



115
596
THS

PARENTAL DEPENDENCY AND
PEER GROUP INTEGRATION

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

David Murray Lemmen

1969

THESIS



MOJII
775 1111

AMERICAN
775 1111
1 877

ABSTRACT

PARENTAL DEPENDENCY AND PEER GROUP INTEGRATION

By

David Murray Lemmen

Much of the literature on adolescent behavior sees the role of the adolescent peer group as a vehicle for reducing the adolescent's dependency on parents; that is, conformity to the peer group is a form of dependency that replaces the parental dependency.

This study represents an attempt to demonstrate that adolescents who remain highly dependent on their parents are not well integrated into their peer groups. The data, however, do not support this. "Behavioral" Dependency has different effects than "Emotional" Dependency, and "Emotional" Dependency seems to affect males differently than females, but there are no uniformly linear trends in the relationship between parental dependency and peer group integration for this college freshman sample of adolescents.

PARENTAL DEPENDENCY AND
PEER GROUP INTEGRATION

By

David Murray Lemmen

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere thanks to Dr. Philip Marcus, who served as my thesis advisor, for the criticism, guidance, encouragement, and patience required to see me through this project.

Thanks also to Dr. Kelly and Dr. Waisanen, who served on my committee, for their criticism and guidance.

Finally, thanks to my parents, whose continued support and encouragement have enabled me to pursue my educational goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	6
Controls	6
The Sample	7
Operationalization of Concepts	8
ANALYSIS OF DATA	18
Behavioral Dependency	18
Popularity	19
Number of Close Friends	21
Emotional Dependency	24
Popularity	25
Number of Close Friends	28
Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency	30
CONCLUSIONS	36
BIBLIOGRAPHY	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Inter-item correlations for the Behavioral Dependency Index	12
2	Inter-item correlations for the Emotional Dependency Index	14
3	Behavioral Dependency by sex	18
4	Female Behavioral Dependency Index score: Popularity	20
5	Male Behavioral Dependency Index score: Popularity	20
6	Behavioral Dependency Index score: Number of Close Friends	22
7	Emotional Dependency by sex	24
8	Female Emotional Dependency Index score: Popularity	26
9	Male Emotional Dependency Index score: Popularity	26
10	Emotional Dependency Index score: Number of Close Friends	29
11	Association between Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency	31
12	Female combined Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index categories: Popularity	32

Table		Page
13	Male combined Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index categories: Popularity	33
14	Combined Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index categories: Number of Close Friends	34

INTRODUCTION

This research problem arises not from a full-fledged theory, rather, from a collection of loosely related ideas about the "parent versus peer" orientation of adolescents. These ideas suggest a shift of dependency from parents to peers as a definitive aspect of adolescence. That is, as will be seen below, part of the definition of adolescence is that it is a time of dissolving the childhood dependency on parents and reinvesting that dependency in the peer group as part of the normal process of maturation.

There has long been recognition of the importance of overcoming familial dependency, as suggested by Freud's statement below:

The more closely the members of a family are attached to one another, the more often do they tend to cut themselves off from others, and the more difficult it is for them to enter the wider circle of life.¹

Pronounced familial dependency would seem to be associated with low integration and attachment with peers, and other non-family members.

¹Sigmund Freud, Civilization and Its Discontents (New York: Norton & Co., Inc., 1962), p. 56.

More explicitly relevant to the topic of adolescent independence from family ties is this statement by Parsons and Bales:

The initial nature of adolescence involves pressure to abandon this familial dependency and to form independent attachments outside the family.²

Gottlieb and Ramsey add:

The childish dependence upon parents must gradually be relinquished as adolescence proceeds. Emotional ties with members of the same age of course are strong, but the extreme attachment and dependence placed upon parents and other adults are a deterrent to the development of adulthood.³

With decreasing familial dependence, the increasing importance of the peer group for the adolescent is noted by many writers:

Above all [the peer group] is the primary repository of the needs for emotional security and acceptance which have been so powerfully fostered in early childhood and then so sharply cut back in relation to the original objects, the parents--particularly, of course, the mother--because of the imperative of achieving independence.⁴

Being in a period of transition in their lives from childhood to adulthood in a society which is itself changing at a relatively accelerated pace, adolescents are thrust betwixt and between

² Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955), p. 44.

³ David Gottlieb and Charles Ramsey, The American Adolescent (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964), p. 118.

⁴ Talcott Parsons, "A Sociologist's View," in Values and Ideals of American Youth, ed. by Eli Ginzberg (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), p. 281.

the values of their own developing world and those of the older generation. This marginality plunges them into the throws of an unstable identity. Frustrated by the gap between their aspirations and what is afforded by the older generation, they gravitate toward one another to establish some identity in the image of their own time, as they perceive it. The products of interactions among individuals caught in the same predicament is formation of their own reference groups which serve as vehicles of reestablishing a stable identity and of mutual support toward more effective attainment of the goals defined by their personal experiences of frustration and deprivation.⁵

He [the adolescent] discovers he is not alone in these feelings nor in his plight: His age mates are in the same boat. Hence, they gravitate toward one another to exchange notes and, in time, to seek ways and means to take steps in concert which assert themselves and satisfy their desires.⁶

Though at times treated as inextricably interwoven in the same process, there are two distinct themes present here. One, that adolescence is a time for reduction of parental dependency; and the second, that adolescence is a time of increasing peer orientation, or peer dependence. The relevant work on this topic is divided in the way these themes are treated. While most of the writers on the topic seem to agree that the bonds of parental dependency must be loosened during adolescence, all do not see the process of forming close peer group attachments as intrinsically related to gaining independence from parents. Some writers speak of forming close

⁵Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn Sherif, Reference Groups (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 40.

⁶Ibid., p. 56.

peer group attachments as the process, or vehicle, of dissolving parental dependency. Other writers speak of adolescents gaining independence from parents without explicitly involving the peer group at all in this process:

Either the child will safely remove himself from emotional dependency on the parent and the family and assume self-direction, or he will fail to make this passage from childhood to adult responsibility and forever afterward, unless later he is especially helped in breaking away from his parasitic support, fail to reach emotional maturity.⁷

Similar accounts which do not explicitly include the peer group are offered by Bell, Burgess and Locke, and Reuter and Runner.

As mentioned above, however, other writers seem to see the aspects of gaining independence from parents, and investing attachment in peers (whether as a vehicle of establishing independence, or by default of the parents' diminished importance or relevance), as essentially part of the same process, including: Coleman, Cavan, Britton, Sherif and Sherif, Parsons, Parsons and Bales, and Douvan and Adelson. The relevance of peer group attachments to waning parental dependency is the issue taken up in this research.

The focus of this research is to investigate empirically the relationship between parental dependency and the adolescent's peer

⁷ Ernest Groves and Gladys Groves, The Contemporary American Family (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947), p. 276.

group attachment, in considering if these processes are independent or if they are dependently related one with another. It should be made clear at the outset that "dependence" and "independence" are concepts which are broad, vague and without specific content. Rather than being referents for something particular and specific, "independency" and "dependency" represent rather loosely conceived modes of orientation. The operationalization of "dependency" and "peer group attachment," as discussed in more detail below, are not by any means exhaustive or completely definitive of their referents, but are hopefully suggestive of the flavor of the "mode of orientation" each is intended to reflect.

The generalized null hypothesis is:

There is no significant relationship between parental dependence and peer group attachment.

As will be seen in the operationalization of the concepts, there are two essentially different aspects of parental dependency and several different aspects of peer group attachment used in the research, giving rise to several specific possibilities for relationship between parental dependency and peer group attachment. Each of these specific possibilities will be examined in light of the relationship between parental dependency and peer group attachment.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Controls

The entire analysis will be controlled by sex as suggested by various theoretical and empirical work. Cavan notes:

The differential training of boys and girls encourages boys to become emancipated from their parents and permits them to have privacy in personal affairs whereas girls are kept under the protective dominance of the parents.⁸

Komarovsky,⁹ and Winch,¹⁰ among others, report empirical support for the idea that female adolescents are less parentally independent than males. (The line of reasoning implied in these accounts is that females are given less behavioral independence, therefore they will have less emotional independence than males. Why there are differences in behavioral independence is not made explicit.)

The Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index scores were controlled by size of home town, in an attempt to discover if

⁸Ruth Cavan, The American Family (New York: Thomas Y. Corwell Co., 1953), p. 426.

⁹Myra Komarovsky, "Functional Analysis of Sex Roles," American Sociological Review, 1950, pp. 508-516.

¹⁰Robert F. Winch, "Courtship in College Women," American Journal of Sociology, November, 1949, pp. 269-278.

the size of the home town in which the respondent was raised had any systematic effect on his parental dependency as here operationalized. No such effects were apparent.

The Sample

This research is a secondary analysis of data collected in a study of kinship patterns and terminology in American families. The initial research project was conceived and directed by Dr. Philip M. Marcus of the Department of Sociology at Michigan State University. The interviewers were graduate students in a course on Modern American Society.

The sample is a random sample of 273 Michigan State University freshmen in 1966. The following chart compares the sample parameters with the population parameters as published in the Michigan State University Enrollment Report, Fall, 1966.

<u>M. S. U. Freshmen, 1966</u>			<u>Sample</u>	
7496		Total	273	
3834	(51.1%)	Males	152	(55.6%)
1654	(22.0%)	Major--No Preference	65	(23.8%)
6153	(83.0%)	In-State Students	235	(86.0%)

It is relevant to note that college students in general may under-represent the independence end of the dependent-independent

continuum for young people, because of the fact of their continued financial, and sometimes emotional, dependence on parents while in college, as compared with non-college youth who are more often beginning to establish their own independent households and families.

Operationalization of Concepts

This research will deal with two different kinds of dependence on parents, and with two different categories of peer group affiliation.

Parsons and Bales suggest parental dependency as falling into the categories of "emotional dependence" and "economic dependence."¹¹ Douvan and Adelson speak of parental dependency in three categories: "emotional, behavioral, and value" dependency.¹² The present research retains the category of "emotional" dependency from both of the above approaches, and utilizes "behavioral" dependency as suggested by Douvan and Adelson, which may be closely related in conception and function with Parsons and Bales' "economic" dependency.

The two categories of dependency are implemented in the present research in the form of an index of each. The questionnaire

¹¹ Parsons and Bales, op. cit., p. 319.

¹² Elizabeth Douvan and Joseph Adelson, The Adolescent Experience (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 130.

items used in the construction of each index were divided into the two categories initially on the basis of face validity. Inter-item correlations were computed and these results, after the elimination of one item from the Behavioral Dependency Index, supported our notion of combining the items. Each of the three remaining Behavioral Dependency items are significantly inter-correlated, as are each of the three Emotional Dependency items, but the relationships for each separate Behavioral Dependency item with each Emotional Dependency item are not uniform or significant.

The Behavioral Dependency Index was constructed from these three questionnaire items:

Have you been home since coming to M. S. U. ? ____yes ____no
If yes: How many times? ____

Have your parents been up to see you since you have been here? ____yes ____no
If yes: How many times? ____

Have you spoken to your parents on the phone since coming to M. S. U. ? ____yes ____no
If yes: How many times? ____

The next questionnaire item was considered for inclusion in the Behavioral Dependency Index, but eliminated on the basis of inconsistent and insignificant relationship with the other three items.

How often have you written home since coming to M. S. U. ?
 _____ times per month.

In the construction of the index, the distance of M. S. U. from home was controlled for each of the above responses according to the following schedule of distance categories:

1. Lansing, East Lansing, or Okemos
2. Commuting distance
3. About 45 minutes
4. Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, Detroit Areas
5. 2, $2\frac{1}{4}$, $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours from Lansing
6. Border area, up-state and upper peninsula
7. Out of state
8. Other country

It would be reasonable to expect that a person could visit home, have his parents visit, and call home more frequently if his home were within commuting distance compared with 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours from M. S. U. , and likewise, for differences between other distance categories. So in assigning index values, the median was computed for each distance category for each questionnaire item. Those responses falling below the median frequency value for each distance category were given an index value of "0." Those responses above the median frequency for that distance category were given an index value of "1." The range for values on the three item index was from "0" to "3." A "0" value on the Behavioral Dependency Index indicates the respondent was below the median frequency of

interaction with parents on all three items, compared with others in the same distance category. A Behavioral Dependency Index value of "3" indicates the respondent was above the median frequency for parental interaction on all three items compared with other persons from his distance category. The assumption underlying this operationalization is that relatively greater frequencies of interaction with parents indicate greater dependence on parents, and relatively lower frequencies of interaction with parents indicate less dependence on parents.

The frequency distribution for these three behavioral items is as follows:

"visited home"	above median	125	index value 1
	below median	128	index value 0
"parents visited you"	above median	79	index value 1
	below median	173 ¹³	index value 0
"spoke on the phone"	above median	133	index value 1
	below median	120	index value 0

All respondents in distance category 1, "Lansing, East Lansing, or Okemos," were eliminated from the behavioral index

¹³ Since the medians were divided at the nearest integer and were computed for each separate distance category where the distributions tended to cluster unevenly and immediately below the true median, the operational breaking points did not always yield a 50%-50% distribution. The cumulated effects of this account for the lopsided distribution of frequencies "above and below the median."

because their responses were not distributed widely enough to make differentiation meaningful. In the coding of responses, any frequency greater than "9" was coded as "9" and most of the responses from distance 1 were coded as "9."

The following gives the inter-item correlations for the Behavioral Dependency Index.

TABLE 1. -- Inter-item correlations for the Behavioral Dependency Index

	γ	x^2
"times phoned" \times "times home"	.31	5.97
"times phoned" \times "parents visit"	.43	10.13
"times home" \times "parents visit"	.32	5.35

The measure of the degree of association used is Yule's Q, or Gamma.

$$p < .05 \text{ if } x^2 \geq 3.8$$

The Emotional Dependency Index was constructed as follows:

How much do you miss being away from your parents?
(check one)

- ☐ I miss being away from them very much
- ☐ I miss being away from them quite a bit
- ☐ I miss being away from them somewhat
- ☐ I miss being away from them a little bit
- ☐ I do not miss being away from them at all

The frequency distribution of responses and the assigned index values are:

"miss very much"	15	(f) = 63
"quite a bit"	48	index value = 1
"somewhat"	79	
"little bit"	81	(f) = 196
"not at all"	36	index value = 0

The breaking point for allocation to categories of "Dependency" and "Independency" does not yield a numerically equal distribution between the two categories. More important than numerically equal categories was the hope to isolate dependent responses in a category as nearly "pure" as possible. In the above case it would have been possible to divide the responses between the categories to yield 143 dependent responses and 116 independent responses, which is a better numerical balance than the 63 to 196 distribution as used. But this more numerically balanced distribution would have watered down the "Dependent" category by including respondents who missed their parents only "somewhat" along with those who missed them "very much" and "quite a bit." The latter two responses seem to constitute a "purer" category of dependent responses and are therefore defined as the "Dependent" category for the analysis.

Suppose you had a chance to go to Europe next summer with either your best friend or your parents. Which would you choose?

___ best friend

___ parents

"parents"	(f) = 74	index value = 1
"best friend"	(f) = 197	index value = 0

Generally speaking, how would you describe your relationship to your parents when you were a senior in high school?
(check one)

___ I was very close to them
 ___ I was quite close to them
 ___ I was somewhat close to them
 ___ I was not very close to them
 ___ I was not at all close to them

"very close"	(f) = 108	index value = 1
"quite"	85	
"somewhat"	49	(f) = 160
"not very"	20	index value = 0
"not at all"	6	

TABLE 2. -- Inter-item correlations for the Emotional Dependency Index

	γ	x^2
"who go to Europe with" \times "miss parents"	.51	14.42
"who go to Europe with" \times "close to parents"	.45	11.98
"miss parents" \times "close to parents"	.53	15.5

γ = Yule's Q or Gamma

$p < .01$ if $x^2 \geq 6.6$

The foregoing table shows the association among the items in the Emotional Dependency Index.

The significance of the value of the Emotional Dependency Index score parallels that of the Behavioral Dependency Index score. The higher the index score, the greater parental dependency indicated. An index score of "0" indicates no dependent responses; a score of "3" indicates 3 out of 3 dependent responses.

As parental dependency is operationalized into two categories--"Behavioral Dependency" and "Emotional Dependency"--so peer group affiliation is operationalized into two categories corresponding with the analytically distinguishable "flow of attachment." The two categories are "Perceived Popularity" and "Reported Number of Close Friends" (male and female). Perceived Popularity can be said to indicate the perceived amount of attachment from peer others to self. And Number of Close Friends can be thought of as indicating the flow of attachment from self to others. The Reported Number of Close Friends is an indicator of how many others the respondent attaches himself to. Popularity represents attachment by peers; Number of Friends represents attachment to peers. Because the sample divides neatly into "males" and "females," and the instrument evokes both the number of close male friends and the number of close female friends, there are four possibilities for analysis:

number of male friends
 number of female friends
 number of opposite sex friends
 number of same sex friends

An analysis of the relationship between "Popularity" and "Number of Friends" is rendered ambiguous by the forms of the questions:

Compared to your classmates when you were a senior in high school, how popular do you think you were with members of the opposite sex ?

<input type="checkbox"/> very much more popular	(f) = 17
<input type="checkbox"/> more popular	(f) = 99
<input type="checkbox"/> about the same as others	(f) = 118
<input type="checkbox"/> less popular	(f) = 30
<input type="checkbox"/> very much less popular	(f) = 7

About how many close male friends do you have here at M. S. U. ?

How many close female friends do you have here at M. S. U. ?

It is ambiguous to approach the relationship between Popularity and Number of Close Friends because each does not refer to the same immediate reference group. Popularity refers to a high school membership group; Number of Friends refers to a college membership group. Although not referring to the same immediate group, each does refer to the "peer group," and the

analysis will proceed at that level of abstraction. Even if the two conceptions are not directly translatable into one another, they both represent indicators of peer group integration or attachment.¹⁴

¹⁴This objection notwithstanding, a comparison of the relationships between

"Popularity" × "Same Sex Friends"

"Popularity" × "Opposite Sex Friends"

"Popularity" × "Male Friends"

"Popularity" × "Female Friends"

shows "Number of Female Friends" to indicate the highest relationship with "Popularity," regardless of the sex of the respondent.

$\gamma = .17$; $x^2 = 5.91$; $p < .05$ if $x^2 = 5.99$.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Behavioral Dependency

As discussed above, the data will be controlled for sex differences because there are theoretical and empirical suggestions that males are more independent, in general, and particularly from parents, than females. The following table indicates that there is

TABLE 3. -- Behavioral Dependency by sex

Behavioral Dependency Index Score	Males		Females		Total Cell Frequency
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Independent 0	29%	40	14%	16	56
1	32	44	37	42	86
2	26	36	34	38	74
3 Dependent	13	18	15	17	35
Total	100%	138	100%	113	251

$$\chi^2 = 7.99; p < .05 \text{ if } \chi^2 = 7.8.$$

a slight tendency for greater proportions of males to obtain a "0" dependency score, but throughout the rest of the range of scores no important differences are apparent. This constitutes only very vague support for the proposition that males are more parentally independent in their behavior than females.

For the bulk of the analysis it seemed sufficient, and convenient, to collapse the four Behavioral Index Scores into two categories: "Dependent" and "Independent." Index values of zero or one, indicating zero or one dependent response out of three possible, comprise the category labeled "Independent," and index values of two or three, representing two or three dependent responses out of three possibilities, were assigned to the "Dependent" category. On this basis, the remainder of the discussion will compare "Dependents" and "Independents."

Popularity

The form of the generalized null hypothesis appropriate here is:

H_{o_1} There is no significant relationship between "Behavioral Dependence on parents" and "Perceived Popularity."

The data, as the following tables show, do not provide grounds for rejecting this null hypothesis. There is no significant

TABLE 4. -- Female Behavioral Dependency Index score: Popularity

Perceived Popularity	Independent		Dependent		Total Cell Frequency
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Low	14%	8	11%	6	14
Average	40	23	47	25	48
High	46	26	42	22	48
Total	100%	57	100%	53	110

$$\gamma = -.03; x^2 = .055; p < .05 \text{ if } x^2 = 5.9.$$

TABLE 5. -- Male Behavioral Dependency Index score: Popularity

Perceived Popularity	Independent		Dependent		Total Cell Frequency
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Low	18%	15	12%	6	21
Average	35	29	47	24	53
High	46	38	41	21	59
Total	100%	82	100%	51	133

$$\gamma = .03; x^2 = 2.16; p < .05 \text{ if } x^2 = 5.99.$$

relationship between "Behavioral Dependency" and "Perceived Popularity" for either males or females.

Number of Close Friends

The following table summarizes the various relationships between Behavioral Dependency and Number of Close Friends. The total sample median for the number of same sex friends was between four and five for both males and females. That is, about half of the females reported four or fewer close female friends; about half of them reported five or more close female friends. And about one-half of the males reported four or fewer close male friends; about half reported five or more close male friends. The total sample median for the number of opposite sex friends was between two and three. Half the females reported two or fewer close male friends; half reported three or more close male friends. Half the males reported two or fewer close female friends; half reported three or more close female friends. The median figures used in the table represent the values for the entire sample as a whole; when the total sample is broken down into the groups below, and divided according to the total sample medians, there may be some irregular departures from 50%-50% distributions above and below the median.

Reading the top row of the table it is evident that 51% of Behaviorally Independent males report five or more close male

TABLE 6. -- Behavioral Dependency Index score: Number of Close Friends

More than the Median Number of Friends	Independent		Dependent		γ	χ^2
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency		
Males 5 or More Male Friends	51%	42	57%	29	.13	.51
Females 5 or More Female Friends	54	36	58	31	.10	.27
Females 3 or More Male Friends	51	34	58	31	.16	.72
Males 3 or More Female Friends	33	27	45	23	.26	2.17

$p < .05$ if $\chi^2 = 3.8$

friends (49% Behaviorally Independent males report four or fewer close male friends), and 57% of Behaviorally Dependent males report five or more close male friends (43% of Behaviorally Dependent males report four or fewer close male friends). Thus there is a small tendency for higher numbers of close male friends to be associated with Behaviorally Dependent males ($\gamma = .13$). In other words, males who are Behaviorally Dependent on their parents tend to report greater numbers of close male friends. Continuing to read the table in this manner, it follows that dependent males also tend to report more close female friends than independent males. Dependent females also report greater numbers of close female and male friends. Throughout the entire table there is evidenced a very mild but consistently positive relationship between parental dependence and higher numbers of close friends.

The particular null hypothesis is:

Ho₂ There is no significant relationship between Behavioral Dependence and reported Numbers of Close Friends.

There is not sufficient evidence to reject this null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance, although there is some small and tentative evidence of a relationship between Parental Dependency and Number of Close Friends. The direction of this relationship, however, would not support the idea that peer group attachment is

a substitute for declining dependence on parents. The most parentally dependent, in terms of behavior, indicate the greatest peer group attachment as well.

Emotional Dependency

The next topic to be explored is the effect of emotional parental dependency on peer group integration.

In a similar fashion to Behavioral Dependency, there are only barely discernable differences for Emotional Dependency between

TABLE 7. -- Emotional Dependency by sex

Emotional Dependency Index Score	Males		Females		Total Cell Frequency
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Independent 0	43%	57	40%	44	101
1	34	46	30	33	79
2	17	22	20	22	44
3 Dependent	6	8	11	12	20
Total	100%	133	100%	111	244

$$\chi^2 = 2.63; p < .05 \text{ if } \chi^2 = 7.8.$$

males and females. Here we see continued extremely minute, but consistent, tendencies for males to outweigh females at the lower end of the Emotional Dependency values, and, conversely, for females to outweigh males at the higher dependency values. These relationships are by no means statistically significant and hardly constitute support for the notion that males are more independent than females from parents at this stage in adolescent life.

Collapsing the Emotional Dependency Index scores into two categories, "Independent" and "Dependent," follows the same procedure as with Behavioral Dependency. Index values of "0" and "1" were treated as the Emotionally Independent group, and index values of "2" and "3" comprise the Emotionally Dependent group.

Popularity

The following two tables indicate the relationship between Emotional Dependency and Perceived Popularity for females (Table 8) and males (Table 9).

For females the measure of association (gamma) between Emotional Dependency and Popularity has a value of $-.36$, indicating a moderate relationship between Dependency on parents and a female's Perceived Popularity. In other words, females who reported greater Emotional Dependency on parents perceived themselves to be somewhat less popular, compared with females who reported Emotional Independence from parents. This association is not statistically significant.

TABLE 8. -- Female Emotional Dependency Index score: Popularity

Perceived Popularity	Independent		Dependent		Total Cell Frequency
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Low	10%	8	21%	7	15
Average	40	31	50	17	48
High	49	38	29	10	48
Total	100%	77	100%	34	111

$$\gamma = -.36; x^2 = 4.48; p < .05 \text{ if } x^2 = 5.9.$$

TABLE 9. -- Male Emotional Dependency Index score: Popularity

Perceived Popularity	Independent		Dependent		Total Cell Frequency
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Low	13%	14	23%	7	21
Average	45	46	23	7	53
High	42	43	53	16	59
Total	100%	103	100%	30	133

$$\gamma = .07; x^2 = 4.74; p < .05 \text{ if } x^2 = 5.9.$$

The corresponding table for males shows somewhat different results.

For males the relationship between Emotional Dependency on parents and Popularity has a value of $+.07$. Taken by itself this value means very little, but when compared with the value of $-.36$ for females, there is some suggestion of a differential effect that Emotional Dependency has for males compared with females.

Comparing the bottom two cells in the "Dependent" columns between males and females shows some indication of a different relationship between the two variables taken by each sex.

Perceived Popularity	Dependent Females		Dependent Males	
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency
Average	50%	17	23%	7
High	29%	10	53%	16

These apparent differences are based on an extremely small number of cases, and the relationships in the larger tables are not significant, at face value, nor statistically, but perhaps there is enough relationship to warrant further investigation of a more direct and more refined nature.

The appropriate form of the null hypothesis is:

H_{o_3} There is no significant relationship between Emotional Dependence on parents and Perceived Popularity.

The data do not constitute sufficient evidence for rejecting this null hypothesis.

Number of Close Friends

In the previous section where Behavioral Dependency was considered, the small positive association between dependency and peer group attachment was consistent for males and females whether peer group attachment was approached through Perceived Popularity or Reported Number of Friends. In this section dealing with Emotional Dependency there is a male-female difference, that is, for males, Dependency is associated with greater Perceived Popularity; for females, Dependency is associated with less Perceived Popularity. As Reported Number of Friends is considered this differential association is maintained. For males, greater Emotional Dependence is associated with reports of greater Numbers of Friends; for females, greater Emotional Dependence is associated with fewer Numbers of Friends. So, Emotional Dependency for males is associated with peer group attachment, whether it is operationalized through Perceived Popularity or Reported Number of

TABLE 10. -- Emotional Dependency Index score: Number of Close Friends

More than the Median Number of Friends	Independent		Dependent		γ	χ^2
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency		
Males 5 or More Male Friends	50%	52	63%	19	+.27	1.56
Females 5 or More Female Friends	56	43	53	18	-.06	.08
Females 3 or More Male Friends	57	44	50	7	-.14	.49
Males 3 or More Female Friends	39	41	47	14	+.15	.51

$p < .05$ if $\chi^2 = 3.8$

Close Friends. For females, Emotional Dependency is associated with lesser peer group attachment, whether it be Perceived Popularity or Reported Number of Close Friends. Again, however, it is important to consider that these relationships, although consistent, are not large or statistically significant.

Again, the data do not warrant rejection of the null hypothesis:

Ho₄ There is no significant relationship between "Emotional Dependence" on parents and "Reported Numbers of Close Friends."

Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency

After having examined the separate effects of Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency on peer group integration, this investigation will combine the two categories of dependency and look for possible patterns of effect. As a preliminary step to this intent, the association between Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency is given in Table 11 on the following page.

There is a slight, significant relationship of +.32 between Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency. This association may have some bearing on the social psychological question of the relationship between behavior and attitudes, for Emotional Dependency may be indicative of an attitude of dependency on parents,

which may be compared with Behavioral Dependency. This question in all its ramifications, however, is beyond the scope of this undertaking.

TABLE 11. -- Association between Behavioral Dependency and Emotional Dependency

Behavioral Dependency	Emotional Dependency				Total Cell Frequency
	Independent		Dependent		
	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	Per Cent	Cell Frequency	
Independent	63%	119	47%	30	149
Dependent	37%	70	53%	34	104
Total	100%	189	100%	64	253

$$\gamma = +.32; x^2 = 5.12; p < .05 \text{ if } x^2 = 3.8.$$

When Emotional Dependency is combined with Behavioral Dependency, little new information is gained, and the sample is parceled out too thinly to warrant confidence in any of the findings. What evidence there is does logically seem to support the earlier findings that Dependency for males tends to mean greater Perceived Popularity; Dependency for females is associated with less Perceived Popularity. (Compare cell "i" in Table 12 with cell "i" in Table 13;

TABLE 12. -- Female combined Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index categories:
Popularity

Perceived Popularity	Independent/ Independent		Independent/ Dependent		Dependent/ Dependent		Total Cell Frequency
Low	Cell "a"		Cell "b"		Cell "c"		14
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	
	12%	5	10%	5	21%	4	
Average	Cell "d"		Cell "e"		Cell "f"		48
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	
	38	16	45	22	53	10	
High	Cell "g"		Cell "h"		Cell "i"		48
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	
	50	21	45	22	26	5	
Total	100%	42	100%	49	100%	19	110

TABLE 13. -- Male combined Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index categories:
Popularity

Perceived Popularity	Independent/ Independent		Independent/ Dependent		Dependent/ Dependent		Total Cell Frequency
Low	Cell "a"		Cell "b"		Cell "c"		21
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	
	16%	11	14%	7	20%	3	
Average	Cell "d"		Cell "e"		Cell "f"		53
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	
	37	25	50	25	20	3	
High	Cell "g"		Cell "h"		Cell "i"		59
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	
	46	31	37	19	60	9	
Total	100%	67	100%	51	100%	15	133

TABLE 14. -- Combined Behavioral and Emotional Dependency Index categories: Number of Close Friends

Greater than the Median Reported Number of Friends	Independent/ Independent		Independent/ Dependent		Dependent/ Dependent	
	Cell "a"		Cell "b"		Cell "c"	
Males 5 or More Male Friends	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency
	50%	34	52%	26	73%	11
Males 3 or More Female Friends	Cell "d"		Cell "e"		Cell "f"	
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency
	29	20	45	23	47	7
Females 3 or More Male Friends	Cell "g"		Cell "h"		Cell "i"	
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency
	50	26	63	31	47	9
Females 5 or More Female Friends	Cell "j"		Cell "k"		Cell "l"	
	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency
	56	29	57	27	58	11

and cell "c" with cell "l," and cell "d" with cell "g" in Table 14.)

Relationships consistent with the earlier findings are not surprising since this is the same data.

CONCLUSIONS

In terms of the initial question posed by this inquiry, the data have to be interpreted as failing to support the idea that peer group attachments are a vehicle, or otherwise part of the process, of dissolving parental dependency during adolescence. The data indicate that gaining independence from parents, and attaching oneself to the peer group, are two independent processes.

On the basis of the findings, however, several kinds of possible relationships are suggested, even though none are "proved" to exist. Considering Behavioral Dependency on parents, the effects seem to be the same for male or female adolescents. Parental Independence is associated slightly more with the extremes of Popularity; Independent respondents outweigh Dependent respondents at both high and low Popularity categories.

For the variable "Number of Close Friends," in all cases, Parental Behavioral Dependence is associated with greater proportions of respondents being above the median Number of Friends. The Behavioral Dependents report above the median Number of Friends in larger proportions than the Behavioral Independents.

This might suggest that there may possibly be a "trait" of closeness to, or dependency on, others: Those who are close to, or dependent on, their families attach themselves somewhat closer to their peers; those who are more independent, or distant, from their families are less likely to attach themselves closely to their peers.

While it is found that some sample members indicate dependency on parents to the exclusion of close peer attachments, and other sample members indicate independency from parents and close attachment to peers, there are still others who report dependency on parents and close peer attachments, and others who indicate independency from parents and distance from peers as well. No consistent patterns of relationship are found that would lend support to the hypothesis that peer group attachment replaces, or facilitates, the withdrawal of dependency on parents.

But for Emotional Dependency the consistent pattern is not evident, rendering the trait hypothesis untenable. Emotional Dependency does not affect males and females identically, as is found with Behavioral Dependency. Emotional Dependency for males is associated with higher proportions reporting high Popularity (42% of Emotionally Independent males report high Popularity; 53% of Emotionally Dependent males report high Popularity). Emotional Dependency for females, however, is accompanied by a sharp drop in the proportion who report high Popularity (49% of Emotionally Independent

females report high Popularity; only 29% of Emotionally Dependent females report high Popularity). Emotional Dependency affects males differently than females.

This male-female difference is preserved when the indicator of peer group attachment shifts from Perceived Popularity to Number of Close Friends. Dependent males report above the median Number of Male and Female Friends in greater proportion than do Independent males, which is consistent with the trait of dependency hypothesis. But Dependent females report above the median Number of Male and Female Friends in smaller proportions than do Independent females. For males, Emotional Dependence on, or closeness to, parents is accompanied by closeness to peers. For females, Emotional Dependence on, or closeness to, parents is accompanied by greater distance from peers.

So this leaves the "trait" hypothesis of dependency, or closeness, as a possibility for males, but not for females. A possible explanation for this reaction from females might be that they are expected to define and execute their dependency, or intimacy, rather narrowly, as compared to males, who are relatively more free to participate in the world more fully and divergently. Females may be expected to confine their flow of attachment more selectively, especially in anticipation of the wife and mother homemaker role, in contrast to males who may spread out their

attachments more widely and include not just one sphere, as the family, but many spheres simultaneously. Whereas a woman's loyalty and devotion have integrity only if they are specifically and narrowly focused, no such restrictive clauses are attached to the integrity of a man's loyalty and devotion.

Thus we have women who are closely attached to their family or the peer group, but not to both; and men who are attached to both the family and the peer group (if they are disposed to dependency or close attachments) and those who are attached to neither family or peer groups (because they are not so disposed).

This investigation does not find much support for the notion that males are significantly more independent from parents than females are. There is only a very slight tendency for males to be more independent from parents, and this is true for Emotional and Behavioral aspects of Dependence and Independence. So either males really are not more independent than females, as popularly believed, or the operationalizations and measurements used in this research are not sufficiently sensitive to reflect the alleged difference.

What this research can claim is to have suggested that Behavioral and Emotional Dependence on parents affect adolescents in somewhat different fashions and, secondly, that males and

females are affected by Emotional Dependency somewhat differently.

Behavioral Dependency affects males and females identically.

Behavioral Dependency is associated with the extremes of Popularity, high and low, and is associated with reporting more than the median Number of Friends. Emotional Dependency affects males differently than females. For males, Emotional Dependency seems slightly associated with closer peer group attachments. For females, in contrast, Emotional Dependency seems to be associated with less close peer group attachments.

To express the reservation that this analysis is inconclusive is to exaggerate the case for doubting the need for a more definitive work. At best, this effort may provide the basis for a sharper focus for research attempting to probe into the nature of parental dependency and its dissolution during adolescence. As this question is considered, researched, and analyzed, light may be shed on the larger question of intra-group dependency and independency, and its relationship with inter-group mobility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, Norman, and Vogel, Ezra. The Family. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.
- Bell, Robert. Marriage and Family Interaction. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1967.
- Burgess, Ernest, and Locke, Harvey. The Family. New York: American Book Company, 1953.
- Cavan, Ruth. The American Family. New York: Thomas Y. Corwell Co., 1953.
- Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Douvan, Elizabeth, and Adelson, Joseph. The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and Its Discontents. New York: Norton & Co., Inc., 1962.
- Gottlieb, David, and Ramsey, Charles. The American Adolescent. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964.
- Groves, Ernest, and Groves, Gladys. The Contemporary American Family. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947.
- Komarovsky, Myra. "Functional Analysis of Sex Roles." American Sociological Review, 1950, pp. 508-516.
- Parsons, Talcott. "A Sociologist's View." Values and Ideals of American Youth. Edited by Eli Ginzberg. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

- _____, and Bales, Robert. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Reuter, Edward, and Runner, Jessie. The Family. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1931.
- Rosenberg, Morris. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Sherif, Carolyn. Reference Groups. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Winch, Robert F. "Courtship in College Women." American Journal of Sociology, November, 1949, pp. 269-278.
- Zelditch, Morris. Sociological Statistics. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1959.

MAY - 9 1969

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 10789 5306