tables.....	iii
List of Appendices.....	iv

## TABLES

<u>Table 1.</u>	Reliability and interobserver agreement coefficients for the apperceptive variables.....	26
<u>Table 2.</u>	Raw validity correlations for each of the apperceptive variables with each of the experiential variables.....	27
<u>Table 3.</u>	Factor loadings of the subscales Rejection, Neglect, and Love of the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire for adult females.....	28

## APPENDICES

<u>Appendix 1.</u>	The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire.....	38
<u>Appendix 2.</u>	Scoring sheet for the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire...	46
<u>Appendix 3.</u>	Sample protocols for the Uniform Adolescent Identification pictures.....	48



#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the support, guidance, and patient criticisms of Dr. John P. McKinney, in the context of whose ongoing research the present study and the apperceptive stimuli used therein were developed. The author also wishes to acknowledge the many helpful suggestions and criticisms of Dr. Lucy R. Ferguson and Dr. Albert I. Rabin which were invaluable in the preparation of this manuscript.

## INTRODUCTION

The study to be discussed in this report suggests an experiential approach to the measurement of emotionality and self-evaluation in the apperceptive situation. The working assumption is that when apperceptive expressions of affect and self-evaluation are examined dichotomously (i.e., pleasant vs. unpleasant and positive vs. negative), reliable differences between individuals will be noted and these differences will be related to salient aspects of the Ss' experiences. The rule that, in general, we act on the basis of our experience (Laing, 1967) is, therefore, merely applied to an experimental situation designed to sample apperceptive behavior and establish correlates of the behaviors sampled. Later in this paper, a more limited form of Laing's broad experiential hypothesis is offered and is based on the distinction between experiences of the self as an object and the self as a subject.

The experiential orientation is thought to be of special relevance when studying the so-called "higher process" in reasonably mature Ss (Hebb, 1960). The developmental assumption is that maturation and level of behavioral complexity combine to maximize the validity of assuming the antecedent influence of experience and minimize the relevance of peripheral determinism. A corollary to this assumption is the ability to "pause" between peripheral excitation and peripheral response (May, 1967). This hypothetical pause provides the means whereby the individual asserts his uniqueness as an experiencing agent through his behavior. The implication for deterministic

psychology is that individuals identified as experiencing similarly might also be observed to behave similarly.

When examining behavior as a function of experience, it is important to articulate the distinction between experiences of the self as an object and experiences of the self as a subject. This distinction has recently been examined empirically by McKinney (1968). This study concerns the construction and validation of a scale to measure characteristic individual differences in the self descriptions of college students as they see themselves (subjective mode of experience) and as others see them (objective mode of experience). Developmentally, the experiential history of the individual can be viewed as a continuous fluctuation between the experiences of oneself as an object of physical and/or interpersonal forces (May, 1967) and the experiences of oneself as an affirming, asserting agent (Tillich, 1952). This dichotomous structuring of personal experience suggests an experiential interpretation of the antecedent-consequent relation. This interpretation asserts the antecedent influence of the experiences of the self as object upon actual behavior (and the attendant experiences of the self as subject). Simply, the experiential structuring of what comes in influences what goes out.

The above distinction has been implicit in "field" theories of personality (Lewin, 1951) as well as more basic ontological theorizing (Tillich, 1952). Bertrand Russell (1945) has employed the epistemological distinction between man as an object of externally given knowledge and man as a subjective affirmer of knowledge as a principle underlying the whole development of Western philosophical thought from the pre-Socratics to the contemporary schools. Recently, there has been movement toward an integration of these two concepts of man's experience (Gendlin, 1962; May, 1967; and

Polanyi, 1958). It is hoped that by integrating the tendency to view man exclusively as an object of external forces (as exemplified by the logical positivism of Ayer, Mach, and Schlick) with the tendency to view man exclusively as a subjective affirmer (as exemplified by the existentialism of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche), a new orientation will be synthesized which pays due heed to both the ontological complexity of man and the needs of scientific psychology.

This paper does not presume to suggest that different types of experiencing are in any way completely separable. It is thought, however, that we may speak of experiences that differ as to certain qualitative characteristics. These words are directly applicable to the distinction between experiences of the self as object and experiences of the self as subject. This distinction is a matter of degree and may be illustrated for the case of interpersonal relations, in order to clarify the theoretical orientation of this paper.

Consider the interpersonal relation as a theoretical situation composed of people and events. The events of interest here are behaviors initiated by people in the relation. If we choose a single individual in the relation to serve as our point of reference, it is possible to describe experiences of the individual which fall into the self as object and self as subject categories mentioned previously. The self as object experiences deriving from the interpersonal relation would include those experiences attendant to actions of others which have our individual of interest as a referent. The self as subject experiences deriving from the interpersonal relation include those experiences which attend the actions initiated by our individual of interest toward other people. More simply, in the first instance our individual of interest is the "object" of the actions of others, while

in the second instance he is the "subject" or asserter of actions. The interpersonal relation is only one situation for which these qualitative differences in experiencing may be described. It is obvious that our individual of interest could, for example, be placed in a similar relation with inanimate objects and the same differences in experiencing would obtain.

In light of these considerations, the general notion advanced by this paper is that characteristic differences in the experiences of the actions of others towards oneself are antecedent to and predictive of individual differences in behavior. The strength of the antecedent-consequent relation is thought to increase as the self as object experiences become of more pervasive importance to the individual and as the behaviors sampled become less a function of rigid determinants in the immediate stimulus situation. To illustrate the first part of this criterion, a child's experiences of himself as a referent of certain parental actions would seem to be a more pervasive set of self as object experiences than, say, the child's experiences of himself as a referent of similar actions on the part of casual acquaintances. To illustrate the second part of the criterion, the responses usually sampled by projective instruments would seem to be reasonably free from rigid determination by the immediate stimulus situation.

Applying these assumptions to empirical measurement provides one with criteria for choosing measures of antecedent and consequent variables of interest. This study, for example, has chosen the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaires (Roe & Siegelman, 1963) as a measure of antecedent self as object experiences. This choice is thought to be theoretically justified, because the structure of the questions exactly satisfies the previous definition of one source of self as object experiences. Specifically, each question asks about an action or actions initiated by either the mother or

father (depending on the form) in which the subject was a referent. By way of further illustration, the present study chose an apperceptive technique as the measure of consequent variables, since it is thought that such an instrument meets the criteria for a consequent measure which can be meaningfully related to self as object experiences. The semi-structured nature of the apperceptive stimuli, as well as the lack of specificity about the actual responses required, minimizes the extent to which the responses are a function of factors other than a S's experiential history (e.g. immediate situational conditions). These are the major reasons for suggesting that the measures employed in this investigation are consonant with the theoretical orientation previously mentioned. The remainder of this section will consider these measures further, in connection with empirical reasons for selecting the three PCM subscales of interest (Love, Rejection, Neglect), the apperceptive variables of interest (affect and Self-evaluation), and the specific predicted relations.

The obvious question is how to apply the previous thoughts to empirical investigation. What experiences of oneself as an object of action have a meaningful influence upon one's behavioral expressions? What behavioral manifestations are pervasive and stable enough to suggest the possibility of experiential correlates? In a sense, these are fundamental questions to which most correlational psychological analyses presume to assert partial answers, either on the basis of intuition or on the basis of empirical data. It is important to choose self as object experiences which are salient in the individual's life history, since the foregoing alludes to the possibility that significant experiences of the self as object may be a source of important antecedent (if not, in fact, formally causative) variables. Likewise, it is important to select those behavioral expressions

which are stable enough across time to justify the assumption that they can be related to interpersonal experience, following suitable categorization and quantification. In general, these two choices provide the antecedent and consequent variables in the correlational analysis of empirical relations.

Under the guise of deductive reasoning, it often is the convention to begin with a statement of those antecedent influences which the investigator believes to be of great relevance, and then proceed to extract the consequent events which are held to be influenced by these antecedent variables. Although this reasoning process most often proceeds in the opposite (inductive) direction as a result of the probative function of prior research (Hebb, 1966), the introductory section of this report will proceed in a roughly cartesian manner.

This study has selected the parent-child relation as its source of antecedent variables. More particularly, the specific aspect of this theoretical relation which has been selected for empirical scrutiny is the adolescent female's experiences of herself as a referent of actions by her parents which fall roughly into three categories: love actions, rejection actions, and neglect actions (or non-actions). There is, of course, an epistemological issue relative to the meaning of action versus non-action. At least one study (Crandell, 1965) has shown an empirical difference in the effects of the experience of action as opposed to nonaction on learning. This empirical and/or philosophical distinction is considered to be beyond the interest of the present paper. That both have an effect, a pervasive effect, seems sufficient reason for investigation.

It is, without question, an existential fact that the parent-child relation has been given a position of prominence in the psychologies of the genetic-developmental tradition. Whether one talks about psychological

development in terms of basic learning paradigms (Bijou & Baer, 1961) or genetic-biological determinism (Freud), the overwhelming emphasis placed on the parent-child relation is still evident. Given the asserted importance of this relation, it remains to suggest specific aspects of this relation that influence behavior. As mentioned previously, the present study focuses on three characteristic self as object experiences derived from the child's reports of this relation.

Empirical evidence in support of the child's experiences of herself as a referent of parental love, rejection, and neglect as influential factors in development can be adduced from the extensive reports of Baldwin, Malhorn, and Breese (1945). The observational methodology of this study made use of the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales. These scales contain all the aforementioned experiential variables in one form or another. In relation to the experiential hypothesis, this paper suggests that an observer's ability to report significant, meaningful material certainly reflects the extent to which an observer is able to put himself in the child's place as an experiencing agent; hence, the Fels scales must represent some third person inferences about the child's experiences of the self as an object of parental actions. The "acceptance" syndrome reported by the Baldwin et al. monograph is obviously analogous to the child's experiences of himself as a referent of parental rejection as measured by the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. In addition, one of the subscales used in relation to the "Acceptance syndrome" (isolation) seems to provide some measure of the child's experiences of parental neglect. Also, one subscale of the "democracy syndrome" (approval) and one subscale of the "indulgence syndrome" (solicitude) appear to be related to experiences of rejection and neglect, respectively. Concerning the child's experience of himself as



a referent of parental love, the subscale hostile-affectionate seems to be of relevance.

In both the earlier report (Baldwin et al., 1945) and a later report (Baldwin, et al., 1949), the observational indices employed were described as meaningful predictors of behavioral differences among the children studied.

The previous two paragraphs were intended only as a means of suggest- in that an examination of how the child experiences the self as an object of parental behavior with respect to the aforementioned actions of interest may provide meaningful interpretations and predictions of behavior. More specific evidence in support of the child's experiences of parental love, rejection, and neglect being related to behavior are discussed in relation to the consequent variables of interest: pleasant vs. unpleasant affects and positive vs. negative self-evaluation (as expressed and measured through apperceptive productions). These apperceptive responses were analyzed in relation to intensity scores of each S on three subscales of the Roe-Siegelman (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire.

The consequent variables examined in this report are two in number: dichotomous (pleasant-unpleasant) affect and general positivity-negativity of self-evaluation. The method chosen to measure the behavioral expressions of these two variables involved quantification of the Ss' responses to a group of eight new apperceptive stimuli. These pictures were originally developed for use in the empirical validation of the Actual and Perceived Self scale (McKinney, 1968). The situations portrayed in these pictures were selected to be of special significance to the social-age group of the Ss (undergraduate females).

In the use of these apperceptive stimuli, this report makes a broad "projective assumption" which is similar to the statements of Cattell (1951)

Rotter (1954), and Sarason (1966) relative to why the apperceptive method is presumed to provide a meaningful measure of the consequent variables of interest. The basic notion is that each subject sees the "unstructured" (i.e., semi-structured) pictorial stimuli somewhat differently as a function of experiential history, among other things. The responses which a S communicates in relation to such stimuli are thought to be organized in patterns which may or may not be correlated with measured (i.e., reported) experience. Since this paper employs apperceptive responses as consequent variables, the additional assumption is made that these "organizing Patterns" are, at least partly, a function of the interpersonal experiences already alluded to. The implication is that in so far as these projective responses and their patterning are a function of experiences deriving from the parent-child relation, reliable and relevant measurements should demonstrate significant statistical relations. Consequently, regardless of whether the apperceptive variables are interpreted in terms of motivational dynamics (Holt, 1951) or in terms of sheer probability of responses (Rotter, 1954), the hypothesis that projective responses vary as a function of experiential determinants remains essentially unchanged.

The first set of apperceptive responses measured in the present study were qualitative differences in expressions of apperceptive affects. Specifically, the affects quantified were only those expressed in relation to the principal (hero) of each story. The reason for this procedure derives from the nature of the apperceptive stimuli, in which a uniform and experimentally defined principal (a member of the Ss' age group) appears in all the pictures. The stated interest of this study was in the differences in degree of pleasantness-unpleasantness of expressed affects as they relate to the experiential measures of interest. This dichotomous approach to

quantification of projective affect is suggested as a procedure which is meaningful in terms of both theory and empirical data.

The method of studying emotional expressions as a dichotomous variable has, of course, frequently appeared in the literature of both clinical and developmental psychology. A projective rating scale has been reported (Eron, 1953) which has this bipartite discrimination as its basis. Observations of the development of emotional expressions have also revealed the twofold nature of these behaviors during the period when the human infant first develops such manifestations. The historic reports of Bridges (1930; 1931; 1932) are cases in point. The earlier reports of her data and the final form of her developmental diagram (1932) indicate that, even early in life, the dichotomous nature of emotionality is evident. Given that emotional expressions appear to fall roughly into two qualitative categories, it seems at least intuitively reasonable to suggest that investigations of emotionality in the later years of development which treat these expressions dichotomously might reveal important developmental correlates of observed individual differences.

The literature appears to offer tentative support for the assertion of experiential correlates of emotional expression deriving from the parent-child relation. Studies with juvenile delinquents (females as well as males), for example, seem to indicate that such juveniles are characterized by abnormally frequent displays of unpleasant affect. The label "juvenile delinquent" has, in fact, become synonymous with such displays in this culture. The crucial point, for this paper, is that studies employing juvenile delinquents as ss (e.g., Medinnus, 1965) have reported that these individuals experience their parents as having **been** more hostile, more rejecting, more neglecting, and less affectionate toward them than do more average juveniles.

Finney (1961) has reported that independently observed maternal behaviors which could be labeled "rejecting" (hostile-rigid) in terms of the child's experience were predictive of unpleasant behavioral-emotional manifestations in the children studied. Siegelman (1965) has shown, similarly, that measured experiences of parental rejection among college students correlate positively with the relative presence of an unpleasant affect that is measured apperceptively by the present study (anxiety). In addition, Rosenthal, Li, Finkelstein, and Berkowitz (1962) demonstrated that, among other things, the child's experiences of the father as cold, distant, and neglecting were positively related to the presence of childhood emotional disturbances. Finally, two other papers have shown suggestive relations obtaining between the child's experiences of the parents as authoritarian-loving and the presence of delinquent behavior (Williams, 1958), and between third person reports of parental rejection and generally undesirable behavioral manifestations (Shoemaker, Shoemaker, & Koelis, 1962). Each of these reports seems to provide partial support for the prediction of a statistical relation between experiences of the self as a referent of parental love, rejection, and neglect and quality of affects expressed (apperceptively).

The second consequent variable examined in the present study was self-evaluation expressions deriving from apperceptive protocols. The actual method involved rating the positivity-negativity of the outcomes of the eight stories for the hero. In so far as Ss identified with the central character, the degree of positivity-negativity of the story outcomes should represent some measure of the subjects' general self-evaluations in interpersonal situations.

Two definitions of "self-evaluation" are relevant here: an abstract definition (or orientation) and a more operational definition. The abstract

conceptualization of self-evaluation is analogous to Sears and Sherman's (1964) definition of self-esteem: the possession of opinions or attitudes about oneself ranging from favorable to unfavorable, depending on the situation. Operationally, this definition implies that when situations are held constant, as in the present study, characteristic individual differences in manifestations of self-evaluation will be observed. The precise operationalization of this concept in the present report embraced the notions of both Rotter (1954) and Tillich (1952). Self-esteem or positive self-evaluation can be thought of both in a passive and an active sense. The passive sense would be the acceptance of reinforcements while the active phase would involve such things as the affirmation of one's desires "in spite of" environmental forces to the contrary. Rotter's (1954) concept of "generalized expectancy" represents the passive pole while Tillich's (1952) notion of the courage to be oneself "in spite of" represents the active pole. The measure of self-evaluation employed in the present study (positivity-negativity of apperceptive story outcomes from the hero's perspective) took in to consideration both of these notions without making a quantitative or qualitative distinction between them. Self-evaluation, then, was construed as one's expectations of success in common life situations.

This report assumes that such expectations are established through the process of validation of one's intrapersonal (subjective) experience with data from one's interpersonal (objective) experience. Allis (1962) has presented some thoughts relating to the development of self-evaluation which are similar to the preceding statement. Allis suggests that people tend to esteem themselves in relation to extrinsic values and the relative presence or absence of pleasant affective states. His relevant notion,

for this paper, is that people tend to act on the assumption that there must necessarily be a one to one correspondence between one's extrinsic value (determined by a person's experiences of how others experience him) and one's intrinsic value (determined by one's subjective, intrapersonal experience). Ellis, then, suggests that self-evaluation is a product of the consensual validation of intrapersonal experiences with interpersonal experiences. It is apparent that this statement is similar to the hypothesis already advanced by the present paper. This hypothesis suggests the antecedent influence of experiences of the self as an object of the actions of others.

It is implied that the group of expectancies which we call self-evaluation is learned during the course of development and that this process proceeds in different directions for different individuals. These directions are partly functions of the three antecedent experiences of interest to the present study. It is suggested, then, that active or passive participation in many situations which produce experiences of derogation of the self by significant others may eventually result in the individual also coming to experience himself as not being of intrinsic worth. This very point seems to be one of the most important messages of a book by Robert Coles (1964). The book is concerned with salient psychological characteristics shared by negro children being raised in the states of the old confederacy. If it is admitted that this society largely rejects and neglects the negro minority, then Cole's report suggests that low self-evaluation is clearly one outcome of such experiences. Cole's indicates (through figure drawings and other data) that negro children in the South are characterized by poorly articulated self-evaluations.

The methodology of this report assumes that in so far as a S does not

see herself as being of worth (because she has experienced the antecedent variables of interest), she will express negative story outcomes in relation to any character with whom she identifies in the apperceptive task. The previously mentioned studies with juvenile delinquents appear to be of relevance here. This is due to the fact that members of this group tend to have generally low evaluations of themselves. Further, the literature also seems to be in support of the proposed relation between apperceptive evaluations and the antecedent experiences discussed earlier.

Heilbrun and Orr (1966) have shown that the self-aspiration component of self-evaluation is related to the experience of mother rejection in late adolescents. Heron (1962) found a similar result in relation to a more general measure of self-evaluation. Conversely, Carlson (1963) reported that preadolescents who experienced "supportiveness" from their parents were higher in self-acceptance. Particularly suggestive are studies by Gorlow et al. (1963a; 1963b) which report that self-evaluation is apparently related to the experience of acceptance by others in both the psychotherapeutic situation and the parent-child relation. Also, Grusec (1966) found that parental love expression plays a crucial role in the development of self-critical attitudes on the part of the children studied.

Concerning the previous statements about the experiential genesis of self-evaluation, studies by Malher et al. (1962), Bruck and Bodwin (1962), and Iuldashevia (1966) all report data which are congruent with the expressed notions. The studies of Malher et al. (1962) and Iuldashevia (1966) are of particular interest, because both studies reported data which indicate that self-evaluation can develop and change as a function of the Ss' experiences of how others value them.

In addition to the suggestive empirical studies of self-evaluation,

there are also clinical reports which seem to indicate that the relations of interest in the present study may be significant ones. Sears and Sherman (1964) have reported case histories of eight elementary school children as these histories relate to the topic of self-esteem. Two youngsters whose case histories indicate they would be of interest to the present investigation seem to provide supportive data for the specific relations predicted. Howard, who had rejecting and unaffectionate-rigid parents, was reported to be consistently low on measures of self-esteem and was apparently high in expressions of unpleasant affects. Carla, who had accepting and loving parents, was consistently high on self-esteem measures and low in expressions of unpleasant affects. In many other areas, such as school achievement, the two children were very similar.

The preceding theoretical and empirical discussion represents the major substantive grounding and experimental justification for asserting the existence of a relationship between the Ss' experiences of parental behaviors in which they were a referent and individual differences in apperceptive affects and self-evaluation. To recapitulate, the suggested antecedents are the adolescent female's experiences of her parents as loving, rejecting, and neglecting her--as measured by Roe and Siegelman's (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCRQ). The consequent variables which are held to be related to these experiential factors are measured expressions of apperceptive affect and self-evaluation (hero-related story outcomes).

On the basis of these general considerations, six specific hypotheses were formulated. These hypotheses were presumed to be predictive of the major relations which were thought to obtain in the data.

- A. Apperceptive expressions of pleasant affects are negatively related to experiences of parental rejection.



- B. Apperceptive expressions of pleasant affects are negatively related to experiences of parental neglect.
- C. Apperceptive expressions of pleasant affects are positively related experiences of parental love.
- D. Apperceptive expressions of positive self-evaluation are negatively related to experiences of parental rejection.
- E. Apperceptive expressions of positive self-evaluation are negatively related to experiences of parental neglect.
- F. Apperceptive expressions of positive self-evaluation are positively related to experiences of parental love.

## METHOD

### Subjects

The experimental Ss were 66 undergraduate females enrolled in the introductory psychology course at Michigan State University. The median age of the experimental Ss was 19.6 years. The range was from 18 to 21 years. Pilot study data were also gathered on alternate group of 50 females enrolled in the introductory psychology course. In both cases (experimental and pilot samples) the Ss were tested as a group.

### Measuring Instruments

Both halves of the Roe-Riegelman (1963) Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCRM) were administered to the group to obtain a measure of the Ss perceived experiences of their parents as loving, rejecting, and neglecting. The intensity scores for each of these experiential variables were derived from the appropriate subscales of the PCRM (subscales Loving, Rejecting, & Neglecting). There are, of course, well established procedures for quantifying the Ss' responses to the questions of each subscale and these procedures have been reported by Roe and Riegelman (1963; Pg. 358).

A series of eight new apperceptive stimuli were also administered to the Ss. As mentioned previously, these pictures were developed in connection with other research (McKinney, 1968). Each S's expressions of affect and self-evaluation were derived from her responses to these pictorial stimuli.

The set of apperceptive stimuli have been labeled the Uniform Adolescent

Identification pictures (UAI) and a parallel set of pictures has been developed for use with undergraduate male Ss. These apperceptive pictures were designed to be of relevance to the particular social-age group of the Ss. The physical structure and the characters of each picture were selected for their presumed social and psychological significance in the lives of undergraduate females. The distinctive feature of this series of pictures is that one central character appears in all of the stimuli and this character is a member of the Ss' social group. Descriptions of these stimuli are as follows:

- F-1 The principal is seated on a large footstool. This is an introductory picture about which the Ss were not asked to compose a story.
- F-1 The principal is in the arms of a young man. In the foreground is a sports car with the words "FUEL INJECTION" imprinted on the front fender.
- F-2 The principal is in the foreground and her facial expression indicates fear. Behind her, a bald man is slumped in a chair, and bottles and cans are scattered about.
- F-3 An elderly woman is seated at a table in the foreground and the principal is running toward her. In the background are a television set and a sign reading "HOLD SWIFT HOLD".
- F-4 The principal is in the foreground of a classroom. In the background, the pythagorean theorem is written on the board and an instructor is pointing to the formula.
- F-5 The principal is in a bedroom. In the foreground, another girl is standing behind the bed and on the wall is a poster advertising a popular musical group.
- F-6 The principal is dancing on an elevated platform with another girl dancing nearby. Around the platform are various other young people

of both sexes.

F-7 The principal is seated at a table with a young man of comparable age. Standing behind the principal is another girl and on the wall is a poster proclaiming "BANANA POWER".

F-8 The principal is in the foreground holding the arm of a man who is smoking a cigarette. In the background another man is walking through a doorway.

It should be reiterated that the introductory picture (F-I) was employed only to introduce the principal to the Ss and to acquaint them with her physical appearance.

#### Procedure

Both halves of the PCMC were administered to the Ss first. Instructions are provided for this questionnaire and have been reported elsewhere (Roe & Siegelman, 1963). These instructions were also included on the front page of each half of the questionnaire which the Ss received. The instructions were also read aloud to the group prior to administration. It may be relevant to note here that the Ss were informed that all responses to the questionnaire and the apperceptive stimuli would be kept confidential. A certain degree of anonymity was achieved by not asking the Ss for their names; rather, the Ss' responses were grouped for analysis on the basis of a numerical designation (student number).

Before asking the Ss to respond to eight pictorial stimuli, E showed the Ss the introductory picture (F-I). The principal was given a name (Mary Ann) and she was identified to the Ss as an undergraduate at Michigan State University. Following this, the Ss were given the following instructions by E:

You are going to be shown a series of pictures. In each

of these pictures, the young lady you see before you--Mary Ann-- will appear with one or more other people. I want you to compose a story about each picture. Some of the things you might talk about are: what events led up to the picture, what is going on in the picture, and how things will turn out. You will be given sufficient time to compose a reasonable complete story.

After the clarification of questions, the pictures were administered in the order in which they were described on the preceding pages. Each of the pictures was flashed on a large screen in the front of the room by means of a large opaque projector. The time each picture was visible was the same for all eight pictures (six minutes). Given these experimental conditions, this report assumes that the chances are maximal that Ss identified with the "experimental her" and talked about her as they would talk about themselves.

In addition to the measuring instruments already mentioned, the Ss were also given both forms of McKinney's Actual and Perceived Self questionnaire. The pilot sample was not given this questionnaire.

#### Quantification of Apperceptive Responses

As mentioned previously, the procedures for quantifying subject responses to the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire subscales have been reported elsewhere and will not be reviewed here. There are 30 questions pertaining to each of the three subscales of interest in the present study (15 on each half of the questionnaire). The subjects, then, responded to 30 questions relative to each of the experiential dimensions measured. There are high scores of "5" possible per item and low scores of "1" possible per item. This means that, for each variable, there was a possible high score of 150 and a possible low score of 30.

It is important to repeat that projective expressions of affect and self-evaluation were scored only in relation to the principal (i.e., hero related manifestations of these two variables). Specifically, only those

emotions expressed or felt by the principal and those story outcomes involving the principal were considered.

The emotional tone of a story was assigned to the negative-unpleasant category and given a numerical designation of "three" if the emotions experienced and expressed by the principal were predominantly of the unpleasant variety. The affects which were considered unpleasant correspond to those which Bridges (1932) reported as being differentiated from general distress during the first two years of life. Bridges reported five major expressions of unpleasant affect in the infant: Distress, jealousy, anger, disgust, and fear. The present study added to these the most commonly accepted synonyms for each. In particular, these synonyms were:

For distress- distraught, displeasure, discomfort, and uneasiness.

For jealousy- envy, suspicion, and doubt.

For anger- annoyance, wrath, resentment, indignance, rage, and vehemence.

For disgust- hate, disapproval, destation, loathing, and aversion.

For fear- dread, horror, terror, alarm, panic, apprehension, and anxiety.

The second affect category to which stories were assigned was the ambivalent-ambiguous classification. A story assigned to this grouping received a numerical designation of "two". Hero related affects were classified as ambiguous-ambivalent when one of two conditions obtained: The story lacked any hero related affective expressions apart from generalized excitement, or the story expressed roughly equal quantities of pleasant and unpleasant affects expressed and experienced by the hero.

The third and final affect category to which stories were assigned was the **pleasant** classification. Stories so grouped were given a numerical designation of "one". Stories in this category manifested a predominance of the emotional expressions reported by Bridges (1932) as being

differentiated from general delight during the first two years of life. Bridges reported five pleasant (positive) emotional expressions: Delight, joy, elation, affection for adults, and affection for children. As was the case for the categorization of unpleasant affects, the most common synonyms for each of the pleasant affects articulated by Bridges were added in the methodology of this study. These synonyms included the following:

For delight - happiness, gladness, glee, and cheerfulness.

For joy- merriness.

For elation- pride and contentment.

For affection for adults and affection for children- love, liking, devotion, admiration, adoration, rapture, infatuation, and sympathy (including empathy and understanding).

The total numerical score for the affect ratings was then taken as the estimate of the degree of negative emotional expression manifested by each respondent in relation to the apperceptive principal.

The estimate of principal related self-evaluation was derived by a procedure involving the classification of story outcomes according to the apparent degree of pleasantness-unpleasantness for the "experimental hero". As mentioned earlier, apperceptive outcomes were classified in terms of both a passive criterion (receipt of positive or negative reinforcements) and an active criterion (affirmation of the hero's wishes in a constraining situation).

Rotter (1954) suggests that the apperceptive technique may be a meaningful measure of individual differences in expectations of success in life situations. Rotter's "generalized expectancy" is too broad a concept for the scope of the present paper. The methodology of this report sought to measure a more limited aspect of Rotter's more general formulation: the direc-

tion and strength of the subjects' apperceptive manifestations of efficacy in interpersonal situations depicted in the eight test stimuli. The only basic addition to Rotter's notion is that affirmations of the hero's desires in constraining situations ~~were~~ also considered to be manifestations of positive evaluation (as were the passive receptions of reinforcements as per Rotter's thinking). As was the case for apperceptive expressions of affect, apperceptive expressions of self-evaluation (story outcomes) were assigned to three categories. The outcome of each story was scored for the positivity-negativity of reinforcements received by the principal (both physical and social) and/or for whether or not the hero asserted herself in the presence of constraining forces. This notion of self-assertion "in spite of" (Tillich, 1952) was found to be most applicable for scoring the outcomes of pictures F-2 and F-8.

The outcome of a story was assigned to the negative category if the hero related reinforcements were predominantly unpleasant and/or if the hero failed to assert herself (i.e., submitted) in the face of constraint. Stories assigned to this category received a numerical designation of "three". The reinforcements mentioned by Ss obviously differ as a function of the structure of the stimuli, with respect to both direction (positive vs. negative) and type (physical vs. social). It is also true that some pictures tended to elicit more negative outcomes than others, but as long as these trends were not too marked, the individual differences hypothesis on which validity correlations are based still seems tenable.

Stories were assigned to an ambivalent-ambiguous outcome category pursuant to two events: the story had no clear outcome (e.g. statements were ~~vague~~ and without direction) or the hero related reinforcements were equally positive and negative. Stories in this group received a numerical designation



of "two".

The third outcome category to which stories were assigned was the positive grouping. Stories so classified received a numerical designation of "one". These stories were characterized by a predominance of positive reinforcements received by the principal and/or assertions by the principal of her own desires in the presence of forces which would mitigate against such assertions.

The procedures mentioned in this section, then, describe exactly the methods by which the protocols of the Ss were interpreted and grouped for analysis.

## RESULTS

Apart from their theoretical value, the appropriateness of the apperceptive scoring procedures outlined in the previous section is fundamentally an empirical question which must be considered as the first step in the analysis of data. The present study employed three basic calculations to determine the empirical reliability of the apperceptive variables and scoring procedures:

1. The internal reliabilities of the self-evaluation and affect scores were determined by the odd-even correlational method. This method involves the calculation of the Pearson product moment correlation for total self-evaluation scores or affect scores on pictures F-1, F-3, F-5, and F-7 (X variables) with total self-evaluation or affect scores on pictures F-2, F-4, F-6, and F-8 (Y variables). The two obtained correlation coefficients were then corrected with the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to provide an estimate of the actual reliability of the two apperceptive measures for the 66 Ss of interest. The corrected odd-even correlation coefficient values appear in the first column of Table 1.
2. Actual test-retest reliabilities of the two apperceptive measures were determined for the pilot sample of 50 female Ss enrolled in the introductory psychology course. These values appear in the second column of Table 1.

3. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was calculated for the independent scoring of all 66 of the protocols by two observers. These interobserver agreement values appear in the third column of Table 1. It should be noted that these two values are raw coefficients of correlation which have not been corrected for attenuation.

Table 1. Reliability and interobserver agreement coefficients for the Apperceptive variables.

	Corrected Odd-even Reliabilities N=66	Test-retest Reliabilities N=50	Interscorer Agreement N=66
Apperceptive Affects	.65	.70	.32
Apperceptive Outcomes	.70	.63	.76

Inspection of Table 1 indicates that all coefficients are within the confidence limits usually applied to such measures (e.g., see Helmstadter, 1964; Pg. 84).

Given that the apperceptive measures were of acceptable reliability, calculation of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for each of the PCRO variables with each of the apperceptive variables was the next procedure in the analysis. Six such coefficients were calculated (for apperceptive affects and outcomes paired with experiences of parental rejection, neglect, and love). Each of these values provides some evidence for the

statistical tenability of one of the six relations advanced in the introduction. These values appear in Table 2. For each cell, the N was 66. All coefficients are raw values that have not been corrected for attenuation

Table 2. Raw validity correlations for each of the apperceptive variables with each of the experiential variables.

	Intensity of experiences of parental rejection	Intensity of experiences of parental neglect	Intensity of experiences of parental love
Positivity of Apperceptive Affects	-.40*	-.40*	+.46*
Positivity of Apperceptive Outcomes	-.59**	-.57**	+.67**

\* (P .002)

\*\* (P .001)

Inspection of Table 2 indicates statistical validation of the six hypothesized relations presented in the introduction. All coefficients were at or above acceptable levels of significance. The term "acceptable" is taken to mean that not only were the values significantly different from chance expectations, but, also, in each case a reasonable portion of the variance was accounted for.

The high correlations reported above raises the obvious question about

the extent to which the three PCMQ subscales represent highly related experiences. In order to provide a partial answer to this question, Table 3 presents the factor loadings originally reported by Roe and Siegelman (1963). The three factors appearing in Table 3 (Loving, Casual-Demanding, and overt) typically account for better than 90 percent of the variance in the factor analysis of the PCMQ. The data are for adult females in the New Haven area.

Table 3. Factor loadings of the subscales Rejection, Neglect, and Love of the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire for adult females

	Factor Loving	Factor Overt	Factor Casual- Demanding
Subscale Rejection	-.75	-.10	-.43
Subscale Neglect	-.83	-.10	-.15
Subscale Love	+.76	+.25	+.25

## DISCUSSION

As indicated, the data demonstrate a statistical confirmation of the six hypotheses advanced in the introduction at "acceptable" levels of significance. Comparison of the top row of Table 2 with the bottom row indicates, further, that the validity coefficients pertaining to the self-evaluation measure are, cell for cell, higher than the validity correlations pertaining to the emotionality measure. These higher validity correlations can be accounted for in two basic ways: (1) the measure of apperceptive self-evaluation may be more reliable than the measure of apperceptive affects, or (2) the experiences measured by the three PCM subscales of interest may be more relevant to the development of self-evaluation (apperceptively measured) than the development of emotional expression (similarly measured). Of these two explanations, the second seems empirically and theoretically the more plausible. The tenability of the first explanation seems questionable on the basis of the reliability coefficients presented in Table 1.

Since Table 1 indicates that the three coefficients calculated for each measure are highly comparable, large differences in correlational validities between apperceptive measures cannot be explained by discrepancies in the corresponding reliabilities of the two measures. Further, the previously mentioned report by Bridges (1932) suggests that the bipartite nature of affective expression is in evidence during the earliest periods of development, while the same cannot be said for expressions of self-evaluation.

Self-evaluation is apparently a more cognitive variable. In addition, Coles' report (1964) seems to indicate that notions of self-evaluation are in flux throughout childhood. Finally, additional support for suggesting the later development of self-evaluation can be adduced from the studies of Iuldashevia (1966) and Malher et al. (1962). These reports found that self-evaluation can be altered relatively late in development as a function of the experience of evaluations of the self held by others.

Empirical evidence would seem to suggest, then, that while emotional expressions are first articulated during the preverbal stages of maturation, the development of self-evaluation is characteristic of periods following the acquisition of verbal facility. The fact that the 90 responses to the PCRQ which were employed in the analysis of this report are very relevant to the period of life when notions of self-evaluation are thought to be in critical flux (late childhood and early adolescence) lends further credence to the explanation advanced in relation to the observed discrepancies in validity correlations. In short, one might suggest that the antecedent experiences measured by the subscales Rejection, Neglect, and Love are just developmentally more relevant to the genesis of self-evaluation than the genesis of affective expressions.

When the vertical rows of Table 2 are examined, it is observed that the validity correlations for each of the apperceptive measures with the three subscales of the PCRQ are higher with the subscale Love than with either the Rejection or Neglect subscales. This result is most easily explained by the reliability argument presented earlier. The Tryon reliabilities (Doe & Siegelman, 1963) are considerably higher for the Love subscales than for either the Rejection or Neglect subscales. Odd-even estimates of the subscale reliabilities were calculated for the data of the

present study. These values were in substantial agreement with the Tryon reliabilities reported by Roe and Siegelman (1963). Given these data about subscale reliabilities, one would predict that quantitative intensity scores on the Love subscale would correlate more highly with a given measure than would scores on the Rejection or Neglect subscales, other things being equal. It should be noted that for the affect measure, the validity coefficients calculated in relation to the Rejection and Neglect subscales are identical. Also, the corresponding validity coefficients for the self-evaluation measure were within one decimal point of each other. These results are consonant with the fact that the reliabilities of the subscales Rejection and Neglect are almost identical when summed across both forms of the PCRQ (Rejection= .76 and Neglect= .75 by the odd-even estimate of the present study).

Considering experiential correlates of dichotomous emotional expression in particular, it seems evident that the experiences measured by the PCRQ do not refer directly to the earlier periods of life when the expressions of affect first develop. The present paper assumes, for explanatory purposes, that the measured experiences are probably more "sophisticated" forms of rejection, neglect, and love which were preceded by more primitive, but nonetheless analogous, manifestations of similar experiences during the early years. That is, given a reasonable amount of consistency in both parents and children across time, the child's experiences of herself as a referent of parental actions during the later years of maturation should be qualitatively comparable to experiences deriving from the earlier years. Simply, parental behaviors and the child's construing of the behaviors should be characterized by some degree of consistency throughout development.

It is, of course, possible to suggest explanations for the statistical



relations of interest in this paper which are quite different from the general notions advanced in the introduction. The most powerful alternative argument would probably be one deriving from social learning models of development (e.g., Rotter, 1954; Dollard and Miller, 1950; Bijou and Bair, 1961) and based largely upon sheer probability of given responses in given situations. Such an explanation would probably assert that rejection and neglect of the child by the parents would tend to elicit unpleasant affects from the child while simultaneously decreasing (or inhibiting) the child's evaluation of himself. Conversely, an orthodox social learning interpretation would be likely to suggest that expressions of affection toward the child by the parents tend to elicit positive affective states which at least one author (Ellis, 1962) asserts to be an integral part of positive self-evaluation. At first blush, such an interpretation seems most parsimonious and, consequently, most seductive. It also seems intuitively reasonable that, as the social learning interpretation would suggest, a S should tend to express those affects and evaluations with which he is most familiar (enter the concepts of response hierarchy and generalization). It is possible, even likely, that things are not quite so simple and that such an interpretation does not do full justice to the facts.

The problem with the simplistic approach delineated above is that it completely ignores the individual S as an experiencing agent. Now it is perfectly alright (on empirical grounds) to ignore the individual as a determinant of his own behavior provided that such a logical-positivistic procedure leads to the most adequate (as well as the simplest) of possible explanations. When Occam expressed his law of parsimony, he stated that the simplest of two explanations is preferable only when both explanations are of equal adequacy with respect to the facts. Too often, the boundary

between these two criteria fades in the light of logical-positivistic reasoning and adequacy is sacrificed for the sake of simplicity. We must face the fact that if the adequacy criterion does not obtain, it may well be that the more complex explanation may be the more parsimonious. In this regard, it is suggested here that any approach which fails to consider the role of the individual as an agent who structures and interprets experience is less than adequate and does not fully account for the observed facts of behavior.

An elementary example will serve to illustrate the above statements. The example derives from instances of behavior disorders in individuals of highly similar backgrounds (in terms of objectively measured events to which they have been exposed), such as siblings or even twins. The behavior syndrome which we call paranoia is a case in point. The existence of paranoid individuals indicates that when people are exposed to essentially the same events, some will see the events as more threatening than will others. Certainly, one could say that paranoid behaviors are higher in the "response hierarchy" of some individuals. But, given the fact that response hierarchy is a somewhat metaphysical construct (with the added assumption of the "eliciting power" of external stimulation), would it not be more parsimonious to simply say that some individuals interpret their experiences differently than do other individuals? Parenthetically, it might be noted here that the assumption of the fundamental importance of the "eliciting power" of external stimuli is not at all unlike the "force at a distance" notion which was the basic assumption of the Newtonian conceptualization of gravity. This concept was also the product of an overemphasis on simplicity (Russell, 1958) and it is impossible to defend when one considers the "objective" realities of individual interpretations of experience as Einstein did.

It is hoped that the preceding example not only suggests that the orthodox social learning approach does not always fully explain the relevant facts (a claim that is frequently made; e.g., see Hebb, 1960), but that such an approach does not always provide the simplest of explanations (a claim which is almost never made). For these reasons and others, this paper holds that when considering individual differences in characteristically human behavioral manifestations, such as the ones examined in the present study, it is crucial to consider individual differences in self-reported experience as meaningful predictors of behavior.

The obvious implication of all this is that considerations of reported experience may provide predictions of behavior which are just as valid as predictions made solely on the basis of the occurrence of external environmental events. Such an orientation may also provide a clue to how behavior may be altered in relation to experience. Specifically, it is not only the actual behaviors manifested toward us by others that determine our action but, also, the manner in which we experience these behaviors. Pursuant to these considerations, the present paper would not predict any one-to-one correspondence between the reports of the experiences of parental behavior measured by the PCRQ and the actual behaviors that were manifested (the actual questions call for a frequency interpretation on the part of the respondent). Rather, it is suggested that it is the child's experiences of these actions of interest which are related to apperceptive responding. If actual parental behavior is predictive of such responding, it is only in so far as objective behavioral events are related to certain types of experience on the part of the child.

#### REFERENCES

- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, J., & Breese, F. H. The appraisal of parent behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1949, 63, No. 299.
- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, J., & Breese, F. H. Patterns of parent behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1945, 58, No. 260.
- Bijou, S. W., & Baer, D. M. Child Development I. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Bridges, K. M. B. Emotional development in early infancy. Child Development, 1932, 3, 324-341.
- Bridges, K. M. B. The social and emotional development of the preschool child. London: Kegan Paul, 1931.
- Bruck, M. & Bodwin, R. F. The relationship between self-concept and the presence and absence of scholastic achievement. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 181-183.
- Carlson, R. Identification and personality structure in preadolescents. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 566-573.
- Cattell, R. B. Principles of design in "projective" or misperceptive tests of personality. In Anderson, H. H. & Anderson, G. L. (eds.) An introduction to projective techniques. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1951, 56-98.
- Coles, R. Children of crisis. Boston: Little-Brown, 1964.
- Crandell, V. C. Reinforcement effects of adult reactions and nonreactions on childrens' achievement expectations. Child Development, 1963, 34, 335-354.
- Dollard, J. & Miller, N. E. Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Ellis, A. Reason and emotion in psychotherapy. New York: Lyle Stuart, 1962.
- Bron, L. D. Responses of women to the Thematic Apperception Test. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 269-282.
- Finney, J. C. Some maternal influences on childrens' personality and

References cont'd

- character. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1961, 63, 199-278.
- Gendlin, E. Experiencing and the creation of meaning. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- Gorlow, L., Butler, A., & Guthrie, G. M. Correlates of self-attitudes of retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963a, 67, 549-555.
- Gorlow, L., Butler, A., Binig, K. G., & Smith, J. A. An appraisal of self-attitudes, a behavior following group psychotherapy with retarded young adults. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963b, 67, 893-898.
- Grusec, J. Some antecedents of self-criticism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 244-252.
- Hebb, D. O. The american revolution. American Psychologist, 15, 1960, 735-745.
- Hebb, D. O. Education for research. Canadian Federation News, 8. 1966.
- Heilburn, A. B. & Orr, M. K. Perceived maternal childrearing history and subsequent motivational effects of failure. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1966, 109, 75-89.
- Helmstadter, G. C. Principles of psychological measurement. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Herron, W. IES test patterns of accepted and rejected adolescents. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1962, 15, 435-438.
- Holt, R. R. The Thematic Apperception Test. In Anderson H. H. & Anderson, G. L. (Eds.) An introduction to projective techniques. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1951.
- Iuldashevia, S. M. The formation of self-appraisal in adolescents. Voprosy Psikhologii, 1966, 4, 87-92.
- Laing, R. D. The politics of experience. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Levin, K. Field theory in social science. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.
- McKinney, J. P. Modes of experience: subjective and objective. Paper in preparation, 1963.
- Malher, M. L., Mensing, J., & Nafziger, S. Concept of self and the reaction of others. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 353-357.
- May, R. Psychology and the human dilemma. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1967.

References cont'd

- Medinnus, G. R. Delinquents' perceptions of their parents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 592-593.
- Polanyi, M. Personal knowledge: towards a post-critical philosophy. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.
- Roe, A. & Siegelman, M. A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34, 355-369.
- Rosenthal, M. J., Mi, Y., Finkelstein, M., & Berkovits, G. K. Father-child relationships and childrens' problems. American Archives of General Psychiatry, 1962, 7, 360-373.
- Rotter, J. B. Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Russell, B. ABC of relativity. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958.
- Russell, B. A history of western philosophy. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945.
- Marason, I. G. Personality: an objective approach. New York, Wiley, 1966.
- Sears, P. S. & Sherman, V. S. In pursuit of self esteem. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1964.
- Shoemaker, R. E., Shoemaker, D. J., & Moelis, I. Laboratory measurement of parental behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 109-114.
- Siegelman, M. College student personality correlates of early parent-child relations. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 558-564.
- Tillich, P. The courage to be. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.
- Williams, W. C. The PALS tests: a technique for children to evaluate both parents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 487-495.

Appendix 1- The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire

# Instructions for the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire

Below are a number of statements which describe ways that father (or mothers) act toward their children. Read each statement carefully and think how well it describes your father (or mother) while you were growing up.

Before each statement there are four lines labelled VERY TRUE, TENDED TO BE TRUE, TENDED TO BE UNTRUE, VERY UNTRUE. Put an X on the line that indicates how true you think each statement was of your father (or mother). If none of these descriptions seems quite right, you may put the X between two of the lines.

For example, if your memory is that your father (or mother) often let you off easy when you did something wrong, you would mark the item as follows:

	TENDED	TENDED		
VERY	TO BE	TO BE	VERY	
<u>TRUE</u>	<u>TRUE</u>	<u>UNTRUE</u>	<u>UNTRUE</u>	My father (or mother)
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>	1. never let me off easy when I did something wrong.

STUDENT NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_



My father (or mother)

1. tried to get me every thing I wanted.
2. complained about me to others when I did not listen to him (her).
3. made no concessions for my age.
4. let me spend my allowance any way I liked.
5. discussed what was good about my behavior and helped to make clear the desirable consequences of my actions.
6. punished me hard enough when I misbehaved to make sure that I wouldn't do it again.
7. took away my toys or playthings when I was bad.
8. was genuinely interested in my affairs.
9. kept forgetting things he (she) was supposed to do for me.
10. took me places (trips, shows, etc.) as a reward.
11. spoiled me.
12. made me feel ashamed or guilty when I misbehaved.
13. let me know I wasn't wanted.
14. set very few rules for me.
15. compared me favorably with other children when I did well.
16. made it clear that he (she) was boss.
17. slapped or struck me when I was improper.
18. made me feel wanted and needed.
19. was too busy to answer my questions.
20. relaxed rules and regulations as a reward.
21. was very careful about protecting me from accidents.
22. nagged or scolded me when I was bad.
23. thought it was my own fault if I got into trouble.
- F24. gave me as much freedom as I wanted. (item for father form only)
- M24. let me dress any way I pleased. (item for mother form only)

My father (or mother)

25. told me how proud he (she) was of me when I was good.
- F26. never let me get away with breaking a rule. (item for father form only)
- M26. thought I should always be doing something. (item for mother form only)
27. took away or reduced my allowance as punishment.
28. made me feel that I was important.
29. did not care if I got into trouble.
30. gave me new books or records as rewards.
- F31. believed I should have no secrets from my parents. (item for father form only)
- M31. couldn't bring herself to punish me. (item for mother form only)
32. punished me by ignoring me.
33. did not spend any more time with me than necessary.
34. let me off easy when I did something wrong.
35. treated me more like a grown-up when I behaved well.
36. pushed me to excel in every thing I did.
37. wouldn't let me play with other children when I was bad.
38. encouraged me to do things on my own.
39. paid no attention to what I was doing in school.
40. let me stay up longer as a reward.
41. protected me from teasing or bullying by other children.
42. made me feel I wasn't loved any more if I misbehaved.
43. did not want me to bring friends home.
44. gave me the choice of what to do whenever it was possible.
45. praised me before my playmates.
46. told me how to spend my free time.
47. spanked or whipped me as punishment.
48. talked to me in a warm and affectionate way.

- 49. did not take me into consideration in making plans.
- 50. rewarded me by letting me off some of my regular chores.
- 51. shamed me before my playmates when I misbehaved.
- 52. did not let me play rough outdoor games for fear I might get hurt.
- 53. disapproved of my friends.
- F54. expected me to take every day disappointments. (item for father form only)
- M54. let me eat what I wanted to. (item for mother form only)
- 55. expressed greater love for me when I was good.
- 56. punished me without any thought or hesitation when I misbehaved.
- 57. gave me extra chores as punishment.
- 58. tried to help me when I was scared or upset.
- 59. did not care whether I got the right kind of food.
- 60. gave me candy or ice cream or fixed my favorite foods for me as a reward.
- F61. made others give in to me. (item for father form only)
- M61. taught me not to fight under any circumstances. (item for mother form only)
- 62. frightened or threatened me when I did wrong.
- 63. went out of the way to hurt my feelings.
- F64. let me stay up as late as I liked. (item for father form only)
- M64. let me do as I liked with my time after school. (item for mother form only)
- 65. gave me special attention as a reward.
- 66. demanded unquestioning respect and deference.
- 67. punished me by sending me out of the room or to bed.
- 68. did not try to tell me everything, but encouraged me to find things out for myself.
- 69. left my care to someone else.
- 70. let me go to parties or play with others more than usual as reward.

71. taught me to go for help to my parents or teacher rather than to fight.
72. told me how ashamed he (she) was when I misbehaved.
73. ridiculed and made fun of me.
- F74. let me do pretty much what I wanted to do.
- M74. let me choose my own friends.
75. praised me when I deserved it.
76. always told me exactly how to do my work.
77. took away my books or records as punishment.
78. respected my point of view and encouraged me to express it.
79. acted as if I didn't exist.
80. rewarded me by giving me money, or increased my allowance.
- F81. wanted me to have at least as large an allowance as my friends. (item for father form only)
- M81. preferred to have me play at home rather than to visit other children. (item for mother form only)
82. compared me unfavorably with other children when I misbehaved.
83. complained about me.
84. let me work by myself.
85. made me feel proud when I did well.
86. pushed me to do well in school.
87. punished me by being more strict about rules and regulations.
88. let me do things I thought were important even if it were inconvenient for him (her).
89. paid no attention to me.
90. hugged me, kissed me, petted me when I was good.
- F91. tried to keep me out of situations that might be unpleasant and embarrassing (item for father form only)
- M91. didn't let me go places because something might happen to me. (item for mother form only)



My father (or mother)

- 92. reasoned with me and explained possible harmful consequences when I did wrong.
- 93. compared me unfavorably to other children no matter what I did.
- 94. did not object to my loafing or daydreaming.
- 95. praised me to others.
- 96. would not let me question his (her) reasoning.
- 97. punished me by not taking me on trips, visits, etc. that I had been promised.
- 98. tried to help me learn to live comfortably with myself.
- 99. ignored me as long as I did not do anything to disturb him (her).
- 100. gave me new things as a reward, such as toys.
- 101. hated to refuse me anything.
- 102. thought that it was bad for a child to be given affection and tenderness.
- 103. did not tell me what time to be home when I went out.
- 104. wanted to have complete control over my actions.
- 105. was willing to discuss regulations with me, and took my point of view into account in making them.
- 106. did not care who my friends were.
- 107. worried about me when I was away.
- 108. did not want me around at all when he (she) had company.
- 109. did not object when I was late for meals.
- 110. taught me that he (she) knew best and that I must accept his (her) decisions.
- 111. encouraged me to bring friends home, and tried to make things pleasant for them.
- 112. left me alone when I was upset.
- 1113. worried a great deal about my health. (item for father form only)
- 1113. would not let me try things if there were any chance I would fail. (item for mother form only)

My father (or mother)

- 114. expected children to misbehave if they were not watched.
- 115. was easy with me.
- 116. expected prompt and unquestioning obedience.
- 117. taught me skills I wanted to learn.
- 118. did not try to help me learn things.
- 119. wanted to know all about my experiences.
- 120. believed a child should be seen and not heard.
- 121. did not bother much about enforcing rules.
- F122. was full of advice about everything I did. (item for father form only)
- M122. kept the house in order by having a lot of rules and regulations for me. (item for mother form only)
- 123. made it easy for me to confide in him.
- 124. forgot my birthday.
- 125. did not want me to grow up.
- 126. avoided my company.
- 127. did not check up on whether I did my homework.
- 128. allowed me to make only minor decisions.
- 129. said nice things about me.
- 130. did not care whether I had the same kind of clothes as other children.

Appendix 2- Scoring Sheet for the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire



PERQ SCORING SHEET FOR  
NOTHING OR FATHERS

Student Number \_\_\_\_\_

Pro	Fun S-L	Rej	Cas	Rew S-L	Dem	Fun D-O	Lov	Neg	Rew S-L
1_____	2_____	3_____	4_____	5_____	6_____	7_____	8_____	9_____	10_____
11_____	12_____	13_____	14_____	15_____	16_____	17_____	18_____	19_____	20_____
21_____	22_____	23_____	24_____	25_____	26_____	27_____	28_____	29_____	30_____
31_____	32_____	33_____	34_____	35_____	36_____	37_____	38_____	39_____	40_____
41_____	42_____	43_____	44_____	45_____	46_____	47_____	48_____	49_____	50_____
51_____	52_____	53_____	54_____	55_____	56_____	57_____	58_____	59_____	60_____
61_____	62_____	63_____	64_____	65_____	66_____	67_____	68_____	69_____	70_____
71_____	72_____	73_____	74_____	75_____	76_____	77_____	78_____	79_____	80_____
81_____	82_____	83_____	84_____	85_____	86_____	87_____	88_____	89_____	90_____
91_____	92_____	93_____	94_____	95_____	96_____	97_____	98_____	99_____	100_____
101_____		102_____	103_____		104_____		105_____	106_____	
107_____		108_____	109_____		110_____		111_____	112_____	
113_____		114_____	115_____		116_____		117_____	118_____	
119_____		120_____	121_____		122_____		123_____	124_____	
125_____		126_____	127_____		128_____		129_____	130_____	

TOTALS: \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix 3- Sample protocols for the Uniform Adolescent Identification Pictures

Subject= 23 Picture= F-1 Affect= positive Outcome= positive

Mary Ann and her steady Bob are about to go for a ride in Bob's new sports car. The car is very new and very stylish and they're so proud of it their minds are about to blow. Mary Ann and Bob are very happy and very much in love. After they finish school they'll get married and raise a large family.

Subject= 10 Picture= F-4 Affect= negative Outcome= negative

Mary Ann is enrolled in OEO math because she flunked her math orientation exam after staying out half the night with a boy met during freshman visitation. The teacher is trying to explain the pythagorean theorem but Mary Ann just can't get the darn thing through her thick skull. She's never been any good at math anyway and has always hated doing those stupid homework problems. Right now she's mad at the Prof. and his stupid explanation because there's a test coming up on Friday which she's certain to flunk.

Subject= 59 Picture= F-6 Affect= positive Outcome= negative

Mary Ann's in her glory now! She's been asked to be a go-go dancer at her dorm's term party and does Mary Ann love to dance. Old Mar feels great when showing off the movements of her body in front of the other kids. She's really putting the nose into her dance of gay abandon. The three kids in front are disgusted by her seductive movements, however, and are about to go get the house mother or the police to throw her off the stage, before some guy rapes her.

Subject= 37 Picture= F-2 Affect= negative Outcome= positive

Horrors! Mary Ann is petrified! She came home early after class and is shocked to find her father slumped in the chair. He has been a diabetic for years and he seems to have taken an overdose of insulin. Mary Ann is torn with indecision. Eventually, she calls an ambulance and her father is saved.

Protocols cont'd

Mary Ann's father is very grateful to her because she has truly saved his life.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03196 4632