THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF SELF-ESTEEM AND MANIFESTATIONS OF CONSCIENCE DEVELOPMENT IN FIFTH-GRADERS

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Judith A. Van Evra

1966

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
The Relationship Between Level of Self-Esteem and Manifestations of Conscience Development in Fifth-Graders

presented by

Judith A. Van Evra

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Psychology

Lucy R. Ferguson
Major professor

Date August 1, 1966

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF SELF-ESTEEM AND MANIFESTATIONS OF CONSCIENCE DEVELOPMENT IN FIFTH-GRADERS

By Judith A. Van Evra

This study investigated some aspects of superego development in latency-age children. Specifically, it explored the relationship of self-evaluation, evaluations by peers, and academic performance level to the degree of internalization of conscience shown in fantasy. That is, an attempt was made to discover what relationships exist between a child's approximation of his ego-ideal, i.e. his self-esteem, and the maturity of his conscience development.

The sample consisted of 116 Caucasian fifth-graders, drawn from a public school population, 60 of whom were girls, 56 boys. Each child completed a battery of paper-and-pencil tasks which included a true-false-type self-esteem inventory, a sociometric task, and a story completion task involving various deviation situations at home and at school. Achievement scores for each child on the Stanford Achievement Test were also obtained.

The data were analysed separately throughout for the two sexes. Correlations and partial correlations were performed on the data to investigate the relationships between all possible combinations of the four major variables (self-esteem, socio-

metric standing, achievement, and internalization of conscience). Some nonparametric comparisons were also made, and an item analysis was done on the scoring criteria for the story completion task. Split-half reliability was determined for the self-esteem inventory.

The major finding of this study was that of a very high relationship between self-esteem, as measured here, and sociometric standing for both sexes, even with the remaining two variables partialled out. Self-esteem and internalization of conscience were not clearly and directly related to each other in this study, but rather seemed to have a parallel relationship. Self-esteem was more highly related to social status and internalization was more highly associated with achievement. This was true for both sexes but was more pronounced for girls. However, although the findings did not confirm, to a significant degree, the hypothesis that self-esteem and internalization of conscience would be directly and positively related, they did suggest that those groups of subjects whose scores were not related in such a way tended to have less external validation for their level of self-esteem and may have been reacting defensively. Achievement was not directly related to self-esteem for boys, and only slightly for girls, except insofar as it was also associated with sociometric standing. The partial correlations between internalization scores and sociometric standing were also very low.

These findings were discussed as they relate to current theories and previous investigations of conscience development, and criticisms of this study as well as implications and suggestions for future research followed.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF SELF-ESTEEM AND MANIFESTATIONS OF CONSCIENCE DEVELOPMENT IN FIFTH-GRADERS

By

Judith A. Van Evra

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1966

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Prof. Lucy Rau Ferguson, committee chairman, without whose willing cooperation and unlimited help this study could not have been carried out; to Professors Charles Hanley and Bertram Karon whose statistical and design suggestions and help were invaluable, and to Prof. John Hurley.

This writer also is extremely grateful to Mr. Bernard Brown, Principal, Central Elementary School, Haslett, Michigan who was most cooperative in granting permission and obtaining subjects for this study, and to the staff and students who willingly participated.

Lastly, the writer is deeply grateful to her family for its unending support, encouragement and patience throughout this work.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Although Freud's original conceptualization of the superego included both conscience and ego-ideal aspects, it is the former that has received the most consideration by far, both theoretical and experimental. Or, to put it another way, the prohibitive aspects of superego have been emphasized at the expense of its function as a model or goal for the individual's behavior, particularly in the study of children.

Several writers, however, have opened the door for theorizing and experimentation in this area. Albert (1957), for example, saw moral anxiety as a function of the discrepancy between ego-ideal and actual self. Haberlin (1961) felt that inferiority feelings result from comparing oneself with one's self-ideal, not with others. Recognition of this discrepancy tends to result in guilt feelings, according to her, and, if they become chronic, in inferiority feelings, the major danger being that they result in resignation, less effort, and less adequate morality. Lipsitt (1958) found a tendency toward self-disparagement in self-concept scale responses of 300 fourth, fifth, and sixth graders, which was significantly related to their readiness to admit anxiety symptoms, and self-concept scores were negatively related to their CMAS responses. Self-disparagement was conceived of as a drive variable producing consonant behavioral effects. That is, a child's behavior which previously resulted in punishment may later elicit the verbal response and stimulus counterpart of the feeling that he has been "naughty" and thus mediates the same emotional response of pain, so self-disparagement was seen as an antecedent condition for anxiety.

Coopersmith (1959) delineated four types of self-esteem

in ordering the data on his fifth- and sixth-grade sample. Two groups consisted of relatively 'pure' or genuine high and low self-esteem groups, pure in the sense that the child's perception of himself was congruent with the external factors of peer status, achievement, and teacher ratings. Another group had low behavioral evaluations but a high self-concept; and the fourth group, despite high external regard and achievement, had a low self-concept. The former he termed defensive, and the latter he felt resulted from these children's subjective evaluation being made against unusually high and rather unrealistic absolute standards. Both of the latter groups refused to accept their actual status.

Sears and Sherman (1964) defined self-esteem as

> "...possession of a favorable opinion of the self, or a favorable self-concept. In the child, judgments about the self are made in relation to problems and tasks of development. The self-concept represents expected success in the child's endeavors to meet these problems and tasks. 'The' self-concept is complex, made up of many facets, with each facet differing in importance - or reward value - from the others. Expectancies have been learned for each facet, so that the individual can predict success or failure in connection with behavior that pertains to a given facet. These expectancies have been acquired and can be changed according to principles of learning. Various aspects of self-concept have properties similar to drive: to protect a good self-concept, one will strive hard (the energizing function) or will select those behaviors which preserve or enhance it. Self-esteem results when the child is able to predict success for important facets of experience" (Sears & Sherman, 1964, p. 10).

The areas or "facets" referred to were things most frequently mentioned by their subjects, mostly referring to school. Different areas had different reward value, depending on cultural values, idiosyncratic values of the children and their families, etc. Ability in various areas also plays a role as it gives a

natural advantage to the child, but how the child perceives his ability may be accurate or defensive. "One of the major hypotheses of our research is that anxiety over achievement in any valued area tends to reduce accuracy of self-perception" (p. 11). They also noted that the opinions of significant others are potential influences on the self-concept, and, conversely, someone with a strong self-concept may influence the ideas of significant others so that they perceive him as he perceives himself. The reported self-concept, or what the child is willing to tell, depends in part on the situation, and there is, according to them, a relationship between the reported self-concept and the child's actual achievement in that area. This suggests that some control for achievement should be introduced into these studies.

In explaining guilt and internalization, Hoffman (1964) maintained that the prototypic learning experience in early moral development is empathic awareness of another's distress and cognitive awareness of having caused it. In early years this awareness must result from having the consequences of one's behavior pointed out and this may be the function of other-directed socialization techniques. He further maintained that for the ego-ideal to underlie conscience, or to include morality, parents' moral attributes must be prominent enough to be part of the model the child sees. Later the ego-ideal can be tied to mastery strivings, and then moral action not only brings gratification with a fulfilled or approached ideal but the child also achieves mastery. The parent, according to Hoffman, strengthens the tie between moral action and ego-ideal by indicating clearly what is

expected of mature individuals and showing pride or disappointment in the child's behavior. Thus there is neither love-withdrawal nor overwhelming guilt but, in the context of an affectionate relationship, parents motivate the child to achieve this ideal. He can then act more in accord with the situation, less rigidly, in a more integrated and humanistic manner.

Hoffman used the intensity of guilt as an index of the degree of internalization. He defined guilt as a "conscious, self-initiated and self-critical reaction" (Hoffman, 1964, p. 11), and differentiated two types of guilt scores, in order to account for maximal guilt and terminal guilt after defenses had dissipated some of it. High self-esteem children showed moderate guilt, low self-esteem showed little, and middle self-esteem children showed high guilt which he interpreted as rigidity. These three levels of guilt he used to categorize persons into the humanistic type (other-directed, flexible), the conventional type (reliance on moral conventions and authorities, emphasis on impulse control, rigidity), and external (apprehension and fear of punishment) respectively.

The humanistic type, according to Hoffman, is more flexible, shows concern for others rather than for looking good, or being "right," and takes responsibility for his acts and judgment. It is the most mature type. Those with the conventional, rigid conscience have internalized rules, so to speak, rather than ways of dealing with moral problems, apply them generally, and in some situations may look the same as the first type. Some self-esteem is derived from the knowledge of having done "right," and having pleased their parents or other authorities,

regardless of circumstances, which is similar to Piaget's stage in which there is no consideration of intention. Consistent with this, Miller and Swanson (1960) found that with partial internalization the child conforms to avoid shame, but that with guilt, he does it to avoid self-disapproval and to retain his high self-esteem. Similarly, Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) noted that with a well-developed conscience, a child is bothered by self-blame as well as feared punishment. He applies his parents' disapproval to himself, and does not feel better until he does something to regain his own and his parents' esteem. Those with external orientations have not internalized in the usual sense and have the most immature conscience. There is only fear of discovery and punishment, rather than fear of lowered self-esteem as a deterrent. They, perhaps, are less satisfied with themselves and are therefore more fearful and anxious over what might happen to them from others <u>because</u> they have not met the expectations of others. It may be that one must first be satisfied with self, and only then can, in a non-defensive way, be more other-directed in his concern following a deviation.

There are also those who feel that manifestations of conscience and 'guilty' behavior are devices used to regain the love and approval of significant others on whom the child is dependent. The "internalized" category of Wright, Hill and Alpert (1961) seemed to indicate not so much intropunitive guilt with feelings of despair and worthlessness, as ways to restore a dependent and nurturant relationship with adults. It was in the nature of peacemaking, placating behavior and, hence, according to them, was more indicative of a strong ego than a strong superego.

They viewed resistance to temptation and reactions to deviations as internalized and learned controls, with fear of punishment preceding fear of loss of love in the learning process.

Hoffman found that parents of children with a humanistic orientation used moderate power assertion, gave reasons and showed disappointment, but these were more often directed toward the issue leading to the deviation rather than toward the aggression or deviation itself. Parents of children with a conventional (rigid) conscience, however, more often used love-withdrawal, ego-attack, and guilt-induction. He maintained that communication of disappointment when a child fails to meet parental standards of excellence (e.g. school) may arouse anxiety about parental love and one's own competence (not impulses) and may stimulate the child to greater effort, but does not contribute to excessive anxiety about impulses because they are not the central issue. It may arouse guilt for having hurt the parent, but it also communicates the parents' feeling that the child is capable of a higher level of performance. It is communication without implied depreciation or disesteem of the child, as compared with ego attack, and is a criticism of the child's performance, not of the child himself. This, according to Hoffman, strengthens the child's mastery and achievement strivings which further motivate inculcation of moral standards. A more discriminating disciplinary pattern allows for reparation so that the child sees that aggression need not damage relationships. Identification is also important in that the moral orientation of the same-sexed parent is an important supplement to overt practices in developing humanistic or conventional moral

orientations.

Sears et al. (1957), working with five and six year olds, considered that guilt and confession indicated the child's fear of loss of love and his effort to assure that love. Girls were reported to show stronger signs of conscience. Sears et al., (1965) studying pre-school children, found that boys of that age who portrayed parents as using isolation showed concern over possible loss of nurturance, and these fantasy responses were then predictive of actual attempts to restore a positive relationship with an adult. Girls with very high "guilt" were very dependent on adult approval. Avoidance of remorse and loss of self-esteem did not seem to be strong motives for resistance to temptation in these four year olds. They also found that boys with high ratings of conscience were likely to have warm, permissive mothers who tended to use praise as an incentive for good behavior and to avoid the use of ridicule, perhaps in an avoidance of anything which might damage the child's sense of self-esteem (1965, p. 226). One might note an analogy here between the two types of maternal attitude and the two aspects of superego; on the one hand is the positive, reward value of good behavior, and on the other, the negative, condemnatory, and shaming attitude toward behavior which the parent (later the superego) finds unsatisfactory or 'wrong' and punishes.

Perceived failure, then, on the part of the individual to measure up to his model, or his ego-ideal, can lead to a decrease in self-esteem, and subjective experiences of unpleasant affect, just as violations of one's conscience can lead to feelings of guilt and anxiety and feared loss of love. In both cases, the

individual has internalized parental standards and experiences self-disapproval and self-derogation for failure in regard to these standards. In other words, self-disapproval and low self-esteem represent internalization of or 'acceptance' of parental criticism. With very strict, authoritarian punishment, the child may feel that he is inadequate to control his own impulses and hence develops poor controls, as Bowlby (1958) suggests, or he may begin to relax his own controls and abrogate them to adults, knowing that they will not allow him to go too far. Similarly, later, he may also tend to rely on external controls. Children with a weaker motivation to fulfill an ideal, perhaps because of a weaker identification process, would likely feel less anxious when it is not fulfilled and less guilt when they deviate from the model, with, perhaps, a greater fear of punishment. Another possibility, suggested by Sears et al. (1965), is that control through anticipated guilt is less effective in resisting temptation if the child has learned effective means of reducing it once it's there. Or perhaps, for some, penance enables a person to transgress, in which case there would be an inverse relationship between guilt and control of impulse.

Many authors, however, from the early work of Hartshorne and May (1928) to the more recent work of Boehm and Nass (1962), have noted the importance of the specific situation. Hartshorne and May (1928), concentrating only on actual conduct in their Studies in Deceit, found that honesty seemed to be a collection of specialized acts, closely tied up with situations and not very dependent on a general trait. Motives, according to them, are very complex and also specialized. The distribution of cheating

scores approximated the normal curve, whereas if honesty were a unified trait, a child would be honest or dishonest in all situations, i.e. intercorrelations between test situations would be positive and high and the distribution would be U-shaped or bimodal. They concluded that character is not a sum of virtues, and virtues are not entities or acts but classifications of acts. Miller and Swanson (1960) found that their subjects were not consistent among the various areas tested, e.g. stealing, disobedience, etc., and concluded that a generalized conscience is very rare. Wright et al. (1961) also found that responsiveness and various conscience signs were not general across situations. They found, for example, that there were more responses in all categories to stories in a home setting. There was more confession at home where suspects are few, whereas in the relative anonymity of the school and where deviations were less obvious, there was more hiding and denial. With severe deviations there was more moralizing.

Similar relationships among guilt, feared loss of love, and lowered self-esteem have been postulated for disturbed as well as normal persons. Fenichel (1945) related the two aspects of super-ego in his idea that guilt accompanying a misdeed and the feeling of well-being accompanying a fulfilled ideal are models -- in normals -- for depression and mania. Sears et al. (1957) noted that guilt in neurotics may be an attempt to regain self-esteem via penance, and hence never reaches the mark. Finally, Cruickshank (1951) noted a relationship between guilt and loss of love in handicapped children. In response to questions concerning their self-concept, they showed strong fear of their

handicap, withdrawal, immature adjustment, and concern and fear over interpersonal relationships such as feeling guilty about their bad treatment of their family. They were very anxious to conform after deviation, possibly as a result of feared loss of love.

One might hypothesize, then, that if high self-esteem were never allowed to develop, "guilt" in the usual and more mature sense, would never develop either, as there would be little self-esteem to risk losing, and self-concern would be too pervasive to allow for real consideration of the consequences of one's acts for others. In such a case, then, anticipation of guilt could not serve as an effective deterrent to transgression or deviation. Resistance to temptation might well be weaker in the absence of authorities or imminent discovery, i.e., it would be more externally oriented, to use Aronfreed's (1961) term, and would depend on the probability of shame, ridicule, and discovery. Theoretically, such a child's level of resistance to temptation in the absence of an authority should be the same behaviorally as in fantasy. Practically, however, some apprehension about discovery would probably remain in any behavioral situation, which would tend to increase resistance. In fantasy, however, the same child with low self-esteem would be thrown exclusively on his own controls, which depend more on external factors than on feared lowered self-esteem; there he might be less resistant because of the little internal control to be used in a fantasy situation. On the other hand, in a child with high self-esteem, one might expect more consistency from fantasy to behavior because his control stems from within, from internalized standards, which when

violated, whether in fantasy or in behavior, would cause negative affect, self-disapproval, and lowered self-esteem.

It seems somewhat surprising that the concept of self-esteem, as it relates to conscience development and guilt, has not been investigated more rigorously, especially in view of the fact that its importance in normal individuals is generally accepted and its relative decrease in such psychopathological states as depression is generally appreciated. In fact, a decrease in self-esteem seems to be an integral feature of any psychopathological picture, albeit less clear in some than in others, just as high self-esteem seems to be characteristic of happy, well-functioning normal individuals. Furthermore, disturbances of conscience in excessive or insufficient or inappropriate guilt also seem to be integral features of pathological states and are not present in healthy individuals. It seems reasonable to conceptualize lowered self-esteem (relative to one's own general level) and guilt as very similar in that both refer to self-disapproval in falling short of superego standards -- either in conscience or ego-ideal aspects. Accordingly, one might refer to the subjective affect associated with this failure as "guilt," as a "fear of annihilation" (Fenichel, 1945), as "guilty apprehensiveness" (Unger, 1962), or as decreased self-esteem.

Given the importance of the self-esteem aspect of superego then, it seems logical to ask which attitudes of the child and which perceptions of himself, his parents, his peers, and others are indicative of high self-esteem or self-regard, and which ones indicative of low self-esteem, and how these attitudes and perceptions relate to manifestations of conscience in him, as

well as to his achievement and peer status. More specifically, if one studies this variable of self-esteem as it occurs during childhood, one may be able to discern more readily which processes, feelings, and attitudes are involved in its development, how it is related to other areas of a child's life, and what relationship it has with the development of conscience. One might also be able to shed light, then, on some of the contradictory findings in the literature on the relationship between resistance to temptation and evidences of guilt following deviations.

It was the purpose of this study, then, to investigate the self-esteem aspect of superego development in latency-age children as it is related to the conscience aspect, including on the one hand the child's verbalized feelings about himself, his peers' feelings about him, and his adademic performance level, and, on the other, the degree of internalization of conscience he showed in fantasy. That is, an attempt was made to find out what kinds of relationships exist between a child's approximation of his ego ideal, i.e. his self-esteem, and the maturity of his conscience development. It was also hoped that the role of interaction of such external, more objective variables as sociometric status and achievement in this relationship might become somewhat clarified. To this end, the following hypotheses were stated: (a) Children with high self-esteem (high satisfaction with self)* will show more internally-oriented reactions or

*Satisfaction in this study was assumed to mean a relatively well-fulfilled ego ideal. Low self-esteem or satisfaction was assumed to mean a poorly fulfilled ego ideal. Middle class children were used in this sample, so it was assumed that the items from Sears and Sherman would likely represent the ego ideal presented to them by their environment and accepted by most of them.

internalized "guilt" to fantasy deviation situations than will low self-esteem children; (b) Children with low self-esteem will show more externally-oriented reactions (e.g. fear of punishment, discovery, etc.) to fantasy deviation situations than will high self-esteem children; (c) Significant effects of peer status and achievement scores on level of self-esteem and internalization will appear; and (d) Children whose self-concept is not consistent with external reality factors (peer and achievement scores) will also be inconsistent in the types of conscience orientations they exhibit.

METHOD

Sample. Five fifth-grade classes were originally tested, yielding a total of 139 protocols.* From this original pool, subjects who had received no achievement score, who had any sort of reading, emotional, or behavioral problem, or who had completed an insufficient amount of the tasks were omitted. The final sample consisted of 60 girls and 56 boys, all white, drawn from a public school population. The two schools sampled are located in a small town bordering on a larger metropolitan area, and although children from all socioeconomic levels attend, the majority of them are from middle-class families.

Procedure. The tasks were group-administered to each class separately, and were introduced to the subjects as part of a research project at Michigan State for which their help

*Fifth-grade children were chosen because of the finding of Boehm and Nass (1962) of markedly less mature responses from children under nine years of age, i.e. nine was a rather marked dividing line.

would be appreciated. They were told that it had nothing to do with their school, that no one at the school nor their parents would see their papers, and that their names would not be used. In all cases, the classroom teacher left the room during the administration.

The booklet containing the self-esteem inventory, the sociometric task, and the story completion items was given to them, in that order, at the start, but they were directed to do only the part assigned at a given time, not to proceed on their own. When at least half of the class was finished with one part, the next part was explained and they were all told to work on the latter and then to finish previous parts if they had time left. Ninety minutes were allowed for the entire task, and in all but a very few cases this was sufficient. The children were free to ask the examiner questions if certain items or directions were unclear, but in no case was conversation among themselves permitted.

Measures. (a) Self-esteem. The self-satisfaction inventory used by Sears and Sherman (1964) was modified somewhat for this study. Ten general areas were covered in their inventory with ten items under each area. For this study, three areas were combined (school subjects, work habits, and mental ability) as many items in these three areas were very similar and weighted the original inventory heavily on academic items. Several conscience items were added, and the items in the area of social relationships with parents were newly devised as those in the original one referred primarily to grooming and appearance. The eight areas finally included were physical ability, mental ability,

social relations with the same sex, with the opposite sex, and with the teacher, social virtues, happy qualities, and family relationships. The order of the items was such that one from each area appeared, then another from each area and so on, so that items from all areas were cycled throughout the inventory. The format was changed to true-false with both positively and negatively phrased items to avoid a response bias as much as possible. Reliabilities for the original inventory were so high as to not be significantly lowered by these changes. A split-half reliability test for total score done on a sample of 50 subjects in this study yielded a correlation of .73. Subjects' responses to new items introduced by this writer were also compared with their responses to the original items which were used here. This comparison yielded a product-moment correlation of .70. Comparing boys and girls separately on the old versus the new sets of items yielded correlations of .82 and .71 respectively. There were 80 items in the final inventory, as contrasted with 100 in the original one, and a child's score was simply the number of responses that were answered in the direction of satisfaction with self. This assumed that the items represented the ego ideal presented to most of the children by their environment, so that items answered positively were congruent with that ideal. An attempt was made in two classes to include an "unimportant" or "irrelevant" choice for each item, but this seemed to confuse most of the subjects, and their responses were ambiguous. It was therefore omitted from the procedure for the rest of the classes. A copy of this inventory is given in Appendix A.

(b) Sociometric rating. In order to find out a subject's

general reputation among his classmates, and thus provide some external validation for a child's professed self-esteem, a sociometric rating task on the order of Hartshorne and May's (1928) "Guess Who Test" was devised. The subjects were given a class list and were asked to choose from among their classmates those whom they considered to be best and poorest in the eight areas covered by the self-esteem inventory. They were also asked to name the three persons in the class of either sex whom they would most like to have as friends, and the two boys and two girls in their class whom they would least like to have as friends. The latter procedure of specifying two of each sex for least-preferred classmates was included to avoid exclusively same-sex choices for favored classmates and opposite-sex choices for least-preferred, the usual pattern found for this age group (e.g. Tuddenham, 1952).

The number of times each child was chosen as best or poorest was tallied across all eight areas and across choices for most and least preferred friends. In each class, those chosen most frequently as best and poorest by same-sex subjects, by opposite-sex subjects, and by the total group were given point scores from plus three to minus three, depending on how many and of which sex had chosen them that frequently. Subjects who received relatively fewer votes, i.e. were not consistently and frequently chosen as best or poorest, received a score of 0. The final score represented the total number of points obtained from all choices, in both the "best" and "poorest" areas and in the most and least preferred friends choices. A copy of the format for this sociometric task is included in Appendix B.

(c) Reaction to deviation. A story completion task was used for this conscience measure. The stories used by Wright, Hill and Alpert (1961) were used because of the rather extensive pilot work done to select them for their appropriate level of severity of deviation and appropriate language for this age group. The eight stories which they had selected from an original pool of 25 were used here. Four dealt with deviations in a home setting, and four with deviations in a school setting. The deviations included aggression, stealing, breaking a rule, and destruction of property. The stem for each story was presented to the subjects, and they were asked to complete them by telling what happened next, what the people in the story were thinking and feeling, and how it turned out. They were reminded that no one else would see their papers, that it was not a test, and that there were no right or wrong answers, and that they could complete the stories in any way they liked. A copy of this task is included in Appendix C.

The stories were then scored by the types of responses given, categorized according to a rating sheet which combined scoring features from the Hoffman and from the Wright et al. studies, drawing mostly on the latter. These scoring criteria covered changes the child made in the stem or in the point of the story, if and how a deviation was discovered by authorities, responses of the deviant child, responses of adult authorities and of other children, and miscellaneous categories, after the grouping of responses of Wright et al. Within each of these groupings, there were criteria indicative of an externalized orientation and those indicative of an internalized orientation. Each subject got a

point for each criterion he met for each story. A copy of the original criteria used and their categorization is given in Appendix D.

Because some of the criteria did not apply at all and some were used very often, and because some of the criteria seemed to cluster with the opposite orientation from that expected, an item analysis was done. First, four extreme groups were selected (the 27% highest and lowest on internalization and the 27% highest and lowest on externalization), and the percentage of subjects in each of these groups using each of the criteria was established. Then, based on these percentages, estimated correlations of each criterion with the total score were obtained from a book of tables (Chung-teh Fan, 1952). (Therefore, criteria used most frequently by the whole group were not necessarily those correlating most highly with the total score.) The correlations were somewhat inflated because the criterion being correlated with the total was also part of the total. Introducing the appropriate correction* indicated that original (inflated) correlations below .26 could not be used. Therefore, only those criteria with correlations of more than .26 with the total score, or an internal consistency figure of .80 or more,* were used in the final score. This is very close to the very stringent levels set by Thorndike et al. (1927) who maintained that items with a correlation of less than .30 should not be used.

The final criteria did differ somewhat for boys and girls.

*The writer wishes to thank Dr. Bertram Karon for his statistical help with this item analysis and his derivation of the correction for the inflated correlations.

Those retained and their correlations with the total are shown in Table 1. From this table it is clear that more of the original internalization criteria are consistent, and hold for both boys and girls. After the item analysis was completed, each subject's score was revised, according to the newly established criteria. Thus each child's score included the per cent of his responses categorized under each orientation and the per cent that fit neither category clearly. The per cent of 'external' responses was then subtracted from the per cent of 'internal' responses for a final internalization score. Thus, verbal fluency did not affect a child's score directly as the partial scores were in terms of per cent of his total number of responses.

Two raters besides the writer scored random samples of 12 stories each, independently and blindly, with no knowledge of the sex, self-esteem score, sociometric score, or achievement score of the subjects whose stories they were scoring. Inter-rater agreement with the writer was .911 for a rater relatively unfamiliar with the area and .908 for one familiar with the area. Thus it was felt that the criteria used were relatively reliable and consistent and lent themselves to similar interpretation by several persons.

(d) Achievement. The schools had on file a score on the Stanford Achievement Test for most of the students, and all five teachers stated that these scores were generally representative of each child's overall academic functioning. These scores, obtained for each subject and used as the achievement measure, covered a wide range of academic functioning and were used to provide further external validation for a child's professed

Table 1. Criteria used for internalization and externalization with internal consistency figures of .80 or more and their respective correlations with the total score

Externalization			
Boys		Girls	
Criterion	Correlation	Criterion	Correlation
Authorities find out in other ways	.36	Authorities find out in other ways	.56
Authorities generally punish	.73	Authorities generally punish	.51
Reprimands, scolding, shaming	.34	Reprimands, scolding, shaming	.38
Loses friends	.45	Loses friends	.45
Physical punishment	.45	Less serious to avoid punishment	.27
Authority fixes or forces child to	.40	Fears rejection, punishment	.56
Others blamed too	.53	Pride in getting away with it	.40
		Revenge	.57
		Deprivation of privileges	.62
		Others forced to help, are punished	.52

Table 1 (con't.)

Internalization			
Boys		Girls	
Criterion	Correlation	Criterion	Correlation
Spontaneous confession	.74	Spontaneous confession	.44
Fixing	.68	Fixing	.68
Apologizes	.65	Apologizes	.56
Shows regret, remorse	.66	Shows regret, remorse	.56
Authorities not emphasized or forgive	.66	Authorities not emphasized or forgive	.40
Reward for doing right	.63	Reward for doing right	.40
Optimistic outcome	.45	Optimistic outcome	.32
Become friends	.45	Become friends	.44
Others help clean up	.59	Others help clean up	.47
Less serious, adults understand	.45	Considers others	.32
Denied privileges	.63	Self-reprimands, castigations	.52
Considers self unreliable, cheat, etc.	.27	Verbal punishment	.45
Learned lesson	.45	If authority fixes, benign	.38

self-esteem. Children for whom scores were not available were not included in the sample.

Statistical analysis. In order to ascertain the degree of association between levels of self-esteem and degrees of internalization in response to a fantasy deviation situation, product moment correlations were used to analyse most of the data. This seemed an appropriate statistic as the data appeared to be approximately normally distributed, N was large, and the data represented continuous variables. First and second order partial correlations were also done in order to find the relationships among all of the possible combinations of variables with the effects of one or both of the other two held constant. Data for boys and girls were analysed separately throughout.

Some nonparametric statistical analyses were also done on parts of the data to investigate other relationships which might exist, such as comparing subjects above and below the median on several variables, comparing high and low self-esteem groups and high and low internalization groups, and comparing high and low achievement groups with both self-esteem groups and both internalization groups, where parametric statistics would have been inappropriate. They were also used to compare differences in response to various types of situations and deviations.

RESULTS

The data were analysed separately throughout for the two sexes. Of their total scorable responses, girls gave 53.5% internalization responses and 46.5% externalization. Comparable figures for boys were 50.8% and 49.2%. Previous to the item

analysis, both sexes had an externalization per cent higher than internalization, with boys having the highest. This change after the item analysis seemed to further indicate the extent to which internalization held up as compared with externalization. After the analysis, many of the external responses were dropped, and therefore the relative per cent of externalization responses in the final score also dropped.

As in Tuddenham's (1952) study, there was greater variability in boys' scores and, as he found, boys and girls got their sociometric scores, particularly "best friend" scores, primarily from same-sex individuals. Also consistent with Tuddenham was the finding here of considerable agreement among classmates in identifying children at the extremes in the various areas, and disagreement centered primarily around children in a more median position in the group.

Girls were somewhat more verbal generally, contributing 59% of all scorable responses, boys only 41% (Girls constituted 52% of the sample, boys 48%). The criteria most frequently applicable to the responses of boys and girls are given in Table 2. If one studies the internally consistent criteria for boys and girls, one of the major differences between them that emerges is the greater emphasis by girls on verbal responsiveness, an internalization item, both in the form of verbal punishment by others and verbal self-punishment such as self-reprimands and castigations, whereas physical punishment, an externalization item, is more highly emphasized by boys. Also, for girls, deprivation of privilege emerged as an externalization criterion, whereas for boys, it correlated more highly with internalization. For both sexes, losing

friends and winning them back and their inclusion in the punishment or in the fixing process were important themes, i.e. the child's relationships with his peers frequently was a significant factor in his reaction to deviation.

For all of the variables other than sociometric, boys' scores covered a wider range and hence had a greater standard deviation. The ranges, means, and standard deviations for each variable for both sexes are shown in Table 3.

In order to test the major hypothesis that internalization and self-esteem would be positively related, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the 15 female subjects with the highest internalization score on self-esteem. This yielded a U of 69, significant at the .05 level of significance. That is, girls who demonstrated high internalization were also high on self-esteem as compared with those low on internalization. However, the corresponding U for boys was 87 and was not significant. Similarly, a X^2 analysis comparing only extreme groups, but with the grouping done on the basis of self-esteem scores rather than internalization scores, revealed a significant positive relationship between self-esteem and internalization for girls (X^2=4.48, P=>.05). For boys, however, this relationship did not approach statistical significance (X^2 = .83). None of the t-tests comparing self-esteem means of high and low internalization groups and comparing internalization means for high and low self-esteem groups was significant for either sex.

All of the correlations and partial correlations for girls and boys are shown in Tables 4 and 5 respectively. In each cluster of four correlations, the top one is the simple correlation

Table 2. The five most frequently used externalization and internalization criteria for boys and girls

Externalization	
Boys	Girls
Fears rejection and punishment	Fears rejection and punishment *
Authorities find out in other ways *	Authorities find out in other ways *
Authorities generally punish *	Authorities generally punish *
Authorities fix or force child to *	Authorities fix or force child to
No longer trusted by others, seen as unreliable, a cheat, etc.	No longer trusted by others, seen as unreliable, a cheat, etc.

* Found to be internally consistent in the item analysis

Table 2 (con't.) The five most frequently used externalization and internalization criteria for boys and girls

Internalization	
Boys	Girls
Shows regret, remorse *	Fixing *
Fixing *	Shows regret, remorse *
Optimistic outcome *	Authorities not emphasized or forgive *
Authorities not emphasized or forgive *	Considers consequences for others, how they feel, etc. *
Emphasis on denied privilege, isolation, verbal punishment * +	Emphasis on denied privilege, isolation, verbal punishment * +

* Found to be internally consistent in the item analysis

+ Of these three types of discipline, only denied privileges was internally consistent for boys and only verbal punishment for girls

Table 3. The ranges, means, and standard deviations for each variable for both boys and girls (N for girls is 60, for boys it is 56)

Variable	Range	Mean	SD
Self-esteem			
Boys	33-78	59.5	9.55
Girls	39-78	60.05	8.92
Internalization			
Boys	+ 90 to - 74	.37	40.04
Girls	+ 87 to - 50	4.12	35.25
Achievement			
Boys	19.5 - 99.0	70.9	21.28
Girls	35.7 - 98.1	72.74	17.31
Sociometric			
Boys	1 - 7	3.73	1.57
Girls	1 - 7	3.72	1.2

Table 4 Correlations and partial correlations among all variables for girls

Variable	Internalization	Achievement	Sociometric
Self-esteem	.294 *	.412 **	.644 **
	(Soc.) .146 (Ach.) .161	(Soc.) .228 (Int) .338 **	(Ach.) .551 ** (Int) .602 **
	(both) .094	(both) .199	(both) .54 **
Internalization		.387 **	.360 **
		(Soc.) .256 * (SE) .309 *	(SE) .236 (Ach) .207
		(both) .34 **	(both) .146
Achievement			.500 **
			(SE) .343 ** (Int) .421 **
			(both) .293 **

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

For boys, with all other variables partialled out, only one remained significant: self-esteem and sociometric status ($>$.01), although the other two significant comparisons for girls approached significance for the boys.

Table 5 Correlations and partial correlations among all variables for boys

Variable	Internalization	Achievement	Sociometric
Self-esteem	.19	.135	.383 **
	(Soc) .19 (Ach) .167	(Soc) .036 (Int) .138	(Ach) .362 ** (Int) .389 **
	(both) .121	(both) -.008	(both) .398 **
Internalization		.228	.03
		(Soc) .232 (SE) .21	(SE) .044 (Ach) .032
		(both) .206	(both) .006
Achievement			.27 *
			(SE) .239 (Int) .207
			(both) .235

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

between the two variables that intersect there, and the bottom one is the correlation between those two variables when the other two are partialled out. The other correlations represent the relationship between the two variables when the labeled one is partialled out. Thus, for example, in the first cluster for girls, .294 is the gross correlation between self-esteem and internalization, and .094 is the correlation between them when both sociometric and achievement scores are partialled out. With only the sociometric score partialled out, the correlation between self-esteem and internalization is .146, and it is .161 when only achievement is partialled out.

For girls, with all other variables partialled out, only three correlations remain significant: self-esteem and sociometric status ($>.01$); internalization and achievement ($>.01$); and achievement and sociometric ($>.05$).

From these correlations, it appears that, for both boys and girls, self-esteem and internalization are not clearly and directly related to each other, but rather seem to have a parallel sort of relationship. Self-esteem is more highly associated with sociometric status, and internalization is more highly associated with achievement. This is the case for both sexes, but is more pronounced for girls. For both sexes the high positive relationship between self-esteem and sociometric score is affected very little by the partialling out of either achievement or internalization scores. In other words, sociometric status is highly related to self-esteem, regardless of achievement level. On the other hand, self-esteem and achievement appear to have little direct relationship for boys; and for girls they are related

significantly only if the sociometric measure is included.

It was also possible to divide the entire sample for either sex into four almost equal groups based on their self-esteem and internalization or guilt z-scores, "high" indicating a positive z-score, "low" indicating a negative z-score. These four groups are those with high self-esteem and high guilt, high self-esteem and low guilt, low self-esteem and high guilt, and low self-esteem and low guilt. For girls, these groups contained 17, 13, 12, and 18 subjects respectively; for boys, they contained 16, 11, 13, and 16 subjects respectively.

In comparing the high self-esteem (SE)-low guilt (G) group of girls with the low SE - low G group, the latter group has significantly more scores below the mean in both the sociometric and achievement areas. The high SE - high G and low SE - high G differ significantly only on the sociometric score, where the latter group has significantly more scores below the mean. And, as would certainly be expected, the low SE - low G group has significantly more scores below the mean on both achievement and sociometric tasks than the high SE - high G group.

For boys, however, of the twelve possible comparisons, only two significant group differences appear, both on the sociometric measure. The high SE - low G group has significantly more sociometric scores above the mean than both the low SE - high G and the low SE - low G groups. None of the other comparisons is significant.

If one goes a step beyond these rather gross comparisons, however, and studies more closely the achievement and sociometric z-scores of the four groups, some interesting differences appear.

The means of the z-scores for both of these variables for the four groups are shown in Table 6. Looking first at the figures for girls, it appears that within the total group of girls with high self-esteem, those with high guilt have higher achievement and sociometric scores than those with low guilt. For boys, the trend is generally in the same direction, although the differences between groups are less pronounced, and one is in a different direction. The latter is the mean sociometric z-score of the high SE - low G group, which is higher than that for the high SE - high G group rather than lower.

DISCUSSION

From the correlations of Tables 4 and 5, it appears that for girls, social status is the most significant variable, and judging from the direction as well as the magnitude of the correlations, it appears that social status tends to be higher with high achievement and thus inflates the relationship between self-esteem and achievement. For boys, despite a significant relationship between social ratings and self-esteem and a near significant relationship between achievement and sociometric score, the relationship between self-esteem and achievement does not approach significance. Indeed, with sociometric and internalization scores held constant, there is almost a zero correlation between them. This suggests that high achievement may contribute somewhat to a boy's social standing and in that way indirectly increase his self-esteem. This is similar to the situation for girls, except in their case there is a slightly higher direct relationship between self-esteem and achievement.

Table 6 Mean z-scores for the four self-esteem and internalization groups of both sexes

Group	Girls		Boys	
	Ach.	Soc.	Ach.	Soc.
High SE - high G	.627	.798	.368	.386
High SE - low G	.005	-.088	-.012	.580
Low SE - high G	-.002	-.370	-.109	-.319
Low SE - low G	-.593	-.556	-.272	-.531

For girls, the self-esteem - sociometric and internalization - achievement correlations remain significant when either or both of the other variables are partialled out. The only other correlation that also remains significant is the one between achievement and sociometric status. This suggests that there is a significant relationship between self-esteem and internalization only if the bridge, so to speak, between achievement and sociometric status is present. If either of these latter two are partialled out, the relationship collapses as is indicated in the first block of Table 4. A trend in the same direction exists for boys but is not significant. For boys, the self-esteem - sociometric correlation is the only one that remains significant when both of the other variables are held constant. Thus, for boys as for girls, social status seems to be the major variable related to self-esteem in an important way, directly, and precedes achievement. Indeed, high achievement seems to be related only indirectly to high self-esteem, via its tendency to be associated with increased social ratings. Thus, the popular or intuitive idea of a compensatory sort of situation, whereby an unpopular child whose achievement is at a high level derives satisfaction and self-esteem from the latter, does not seem true here, especially for boys, although the converse holds true. That is, self-esteem and sociometric status are highly related regardless of achievement. For girls, achievement appears to be an additional variable in, or perhaps source of, self-esteem but to a much lesser extent than sociometric rating.

It is also possible, of course, that what is measured here in the self-esteem inventory is not what is usually thought

of as self-esteem, i.e. the degree to which one's self-ideal is approached or fulfilled. Characteristics which would increase one's self-esteem on this scale might also well be things tending to make one popular, and hence would increase the correlation between the two.

The division of the sample into four groups, based on z-scores, and the comparison of all possible combinations of group scores merely serves to confirm the findings from the correlations. These comparisons indicate clearly the important relationship between social status and self-esteem for both boys and girls. For girls, however, there is the additional finding of a significant relationship between achievement and self-esteem when comparing the two low guilt groups and the two extreme groups (high SE - high G with low SE - low G). The two significant comparisons for boys are those between high SE - low G and low SE with high G and the two low G groups, both on the sociometric measure. The most extreme boys' groups, high SE - high G and low SE - low G, do not differ significantly on achievement or sociometric status as the extreme girls' groups do. This suggests that the important thing in a significant difference on the sociometric measure, for boys, is that one or the other, SE or G, is high. If both are high, they do not differ significantly on achievement or sociometric status. As achievement and internalization tend to be associated also, those who have high achievement but low sociometric status might well show low self-esteem and high guilt, whereas those who have high social status might well also be those with lower achievement and internalization but high self-esteem. Again, as with the correlations, achievement is not

significantly different between any combination of groups of boys, whereas there is at least some relationship between achievement and self-esteem among girls.

If one goes beyond these rather gross comparisons, however, and studies more closely the achievement and sociometric mean z-scores of the four groups, as shown in Table 6, other interesting differences appear. The finding, within the total group of girls with high self-esteem, of higher achievement and sociometric scores among those with high guilt than among those with low guilt suggests that the components or characteristics of self-esteem in these two subgroups may differ. For girls with high guilt, i.e. those who support the original hypothesis, there is more external evidence for high self-esteem. Those who fail to support that hypothesis, i.e. have high self-esteem but low guilt scores, also show a relative lack of external validation for their high self-esteem, which may indicate defensively high self-esteem, inaccurate perception, low ideal goals or altogether different ideal goals. Conversely, among the low-esteem girls, those who have low guilt, and thus lend support to the second hypothesis, have relatively poorer achievement and sociometric scores than their high guilt counterparts. The latter subgroup thus has less external validation for their low self-esteem, and may also be using this lowered self-esteem (or the higher guilt) in some defensive way. Also, within the low SE - High G group, the sociometric scores are lower relative to the achievement scores, which suggests that the high guilt score may represent an attempt to gain better social acceptance, may represent feelings of rejection, and/or may indicate self-blame and self-accusations in

poor social relationships.

For boys, the trend is generally in the same direction, although the differences between groups are less pronounced and one is in a different direction. For that group, the mean sociometric z-score of the high SE - low G group is higher than that for the high SE - high G group rather than lower. This tends to give some external validation to their high self-esteem and, in conjunction with the low guilt score, suggests that perhaps a more external orientation is seen as desirable, perhaps fun and exciting, by a boy and his peers in this age group.

This study does suggest that perhaps self-esteem is more dependent, in both boys and girls, on external factors such as sociometric standing than is sometimes assumed. Or perhaps one should say that high social rankings, i.e. popularity, seems to play a significant role in the self-ideal of many children and a gap between that ideal and actual social standing has considerable influence in lowering self-esteem. * Although low self-esteem in some cases might be due to internalization of very high and unrealistic absolute standards, as Coopersmith (1959) suggested, the mean z-scores of these groups in Table 6 do not indicate that their achievement or social standings are high relative to even the mean.

* As this is a correlational study, however, one might interpret the findings just as logically in the other direction, i. e. children who have high self-esteem tend to be more popular. Although at times causal sequences may be implied or suggested, the writer has intended them to go no further and no pretense is made of actually deriving or deducing causal direction from these data. Hopefully, such suggestive statements might later be followed by experimental work such that causal statements could be made.

The division of the sample into four self-esteem groups is similar to and supportive of Coopersmith's (1959), and lends itself, to some extent, to a similar conceptualization of the makeup of the groups, such as defensive use of unrealistically high or low self-esteem. However, Coopersmith also found a significant positive relationship between success experiences and self-esteem. This was only partly true in this study. High achievement did not seem to be independently and significantly related to high self-esteem. Rather, success in the area of social relationships was an important variable in self-esteem and only insofar as high achievement was also related to social standing did it relate to high self-esteem.

The findings in this study also appear to be compatible with Hoffman's (1961) differentiation of two types of "internalized" guilt. One type, as was mentioned previously, was the humanistic type. Persons of this type, according to Hoffman, were more attuned to the consequences of their acts for others and were more other-oriented. They accepted blame and responsibility for their acts, gave more personal responses, and were quicker to relinquish conventional standards when there was a conflict of needs. One might expect, as was discussed earlier, that one must first be satisfied with one's self, i.e. have relatively high self-esteem, before he can direct his concerns outward. Such a person would also, presumably, be more popular because he was more other-directed, and hence would fit the picture of the high SE - high G group of Table 6. On the other hand, Hoffman's conventional type was more rigid and repressive, and directed more energy inward for control of impulses. They tended to deny

and blame others, used power assertion, etc. One might expect that such an "inner-directed" rigid person would be less popular, though also manifesting signs of high guilt and would fit the picture of the low SE - high G group of Table 6. And the two low guilt (i.e. low internalization) groups would be compatible with Hoffman's "external" group.

The findings of this study are also congruent with and supportive of those of Wright et al. (1961) in many respects. In the first place, there were relatively few major sex differences. Where differences did exist, they were primarily differences in magnitude rather than representative of diversified trends. Secondly, girls more frequently included verbal punishment, boys, physical. Wright et al. found a decrease in the use of physical punishment and punishment by shaming and an increase in verbal punishment with age. These age differences are the same as the sex differences of this study, and suggest that girls of this age tend to be more mature in this area of development as well as in others that have been reported.

The differences between the sexes in conscience development which Freud (1932) postulated do not receive support here insofar as the material here is relevant to his hypotheses. He maintained that while the Oedipal complex in boys is terminated by a fear of castration and replaced by a severe superego, for girls it is a "preliminary solution" to which they cling indefinitely. "In these circumstances the formation of the superego must suffer; it cannot attain the strength and independence which give it its cultural significance" (p. 129). According to this, Freud seemed to be saying that boys should be expected to have

strong, independent superegos, whereas girls' superegos will be weaker, and more conditional or dependent on other factors. While the strength and independence of the superego was not directly investigated here, it is noteworthy that neither the internalization scores themselves nor their positions relative to other variables differed significantly between the sexes. Indeed, the extremely wide range of internalization scores within each sex group rather eclipsed the differences in scores between the groups. It would be interesting to speculate, in connection with this, whether perhaps what Freud meant by "severe superego," and "weaker" superego would not perhaps roughly correspond to Hoffman's conventional and humanistic, more flexible types respectively. In any case, the differences between boys and girls were not such as to suggest that one sex was of one type, the other one of the other type, at least not at this point in their development.

As measured here, then, there is little support for the idea that the two major aspects of superego, self-esteem and conscience development, are but two sides of a coin. Indeed, there is little direct relationship between them. Rather, they appear to be related in a parallel fashion to achievement and sociometric variables. However, in a study such as this, there are several possible sources of error which make definitive statements about the results inappropriate and unwise.

For one thing, a major assumption made in this study was that the items in the self-esteem inventory constituted a representative sampling of characteristics likely to have been internalized by fifth-graders as part of their ego ideal. This

assumption was probably not inappropriate for a large majority of these middle-class children, and most of the items used were from the Sears and Sherman scale which was based on the statements of many children concerning what they would like to be. However, the number of children for whom these items were relevant to their ideal is unknown and introduces an unknown degree of error into the results.

Secondly, not the least of the difficulties in a study such as this is the heavy reliance on self-report and fantasy, both of which are influenced by myriad factors. The logical sequel to this study would be one in which these same measures are used with the addition of a behavioral phase which was not possible in this study. In that way one could not only compare the various groups in actual behavior but could also investigate the consistency of conscience manifestations within groups from fantasy to behavior, and thus increase predictive accuracy.

Thirdly, not only would a behavioral phase as mentioned above be desirable, but there should also be further validation and refinement of the measures of self-esteem and internalization themselves. For example, in view of the problem of the relevance of the items to the self-ideals of all of the subjects, a Q-sort technique might prove to be an appropriate and useful tool in this type of study. In that way, one could more directly assess the discrepancy between the ego-ideal and perceived self for any given child. One might then predict, following the hypotheses of this study, that there would be an inverse relationship between the size of the discrepancy and the degree of internalization of conscience.

Finally, regardless of how one might interpret the results of this study, the fact remains that this is a strictly correlational study and allows for no statements concerning causality. Such statements must await more rigorous experimental work.

Thus, although this study is not without serious limitations, it can, it seems to the writer, be of both theoretical and practical benefit.

Theoretically, it raises the question of the actual relationship between the two aspects of superego. If self-esteem and internalization--or conscience--are not, in fact, two sides of one coin (the superego), or if they are not directly related in some way, how does one then justify incorporating them both into the singular concept of superego? If they are more directly related in some way not apparent here, what constitutes the basis for that relationship? Finally, are different processes involved in the development of these two aspects of "superego"? And, if so, in what way are they similar and in what way do they differ?

In a more practical vein, this study suggests the potential benefit that might be derived from a comparison of normal and disturbed children on the measures used here and on the suggested behavioral measures. One might ask how the latter's scores would compare with those of normals. Could they be grouped in a similar way as normals or would they tend to be concentrated in one or two of the other groups? Would there be greater sex differences among disturbed children? Would self-esteem and internalization appear to be more closely related in the disturbed? And would they be more or less consistent from

fantasy to behavior than normals? It would seem that the findings from such studies might well have therapeutic implications in, for instance, indicating what influences might be exerted to increase a child's self-esteem, to lessen rigidly high guilt, or to increase pathologically low guilt, etc. Such research might also suggest how parents and teachers might be educated in methods of handling and disciplining children which would not be destructive to their self-esteem, and which would be conducive to healthy conscience development.

SUMMARY

The findings of this study indicate that self-esteem and internalization seem to have a parallel rather than direct relationship to each other. Self-esteem and sociometric ratings are highly positively correlated, and internalization tends to be more highly associated with achievement. Trends in this direction were true of both boys and girls but were more pronounced for girls. Also, there was a low positive relationship between achievement and self-esteem for girls. It seems that for both sexes, sociometric status is the most important variable in self-esteem, as it was measured here, with achievement related to self-esteem only insofar as it is associated with social standing. Achievement, on the other hand, is more highly associated with the conscience measure. There was a low correlation between internalization and sociometric status for both sexes, suggesting that manifestations of conscience, at least as they are verbally expressed in a fantasy task, have little to do with one's popularity.

The findings of this study and their implications were discussed as they relate to some of the literature; and limitations of this study as well as suggestions for further research were discussed.

REFERENCES

Albert, R. S. Comment upon three dimensions of self-attitude and anxiety. J. gen. Psychol., 1957, 56, 13-20.

Aronfreed, J. M. The nature, variety, and social patterning of moral responses to transgression. J. abn. soc. Psychol., 1961, 63, 223-240.

Boehm, Leonore, & Nass, M. L. Social class differences in conscience development. Child Develpm., 1962, 33, 565-574.

Bowlby, J. Psycho-analysis and child care. In J. D. Sutherland (Ed.), Psycho-analysis and contemporary thought. London: Hogarth Press, 1958, ch. 2.

Chung-teh Fan. Item analysis table. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1952.

Coopersmith, S. A method for determining types of self-esteem. J. abn. soc. Psychol., 1959, 59, 87-94.

Cruickshank, W. M. The relation of physical disability to fear and guilt feelings. Child Develpm., 1951, 22, 291-298.

Fenichel, O. The psychoanlaytic theory of neurosis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1945.

Freud, S. Femininity. In New introductory lectures on psycho-analysis and other works. Vol. 22 (1932-1936). London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-analysis, 1964, ch. 33 (pp. 112-135).

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric methods. New York and London: McGraw Hill, 1936.

Haberlin, Annemarie. Miderwertigkeitsgefuhle. Diss. Abstr., 1961, 35, 3502. (Abstract)

Hartshorne, H. & May, M. A. Studies in deceit. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1928.

Hoffman, M. & Saltzstein, H. D. Techniques and processes in moral development. Unpublished manuscript. N.I.M.H. research project, 1961.

Lipsitt, L. P. A self-concept scale for children and its relationship to the children's form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale. Child Develpm., 1958, 29, 463-472.

Miller, D. R. & Swanson, G. E. Inner conflict and defense. N. Y. Henry Holt, 1960

Sears, Pauline S., & Sherman, Vivian S. In pursuit of self-esteem. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1964

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, Eleanor, & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Ill., White Plains, N. Y.: Row, Peterson & Co., 1957.

Sears, R. R., Rau, Lucy & Alpert, R. Identification & Child Rearing, Stanford University Press, 1965

Thorndike, E. L., Bregman, E. O., Cobb, M. V., & Woodyard, Ella. The measurement of intelligence. N. Y.: Columbia Univ., 1927.

Tuddenham, R. D. Studies in reputation: I. Sex and grade differences in school children's evaluations of their peers. Psych. Monographs, 1952, 66, no. 1, 1-39.

Unger, S. M. Antecedents of personality differences in guilt responsivity. Psychol. Rep., 1962, 10, 357-358.

Wright, J. C., Hill, J. P., & Alpert, R. The development and expression of conscience in fantasy by school children. Unpub. paper read at biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Devel., Penn. State, 1961.

APPENDIX A

Self-Esteem Inventory

	Items	Scoring	
		TRUE	FALSE
1.	I enjoy outdoor games after school.	+	-
2.	I feel that I am an important member of my family.	+	-
3.	I don't get along well with boys.	-	+
4.	I get along well with teachers.	+	-
5.	I am sensitive to what other people are feeling.	+	-
6.	I am not very comical or humorous.	-	+
7.	I don't get along well with girls.	-	+
8.	I am not a very good student.	-	+
9.	I am a good size and build for my age.	+	-
10.	I am usually reasonable with members of my family.	+	-
11.	I control my temper with boys.	+	-
12.	I control my temper with teachers.	+	-
13.	I am willing to help others.	+	-
14.	I don't feel very confident, I am more timid or shy.	-	+
15.	I control my temper with girls.	+	-
16.	I am not very smart.	-	+
17.	I am not very good at things that require physical skill.	-	+
18.	I don't keep my room cleaned up at home.	-	+
19.	I don't make friends very easily with boys.	-	+
20.	I am able to take orders without resenting it.	+	-

Appendix A (con't.)

		TRUE	FALSE
21.	I am courteous, have good manners.	+	-
22.	I don't get a lot of fun out of life.	-	+
23.	I make friends easily with girls.	+	-
24.	I don't have many new, original ideas.	-	+
25.	I do outdoor activities - hiking, riding, swimming.	+	-
26.	I don't have much fun with my parents.	-	+
27.	I am not a leader - the one to get things started, with boys.	-	+
28.	I pay attention to teachers, don't close my ears to them.	+	-
29.	I'm not very willing for others to have their way sometimes.	-	+
30.	I don't expect everything I do to be perfect.	+	-
31.	I'm not a leader - the one to get things started, with girls.	-	+
32.	I study hard, don't waste time.	+	-
33.	I'm attractive, good-looking.	+	-
34.	I am not able to go to my parents for advice.	-	+
35.	I have plenty of friends, among the boys.	+	-
36.	I am not able to talk to teachers easily.	-	+
37.	I make other people feel at ease.	+	-
38.	I don't have lots of pep and energy.	-	+
39.	I have plenty of friends, among the girls.	+	-
40.	I go ahead with school work on my own.	+	-
41.	I never cheat in order to win.	+	-
42.	I feel happy and satisfied at home.	+	-

Appendix A (con't.)

		TRUE	FALSE
43.	I'm not very active in social affairs, with boys.	-	+
44.	I don't feel very comfortable with teachers.	-	+
45.	I have trouble getting others in class to like me.	-	+
46.	I enjoy myself in school.	+	-
47.	I'm active in social affairs, with girls.	+	-
48.	I get good grades in school.	+	-
49.	I don't take advantage of smaller children	+	-
50.	I don't obey my parents.	-	+
51.	I'm not very popular, with boys.	-	+
52.	I don't feel that my teachers have confidence in me.	-	+
53.	I like others in class.	+	-
54.	I'm not able to change things when they don't suit me.	-	+
55.	I'm not popular, with girls.	-	+
56.	I usually stick to things, not giving up easily.	+	-
57.	I'm healthy and strong.	+	-
58.	I feel that my parents have confidence in me.	+	-
59.	I have fun with boys in the class.	+	-
60.	I don't have fun at school with teachers usually.	-	+
61.	I'm easy to get along with.	+	-
62.	I can't get along without worrying too much.	-	+
63.	I don't have much fun with girls in the class.	-	+
64.	I sometimes don't do my own work, I sometimes borrow from others.	-	+

Appendix A (con't.)

		TRUE	FALSE
65.	I don't win very often.	-	+
66.	I don't feel very comfortable with my parents.	-	+
67.	I'm cooperative, with boys.	+	-
68.	I'm not very cooperative, with teachers	-	+
69.	I'm usually fair.	+	-
70.	I like to live as I please.	+	-
71.	I'm cooperative, with girls.	+	-
72.	I make excuses for work which I haven't completed.	-	+
73.	I'm not very neat and clean in appearance.	-	+
74.	I'm honest with my parents.	+	-
75.	I don't understand boys' feelings.	-	+
76.	I don't understand teachers' feelings.	-	+
77.	I don't understand other people.	-	+
78.	I'm able to live my own life.	+	-
79.	I don't understand girls' feelings.	-	+
80.	I have trouble giving my own opinions when they differ from the majority.	-	+

APPENDIX B

Sociometric Measure

1. Ability in sports and athletic things

   Best _____

   Poorest _____

2. Gets along with boys

3. Is smart and does well in school

4. Gets along with teachers

5. Has lots of friends, seems to know just what to do at the right time when dealing with others

6. Gets along with girls

7. Seems happy most of the time

8. Gets along with parents, seems happy at home.

The three people in the class that I would <u>most</u> like to have as friends are

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

The two boys in the class that I would <u>least</u> like to have as friends are

1. _____

2. _____

The two girls in the class that I would least like to have as friends are

1. _____

2. _____

APPENDIX C

Story Completion Stems

1. (Aggression, home.) The mother tells this boy (girl) to take care of the baby while she goes to the store. The boy's mother leaves. The baby is sleeping, but after a while it wakes up and is hungry, so it starts to cry. The boy does not like to hear this crying, so he tells the baby to be quiet. But the baby keeps on crying. The boy gets mad and smacks the baby. After a long time the baby goes to sleep.

   What happens now?

   What are the people in the story thinking and feeling?

   How does it turn out?

2. (Aggression, school) This boy (girl) is on the playground playing tag with his friends at recess. The boy has a good time playing tag, but all at once someone bumps into him and knocks him down on the ground. The boy gets up and is very mad. He hits the friend who has knocked him down and the friend starts to cry.
3. (Breaking a rule, home) This boy (girl) is going outside the house to play with his friends. It has just finished raining, and the ground is all wet. When they all come in,

Appendix C (con't.)

his friends wipe their feet, but he has had so much fun playing that he forgets to wipe off his feet, and his muddy shoes leave big tracks on the carpet.

4. (Breaking a rule, school) This boy (girl) gets excused from class to go to the lavatory. On the way to the lavatory he finds a crayon on the floor. When he is in the lavatory by himself, he takes the crayon and scribbles all over the lavatory wall.
5. (Stealing, home) This boy (girl) is in the living room with his mother. The phone rings. His mother leaves her purse on the table while she goes to answer the telephone. The boy sees a lot of money in his monther's purse. He knows that if he asks, the mother will give him some for his bank, but the mother isn't there, so he takes a quarter to buy comic books.
6. (Stealing, school) The teacher tells the class it's time for recess. While they are outside this boy (girl) comes into the empty room to get his coat. He walks by the teacher's desk and sees a big box of paintbrushes on the desk. He is all alone, and he takes one of the teacher's paintbrushes and puts it in his own desk.
7. (Destruction of property, home) This boy (girl) is looking at a book that he has taken down from the bookcase at home. The boy gets very interested in the book and turns the pages so fast that he makes a tear in one page.
8. (Destruction of property, school) The teacher has told the

Appendix C (con't.)

class that they can paint pictures now. The teacher leaves the room for a while. This boy (girl) is painting a picture that he thinks is very good. He really likes the picture, so he turns around to show it to his friend. But he is so excited that he knocks the paint off the table and the paint ruins the friend's poster.

APPENDIX D

Original Scoring Criteria

Externalization	Internalization
DISTORTIONS OF STEM	
1. Makes deviation less serious to avoid punishment - or denies or rationalizes deviation - or stays angry	1. Makes deviation more serious 2. Makes deviation less serious because adults understand
WAYS AUTHORITIES FIND OUT OR FAIL TO FIND OUT WHO IS RESPONSIBLE	
2. Forced or elicited confession 3. Find out in other ways (tattling by others, guessing, observation) 4. Denies responsibility or blame	3. Spontaneous confession 4. Whether authorities find out is relatively unimportant to the child 5. Accepts responsibility or blame
RESPONSES OF DEVIANT CHILD	
5. Hides self or evidence or lies 6. Makes excuses to appear less blameworthy 7. Fears rejection and/or punishment by others. Is anticipatory. (Feels scared, uneasy, funny, et. People get angry, get into fights, talk about him) 8. Any signs of regret, remorse, etc. seem more a function of being caught and/or punished (he's scared and sorry, hurts when punished, etc.) 9. Feels some pride in getting away with it or doing it (feels good, happy)	6. Fixing (restoring, undoing, compensating) 7. Apologizes 8. Considers others (consequences for them, their feelings, etc.) 9. Shows regret, remorse, etc. (Feels bad, cries, looks sad) 10. Disappointed in self 11. Considers <u>self</u> unreliable, bad, etc.

Appendix D (con't.)

Externalization	Internalization
RESPONSES OF ADULT AUTHORITIES OR OTHER CHILDREN	
10. Authorities generally punish (actually gets punished, gets into trouble, etc.)	12. Authorities generally not emphasized or they forgive, i.e. they are more benign
11. Reprimands, scolding, shaming (goes to principal, scolded, etc.)	13. Self-reprimands, self-castigation
12. Emphasis on physical punishment	14. Emphasis on denied privileges, isolation, and/or verbal punishment
13. Authority fixes or forces child to (forced apology, has to clean up, etc.)	15. If authority fixes, he's benign, does so at request of child
14. No longer trusted, others see him as unreliable, bad, etc.	16. Reward for doing right (feels better, gets money for being honest, etc.)
MISCELLANEOUS CATEGORIES	
1. Never gets caught (even though he may be suspected)	1. Caught but not punished
2. Punishment ends episode	2. Longer or later suffering or punishment by guilt, God, fate, or impersonal agent
3. No evidence of having learned from this (e.g. others prevent him from doing it again such as forbidding him to babysit again)	3. Learned lesson, won't repeat
4. Concentration on immediate problem in a concrete way	4. Dwells on moral, instructive value of episode
5. Pessimistic outlook	5. Optimistic outcome
6. Loses friends - or carries grudge	6. Become friends
7. Others are blamed too	7. Others help clean up at request of child or spontaneously or are sorry too
8. Others forced to help clean up or are punished in some way, e.g. sent home	