CHILDREN'S FANTASY PLAY AS RELATED TO PARENTS' AND
CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTAL CAREGIVING BEHAVIORS
AND CHILDREN'S PSYCHO-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

By

Yanon Volcani

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1980

ABSTRACT

CHILDREN'S FANTASY PLAY AS RELATED TO PARENTS' AND CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTAL CAREGIVING BEHAVIORS AND CHILDREN'S PSYCHO-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

By

Yanon Volcani

The current investigation explored the relationship between children's fantasy play, parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors, the children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors, and the children's psycho-social adjustment. Ten Caucasian, latency aged (7-9 year old), "normal" boys, living in upper-middle class two-parent families, participated in the study. Fantasy play was elicited using the Lowenfeld World View Technique (Lowenfeld, 1939)--an instrument consisting of a small sandbox and numerous objects (i.e. miniature people, animals, buildings, vehicles) with which the child constructs a "World."

Each child made 3 Worlds over a one week period which were videotaped and later coded by 3 sets of raters using a scoring system developed by the current experimenter. Measures were made to assess dimensions of fantasy play that best discriminated high and low psycho-social functioning in children, these being: (1) Aggression (subcategories: Devouring, Direct Physical, Distance Physical, Accident, Verbal, Social, Deprivation, Abandonment); (2)

Benevolence (subcategories: Physical, Verbal, Helping,   .
Affiliative Acts, Satisfying Experiences); (3) Adequacy
(Positive and Negative); (4) Assertion (Reactive and
Iniated); (5) Construction; (6) Dominance; (7) Submission;
(8) Dependence; (9) Propensity for Imaginative Play.

Parents' perceptions of their caregiving attitudes
and practices were assessed using 2 self-report inventories,
independently completed by each parent. Children's percep-
tions of their parents' caregiving behaviors were assessed
using an orally administered inventory, while their psycho-
social adjustment was measured by parents' and teachers'
ratings of the children's functioning on several inventories.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients
yielded several interesting relationships between the de-
pendent and independent measures. For example, there was
a positive relationship between fathers' composite score of
engaging in theoretically effective caregiving behaviors and
fantasized Benevolence, and a negative relationship between
mothers' Rejecting behaviors and Benevolence. Furthermore,
children's perception of their fathers as being rejecting
positively related to Dependency, while negatively related
to Propensity for Imaginative Play. There were no strong,
consistent relationships between children's fantasy play
and parent/teacher ratings of their psycho-social adjustment.
Examination of the relationship between parents' percep-
tions of their caregiving and their children's adjustment

generally
social fu
acceptance
autonomy.
haviors we
behaviors
adjustment

generally showed a positive association between high psycho-social functioning and caregiver behaviors characterized by acceptance, explicit limit setting, and the fostering of autonomy. Separate effects for paternal and maternal behaviors were found, with paternal as compared to maternal behaviors showing a stronger relationship to the children's adjustment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

computers and SPSS was magical, oh good fairy. Our friendship has been a harbour and a home.

Joel Aronoff, your uncompromising standards and insistence on excellence have been the buoys by which I have guided the quality of my work. Thank you.

Larry Messe, thank you for the 90.1-second phone consultations that saved hours of time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

METHOD .

      Sub
      San
      Pro

RESULTS .

      Anal
      Inde

Depen

vi

LIST OF TABLES

CHILDREN'S FANTASY PLAY AS RELATED TO PARENTS' AND
CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTAL CAREGIVING BEHAVIORS
AND CHILDREN'S PSYCHO-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

INTRODUCTION

> In the beginning . . . there was
> darkness and the earth was with-
> out form. And God said, 'Let
> there be light.' And there was
> light.

One of the few areas of confluence between the many
divergent theories of psycho-emotional development in chil-
dren is the assumption that the human infant first experi-
ences the universe as an undifferentiated, holistic mass of
conglomerated sensations with which s/he feels at one
(Freud, 1953; Fenichel, 1945; Guntrip, 1969; Jung, 1956;
Kernberg, 1976; Lewin, 1935; Mahler, 1975; Neuman, 1973;
Piaget, 1937; Sullivan, 1953; Werner, 1948). These theories
further agree that development out of this original sense of
"primordial oceanic omnipotence" (Fenichel, 1945), complete
"ego-centricism" (Piaget, 1962), or "uroboric unity" of at-
oneness-with-the-universe (Neuman, 1973), involves a slow
differentiation of self from world, wherein the attainment
of language plays a key role.

Recent discoveries in physiological psychology char-
acterize this transition in terms of the lateralization of

1

brain f

tactic,

typical

origina

of expe

Barna

the con

transfo

system.

objecti

does no

reasoni

1996; 1

after g

ceives

interna

what Sa

is the

percepti

hood ex

'cluste

images,

a holis

boundar

Bower,

brain hemispheres, with the child's newly developing syn- ·
tactic, lineal, rational mode of cognitive functioning
typically being localized in the left hemisphere, while the
original non-syntactic, spacial-aesthetic, irrational mode
of experiencing being delegated to the right hemisphere
(Harnad, 1977; Ornstein, 1974; Whitaker, 1976). Here lies
the contrast between analogic and analytic thought, the
transformation from the analog system to the digitial
system.

This progression towards lineal thinking, with its
objective, consensual nature, is a slow one. Thus the child
does not fully have the capacity for abstract, deductive
reasoning until after his/her first decade of life (Piaget,
1936; 1962). Before this time, and to varying degrees
after the acquistion of analytic thought, the child per-
ceives and formulates much of his/her experiencing of the
internal/external world along the subjective dimensions of
what Sample (1976) has called the "metaphoric mind." This
is the world of prelogical, prerational, preconsensual per-
ceptions, thoughts, and feelings, the quintessence of child-
hood experiencing. It is an ordering of the universe along
"clusters" of inextricably interwoven sensations, affects,
images, concepts, and memories, nonsequencially encoded in
a holistic, unified, all-at-once fashion, immuned to the
boundaries of time and linear logic (Lowenfeld, 1938; 1964;
Bowyer, 1970).

The language of this fusion of experiencing is the ·
child's fantasy play. It is the bridge between the meta-
phoric and analytic mind; it is the very switch that ini-
tially turned on the light of consciousness in the vast,
primordial darkness of unconscious experiencing. Thus any
adequate understanding of children's perceptions, thoughts,
feelings, struggles, concerns, and wonderings about their
internal/external worlds is inseparable from a thorough
understanding of their fantasy play.

Concomitantly, such an understanding of children's
fantasy play necessitates an exacting analysis of other
pertinent aspects of their life spaces. Most relevant here
would appear to be the child's psycho-social development,
reflected in his/her overt social behaviors, and the child's
experiencing of his/her parents--figures deemed by both
conventional and contemporary wisdom to be a crucial influ-
ence in the formation of the person. If this is indeed the
case, it would furthermore seem imperative to glean a fuller
understanding of the parents' own perceptions of their care-
giving behaviors and how these relate to the child's fantasy
play.

The current investigation thus explored the relation-
ship between children's perceptions of their parent's care-
giving behaviors, the parents' self perceptions of their
caregiving behaviors, the children's psycho-social function-
ing, and various related dimensions of their fantasy play.

In brief, this study examined five conceptually interrelating facets of the child's life space: (1) the parents' self-perceived caregiver behaviors and child's psycho-emotional development; (2) the child's perception of his parents' caregiving behaviors and his psycho-emotional development; (3) the parents' self-perceived caregiver behaviors and the child's fantasy play; (4) the child's perception of his parents' caregiver behaviors and his fantasy play; (5) the child's psycho-emotional development and his fantasy play.

Since a plethora of research--by no means conclusive --now exists on the relationship between child-rearing practices and children's psycho-social development (see Mussen, 1970), children's perceptions of their parents' behaviors and their psycho-social development (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Goldin, 1969; Michaels, et al., 1977; Serot and Teevan, 1961; Schaefer, 1965), and children's social behaviors and their fantasy play (see reviews by Levin and Wardwell, 1962; Singer and Singer, 1976), the focus of the present investigation was on children's perceptions of their parents' caregiver behaviors, the parents' self-perception of their caregiving behaviors, and the children's fantasy play. Indeed, it is here that an auspicious hiatus exists in the literature. Yet the effects of caregiver attitudes and practices upon children cannot be adequately understood without a thorough exploration of the very language children most naturally use

to communicate their experiencing of their worlds--their

fantasy play.

It was toward the bridging of this gap and further

exploring the tapestry of the child's inner world that the

present study was aimed.

Children's Psycho-social Adjustment

A pivotal construct in the present investigation is

what is referred to as children's "psycho-social adjustment."

This admittedly rather lofty phrase is intended to denote

the broad domain of behaviors indicative of the child's

ability to effectively, competently, and masterfully respond

to and act upon various aspects of the internal/external en-

vironment--what traditionally has been termed "positive

mental health." Clearly, the process of delineating such

behaviors is fraught with the biases of cultural, social,

and personal perceptions, values, and attitudes. Nonethe-

less, a number of psychological theorists have grappled with

this specter of cultural-personal subjectivism in attempting

to define trans-cultural criterias of healthy psychological

functioning (e.g., Allport, 1960; Besell and Palomares, 1970;

Jahoda, 1958; Lindemann, 1955; Maslow, 1962; Stollak, 1978;

White, 1959).

Stollak (1978), for example, conceptualizes positive

psychological functioning as involving the following areas:

(1) Positive "self-esteem," "self acceptance," and "self

regard,
ture va
of a la
skills
self-aw
dence,
the app
social
interpe
other's
such aw
cumulat
and scr
tion of
objects
various
dimensi
curately
interna

dren in
tories
children
relevan
Appendix

regard," which involves both accurate perception and positive valuing of one's experiencing; (2) the accumulation of a large repertoire of personal cognitive and emotional skills and capacities, characterized by such things as self-awareness and understanding, self-control, self-confidence, initiative, and an ability to reason and learn; (3) the accumulation of a large repertoire of interpersonal and social skills and capacities manifested by empathy and interpersonal awareness, understanding and acceptance of other's experiencing along with the ability to communicate such awareness, understanding, and acceptance; (4) the accumulation of skills involving mastery of body functions and somatic capacities and capabilities; (5) the accumulation of skills involving mastery of the environment and its objects. Thus "high psycho-social adjustment" refers to various degrees of competent functioning along these five dimensions. More globally it involves the ability to accurately perceive, evaluate, and effectively act upon the internal/external environment so as to maximize adaptation.

The degree of psycho-social adjustment of the children in the current investigation was determined by inventories filled out by the parents and teachers of the children, inventories which were intended to assess the relevant dimensions of psychological competence (see Appendix C).

Caregiver Behaviors and Children's
Psycho-social Adjustment

The human infant is born into the world with many constitutionally predisposed, idiosyncratic patterns of perceiving and responding to the environment. His/her unique ways of behaving strongly effect how others in turn behave towards him/her (Thomas, Chess, and Birch, 1968; Mahler, 1962). Thus dynamic, mutually influencing interactions between infant and caregiver occur from birth.

Jungian and Object Relations theories hypothesize that all facets of the early infant's environment are holistically experienced as "Mother." The warm sun on the infant's skin would be internalized as part of the intrapsychic constellation of the "good mother," while the experience of a wet, irritating diaper would be internalized as part of the "bad mother" constellation. Thus any number of situational factors, totally irrespective of the actual caregivers' behaviors, can effect the infant's experiencing of his/her caregivers (Guntrip, 1969; Jung, 1956; Kernberg, 1976; Mahler, 1976; Neuman, 1976). To quote Neuman, "A 'good' personal mother can become for her child a 'terrible' mother through the preponderance of negative transpersonal factors such as sickness or affliction" (Neuman, 1976, p. 73). In Piaget's (1962) terms, the primary, assimilated schemas that define the experience of "mother" are altered by factors that have nothing to do with the actual, personal mother.

Clearly the interactional effects between child and caregiver are immensely complex, with much of the variance in terms of the child's psycho-social adjustment being possibly attribted to factors having little directly to do with the parents' caregiving practices.

Yet it is just as apparent that caregiver behaviors do have a profound influence on children's psycho-emotional development. The literature is replete with studies attempting to discern the dimensions and directions of these effects (see Mussen, 1970). From the psychoanalytic perspective, parental behaviors would have a great influence on the severity of superego conflicts, whereby a stricter, more punitive approach would be internalized by the child as a harsher superego constellation, manifesting a more "global condemnation" of the self for its socially distonic impulses (Gould, 1972). For social learning theorists, parents play a key role as reinforcement agents and models for their children (Bandura, 1969; Dollard and Miller, 1950).

More important to the humanistic school of thought is the quality of the relationship between parent and child, whereby the parents, through behaviors that communicate empathy, genuineness, and unconditional positive regard for the child, create a psychologically safe environment that frees the child's motivation towards self-actualization (Axline, 1947; Maslow, 1962; Moustakas, 1959; Rogers, 1961; Stollak, 1978).

The present research alligned itself with the psycho-philosophy of this latter school of thought, and thus studies will here be reviewed from this orientation.

A consistent trend in the multifarious research on child rearing attitudes, caregiver behaviors, and child psycho-social adjustment is the finding that warm, accepting parental behaviors, coupled with firm, clearly deliniated and explicated limit setting are positively associated with children's behaviors indicative of high psycho-social competence (Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Becker, 1964; Coopersmith, 1967; Hoffman, 1963; Liberman, et al., 1971; Mussen, 1970).

Baumrind (1967) and Baumrind and Black (1970), in studying parental behaviors related to three empirically determined patterns of socio-emotional behaviors in pre-school children, found that children who were rated as being highly explorative, mature, self-reliant, and socially responsible (Pattern I), had parents who in structured interview and observed parent-child interactions were found to be more loving, understanding, demanding, and controlling ("authoritative") as compared to the parents of children who were rated as more withdrawn, distrustful, "dysphoric and disaffiliated" (Pattern II). Pattern II children had parents who were less affectionate and more punitive, detached, and controlling ("authoritarian") than Pattern I parents. The parents of the children who were rated as immature, lacking in self-control and self-reliance (Pattern III), were found

to be relatively warm though non-demanding and non-controlling, which Baumrind called "permissive." Stollak (1978) points out that these parents' behaviors are more accurately termed "submissive").

Similarly, Coopersmith (1967) found that junior high school children who showed high self esteem on subjective and behavioral indices, had mothers who were highly accepting of their children, clearly defined and enforced limits, while showing much flexibility within the prescribed limits.

Several studies by Hoffman (1963, 1970) are corrobrative here. Studying the child rearing behaviors of parents whose children were described as being highly considerate of others, Hoffman found that these children's parents were warm, explanatory when disciplining, and pointed out the consequences of the child's behavior. In a later study, Hoffman (1970) delineated three styles of parental discipline--those characterized by physical punishment and threat ("Power Assertion"), those characterized by non-physical direct expression of anger and disapproval by means such as shaming and criticizing ("Love Withdrawal"), and those involving explanation and reasoning ("Induction"). High moral development in children was positively related to "Induction" discipline, low moral development was positively associated to "Power Assertion" discipline, while "Love Withdrawal" did not clearly fit any pattern of moral behavior.

along tw

ny' an

found by

conseque

to be re

Children

nad pare

while cr

social

'permiss

sure-ho

alloplas

hostile

ness.

parent-

dren's

includi

tery, a

parenta

setting

sion an

1953

of mate

Parental discipline approaches that were divided along two orthogonal dimensions of "Warmth versus Hostility" and "Permissiveness versus Restrictiveness" were found by Becker (1964), in a comprehensive review of the consequences of different styles of parental discipline, to be related to psycho-social development in children. Children who displayed competent psycho-social adjustment had parents who were characterized as "permissive-warm," while children who displayed less effective, more dyssocial behaviors had parents who were characterized as "permissive-hostile" or "restrictive-hostile." "Permissive-hostile" discipline approaches were associated with alloplastic aggressiveness in children, while "restrictive-hostile" discipline was related to autoplastic destructiveness.

Liberman, Stollak, and Denner (1971), investigating parent-child interactions in a playroom, found that children's behaviors reflecting positive emotional adjustment-- including the child's awareness of self and others, mastery, and interpersonal skill--were positively related to parental behaviors in the playroom indicative of empathy, geniuneness, and non-possessive warmth.

In studying the child-rearing antecedents of aggression and dependency in preschool children, Sears, et al. (1953) found a clear positive association between severity of maternal punitiveness for aggression and dependency and

amount of overtly aggressive and dependent behaviors in

boys, while the relation for girls was curvlinear. The

authors speculated that girls identified more with their

mothers and thus experienced the punishment as more severe,

thereby inhibiting overt expression. They found that

severe punishment inhibited general activity level, in the

girls studied, however when this variable was partialled

out, there was a sharp rise in both aggression and depend-

ency in high punished girls.

Of still greater relevance to the present study are

the findings of research specifically investigating parent-

al self-perception of caregiving behaviors and children's

psycho-social adjustment. These studies consistently indi-

cate that parents' self-perceptions of their caregiving be-

haviors as being warm, loving, and accepting are positively

related to high psycho-social adjustment in their children

(Sears, et al., 1957; Yarrow, et al., 1968), while self-

perceptions of punitive caregiving practices were associated

with child maladjustment (Lefkowitz, Walder, and Eron, 1963;

Sears, et al., 1957).

The above studies consistently point to the conclu-

sion that parental behaviors characterized by warmth, accept-

ance, and clear delineation of limits positively influence

high psycho-social adjustment in children. Thus it was pre-

dicted that high self ratings on these dimensions of care-

giver behaviors by parents participating in the present

research

competen

teacher

As

ending of

parents'

experien

tation o

ure, bu

speculate

parents

the paren

to actual

perspecti

would be

nevolent

it is ch

of his he

parents'

Th

children'

Schaefer,

ceptions

of the ch

research would be positively related to high psycho-social·
competence in their children, as measured by parent and
teacher ratings.

Children's Perceptions of Caregiver Behaviors and Their Psycho-social Adjustment

As previously emphasized, much of children's experi-
encing of their parents might have little to do with their
parents' actual behaviors. Not only might transpersonal
experiences be incorporated into the internalized represen-
tation of the parent (Kernberg, 1976; Mahler, 1976; Neuman,
1976), but Freud (1924), Hartmann (1964), and others have
speculated that much of the child's perception of his/her
parents involves projections of his/her own feelings towards
the parents. Clearly these feelings have some relationship
to actual caregiver behaviors, though the psychoanalytic
perspective speculates that Oedipal fear and hostilities
would be projected onto the parents irrespective of how be-
nevolent they may actually be (Freud, 1926; Fenichel, 1945).
It is thus imperative to ascertain the child's perception
of his/her parents' caregiver behaviors, independent of the
parents' self-perceptions.

There is a growing body of research indicating that
children's perceptions of their parents (Goldin, 1969;
Schaefer, 1965; Serot and Teevan, 1961) and parents' per-
ceptions of their own caregiver behaviors and other aspects
of the child-parent relationship are related to child psyco-

emotiona

Michaels

Michaels

I

self-per

caregiv

children

Masse',

1971.

M

found sy

with chi

haviors

ishing"

their ch

perceive

to be cr

A

found th

"loving"

playroom

percepti

with ade

findings

as parti

Anderso

emotional adjustment (Fergusion, Partyka, and Lester, 1974;
Michaels, Messe', and Stollak, 1977; Stollak, Meese',
Michaels, and Ince, 1977).

Evidence of little correspondence between parents'
self-perceptions and children's perceptions of their parents'
caregiving behaviors, or parental inferences about their
children's perceptions has been consistently found (Michaels,
Messe', and Stollak, 1977; Serot and Teevan, 1961; Zuker,
1971).

Michaels, Messe', and Stollak (1977), for example,
found systematic differences in parent-child perceptions,
with children tending to view their parent's caregiving be-
haviors more positively (i.e. more "loving" and less "pun-
ishing") than the parents viewed themselves or expected
their children to view them. Parents, however, were also
perceived as more "demanding" than they perceived themselves
to be or expected their children to perceive them.

A second part of the Michaels, et al. (1977) study
found that children's perceptions of their parents as
"loving" was positively related to adaptive behaviors in a
playroom situation with a stranger. Unexpectedly, children's
perceptions of their parents as punitive was also correlated
with adaptive playroom behaviors, contradicting previous
findings, wherein children's perceptions of their parents
as punitive were positively associated with maladjustment
(Anderson, 1940; Schaefer, 1965). This was explained by the

authors a

dren in t

to deny

naviors

Fi

dren's pe

turing"

ture of

related

investig

i

and func

evident.

to assia

Gould, 1

1983; Wa

purpose

over the

Klinger

Schachte

tection

explora

psychoa

authors as perhaps being due to the use of "normal" chil- ·
dren in their study, these children having less inclination
to deny the existence of the relatively few punitive be-
haviors that their parents might actually exhibit.

From the above studies it was presumed that chil-
dren's perceptions of their parents as "warm" and "struc-
turing" (along with other dimensions theoretically indica-
tive of "effective" caregiver practices) would be positively
related to high psycho-social adjustment in the present
investigation.

The Nature and Function of Fantasy Play

In reviewing the myriad of theories on the nature
and function of fantasy play, two broad distinctions become
evident. Fantasy appears to serve as a _defensive_ strategy
to assuage fear and anxiety (Freud, 1936; Freud, 1953;
Gould, 1972; Kardos and Peto, 1956; Sandler and Nagera,
1963; Waelder, 1932), or it can possibly serve an _expansive_
purpose in furthering the child's mastery and competence
over the internal/external environment (Griffths, 1935;
Klinger, 1971; Lowenfeld, 1935; Murphy, 1956; Piaget, 1961;
Schachtel, 1959; Singer, 1973). The former aims at pro-
tection and restitution (Freud, 1936; 1965), the latter at
exploration and adaptation.

Fantasy as a defensive strategy is exemplified in the
psychoanalytic interpretation of fantasy play as being a

cathai

repres

with

ety an

Freud

Peto,

Fantas

tion o

tion a

the ch

The "r

enacti

an atte

child

of fan

concep

but its

through

in such

it rath

are th

to bett

applies

of fan

cathartic release and compromised fulfillment of primitive,
repressed, ego-distonic libidinal striving and impulses,
with the temporary suspension of ego alleviating the anxi-
ety and guilt normally associated with these strivings
(Freud, 1936; 1965; Freud, 1953; Gould, 1972; Kardos and
Peto, 1956; Sandler and Nagera, 1963; Waelder, 1932).
Fantasy here is theorized to allow expression and integra-
tion of anxiety arousing wishes and fears through exaggera-
tion and symbolic representation which buffer and distance
the child from the direct impact of what is being expressed.
The "repetition compulsion" (Freud, 1953)--a perpetual re-
enacting of a traumatic event under safe circumstances in
an attempt to gain mastery over a situation in which the
child previously felt helpless--is an exaggerated instance
of fantasy play serving defensive ends.

Fantasy as a means of expansion and adaptation is
conceptualized by Piaget (1961) who, while also pointing
out its wishfulfilling purpose, further speculates that
through fantasy play the child is able to assimilate reality
in such a manner so that the ego can effectively integrate
it rather than be overwhelmed by it. Pre-existing schemas
are thus both consolidated and altered in the fantasy play
to better accommodate reality.

Expanding on these formulations, Singer (1973; 1975)
applies Tomkins' (1962; 1963) theory of affects to a theory
of fantasy play, noting that imaginative play reduces the

novel;

others

result;

joy af

to ada

* Fanta

animati

ty, th

surpris

environ

own ins

memorie

and Si

inform

fantasy

* inter

quences

mental

curren

ancies

havior

combin

ated s

likely

adapti

enviro

novelty and complexity of new experiences which would

otherwise evoke feelings of anxiety and fear. Instead, the

resulting reduction of neural stimulation arouses interest-

joy affects, the child thus wanting and being better able

to adapt and master the new information. Singer summarizes,

"(Fantasy play) is a form of exploration, a controlled ex-

amination of novelty and gradual assimilation of that novel-

ty, that is accompanied by the altering affects of interest,

surprise, and joy. The exploration is not of the physical

environment but of a stimulus field created by the child's

own insufficiently assimilated experiences and fantasies or

memories of adult interactions and communications" (Singer

and Singer, 1976, p. 12).

Klinger (1971), borrowing from stimulus-response and

information processing theories, stresses that children's

fantasy activities orient around their "current concerns"--

"interrupted but nonabandoned instrumental response se-

quences." Fantasy play is thus a further attempt at instru-

mental adaptation as well as emotional integration.

Current concerns have associated with them affects, expect-

ancies, memories, and schemas of sequencial operant be-

haviors. The child, in his/her fantasy play, tries out new

combinations of these old schemas, grouped along the associ-

ated sequences of the current concerns. Elements are thus

likely to be fused together in novel ways, creating new,

adaptive, instrumental operations for the mastery of the

environment.

Griffths (1935), in an earlier formulation of the

adaptive, problem solving nature of fantasy play, concep-

tualized fantasy as serving to "undertake the resolution

of a problem perceived at the conscious level but which

cannot be straight away understood" (p. 356). Noting a

specific ordering of the "fantasy work," Griffths outlined

a three-fold process, involving (1) a statement of the

problem, often reiterated time and again; (2) a development

and embellishment of the problem by means of a series of

successive imagined experimental and provisional solutions;

(3) a formulation, by way of the child's increasing contact

with the world, of a more objective, adaptive, and socially

appropriate attitude and mode of responding. Thus fantasy

play leads to the acquisition of new information and a

change of attitude and perception, moving the child "from a

personal, subjective, and generally egocentric attitude,

towards a more socialized, objective, and realized

attitude" (p. 74).

To synthesize from what has been reviewed, fantasy

as a defensive mechanism is characterized by rigidity,

repetitiveness, inflexibility, an undoing or redoing of

past events, and an expulsivity in an urge to rid the self

of a feared reality (Freud, 1936; 1965). Indeed fear, anxi-

ety, and guilt are the dominant affects motivating the de-

fensive response. Fantasy as an expansive mode is

characte

ration o

in an ac

newly di

cterent

ated aff

Singer,

C

events g

organism

tion of

Rogers

sense of

timately

ships.

ing that

the sens

the infa

caregive

ceptance

thoughts

this sen

Gould (

munication

ings, an

characterized by flexibility, variety, a seeking and explo-
ration of novelty, and an embracement of the external world
in an attempt to assimilate and bring into the self some
newly discovered, exciting aspect of reality. Indeed ex-
citement, interest, and joy are the motivating and associ-
ated affects of this form of play (Singer, 1973; Singer and
Singer, 1976).

Clearly there are innumerable circumstances and
events that evoke terror, dread, and angst in the human
organism, necessitating temporary and long term mobiliza-
tion of defensive stratagems. However, Maslow (1962),
Rogers (1961), and others have argued that a fundamental
sense of "psychological safety" (Stollak, 1978) derives ul-
timately within the context of significant human relation-
ships. Stollak (1978) extends this viewpoint in emphasiz-
ing that it is the role of primary caregivers to maintain
the sense of psychological (as well as physical) safety in
the infant and child. Specifically, Stollak believes that
caregiver behaviors that communicate an unconditional ac-
ceptance and acknowledgment of the validity of the child's
thoughts, feelings, and experiencing function to maintain
this sense of psychological safety, self worth and what
Gould (1972) calls "entitlement." Furthermore, clear com-
munication to the child of the caregivers' thoughts, feel-
ings, and experiencing of the world, along with well defined

and fo

havior

for, a

world.

ent wi

ing to

child,

expans

ing an

behavi

serve

fensive

anxiety

To pars

associa

tion,"

necessi

ical co

S

N

Singer's

sive, "s

their fr

ticular

and fully explicated limits and guidelines as to the be- ·
haviors expected from the child, function to protect, model
for, and teach the child effective modes of being in the
world. The studies previously reviewed are highly consist-
ent with this line of reasoning.

Thus it is these parental caregiver behaviors, serv-
ing to maintain and foster the psychological safety of the
child, which help free him/her to use fantasy play as an
expansive strategy in the acquisition of modes of respond-
ing and adapting to the environment. Likewise, parental
behaviors that disturb the child's sense of safety only
serve to augment his/her need to use fantasy play as a de-
fensive mechanism in coping with the feelings of fear,
anxiety, helplessness, and loneliness that are thus aroused.
To paraphrase Klinger (1971), fantasy is not only a response
associated with the absence of "compelling external stimula-
tion," but mature, highly developed, expansive fantasy play
necessitates the absence of compelling <u>internal</u> psycholog-
ical conflict.

Caregiver Behaviors and Children's Fantasy Play

Relevant to the preceding line of deduction is
Singer's (1973) speculation that much of the highly aggres-
sive, "dark" side of children's fantasy play derives from
their frightening experiences with significant others, par-
ticularly parents who tease, threaten, and punish the child.

The child in these moments is overwhelmed with a sense of ·
psychological non-safety (Maslow, 1961; Stollak, 1978) and
uses the fantasy play to cope with the terror and angst
that is thereby evoked. These frightening experiences with
parents are the "material which the child then attempts to
assimilate in grossly exaggerated or distorted form into
his narrow range of schemata" (Singer, 1973, p. 232). Thus
it is through exaggeration and elaboration that children
desensitize themselves to their disturbing experiences with
caregivers, thereby attempting to regain a sense of mastery
and control.

Following these assumptions, one would speculate
that children who experience their parents as frightening
would display high amounts of exaggeratedly aggressive,
frightening fantasy play. Similarly, children who do not
experience their parents as frightening--and again, the
essence of the "effective" caregiver behaviors previously
discussed is that they presumably maintain and foster the
psychological safety of the child--would have a low inci-
dence of grossly elaborate fantasized aggression.

Sears (1951) and Sears, et al. (1953), indeed, found
a clear positive relationship between fantasy aggression in
doll play and severity of maternal punitiveness. These re-
sults were replicated by Hollenberg and Sperry (1951) who
studied the children who participated in the Sears, et al.
(1951) research a year later. Of particular interest was

the fi...

behavio...

verily...

doll pl...

punishe...

behavi...

situati...

of a le...

puniti...

frustra...

preted...

sare t...

of aggr...

ing res...

ness" ...

room e...

There ...

materna...

amount...

fantasy...

of the...

behavio...

(1972)...

haviors...

the finding that unlike overt, social display of aggressive behaviors, which showed a curvlinear relationship with severity of punishment for aggressive behavior in girls, the doll play aggression showed no such trend. Thus severly punished girls who inhibited overt expression of aggressive behaviors in the classroom did not do so in the doll play situation. The authors conceptualized the findings in terms of a learning theory paradigm, proposing that the mothers' punitive behaviors produced conflict-drive and increased frustration in their children. Punishment here was interpreted to evoke aggression in the children while at the same time increasing the tendency to inhibit the expression of aggressive behaviors for fear of further retaliation.

Similar results were found by Isch (1952) in comparing measures of "aggression," "rejection," and "directiveness" for mothers interacting with their children in a playroom environment, and the children's fantasy doll play. There was a significant, positive association between maternal aggression, rejection, and directiveness and the amount of such behaviors emitted by the mother doll in the fantasy play. Thus the fantasy play here was replicative of the actual behaviors of the mother.

In a more direct exploration of the effects of adult behaviors on children's fantasy play, Reif and Stollak (1972) found that "permissive" and "responsive" adult behaviors were positively related to mature, highly developed

imag

such

by c

ness

sive

asso

orga

than

resp

stud

dren

by th

Prote

ation

child

"reas

sions

while

acts.

than

"cons

sized

by tha

paren

by 'pe

imaginative play in children. Children who encountered ·
such adult behaviors engaged in fantasy play characterized
by cognitive and affective complexity, interpersonal aware-
ness, and "symbolic expression of conflict." "Non-permis-
sive," "non-responsive" adult behaviors were positively
associated with lower levels of fantasy play, e.g. dis-
organized motor behavior, greater use of inanimate rather
than animate objects in the play, and more stereotypic
responses.

Also relevant to the present investigation is a
study by Wowkanech (1977), who found that preschool chil-
dren rated as "competent/compliant" (Baumrind, 1967; 1973)
by their teachers predominantly identified with "Provider-
Protector" roles (Gould, 1972) in a modified Miniature Situ-
ations Test (Santostefano, 1962). Furthermore, these
children perceived symbolic parental figures as using
"reasoning" responses to deal with fantasized transgres-
sions in Deviation Doll Play (Sears, Rau, and Alpert, 1965),
while the children themselves apologized for the deviant
acts. In contrast, "Impulsive/Withdrawn" children predom-
inantly identified with "Aggressor" roles and displayed
"continued deviant aggression" in their responses to fanta-
sized transgressions. Wowkanech concludes, "It seems like-
ly that strong identification with at least one stable
parent figure, usually of the same sex, who is also general-
ly 'permissive, nurturent,' vs. 'cold, restrictive,' is

conduc

sion a

master

it is

the re

parent

petenc

cisely

served

pandin

ing th

behavi

social

fantasy

the pl

foreros

thought

is thus

for the

tive la

It is

flages

intuiti

or becs

conducive to the promotion of the child's fantasy expres- ·
sion as a means of achieving 'catharsis' and/or 'ego
mastery'" (p. 18).

The importance of this study lies in the fact that
it is the only one in the current literature that addresses
the relationship between children's perceptions of their
parents' disciplinary behaviors, their psycho-social com-
petency, and dimensions of their fantasy play. It was pre-
cisely the surprising paucity of research in this area that
served as a key impetus for the present investigation, ex-
panding on Wowkanech's contribution by additionally explor-
ing the parents' self-perceptions of their caregiver
behaviors in relation to the children's perceptions, psycho-
social adjustment, and fantasy play.

To reiterate, the importance of studying children's
fantasy play lies in the fact that whether the function of
the play is "expansive" or "defensive," it is first and
foremost communicative--expressing the child's perceptions,
thoughts, feelings, and experiencing of his/her world. It
is thus a "live, dynamic, individual language indispensable
for the expression of subjective feelings, for which collec-
tive language alone is inadequate" (Piaget, 1962, p. 167).
It is "exactly suited to the nature of what is signified"
(Piaget, 1962, p. 155), often being "an expression of an
intuitive idea that cannot yet be formulated in any other
or better way" (Campbell, 1971, p. 307). It can be an

expressi

unseen

thus a

standin

from, i

Newman,

standin

the chil

Techniqu

tasy pla

consists

miniatur

which th

structed

like in

(1917,

an appro

it gave

percepti

Stressin

that of

thinking

expression of the numinous, a "bridge thrown out towards an unseen shore" (Campbell, 1971, p. 311). Fantasy play is thus a metaphorical, analogic mode of communicating, understanding, problem solving, and knowing (Campbell, 1971; Fromm, 1955; French and Fromm, 1964; Lowenfeld, 1935; Neuman, 1954; Samples, 1976), indispensable for the understanding of the effect of parental caregiver behaviors on the child.

Measurement of Children's Fantasy Play

The current study used the Lowenfeld World View Technique (Lowenfeld, 1935; 1938; 1939) to explore the fantasy play of the children who participated. The technique consists of a small sandbox and numerous objects (i.e. miniature people, animals, houses, trees, cars, etc.) with which the child creates a "World." The child is simply instructed to use the objects to build whatever s/he would like in the sandbox.

Deriving the idea from H. G. Wells' Floor Games (1911), Lowenfeld was quick to deduce the advantage of such an approach to exploring the inner world of childhood, for it gave the child a nonverbal medium to express his/her perceptions, thoughts, feelings, and experiencing of reality. Stressing that much of childhood experiencing (as well as that of adults) is of an inextricably nonverbal, image-thinking nature, the technique proved highly efficacious in

tappl

of th

a col

gende

tatio

allow

cient

eleme

entir

feld,

turin

divers

produ

nique

and P

Murphy

constr

effect

(Bowye

1951);

(Bowye

develo

Van Wy

these

tapping this analogic, metaphoric domain. Lowenfeld speaks of the World Technique as being, "An apparatus which gives a child power to express his ideas and feelings . . . independent of knowledge of skill . . . capable of the representation of thought simultaneously in several places at once, allowing representation of movement and yet being sufficiently circumscribed to make a complete whole, combining elements of touch and sensation, as well as sight, and being entirely free from a necessary relation to reality" (Lowenfeld, 1938, p. 67). The nonorganization of external structuring is particularly conducive to the elicitation of rich, diverse fantasy play, while the concrete, three-dimensional product lends itself easily to objective scoring.

Further development and standardization of the technique have been attempted by numerous researchers (Bolgar and Fischer, 1947; Bowyer, 1956; Buhler and Kelly, 1941; Murphy, 1956; Van Wylick, 1935). This work has established construct validity for the instrument, e.g. the technique effectively discriminated normal from clinic populations (Bowyer, 1956; 1958; Buhler, 1951; Fischer, 1950; Lumbry, 1951); normal from institutionally retarded individuals (Bowyer, 1958; Buhler, 1951); and children at different developmental stages (Bowyer, 1956; Kamp and Kessler, 1967; Van Wylick, 1935). The dimensions that discriminated among these populations will be explicated below.

Relevant to the present investigation is a study by Ridley (1952) comparing the Worlds of 12 year old boys with teacher rating of their psycho-social adjustment. Worlds were scored solely on a structurally quantitative basis (i.e. number and kinds of objects used), and thus it is not surprising that no significant results were found. Indeed it would appear that the subleties and complexities of children's fantasy behaviors would be better reflected in measures that approached both the structural and content aspects of the Worlds using broad yet highly specified and detailed categories of analysis.

In a more sophisticated design, Buhler and Carrol (1951) compared the Worlds of 30 5th graders with teacher ratings of the children's "adjustment to the environment" and "inner balance." The children were also administered the California Test of Personality and the Brown Personality Test. Results showed a highly positive relationship between the amount of aggression in the Worlds and teacher ratings of low adjustment and "inner balance." Low psycho-social adjustment also positively correlated with "Empty," "Closed," "Rigid," and "Disorganized" Worlds. Interestingly, neither personality inventory correlated with teacher rating or Worlds; the authors speculating this as being due to the nature of the different measures--the personality inventories reflecting more social desirability and the children's attempts to "look good," the teacher ratings reflecting

more

ated

used

freq

1958

These

anim

socia

objec

refle

eithe

"Peno

of ob

.

tecti

seek

from

there

an at

"Disc

With

disso

press

tion,

"prin

insti

more immediate social behaviors, while the Worlds illumin-·
ated "deeper" aspects of the personality.

The six "symptoms" delineated by Buhler (1951) and
used in the preceding study have become the categories most
frequently used to evaluate children's Worlds (Bowyer, 1956;
1958; Buhler and Carrol, 1951; Lumbry, 1951; Ridley, 1952).
These are: (1) "Unpeopled Worlds" lacking any people or
animals, theoretically indicative of severe disturbances in
social relationships; (2) "Empty Worlds" of five or less
object categories or fewer than fifty total objects used,
reflecting an inability to use cognitive resources due to
either intellectual limitation or emotional blockage; (3)
"Fenced Worlds" where many areas are closed off by fences
or other objects, considered to signify "active self pro-
tection" by children who either fear their own impulses and
seek outside control, and/or wish separation and seclusion
from a world perceived as hostile; (4) "Rigid Worlds" where
there is an exaggeration of symmetry and order, suggesting
an attempt at impulse control by obsessional means; (5)
"Disorganized Worlds" with objects scattered chaotically
with no apparent interrelationship, interpreted to reflect
dissolutionment and breakdown of ego organization; (6) "Ag-
gressive Worlds" with themes of extreme violence and destruc-
tion, found in all groups of children though apt to be more
"primitive" (i.e. animals devouring people as opposed to
institutionalized forms of aggression such as war) in

clini

ever,

rathe

"abi

thro

gories

since

used

tation

might

peten

cepts

elabor

the fo

et al.

1983),

1983),

1983),

Prelim

and Pr

et al.,

Bowles

Werner,

Singer

1956; B

clinic referred children. Bowyer (1970) speculates, how- .
ever, that aggression may denote "emotional potential"
rather than hostility or fear of hostility, implying an
"ability to face dangers without repression, and to work
through them, play them out" (p. 90).

The present study incorporated Buhler's (1951) cate-
gories in the evaluation of the children's Worlds. However,
since these categories, like the vast majority of measures
used to assess fantasy play, emphasize pathological manifes-
tations in the play rather than attempting to measure what
might constitute the characteristics of highly mature, com-
petent fantasy, other criteria were developed. Thus con-
cepts initially formulated by other researchers were
elaborated and adapted by the present Experimenter to form
the following scales: Benevolence (Gould, 1972, Hartwell,
et al., 1953; Wowkanech, 1977), Adequacy (Hartwell, et al.,
1953), Assertion (Erikson, 1950; Pitcher and Prelinger,
1963), Construction (Erikson, 1950; Pitcher and Prelinger,
1963), Dominance (Hartwell, et al., 1953; Pitcher and
Prelinger, 1963), Submission (Hartwell, et al., 1953; Pitcher
and Prelinger, 1963), Dependence (Erikson, 1950; Hartwell,
et al., 1953; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963), Expansion
(Bowyer, 1956; Lewin, 1935; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963;
Werner, 1948), and Propensity for Imaginative Play (see
Singer and Singer, 1976), as well as Aggression (Bowyer,
1956; Buhler, 1951; Hartwell, et al., 1953; Pitcher and

Prelinger, 1963; Sears, 1947). Emphasis was placed on evaluating theme content, though records of all objects used were made. Composite scores of Human, Animal, and Transportation object use were made based on Gondor's (1964) speculation, supported by Gershowitz (1974) and Pitcher and Prelinger (1963), that a progression from inanimate to animal to human object reference in fantasy play was indicative of increasing ego development.

Summary. Unlike previous studies, the orientation towards the scoring of children's Worlds in the current investigation was designed to assess aspects of fantasy play indicative of high psycho-emotional functioning, rather than pathology. A wide array of scoring systems--both specifically for the World Technique, as well as for other projective and play techniques--that have shown to be discriminative of high and low psycho-social adjustment were drawn upon (Bach, 1945; Bolgar and Fischer, 1947; Bowyer, 1956; Buehler, 1951; Gershowitz, 1974; Gould, 1972; Hartwell, et al., 1953; Kamp and Kessler, 1967; Leary, 1957; Murray, 1943; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963; Sears, et al., 1947; Singer, 1973; Tomkins, 1947; Wowkanech, 1977). Any construction of a protocal to assess fantasy behavior must be approached with great humility, for one is immediately faced with an enigma--how to meaningfully quantify the phenomena without losing the quality of what is being expressed.

The difficulty of the task is made clearer in the realiza-· tion that fantasy is essentially a metaphorical, non-syntactic, analogic, "right brain" phenomenon, while the language of statistical analysis is by its very nature a highly lineal, syntactic, digital, "left brain" system. The dilemma is thus one of changing apples into algorisms while still preserving something of the essential "appleness."

Developmental Aspects of Children's Fantasy Play

The ages of the children who participated in the present research ranged from 6-9 years to 9-3 years, with a median age of 8-2 years. This is a stage of maturation typified by characteristic development in the physical, cognitive, interpersonal, and psychogenetic spheres. Thus a brief overview of the expected cognitive, social, emotional, and intra-psychic characteristics and concerns of this age period will be given before further explicating the dependent measures used in the present study.

Cognitive Functioning

By age seven the child, according to Piaget (1937), is progressing into the stage of Concrete Operations. Cognitive functioning is here characterized by a developing ability for conservation, reversibility, negation, deductive reasoning, inference, introspection, seeking causal explanations in objects themselves, an awareness of

re
se
en
sy
com
fco
fco
beh

Psy

age
sta
dra
195
with
regu
retu
crea
on
inte

vs.
acco
of ho
pete

reciprocal relationships, logical classification, and
serialization. There is a high level of cognitive differ-
entiation (Werner, 1948), with a decrease in animism and
syncretic, egocentric thinking as the thought processes be-
come more socialized. With this comes an increased concern
for objectivity and realism. There is also a progression
from what Stevenson (1962) termed "reflexive to reflective
behavior," with an increase in planning before acting.

Psychological Development

From the psychoanalytic perspective, the child at
age seven has passed through the sequence of pre-genital
stages, having moved through the height of the Oedipal
drama, and has now entered into the latency period (Freud,
1953). Here childhood sexuality is supposedly inhibited,
with the decreased intensity of libidinal urges and the
regnancy of specifically cathected objects allowing for a
return of interest to the external world. There is an in-
creased awareness of self, along with some ability to take
on the role of others. Parental sanctions have now been
internalized, solidifying the formation of the superego.

This hallmarks Erickson's (1950) stage of Industry
vs. Inferiority. Fantasy themes thus revolve around social
accomplishments, technical achievements, and the discovery
of how things operate and are made. Responsibility, com-
petence, assertiveness, ingenuity, effectiveness, and

persistence are further characteristic themes of the fantasy play of this stage of psychosexual development (Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963). Superego conflicts are typically expressed through themes of punishment, retribution, dominance/submission, judgment, positive/negative adequacy, shame, and guilt (Hartwell, et al., 1953; Haworth, 1966; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963). Furthermore, children by this age--with their own ego boundaries having been more solidified--are better able to distinguish fantasy from reality, more easily moving in and out of both while being able to discriminate real from pretend danger (what Gould (1972) terms "fluctuating certainty").

Major Tasks and Concerns

A significant shift at this stage of development of the child is the loosening of ties to the parents, accompanied by the increased importance of school and peer group in the child's life space (Erikson, 1950). Thus school adjustment, relationships with peers, development of independence, autonomy, self-reliance, and a mastery of cognitive, social, and motor skills all become issues of paramount importance for the child. Specific fears and concerns of this age group thus typically center around school failure, peer acceptance, disease, disfigurement, and death (Jersild, 1968; Jersild and Holmes, 1935).

con
tal
in
acq
deve
w
orde
to
prog
tact
tion
lina
1936
ize
be e
psyc

fant
(Wl
year
Mast
ory,
subs
refle

Defenses and Coping Strategies

The decrease in egocentricity by age seven is accompanied by a decrease in the feelings of self and parental omnipotence. The fears and concerns evoked by this, in conjunction with the tasks of psycho-social-cognitive acquisition now demanded of the child, call forth a parallel development of defensive and coping strategies (Freud, 1936; Murphy, 1962). Anna Freud (1936) delineated a hierarchical ordering of defense mechanisms, with the child regressing to using the more primitive ones under stress or where proper maturation has not occurred. The major defensive tactics of this age period are repression, undoing, isolation, displacement, projection, reaction formation, and sublimation, the latter two being the most prominent (Freud, 1936). Rationalization and intellectualization characterize more sophisticated defensive strategies and thus would be expected to be employed by those children who are more psycho-socially advanced.

In summary, it would be expected that, to the degree fantasy content centers around children's "current concerns" (Klinger, 1971), the typical fantasy play of seven to nine year old children would be characterized by themes of mastery and conquest over the environment, assertion, autonomy, adequacy, construction, social recognition, dominance/submission, and benevolence/aggression. Such themes thus reflect children's concerns and struggles with their

deve
from
exte
tion
soci
peer
powe
psyc
to g
ness
woul
tion
Hart

<u>Stru</u>

meas
alon
part
'Bow
Libr
made
peop
trans
1964,
ness

developing sense of self, of independence and separation .

from parents, of increased mastery over the internal and

external domain necessitated by the demands of socializa-

tion and the subsequent rapid acquisition of new cognitive,

social, and motor skills, and of the increased valuing of

peer acceptance and recognition. Depiction of exaggerated

power and ability would be expected in children of less

psycho-social competence as they employ reaction formation

to compensate for their feelings of helplessness, powerless-

ness, and inadequacy. Highly adjusted children, however,

would be expected to manifest themes of construction, asser-

tion, and benevolence in their fantasy play (Gould, 1972;

Hartwell, et al., 1953; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963).

Dependent Measures

Structure of the Children's Worlds

Structural aspects of the children's Worlds were

measured using object frequency counts and rating scales

along the five structural dimensions found to be signifi-

cantly related to psycho-social adjustment in past research

(Bowyer, 1956; Buhler, 1951; Buhler and Carrol, 1951;

Lumbry, 1951; Ridley, 1952). Thus composite scores were

made for the number of human figures used (Buhler's "Un-

peopled" score), as well as the number of animals and

transportation vehicles used (Gerschowitz, 1974; Gondor,

1964; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963). A rating for "Sparse-

ness" and a record of the total number of objects,

categories, and subcategories used gave a measure of

"Emptiness," following Lewin's (1935) and Werner's (1948)

conceptualization of maturity as involving an increase in

the differentiation and organization of part-to-whole rela-

tionships, here being manifested in the increased number of

objects and categories used to form a coherent, integrated

World (Bowyer, 1956; 1958; Kamp and Kessler, 1967).

"Closedness," "Rigidity," and "Disorganization" (Buhler,

1951) were evaluated by rating scales.

Content of the Fantasy Play

Children were asked to describe what they had creat-

ed and explain on-going events while building their Worlds,

most doing so spontaneously, often becoming deeply engrossed

in dramatically playing with the objects rather than formal-

ly constructing a scene. From these descriptions and play

frequency counts of thematic content were made along the

following dimensions:

(1) Aggression. Numerous researchers using the World

Technique have found a positive relationship between high

degrees of aggression and low psycho-social adjustment,

particularly when the aggression was of a "primitive" level

(i.e. animals devouring people in contrast to more "social-

ized" aggression such as war) (Bowyer, 1956; 1958; 1970;

Buhler, 1951; Buhler and Carrol, 1951; Lumbry, 1951; Ridley,

1952). This positive relationship between high fantisized

aggression and low psycho-social adjustment has also been .
consistently found in the doll play research (Bach, 1945;
Isch, 1952; Sears, et al., 1947; see Levin and Wardwell,
1962), as well as studies using children's spontaneous
stories (Buss, 1961; Kapan, 1956), stories to stimulus
pictures (Hartwell, et al., 1953), and fantasy play in a
natural setting (Gould, 1972).

(2) **Benevolence**. Hartwell, et al. (1953) in studying
the responses of over 700 children to stimulus pictures
while developing the Michigan Picture Test, found that
children rated highest on psycho-social adjustment by their
teachers expressed significantly more themes of positive
affiliation, affection, and love than children rated as
poorly adjusted.

Gould (1972), in her analysis of children's spontan-
eous fantasy play, discerned three forms of identification
used by the children in their play: (1) Identification
with the Provider-Protector role (characterized by acts of
nurturance, care, and giving); (2) Identification with the
Aggressor (characterized by acts of destruction towards
others/objects; (3) Identification with the Victim (char-
acterized by being hurt by the environment). Gould specu-
lates that identification with the Provider-Protector role
derives from the children's early experiences with care-
givers as warm, nurturant, and protective, and was indica-
tive of positive psycho-emotional adjustment.

Strong empirical support for this contention was .

given by Wowkanech (1977), who found that children rated as

"Competent/Compliant" (Baumrind, 1967) by their teachers

indeed chose "Provider-Protector" roles significantly more

frequently than peers who were not perceived to be as high-

ly adjusted. The "Competent/Compliant" children further-

more depicted parents as using "reasoning" responses in

dealing with fantasized transgressions in Deviation Doll

Play, thus suggesting they perceived their parents as using

caregiver behaviors presumed to enhance psycho-emotional

development in children by the research previously reviewed

(Baumrind, 1967; 1971; Baumrind and Black, 1970; Becker,

1964; Coopersmith, 1967; Hoffman, 1963; Liberman, et al.,

1971; Mussen, 1970).

(3) Adequacy. Hartwell, et al. (1953) found that

children rated as highly adjusted by their teachers gave

significantly more references of both positive and negative

"adequacy" to stimulus pictures (i.e. "She's a pretty girl

eating the yucky cereal") than children rated as poorly

adjusted.

(4) Assertion. As was previously discussed, the

children in the present study were psychologically in

Erikson's stage of Industry vs. Inferiority (Erikson, 1950).

Thus high psycho-social development would be expected to be

reflected in fantasy themes of assertion, self-sufficiency,

self-reliance, confidence, and mastery (Pitcher and

Prelinger, 1963).

(5) Construction. Pitcher and Prelinger (1963) found
a trend towards an increase in themes of building and con-
struction with increasing ego development in boys, support-
ing Erikson's (1950) theory of psychogenic development.
The oldest children in their study were five years of age,
thus the authors suggest the need to study older age groups
to see in what way this trend continues. Their suggestion
was a impetus for the use of the seven to nine year old age
range in the present study.

(6) Dominance. Pitcher and Prelinger (1963) also
speculate that characteristic superego development and con-
flict in this age group are typically expressed in themes
of dominance and control. Such themes represent the subju-
gation of ego-distonic impulses by internalized parental
and social norms. Studies by Hartwell, et al (1953) and
Haworth (1966) are corrabrative here.

A specific association between themes of dominance
and psycho-social adjustment have not been clearly differ-
entiated, however it would seem reasonable to expect a
curvlinear relationship, with either a very low or very
high frequency of such themes being indicative of lax or
overly harsh superego functioning and thus less satisfactory
psycho-social adjustment (Gould, 1972). Dominance themes
would also appear to be related to assertion and self confi-
dence, reflecting the ability to impose one's will on the
environment.

soci

et a

High

a se

exte

cont

"ent

here

flec

chil

posi

peri

slow

pare

self

ency,

and s

of hi

(Pit

trend

(1963,

pansio

thereb

(7) <u>Submission</u>. This is a corollary to the above .
score based on the same rational (Erikson, 1950; Hartwell,
et al., 1953; Haworth, 1966; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963).
High scores on this scale would conceptually be related to
a sense of helplessness, inferiority, and subjugation to
external demands, in contrast to feelings of autonomy-
control (Erikson, 1950; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963) and
"entitlement" (Gould, 1972). Whether the fantasy play is
here replicative of domineering parental practices, or re-
flective of intra-psychic superego conflicts within the
child, a high score on Submission would be expected to
positively relate with low psycho-social adjustment.

(8) <u>Dependence</u>. A key component of the latency
period and the Industry vs. Inferiority stage, is the child's
slowly emerging independence and separation from his/her
parents as a necessary occurrence for the individuation of
self (Erikson, 1950). Thus a decrease in themes of depend-
ency, concomitant with an increase in themes of assertion
and self-sufficiency, would be expected in the fantasy play
of highly competent children during this stage of development
(Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963).

(9) <u>Expansion</u>. In their study of developmental
trends in children's fantasy stories, Pitcher and Prelinger
(1963) noted a general progression towards increasing ex-
pansion and differentiation of the internal/external domain,
thereby lending support to the developmental theories of

Lewin

ly co

in th

World

of th

outsi

lands

futur

expan

sured

logic

nifica

probl

adjus

al.,

Levine

the l

imagi

emoti

inativ

gress

follow

affec

less

Lewin (1935) and Werner (1948). These findings were strongly corroborated by Bowyer (1956) and Kamp and Kessler (1967) in their studies of developmental trends in children's Worlds. Expansion here was reflected in an increasing use of the sandbox area, an increase in Worlds depicting events outside of the child's immediate environment (i.e. foreign lands or outer space), and an increase reference to past or future events as opposed to sole use of present time. This expansion on the spacial and temporal dimensions was assumed to reflect a general expansion in the child's psychological life-space.

(10) Propensity. Numerous studies have found a significant positive relationship between a general ability and proclivity to engage in fantasy play and high psycho-social adjustment (Meichenbaum and Goodman, 1971; Nahme-Huang, et al., 1976; Rosenhan, et al., 1974; Singer, 1973; Spivak and Levine, 1964). Singer and Singer (1976) in their review of the literature state, "In general, the data suggest that imaginative play is accompanied by a good deal of positive emotionality and that children already predisposed to imaginativeness in their play are likely to show less overt aggressive behavior, to be harder to arouse to aggression following frustration, and to show, in general, more positive affects or indeed a broader range of affects than children less imaginatively inclined" (p. 99).

Propensity for Fantasy play in the current study was measured using several rating scale items that theoretically reflected various dimensions of the child's ability to engage in complex, highly developed fantasy behaviors.

HYPOTHESES

The purpose of the present investigation was to explore the relationship between parents' self-perception of their caregiving behaviors, children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors, children's psycho-social adjustment, and their fantasy play. Perceptions of caregiver behaviors were measured by rating scales along several dimensions deemed relevant to children's psycho-social adjustment by past research; children's psycho-social adjustment was measured by teacher-parent ratings of relevant child behaviors. Children's fantasy play, using the Lowenfeld World Technique (Lowenfeld, 1935), was assessed using rating scales and frequency counts along dimensions shown to be relevant by the literature. The following hypotheses were examined:

High psycho-social adjustment in the children will be positively related to: (1) Parents' perceiving themselves as exhibiting "effective" caregiver behaviors; (2) children's perceptions of their parents exhibiting "effective" caregiver behaviors; (3) fantasy play behaviors in the children's Worlds exhibiting (a) Benevolence, (b) Adequacy, (c) Assertion, (d) Construction, (e) Dominance, (f)

Expansio

E

be negati

selves as

children'

tive" car

children'

and or c

In

lence, A

sion, and

Parents'

caregiver

parents e

In

negativel

as exhibi

dren's pe

caregiver

In

gression,

lated to:

"ineffect

tions of

behaviors,

Expansion, and/or (g) Propensity for Imaginative play.   .

High psycho-social adjustment in the children will be _negatively_ related to: (1) Parents' perceiving themselves as exhibiting "ineffective" caregiver behaviors; (2) children's perceptions of their parents exhibiting "ineffective" caregiver behaviors; (3) fantasy play behaviors in the children's Worlds exhibiting (a) Aggression, (b) Submission, and/or (c) Dependency.

Indices of "competent" child fantasy play (Benevolence, Adequacy, Assertion, Construction, Dominance, Expansion, and Propensity) will be _positively_ related to: (1) Parents' perceiving themselves as exhibiting "effective" caregiver behaviors; (2) children's perceptions of their parents exhibiting "effective" caregiver behaviors.

Indices of "competent" child fantasy play will be _negatively_ related to: (1) Parents' perceiving themselves as exhibiting "ineffective" caregiver behaviors; (2) children's perceptions of their parents exhibiting "ineffective" caregiver behaviors.

Indices of "less competent" child fantasy play (Aggression, Submission and Dependency) will be _positively_ related to: (1) Parents' perceiving themselves as exhibiting "ineffective" caregiver behaviors; (2) children's perceptions of their parents exhibiting "ineffective" caregiver behaviors.

be nep

selves

child

tive"

Indices of "less competent" child fantasy play will·
be _negatively_ related to: (1) Parents' perceiving them-
selves as exhibiting "effective" caregiver behaviors; (2)
children's perceptions of their parents exhibiting "effec-
tive" caregiver behaviors.

dressed

fourth

the Lan

structe

dition

study,

closed

ingness

further

tion du

should

which c

tion of

year ol

Fortuna

to part

represe

and the

METHOD

Subject Selection

Roughly 350 introductory letters, with stamped, addressed return postcards, were distributed to first through fourth grade students attending eight elementary schools in the Lansing area (see Appendix A). The students were instructed to take the letters home to their parents. In addition to explaining the general nature of the current study, the letters requested the parents to return the enclosed stamped, addressed postcard indicating their willingness to receive a phone call from the Experimenter to further explain the study and arrange for their participation during the months of January through March, 1977, should they decide to become involved.

Thirty-seven postcards (10.6%) were returned, of which only 10 fit the specific criteria for subject selection of the present investigation. Subjects were to be 7-9 year old Caucasian males, living in two-parent families. Fortunately, all 10 of those who fit these criteria agreed to participate.

Clearly, the present sample cannot be considered representative of the total population of 7-9 year old boys and their families. However, given the paucity of

know

in t

View

ing

thei

sibli

paren

paren

males

8-2.

order

having

"middl

head

profes

ed su

curren

the E,

ers of

receive

knowledge as to the characteristics of fantasy play of boys in this age range--particularly in respect to the World View Technique (WVT)--and the lack of well developed scoring categories for the WVT.

Sample Characteristics

General demographic information on the children and their families (age of the subject, age and sex of his siblings, ages, occupations, and years of education of both parents) were obtained through a form completed by the parents (see Appendix B). The children, all Caucasion males, ranged in age from 6-9 to 9-3, with a mean age of 8-2. The sample was highly homogenous with respect to birth order (80% being second or third born) with only one child having no siblings. The children were living in two-parent, "middle-class" urban families, (Groups II of the Hollingshead Index), with fathers working in "white-collar" and professional occupations (see Appendix G for a more detailed summary of the sample characteristics).

Procedure

Independent Measures

Packets containing all the inventories used in the current investigation, and a stamped envelope addressed to the E, were distributed by the E to the parents and teachers of the children participating in the study. Parents received their packets during the initial home visit and

were instructed to complete all the inventories independ- .
ently. After obtaining parental permission, teachers were
telephoned by the E and asked if they would be willing to
fill out three inventories on the designated child. All
the teachers agreed to do so, and packets were delivered to
the schools by the E.

All inventory packets were returned in the self ad-
dressed, stamped envelopes provided by the E while the
subjects were participating in the fantasy play procedure.
Inventory packets were not opened, however, until all Sub-
jects had been run, thereby assuring blindness as to Ss'
psycho-social functioning and their parents' caregiving
behaviors.

Children's Psycho-social Adjustment: An abridged version
of the Children's Behavior Checklist (CBC) (Ferguson, et al.,
1974) (see Appendix C)--independently filled out by the Ss'
parents and teachers--was used as one measure of psycho-
social adjustment. Cumulative scores of positive and dys-
functional adjustment were derived from the totals of items
found by Ferguson, et al. (1974) to be characteristic of
nonclinic and clinic referred children, as designated by
their parents. For an item to be counted in the cumulative
score in the present study, it not only had to be designat-
ed as "applying" to the child but in fact be "characteris-
tic" of him.

.in

mares

asses

indep

see

psych

file

et al

score

in th

Paren

ents'

sesse

both

vento

tors

and n

facto

socia

enting

Hosti

Threat

sic Pe

An abridged version of the Developmental Profile (in current study designated as "B-P") (Besell and Palomares, 1970)--an inventory specifically oriented towards assessing competent, pro-social behaviors in children--was independently filled out by each S's parents and teacher (see Appendix C). The B-P gives a single, global score of psycho-social adjustment.

In addition to the above inventories, teachers also filled out the A-M-L Behavior Rating Scale (AML) (Cowen, et al., 1975), an instrument that yielded a single, global score indicative of the child's psycho-social adjustment in the classroom (see Appendix C).

Parents' Perceptions of Their Caregiving Behaviors: Parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors were assessed using two inventories, completed independently by both parents.

The Child Rearing Concerns and Practices (CRCP) inventory developed by Green (1975) was used to yield 9 factors and 3 variables theoretically associated with positive and negative caregiving behaviors (see Appendix D). The 9 factors were as follows: (1) Concern with Child's Prosocial Behavior (assumed to be indicative of positive parenting behaviors); (2) Concern with Child's Aggression-Hostility (assumed to be a positive trait); (3) Criticize-Threaten (assumed to be a negative trait); (4) Give Extrinsic Rewards for Desired Behavior (assumed to be a negative

trait); (5) Point Out Intrinsic Reward for Desired Behavior
(assumed to be a positive trait); (6) Nonverbal Rejection
(assumed to be a negative trait); (7) Inductive Discipline
(assumed to be a positive trait); (8) Express Pride (assum-
ed to be a positve trait); (9) Demand Self Control (assumed
to be a positive trait). The 3 additional variables, as-
sumed to be indicative of negative parenting behaviors,
were Criticize-Shaming, Do Nothing, and Take Desirable Be-
havior for Granted. In the present investigation these
factor and variable scores were grouped together to form
two composite scores of positive and negative caregiver be-
haviors.

In addition to the CRCP, parents also independently
completed an abridged, revised version of Schaeffer's
(1965) Children's Report of Parental Behavior inventory
(CRPB) (Armentrout and Burger, 1972; Burger and Armentrout,
1971) (see Appendix D). The inventory yielded 3 orthoginal
factors assumed to be characteristic of positive and nega-
tive caregiving behaviors. The 3 factors were: (1) Accept-
ance vs. Rejection (Acceptance was assumed to be positive);
(2) Psychological Autonomy vs. Psychological Control (Psy-
chological Autonomy was assumed to be positive); (3) Firm
Control vs. Lax Control (Firm Control was assumed to be
positive).

Children's Perceptions of Their Parents' Caregiving Behav-
iors: An abridged, revised version of Schaeffer's (1965)

Children's Report of Parental Behavior inventory (CRPB) ·   ·

(see Appendix E) was orally administered by the E to each S

in his home upon the initial visit. The inventory was ad-

ministered separately for the child's perception of his

father and mother, thereby individually assessing the child's

perception of each parent along the 3 orthoginal dimensions

listed above.

During the initial visit to the home, each S was also

administered by the E the Vocabulary and Block Design sub-

tests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children--

Revised. These scores, ranging from 10 to 16 ($\overline{X}$ = 13.3;

s.d. = 1.89) on Vocabulary and 9 to 19 ($\overline{X}$ = 14.7; s.d. =

3.59) on the Block Design, were obtained to help determine

any possible relationship between verbal or analogic intel-

ligence and behaviors on the WVT. Pearson correlations

showed no significant relationship between the WISC-R scores

and any of the dimensions assessed on the WVT.

A Rorschach was administered to each S by the E before

beginning the first WVT session. Protocols were obtained

for possible future comparison to behaviors on the WVT.

Dependent Measures

Children's Fantasy Play Behaviors: The children's fantasy

play was prompted using the Lowenfeld World View Technique

(WVT) (Lowenfeld, 1935; 1938; 1939). The WVT, also known

as the "Sandtray Technique" (Bowyer, 1970), the "World

Test" (Buhler, 1951), and "Sandplay" (Kalff, 1971), con-

sists of a small sandbox (36" x 25") and numerous objects

(i.e. miniature people, animals, houses, vehicles, trees,

etc.), stored by groupings on 12 shelves in a cabinet. The

cabinet and sandbox were made for the E* following specifi-

cations suggested by Bowyer (1970). Toys were selected and

purchased by the E at various stores throughout the Lansing

area using lists suggested in Bowyer (1970) and Kalff (1971).

Tombstones, certain buildings, explosion/fire objects, and

other miscellaneous objects were constructed by the E.

Each child was picked up at his home and driven to

Olds Hall, on the Michigan State University Campus, by the

E, who returned them home at the end of each session. Each

child was brought to a self-contained room with a one-way

mirror, having been informed that his fantasy play would be

videotaped. Before beginning, the child was introduced to

the camera person in the adjoining room behind the one-way

mirror and allowed to explore the videotape equipment.

Upon entering the room with the sandbox and object cabinet,

the E introduced the WVT in the following manner:

> This is a miniature sandbox and this is
> a cabinet full of little toys. As you can
> see there are tiny people, animals, houses,
> cars, trees, and all kinds of other things

> (the child is shown the objects on each
> of the 12 shelves). I'd like you to
> build whatever you'd like with these
> toys in the sandbox. You can use as
> many or as few of the toys as you like,
> and build for as short or as long a
> time as you'd like for up to an hour.
> If you spread the sand, you could use
> the blue painted bottom as make-believe
> water (the author spreads the sand to
> show the blue bottom). Go ahead and
> make whatever you'd like in the sandbox
> with the toys.

The E sat to the side of the sandbox while the child constructed his World. The child was occasionally asked to clarify what he was doing and when finished, asked to describe what he had made. Each child also was asked upon completion whether his World depicted a scene in the past, present, or future, whether the events were occurring during morning, noon, or night, whether he would want to be in the World, and if so who or what would he be and what would he be doing.

The child was brought back to make a World two more times during the week, thus each child made three Worlds in one week. In introducing the second and third sessions the child was told to build whatever he would like in the sandbox using as many or as few of the toys as he would like, taking as little or as much time as he would like for up to an hour. The rest of the procedure for the two additional Worlds were identical to the initial session.

Scoring the Dependent Measures: Drawing upon a diverse spectrum of scoring systems used in a multitude of fantasy

play and projective techniques (Bach, 1945; Bolgar and

Fischer, 1947; Bowyer, 1956; Buhler, 1951; Gershowitz, 1974;

Gould, 1972; Hartwell, et al., 1953; Kamp and Kessler, 1963;

Leary, 1957; Murray, 1943; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963;

Sears, et al., 1947; Singer, 1973, Tomkins, 1947; Wowkanech,

1977), measures were developed by the current E to assess

those dimensions of fantasy play that best discriminated

high and low psycho-social functioning in children. Both

frequency counts (see Appendix F) and rating scales (see

Appendix F) were used in assessing these dimensions.

Frequency counts, scored by raters independently viewing

videotapes of the WVT sessions, were made of the number of

times specified behaviors occurred during each 30 second

interval. The occurrence of relevant behaviors was deter-

mined in three possible ways: (1) direct action or verbal-

ization by the child to an object (i.e. the child kisses a

figure or tells the Experimenter that the object is very

beautiful); (2) action or verbalization through an object

(i.e. one figure kisses another or tells another figure it

is very beautiful); (3) action or verbalization described

by the child to the Experimenter (i.e. the child states

that a figure is kissing another figure or states that one

figure is telling another one that it is very beautiful).

Rating scales, independently scored by the raters after

viewing the entire session, ranged from one to four, with

four representing the "positive" end of the scale. An

object count was made by the author using the description .

given at the end of each WVT session of the objects used

(see Appendix F).

Definitions for the 8 categories scored using fre-

quency counts were as follows (see Appendix F for coding

manual and rating forms):

1. Aggression: Any event where something was phy-

sically or emotionally harmed. Aggression was differenti-

ated into 8 subcategories--(a) Devouring/Biting, defined as

any incident where a non-food object was bitten, eaten, or

devoured; (b) Direct Physical, any incident involving pur-

poseful, direct physical contact intended to harm another

object (i.e. hitting, stabbing, kicking, smashing, choking,

wrestling, running over, etc.) (if not obviously intention-

al the event would be scored under "Accident"); (c) Distance

Physical, any incident involving a purposeful attempt to

harm an object from a distance (i.e. shooting, bombing,

exploding, throwing something to hurt an object, etc.), also

any act of violence in which it was not stated how the act

occurred though it was clearly not accidental (i.e. "they

were murdered"), as well as poisoning; (d) Accident, any

incident involving a harmful outcome where there was no

apparent intentionality or control (i.e. accidental crashes,

fires, natural disasters, etc.), also events involving a

harmful outcome in which it was not stated how the act

occurred (i.e. "they're dead"); (e) Verbal, any verbal

attempt to emotionally hurt or demean another object (i.e.·
teasing, ridiculing, swearing at, cursing, scolding, ad-
monishing, threatening, harrassing, laughing at, embarras-
sing, name calling, etc.) (not merely stating a feeling,
such as "I'm mad at you," or daring the other, as in "I
bet you can't," but comments that were clearly not respect-
ing the other and were attempting/succeeding in making the
other feel bad); (f) Social, any incident that clearly, un-
ambiguously breached social norms of etiquette and moral
conduct that was not included in the preceding categories
(i.e. lying, stealing, cheating, deceiving, scaring, reject-
ing pleas for help, taking away what others want, being
greedy, being stingy, committing gross dissocial acts such
as urinating in public, etc.); (g) Deprivation/Suffering,
any incident of suffering, unhappiness, or unpleasantness
due to general circumstances rather than purposeful aggres-
sion from other objects (i.e. hunger, sickness, coldness,
general physical or emotional discomfort and uneasiness);
(h) Abandonment/Lost, any incident where an object was left
contrary to its desire as specified by the child or the
object's reaction, as well as any incident in which an
object is lost.

2. Benevolence: Any act of goodness towards an
object. Benevolence was differentiated into 5 subcate-
gories--(a) Physical, defined as any direct physical con-
tact that communicated warmth and caring (i.e. kissing,

hug

eac

.b

por

"I

eto

tiv

was

gui

for

obj

of

(d)

wer

joy

(i.

eto

joy

gor

par

(e)

sat

ly

spe

a wo

Poth

hugging, cuddling, stroking, holding hands, arms around . .

each other, massaging, patting the other on the back, etc.);

(b) Verbal, any verbal expression of care, empathy, sup-

port, comfort, warmth, complimenting (i.e. "I love you,"

"I hope you feel better," "It'll be OK," "You're pretty"

etc.) (compliments were also scored under "Adequacy: Posi-

tive"); (c) Helping/Rescuing, any incident where an object

was helped or rescued (i.e. feeding, dressing, protecting,

guiding, giving helpful advice, warning with clear concern

for the object's welfare, taking care of a sick or hurt

object, tucking into bed, guarding, etc.); as well as acts

of service such as delivering milk, mail, or the paper;

(d) Affiliative Acts, any incident where two or more objects

were engaged in an activity that was clearly mutually en-

joyable, as specified by the child or the objects' reactions

(i.e. playing together, singing together, dancing together,

etc.), as well as acts of generosity, care, goodwill, and

joyful social events not included in the preceding cate-

gories (i.e. gift giving, sharing, social gatherings like

parties, picnics, sporting events, weddings, parades, etc.);

(e) Satisfying Experiences, anytime an object was feeling

satisfied, happy, content, as specified by the child direct-

ly or through the object, due to general circumstances or

specific acts by others (i.e. "I feel good today," "What

a wonderful night's sleep," "The little girl was fed by her

mother and felt great," etc.).

3. Dominance: Any act of controlling, ordering, ·
commanding, forcing, demanding, restraining, arresting, or
in any other way forcing one's will on another (i.e. "Stop
that!" "Come here!" "You guys are under arrest," "The
witch cast a spell so the girl couldn't move," "Superman
grabbed him and wouldn't let him go" (this would not be
scored "Direct Physical" unless the child stated that Super-
man was trying to hurt the person), etc.). The incidents
here did not involve mere requests, giving the impression
that two equals are interacting, but instead gave a clear
sense that one object was or was trying to be more powerful
than the other.

4. Construction: Events that involved physical
building, creating, or producing, as depicted through the
objects or through the child himself pretending to be a
machine building something. The incidents here do not mere-
ly involve the child creating a World scene, but are defined
by the specific use of objects or oneself to depict the
building of something (i.e. "They're building a road,"
"These workmen are constructing a house," "They're clearing
the land to build a housing project," "I'm a crane digging
out the lake" (not merely the fact that the child used his
hands to dig but that he specifically stated he was some
kind of construction equipment building something), etc.).
It is important to note that construction equipment could
be used for destructive purposes, such as a crane

intentionally chopping off a person's head, at which point·
it would be scored as "Aggression: Direct Physical."

5. Adequacy: Any evaluative or judgmental refer-
ence about the characteristics of something or attribution
of positive or negative qualities to it. Adequacy was dif-
ferentiated into 2 sub-categories--(a) Positive Adequacy,
where the child directly or through another object attribut-
ed a positive quality or characteristic to an object (i.e.
"You're beautiful," "The pretty princess," "She was strong
and kind," etc.). Generally any use of a complimentary
adjective, such as "wonderful," "cute," "smart," "generous,"
"honest," and the like, would be scored under Adequacy:
Positive, though sometimes only context can define whether
a description is meant positively or negatively. Thus, the
"little, tiny puppy" might infer a positive cuteness or a
negative helplessness. Furthermore, it might merely be
descriptive without implied valuing, in which case it would
not be scored at all. Complementary adjectives that became
a part of and object's name, such as "the Good Fairy," were
only scored one. (b) Negative Adequacy, in which the child
directly or through another object attributed a negative
quality or characteristic to an object (i.e. "You're ugly,"
"He was a cruel wolf," "That's a stupid house," etc.).

6. Submission: Any act of obeying, giving into the
demands of another, following orders, going along with what
one was told to do, cowering, feeling ashamed or embarrassed.

Events here did not involve the mere cooperation with a

request but clearly gave the sense of an object willfully

following the orders, demands, or commands of another

object that was more powerful (i.e. "They obeyed the King's

command," "They did exactly what she told them to do,"

"I'm embarrassed," "The dog was ashamed," etc.). Any ex-

plicit act of deference was also scored here, such as bowing.

7. Assertion: Any act involving asserting oneself

to gain or maintain what one wanted. Assertion was differ-

entiated into 2 sub-categories--(a) Reactive, as reflected

in assertion against the restrictions, demands, or commands

of others or the environment (i.e. "She refused to do what

she was told to," "The river tried to sweep him in but he

hung on," "It was real hot but he didn't let that stop him

from playing," etc.); (b) Initiated, as shown in assertive

acts to gain what one wanted that were not in response to

external constrictions or demands, but rather acts that

gave a sense of independence, self-sufficiency, resourceful-

ness, masterfulness, confidence, pride, effectiveness,

autonomy, daringness, exploration (i.e. "The little girl

tied her shoes all by herself," "She knew she could do it,"

"I don't need any help in building this road," "They were

proud of the job they did all on their own," etc.).

8. Dependence: Any incident involving the seeking

of aid, comfort, help, consolation, forgiveness, support,

protection, guidance, advice, care, succorance (i.e. "They

asked for someone to come pick them up," "Please make me .

something to eat," "The cat wanted to lay in her lap,"

"I'm sorry I did that, I'll be better next time," "Don't

let the monster hurt me, please protect me," "They asked

him how to get to the town," etc.).

Frequency count subscales were composited to give a

single score for each category per session. Mean scores

for each dependent measure across all three WVT sessions

were also determined and a Student's T-Test was performed

to assess if there was a significant difference in category

use between the three sessions.

A ninth dimension, "Propensity for Imaginitive Play,"

was also determined through several rating scale items.

The measure was not intended to discriminate the degree or

ability to deviate from the boundaries of reality (i.e. play

involving fantastical events not possible in reality as

opposed to those likely to occur in the child's everyday

life), but rather to assess the child's ability to develop

elaborate, complex stories and themes, irrespective of the

degree of proximity to real life events. Definitions for

each point on the scale were as follows:

> (1) The child shows little ability for
> imaginative play.
>
> (2) The child shows some ability for
> imaginative play.
>
> (3) The child shows quite a bit of ability
> for imaginative play.

(4) The child shows a great deal of
     ability for imaginative play,
     creating rich, elaborate, highly
     involved themes and stories.

In addition to this global rating, several other

ratings thought to be relevant to this same dimension were

also scored. These were:

(A) Approach to Task--assessing the child's general

way of creating his World, with each point on the scale

being defined as follows:

(1) Items carefully placed for scene con-
     struction, rarely played with.

(2) Some playing with items during scene
     construction.

(3) Quite a bit of playing with items
     during scene construction.

(4) Much dramatic playing with items
     throughout the WVT session.

(B) Description vs. Story--determining the child's

tendency to develop stories with the objects and scenes he

constructs as opposed to building a scene and simply de-

scribing what has been made. Discriminative points on this

scale were as follows:

(1) The child merely constructs scene; no
     story or incidents are depicted, the
     child only describes what he has made.

(2) A few brief events are depicted.

(3) Several longer incidents are depicted.

(4) Many stories and incidents are depicted;
     many interrelated events or one long
     story is developed.

(c) Theme Complexity--intended to discern the degree

of sophistication elaboration, and complexity of the themes in the child's fantasy play. The descriminative points here were:

    (1)   Theme very simple; merely descriptive of items.

    (2)   Theme generally simple though a few aspects are more elaborate.

    (3)   Theme somewhat complex with some elaboration of ideas.

    (4)   Theme highly complex and elaborate.

A global score of the child's propensity for imaginative play was determined, both for each session and across all three WVT sessions, by compositing the above rating scales. Justification for such a grouping was based on a reliability analysis for the composite scale, resulting in a standardized item alpha of .99 for World I, .97 for World II, .80 for World III, and .92 across all three Worlds.

Other rating scale items were developed by the author as part of a 27 item rating scale protocol assessing various dimensions of the WVT (see Appendix F). Unfortunately, there was insufficient reliability to use any but the above items in the data analysis. (For a complete list of the reliabilities of each item see Table 2.)

Procedure for Coding the Fantasy Play: 3 sets of 2 raters each scored each child's WVT, with each rater working independently. Each set of raters was assigned to score one session from each of the 10 Subjects, alternately being

given the first, second, or third session (raters were not. aware of which session they were scoring). To control for practice effect, raters in each set scored the WVT in reverse order. Thus one rater started with Subject 10 and worked back to Subject 1 while his/her partner started with Subject 1 and worked up to Subject 10. To assure all raters started scoring at the same point in the videotape, the author dubbed himself saying "now" at the beginning of each tape. Raters' means for the individual categories were used in the data analysis.

Unaware of the hypotheses of the current investigation, the six raters* initially met together with the E and were given a manual defining the categories to be scored and the scoring procedures (see Appendix F). The manuals were read aloud, with each category being fully described and revised as needed. Raters kept their manuals to further familiarize themselves with the scoring dimensions. The raters met as a group with the E on 3 additional occasions to code a practice tape, thereby refining the scoring criterias and procedures until consensual agreement was reached. At this point, each rater was given a practice tape to score individually, with his/her rating being compared with the E's, who served as expert. The E then met

_____

with each rater to clarify any specific problems. An ad-
ditional practice tape was independently scored by the
raters, with these scores being compared between raters
and with the author and thereby used to determine inter-
rater reliability. The reliabilities proved sufficient on
all of the frequency count variables and on the "Propensity
for Imaginative Play" variable which was scored via a
rating scale (see Tables 1 and 2).

Reliability of the WVT Variables: Tables 1 and 2 represent
the average correlations of the mean scores of each rater
team over the 3 WVT sessions. The values are based on the
scores of the 6 raters, independently rating their assigned
10 videotapes on the designated variables. Each rater was
compared to his/her team member in deriving the inter-
coder reliability.

As can be seen, the reliability for all the frequen-
cy count variables (Table 1) was very high, most being at
the $p < .001$ level and thus sufficient to be used in the
subsequent analyses. However, some of the rating scale
items originally developed and trained for did not reach
sufficient reliability ($p < .05$) (Table 2) and unfortunate-
ly had to be dropped.

Table 1. Inter-rater reliabilities across the 3 WVT sessions
on dimensions assessed using frequency counts.

Variable	Rater Team		
	A	B	C
Aggression:			
Devouring/Biting	.98	.99	.98
Direct Physical	.91	.94	.95
Distance Physical	.95	.91	.94
Accident	.93	.90	.92
Verbal	1.00	.99	.99
Social	.97	.96	1.00
Deprivation/Suffering	.99	.98	.98
Abandonment/Lost	1.00	1.00	1.00
Benevolence:			
Physical	1.00	1.00	1.00
Verbal	.98	.98	.99
Helping/Rescuing	.94	.92	.94
Affliative Acts	.99	.98	.97
Satisfying Experiences	.98	.97	.98
Dominance	.93	.93	.95
Construction	.93	.92	.91
Adequacy:			
Positive	.99	.91	.98
Negative	.98	.97	.96
Submission	.98	.98	.97
Assertion:			
Reactive	.99	.98	.98
Initiated	.99	.97	.98
Dependence	1.00	.98	.91

Table 2. Inter-rater reliabilities across the 3 WVT sessions
on dimensions assessed using rating scales.

Variable	Rater Team		
	A	B	C
Involvement	—*	.18	.36
Approach	.75	.84	.86
Organization	.40	.27	.52
Structure	.56	—	.67
Haphazardness	.30	—	.62
Closedness	.44	.43	.50
Sparseness	—	—	.52
Crowdedness	.62	-.99	-.17
Area	—	.55	.57
Description/Story	.42	.79	.92
Realism	.64	.80	.68
Expansion	.80	.37	—
Time:			
Distant Past	1.00	1.00	.41
Past	.67	1.00	.61
Recent Past	1.00	.67	.50
Present	.80	.80	.41
Future	—	—	—
Complexity	.70	.73	.81
Main Figure	—	.37	.56
Qualities	.00	.15	.77
Emotions	—	.67	.55
Thinking	.00	.90	.98
Imaginary Figures	.78	.84	.13
Magic	—	—	—

Table 2. (Continued)

Variable	Rater Team		
	A	B	C
Object Use	.84	-.20	.83
Propensity	.73	.87	.81
In/Out Ability	.32	.76	.54

*Could not be computed due to one Rater holding constant

RESULTS

Analysis of the Data

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were derived to examine possible relationships between the independent and dependent measures, as well as to clarify possible relationships within the independent and dependent measures themselves. Thus the 3 independent variables--the children's psycho-social adjustment, the parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors, and the children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors--were correlated with the 9 dependent measures assessing the children's fantasy play (Aggression, Benevolence, Dominance, Construction, Adequacy, Submission, Assertion, Dependence, and Propensity for Imaginative Play).

A two-tailed Student's T-test was also performed to discern whether there was a significant difference between the 3 WVT sessions on the dependent measures.

Independent Measures

Children's Psycho-social Adjustment: Table 3 shows the mean, standard deviation, and range of the Subject's scores obtained from parents' and teacher's ratings of dimensions

Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and ranges of
         fathers', mothers', and teachers' ratings
         of children's psycho-social adjustment.

Rater		Inventory		
		B-P*	CBC Positive**	CBC Negative***
Father	X̄ = 38.10	17.58	5.20
	SD = 5.00	6.40	6.70
	Range = 27-45	3-24	0-20
Mother	X̄ = 35.70	17.10	4.30
	SD = 4.50	5.30	4.80
	Range = 28-48	8-23	0-14
Teacher	X̄ = 36.30	10.80	3.70
	SD = 8.80	6.30	4.10
	Range = 24-48	4-24	0-11
	AML****		
(Teacher)	X̄ = 70.40		
	SD = 24.40		
	Range = 45-121		

*10-50 possible, higher score signifies positive adjustment.
**0-27 possible, higher score signifies positive adjustment.
***0-25 possible, higher score signifies negative adjustment.
****43-215 possible, higher score signifies negative adjustment.

relevant to the Subject's psycho-social adjustment. Scores
indicate that the sample was composed of children perceived
to be relatively well adjusted by the adults who have close
contact with them. The sample was made up, however, of a
diverse range of perceived degree of adjustment. Thus the
mean scores on the B-P, which has a possible range of 10-50,
with a higher score being theoretically indicative of
greater psycho-social adjustment, was 38.1, 35.7, and 36.3
as rated by father, mother, and teacher respectively. The
ranges, again by father, mother, and teacher, were 27-45,
28-43, and 24-48. Similarly, mean scores for behavior in-
dicative of positive psycho-social functioning on the CBC
(possible range of 0-27 with increased score being associ-
ated with increased functioning) were 17.5, 17.1, and 10.8
with ranges of 3-24, 8-23, and 4-24. Means for cumulative
scores indicative of poor psycho-social adjustment on the
CBC (possible range of 0-25, higher score associated with
poorer functioning) were 5.2, 4.3, and 3.7 with ranges of
0-20, 0-14, and 0-16. The mean scores by teachers on the
AML (possible range of 43-215, higher score associated with
poorer functioning) was 70.4 with a range of 45-121.

Important to note is that though father, mother, and
teacher ratings of the children's adjustment appear to be
relatively similar, direct correlations between these
measures reveal in fact a mixed pattern of reliability.
Thus Table 4 shows that fathers' and mothers' positive

Table 4. Correlations between fathers', mothers', and teachers' ratings of children's psycho-social adjustment.

		Positive Adjustment						Negative Adjustment			
		B-P			CBC Positive			CBC Negative			AML
		Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Teacher
B-P	Father		.44	.07	-.20	.77@	.02	-.70***	-.05	-.31	-.44
	Mother			.63	-.13	.21	.24	-.29	-.55*	-.54*	-.64**
	Teacher				-.08	-.13	.67**	-.39	-.47	-.80@	-.89@@
CBC Pos.	Father					-.27	.33	.43	.03	.56	.23
	Mother						-.18	-.25	.50	-.06	-.12
	Teacher							-.21	-.43	-.31	-.60
CBC Neg.	Father								.45	.70@	.68**
	Mother									.46	.50
	Teacher										.89@@

*p<.05
**p<.02
***p<.01
@p<.004
@@p<.001

ratings of their sons' adjustment agree to a statistically·
significant extent only across one measure, that is between
the fathers' B-P and mothers' CBC Positive (.77, p < .004).
When comparing mothers' B-P with fathers' CBC Positive, or
mothers' CBC Positive with fathers' CBC Positive, we in
fact find negative correlations (-.13 and -.27 respectively).
Thus the mothers and fathers in the present sample indeed
perceived their children rather differently. This could be
accounted for by different perceptual styles between the
mothers and fathers (Messé, et al., 1978), different
amounts of exposure to their children in different situa-
tions, the children behaving differently with each parent,
or an interaction between several or all of these
possibilities.

Agreement between parents and teachers was also
mixed, being most reliable between fathers' and teachers'
ratings of the children's negative behaviors (e.g. fathers'
and teachers' CBC Negative ratings correlated .70 (p < .03)).
Again, similarity in perceptual styles, similarity in the
children's behaviors towards these adults--perhaps experi-
encing both in authoritative, disciplinarian roles--or an
interaction between both of these factors could account for
this high correlation coefficient.

Equally important is the rather perplexing pattern
of reliability across rating scales purporting to measure
similar dimensions of children's psycho-social adjustment.

Thus only teachers' B-P significantly correlated with

teachers' CBC Positive (.67 (p < .02)), while fathers' B-P

correlated slightly negatively with fathers' CBC Positive

(-.20). Fathers', mothers', and teachers' B-Ps do corre-

late significantly negatively, however, with fathers',

mothers' and teachers' CBC Negative as expected (-.70

(p < .01), -.55 (p.<05), -.80 (p.<003) respectively).

Fathers' and mothers' CBC Positive tended to positively

correlate with their CBC Negative (.43, .50), though this

could be due to merely an awareness of both the children's

positive and negative behaviors.

These findings clearly warn against using a single

inventory to measure a characteristic. They also, however,

point out the problem of assuming that using several inven-

tories to measure the same dimension necessarily makes the

results more valid. Another possibility here is that high

psycho-social competence is not a global, uniform trait but

instead is made up of separate, interrelated or independent

characteristics. Thus a child could be competent in some

areas and not in others, with the inventories tapping dif-

ferent areas.

Nonetheless, the relatively inconsistant scores

across inventories and across fathers', mothers', and

teachers' ratings necessitated treating the scores inde-

pendently in the data analysis rather than combining them

to form a singular, global scores of the children's psycho-

social adjustment.

Parents' Perceptions of Their Caregiving Behaviors: Table·
5 shows the means, standard deviations, and ranges of
scores obtained from father and mother self ratings of
their caregiver attitudes and behaviors on the 3 factors
of the CRPB and the two composite scores of the CRCP. Thus,
for example, along the Acceptance-Rejection factor of the
CRPB (possible range 24-72, higher score associated with
rejection and considered ineffective caregiver behavior)
the mean scores for fathers and mothers were 41.30 and
36.30, with standard deviations of 4.3 and 3.7, and ranges
of 35-47 and 31-41 respectively. As can be seen, the
present sample was comprised of parents who described them-
selves as fairly effective caregivers in terms of the fac-
tors assessed by the CRPB and CRCP, though here too the de-
gree of ascribed effectiveness is quite diverse.

Noteworthy here is the general similarity of matern-
al and paternal self perceptions, though the mothers tended
to present themselves as being more accepting on the CRPB
and exhibiting more positive and less negative parenting
behaviors on the CRCP.

Parents' Perception of Their Caregiving Behaviors and
Children's Psycho-social Adjustment: Table 6 presents the
correlation coefficients between parental reports of their
caregiving behaviors and parent/teacher ratings of the
children's adjustment. It is clear the results are highly
variegated.

Table 5. Means, standard deviations, and ranges of
fathers' and mothers' perceptions of their
caregiving behaviors.

Rater		Inventory			
		CRPB			CRCP
	Acptnc-Rejctn*	Autnmy-Contrl**	Lax-Firm***	Postv@	Negatv@@
Father X̄ = 41.30	42.50	41.10	100.00	81.20	
SD = 4.30	3.60	4.90	14.60	19.60	
Range = 35-47	36-46	33-48	81-120	48-119	
Mother X̄ = 36.30	42.70	41.40	108.70	73.80	
SD = 3.70	3.70	4.80	8.30	25.50	
Range = 31-41	36-46	32-45	98-125	42-121	

*24-72 possible, higher score signifies ineffective behaviors.

**16-48 possible, higher score signifies effective behaviors.

***16-48 possible, higher score signifies ineffective behaviors

@28-140 possible, higher score signifies effective behaviors

@@39-195 possible, higher score signifies ineffective behaviors.

Table 6. Correlations between parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors and ratings of children's psycho-social adjustment.

| | Positive Adjustment | | | | | | Negative Adjustment | | | |
| | B-P | | | CBC Positive | | | CBC Negative | | | AML |
	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Teacher
CRCP										
Fa Postv	.77**	.69**	.08	.08	.64*	.21	-.28	-.12	-.11	-.37
Mo Postv	.23	.67**	.45	.22	.15	.11	-.09	-.33	-.27	-.37
Postv Crgvng										
CRPB										
Fa Autnmy	.20	.49	.63*	-.49	.25	.44	-.31	-.08	-.70**	-.74**
Mo Autnmy	-.29	-.25	.33	-.36	-.50	.26	-.28	-.22	-.45	-.32
CRCP										
Fa Negtv	-.26	-.11	.04	.30	-.44	-.32	.09	-.09	.09	.11
Mo Negtv	-.03	-.23	-.36	.36	.25	-.19	.39	.41	.64*	.51
Negtv Crgvng										
Fa Rejctn	-.46	-.68**	-.20	-.26	-.15	-.20	.26	.40	.16	.42
Mo Rejctn	-.16	-.27	-.36	-.20	-.05	.05	.05	-.04	.12	.32
CRPB										
Fa Lax	-.09	-.05	.22	.45	.11	.50	.18	.07	.05	-.09
Mo Lax	-.33	.27	.52	.28	-.25	.34	.31	-.20	-.22	-.23

*p<.02
**p<.01

The composite score of the various factors of the CRCP theoretically indicative of positive paternal caregiving behaviors did indeed correlate significantly in the expected direction with fathers' and mothers' ratings of high adjustment using the B-P (.77 (p < .005), .69 (p < .01)) and mothers' ratings on the CBC Positive (.64 (p < .02)). This same composite score for effective maternal caregiving behaviors also correlated positively with competent child functioning as measured by the mothers' B-P ratings (.67 (p < .02)). Furthermore, there was a positive relationship between teacher ratings of high adjustment and fathers who perceived themselves as fostering autonomy (.63 (p < .03)), as well as a negative relationship between such paternal behaviors and teacher ratings of low adjustment (-.70 (p < .02) on the CBC Negative, -.74 (p < .02) on the AML). In general, positive parental behaviors correlated negatively with every measure of low child adjustment, though most of these correlations were small.

Parental reports of theoretically ineffective caregiver behaviors tended to negatively relate to ratings of high psycho-social adjustment, while positively relating to ratings of poor adjustment, though here again the relationships were small.

Of the specific factors of caregiving behaviors on the CRCP the most consistent pattern of correlations was between maternal reports of giving extrinsic rewards for

desired behavior (assumed to be an ineffective caregiver ·
response) and ratings of low psycho-social functioning.
Thus this factor correlated positively with every rating
of poor child functioning, correlating .59 (p < .07) with
fathers' CBC Negative, .72 (p < .02) with mothers' CBC
Negative, .89 (p < .001) with teachers' CBC Negative, and
.81 (p < .004) with teachers' AML. Admittedly, given the
small number of subjects in the current sample, this could
be accounted for by one mother who loaded high on this
factor and whose child happened--for a myriad of reasons
other than his mother's tendency to give him extrinsic re-
wards for desired behavior--to be rated low on psycho-
social adjustment. Nonetheless, the finding was indeed an
interesting one.

Another more general pattern was found in the posi-
tive correlations between effective paternal behaviors, as
assessed by the CRCP, and ratings of high child functioning.
Thus fathers' reports of expressing pride in their children
correlated .70 (p < .01) with fathers' B-P, .57 (p < .04)
with mothers' B-P, and .80 (p < .002) with mothers' CBC
Positive, while inexplicably correlating -.22 with fathers'
CBC Positive and not correlating significantly with any of
the teachers' ratings of positive psycho-social functioning.

Children's Perceptions of Their Parents' Caregiving
Behaviors: Table 7 presents the means, standard deviations,

Table 7. Means, standard deviations, and ranges of children's
          perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors.

Person Rated		Inventory		
		Acceptance-Rejection*	CRPB Autonomy-Control**	Lax-Firm***
Father	$\bar{X}$ = 32.50		36.00	36.20
	SD = 5.90		8.50	4.70
	Range = 26-45		22-48	28-42
Mother	$\bar{X}$ = 32.50		36.90	35.90
	SD = 6.76		8.90	4.80
	Range = 25-44		20-48	29-43

*24-72 possible, higher score signifies ineffective behaviors.

**16-48 possible, higher score signifies effective behaviors.

***16-48 possible, higher score signifies ineffective behaviors.

and ranges of children's perceptions of their parents' care-
giving behaviors on the 3 orthoginal dimensions of the CRPB.
As can be seen, the children in the present study generally
viewed their parents as exhibiting behaviors assumed to be
effective, though a wide spectrum of perceptions existed.
Mothers and fathers were viewed nearly exactly the same,
though this in part could be due to the children not wanting
to give the impression of liking one parent better than the
other.

The present results support the research of Michaels,
et al. (1977) in finding that the children perceived their
parents to be more accepting, while also more psychological-
ly controlling, than the parents viewed themselves. Further-
more, they experienced their parents as exhibiting more
firm control than the parents reported.

Children's Perceptions of Their Parents' Caregiving
Behaviors and the Children's Psycho-social Adjustment: As
Table 8 shows, the relationship between the children's per-
ceptions of theoretically effective and ineffective care-
giving behaviors exhibited by their parents, and various
ratings of the children's competence was to some extent con-
tradicted expectations. For example, it was indeed sur-
prising to find that children's perceptions of their parents
as rejecting correlated positively with parent ratings in-
dicative of good adjustment (children seeing fathers as re-
jecting correlated .50 (p < .07) and .67 (p < .02) with

Table 8. Correlations between children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors and ratings of children's psycho-social adjustment.

Children's Perceptions of Caregiving	Positive Adjustment						Negative Adjustment			
	B-P			CBC Positive			CBC Negative			AML
	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Teacher
Postv Crgvng										
Fa Autnmy	.11	.44	.53	-.67**	.09	.15	-.32	-.12	-.74***	-.65**
Mo Autnmy	.37	.70***	.48	-.66*	.40	.04	-.36	-.13	-.68**	-.62*
Negtv Crgvng										
Fa Rejctn	.50	.67**	.04	-.42	.31	-.10	-.45	-.46	-.43	-.32
Mo Rejctn	.60**	.81@	.18	-.44	.39	-.13	-.46	-.38	-.54	-.49
Fa Lax	-.32	.23	.71***	.07	-.28	.59	.02	-.31	-.50	-.53
Mo Lax	.02	.40	.83@	-.26	.12	.38	-.13	.01	-.69**	-.71***

*p<.05
**p<.03
***p<.01
@p<.002

fathers' B-P and mothers' B-P; children seeing mothers as ·
rejecting correlated .60 (p < .03) and .81 (p < .002) with
fathers' B-P and mothers' B-P). Furthermore, the table
reveals that fathers and mothers perceived as rejecting
negatively correlated with all measures of low psycho-
social adjustment.

Building on Michaels', et al.'s (1977) reasoning, it
could be that the more competent children in the present
study had less need to deny the existence of the relatively
few rejecting behaviors their parents displayed, since these
children felt psychologically safe enough in their relation-
ships with their parents to be candid about their percep-
tions of them. Parents did not have to be idealized but
could be seen as they were.

Children's perceptions of their parents as exhibit-
ing lax control--behaviors assumed to be characteristic of
ineffective parenting--were also unexpectedly positively
correlated with teacher ratings of high psycho-social com-
petence (children perceiving fathers as lax correlated .71
(p < .01) with teachers' B-P, while their perception of
mothers being lax correlated .83 (p < .001) with teachers'
B-P). This factor was also negatively correlated to most
of the teachers' ratings of poor adjustment. Here again,
these results could be explained by assuming that the rela-
tively low degree of perceived laxness in the present
sample of generally well functioning children were not

sufficient of hinder positive psychological development. ·

In fact, the children might have experienced such laxness

as a validation of their ability to make choices for them-

selves and a valuing of their autonomy.

Dependent Measures

Category Usage: Table 9 presents the means, standard de-

viations, and minimum-maximum occurrences--rank ordered by

frequency of usage--for the 9 fantasy categories that were

scored, 8 by way of frequency counts and one using a com-

posite of rating scale items. Mean category usage of these

dimensions assessed by frequency counts was based on the

average scores of the two independent raters, summed across

the three WVT sessions.

Clearly, aggressive acts ($\overline{X}$ = 51.15) were far more

prevlant than any of the other categorized behaviors, being

five times more frequent than benevolent acts ($\overline{X}$ = 10.25)

which was the next most prevalent category used. Previous

studies have found that "permissiveness" of aggression by

an adult experimenter increased fantasy aggression (Pintler,

1945; Siegel, 1957; Siegel and Kohn, 1959). Perhaps this

phenominon contributed to the high degree of aggression in

the present investigation.

Construction, Dominance, and Adequacy occurred with

roughly equal frequency ($\overline{X}$ = 5.95, $\overline{X}$ = 5.80, $\overline{X}$ = 5.35 re-

spectively), and though in absolute terms they did not

Table 9. Means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum
          occurances of fantasy play categories.

Category	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Minimum-Maximum Occurrance
Aggression	51.15	25.27	16-81
Benevolence	10.25	5.53	1.5-20
Construction	5.95	5.17	0-16
Dominance	5.80	6.12	0-17.5
Adequacy	5.35	5.25	0-16.5
Assertion	.75	.83	0-2
Submission	.70	1.27	0-3.5
Dependency	.40	.70	0-2
Propensity for Imaginative Play*	31.30	9.95	20-47.5

*Based on composite scores of several rating scale items; 12-48 possible
score range, higher score signifies greater propensity.

occur often, they indeed occurred much more frequently than

Assertion, Submission, and Dependence ($\overline{X}$ = .75, $\overline{X}$ = .70,

$\overline{X}$ = .40). Clearly, these last three categories occurred

infrequently.

As can be seen, Propensity for Imaginative Play--a

composite score of several rating scale items--had a mean

of 31.30, a standard deviation of 9.95, and a range of

20-47.5 (a rating of 12-48 was possible, with higher score

being indicative of greater propensity).

These ratings reflect the diversity of the kind of

fantasy play engaged in by these children in the sandbox

context and the differences in their proclivity to do so.

Changes Across the 3 WVT Sessions: A Student's T-test was

performed to determine if there was a significant difference

between the 3 WVT sessions across any of the relevant di-

mensions (see Appendix H). Computations revealed no sig-

nificant differences between sessions on any of the cate-

gories. The highest significance level reached was p.< 30,

occurring when comparing the amount of Adequcy responses

between the first and third WVT.

These findings are in contrast to previous research

that found aggression to increase across fantasy play

sessions e.g., Bach, 1945; Hollenberg and Sperry, 1956;

Sears, 1951), although the play contexts were not the same

as the present study, i.e. the Ss in this study were limited

to the sandbox and the miniature objects.

Table 10 presents the means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum occurrences for the frequency of the various categories across the 3 WVT sessions. It can be seen that despite differences not being statistically significant, the occurrence of aggression decreased over the sessions while Benevolence, Construction, and Adequacy increased. Also, the general propensity to engage in imaginative play increased.

When delineating Aggression and Benevolence into their component subcategories--as is shown in Table 11--we find that Distant Physical, Direct Physical, Accidents, and to a lesser extent Devouring acts made up most of the Aggression score, while Helping behaviors made up by far most of the Benevolence score. In fact, according to the raters, no act of Physical Benevolence (e.g. hugging, kissing, etc.) occurred in any of the 3 WVT sessions, while only one rater scored one act of Verbal Benevolence (e.g. complimenting) having occurred in sessions 2 and 3. There appeared to be a trend toward decreasing expression of direct aggression (e.g. Devouring, Direct Physical, Distant Physical), with a concomitant increase in more symbolic ways of expressing aggression through Accidents. At the same time, Helping behaviors increased across the 3 sessions.

Table 12 shows the means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum use of human, animal and transportation

Table 10. Means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum
occurrances for categories across the 3 WVT sessions.

Category		WVT 1	WVT 2	WVT 3
Aggression	$\bar{X}$ =	20.50	17.40	13.60
	SD =	25.13	23.68	16.00
	Min-Max =	0-72	0-66.5	0-47
Benevolence	$\bar{X}$ =	2.20	4.00	4.05
	SD =	2.99	5.90	4.90
	Min-Max =	0-8.5	0-19	0-16.5
Construction	$\bar{X}$ =	1.80	1.90	2.25
	SD =	3.20	2.31	2.94
	Min-Max =	0-10	0-5.5	0-6
Dominance	$\bar{X}$ =	1.95	2.25	1.60
	SD =	2.67	3.56	2.10
	Min-Max =	0-8.5	0-12	0-6.5
Adequacy	$\bar{X}$ =	.70	1.25	1.45
	SD =	.62	1.25	2.25
	Min-Max =	0-3	0-6.5	0-14.5
Assertion	$\bar{X}$ =	.15	.10	.13
	SD =	.33	.29	.27
	Min-Max =	0-2	0-1.5	0-1.5
Submission	$\bar{X}$ =	.40	.10	.20
	SD =	1.10	.32	.63
	Min-Max =	0-3.5	0-1	0-2
Dependency	$\bar{X}$ =	.15	.10	.15
	SD =	.34	.32	.34
	Min-Max =	0-1	0-1	0-1
Propensity for Imaginative Play	$\bar{X}$ =	9.35	10.55	11.40
	SD =	5.01	4.13	2.54
	Range* =	4-16	5-15.5	7.5-16

*4-16 possible on each WVT session.

Table 11. Means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum occurrances for the sub ategories of Aggression and Benevolence.

Aggression

Session		Devouring	Direct Physical	Distance Physical	Accident	Verbal Malevolence	Social Malevolence	Deprivation	Abandonment
WVT 1	$\bar{X}$ =	2.05	5.35	7.80	4.00	.50	.30	.15	0
	SD =	3.85	4.46	10.36	4.06	1.58	.48	.34	0
	Min-Max =	0-12	0-13.5	0-27	0-12.5	0-.5	0-1	0-1	0
WVT 2	$\bar{X}$ =	1.20	3.75	4.70	6.85	.10	.50	.20	.10
	SD =	2.11	4.97	5.56	9.34	.21	.82	.35	.32
	Min-Max =	0-6.5	0-13.5	0-14	0-28	0-.5	0-2	0-1	0-1
WVT 3	$\bar{X}$ =	1.05	3.95	2.80	4.70	.20	.60	.30	0
	SD =	1.75	4.17	5.00	4.00	.42	.81	.35	0
	Min-Max =	0-5.5	0-11	0-15	0-11.5	0-1	0-1	0-1	0

Benevolence

Session		Physical Benevolence	Verbal Benevolence	Helping	Affiliative Acts	Satisfying Experiences
WVT 1	$\bar{X}$ =	0	0	1.95	.25	0
	SD =	0	0	2.36	.63	0
	Min-Max =	0	0	0-6.5	0-2	0
WVT 2	$\bar{X}$ =	0	.05	3.15	.70	.10
	SD =	0	.16	4.71	.82	.21
	Min-Max =	0	0-.5	0-16	0-2	0-.5
WVT 3	$\bar{X}$ =	0	.05	3.70	.20	.10
	SD =	0	.16	4.08	.35	.32
	Min-Max =	0	0-.5	0-14	0-1	0-1

Table 12. Means, standard deviations, and minimum-
maximum occurrences for objects used in
the 3 WVT sessions.

Object Category	$\overline{X}$	SD	Minimum-Maximum
Human	43.7	42.06	2-145
Animal	59.8	55.62	13-191
Transportation	42.0	23.61	6-85

figures across the 3 WVT sessions. As can be seen, animal·
figures were more often used by the children in the current
study than human or transportation objects, though here
again there was a great diversity in the numbers used by
different children. When inter-correlating the use of these
three groups of objects, we find no statistically significant
relationship (Table 13).

Inter-relationships Between Categories of Fantasy Behaviors:
As Table 14 shows, the various categories of fantasy behav-
iors were by no means independent and mutually exclusive.
Dimensions that would appear to be in polar opposition were
in fact correlated, i.e. Aggression and Benevolence (.64,
p<.02). Thus it would appear that the children in the cur-
rent study often manifested seemingly bi-polar behavior
rather than simply exhibiting a predominance of a single
mode of fantasy play.

Caution must be taken in interpreting the interesting
correlation between Dependency and Dominance (.83, p < .002),
Assertion (.77, p < .005), and Aggression (.64, p < .02),
since the mean frequency of Dependent behaviors was only
.40 across all 3 sessions, and occurred maximally only
twice. Thus these high correlations appear to be due to a
single child who happened to display the few Dependency be-
haviors while also exhibiting Dominance, Assertion, and
Aggression.

Table 13. Inter-correlations between categories
of objects used.

Object Category	Human	Animal	Transportation
Human	1.00	-.19	.23
Animal	-.19	1.00	.29
Transportation	.23	.29	1.00

Table 14. Correlations among fantasy play categories.

Category	Benvlnc	Constrctn	Domnc	Adqucy	Assrtn	Submssn	Depndncy	Prpnsty
Aggression	.64**	-.22	.75***	.73***	.68**	-.11	.64**	.92@
Benevolence		-.09	.20	.69**	.11	-.04	.14	.58*
Construction			-.23	-.08	-.29	.15	.11	.03
Dominance				.34	.91@	-.09	.83***	.76***
Adequacy					.45	-.19	.38	.75***
Assertion						-.21	.77***	.70***
Submission							-.22	-.12
Dependency								.77***

*p .05
**p .02
***p .006
@p .001

Also of interest is the surprisingly small relation-ship between Construction and all other categories. This too could be due to one or two children who exhibited most of the Construction behaviors while manifesting few other behaviors and playing in what the raters assessed to be a relatively unimaginative way (Construction correlated .03 with Propensity for Imaginative Play).

When delineating the Aggression and Benevolence com-posite scores into their subcategories and inter-correlat-ing these, interesting patterns arise. Thus Table 15 seems to suggest two different patterns of aggressive behaviors, in that Devouring and Direct Physical are highly correlated (.91, p < .001) while being negatively correlated with Distant Physical (-.33 and -.25). Similarly, there is little relationship between Helping and Affiliative Acts (-.08), suggesting that these behaviors also make up sep-arate dimensions of play and are not components of a sing-ular factor. Thus children in the present investigation who engaged in benevolent behaviors by way of helping be-haviors did not necessarily engage in make believe affilia-tive actions or physical or verbal benevolence.

The high correlation between Accident and Helping (.91, p < .001) reveals that the children in the present study strongly tended to have Helping behaviors occur con-comitant with Accidents. This could be an important char-acteristic of the fantasy play of relatively well adjusted

Table 15. Inter-correlations between Aggression and Benevolence subcategories.

Subcategory	Devrng	Drct Phys	Dstnc Phys	Acddnt	Vrbl Mal.	Socl Mal	Helping	Afflty Acts
Propensity for Imaginative Play	.58*	.69***	.41	.60**	-.23	.11	.58*	-.09
Devouring		.91@	-.33	.10	.02	.02	.28	-.11
Direct Physical			-.25	.20	.003	.06	.31	.12
Distance Physical				.27	-.31	.26	-.02	-.02
Accident					-.02	.26	.91@	.09
Verbal Malevolence						.63*	.16	.42
Social Malevolence							.02	.55*
Helping								-.08

*p .05
**p .03
***p .01
@p .001

non-clinic children. It also accounts for most of the   ·

positive relationship between Aggression and Benevolence

(.64, p < .02).

Children's Fantasy Play and
Their Psycho-social Adjustment: The relationship between

the various measures of the children's psycho-social adjust-

ment and dimensions of their fantasy play was highly varied

and inconsistent, as Tables 16 and 17 reveal. That fathers,

mothers, and teachers perceived and experienced that same

child very differently again becomes clear through the dis-

crepancies in the data. Thus, for example, while Aggres-

sion correlated positively with teachers' and fathers' BP

and CBC Positive (measures of positive functioning), it

correlated negatively with mothers' ratings on these same

measures. Such discrepancies were also found in regards to

Dominance, Adequacy, Assertion, and Propensity for Imagina-

tive Play.

Inconsistencies between inter-measure reliability

were also evident in contradictory patterns such as Domi-

nance negatively correlating with fathers' BP while posi-

tively correlating with fathers' CBC Positive--inventories

that supposedly measure the same traits. Such incongruen-

cies compounded the difficulty of interpreting the data,

though it is clear that no strong, consistent statistically

significant trends in the relationship between the chil-

dren's fantasy play and measures of their psycho-social

Table 16. Correlations between fantasy play categories and measures of psycho-social adjustment.

| Fantasy Category | Positive Adjustment | | | | | | Negative Adjustment | | | |
| | B-P | | | CBC Positive | | | CBC Negative | | | AML |
	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Teacher
Aggression	.04	-.31	.22	.28	-.34	.51	-.36	-.28	-.03	-.20
Benevolence	.32	.11	.22	.36	.15	.51	-.15	-.09	.14	-.20
Construction	.03	-.27	-.11	.23	.47	.09	.34	.61**	.25	.20
Dominance	-.09	-.31	.34	.27	-.48	.24	-.36	-.27	-.21	-.25
Adequacy	-.04	-.10	.23	.04	-.20	.42	-.14	-.25	-.01	-.08
Assertion	-.10	-.25	.46	-.11	-.44	.18	-.47	-.30	-.46	-.36
Submission	.47	.59*	.31	.24	.18	.46	-.38	-.54*	-.32	-.48
Dependency	.02	-.59*	-.02	.17	-.16	-.06	-.28	.09	.05	.09
Propensity for Imaginative Play	-.06	-.43	.24	.33	-.31	.49	-.25	-.15	.04	-.10

*p .05
**p .03

Table 17. Correlations between Aggression and Benevolence subcategories and psycho-social adjustment.

Fantasy Subcategory	Positive Adjustment						Negative Adjustment			
	B-P			CBC Positive			CBC Negative			AML
	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Father	Mother	Teacher	Teacher
Aggression										
Devouring	-.05	.10	.54**	-.24	-.24	.50	-.38	-.50	-.45	-.39
Direct Physical	-.14	-.08	.42	-.08	-.23	.55**	-.17	-.29	-.24	-.24
Distance Physical	.06	-.53*	-.25	.37	-.37	.06	-.16	.008	.22	.15
Accident	.31	-.11	.04	.34	.11	.46	-.21	.002	.23	.12
Verbal Malevolence	.12	.51	.23	-.31	.01	-.23	-.02	-.14	-.28	-.23
Social Malevolence	.06	.42	.45	.02	-.37	.31	-.24	-.49	-.40	-.53*
Benevolence										
Helping	.38	.09	.28	.29	.24	.50	-.25	-.03	.06	-.27
Affiliative Acts	-.12	.27	-.13	.28	-.27	.15	.33	-.26	.24	.10

*p .06
**p .05

adjustment were to be found in the present investigation. ·
Furthermore, trends that did appear often seemed to contra-
dict previous research, e.g. Construction positively corre-
lating with measures of low adjustment.

Children's Fantasy Play and Parents'
Perceptions of Their Caregiving Behaviors: Table 18 sug-
gests no strong, consistent relationship between caregiving
behaviors and the various measures of fantasy play used in
the current study. A few correlations are in the expected
direction, however, as in the negative relationship between
mothers who reported manifesting rejecting behaviors toward
their sons and benevolent behaviors in their sons' fantasy
play. Furthermore, mothers' reports of fostering autonomy
in their children positively related to dominant and asser-
tive behaviors in the fantasy play.

Numerous unexpected relationships also were evident,
for example the positive correlation between measures of
theoretically ineffective paternal caregiving behaviors and
construction themes in the children's fantasy play--themes
that are hypothetically indicative of positive psycho-social
functioning. That indices of effective paternal behaviors
negatively correlated with Assertion and Propensity for
Imaginative Play was also unexpected, as was the positive
relation between Aggression and mothers' reports of foster-
ing autonomy.

Table 18. Correlations between fantasy play categories and parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors.

| Fantasy Category | "Positive" Parenting | | | | "Negative" Parenting | | | | | |
| | CRCP | | CRPB | | CRCP | | CRPB | | | |
	Fa Postv	Mo Postv	Fa Autnmy	Mo Autnmy	Fa Negatv	Mo Negatv	Fa Rejctn	Mo Rejctn	Fa Lax	Mo Lax
Aggression	-.13	-.39	-.15	.54	.10	-.11	.14	-.16	-.11	-.12
Benevolence	.44	.07	.10	-.09	.01	.41	-.24	-.50	-.07	-.14
Construction	-.02	-.08	-.04	-.31	.51*	.19	.43	.37	.75@	.41
Dominance	-.45	-.14	-.26	.54**	.52*	-.27	.14	-.27	-.07	.12
Adequacy	-.05	-.25	-.14	.33	-.16	.09	.38	-.01	-.10	.15
Assertion	-.52*	-.17	-.07	.69**	.40	-.37	.32	-.19	-.18	.14
Submission	.51	.45	.18	-.28	-.37	-.31	-.51	.28	.54*	.30
Dependency	-.51	-.28	-.53*	.31	.32	.01	.47	.01	.02	.01
Propensity for Imaginative Play	-.32	-.27	-.29	.40	.11	.07	.34	-.07	.14	.07

*p .06
**p .01
@p .006

Of more general importance seems to be the different effects the same behaviors can have when manifested by the father or mother. Thus fathers fostering autonomy tended to relate negatively with aggression in the play, while mothers fostering autonomy related positively to aggression. Similarly, theoretically ineffective caregiver behaviors in fathers were positively related to dominance in the children's play, while such fantasy behaviors were negatively related to theoretically ineffective caregiver behaviors in mothers.

When the CRPB Positive and Negative composite scores were differentiated into the factors making them up and related to the fantasy play, only a few relationships reached statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level (see Appendix I). These were as follows: Fathers' concern with aggression (a theoretically positive attribute) correlated $-.62$ ($p < .03$) with Dependency; fathers' stressing intrinsic rewards for pro-social behaviors (theoretically effective behavior) correlated $.58$ ($p < .04$) with Benevolence; fathers' use of inductive discipline (considered effective parenting) correlated $.65$ ($p < .02$) with Submission; mothers' showing pride in their children (assumed effective) correlated $-.66$ ($p < .02$) with Aggression, $-.76$ ($p < .005$) with Dominance, $-.73$ ($p < .008$) with Assertion, and $-.55$ ($p < .05$) with Propensity for Imaginative Play; fathers being rejecting and taking pro-social behaviors for granted (both considered

ineffective) correlated -.57 (p < .04) and -.60 (p < .03) ·
with Construction.

In relating the Aggression and Benevolence subcate-
gories with the perceived caregiver behaviors, four relation-
ships reached statistical significance at the p < .05 level
(see Appendix J). These were Driect Physical with fathers
being rejecting (.55, p < .05), Verbal Malevolence with
fathers being lax (-.69, p < .01), Social Malevolence with
mothers exhibiting ineffective parenting skills (.57, p < .04),
and Helping with mothers being rejecting (-.55, p < .05).
When these subcategories were related to the factors making
up the global positive and negative parenting scores on the
CRPB, the following significant relationships occurred (see
Appendix J): fathers emphasizing intrinsic rewards for pro-
social behaviors and Helping (.55, p < .05); fathers showing
pride in their children and Distance Physical (-.59, p < .04);
fathers taking pro-social behaviors for granted and Distance
Physical (.56, p < .05); fathers not disciplining and Affil-
iative Acts (-.55, p < .05); mothers showing pride and Dis-
tance Physical (-.58, p < .04); mothers showing pride and
Social Malevolence (-.55, p < .05); mothers criticizing and
Social Malevolence (-.57, p < .04); mothers stressing ex-
ternal rewards for pro-social behaviors and Devouring (-60,
p < .03); mothers being rejecting and Helping (.60, p < .03);
mothers shaming and Social Malevolence (-.56, p < .05);
mothers shaming and Helping (.56, p < .05); mothers taking

pro-social behaviors for granted and Accident (.57, p < .04);
and mothers taking pro-social behaviors for granted and
Helping (.55, p < .05). Though many of the relationships
here were in the expected direction, it is clear that many
were not.

Children's Fantasy Play and Their
Perceptions of Their Parents' Caregiving Behaviors:

There
again seems to be only minimal association between the chil-
dren's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors
and the measures used to assess fantasy play in the current
investigation, as is shown in Table 19.

The most important variable seemed to be fathers and
mothers being perceived as rejecting, which correlated
positively with Submission (.67, p < .02 and .55, p < .05
respectively) and negatively with Propensity for Imaginative
Play (-.60, p < .03 and -.66, p < .02). This variable al-
most reached significance in relation to Aggression (-.50,
p < .07 for fathers and -.48, p < .08 for mothers and De-
pendency (-.51, p < .07 for fathers and -.54, p < .05 for
mothers thereby reaching adequate significance). While
mothers being perceived as fostering autonomy predictively
correlated negatively with Dependency (-.62, p < .03), it
unexpectedly also correlated negatively with Propensity for
Imaginative Play (-.54, p < .05).

The only relationship that reached statistical sig-
nificance at the p < .05 level when relating the Aggression

Table 19. Correlations between fantasy play categories and children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors.

Fantasy Category	"Positive" Parenting		"Negative" Parenting			
	Fa Autonomy	Mo Autonomy	Fa Rejecting	Mo Rejecting	Fa Lax	Mo Lax
Aggression	-.15	-.41	-.50	-.48	-.15	.05
Benevolence	-.13	-.05	-.37	-.25	-.22	.07
Construction	-.33	-.26	-.20	-.29	.13	.14
Dominance	-.15	-.44	-.47	-.40	.06	.10
Adequacy	-.15	-.22	-.38	-.40	-.19	.07
Assertion	.10	-.18	-.37	-.30	.11	.29
Submission	-.07	.11	.67***	.55*	.37	-.01
Dependency	-.45	-.62**	-.51	-.54*	-.23	-.12
Propensity for Imaginative Play	-.35	-.54*	-.60**	-.66***	.02	-.01

*p .05
**p .03
***p .02

and Benevolence subcategories with the children's percep- ·

tions of their parents' caregiving behaviors was perceiving

mothers as fostering autonomy with Distance Physical (-.58,

p < .04).

DISCUSSION

Qualifications of Results

Number of Subjects: Clearly, the most limiting aspect of
the current investigation for generalizability was the
small number of children who participated. Indeed, conclu-
sions about the relationship between caregiver behaviors,
child psycho-social adjustment and fantasy play based on a
sample of only 10 children must be made in very tentative,
equivical terms. The greatest liability here was that the
results as a whole became highly vulnerable to the effects
of any extreme. That is, strong, statistically significant
relationships between variables could be due to a single,
extreme rating on any dimension--caregiver behaviors, child
psycho-social functioning, or fantasy play--rated by either
of the parents, the teacher, or the child. Thus, for ex-
ample, the significant relationship between Assertion and
mothers fostering autonomy (.69, $p < .01$) could be accounted
for by a single child who exhibited a few fantasy assertive
behaviors, while his mother perceived herself as manifesting
many autonomy-fostering caregiver responses. This does not
necessarily imply a strong general relationship between
mothers' fostering autonomy and assertion in their children's
fantasy play.

<u>Characteristics of the Sample</u>: The present sample consist-
ed of 10, middle class, non-clinic referred boys who were
perceived by their parents and teachers as psycho-socially
functioning relatively well. In addition, the parents in
the current study perceived themselves, and were perceived
by their children, as exhibiting relatively effective care-
giver behaviors. With such a normative sample, both in re-
spect to the children's psycho-social adjustment and the
parents' caregiver behaviors, effects between parenting
styles, child functioning and fantasy play would have to be
extremely strong for any inter-relationship to reach sta-
tistical significance in a consistently patterned way.

More subtle effects could be discerned by contrast-
ing groups that were extreme on any of the three main di-
mensions. Thus selecting children who were rated on the
highest and lowest ends of the competency continuum, or
parents who reported and/or were perceived by their children
as exhibiting the highest and lowest degrees of effective
caregiver behaviors, or children who manifested extreme
fantasy play behaviors, would have illuminated more clearly
the relationships between these variables. Indeed, Baum-
rind's (1967; 1970) studies of the relationships between
parenting styles and children's psycho-social adjustment
followed such a design.

Lastly, the 10 subjects who agreed to participate in
the present study were selected from 37 families who

initially volunteered. These families, in turn, were the ·
only ones to respond to the 350 requests that were original-
ly sent out through the elementary schools. Generalizabili-
ty from such a select sample--likely not to be representative
of the population as a whole--is indeed trepidaciously pre-
carious.

Reliability of Measures: The sporadic, inconsistent reli-
ability between fathers', mothers', and teachers' ratings of
the children's competence, as well as the low inter-measure
reliability between measures of competence, left ambiguous
the degree of the children's adjustment and the validity of
the measures for this concept.

More precise objectification would have been obtained
by having trained raters observe the children in various
settings to measure their degree of competence. Thus, for
example, Baumrind (1967; 1970) had trained raters spend 2
weeks in the classrooms assessing the children's competence,
comparing these ratings with the teachers' scores to deter-
mine the teachers' reliability.

More careful assessment of actual caregiver behaviors,
again using trained raters making in vivo observations of
the interactions between the parents and their children in
various settings, would have indicated more clearly the
parenting styles. An attempt in this direction was made by
Sears, et al. (1953) in assessing maternal behaviors towards
their children through direct observations of the mother-

child interactions in the playroom.

**The World View Technique as a Means
of Evoking Fantasy Play:** Children's fantasy play in the
current investigation was assessed using the Lowenfeld World
View Technique. This approach was used due to its being an
unusually good medium for tapping the nonverbal, analogic
domain of childhood experiencing. It further allows for
various means of objective scoring, while remaining rela-
tively free of an overly intrusive, inhibiting, experimental-
ly induced structuring. Yet these very properties of the
technique which potentiate the elicitation of a phantasma-
gorical array of imaginative themes, perhaps have a pro-
found influence on the nature of the play itself.

Jung (1968), Leary (1957), Sullivan (1953) and others
have speculated on the existence of various levels of un-
consious experiencing. Demarcating these as the "Personal"
and "Collective" Unconscious (Jung, 1968), "Levels I - V"
(Leary, 1957), or "Prototaxic" and "Parataxic" experiences
(Sullivan, 1953), these theorists all postulated a hier-
archical structure of the continuum between unconscious and
conscious experiencing. Traditional psychoanalytic thought
also makes an implicit assumption that latent unconscious
content is subject to differing degrees of repression
(Freud, 1953; Fenichel, 1945). Uniform to all of these
theories is the idea that at the more primordial levels of
the psyche, the structure of experience becomes more trans-

personal, universal, and alike. Individual issues give way to specie issues.

If, in fact, the WVT evokes these deeper regions of the psyche, as Bowyer (1970), Buhler and Carrol (1951), Kalf (1971), and Lowenfeld (1935; 1939) have speculated, then one would <u>not</u> expect significant differences in the Worlds of relatively well functioning individuals, for at these deeper levels we would expect the themes to be alike. From another perspective, it becomes clear that competence is not so much defined by <u>what</u> unconscious processes under-lie the personality, but rather by <u>how</u> these processes are expressed and integrated into the personality. (The issue here essentially echoes the transition from the early id-oriented psychoanalytic thought (Freud, 1953; Fenichel, 1945) to the later ego-psychologies of Rappaport (1967), Hartmann (1958), and others.) It may well be that the WVT expresses the "what" of the unconscious more than the "how" of the ego.

Perhaps the WVT, in its propensity to evoke more id-laden fantasy play, is analogous to the Rorschach in re-flecting more primitive layers of the personality, as opposed to the more structured, ego-fantasies elicited by the TAT (Allison, et al., 1968; Rabin, 1968). Indeed, we would expect more variation between the TAT stories of "normal" individuals than between their Rorschach responses (Allison, et al., 1968; Rabin, 1968).

In reviewing the past research on children's fantasy play, one realizes that the methods used to elicit the fantasies tended to evoke what could be considered more ego-oriented, higher order forms of fantasy. Thus Pitcher and Prelinger (1963), in their study of children's fantasy life, used the children's verbalized stories for their data. Verbalization—as has previously been pointed out—is a relatively high order level of ego functioning in children (Lewin, 1935; Piaget, 1937; Werner, 1948), and thus the nature of this form of fantasy is likely to be quite different from other fantasy expressions. Sears, et al. (1965) and Wowkanech (1977), in their research on imaginative play using a structured doll play technique, introduced a relatively explicit, well defined format which again would tend to elicit higher order forms of ego-oriented fantasy play. Even naturalistic observations of children's play, as done by Erikson (1950), Gould (1972), and Reif and Stollak (1972), could be observing a more ego based form of play since in the free and unstructured manipulation of the physical and social environment the child by necessity must make many subtle accommodations to the external reality. Thus, for example, the child must attend and accurately respond to many interpersonal cues from his/her peers if s/he is to continue playing with them. If s/he does not accurately gauge the degree of "fluctuating certainty" (Gould, 1972) of a playmate and introduces a fantasy theme that overwhelms

the other child, the now fearful playmate might stop play-·
ing. Such awarenesses and decisions are ego operations and
thereby raise the level of play to a more ego-oriented form.

Few such restrictions exist in the WVT situation
since the child need be only indirectly aware of the E, who
attempts to be highly permissive and accepting of the
child's behaviors. The minimal amount of physical and
social reality demands inherent in the WVT, along with the
use of a sandbox and miniature toys--truly the environment
of the earliest forms of sensory-motor play--are likely to
evoke the most regressive forms of play. Stated in Pi-
agetian terms (Piaget, 1957), the WVT necessitates minimal
accommodative responding and thereby allows for the maximi-
zation of assimilative behaviors. Clearly, research com-
paring children's fantasy play evoked by different means
would help elucidate the question of different levels of
"ego-oriented" and "id-oriented" fantasy and how such phe-
nomina interact with different fantasy play mediums.

Relevance of Findings for Hypotheses

The expectation that there would be a positive rela-
tionship between high parental self reports on dimensions
theoretically indicative of effective caregiving behaviors
and high psycho-social adjustment in their children was
partially confirmed. This relationship was stronger and
more consistent for fathers, where several dimensions

reflective of positive parenting correlated positively with measures of child competence and negatively with indices of poor adjustment. Some specific caregiver behaviors had a stronger effect of child adjustment, most of these being in the expected direction. The overall pattern was variegated, however, lacking a consistent positive relationship between theoretically effective caregiving responses and competent child behaviors, and/or a prevailing negative relationship between theoretically ineffectual parenting and poor adjustment.

The finding in regard to children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behaviors and the children's adjustment were in general antithetical to the initial predictions. There was an unexpected positive relationship between children's perception of both parents as rejecting and measures of high adjustment. This positive relationship also existed for perceptions of parents as being lax and one teacher rating of competence. Perceived parental fostering of autonomy related both positively and negatively to measures of competence, though it consistently correlated negatively with measures of low functioning, as was initially assumed.

Assessment of the various dimensions of the children's fantasy play also produced some unexpected results. There was no significant differences across the 3 WVT sessions on any of the measures used. This was in contrast to the

expected increase in aggression. On the contrary, the trend was for aggression to decrease, while fantasized helping behaviors, constuction, adequacy, and propensity for fantasy play to increase. Furthermore, there was a decrease in the more primitive forms of aggression in conjunction with an increase in the more socialized forms.

The assumption that certain dimensions of fantasy play--specifically Benevolence, Construction, Adequacy, Assertion, Dominance, and Propensity for Imaginative Play-- would be positively related to high psycho-social functioning, while Aggression, Submission, and Dependency would show a negative relationship, was not substantiated by the results of the current investigation. Indeed, there was no readily interpretable pattern of relationship between the children's fantasy play and their psycho-social adjustment. They appeared to be separate facets of the child's life space.

Similarly, there were few significant relationships between dimensions of the fantasy play and parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors. Though a few expected relationships were found, in general, the interrelational patterns were highly scattered and inconsistent, often contradiciting the original assumption of a positive relationship between effective parenting behaviors and competent child fantasy play.

chi

ior

tiv

cor

as

tiv

lac

in

$\frac{In}{ar}$

su

ti

b

fo

ch

l

L

Ya

fo

(1

s

ig

t

What few significant effects that existed between

children's perceptions of their parents' caregiving behav-

iors and the children's fantasy play tended to be suppor-

tive of the original hypotheses. Thus there was a positive

correlation between children's perception of their parents

as rejecting and fantasized Submission, as well as a nega-

tive relation with Propensity for Imaginative Play. The

lack of stronger, more pervasive and consistent effects was

in contrast, however, to initial expectations.

Relevance to Past Theory and Research

Implications for Caregiving Behaviors
and Children's Psycho-social Adjustment: The current re-

sults only partially supported previous findings of a posi-

tive relationship between caregiver behaviors characterized

by warmth, acceptance, clear delineation of limits, and

fostering of autonomy, and high psycho-social competence in

children (Baumrind, 1967; 1971; Becker, 1964; Coopersmith,

1967; Green, 1975; Hoffman, 1963; Lefkowitz, et al., 1963;

Liberman, et al., 1971; Mussen, 1970; Sears, et al., 1957;

Yarrow, et al., 1968). This inconsistency was also found

for the specific caregiver factors delineated by Green

(1975).

A more thorough discussion of the possible relation-

ship between caregiver behaviors and children's competence

is given in Appendix K. In explicating this possible rela-

tionship it is imperative to reiterate that caregiver

behaviors are only one of the multifarious factors effect-.
ing psycho-social adjustment. Yet it is clear that this
factor in itself is immensely complex (see Appendix K).
In light of this, it is not surprising that the results of
the current investigation did not support the supposition
that there exists a direct, consistent correspondence be-
tween caregiver behaviors and child psycho-social function-
ing. Indeed, if such a simple correspondence did exist,
the controversy as to how best to parent would have ceased
long ago, and the world would be burgeoning with individuals
possessing exquisite psycho-social skills. Given the small
number and relative homogeneity of the subjects in the
present study, it was encouraging, if not remarkable, that
the trends between caregiver behaviors and child function-
ing were as supportive of previous research as they were.
Thus the current results do support, in a more global sense,
the importance of caregiver acceptance, limit setting, and
encouragement of autonomy in the formation of psycho-social
competence.

More conclusively, the current findings point to the
importance of the separate effects of paternal and maternal
caregiving behaviors. The apparently stronger effects of
paternal behaviors on the psycho-social adjustment of the
children in the present study would seem to be congruent
with psychoanalytic theory, since the present sample con-
sisted of latency age boys who would theoretically be highly

influenced by their fathers due to their identification with them in the resolution of the Oedipal drama (Freud, 1953). There has been a recent interest in studying the effects of paternal behaviors on children's development (Lamb, 1976; Levine, 1978), a trend the current findings would certainly support.

Implications for Theories on The Nature and Function of Fantasy and Child Development:

The current results often appeared to conflict with previous research on fantasy play in children. This discrepancy existed both for studies using the WVT as well as those using other approaches to elicit fantasy play.

The sharpest contrast between the current results and previous studies using the WVT was in the lack of association between aggression and poor psycho-social functioning (Bowyer, 1956; 1958; 1970; Buhler, 1951; Buhler and Carrol, 1951; Lumbry, 1951; Ridley, 1952). Furthermore, no relationship was found to exist between more "primitive" expressions of aggression and poor adjustment, as has been previously found (Bowyer, 1956; 1958; 1970; Buhler, 1951). Quite to the contrary, aggression was positively related to one measure of positive adjustment. The discrepancy here may in part be due to the lack of highly specific, operationalized criteria for what constituted "high aggression" in the previous studies. It was for this reason that the current investigation used frequency counts to discern the amount of

aggression, rather than more global rating scales.

Somewhat more corroborative of past research with the WVT was the apparent lack of the other "clinical signs" delineated by Buhler (1951), as would be expected since the present sample was made up of non-clinic referred children. There were no "Disorganized," "Rigid," or "Fenced" Worlds, though this assumption is based on the current author's subjective opinion since there was insufficient reliability for these measures in the present study. Object counts showed there was no "Unpeopled" Worlds, though some Worlds were made up of less than 5 object categories or 50 total objects --what Buhler (1951) referred to as "Empty" Worlds, also presumed to be a pathonomic sign.

The lack of relationship between aggression and poor psycho-social functioning was also antithetical to findings of other research on children's fantasy play using different means to elicit fantasy. These included structured doll play (Back, 1945; Isch, 1952; Levin and Wardwell, 1962; Sears, et al., 1947), stories told to stimulus pictures (Hartwell, et al., 1953), spontaneous stories (Buss, 1961; Kaplan, 1956), and free play situations (Gould, 1972).

As was previously discussed, the lack of congruency here could be due to the particularly regressive nature of the fantasy evoked by the WVT, in contrast to the more "ego-laden," reality determined play of these other approaches. Furthermore, there is a lack of a uniform, cross-study

criterion measure of "high" aggression. Thus, there may be a relatively broad continuum of normative fantasized aggression which is characterized by a relatively high magnitude of frequency and intensity, with a rather specific basal point which differentiates pathologic behavior. The relation could be a curvlinear one, with either extremely low or high amounts of fantasized aggression being related to poor adjustment. The lack of a significant relationship between fantasized aggression and adjustment in the present study could be accounted for by the fact that the discriminative criterion point for pathonomic aggression might be above and below the degree of aggression exhibited by the present sample of relatively well adjusted children.

The lack of a significant positive association between fantasized benevolence, assertion, dominance, construction, references to adequacy, and propensity for fantasy play with positive psycho-social functioning--as well as the lack of a negative relationship between adjustment and fantasized submission and dependency--was also in contrast to previous findings using various mediums of fantasy play (Gould, 1972; Hartwell, et al., 1953; Haworth, 1966; Meichenbaum and Goodman, 1971; Nahme-Huang, et al., 1976; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963; Rosenhan, et al., 1974; Singer, 1973; Singer and Singer, 1976; Spivok and Levine, 1964; Wowkanech, 1977). Here again, there are no uniform, cross-study criteria for these dimensions, thus comparison

becomes difficult. As speculated for aggression, here too. there may be a wide spectrum of normative behaviors, with only the extremes--not found in the present sample--being indicative of positive and/or negative adjustment.

Nonetheless, the unexpectedly high amounts of fantasized aggression, and the relatively low amounts of benevolence, dominance, construction, adequacy, and assertion is dissonant with general assumptions of childhood development, particularly during the latency period (Erikson, 1953; Freud, 1936; Freud, 1953; Gould, 1972; Lewin, 1935; Murphy, 1962; Pitcher and Prelinger, 1963; Werner, 1948). These theoreticians speculate that such fantasized behaviors are both the expression of and the mechanisms by which the socialization of impulses occurs, being integrated, sublimated, and/or displaced. Such behaviors also presumably express the process towards autonomy, individuation, and mastery of the internal/external domain, as the child's burgeoning sense of self becomes more fully constellated.

Again, it may be that the high amount of aggression in the present study is due to the "id-evoking" characteristic of the WVT. Indeed, there are apparently no studies comparing the amount of fantasized aggression in different fantasy play techniques to help ascertain the validity of this assumption. Perhaps the more central issue here, however, is not what is evoked, but how it is dealt with. That is, the content of the play is perhaps secondary to

the process of the play, since process lies in the domain of ego while content is more expressive of unconscious concerns. Important to remember here is that competence is defined more by ego skills than the content of unconscious presses. Thus it becomes imperative to study the sequence of events rather than simply their occurrence. For example, a child whose fantasy play involves someone hitting someone else but then helping them is perhaps very different from a child who fantasizes someone is helping someone and then hits them, though the frequency count of helping and aggressive behaviors is the same in both cases.

Furthermore, the more general pattern of event occurrence--whether aggression increases or decreases during the session or across the 3 sessions--might also be indicative of high or low psycho-social functioning. Pertinent here was the slight tendency in the current investigation for aggression to decrease over the 3 sessions and be expressed in more socialized forms, while benevolence slightly increased. This pattern might be related to high adjustment, similar to the ability on the Rorschach to re-assert appropriate form-to-percept responding on the color cards after an initial slippage of distorting internal presses (Allison, et al., 1968; Rabin, 1968). Crucial here is the ego's ability to adaptively structure, transform, assimilate, and integrate affect laden, symbolically charged material. Thus it is in studying the miniscule, as well as more global,

delineations of the moment to moment sequencing of fanta- .
sized events that will likely lead to a clearer understand-
ing of the characteristics of the fantasy play of highly
competent and less competent children.

That there was no incidence of physical benevolence
(i.e. fantasized hugging, kissing, etc.) or verbal benevo-
lence (i.e. complimenting or stating affection) in any of
the children's fantasy play in the present study is indeed
surprising, perhaps even disheartening. But rather than
being a direct comment on the children's experiencing of
the world as an unloving, threatening place or revealing
their lack of proclivity for expressing warmth and affec-
tion, this tendency might be more a reflection of the
nature and function of fantasy per se. Thus in synthesizing
the assumptions of numerous theorists who have speculated on
the phenomenology of fantasy, it would appear that the es-
sence of such play involves the repeated evocation, manipu-
lation, and exploration of subjectively relevant, pressing,
unresolved concerns in an attempt to understand and master
these issues under a controlled situation that reduces
novelty and complexity to a manageable degree (Freud, 1936;
1935; Griffths, 1935; Klinger, 1971; Piaget, 1961; Singer,
1973; 1975).[1] Thus fantasy play presumably is oriented
around potentially anxiety arousing material, rather than
what the child is comfortable with. Assuming that relative-
ly well adjusted children are not highly conflicted about

the expression of warmth and affection, it would be expected that aggression would predominate their play as a means of coping with the areas in which they do feel fearful, helpless, and powerless. A lack of appropriate aggression might in fact indicate a sense of being overwhelmed and an unwillingness to confront pressing matters (Bowyer, 1970). The consistently high level of aggression in the present study, therefore, could be interpreted as deriving from the functional attributes of fantasy play, rather than poor psycho-social adjustment or overbearing concerns with a world that is experienced as threatening and malevolent.

Development necessitates confrontation with novelty, since it involves the acquisition of hither to non-existent schemas and ways of perceiving and responding. Such novelty can, depending on the degree, evoke stress and anxiety, which in turn can provoke an aggression response. Furthermore, fear, angst, dread, disappointment, pain, anger, and the various other states of psychological dis-safety are inherent to the human condition. Thus competence is perhaps better defined by the effectiveness of the stratagems one possesses to cope with the concerns and stresses of life, rather than the limitation or elimination of such feelings.

Concomitantly, effective parenting becomes characterized more by the encouragement of the development of adaptive means for dealing with novelty and stress rather than

simply its reduction. Clearly, the reasoning here is some-what circular since it has been previously argued that the development of a wide range of effective coping skills can only occur within a relatively safe environment where the organism does not feel overwhelmed by threat. Thus parents need to minimize the threat experienced in the child's relationship to them so that the child can go on with the task of mastering the challenges posed by everyday living. Nonetheless, no form of parenting could, or in fact should, eliminate all the pains, strains, and stresses of growing up. It is these unavoidable feelings and concerns that will be expressed through fantasy play, one of our greatest tools for synthesis and adaptation.

Implications for Research Methodology and Directions for Future Research:

Some methodological problems that arose in the current investigation serve as a caveat for future research. Most notably, the highly divergent ratings between the mothers', fathers' and teachers' assessments of the children's psycho-social functioning bring to question the practice of combining such scores into one measure of adjustment. It appears that issues of interpersonal perceptual style, as elucidated by Messe, et al. (1979), as well as the different relationships these significant others have to the children at various developmental stages, confound attempts to establish an "objective" assessment of the children's adjustment.

Such objectification would seem to necessitate the .
use of trained raters for in vivo observations of the chil-
dren. These observations would need to span across various
facets of the children's lives, for it may well be that
there is no "g-factor" (Cattell, 1971) of psycho-social
competence and that competence is situationally determined.
Thus a child's social behavior with peers might vary con-
siderably from classroom to playground to home and across
various activities within each of these locations. This
could partially account for the relatively poor inter-meas-
ure reliability of the rating scales theoretically assess-
ing competence. It could be that the items were in fact
highlighting different, independent facets of competence.
The relationship between the various traits that make up
competence clearly need to be further studied.

The suggested rigorous, in vivo observations across
a plethora of daily situations would also seem relevant to
increasing the knowledge of the effects of caregiver behav-
iors on children's functioning. Indeed, it appears that
none of the multitude of studies investigating parenting be-
haviors actually observed parents with their children in
their natural environment across various situations over a
prolonged period of time. Thus the edifices of theories of
competence and the effects of parenting styles are presently
built upon the terra non-firma of self-rating scales and
brief playroom observations, rather than the thorough

assessment of behaviors occurring on the natural settings ·
which the theories purport to explain.

That such in vivo approaches are needed is made
still clearer by the relatively poor inter-measure reli-
ability of the instruments supposedly measuring similar
dimension of psycho-social adjustment. Such low inter-
measure reliability certainly cautions against using a
single measure of a trait, as well as assuming that using
multiple measures of a trait in and of itself increases
reliability and validity. It further brings to light the
liability of self-rating scales to idiosyncratic interpre-
tations based upon phrasing--a mere change in the wording
of an item can in fact dramatically change how the item is
interpreted.

The apparently differing effects of maternal and
paternal caregiving behaviors of the children in the present
study warns against the previous convention of only studying
maternal behaviors, as well as the more recent approach of
clustering both parents together. It would seem to be im-
perative to explore the effects of each parent separately,
both across various caregiver behavior variables and at
different developmental stages of the child. This latter
dimension is important since most dynamic theories of de-
velopment assume that the mother and father become intra-
psychically and interpersonally significant in different
ways at various junctures of the growth process (Freud,

1953, Jung, 1956).

The orally administered rating scale purporting to assess the children's perceptions of their parents could well be contaminated by social desirability, recent impactful interactions with a parent (i.e. having just been scolded or allowed to do something special), and the child's own anxiety about experiencing the parents in certain ways. Thus a more unobtrusive method of assessing children's perceptions of their parents--perhaps via situational doll play as was used by Wowkanech (1977)--need be implemented. It would be interesting to compare Schaefer's (1965) more direct inventory, as used in the present study, with these other approaches.

In regards to research in the area of fantasy, the present investigation strongly suggests some necessary directions of exploration. Methodologically, it will be important to objectify criteria of assessing various dimensions of fantasy so that accurate cross-study comparisons can be made. Clearly there is still much work needed to be done to better discern what constitute the crucial dimensions of competent fantasy play in the first place.

Some of the current discrepant findings have been explained as being due to the more "id-laden" form of fantasy evoked by the WVT. This assumption of a gradient of fantasy levels being evoked by differing mediums or modes of play needs to be further tested. Thus it would be

important to explore the relationship between the structure and content of children's free play, story telling, structured doll play, Rorschach responses, Worlds, and other forms of imaginative activities. It may well be that children differ on their ability to use various forms of fantasy, being more drawn to specific modalities rather than simply being generally more or less imaginative.

The current findings further suggest that research on fantasy play, and particularly those using the WVT, needs to shift emphasis from content to process. The sequencing and moment-to-moment unfolding of events in the fantasy are likely to be more indicative of the child's ego integrative abilities than the specific amount of aggression, benevolence, or other behaviors per se. Microscopic assessment of the order of events is imperative for future studies if we are to broaden our base of knowledge on the relationship between fantasy and psycho-social competence.

The pivotal assumption of the current investigation, congruent with nearly all theories of fantasy, was that fantasy behaviors are a means of exploring and mastering central internal concerns--both in a defensive fashion of resolving past conflicts and in an expansive fashion of developing new schemas that increase the repetoire of potentially adaptive responses. This being such a crucial assumption in the literature on fantasy behavior, it is indeed astonishing to discover the paucity of research

attempting to empirically ascertain the accuracy of this .
notion. Thus there are apparently no studies that explore
in a specific, predictive manner, the play of children with
overt, explicit situational concerns--such as an impending
operation, a recent death of a significant other, or a
divorce--to see if in fact such themes predominate their
play. Furthermore, to what extent and in what ways does
such play facilitate adaptive coping with these events? Do
children who are given access and encouragement to engage
in fantasy behaviors function more effectively? Clearly
this is the axiomatic rational for play therapy, thus the
question arises in what ways do the content, structure, and
process of children's fantasy play change over the course
of treatment and in relation to changes the child makes in
his/her external environment? In addition, how do we free
fantasy that is merely persevatory defensive re-enactment
of a trauma into an expansive integration and resolution of
the event? It is these questions that must be addressed
to hedge us closer in our understanding of the nature and
function of fantasy--this magical domain at the interface
of the conscious and unconscious, mirroring the unfathom-
able possibilities of our souls.

FOOTNOTES

[1]There is a need for research that further explores this assumed relationship between current concerns and fantasy play, in which the concerns would be specified--perhaps through experimental manipulation--and predictions as to the fantasy play would be tested. Though this has been attempted, with little success, in dream research, it has apparently not been explored using fantasy play.

APPENDIX A

Letters to Parents and Teachers

APPENDIX A

Letters to Parents and Teachers

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Psychology   East Lansing - Michigan 48824
Olds Hall

Dear Parents:

My name is Yanon Volcani; I am a graduate student in psychology at MSU
working with Professor Gary Stollak in studying the fantasy play of 7
to 9 year old boys. My project involves children using miniature
figures and toys to create scenes in a small sandbox. Each child is
brought to our facilities by myself for three, separate, one hour
sessions at the child's and parents' convenience. Since I am also
interested in parental attitudes and approaches to child rearing, as
well as the child's general behavior in the world, I would also like
parents to fill out some questionnaires on child rearing attitudes and
practices and their perceptions of their child's behavior. These take
roughly an hour to complete. Furthermore, before beginning the three
play sessions I meet with each child at his home for an hour to ask
him similar questions to those filled out by the parents on their
questionnaires.

If you feel you and your child might be willing to participate in our
research sometime between now and August, or else in the Fall, please
return the enclosed postcard indicating that you are willing to
receive a call from me (returning the card in no way commits you to
participate in our research but only indicates your willingness to
receive a call from me for a more detailed description). We have
found that children readily take to the form of fantasy play we are
studying and thus anticipate your child will thoroughly enjoy the
experience. If you have any questions feel free to call me at
349-9408 or Professor Stollak at 353-8877. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Yanon Volcani

YV:GS:mss

130

Dear Teacher,

My name is Yanon Volcani. I am a graduate student in clinical psychology at Michigan State University working with Prof. Gary Stollak. My research involves exploring the relationship between children's fantasy, parenting style, and children's behaviors. It is in regards to this last area that I need your help. Previous studies have found that teachers are very accurate in judging their pupil's general social and emotional behaviors. Mr. and Mrs._____ have been kind enough to allow_____to participate in my study and have given their approval of your filling out, if you wish, the enclosed questionnaires on him (I've enclosed their permission slip). I realize you're very busy and thus I have tried to select inventories that will give me maximum information about the child's general social/ emotional behaviors while minimizing your time involvement (the average time involved is roughly one hour). I would very much appreciate your cooperation in filling out the enclosed forms, mailing them back to me in the self addressed, stamped envelope when you're finished. If you have any questions feel free to call me at either my home (349-9408) or office (353-8877).

                                        Sincerely yours,

                                        Yanon Volcani

APPENDIX B

Parent Information Form

APPENDIX B

Parent Information Form

Code Number_____

Name_____Age_____Telephone No._____

Present Address_____

Marital Status_____

Occupation_____Years in Occupation_____

Highest Level of Education Completed (circle one):

elementary grade: 1 2 3 4 5 6
junior high school: 7 8 9
high school: 10 11 12
college: 1 year 2 years 3 years 4 years degree granted
M.A. degree
Ph.D. degree
other degrees or certificates (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., D.O., law
   or high school certificates indicating completion of
   vocational training):

_____

Names and Ages of Children_____

_____

Children's Grades in School_____

_____

Other People in Household and Relationship to Children_____

_____

Note: Only this questionnaire will contain your name. The checklists
you will complete will contain only the code number noted in the upper
right-hand corner. This questionnaire will be removed and kept in a
separate locked file and your answers will be kept completely
confidential.

132

APPENDIX C

Measures of Children's Psycho-social Adjustment

APPENDIX C

Measures of Children's Psycho-social Adjustment

B - P

Rating Scales

Name of Person Being Rated_____

Name of Rater_____

Date(s) Rated_____

FLEXIBILITY

The flexible person can shift his viewpoint or behavior in accordance with new information or new demands of the people. He is adaptive, but shifts because of conviction rather than because of passively submitting to persuasion. When changing he continues with the same degree of interest and involvement.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Very flexible. Adapts readily and easily to new information and demands. Participation continues with undiminished interest.
4			Very frequently flexible. Most of the time adapts although shows some tendency to persist even in the face of new information or new expectations.
3			Reasonably flexible, but often clings to his original viewpoint or behavior.
2			At times flexible, but usually unable to adapt to new information or demands.
1			Rigid. Very unresponsive to new information or demands. Cannot shift.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

5

4

3

2

1

EAGERNESS

The eager person likes to try new things or take on a new problem. He is eager to overcome, to engage, and to try to master a new problem.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Loves challenge; eager to try anthing that is new. Delights in testing his ability.
4			Frequently seeks out and meets new and challenging situations. Shows little hesitancy.
3			Often rises to a challenge that is presented to him, but does not seek out challenging situations of his own. Shows some hesitancy.
2			Tends to shy away from challenges much of the time, but will deal with them when encouraged.
1			Almost always shies away from challenge. Requires a great deal of encouragement, before he reluctantly tries.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

F

5

4

3

2

1

EFFECTIVENESS

> The effective person copes appropriately. He readily tries and is successful in his efforts to implement his own desires or to meet the external demands of the environment.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Very effective. Always deals appropriately and successfully with his inner needs and external demands. Always meets and responds effectively to a problem situation.
4			Mostly effective. Typically gets his needs met and handles challenge successfully.
3			Moderately effective. Often successful, but often fails to get his needs met or to cope with problems with success.
2			Mostly ineffective. But occasionally successful in his efforts.
1			Rarely succeeds in his efforts. Inadequate. Ineffective.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

AWARENESS OF SELF

The aware person (child or adult) knows how he or she feels, what he thinks, and what he is doing. Although he is conscious of himself, he is not self-conscious, insecure or embarrassed. This awareness does not produce anxiety. He accepts and can acknowledge how he really feels, thinks, and acts.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Very aware; always conscious of his feelings, wishes, fears, and the meaning of his behavior (positive or negative).
4			Most of the time aware, ready to acknowledge what he feels, thinks, and does. Only occasionally uses denial.
3			Often aware of his feelings, thoughts and behavior, and willing to recognize them as such. However, often reacts without awareness or uses denial.
2			Usually unconscious or unaware of himself; denies his real feelings and thoughts, and cannot recognize his own actions for what they are.
1			Unconscious; full of denial, completely unable to recognize his true feelings, thoughts, or behavior.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

CONSIDERATENESS

> The considerate person cares about the well-being of others. He adjusts his behavior in ways that are thoughtful and beneficial to others.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Extremely considerate. Always thoughtful and spontaneously concerned with the other person's welfare.
4			Very considerate. Most of the time he is thoughtful and deals constructively with others.
3			Somewhat considerate, but sometimes inconsiderate about what is good for another person.
2			Seldom considers the well-being of other people. Only rarely takes into account what others may feel. Tends to be thoughtless, indifferent.
1			Rarely considers the other person. Tends to pursue his behavior no matter how it may affect the other person.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

TOLERANCE

The tolerant person recognizes and accepts individual differences. He accepts and gives full regard to others who have different feelings, thoughts, and reactions than his own. But he does not necessarily approve or yield to their influence.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Extremely tolerant. Understands and accepts differences as natural. Tolerates a very broad spectrum of feeling, thoughts, and behavior in others.
4			Reasonably tolerant about individual differences.
3			Mildly tolerant, but tends to not accept certain natural variations.
2			Usually intolerant. Tends to regard people who differ from him as being unacceptable, even wrong.
1			Very intolerant. His way of feeling, thinking, and reacting is the only way that he can accept. People who are different are completely unacceptable. Very narrow.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

5

4

3

2

1

STABILITY

The stable person is emotionally balanced. He remains composed in the face of stressful events. He remains involved and does not find it necessary to shift his direction.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Very stable. Not easily upset by change or disappointment.
4			Usually stable. Accepts and adjusts well to changing circumstances, but occasionally loses his calmness and direction.
3			Moderately stable. Often retains his equilibrium, but rather easily upset and loses his direction.
2			Sometimes shows stability, calm and direction, but frequently is upset and loses his bearings when circumstances change.
1			Unstable. Shows little capacity to accommodate to change. Excitable or immobilized by new demands.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

F

5

4

3

2

1

SPONTANEITY

The spontaneous person is natural. His acceptance of himself is high and permits freedom of expression. He is uninhibited, but not dramatic or exhibitionistic.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Always highly spontaneous. Very natural and free in his expressions.
4			Very often spontaneous. Most of the time reacts freely and naturally, but on occasion is inhibited.
3			Usually spontaneous. While he frequently expresses himself naturally he is inhibited on many occasions.
2			Shows spontaneity on occasion, but more often inhibited, constricted, and stilted in his response.
1			Many strong inhibitions, very constricted. Almost never spontaneous; not natural.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

SENSITIVITY TO OTHERS

The sensitive person is aware and concerned about the welfare of other people. He readily ascertains what the other person is feeling and what would be in their best interest.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Acutely aware and concerned about people's feelings and reactions.
4			Most of the time aware and concerned about how others are truly feeling and reacting.
3			Often aware and concerned, but in many instances seems unaware and relatively unconcerned about other people's feelings and reactions.
2			Usually unaware and disinterested in what other people are feeling, but can recognize what is going on in others when it is directly called to his attention.
1			Insensitive and unconcerned as to what is going on in and with other people. Deals with them as though they were devoid of feelings.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

SELF-CONFIDENCE

The confident person be-
lieves that he is able and
behaves with a calm assured
manner. He is self-assured
and realistic when coping
with new challenges.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Realistically very confident. Approaches challenge with assurance. Possible failure does not deter action.
4			Confident most of the time with realistic challenges. Only mild caution with unfamiliar tasks.
3			While often confident, in many instances is unsure of his ability to cope with realistic challenge.
2			Some degree of confidence with familiar things, but often expects to meet with failure with challenge.
1			Virtually no self-confidence. Unable or unwilling to try. Almost always behaves as though he expects to fail with new challenges.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

INTERPERSONAL COMPREHENSION

This trait assesses the person's understanding of how one person's behavior causes approval or disapproval of that behavior in another person.

F	W	S	RATING
5			Very high comprehension. Person almost always recognizes the effect of any given behavior.
4			Usually comprehends what the second person's reaction will be to the first person's behavior.
3			Sometimes perceives the interpersonal effects, but just as often fails to comprehend how one person's behavior affects another person's attitude.
2			Seldom comprehends interpersonal interaction. Usually at a loss in being able to see how one person's behavior affects another person's reactions.
1			Virtually no comprehension of how a person's behavior causes attitudes in other people. Almost always fails to comprehend the interaction.

ACTIONS JUSTIFYING RATING

CHILDREN"S BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST FORM A

Name of child:_____Age:____Date:_____

Name of person filling out checklist:_____

Relationship to child named above (mother, father, teacher, etc.):____

       This is a list of items describing many aspects of children's behavior—things that children do or ways they have been described by others. Not all of the items will apply to the particular child you are describing, but quite a few of them will. First, go through the list and put a checkmark (√) in the first column by each item which applies to this child. If you feel that the item does not apply to the child, put a zero (0) in the first column.

       After you have gone through the list, please go back through those items you have checked and put another checkmark (√) in the second column opposite those that are now most characteristic of this child, that describe how he (she) is most of the time.

	Does this apply at all?	Is it characteristic?
1. Is happy when h/she does a "good job."	_____	_____
2. Gets carried away by his/her feelings.	_____	_____
3. Is tidy and neat, perhaps even a little bit fussy about it.	_____	_____
4. Can't wait - wants to have things immediately.	_____	_____
5. Is concerned about the feelings of adults.	_____	_____
6. Gets irritated or angry easily.	_____	_____
7. Feelings are apparent in his/her facial expression.	_____	_____
8. Plays with toys in a rough way.	_____	_____
9. Handles small objects skillfully.	_____	_____
10. Doesn't pay attention to what others say.	_____	_____

	Does this apply at all?	Is it characteristic?
11. Activity is focused on a particular purpose, seems to accomplish what he/she sets out to do.	_____	_____
12. Looks awkward when he/she moves around.	_____	_____
13. Accepts new ideas without getting upset.	_____	_____
14. Acts in ways that makes adults not like him/her.	_____	_____
15. Shows pride in accomplishment.	_____	_____
16. Appears stiff in walking or moving about.	_____	_____
17. Seems comfortable in new situations.	_____	_____
18. Has trouble finding the right words to say what he/she means.	_____	_____
19. Wants very much to be approved of.	_____	_____
20. Seems to do things just to get adults angry at him/her.	_____	_____
21. Moves gracefully - well coordinated.	_____	_____
22. Has a characteristic mannerism or nervous habit.	_____	_____
23. Plays to win.	_____	_____
24. Quickly loses interest in an activity.	_____	_____
25. Does what persons ask him/her to do.	_____	_____
26. Never gets excited about anything, even when you expected him/her to be pleased with something.	_____	_____
27. Makes friends quickly and easily.	_____	_____
28. Seems sad and unhappy.	_____	_____
29. Self-confident.	_____	_____

	Does this apply at all?	Is it characteristic?
30. Tends to go too far unless reminded of rules.	_____	_____
31. Talks all the time.	_____	_____
32. Often has to be reminded of what he/she can and can't do.	_____	_____
33. Affectionate - enjoys being physically close to adults.	_____	_____
34. Threatens to hit or hurt others.	_____	_____
35. Is able to stand up for himself/ herself.	_____	_____
36. Seems out of touch with what is going on around him/her - off in his/her own world.	_____	_____
37. Is polite and cooperative.	_____	_____
38. Has uncontrollable outbursts of tempter.	_____	_____
39. Is easily embarrassed.	_____	_____
40. Often breaks the rules in games.	_____	_____
41. Is careful in explanation - precise.	_____	_____
42. When told to do something he/she doesn't want to do, he/she becomes angry.	_____	_____
43. Is curious about things.	_____	_____
44. Plays aimlessly, doesn't seem to make or accomplish anything.	_____	_____
45. Prefers competitive games.	_____	_____
46. Seems selfish, always wants his/ her own way.	_____	_____
47. Showed appreciation when others helped or did things for him/her.	_____	_____
48. Seldom laughs or smiles.	_____	_____

		Does this apply at all?	Is it char-acteristic?
49.	Energetic.	_____	_____
50.	Doesn't seem to care about how he/she looks - often looks sloppy.	_____	_____
51.	Asks sensible questions.	_____	_____
52.	Blows up very easily when bothered.	_____	_____
53.	Shows pleasure and involvement in most things he/she does.	_____	_____
54.	Fidgety and restless.	_____	_____
55.	Is competitive.	_____	_____
56.	Acts as if adults are against him/her.	_____	_____
57.	Pitches in when things have to be done.	_____	_____
58.	Often seems angry for no particular reason, expresses it in many different ways.	_____	_____
59.	Quick and clever.	_____	_____
60.	Aggressive and overpowering.	_____	_____
61.	Learns quickly.	_____	_____
62.	Bossy.	_____	_____
63.	Likes to do things well.	_____	_____
64.	Tires easily in activities.	_____	_____

AML

Pupil_____   Date_____

Sex of Pupil_____M_____F_____
                  (circle one)

Grade of Pupil_____

School_____

Teacher's Name_____

We would like you to indicate how often you have observed certain be-
haviors in the classroom of the child named above. To help you inter-
pret the five rating points, brief descriptions are provided for each.

> (1)   Never—You have literally never observed this
>   behavior in this child.
>
> (2)   Seldom—You have observed this behavior once or
>   twice in the past three months.
>
> (3)   Moderate frequency—You have seen this behavior
>   more often than once a month but less
>   often than once a week.
>
> (4)   Often—You have seen the behavior more often than
>   once a week but less often than daily.
>
> (5)   Most or all of the time—You have seen the behavior
>   with great frequency, averaging once a day
>   or more often.

Two things should be kept in mind while completing the AML: (a) Work
rapidly and don't fret too much about making fine discriminations,
(b) It is extremely important that your ratings realistically reflect
problems that the child evidences. Please make your ratings reflect
problems as you have perceived them.

Thank you for your attention.

Section I. Please rate every item on the following scale:

1. not a problem   3. moderate problem 5. very serious problem
2. very mild problem 4. serious problem

Child's Classroom Behavior:

___disruptive in class

___fidgety, hyperactive, can't stay in seat

___talks out of turn, disturbs others while they are working

___constantly seeks attention, "clowns around"

___overly aggressive to peers, (fights, is overbearing, belligerent)

___defiant, obstinate, stubborn

___impulsive, is unable to delay

___withdrawn

___shy, timid

___does not make friends

___over conforms to rules

___daydreams, is preoccupied, "off in another world"

___unable to express feelings

___anxious

___worried, frightened, tense

___depressed

___cries easily, pouts, sulks

___does not trust others

___shows other signs of "nervous-ness," specify:_____

___specific fears specify:_____

Other Behaviors:

___lacks self-confidence

___overly sensitive to criticism

___reacts poorly to disappointment

___depends too much on others

___pretends to be ill

___other, specify:_____

___poor grooming or personal hygiene

Child's Academic Performance:

___underachieving (not working up to potential)

___poorly motivated to achieve

___poor work habits

___difficulty following directions

___poor concentration, limited attention span

___motor coordination problem

___other, specify:_____

Child has specific academic problems in:

___reading___math___numbers

___writing___colors___concepts

___language skills problems,

    specify:_____

    _____

PLEASE RATE THIS PUPIL'S BEHAVIOR AS
YOU HAVE OBSERVED AND EXPERIENCED IT:

This Pupil—	Never (1)	Seldom (2)	Moderately Often (3)	Often (4)	Most or all of the time (5)
1. Gets into fights or quarrels with other students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Has to be coaxed or forced to work or play with other pupils	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Is restless	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Is unhappy or depressed	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Disrupts class discipline	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Becomes sick when faced with a difficult school problem or situation	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Is obstinate	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Feels hurt when criticized	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Is impulsive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Is moody	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Has difficulty learning	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Below, we have listed specific behavior and adaptation problems which
may appear to you as interferring with this child's ability to profit
from his/her school experience. Please rate every item in Section I
on the following scale of problem severity:

1. not a problem   4. serious problem

2. very mild problem   5. very serious problem

3. moderate problem

Specific instructions are provided for Sections II and III.

Section II. From your experiences with this child, please check (✓) ·
any of the following which you believe relate to the problems you have
reported:

___separation or divorce of parents   ___economic difficulties

___illness or death of a family   ___under family pressure to
   member   succeed

___lack of educational stimulation   ___family difficulties
   in the home

Section III. From your experiences with this child, please check (✓)
where she/he would lie on the following dimensions taking into account
the direction of each item:

Know child well   Barely know child

1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7

Child seems easy   Child seems
to like   difficult to like

1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7

Child has significant   Child has no school
school adjustment problems   adjustment problems

1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6_____7

APPENDIX D

Measures of Parents' Perceptions
of Their Caregiving Attitudes and Behaviors

Measures of Parents' Perceptions
of Their Caregiving Attitudes and Behaviors

CRCP QUESTIONNAIRE

Since we don't know for sure what are the best ways to raise children, we are studying more about what parents and prospective parents do (or might do) in different situations involving children.

In answering all of the questions, try to imagine that you are the parent of the 4 to 10 year-old child whose behavior is described in the item. We are interested in what you would actually feel or do in the situations described, not what you think a person should ideally feel or do. While different people give different responses to these questions, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Every person has his or her own individual way of responding to children. We want to learn what your way is or would be in these situations.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. No one but the researchers will ever see your answers. Read the directions carefully and do not skip any items.

Your name: _____

Your address: _____

Your age: _____

Your sex: _____

Today's date: _____

Please list the names, ages and sex of your children in the space below. Please put a checkmark in front of the name of the child who took part in our study.

Your last grade completed in school: _____

Your occupation: _____

Marital status: Single   Married   Divorced

                  Separated   Widowed   Remarried

153

Part I

Directions: Below is a list of items describing many aspects of children's feelings and behaviors. Of course, not all of these items apply to a particular child, but quite a few of them apply to most children.

We are interested in how much parents and prospective parents focus their attention on various behaviors that children engage in. We want to know how much you would emphasize, place importance on, be concerned about, care about, focus on, or give your attention to each behavior described. We want to know how much it would matter to you if your child acted in certain ways.

It makes no difference here whether you would encourage or discourage the behavior in question. We only want to know how much it would matter to you if your child engaged in the behavior, regardless of how you might show it. For example, while all parents may agree that a child should wear a hat in winter, some parents might focus their attention on this behavior more than other parents would.

Read each item carefully and indicate the extent to which the behavior described would matter to you in raising your own child. Imagine you are the parent of a 4 to 10 year-old child who is engaging in the described behavior. Then use the following scale to indicate how much the behavior would matter to you--how much you would focus your attention on it:

1 = It would matter very little.
2 = It would matter somewhat.
3 = It would matter to a moderate degree.
4 = It would matter quite a bit.
5 = It would matter a great deal.

Read each item carefully, then darken the number that best indicates the extent to which you would focus your attention on the behavior in question--the extent to which it would matter to you. Do not skip any items. Use the purple answer sheet.

How much would it matter to you if your child:	very little	some-what	moderate extent	quite a bit	a great deal
1. Ignores what adults tell him/her to do?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Shares toys?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Gets irritated or angry easily?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Shows pride in an accomplishment?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Tells lies?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Shows concern about the feelings of others?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Fights with friends or with brothers and sisters?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Shows self-confidence?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Has to be reminded of what he/she may or may not do?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Makes friends easily?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Plays with toys in a rough way?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Does well at a new task?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Becomes angry when told to do something he/she doesn't want to do?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Is polite and cooperative with others?	1	2	3	4	5
15. Does things just to get others angry?	1	2	3	4	5
16. Plays to win?	1	2	3	4	5
17. Goes too far unless fre-quently reminded of rules?	1	2	3	4	5

CRCP Questionnaire.

How much would it matter to you if your child:	very little	some-what	moderate extent	quite a bit	a great deal
18. Pitches in when things need to be done?	1	2	3	4	5
19. Blows up easily when bothered by someone?	1	2	3	4	5
20. Accomplishes what he/she sets out to do?	1	2	3	4	5
21. Cheats in school?	1	2	3	4	5
22. Helps around the house?	1	2	3	4	5
23. Threatens to hit or hurt others?	1	2	3	4	5
24. Keeps new clothes clean?	1	2	3	4	5

Part II

      Directions: Four parent-child situations are described on the following pages. Below each description, there is a list of things that some parents (who were interviewed in the past) do in such situations.

      Read each description carefully, then check how often you honestly believe you would do each of the things on the list of parental responses. Use the following scale to indicate how often you feel you would do each thing (or something like it) if you were the parent of a 4 to 10 year-old child at such times:

    1 Never

    2 Rarely

    3 Sometimes

    4 Frequently

    5 Usually

      Imagine you are the child's parent at such times as those described. Then darken the appropriate number for how often you would do each thing on the list in these kinds of situations. Read the items carefully, and please do not skip any items. Continue to use the purple answer sheet.

*NOTE: The word "he" is to be read as "he or she."

SITUATION A

Some times it's hard for parents to get children to do things for them. For example, imagine you have something that you want very much for your child to do right away. You walk to the room he's in and tell him what you want him to do, and ask him to do it right away. He says he's busy watching a television program and can't do the thing you want him to do now. Here is a list of things that some parents have done at times like that. Circle how often you would do each one or something like it in such situations.

    1 = Never
    2 = Rarely
    3 = Sometimes
    4 = Frequently
    5 = Usually

		Never		Some times		Usually
25.	Hit or spank him.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Tell him he ought to be ashamed of himself.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Explain that if he would do it now, then I would have a chance to do some other things I need to do.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Tell him he's being selfish.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Give reasons why the thing has to be done right away.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Tell his father (mother) and let him (her) handle it.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Go over and turn off the television.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Tell him he can finish the program as long as he does what I want as soon as it's over.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Go and do it myself, but show him that I'm hurt and disappointed in him.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Tell him I'm sorry he'll miss the program and explain why the thing must be done now.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation A (continued)

		Never		Some-times		Usually
36.	Tell him that if he doesn't do it now, he won't be able to have something he likes or do something he likes to do.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Tell him I'm disappointed in him.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Do it myself and show him I don't like it by not talking to him for awhile.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Tell him that we each have to help each other out and that I need for him to do the thing right away.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Tell him I would like him to be more considerate of my wishes.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Do nothing.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Tell him to do it now anyway.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	Tell him he is just being stubborn and that he better stop it right now.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Tell him he'll be sorry if he doesn't do it right away.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation B

There are times when every child shows self-confidence and performs well at a new task in school. Here is a list of things some parents do when this happens. Please check how often you would do each thing or something like it in such situations.

        1 = Never
        2 = Rarely
        3 = Sometimes
        4 = Frequently
        5 = Usually

45.	Give him some extra spending money or something else he wants.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation B (continued)

		Never		Some-times		Usually
		1	2	3	4	5
46.	Explain how good he must feel after trying hard and succeeding.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Kiss him or hug him.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Show him that he could still do even better.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Promise him something he wants.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Explain that he feels good because he's working up to his potential.	1	2	3	4	5
51.	Do nothing.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	Show him how proud I am.	1	2	3	4	5
53.	Tell him to keep up the good work.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Tell him that what he did makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	Buy him something he wants.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	Tell him how much it means to us for him to do well.	1	2	3	4	5
57.	Remind him that he shouldn't get conceited or brag about his accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5
58.	Explain to him that doing well will help him feel good about himself and get what he wants in life.	1	2	3	4	5
59.	Tell him I know how proud and happy he must be because he did so well.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	Show him that these things are just expected from him and that they are no big deal.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	Tell him he'll be rewarded for doing so well.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation B (continued)

		Never		Some-times		Usually
62.	Tell him what a talented person he is.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	Tell him that a job well done is rewarding for its own sake.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	Make arrangements for him to do something he has wanted to do for a long time.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation C

Every child when he can't have his own way will sometimes get angry at his parents and talk back. Here is a list of things some parents do when a child angrily talks back. Please circle how often you would do each thing or something like it in such situations.

    1 = Never
    2 = Rarely
    3 = Sometimes
    4 = Frequently
    5 = Usually

65.	Hit or spank him.	1	2	3	4	5
66.	Tell him I don't like it when he talks back angrily and that he can discuss it more calmly.	1	2	3	4	5
67.	Tell him I don't like children who don't show respect for their parents.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	Tell him I'll hit or spank him if he ever talks like that again.	1	2	3	4	5
69.	Explain that even though he's angry, I would prefer that he express his feelings in a regular tone of voice.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	Tell him I don't want to talk to him or have anything to do with him unless he says he's sorry.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation C (continuted)

		Never		Some-times		Usually
71.	Not let him have something he likes or do something he likes to do.	1	2	3	4	5
72.	Tell him that what he said hurts my feelings and that he can express his anger without saying nasty things to me.	1	2	3	4	5
73.	Give him an angry look and walk away.	1	2	3	4	5
74.	Tell his father (mother) and let him (her) handle it.	1	2	3	4	5
75.	Do nothing.	1	2	3	4	5
76.	Tell him he is acting like a little baby and that he better stop it right now.	1	2	3	4	5
77.	Tell him I'm angry at him for what he said and explain why he can't have his way.	1	2	3	4	5
78.	Send him to his room until he's ready to talk about it.	1	2	3	4	5
79.	Tell him he'll be sorry if he doesn't be quiet.	1	2	3	4	5
80.	Tell him he ought to be ashamed of himself for talking like that.	1	2	3	4	5
81.	Give him reasons why he can't have his way.	1	2	3	4	5
82.	Give him an angry look and ignore him for awhile.	1	2	3	4	5
83.	Tell him I won't talk to him or have anything to do with him if that's the way he's going to act.	1	2	3	4	5
84.	Tell him I know he's angry and explain why he can't have his way.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation D

There are times when every child shows a great deal of concern for the feelings of others, being kind of helpful and cooperative when it is needed. Here is a list of things some parents do when this happens. Please circle how often you would do each thing or something like it in such situations.

        1 = Never
        2 = Rarely
        3 = Sometimes
        4 = Frequently
        5 = Usually

		Never		Some-times		Usually
85.	Let him do something special he wants to do.	1	2	3	4	5
86.	Not make anything of it even though I might feel good inside.	1	2	3	4	5
87.	Explain to him that doing good will make him feel good about himself in life.	1	2	3	4	5
88.	Tell him that I love kind and considerate people like him.	1	2	3	4	5
89.	Tell him what a helpful and good person he is.	1	2	3	4	5
90.	Reward him for doing the good deed.	1	2	3	4	5
91.	Ask why he isn't always so cooperative and considerate.	1	2	3	4	5
92.	Tell him that what he did makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	5
93.	Say it is good when you treat others as you would like to be treated.	1	2	3	4	5
94.	Explain how it makes him happy to do kind and helpful things.	1	2	3	4	5
95.	Show him that these things are just expected and are no big deal.	1	2	3	4	5

Situation D (continued)

		Never		Some-times		Usually
96.	Tell him I am very proud of the way he acted.	1	2	3	4	5
97.	Give him some extra spending money or something else he wants.	1	2	3	4	5
98.	Point out some other good things he ought to do but hasn't been doing.	1	2	3	4	5
99.	Explain that being considerate to others makes a person feel worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5
100.	Tell him that doing something kind is very rewarding just in itself.	1	2	3	4	5
101.	Promise him something he wants.	1	2	3	4	5
102.	Tell him that "nice guys finish last."	1	2	3	4	5
103.	Kiss him or hug him.	1	2	3	4	5
104.	Buy him something he has wanted for a long time.	1	2	3	4	5

Before returning the questionnaire, please check to be sure that each item has been completed. Thanks for your participation.

Code Number_____

PARENT'S CRPB FORM B - BOYS

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES YOU WILL FIND A LIST OF STATEMENTS. FOR EACH

STATEMENT YOU ARE TO INDICATE WHETHER THE STATEMENT IS "LIKE," "A

LITTLE LIKE," OR "NOT LIKE" THE WAY THINGS ARE IN YOUR FAMILY. PLEASE

PUT YOUR ANSWERS ON THE ANSWER SHEET THAT IS ENCLOSED WITH THE

QUESTIONNAIRE, USING THE FOLLOWING ANSWER FORMAT:

1 = Like

2 = A little Like

3 = Not Like

THAT IS, IF A STATEMENT IS "LIKE" THE WAY THINGS ARE IN YOUR FAMILY,

FILL IN THE NUMBER 1 ALONGSIDE THAT STATEMENT NUMBER. IF THE ITEM IS

"A LITTLE LIKE" THE WAY THINGS ARE IN YOUR FAMILY, FILL IN THE NUMBER

2 ALONGSIDE THAT STATEMENT NUMBER. IF THE STATEMENT IS "NOT LIKE" THE

WAY THINGS ARE IN YOUR FAMILY, FILL IN THE NUMBER 3 ALONGSIDE THAT

STATEMENT NUMBER.

Measures of Children's Perceptions
of Their Parents' Caregiving Behaviors

CRPB Form B - Mothers

1. Mother can be talked into things easily.

2. Mother does not bother to enforce rules.

3. Mother says that sooner or later we always pay for bad behavior.

4. Mother likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.

5. Mother seems proud of the things I do.

6. Mother smiles at me very often.

7. Mother says some day I'll be punished for my bad behavior.

8. Mother enjoys working with me in the house or yard.

9. Mother says if I really cared for her, I would not do things that cause her to worry.

10. Mother makes her whole life center about her children.

11. Mother cheers me up when I'm sad.

12. Mother excuses my bad conduct.

13. Mother doesn't check up to see whether I have done what she told me.

14. Mother says if I loved her, I'd do what she wants me to do.

15. Mother lets me get away without doing work I had been given to do.

16. Mother does not insist I obey if I complain or protest.

17. Mother thinks I'm not grateful when I don't obey.

18. Mother seems to see my good points more than my faults.

19. Mother isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.

20. Mother enjoys staying at home with me more than going out with friends.

21. Mother worries about how I will turn out, because she takes anything bad I do seriously.

24. I think and talk about his misbehavior long after it is over.

25. I make him feel like the most important person in my life.

26. I let him off easy when he does something wrong.

27. I often speak of the good things he does.

28. I have a good time at home with him.

29. I tell him how much I have suffered for him.

30. I am able to make him feel better when he is upset.

31. I enjoy going on drives, trips or visits with him.

32. I let him stay up late if he keeps asking.

33. I give him a lot of care and attention.

34. I think that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.

35. I don't insist that he does his homework.

36. I often give up something to get something for him.

37. I almost always speak to him with a warm and friendly voice.

38. He can talk me out of an order, if he complains.

39. I enjoy doing things with him.

40. I don't pay much attention to his misbehavior.

41. I let him get away with a lot of things.

42. I feel hurt by the things he does.

43. I understand his problems and worries.

44. I am always thinking of things that will please him.

45. I feel hurt when he doesn't follow advice.

46. I say to him that someday he'll be sorry that he wasn't better as a child.

47. I comfort him when he's afraid.

48. I am easy with him.

49. I usually don't find out about his misbehavior.

50. I tell him of all the things I have done for him.

51. I spend almost all of my free time with my children.

52. I enjoy talking things over with him.

53. I make him feel better after he talks over his worries with me.

54. If he breaks a promise, I don't trust him again for a long time.

55. I seldom insist that he do anything.

56. I can't say no to anything he wants.

APPENDIX E

Measures of Children's Perceptions
of Their Parents' Caregiving Behaviors

APPENDIX F

World View Coding Manual and Rating Forms

APPENDIX F

World View Coding Manual and Rating Forms

Coding Manual

Coding procedures:

(1)   Run beginning of tape 'till I come on saying "Now."

(2)   Set tape on "Pause," SET TAPE COUNTER ON "000" and WRITE THIS NUMBER ABOVE COLUMN 1, wait for the 30 sec. beep.

(3)   As soon as you hear the beep start running the tape and coding.

(4)   When you hear the next 30 sec. beep set tape on "Pause," WRITE DOWN THE COUNTER NUMBER ABOVE THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN, check to see if any more categories need be marked, wait for next beep to proceed.

(5)   Stop rating at the point where I tell the camera person to scan the World after the child has described it and before I begin to collect objects (you DO code while the child is describing the World and I am asking questions).

Don't forget to put the tape code # and your initials in the provided spaces as well as the page number of the presence/absence coding sheet!!!

NOTES AND GUIDELINES

<u>Response determinants</u>: There are four different ways to determine under what category a response is to be classifed—

    (1)   Through what the child directly says about an object or scene (i.e. "These are the good guys and they go over and kiss the ladies").

    (2)   Through what the child indirectly says by speaking through the objects (i.e. "We're the good guys and we're going to give you ladies a kiss").

    (3)   Through the nonverbalized actions of the objects (i.e. the child picks up the male figures, places them against the female figures and makes a kissing sound).

    (4)   Through how the child answers the experimenter's questions (i.e. I ask, "Are these guys kissing the ladies?" and the child answers, "Yes").

- Code only if an action has actually occurred, will occur, or has been attempted, <u>NOT</u> if the child states it <u>might</u> occur.

- Do <u>NOT</u> code <u>my</u> repeating of the child's statement of what just occurred in previous 30 sec.

- If a camera is on an object/scene (i.e. construction equipment) right after "beep" and child no longer directly involved in it do NOT code— code what child actually is doing/saying at the moment!

DEFINITIONS

Aggression: Any event where something is physically or emotionally harmed.

Devouring/Biting—Any incident where a non-food object is bitten, eaten, or devoured.

Direct Physical—Any incident involving purposeful, direct physical contact intended to harm another object; hitting, stabbing, kicking, smashing, choking, wrestling, running over, etc. (If not obviously intentional score under "Accident".)

Distance Physical—Any incident involving a purposeful attempt to harm an object from a distance; shooting, bombing, exploding, throwing at, etc. Also any act of violence that not specifically stated how occurred but clearly non-accidental (i.e. "they were murdered"), poisoning.

Accident—Any incident involving a harmful outcome where there is no apparent intentionality or control; accidental crashes, natural disasters—fires, "dying", etc.

Verbal—Any verbal attempt to emotionally hurt or demean another object; teasing, ridiculing, swearing at, cursing, scolding, admonishing, threatening, harrassing, laughing at, embarrassing, name calling. (NOT merely stating a feeling i.e. "I'm mad at you" or daring i.e. "I bet you can't" but comments that are clearly not respecting the other and are attempting/succeed in making the other feel bad.)

Social—Any incident that clearly, unambiguously breaches social norms of good etiquette and conduct not included in the above categories; lying, stealing, cheating, deceiving, tricking, gross dissocial acts (i.e. peeing in the street), rejecting pleas for help, taking away what others want, greed, stinginess, scaring.

Deprivation/Suffering—Any incident of suffering, unhappiness, due to general circumstances rather than purposeful aggression from other objects; hunger, sickness, coldness, general physical/emotional discomfort and uneasiness.

Abandonment/Lost—Any incident where an object is left contrary to its will (as specified by the child or by the object's reaction to being left); any incident where an object is lost.

Benevolence: Any act of goodness towards an object.

Physical—Any direct physical contact that communicates warmth and caring; kissing, hugging, cuddling, stroking, holding hands, arms around each other, patting on the back, massaging.

Verbal—Verbally expressing care, empathy, support, comfort, warmth, complimenting; "I love you," "I hope you'll feel better," "It'll work out ok," "You're pretty" (compliments should also be scored under "Adequacy: Positive").

Helping/Rescuing—Any incident where an object is helped or rescued; feeding, dressing, protecting, guiding, giving helpful advice, warning (where clear concern for the object's welfare), tucking into bed, taking care of a sick/hurt object, etc. doing a service for someone (i.e. milkman delivering milk), guarding something.

Affiliative Acts—Any incident where two or more objects are engaged in an activity that is clearly mutually enjoyable as specified by the child or the objects' reactions; playing, singing, dancing, etc. Acts of generosity, care and good will that are not included in above categories i.e. gift giving, sharing what one has, singing a lullaby, social gatherings like parties, picnics, sporting events, weddings, parades, etc.

Satisfying Experiences—Anytime an object is feeling satisfied, happy, content, as specified by the child directly or through the object, due to general circumstances or immediate, specific acts by/with others; "I feel good today," "What a wonderful night's sleep," "The little girl saw it was a beautiful morning and felt very happy," etc.

Dominance: Any act of controlling, ordering, commanding, forcing, demanding, restraining, arresting an object; NOT merely requesting something of an object where there's a sense of two equals interacting, but instances where there's a clear sense that one object is or is trying to be more powerful/in command/the boss of the other object; "Stop that right now!" "Come here immediately!" "You guys are under arrest," "The witch cast a spell so the girl couldn't move," "Superman grabbed her from behind and wouldn't let her go" (this would NOT be scored "Direct Physical" unless the child states that Superman was trying to hurt her; it is scored "Dominance" since it is an attempt to control another and prevent them from doing what they would like).

Submission: Any act of obeying, giving into demands, following orders, going along with what told to do, cowering, feeling ashamed or embarrassed; NOT merely cooperating with a request but clearly giving the sense of willfully going along with the orders, commands, instructions, demands of an object that is superior/the boss rather than an equal; "The boy followed what the others told him to do," "She felt very embarrassed," "They were ashamed," the child has one object order another one and has the other then carry out the order in action though doesn't explicitly state obedience; deference, cow-tow.

Construction: Events involving physically building, creating, or producing either by the objects or the child pretending to be a construction equipment doing a job; NOT merely the child creating/constructing a World scene, but specifically using objects or himself to depict

themes involving construction/building; "They're building a road," "These workmen are constructing a house," "They're clearing the land to build a housing project," "I'm a crane digging out the road" (NOT merely the fact that the child uses his hands to dig out a road or river but that he specifically states he is some kind of construction equipment building something); (a good clue in for construction themes is whenever the child selects out objects like the crane, bulldozer, dump truck, and other construction equipment BUT a child could also use construction equipment for destruction as in running over someone with it or explicitly stating the equipment was destroying the land/ town/whatever, in which case it would be scored "Aggression: Direct Physical").

Assertion: Asserting oneself to gain or maintain what one wants.

Reactive—Assertion against restrictions/demands/comands of others or the environment; sticking up for oneself against others who are or are trying to be in a dominating/more powerful/controlling position; not doing what asked to do; rebelling or not conforming to others' intentions; "They tried to scare her (would be scored "Aggression: Social") but she wasn't," "No, I won't do it," "It was raining real hard but he didn't let that stop him from going;" generally not letting others/nature stop one from what wanting to do or force one to do what don't want to.

Initiated—Self initiated assertion to gain what one wants where NOT as a reaction to external restraints/demands; acts that give a sense of independence, self-sufficiency, resourcefulness, masterfulness, confidence, pride, effectiveness, enterprising, exploration; doing things for oneself; "The little boy wanted to tie his shoes all by himself," "She knew she could do it," "I don't need any help in building this house" (scored "Assertion: Initiated" as well as "Construction"), "She was proud of the good job she did all on her own" (scored also for "Adequacy: Positive").

Adequacy: Any evaluative/judgmental references about the characteris- tics of something or attributions of positive/negative qualities to it.

Positive—The child directly or through another object attributes a positive quality or characteristic to an object; use of any of the positive adjectives in describing something, i.e. beautiful, strong, smart, kind, generous, loyal, honest, nice, wonderful, cute, etc., etc., etc. (sometimes whether a description is meant positively or negatively can only be determined in context, thus "The little, tiny puppy" might infer a positive cuteness or a negative helplessness, or merely descriptive and thus not be scored "Adequacy" at all.

Negative—The child directly or through another object attributes a negative quality or characteristic to an object; use of any of the negative adjectives in describing something, i.e. ugly, weak, stupid, cruel, stingy, unfaithful, dishonest, horrible, etc., etc., etc.

(NOTE: Any compliment or deridement which is stated through an object and not directly by the child (i.e. one object says to another "You are beautiful" vs. the child saying "This object is beautiful") is scored BOTH "Benevolence: Verbal" or "Malevolence: Verbal" AND "Adequacy: Positive" or "Adequacy: Negative." However, anytime the child makes direct evaluative statements about an object, i.e. "Wow, what a far out car!" it is ONLY scored under "Adequacy: Positive or Negative" and NOT under "Benevolence or Malevolence: Verbal".)

Dependence: Seeking aid, comfort, help, consolation, foregiveness, support, protection, guidance, advice, care, succorance; "The little girl wanted someone to come pick her up" (the phrase "the little girl" is NOT scored under "Adequacy: Positive or Negative" since there is no sense of evaluation or judgment being made here but merely description), "Please make me something to eat," "I want to lay in your lap," "I'm sorry I did that, I'll be a better boy next time" (scored also for "Adequacy: Negative" since the implication is the boy is NOT being good now), "Don't let the monster hurt me" or "Monster, please don't hurt me" or "She didn't want the monster to hurt her," "He asked them how to get to the town."

Hiding/Escaping: Any incident of something explicitly hidden or hiding (as directly or indirectly specified by the child), escaping, fleeing, running away; "They stayed in the cave so nobody would find them," "He got away from the cops," "She jumped over the railing so that they wouldn't catch her."

Searching/Finding: Any act of seeking/searching for something and/or finding it; "They found the lost treasure" (scored also under "Abandoment/Lost" for the "lost treasure"), "She was looking for a place to sleep," "They were trying to find the escaped convict" (scored also under "Hiding/Escape" for the "escaped convict").

Code #_____ Rater _____ Page _____

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Ttl
AG-GRES-SION Devouring/Biting																					
Direct Physical (hitting)																					
Distance Physical (shooting)																					
Accident																					
Verbal (teasing)																					
Social (stealing)																					
Deprivation/Suffering																					
Abandonment/Lost																					
BE-NEV-O-LENCE Physical (hugging)																					
Verbal (comforting)																					
Helping/Rescuing																					
Affiliative Acts																					
Satisfying Experiences																					
ADE-quacy Positive																					
Negative																					
ASSER-TION Reactive																					
Initiated																					
DOMINANCE																					
SUBMISSION																					
CONSTRUCTION																					
DEPENDENCE																					
HIDING/ESCAPING																					
SEARCHING/FINDING																					

Code #_____   Rater_____

(1) Task involvement:

1	2	3	4
Uninvolved	A little involvement	Quite a bit of involvement	Extremely involved

(2) Approach to task:

1	2	3	4
Items carefully placed for scene construction, rarely played with	Some playing with items during scene construction	Quite a bit of playing with items	Much dramatic playing with items

(3) Organization:

1	2	3	4
Items apparently unrelated, placed totally at random; W looks chaotic	A few areas of interrelating items though these areas not related to each other	Numerous areas of interrelated items though not all of these areas related to each other	Most/all items interrelated in a single cohesive theme, interdependent and organized by a unifying idea; items can be in separate groups of interrelated items though these groups are interrelated by a single theme/idea

(4) Structure/rigidity:

1	2	3	4
Most of W very structured; items in rigid rows/ columns equal distance, highly regimented	Much of W rigidly structured though some areas not	A few areas rigidly structured though most of W not	No/little rigid structuring; items in orderly relation yet forming diverse patterns

or

1	2	3	4
Total lack of symmetry; items in a multitude of directions, spacially haphazard	Much of W lacks symmetry though a few cohesive, orderly areas	A few areas haphazard though most of W not	No/little haphazardness; items in orderly, diverse patterns

Code #_____   Rater_____

(6) Closedness:

1	2	3	4
Many areas closed off to contain/exclude items by encircling them with fences, sand, river, other items; or whole W encircled	Several enclosed areas or one large area though some of W not enclosed	A few enclosed areas	No enclosures, no areas segregated from others

(7) Sparseness:

1	2	3	4
Items are scattered very far apart with much space between them; W appears sparse	Items are placed somewhat far apart; W appears somewhat sparse	A few areas where items somewhat far apart	Items placed in an expected distance from each other; W does not appear sparse

or
(8) Crowdedness:

1	2	3	4
Items are compacted very close together; W appears very crowded	Items are placed somewhat close together; W appears somewhat crowded	A few areas where items somewhat crowded	Items placed in an expected distance from each other; W does not appear crowded

(9) Use of area:

1	2	3	4
Child uses roughly one fourth of box area	Child uses roughly half of box area	Child uses roughly three fourths of box area	Child uses nearly all of box area

(10) Description vs. story:

1	2	3	4
Child merely constructs scene; no story/incidents depicted, child only describes what made	A few brief incidents depicted	Several longer incidents depicted	Many stories /incidents depicted; many interrelated events or one long story

Code#_____   Rater_____

(11) Realism:

1	2	3	4
W totally of fantasy events that have no counterpart /possibility in reality	W mostly of fantasy events that have no counterpart in reality though some events are possible	W of events that could occur in reality but are not part of the child's everyday life	W entirely realistic all items and themes have counterparts in child's everyday reality

(12) Expansion: Rate the greatest degree of expansion found in the World as indicated by specific mention of places or what the items portray.

1	2	3	4
W depicts activities inside the home	W depicts activities around home and immediate vicinity (i.e. backyard)	W depicts familiar, local environments	W depicts environments beyond the child's actual local environment (i.e. battlefields, foreign countries)
5 W depicts environments outside of earth (i.e. the moon) or of imaginary lands not possibly existing on earth; or intermingles (i.e. part earth, part another planet)			

Time: Rate the time dimension used in the World where clearly indicated by the events depicted or the child's explicit statements while building the scene (irrespective of whether the child states the World is in the present, past, or future when asked at the conclusion).

(13) 1	(14) 2	(15) 3	(16) 4
W depicts distant past before recorded history i.e. prehistoric days of dinosaurs)	W of past events before 1900 but after recorded history (i.e. Romans/Greeks, cowboys/indians)	W of recent past; events after 1900 up to near present (i.e. W W II, Nixon's impeachment	W of present; events occurring in the last week or where the theme does not clearly dictate past/ future

Code #_____   Rater_____

(17)
5
W of future;
events of things
in the future that
not possible yet
(i.e. space worlds)

(18) Theme Complexity:

1	2	3	4
Theme very simple; merely descriptive of items	Theme generally simple though a few aspects more elaborate	Theme somewhat complex with some elaboration of ideas	Theme highly complex and elaborate

(19) Differentiation of main figure:

1	2	3	4
One clearly differentiated MF which remains in central focus throughout the story	A well defined MF though focus occasionally shifts	A MF can be distinguished but other figures are also in the foreground or become MF's for a time	No MF is distinquishable; or different figures become MF's with equal emphasis

(20) Differentiation of intra-character qualities: Score the highest
      degree of differentiation of qualities/attributes/roles/be-
      haviors for any character (i.e. good-bad, happy-sad, cruel-
      kind). ("Character" includes nature/object/animal/human.)

1	2	3	4
Characters have one extreme and/or exaggerated quality (i.e. all good/all bad); one quality is given to each character or group of characters	Characters have extreme qualities though on occassion manifest a different quality than the dominant one	Characters have different qualities on several occasions though still portray one dominant quality	Characters have different qualities in response to different situations; qualities span a wide spectrum of type and degree

Code #_____   Rater_____

NOT APPLY

(21) Emotional differentiation: Rated for story as a whole; include
     pleasure/pain and any behaviors that allude to affects such
     as smiling/laughing/crying.

1	2	3	4
No mention of any feeling, affect, emotion	One/a few feelings mentioned	Several feelings mentioned on a number of occasions	Different feelings and shades of emotions described often

(22) Action vs. thought processes: Score the highest degree of com-
     plexity found in the story regardless of which character is
     involved. "Thought processes" here refer to planning, evalu-
     ating, reflecting, pondering, scheming, deducing, analyzing,
     remembering, forgetting.

1	2	3	4
No mention of thinking; characters act with no reference to their thoughts	Thinking mentioned one/a few times	Thinking mentioned on quite a few occasions	Thinking mentioned and related to past/present/future behaviors consistently

(23) Use of imaginative figures: "Imaginative figures" are characters
     the child alludes to that are not represented by actual, phy-
     sical objects (i.e. "the guy driving the car" when no physical
     object is in the car).

1	2	3	4
No use of imaginative figures	Imaginative figures referred to a few times	Imaginative figures referred to on several occasions	Imaginative figures referred to on many occasions

Code #_____   Rater_____

(24) Use of magic: "Magic" as supernatural powers/abilities/means not
      possible in reality used to do/gain something (spells, hexes,
      incantations, sorcery, granting wishes). Not just Superman
      being able to fly/having super strength but specifically magical
      powers/acts to gain an end.

1	2	3	4
No use of magic	Magic occurs a few times	Magic occurs quite a few times	Magic occurs many times, dominates the story

(25) Use of objects in ways other than specified: Where child is clear-
      ly aware of the general use of an object but uses it in a differ-
      ent way or uses clay to mould something that's wanted but not in
      the cabinet (i.e. taking a house and explicitly stating that it
      is being used as a table).

1	2	3	4
Objects never used for anything other than what desig- nated	Objects/clay used in different than designated way one/a few times	Objects/clay used in different ways on several occa- sions	Objects/ clay used in differ- ent ways on numerous occasions

(26) Propensity for imaginative play:

1	2	3	4
Child shows little ability for imagin- ative play	Child shows some ability for imagin- ative play	Child shows quite a bit of ability for imaginative play and creative theme construction	Child shows a great deal of ability for imagin- ative play creating rich, elab- orate, high- ly involved themes and stories

Code #_____   Rater_____

(27) Ability to move in/out of fantasy:

1	2	3	4
Child shows very little ability to become involved in fantasy or becomes totally immersed in fantasy and shows very little ability to pull out on own	Child shows some ability on a few occasions to move in and out of fantasy	Child shows quite a bit of ability to more in and out of fantasy	Child shows a high ability to move in and out of fantasy, becoming deeply involved in fantasy while also pulling out to be descriptive, self reflective, or otherwise relate to E in present, realistic, here-now way

Code #_____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF WORLD:

Use of sand:

___Only place objects on   ___Patting, stroking, smoothing

___Mounds, hills, poles   ___Pouring, filling

___Caves, tunnels   ___Digging, excavating

___Roads, rivers   ___Deeply embedding objects
                                    (short of actually burying)
___Working with objects

___Marking, tracing patterns   ___Burying

Types of landscapes created:

___Ocean ___Lake ___River ___Hill/Mountain ___Desert ___Forest

___Jungle ___Valley/Canyon ___Cave Other:

Types of city environments:

___Residential ___Business ___Social institutions ___Transportation
                                                      facilities
___Park ___Zoo ___Road ___Farm ___Monument

Other:

No. of landscapes created:___

No. of city environments:____

Code #____

OBJECTS USED:

People

Armymen.............Total:___

Cowboys............Total:___

Indians............Total:___

Superheroes........Total:___

Civil servants......Total:___

Other..............Total:___

                Sum:___

Animals

Domestic/farm.......Total:___

Tame...............Total:___

Wild...............Total:___

Fantastic/prehstrc..Total:___

Fish...............Total:___

Crustaceans........Total:___

                Sum:___

Transportation

Private cars........Total:___

Civil servants......Total:___

Construction........Total:___

Army...............Total:___

Planes.............Total:___

Helicopters........Total:___

Trains.............Total:___

Boats..............Total:___

Rockets............Total:___

Other..............Total:___

                Sum:___

Landscape—city

Instutnl bldings....Total:___

Other bldgings......Total:___

Fences.............Total:___

Other..............Total:___

                Sum:___

Landscape—nature

Trees..............Total:___

Shrubbery..........Total:___

Rocks..............Total:___

                Sum:___

Miscellaneous

Food...............Total:___

Fire/explosions.....Total:___

Tombstones.........Total:___

Clay/card..........Total:___

Other..............Total:___

                Sum:___

Total objects used....Total:___

Total categories used.Total:___

Total subctgrs used...Total:___

Child states W in:

___Past ___Present ___Future

___Morning ___Noon ___Night

___Would ___Would not want to
           be in scene

Who/what/where would be:

Building time:___

Time including questions:___

APPENDIX G

Sample Characteristics

APPENDIX G

Sample Characteristics

No.	Subject Age	Father Age	Father Occupation	Father Education	Mother Age	Mother Occupation	Mother Education	Siblings Sex	Siblings Age
1	9-3	36	Transportation Supervisor	14	29	Program Analyst	B.A.	F	7
2	9-7	38	Teacher	M.A.	33	Teacher	14	–	–
3	8-9	27	Groundsman	7	23	Not employed outside home	12	F	9 months
4	8-2	37	Teacher	M.A.	35	Salesperson	14	M	10, 12
5	9-3	40		B.A.	39	Not employed outside home	12	F M	13, 18 14
6	8-0	33	Archivist	Ph.D.	35	Not employed outside home	Ph.D.	M	3
7	7-1		(not made available)		30	(not made available)		–	–
8	8-10	36	Building Tradesman	B.A.	34	Not employed outside home	14	F	4, 13
9	9-6	36	Librarian	M.A.	34	Nurse	M.A.	F	6
10	7-0	31	Nurse	14	31	Secretary	14	F M	9 8

188

APPENDIX H

T-values for Differences between World View Sessions

T-values for Differences between World View Sessions

T-values for differences between WVT sessions
on fantasy play categories.

Category	WVT 1 - 2	T-value WVT 1 - 3	WVT 2 - 3
Aggression	.46	1.02	.68
Benevolence	-.99	-1.06	-.02
Construction	-.07	-.37	-.32
Dominance	-.26	.43	.52
Adequacy	-1.09*	-.91	-.35
Submission	.80	.51	-.43
Dependency	.43	.00	-.43

*p < .30, highest significance reached

APPENDIX I

Correlations between World View Categories
and Factors of Positive/Negative Caregiving Behaviors
on the CRCP

Correlations between fantasy play categories and
factors of positive caregiving behaviors on the CRCP.

CRCP Factors	Aggrssn	Benvlnc	Constrctn	Domnc	Adqucy	Assrtn	Submsn	Dpndcy	Prpnsty
Fa Pro-Socl	.05	.41	.23	-.31	.14	-.26	.46	-.25	-.07
Mo Pro-Socl	-.23	-.24	.20	-.39	.23	.21	.34	-.29	-.24
Fa Aggrssn	-.08	.38	.21	-.44	.02	-.40	.26	-.62*	-.17
Mo Aggrssn	-.21	.05	-.30	-.12	-.12	-.02	.32	-.42	-.16
Fa Intrnl Rewrds	-.04	.58*	-.10	-.25	.02	-.46	.46	-.35	-.12
Mo Intrnl Rewrds	-.28	.19	-.26	-.13	-.29	-.23	.41	-.27	-.23
Fa Indctv Dscpln	-.30	.003	-.10	-.39	-.34	-.52	.65**	-.45	-.50
Mo Indctv Dscpln	.29	-.35	-.13	.67**	-.13	.73@	-.18	.48	.33
Fa Proud	-.19	.46	.19	-.48	.13	-.41	.17	-.38	-.26
Mo Proud	-.66**	-.06	.25	-.76@@	-.17	-.73@	-.13	-.42	-.55*
Fa Self Control	-.10	.10	-.49	-.34	-.23	-.37	.22	-.51	-.45
Mo Self Control	.12	.25	.19	.44	.03	.31	.36	.22	.22

*p .05
**p .02
@p .008
@@p .005

Correlations between fantasy play categories and
factors of negative caregiving behaviors on the CRCP

CRCP Factors	Aggrssn	Benvlnc	Constrctn	Domnc	Adqucy	Assrtn	Submsn	Dpndcy	Prpnsty
Fa Crtcz	-.08	-.07	-.41	.41	-.19	.36	-.17	.30	.003
Mo Crtcz	-.17	.39	.20	-.29	.15	-.32	-.09		
Fa Extrnl Rewrds	.29	.30	-.25	.43	.06	.19	-.51	.33	.29
Mo Extrnl Rewrds	-.15	.14	.30	-.22	-.14	-.43	-.48	.10	-.06
Fa Rejctng	-.001	-.42	-.57*	.31	-.15	.36	-.29	-.02	-.03
Mo Rejctng	.18	.51	-.17	.02	.27	-.03	-.41	.11	.31
Fa Shaming	-.20	-.14	.29	.34	-.30	.27	-.18	.26	-.12
Mo Shaming	-.09	.46	.20	-.24	.20	-.27	-.10	-.02	.13
Fa Take Pstv Grntd	.34	.30	-.60**	.49	-.11	.40	-.13	.29	.18
Mo Take Pstv Grntd	-.03	.51	-.10	-.36	.05	-.45	-.42	-.22	-.05
Fa Do Nothing	.12	-.41	-.44	.35	-.23	.52	-.15	.19	.07
Mo Do Nothing	.08	.12	-.03	-.09	.23	.06	.00	.30	.16

*p .04
**p .03

APPENDIX J

Correlations between Aggression and Benevolence
Subcategories and Parents' Perceptions
of Their Caregiving Behaviors

APPENDIX J

Correlations between Aggression and Benevolence sub-categories and parents' perceptions of their caregiving behaviors.

Fantasy Categories	"Positive" Parenting				"Negative" Parenting					
	Fa Pstv	Mo Pstv	Fa Autnmy	Mo Autnmy	Fa Ngtv	Mo Ngtv	Fa Rejctng	Mo Rejctng	Fa Lax	Mo Lax
Aggression										
Devouring	-.20	.01	.13	.39	-.27	-.17	.39	.23	.16	.36
Drct Physcl	-.20	-.25	.06	.46	-.39	-.19	.55*	.29	.23	.44
Dstnc Physcl	-.33	-.38	-.40	.33	.48	-.17	-.08	-.12	-.17	-.38
Accdnt	.37	-.14	-.02	.03	.04	.36	-.26	.45	-.15	-.42
Vrbl Malvlnc	.23	.11	.21	.15	.25	-.19	-.16	-.53	-.69@	.12
Socl Malvlnc	.23	.06	.34	.54*	.28	.57**	-.42	-.51	-.49	.07
Benevolence										
Helping	.41	.17	.06	-.13	.05	.43	-.26	-.55*	-.02	-.20
Affltv Acts	.36	-.28	.05	.14	-.20	-.34	-.15	.08	-.19	.24

*p .05
**p .04
@p .01

APPENDIX K

Caregiver Behaviors and Children's Psycho-social
Adjustment: Toward a Synthesis of Piagetian
and Humanistic Perspectives

APPENDIX K

Caregiver Behaviors and Children's Psycho-social Adjustment: Toward a Synthesis of Piagetian and Humanistic Perspectives

The current variegated finding brazenly point out the tremendous complexity of the factors involved in the development and/or maintenance of psycho-social competence in human beings. A more detailed discussion will be made here. Competence would seem to be resultant from the dynamic, mutually related interface of 3 dimensions: (1) the individual's constitutionally predisposed means of perceiving and responding to the environment (Freedman, 1979; Thomas, et al., 1968); (2) life events, circumstances, and experiences, including those having occurred by mere whims of fate and fortune; (3) the behaviors of significant others towards the individual. The current investigation attempted to further elucidate the role of the latter of these 3 dimensions, being highly cognizant of the fact that only a limited amount of the variance could be attributed to this variable. Further explication of this hypothesized relationship between caregiver behaviors and the development of competence will be made at this point. The line of reasoning here will be an attempted synthesis of Piagetian and humanistic perspectives, thus a definition of competence from a Piagetian viewpoint need be given. Competence, in this framework is defined as the maximization of potential responding through the equilibration of assimilative and accommodative capacities, thereby allowing for the greatest possibility of effective adaptation to occur in any given situation (Piaget, 1957; Weiner, 1975).

192

In the previous review of the literature on caregiver behaviors associated with positive psycho-emotional development in children, 3 global factors were discerned. These were empathy, warmth, or acceptance, firm setting of limits with clearly defined rules and expectations, and flexibility and encouragement of autonomy within the prescribed limits. The interplay of these 3 factors in the development of competence is perhaps as follows: (1) Empathy and the communication of acknowledgment, acceptance and valuing of the child's experiencing fosters a sense of psychological safety, a sense that one's thoughts, feelings and desires are valuable, that one's being as a unique individual is worthwhile (Axline, 1947; Maslow, 1962; Moustakas, 1959; Rogers, 1961; Stollak, 1978).[1] These positive early perceptions and experiences of oneself, acquired through the perceived reactions of the environment, constellate into a primitive self-schema, or "core-me" (Gould, 1972) that includes the attributions of goodness, "entitlement" (Gould, 1972), and potential masterfulness. Such trust and confidence in oneself and the environment augments exploration and manipulation of the social/ material world, thereby increasing accommodation and assimilation of new schemas. Equilibration—the adaptive balancing of accommodation and assimilation (Piaget, 1957; Weiner, 1975)—is also heightened by the affirmation of self, since the child is not compelled to be over accommodative out of fear that the environment will be overwhelming if not molded to, nor be over assimilative due to a fragile sense of self that necessitates the environment to conform to its schemas for fear that accommodation would result in a giving over or loss of identity.[2]

(2) Firm, consistent setting of limits with clearly specified rules and expectations would seem to aid the child in adaptive accommodation by teaching him/her effective ways of acting upon the environment and thereby increasing the assimilation of new schemas. The predictability of the limits would probably also enhance the sense of safety since they would give a clear framework within which to act with predictable consequences.

(3) The encouragement of autonomy within prescribed limits expands accommodation as the child tries out and develops new modes of responding, again assimilating new schemas in the process. Such allowance for experimentation within set boundaries also constellates into the "core-me" the attribution of competency, masterfulness, and effectiveness.

Thus it would appear that psychological safety and the encouragement of autonomous exploration are necessary, though not sufficient, conditions for the development and maintenance of psycho-social competence. As Stollak (1978) points out, however, competence is also developed through the child seeing caregivers engaging in competent behaviors with others, in addition to him/herself. The child thus models after such behaviors, thereby assimilating new schemas and expanding his/her modes of accommodation and adaptation.

FOOTNOTES

[1]While expressed empathy and the communication of acknowl-
edgment and acceptance of others' experiencing would
appear in general to be condusive to psychological growth
and a sense of psychological safety, I have on occassion
experienced verbalized empathy as something of a psycho-
logical assault to the integrity of my self-boundary--
whether the empathy was accurate or not. Such empathy
was experienced as intrusive, engulfing, and violating a
sanctimonious boundary of self. Perhaps this echoes a
developmentally earlier phenominon, beginning in the
"terrible twos" (Erikson's (1958) second stage of develop-
ment involving autonomy vs. shame and doubt), in which
the child begins to define a budding sense of self by
asserting him/herself against the parents and the environ-
ment. It is in this regard that Lang (1962) asserts the
importance of the first lie as being a primary experienc-
ing of a separate, inviolable self that is at that moment
individuated from a hitherto omnipotent, all-knowing
parent. Thus initial dependency, expressed in "yes,"
progresses to a budding independency, asserted in "no,"
and finally reaches an interdependency in which there is
a strong enough sense of identity that either compliance
or defiance can be made without a loss of boundary.*
Nonetheless, there are times in which identity feels
threatened rather than affirmed by verbalized accurate
empathy.

[2]Over accommodation would thus appear to be an attempt to
define, delineate, and protect the self by fusing with the
environment, while over assimilation would seem to achieve
definition, delineation, and protection of self through
opposition to the environment. The former is perhaps a
more regressive mechanism, reminiscent of symbiotic, Stage
I issues (Erikson, 1958), while the latter seems more
characteristic of Stage II power struggles. Thus forms of
pathology and coping styles can be defined by the prepon-
derance of accommodative vs. assimilative modes of re-
sponding (Weiner, 1975).

[3]Interesting to note is that even Pines' (1979) research on
"invulnerables"--children raised under extremely difficult

---

*The author wishes to thank Lawrence Jaffa for his comments
here.

circumstances who nonetheless psychoemotionally flourish--
found that in every case there appeared to be at least one
supportive, nurturing relationship with a significant
other, usually outside of the home.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Albino, R. Defences against aggression in the play of young children. British Journal of Medical Psychiatry, 1954, 27, 66-71.

Allison, J., Blatt, S.J., and Zimet, C.N. The Interpretation of Psychological Tests. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Allport, G.W. Personality and Social Encounter. New York: Beacon, 1960.

Ames, L.B. Child Rorschach Responses. New York: Brunner and Maxel, 1974.

Anderson, J.P. A study of the relationships between certain aspects of parental behavior and attitudes and the behavior of junior high school pupils. Teacher College Contributions to Education, 1940, No. 809.

Armentrout, J.A., and Burger, G.K. Factor analysis of college students' recall of parental child-rearing behaviors. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1972.

Arietti, S. Interpretation of Schizophrenia. New York: Brunner, 1955.

Arietti, S. The Intrapsychic Self. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Axline, V. Place Therapy. New York: Ballantine Books, Inc., 1969.

Bach, G. Young children's play fantasies. Psychological Monographs, 1945, 59, 3-69.

Bandura, A. Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of pre-school behavior. Child Development, 1967, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority.
        Developmental Psychology Monographs, 1971, 4, No. 1.

Baumrind, D. The development of instrumental competence
        through socialization. In Minnesota Symposia on
        Child Psychology, 1973, 7, 3-46.

Baumrind, D. Early Socialization and the Discipline
        Controversy. New Jersey: General Learning Press,
        1975.

Baumrind, S., and Black, A.E. Socialization practices
        associated with dimensions of competence in pre-
        school boys and girls. Child Development, 1967, 38,
        291-327.

Becker, W. Consequences of different kinds of parental
        discipline. In M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman (Eds.),
        Review of Child Development Research. New York:
        Russel Sage, 1964.

Berg, M. The function of imaginative play. Unpublished
        research proposal, Michigan State University, 1975.

Berlyne, D. Conflict, Arousal and Curiosity. New York:
        McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Bessell, H. and Palomares, U. Methods in Human Development:
        Theory Manual. San Diego, Ca.: Human Development
        Training Institute, 1970.

Bettleheim, B. The Uses of Enchantment. New York: Knopf,
        1976.

Bilbow, E. Imaginative play and the control of aggressive
        behavior. In J. Singer The Child's World of Make-
        Believe. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Bolgar, H. and Fischer, L.K. Personality projection in the
        world test. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,
        1947, 27, 117-128.

Bowyer, R. The sand-tray world as a projective technique
        with mental defectives. Journal of the Midland
        Mental Deficiency Society, 1958, 4, 44-51.

Bowyer, R. A normative study of sand-tray worlds.
        Bulletin, British Psychology Society, 1956.

Bowyer, R. The Lowenfeld World Technique. London:
        Pergamon, 1970.

Bridges, K. M. B. A genetic theory of emotions. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1930, 37, 514-527.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Buhler, C. The world test, a projective technique. Journal of Child Psychiatry, 1951, 2, 4-12.

Buhler, C. and Kelly, G. The World Test: A Measurement of Emotional Disturbance. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1941.

Buhler, C. and Carrol, H.S. A comparison of the results of the world test with teacher's judgment concerning children's personality adjustment. Journal of Child Psychiatry, 1951, 2, 36-43.

Burger, G. K. and Armentrout, J. A. A factor analysis of fifth and sixth graders' reports of parental child rearing behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 483.

Burger, G. K., Armentrout, J. A. and Rapfogel, R. G. Estimating factor scores for children's reports of parental child-rearing behaviors. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 123, 107-113.

Buss, A. The Psychology of Aggression. New York: Wiley, 1961.

Campbell, J. (Ed.) The Portable Jung. New York: Viking, 1971.

Cappell, M. Games and the mastery of helplessness. In R. Solvenko and J. Knight (Eds.), Motivations in Play, Games, and Sports. Illinois: Thomas, 1967.

Cattell, R. B. Abilities, Their Structure, Growth and Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1967.

Cowen, E. L., Trost, M. A., Izzo, L. D., Lorion, R. P., Dorr, D. and Isaacson, R. V. New Ways in School Mental Health. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1975.

Dansky, J. L. and Silverman, I. W. Effects of play on associative fluency in preschool-age children. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 38-43.

Dansky, J. L. and Silverman, I. W. Play: A general facilitator of associative fluency. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 104.

Dave, R. D. The effects of hynotically induced dreams on creative problem solving. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Michigan State University, 1976.

Dollard, J. and Miller, N. E. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Erikson, E. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton, 1950.

Eron, L., Banta, F., Walder, L., and Laulicht, J. Comparison of data obtained from mothers and fathers on childrearing practices and their relation to child aggression. Child Development, 1961, 32, 457-472.

Fein, G. A transformational analysis of pretending. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 3, 291-296.

Feitelson, D. Developing imaginative play in pre-school children as a possible approach to fostering creativity. Early Child Development, 197-3, 16, 220-223.

Ferichel, D. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1945.

Ferguson, L. R., Partyka, L., and Lester, B. M. Patterns of parent perception differentiating clinic from non-clinic children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1974, 2, 169-181.

Fischer, J. K. A new psychological tool in function: A preliminary clinical experience with the Bolgar-Fischer World Test. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1950, 4, 281-292.

Flavell, J. H. The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget. New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1963.

Franklin, D. Block play modeling and its relationship to imaginativeness, impulsivity-reflection and internal-external control. Unpublished pre-dissertation research, Yale University, 1975.

Freedman, D. G. Human Sociobiolgoy. New York: Free Press, 1979.

French, T. and Fromm, E. Dream Interpretation: A New Approach. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Freud, A. The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defenses. London: Hogarth Press, 1936.

Freud, A. Normality and Pathology in Childhood. New York: International University Press, 1965.

Freud, S. A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. New York: Pocket Books, 1953.

Fromm, E. The Forgotten Language. New York: Rinehart, 1951.

Gershowitz, M. Fantasy behaviors of clinic-referred children in play encounters with college undergraduates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

Gesell, A. and Ilg, F. L. The Child from Five to Ten. New York: Harper, 1946.

Goldberg, L. Aggression in boys in a clinical population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 1973.

Goldin, P. A review of children's reports of parent behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 222-236.

Golomb, C. and Cornelius, C. B. Symbolic play and its cognitive significance. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 3, 13-20.

Gondor, L. H. Use of fantasy communications in child psychotherapy. In M. R. Haworth (Ed.), Child Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Gottlieb, S. Modeling effects upon fantasy. In J. L. Singer The Child's World of Make-Believe. New York: Ach, 1973.

Gould, R. Child Studies through Fantasy. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972.

Green, R. J. Child-rearing attitudes and perceptions of children's behavior across two generations in families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975.

Griffiths, R. A Study of Imagination in Early Childhood and Its Function in Mental Development. London: Paul, Trubner, and Co., 1935.

Groos, K. The Play of Man. New York: Appleton, 1901.

Guntrip, H. Schizoid Phenomena, Object Relation and Self. New York: International University Press, 1969.

Hall, G. S. Youth. New York: Appleton, 1920.

Harlow, H. F. Motivational forces underlying learning. In Learning Theory, Personality Theory and Clinical Research - The Kentucky Symposium. New York: Wiley, 1954.

Harnad, S. (Ed.) Lateralization in the Nervous System. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Hartmann, H. Ego Psychology and the Problem of Adaptation, M.D. Rapaport. New York: International University Press, 1958.

Hartwell, S. W., Andrew, G., Hutt, M. L., and Walton, R. E. The Michigan Picture Test: Diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities of a new projective test in child guidance. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1951, 21, 124-137.

Hartwell, S. W., Andrew, G., Hutt, M. L., and Walton, R. E. The Michigan Picture Test. Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, 1953.

Haworth, M. R. The CAT: Facts about Fantasy. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1966.

Herron, R. and Sutton, B. (Eds.) Child's Play. New York: Wiley, 1977.

Hoffman, M. L. Child-rearing practices and moral development, generalization from empirical research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 295-318.

Hoffman, M. L. Parent discipline and the child's consideration for others. Child Development, 1963, 34, 573-588.

Hoffman, M. L. Conscience, personality, and socialization techniques. Human Development, 1970, 13, 90-126.

Hoffman, M. L. Moral development. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Hoffman, M. L.   Moral internalization, parental power, and
        the nature of parent-child interaction.   Develop-
        mental Psychology, 1975, 11, 228-239.

Hoffman, M. L. and Saltzstein, H. D.   Parental discipline
        and the child's moral development.   Journal of
        Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.

Hollenberg, E.   A study of some effects of child-training
        practices on doll play behavior.   Unpublished Masters
        Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1949.

Hollenberg, E. and Sperry, M.   Some antecedents of aggres-
        sion and effects of frustration in doll play.
        Journal of Personality, 1951, 1, 32-43.

Holway, A. R.   Early self-regulation of infants and later
        behavior in play interviews.   American Journal of
        Orthopsychiatry, 1949, 19, 612-623.

Isch, M. J.   Fantasied mother-child interaction in doll
        play.   Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1952, 81,
        233-258.

Jahoda, M.   Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health.
        New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Jeffre, M. F. D.   Fantasied mother-child interaction in
        doll play.   Unpublished doctoral dissertation,
        University of Iowa, 1946.

Jersild, A. T.   Child Psychology.   New Jersey: Prentice
        Hall, 1968.

Jersild, A. T. and Holmes, F. B.   Children's Fears.   New
        York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

Johnson, E. Z.   Attitudes of children toward authority as
        projected in their doll play at two age levels.
        Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Jung, C. G.   Two Essays on Analytical Psychology.   New
        York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Jung, C. G.   Man and his Symbols.   New York: Dell Publish-
        ing Co., 1968.

Kagan, J.   The child's perception of the parent.   Journal
        of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 257-258.

Kagan, J., Hoskin, B., and Watson, S. The child's symbolic conceptualization of parents. Child Development, 1961, 32, 625-636.

Kalff, D. Sandplay: Mirror of a Child's Psyche. San Francisco: Browser, 1971.

Kamp, J. M. J. and Kessler, E. S. The World Test: Preliminaries to a developmental scale. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Utrecht University, 1967.

Kardos, E. and Peto, A. Contributions to a theory of play. British Journal of Medical Psychiatry, 1956, 29, 100-113.

Kernberg, O. Object Relation Theory and Clinical Psychoanalysis. New York: Aronson, 1976.

Klein, M. The Psychoanalysis of Children. London: Hogarth Press, 1932.

Klinger, E. The Structure and Functions of Fantasy. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Kretschmer, E. A Textbook of Medical Psychology. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Lamb, M. The Role of the Father in Child Development. New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976.

Lang, R. D. The Self and Others. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1962.

Leary, T. F. Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality: A Functional Theory and Methodology for Personality Evaluation. New York: Ronald, 1957.

Lefkowitz, M. M., Walder, L. O. and Eron, L. D. Punishment, identification, and aggression. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 159-175.

Levin, H. and Sears, R. R. Identification with parents as a determinant of doll play aggression. Child Development, 1956, 27, 135-153.

Levin, H. and Wardwell, E. Research in doll play. Psychological Bulletin, 1962, 59, 27-56.

Levine, J. A. Fathering books: A new generation. Psychology Today, 1978, 12, 152-161.

Levy, D. Use of play techniques as experimental procedure. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1933, 3, 266-277.

Lewin, K. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.

Liberman, M., Stollak, G. E., and Denner, B. Dimensions of psychological health in family play interactions. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Detroit, Michigan, 1971.

Lindemann, E. Mental health: Fundamentals to a dynamic epidemiology of health. In T. Goldston (Ed.), The Epidemiology of Health. New York: Academy of Medicine, 1955.

Lowenfeld, M. Play in Childhood. London: Gollancey, 1935.

Lowenfeld, M. The theory and use of play in psychotherapy of childhood. Journal of Mental Science, 1938, 84, 1057-1063.

Lowenfeld, M. The World Pictures of children: A method for recording and study them. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1939, 18, 65-72.

Lowenfeld, M. Non Verbal Thinking. London: Institute of Child Psychology, 1964.

Lumbry, G. K. Study of the World Technique characteristics as a basis for discrimination between various clinical categories. Journal of Child Psychiatry, 1951, 2, 24-29.

Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., and Bergman, A. The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Maslow, A. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostraud, 1962.

Meichenbaum, D. H., and Goodman, J. Training impulsive children to talk to themselves. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 115-126.

Messé, L. A., Stollak, G. E., and Michaels, G. Y. Sensitivity to children's behavior and adult-child playroom interactions. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, 1977.

Messé, L.A., Stollak, G.E., Larson, R.W. and Michaels, G.Y. Interpersonal consequences of person perception processes on two social contexts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 369-379.

Michaels, G.Y., Messé, L.A. and Stollak, G.E. Relationships among children's perceptions of parent behavior, parents' inferences of their children's perceptions, and parents' self-perceptions. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1977.

Michaels, G.Y., Messé, L.A., and Stollak, G.E. Predicting children's social behavior from parent person perception processes. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, 1977.

Millar, S. The Psychology of Play. London: Penguin, 1968.

Moustakas, C.E. Psychotherapy with Children. New York: Harper, 1959.

Murphy, L. Personality in Young Children. New York: Basic Books, 1956.

Murphy, L. The Widening World of Childhood: Paths Towards Mastery. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Murray, H.A. The Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.

Mussen, P.H. (Ed.) Manual of Child Psychology: Volume II. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Nahme-Huang, L., Singer, D.H., Singer, J.L. and Wheaton, A. Imaginative play and perceptual motor intervention methods with emotionally-disturbed, hospitalized children: An evaluation study. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, New York, 1976.

Neuman, E. The Origins and History of Consciousness. Cambridge: Princeton University Press, 1954.

Neuman, E. The Child. New York: Harper, 1976.

Ornstein, R. The Nature of Human Consciousness. New York: Viking, 1974.

Piaget, J. The Construction of Reality in Childhood. New York: Basic Books, 1937

Piaget, J. Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood. New York: Norton, 1957.

Piaget, J. The Moral Development of the Child. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Piaget, J. and Inhelder, B. Mental Imagery in the Child. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Pines, M. Superkids. Psychology Today, 1979, 12, 53-63.

Pintler, M.H., Phillips, R. and Sears, R.R. Sex differences in the projective doll play of preschool children. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 73-80.

Pitcher, E. and Prelinger, E. Children Tell Stories: An Analysis of Fantasy. New York: International University Press, 1963.

Rabin, A.I. (Ed.) Projective Techniques in Personality Assessment. New York: Springer, 1968.

Rapaport, D. The Collected Papers of David Rapaport, M.M. Gill (Ed.). New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Reif, T. and Stollak, G.E. Sensitivity to Young Children: Training and its Effects. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1972.

Reiss, A.A. Study of some genetic behavioral correlates of human movement responses in children's Rorschach protocols. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1957.

Ridley, D. A pilot study of the sandtray World to examine the possibilities of a quantitative scoring method. Unpublished Bachelors Thesis, University of Bristol, 1952.

Rogers, C. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Mifflin, 1961.

Rosenhan, D., Underwood, B. and Moore, B. Affect moderates self-gratification and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 546-552.

Samples, B. The Metaphoric Mind. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1976.

Sandler, J. and Nagera, A. Aspects of the metapsychology of fantasy. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1963, 18, 160-195.

Santostefano, S. Miniature situations as a way of inter-
        viewing children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Behavior
        Development, 1962, 8, 261-269.

Schachtel, E. Metamorphosis. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Schaefer, E. Children's reports of parental behavior: An
        inventory. Child Development, 1965, 36, 413-424.

Schaefer, E. A configurational analysis of children's
        reports of parental behavior. Journal of Consulting
        Psychology, 1965, 29, 552-557.

Schiller, F. Essays Aesthetic and Philosophical. London:
        George Ball, 1875.

Sears, R.R. Relation of fantasy aggression to interpersonal
        aggression. Child Development, 1950, 21, 5-6.

Sears, P.S. Doll play aggression in normal young children:
        Influence of sex, age, sibling status and father's
        absence. Psychological Monographs, 1951, 65, No. 6.

Sears, R.R., Whiting, J.W.M., Nowlis, V. and Sears, P. Some
        child-rearing antecedents of aggression and dependency
        in young children. Genetic Psychology Monographs,
        1953, 47, 135-234.

Sears, R.R., Maccoby, E.E. and Levin, H. Patterns of Child-
        rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co.,
        1957.

Sears, R.R., Rau, L. and Alpert, R. Identification and
        Childrearing. Stanford, California: Stanford
        University Press, 1965.

Serot, N. and Teevan, R. Perception of the parent-child
        relationship and its relation to child adjustment.
        Child Development, 1961, 32, 373-378.

Singer, J.L. The Child's World of Make-Believe: Experi-
        mental Studies of Imaginative Play. New York:
        Academic, 1973.

Singer, J.L. Imagery and Daydream Methods in Psychotherapy
        and Behavior Modification. New York: Academic, 1974.

Singer, J.L. The Inner World of Daydreaming. New York:
        Harper and Row, 1975.

Singer, J.L. The experience types: Some behavioral cor-
     relates and theoretical implications. In M.R.
     Rickers-Orsiankina (Ed.), Rorschach Psychology.
     New York: Wiley, 1960.

Singer, J.L. Imaginative play and pretending in early
     childhood: Some experimental approaches. In
     A. Davids (Eds.), Child Personality and Psychopath-
     ology: Current Topics. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Spencer, H. Principles of Psychology. New York:
     Appleton, 1873.

Sperry M. An experimental study of the effects of dis-
     approval on doll play. Unpublished Masters Thesis,
     State University of Iowa, 1949.

Spivak, G. and Levine, M. Self regulation and acting out
     in normal adolescents. Progress report for NIMH
     grant N-4531. Devon, Pennsylvania: Devereaux
     Foundation, 1964.

Stevenson, H.W. Piaget, behavior theory and intelligence.
     In W. Kesen and C. Kuhlman, Thought in the young
     child. Monograph on Social Research in Child
     Development, 1962, 27, 113-126.

Stollak, G.E. Until We Are Six. New York: Kriegen
     Publishing Co., 1978.

Stollak, G.E., Messé, LA., Michaels, G.Y. and Ince, R.
     Children's behavioral problems and parental per-
     ceptual bias. Paper presented at the meeting of the
     American Psychological Association, San Francisco,
     California, 1977.

Sullivan, H.S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry.
     New York: Norton, 1953.

Sutton-Smith, B. A reply to Piaget: A play theory of copy.
     In R. Herron and B. Sutton-Smith (Eds.), Child's
     Play. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Sutton-Smith, B. The role of play in cognitive behavior.
     In R. Herron and B. Sutton-Smith (Eds.), Child's
     Play. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Sutton-Smith, B. A syntax for play and games. In R.
     Herron and B. Sutton-Smith (Eds.), Child's Play.
     New York: Wiley, 1971.

Syle, W.H. and Levitt, E.E. Punitiveness, authoriatarianism and parental discipline of grade school children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 42-46.

Symonds, P.M. Fantasy. In The Dynamics of Human Adjustment. New York: Appleton-Century, 1946.

Thomas, A., Chess, S. and Birch, H.G. Temperment and Behavior Disorders in Children. New York: New York University Press, 1968.

Tomkins, S.S. The Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.

Tomkins, S.S. Affect, Imagery, and Consciousness. Volumes I and II. New York: Springer, 1962, 1963.

Tucker, J. The role of fantasy in cognitive-affective functioning: Does reality make a difference in remembering? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1975.

Van Wylick, M. Die Welt des Kindes in seiner Darstellung. Vienna: Eberle, 1935.

Vernon, M.D. The relation of cognition and phantasy in children. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1940, 31, 1-21.

Waelder, R. The psychoanalytic theory of play. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1932, 2, 208-224.

Weiner, M. The Cognitive Unconscious: A Piagetian Approach to Psychotherapy. New York: International Psychological Press, 1975.

Weiner, M. Dynamic cognitive therapy. In R. Herink (Ed.), Psychotherapy Handbook. New York: New American Library, 1979.

Werner, H. Comparative Psychology of Mental Development. New York: Follet, 1948.

Whitaker, H. and Whitaker, H. (Eds.) Studies in Neurolinguistics. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

White, R.W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.

White, S.H.   Evidence for a hierarchical arrangement of
        learning processes.   In L. Lipsitt and C. Spiker
        (Eds.), Advances in Child Development and Behavior.
        Volume II.   New York: Academic Press, 1963.

Witkin, H.A.   Personality through Perception.   New York:
        Harper, 1954.

Wowkanech, N.K.   Children's differential coping styles
        on fantasy related to social competence.   Unpublish-
        ed doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University,
        1977.

Yarrow, L.J.   The effect of antecedent frustration on pro-
        jective play.   Psychological Monographs, 1948, 62,
        No. 293.

Yarrow, M.R., Campbell, J.D. and Burton, R.V.   Child Rearing:
        An Inquiry into Research and Methods.   San Francisco,
        California: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Zucker, R. and Barron, F.H.   Toward a systematic family
        mythology: The relationship of parents' and ado-
        lescents' reports of parent behavior during childhood.
        Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psycho-
        logical Association, New York, 1971.