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AN EMPIRICAL STUDY
OF THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
ADULT PERCEPTION OF PARENTS
AND
EXPRESSED SELF-CONCEPT

CHAPTER I
REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY

GENERAL STATEMENT

The essential idea is that the adult's prolonged attachment to parents presumably provides major motivations and directives for his* personality development. Parental influence means that the ways for the family tend to become the ways for the offspring. All experiences are perceived, and consciously and unconsciously understood, while being reacted to by the offspring according to the patterns laid down by the family (Freud, 1938, pp. 747-755; Horney, 1939, pp. 1-78; Sullivan, 1953, pp. 158-171; Erikson, 1963, pp. 247-284; Berne, 1972, pp. 11-27; Ellis, 1973, pp. 31-53; Atwater, 1983, pp. 81-101). The basic idea is that, through the experience with the family, the adult acquires characteristics by identifying with parents.

Two meanings of self-concept have been labeled by Hall and Lindzey (Hall and Lindzey, 1957, pp. 467-502): 1) the self as process and 2) the self as object. The self as process

* All masculine pronouns denote both genders
means that reality is negotiated through the self as doer. Among the self-processes are the abilities of perception and thinking.

The self as object concerns the individual as an interpreter of his own experience. Rogers (Rogers, 1964, p. 125) views the inner world of the individual as having a more significant influence on his behavior than the external environment. Rogers holds here that a person's experiences and inter-interpretations influence the extent to which self-actualization appears to be a function and of the degree to which perception of self and perception of the world are in accord. He states that an individual's ability to perceive experiences accurately is related to the person's self-regard and the regard that he senses others have for him (Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., pp. 478-489). Rogers believes that personal growth involves self-awareness, self-actualization, and meaningful social relationships. If an individual is to maintain a forward-moving tendency, he must clearly perceive and symbolize the options open to him. Rogerian theory continues to focus on the individual as the perceiver and experimenter of his psychological field (Hall and Lindzey, loc. cit., pp. 478-489).

G.A. Kelly (Kelly, 1955, pp. 659-681) also stressed self-development in all persons. For Kelly how one perceives himself is a part of a continuous process. This process involves a person's interpretations of himself and the world
world about him and his anticipation of future events. Kelly commented that "a person's processes are psychologically channelized by ways in which he anticipates events." Kelly refers to the products of the person's growing processes as constructs. The constructs are the interpretations that a person makes of internal and external events around him. Kelly (Kelly, ibid.) maintains that each individual's personal constructs are an important means of bringing order to his life.

These humanistic-existentialistic points of view stress the need for the person to achieve a better understanding of his relationships to the world. Humanistic theorists are consistent in emphasizing that the individual's awareness of himself influences his behavior (Hall and Lindzey, loc. cit., pp. 478-489. Rogers, while acknowledging the importance of the person's perception of the environment, has additionally concerned himself with the individual's subjective experience.

Another orientation to behavior approaches personality theory with a broader, more social context. Field theorists emphasize not only persons' perceptions of themselves, but their perceptions of their environment. The field theorists seek an overall theory that encompasses a self-world relationship. Field theory, which is best exemplified by Kurt Lewin, treats behavior as a function of the world perceived by the individual. Where the self theorists have focused on
perception of the self, Lewin's theory is more directed to the
perception of the world (Hall and Lindzey, 1957, pp. 206-
256). Lewin contended that the way to think of behavior was
as the product of field forces or vectors. He stated that a
person's behavior was a function of his psychological field.
The forces or vectors in this field may have their source
either within the individual or they may come from the environ-
ment. Lewin recognized that the environment is transformed
by the individual and that each person's perceptions of
environment stimuli is not the same as the stimuli themselves.
The perception of external events, rather than the events
themselves, contributes to the determination of behavior
(Lewin, 1951, pp. 57-58). Lewin identified the total field
forces as the life space. The life space contains the total
configuration of the psychological reality of any given
moment. Behavior is a function of the life space.

Lewin held that the life space was determined by the
environment and the person. The distinction between events
of the real world and the individual's perception of them
demonstrates that Lewin does not deal with the subjective
reality of the self theorists. For Lewin, the life space
can be conceived as a geometric shape which interior consists
of psychological reality. Outside the perimeter of this
shape is the physical world. The boundary between the life
space and the physical world is permeable. Changes take
place in the life space as a result of the person's contact with the physical world. The changing psychological environment in the life space consists of the aspects of the physical world that are incorporated into the individual's personal world. Lewin viewed the inner person as being composed of several regions or differentiated structures. These regions can be subdivided, varying from individual to individual.

According to Lewin, changes occurring between regions of the life space require energy. In states of personality balance, the energy is at rest. When there is conflict, energy is utilized by the individual to solve problems. Energy is stimulated by conflicting psychological states, changing environment, conflicting goals, and interpersonal needs. The properties that lead to expenditure are referred to as valences (Lewin, 1938, p. 88). Positive valences refer to the person's desires. Negative valences refer to that which the person avoids.

Lewin (Hall and Lindzey, 1957, 206-256) believed that personal development consisted of two processes: 1) differentiation in which the number of regions within the life space increases and 2) integration which is characterized by the extent to which the regions become unified within the individual. As each person develops, regions corresponding to abilities, interests, and goals become differentiated. As these regions proliferate, it becomes necessary for the second process of integration to come into play.
Not all of Lewin's concepts have been discussed here. The aim of the discussion has been to characterize what is involved in a psychological field theory oriented to the person's perception of the world. Lewin recognizes that an individual's perception of contemporary events influences his behavior.

A person's perception and judgment are influenced by situations. However, perception is also influenced by relationships with significant others. Harry Stack Sullivan's (1953) interpersonal theory emphasizes personal relationships.

In Sullivan's view (1953), the course of personality development begins with a perception of self. He emphasized that the unit of study is the interpersonal situation, not the individual alone. Personality manifests itself in the individual's behavior in relation to others. Sullivan contends that personality is not determined at an early age and that it may change at anytime as new interpersonal relationships develop.

One of the most interesting aspects of Sullivan's studies on personal relationships was his approach to the socialization process and its variables. Sullivan emphasized two general classes of needs: 1) those connected with the satisfaction of biological wants and 2) those related to the individual's sense of security. By security, Sullivan meant the experiences of happiness and conflict. He used the term euphoria to indicate the state of extreme elation. An example
of euphoria for Sullivan is the comfort of the infant who has just been fed. With maturation, the individual's sense of security is increasingly influenced by his environment. Sullivan states that each person strives to enhance his security to avoid personal and psychological pain (Sullivan, 1953, p. 42).

Significant persons such as mother or father have the power to define situations that are associated with feelings of security or insecurity. Behavior which is displeasing to parents may be punished and result in insecurity. Behavior which is viewed as acceptable by an individual's parents may be rewarded, which results in security.

Sullivan believed that as the individual develops, he formulates a sense of self. The self develops as a function of the history of personal relationships. Sullivan used the terms "good me" and "bad me" to refer to the two kinds of self that are in each person. The "good me" develops by way of rewards which increase security. The "bad me" is associated with behaviors which are punished, causing anxiety and pain. Both concepts refer to the different ways individuals organize their perceptions regarding the relationship with mother and father.

Sullivan's theoretical orientations regarding personality development have stressed that perception has a profound impact on the personal relationships within the family.
The social learning theorists have also researched the field of perception. Learning theory is rooted in the idea that behavior is changeable (Skinner, 1953, p. 31). Through the reaction that a person has with his environment the process of learning takes place. According to Skinner, this is the concept of stimulus and response. However, the two aspects of learning theory with which the present study is concerned involve the individual's perception of social influences affecting his attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and expectations. Rotter (Rotter, 1954, pp. 279-331) has demonstrated that social stimuli play an integral part in shaping personality. Social learning theorists have found that behavioral patterns can be accounted for by two factors: 1) positive and negative reinforcement which determines the emission of desirable or undesirable behavior and 2) modeling and imitation. Bandura (Bandura, 1963, pp. 274-281) contended that behavior can be learned through the direct or indirect experience of observing others. Bandura stressed the role that environmental events have in determining behavior. People imitate individuals who are more important, powerful, successful, or liked. In addition, people who are seen most often are the ones who are imitated most. Parents who fit all these criteria are the primary models for individuals during their early years. Bandura has demonstrated that an individual models a parent's behavior. This is further indication that each person has his own view as determined by the perception he has of his parental models.
In general the social learning theorists stress the role played by external events in an individual's responses to specific situations and significant others (Hall and Lindzey, 1957, pp. 420-466).

In summary, the self theorists have viewed the individual's development as a process which is affected by parental acceptance, warmth, and love. Theorists such as Rogers believe that personality development is primarily determined by the way in which the individual perceives himself and the world about him. The field theorists such as Lewin emphasize that the individual needs to be aware of the social and personal events that affect him (Hall and Lindzey, 1957, pp. 206-256). The examination of studies of all the theorists demonstrates that a person's perception is influenced by both internal and external events. It is also apparent, through the analysis of theory, that the individual develops a concept of self through observation of others.

There is another point of view which supports the idea that communication reveals information about the self. Communication is an essential part of personality development (Rahskopf, 1965, p. 163). Rahskopf writes:

"The self as the center of personality develops in terms of the individual's awareness of the attitudes others take toward him." (p. 2)

Mind and self are generated in a social process. Personality is the sum total of the distinctive behavior patterns of the individual which make him unique. The self is an
inner core and the private sense of the individual. This theory of communication in personality development fosters the idea that an individual develops out of a framework of the social community. George Mead (1934) feels that the uniqueness of personality develops on the basis of the reactions each person has toward others.

"The self and the mind emerge in the social process of the interactions of people to each other." (Mead, 1934, p. 169)

"The self's development begins with biologic individuals who use the early stages of each other's acts as guides to completion of action. This is preliminary to language, not language proper." (Rahskopf, 1965, p. 2)

The social process of interactions determines how we derive a sense of self as a social being.

"The individual learns to call out in himself the same kinds of responses he sees in others." (Mead, 1934, p. 173).

When others become mirrors of behavior, the individual will adjust his behavior and evaluate himself in terms of what he sees others do. Therefore, an individual responds to his own behavior as others respond to him. The individual's continued development also requires that he is able to generalize and select from among the many responses of others, which are organized and integrated into behavior patterns (Rahskopf, 1965, p. 2).

Communication is essential to the development and maintenance of an organized social life. Social scientists have asserted that communication is the principle medium for
social interaction. As Grace A. DeLuguna phrased it, communication "is the great medium through which human cooperation is brought about." (DeLeguna, 1927, p. 19). In other words, communication is an essential process in the maintenance of an orderly and stable society.

The communicative process also involves social groups of people that work together for common beliefs. A group is a body of people with a definite relationship to one another within a given situation. There is a mutual face-to-face relationship in a group (Yalom, 1975, pp. 3-18). Communication for society is a means toward exploration, cooperation, persuasion, stability, and continuity (Yalom, ibid.). In other words, communication for the individual is the degree of response to environment, formulation of thought, expression of thought, emotional release, aesthetic enjoyment, growth, and development (Rahskopf, 1965, p. 4).

The family is the primary group where the communication for the individual will be the most meaningful (Atwater, 1983. In the family, communications involve a number of transactions between people (Boszormenyi-Nagi and Framo, 1965, pp. 33-86). A transaction in the family consists of a web or underlying pattern of interactions which include a meaning, message, and information (Burgess, Locke, and Thomes, 1965, pp. 205-212); Boszormenyi-Nagi and Framo, op. cit., pp. 33-34). The direct interactions within the nuclear family are: 1) father
to mother and mother to father; 2) father to child and child to father; 3) mother to child and child to mother; and 4) child to child (Burgess, Locke, Thomes, op. cit. pp. 212-232).

Since the mother has a high degree of control over the offspring's early development, her role appears to be more dominant (Erikson, 1963, p. 87). The perception of the mother toward her offspring is a function of his behavior. As the offspring matures to adulthood, the offspring will adopt specific characteristics determined by the experiences he shares with his mother. Careful study of parent offspring relationships indicate that the personality of the mother and the relationship she establishes with her offspring is a critical factor in each individual's development.

Through the early years of each person's life, it appears that she may have the most pervasive influence over the offspring. Although the mother spends more time with the offspring, in some instances, however, she may not have the greatest influence. The amount of time is not necessarily a determining factor in the amount of influence exerted on an individual (Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 72-95). The perception that the father has of the offspring has been shown to have an impact on the personality development of the individual.

The roles of mother and father within the family cannot be viewed separately (Erikson, 1963, pp. 247-274; Coopersmith, 1967; Ferguson and Allen, 1978, pp. 345-347).
values and perceived responsibilities not only guide them in rearing their offspring, but also have implications for the individual's view and the world in which he lives (Ferguson and Allen, ibid.). Through the interactions he has with his mother and father, the offspring influences behavior in the family. The offspring becomes aware of his role as an influence on behavior when he becomes relatively independent of parents (Atwater, 1983, p. 105).

The parent-offspring relationship influences the manner in which the individual relates to others. As Erikson (Erikson, 1963, pp. 247-274) emphasized, the parent-offspring relationship influences the quality of the basic trust the offspring develops, the trust he has in others, in himself, and the world in which he lives. This relationship also contributes to the individual's self-esteem as a member of the male or female sex. Each person properly requires two parents: a parent of the same sex with whom he can form an object of identification to follow into adulthood, and a parent of the opposite sex who serves as a basic love object and whose approval is sought by identifying with the parent of the same sex.

There is further study to suggest that parents' rearing styles are a key variable affecting the development of self-esteem in individuals. Coopersmith, 1967, found that high self-esteem in individuals is related to parental acceptance. Sears (1970) also found that parental acceptance and warmth
correlated positively with an individual's self-esteem. In these studies, parents' perception of the offspring was shown to be a determining factor in each individual's self-esteem. The quality of an individual's interaction with his parents appears to be an important factor in the development of self-esteem by a number of theorists (Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 174-181; Schluderman, 1970, pp. 239-249; Dickstein, 1978, pp. 273-276; Graybill, 1978, pp. 719-722; Atwater, 1983, p. 105.

Dickstein's study, which examined self-esteem and relationship with parents, showed that the self-esteem of the individual is directly influenced by the quality of the relationship that is shared with both parents. The most interesting aspect of her study showed that there was a high correlation between self-esteem and acceptance by the same sex parent. The correlation between self-esteem and acceptance by the opposite sex parent was not as high. Dickstein's research illustrates that there is a definite relationship between high self-esteem and the perception of the parental relationship as perceived by the offspring. From examination of current studies it is apparent that an individual's self-esteem is not only influenced by the perception that parents have of the offspring, but it is also influenced by the perception that the offspring have of the parents.

Examination of the literature has shown that the offspring's perception of his parents is related more to his adjustment than the actual behavior of his parents, and that
the adult's self-worth is directly influenced by the manner in which the parents are perceived as filling their roles as mother and father (Brown and Morrison, 1947, pp. 422-428; Ausbel and Welkwitz, 1954, pp. 173-183; Cooper and Blair, 1959, pp. 93-100; Bronfenbrenner, 1961, pp. 239-271; Morrow and Wilson, 1961, pp. 501-510; Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 174-181). These studies have suggested that who the parents are, how they behave, and how they communicate and relate to one another are primary factors in establishing the individual's perception of both parents and self.

Sears' study (Sears, op. cit., pp. 268-289) sampled eighty-four girls and seventy-five boys that attended the sixth grade. A self-concept inventory was administered to the individuals, which was developed by Sears in 1963. The ten items on the questionnaire consisted of categories which he saw as important factors in each person's development. Categories ranged from social relations with boys, girls, parents, etc., and were followed up by a question for each category (Sears, 1970, p. 272). Sears' results indicated that a high degree of self-esteem in both boys and girls related to uncritical acceptance and praise in the early years.

Through the reports of the individual's perception of his parents' behavior, Sears' study was clearly consistent with Coopersmith's findings. Coopersmith's results were compiled through questionnaires and interviews that required
the individual to respond on issues dealing with parental treatment. Coopersmith's study primarily dealt with maternal influence, because it was difficult to contact fathers, as a result of job factors or time conflicts. However, Coopersmith states that the mother and offspring agreed in many of their statements regarding paternal attitudes and actions. He found that offspring with high self-esteem are likely to perceive their parents as a positive or constructive influence on their lives than those with a low or medium self-esteem.

The important aspect of Coopersmith's research is that he defined parental acceptance as the attitudes and practices directed toward the specific individual, rather than acceptance of any parental role identification. Coopersmith also mentions that moderate expressions of acceptance are more reliable than extreme expressions of parental love, support, or approval. He suggests that unbounded love may be associated with an underlying feeling of rejection or resentment toward the parent. Coopersmith also indicated that an individual's perception of parental acceptance is as important as the parents' view of the practices that they employ toward the offspring.

Coopersmith also found that an individual's perception of parental behavior is not necessarily as favorable as the parents themselves perceive it. Therefore, individuals may
perceive the parental behavior as being destructive when the parents intended to act in behalf of the offspring.

Coopersmith's findings also indicated that families whose offspring had the highest self-esteem established structured rules within the family. Coopersmith (Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 181-214) stated that the family structure resulted in the development of parental authority, the definition of a family environment, and a standard whereby the child could evaluate his own growth. Parental recognition of the child's rights and opinions was also a factor which related to the offspring's high self-esteem. Coopersmith's research indicated that offspring with a low self-esteem came from families which lacked confidence in establishing structure and where behavior was controlled by harsh treatment over the offspring.

Coopersmith (Coopersmith, 1967, pp. 199-234) was also able to demonstrate that parental training of the offspring to rely on their own self-appraisal rather than being dependent on others for self-evaluation resulted in persons with a higher degree of self-worth. Although Coopersmith notes that a person's self-esteem can be the result of several failures, it is important that self-esteem should be judged by self-appraisal. He suggests that the offspring absorb opinions from their parents and formulate a self-concept of their own, and seek assurance from the parents when ambiguity arises. The parent therefore acts as confirmation of the offspring's worthiness as a human being.
The most interesting point in Coopersmith's study refers to the individual as being the only judge for himself in the perception of his parents, which will result in his own self-evaluation of his attainment of desired goals and growth.

**SUMMARY**

The examination of studies dealing with the individual's perception of parents demonstrates that an individual's self-esteem may be more associated with how he perceives the parental practices and attitudes than the actual parent behavior. The evaluation of a parent–offspring relationship involves the interaction of father, mother, and offspring. The offspring's development is often viewed as the interaction of his personality with his environment, which is determined by the behavior of his two parents. The offspring's behavior may be regarded as his reaction to his parent's behavior as he perceives and interprets it.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The purpose of this study was to continue the research in the area of the adult offspring's perception of his parents. The studies that examine the offspring's perception of parents suggest that if the adult perceives that he has a negative relationship with his parents, then he becomes subject to conflicting motivations, directives, and standards that interfere with the development of his personality. Therefore,
acceptance of parents becomes important for the individual because acceptance strengthens identity and enhances the self-esteem of the adult (Atwater, 1983, p. 105). A positive perception of mother and father allows a person to establish a positive connection with family both past and present (Pearce and Friedman, 1980, p. 131).

The family provides the essential bond which enables the individual to find a place in society, because the family is the primary source of identity for the adult. Therefore, a relationship between the adult's perception of parents and the self-esteem should be demonstrable.

**NULL HYPOTHESIS**

This study predicted a relationship between self-esteem and the offspring perception of parents: 1) the offspring's positive self-perception can be associated with a positive perception of parents, and that 2) a negative perception of self is related to a negative perception of parents.

The study tested the null hypothesis that no significant difference in self-perception can be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents.
LIMITS

There are inherent limitations in any pioneering study related to subjects, measurement methods, and statistical techniques. Because of the intimate nature of this study which focuses on parents and self-perception, it is also expected that many subjects will not wish to participate in this research.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between an adult offspring's perception of parents and his own self-esteem. The prediction was that the adult offspring's positive perception of his parents was associated with a positive self-esteem, and that an adult's negative perception of his parents was associated with a negative self-esteem.

INSTRUMENTS

Because of the intimate nature of this study, the identity of all subjects participating in any instrument was treated confidentially.

P.O.I. RATIONALE

The Personal Orientation Inventory (P.O.I.) was the standardized instrument which measured each individual's self-esteem. The P.O.I. was developed to provide a standardized instrument which measured the values and behavior of the self-actualizing individual. The concepts measured by the P.O.I. reflect a model of self-development that is used with other medical inventories by counselors and therapists (Shostrom, 1972, pp. 194-198; Shostrom, 1980, pp. 23-27). The medical model that is used most often with the P.O.I. is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (M.M.P.I.). The M.M.P.I.
stresses movement from illness to a mean of normality (Shostrom and Knapp, 1966, pp. 193-202). The P.O.I. was selected over the M.M.P.I. because it presents an educational paradigm which emphasizes a way by which the individual can become more effective and self-fulfilled. The positive interpretation of the self-development scales and the nonthreatening design of the test items were a prime consideration in selection of this inventory.

Scoring of the P.O.I. was accomplished in terms of three scales that refer to the self-esteem of the individual:

1) Self-Regard (SR) measures affirmation of self because of worth or strength. A high score measures the ability to like oneself because of one's strength as a person. A low score suggests feelings of low self-worth;

2) Self-Acceptance (SA) measures the affirmation or acceptance of oneself in spite of one's weaknesses or deficiencies. A high score suggests acceptance of weaknesses, and a low score suggests an inability to accept one's weakness;

3) Capacity for Intimate Contact (C) measures the ability to develop contactful relationships with other human beings, unencumbered by expectations and obligations. A high score indicates the ability to develop meaningful, contactful relationships with other human beings, while a low score suggests that one has difficulty with warm interpersonal relationships.
Scales SR and SA were selected as measurements of self-esteem and scale C was selected because it measured the degree of intimate contact each individual can establish with others. Scale C was compared to scales SR and SA in order to observe the influence that self-esteem had on the ability of a person to establish intimacy with another. The ease of interpretation and availability of test results was made possible through the machine process analysis of Educational and Industrial Testing Service (Edits), which assisted in compiling the necessary data.

The P.O.I. score comparisons were not considered in this study. The P.O.I. had no time limit for test completion by each examinee. Each test form took approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. The P.O.I. was brief enough to be followed up by a second measure that examined perception of parents, which will be discussed in the next section (Shostrom, op. cit., pp. 6-7).

The P.O.I. was also interpreted on an individual level based on test scores with a profile plotting sheet. This maximized the interpretability and the ease with which the meaning of the inventory concepts could be fed back to each examinee.

The P.O.I. maintains a positive approach towards mental health. The researcher of this present study is familiar with the test format and selected the inventory because of its relatedness to the topic of research.
P.O.I. DESCRIPTION

The P.O.I. consists of one hundred and fifty 2-choice comparative judgment items reflecting values and behaviors important to the development of an individual's self-actualization. The P.O.I. describes self-actualizing people as those who utilize their talents and capabilities to become more effective and self-fulfilled.

When the examinee responded to the P.O.I., he was asked to select the one statement in each pair that was most true of himself. Clinically derived questions comprised of items logically grouped into three scales were used in comparing examinees' responses.

The P.O.I. format is composed of paired opposites presented in positive or negative statements. Scales are not paired because each scale is scored independently of the other. The P.O.I. is comprised of a total of ten scales which are: Self-Actualizing Value (SAV), Existentiality (Ex), Feeling Reactivity (FR), Spontaneity (S), Self-Regard (SR), Self-Acceptance (SA), Nature of Man (No), Synergy (Sy), Acceptance of Aggression (A), Capacity for Intimate Contact (C). Three of these scales relevant to an individual's self-esteem were used for this study. The three scales which were implemented are 1) Self-Regard (SR), 2) Self-Acceptance (SA), and 3) Capacity for Intimate Contact (C).
The mean standard score for each of the ten scales is 50, with a standard deviation of 10. The P.O.I. assumes that about 95% of the population falls between the standard scores of 30 and 70 on any given scale.

The profile sheet for the P.O.I. was based on college students and various occupational and clinical groups. The college student norms for the P.O.I. are shown in percentiles. The P.O.I.'s occupational and clinical group norms are presented as means, standard deviations, and plotted group profiles.

According to Shostrom, the P.O.I. has a built-in lie score profile which can be easily identified. Shostrom concludes that faking good can be detected by two lie profiles on the P.O.I. One is identified through an excessively high score on Self-Regard (SR) with a depressed Self-Acceptance (SA) and Existentiality scores. The second detection for faking good is reflected in an elevated overall profile. Shostrom has shown that the P.O.I. is based on culturally accepted standards, and that the elevated scores between 60-70 can be interpreted as a lie score profile. He also illustrated that attempts to look well-adjusted on the P.O.I. can result in excessively low scores. Although Shostrom suggested that the P.O.I. shows an unexpected resistance to faking, he mentioned that persons can improve their P.O.I. scores under certain circumstances.
He states that the P.O.I. is based on personality inventories which depend on self reported values and behaviors, which can result in conscious as well as unconscious attempts to fake responses. However, Shostrom feels that a lie profile can be a significant factor in the interpretation of an examinee's test results.

The development of P.O.I. items are based upon an individual's ability for self-fulfillment defined by the concept of self-actualization. The P.O.I. items are predicated upon the theories espoused by writers such as Maslow, Riesman, Rogers, Shostrom, and Perls. The P.O.I. items are stated positively and negatively by opposite statements.

Early studies of the P.O.I. have concerned themselves with its validity and reliability. Shostrom demonstrated that the P.O.I. scores differed between actualizing and non-actualizing persons. Shostrom's study provided the initial validity for the P.O.I. His study showed that the P.O.I. was able to distinguish the difference between individuals who had reached a relatively high degree of actualizing, as opposed to individuals who had not. The P.O.I. was also administered to two groups of actualizing and nonactualizing adults, which were carefully selected by clinical psychologists. Results indicated that the two groups' profiles could be clearly differentiated on the P.O.I.'s ten scales.
In a study involving outpatients, Shostrom and Knapp found that all P.O.I. scales identified a sample of outpatients beginning counseling from those who were in the advanced stages of therapy. Profiles for these groups were intercorrelated with the M.M.P.I. scales for the male and female outpatient samples. Correlations ranged from .00 to -.67. While the correlations of the P.O.I. and M.M.P.I. seemed to run in the same direction and were generally consistent, the low correlations also showed that the two instruments were measuring different aspects of the individual. However, the M.M.P.I. scales which have the highest degree of relatedness for the P.O.I. are the depression scale (D), Psychasthenia scale (Pt), and the Social Introvert scale (Si). More significant results were found with the Social Introvert (Si) scale than any other M.M.P.I. scale. The M.M.P.I. authors note that the Social Introvert (Si) scale is not a clinical scale, but it is widely used in counseling and guidance settings (Shostrom, op. cit., pp. 26-27).

The Social Introvert (Si) scale measures the degree of effectiveness that a person maintains in his interpersonal relationships (Anastasi, 1976, pp. 494-503). The correlations with the Social Introvert (Si) scale and the P.O.I.'s Feeling Reactivity (FR) scale which measures the ability to accept anger, and the Capacity for Intimate Contact (C) scale was found to be .40 or larger beyond the .01 confidence level in both samples (Shostrom, 1980, pp. 26-27). The correlations with the Depression (D) scale which measures the mood
changes and indicates depression in an individual were over .40 with the sampled populations on the Acceptance of Aggression (A) scale on the P.O.I. Correlations with the Psychasthenia (Pt) scale which measures obsessive behavior or compulsive behavior used to control anxiety and the Spontaneity (S) scale on the P.O.I. which measures the ability to express feelings of spontaneity were found to range from .33 to -.38 for the two groups (Shostrom, loc. cit., pp. 26-27). The P.O.I.'s correlations with several scales on the M.M.P.I. indicated that both tests can be correlated with each other.

The P.O.I. has also been used extensively in a variety of counseling situations, educational environments, encounter group experiences, and industry. Other correlational studies that have been undertaken with the P.O.I. which have examined the major trait personality inventories are the Cattell, Comrey, Eysenck, and the Guilford.

The stability of the P.O.I. has been obtained by examining the test-retest reliability. Klavetter and Morgan in 1967 administered the P.O.I. twice a week with one week intervals to a sample of forty-eight college students, and obtained r's ranging from .52 to .82, on the ten scales. The scales that were used for this study measured the following r's: 1) Self-Regard (SR) .71, 2) Self-Acceptance (SA) .77, and 3) Capacity for Intimate Contact (C) .67.
Ilardi and May (1968) also completed similar correlational research with the M.M.P.I. (Shostrom, ibid.) The theorists concluded that when they contrasted their results with those for other personality inventories administered to similar couples at approximately the same time intervals, the findings were well within the ranges comparable to M.M.P.I. reliability studies (Shostrom, ibid.).

Bloxom (1972), in reviewing the P.O.I., stated that variables on the P.O.I. are broadly defined. Cattell (1972) also suggested that, with personality scale construction, the ideal homogeneity of the P.O.I. items is not the greatest attainable desire. The P.O.I. does not lend itself to tests of internal consistency. The item reflecting each scale concept appears to have low r's for each profile illustrating broad complex concepts, rather than homogenous scales. Therefore, the P.O.I. scales are measuring different dimensions of personality development, rather than examining the same traits for each individual. This means that the desired scales that are important to this study can be examined separately. The items of each scale are not paired with those of other scales, and the scoring of each item remains independent.
P.P. RATIONALE

The P.O.I. which measured the self-esteem of each individual was followed up by an evaluation which assessed the offspring's perception of his parents (P.P.). The P.P. was devised by this researcher in order to obtain a perception of the characteristic behavior patterns of parents toward their offspring, as perceived by the offspring. It has been experienced by this researcher that there is no standardized instrument which concerns itself with the offspring's assessment of parental behavior. Also the examination of the literature which evaluates the offspring's perception of his mother's and father's behavior and the relationship to self-esteem revealed that each writer either developed his own instrument to measure perception of parents or utilized a tool that was formulated by another colleague (Sears, 1967, pp.268-289; Schluderman and Schluderman, 1970, pp. 239-249; Dickstein, 1973, pp. 273-276). Each evaluation found in the literature was appraised and considered for this study. However, the measurements reviewed were not appropriate because their context dealt solely with the child's and not the adult's perception of parents. It was necessary to develop a measure that could evaluate the adult offspring's perception of parents.

The introductory section of the P.P. consists of six questions which are a brief inquiry into each person's social background and family history. The questions are necessary
because they provide a general description of the relationship that exists between the parents and their offspring. The questions also ask the offspring to respond to the developmental phases of the family, such as divorce, death, the desire for parenthood, the status of being a parent, the effects of blended families, family size, and birth order. These cultural factors are crucial in the parent-offspring relationship. The usefulness of these questions also provided important personal information, while protecting each examinee's rights to privacy.

The second section of the P.P. consists of a 14-item questionnaire that was adapted from Coopersmiths' (B.R.F.) Behavioral Rating Form (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 267).

The questions ask the individual to rate the perception that he has of parents with regard to: confidence in new situations, reactions to failure, sociability with peers and family members, the need for encouragement and reassurance, marital satisfaction, and the degree of identification with mother and father. Coopersmith's defense of the above mentioned areas was founded upon experimental observations and interviews. Although Coopersmith's B.R.F. was developed in 1967, his concepts on the B.R.F. are long standing.

Atwater (1983) states that the mother and father influence the offspring's behavior through their reaction to peer influence, social and family settings, the degree of love
and support, and socioeconomic factors. Atwater's work also shows that the offspring have a strong desire for autonomy. He states that individuality is maintained through the quality of the parent-offspring relationship. Autonomy and self-confidence are influenced by the degree of identification with mother or father, and the love and acceptance received while growing up. Although individuals can achieve self-reliance and autonomy, they continue to need assurance from their parents throughout their lives.

The parents prepare the individual for life, and they may be perceived as having a positive or negative effect on the offspring, as perceived by the offspring. Coopersmith states that the offspring can be the only judge as to whether the parents are having a positive or negative effect on the family. With regard to Coopersmith's work, Atwater takes it one step further by discussing the need to examine the development of the individual as he is confronted by social and cultural changes within the family. The B.R.F. then becomes useful, because it examines the necessary perceptual concepts and changes that occur in each family as espoused by Atwater.

The B.R.F. was an appropriate measure for the individual's self-appraisal of parents. The questions not only combined two major works in the field of perception of parents, but they also evaluated the necessary concepts desired by this researcher.
The items selected for the third section of the P.P. were based upon Osgood's Semantic Differential (Messick, 1957, pp. 200-206; Osgood, 1957, pp. 50-70). The semantic differential was the only measure used in a pilot study, followed up by an oral conversation with each examinee. The follow up study was helpful in obtaining necessary feedback. The pilot study was run in July 1983 and consisted of twenty subjects. The pilot study indicated the need for revisions. Without the use of additional questions in the pilot study, data could not be obtained regarding socioeconomic status, age, birth order, or status of parents. The pilot study had information on the semantic differential regarding mother and father, but could make no conclusions about perception of parents. Therefore, the B.R.F. was a useful measure. It complemented the introductory questions and the semantic differential by evaluating the necessary factors in a family influencing each offspring's perception of mother and father.

The follow-up study revealed that the original semantic differential forms were not completed by examinees because they were long and confusing. A shortened and appropriate version was adapted from the original format for each examinee. The pilot study was comprised of ten females and ten males ranging in age from twenty-six to forty-four. Each subject was randomly selected from the greater Seattle area. Since there was no questionnaire on the original P.P., little was known regarding the personal history of each subject.
The original question asked the examinees to list the characteristics they saw as important in a father and mother. Then, each subject was asked to list each characteristic on the semantic differential forms, circling the number for each of the opposites below which most clearly describe his own father and mother. The above procedure evaluated the appropriateness of the semantic differential items. The follow-up study resulted in the addition of new items that were more agreeable to each subject. The list of characteristics was a useful objective tool for reporting results on perception of parents and assisted in providing revisions to the original semantic differential.

In order to present an appropriate measure to investigate perception of parents, nine of the most frequently used scales in the semantic differential were used for the pilot study. The selection of scales was based upon data collected by Osgood, which revealed an agreement of meanings by a majority of individuals. Since the agreement of the meaning of concepts is necessary in the use of a semantic differential, it was important to find common terms through the follow-up study. Terms uniformly selected by subjects that applied to both mother and father were: consistency - inconsistency, patience - impatience, trusting - untrusting, expressive - inexpressive, independent - dependent, likeable - unlikeable. The terms subjects could not agree upon were: large - small, light - heavy, slow - fast. The latter were found to be confusing and
required explanation of their usage to each subject. Therefore, the terms that resulted in disagreement by examinees were substituted with more appropriate terms. A maximum of twelve items on the semantic differential was desired for the sake of brevity. The most interesting aspect of the follow-up study indicated that subjects described the six added items as being important for both parents.

The semantic differential is an assessment of behavior using paired verbal opposites. Each concept is presented in a positive and negative single word phrase. The format is brief and was chosen on the basis of examinees' agreement with the meaning and usage of selected adjectives. The usage of the semantic differential is based upon the human tendency to think in opposite terminology. Adjectives are used because they provide the primary root meanings of terms that determine our judgments. For Osgood, adjectives provide the most "general and natural qualifiers" in the English language. The issue that is raised with the semantic differential focuses on the measure as being a method of forced choice opposites that do not relate. Osgood has demonstrated that the semantic differential items accurately show considerable correspondence and can predict meaningful results.

Osgood states (1957) that more research is needed on the semantic differential item selection. The effects of new experimentation can be observed in the results of the pilot study. Two questions which requested information on
the characteristics perceived as important in a mother and father were used for the P.P. The questions also collected any material that was omitted from the semantic differential. The questions were designed as an objective self-report design that infers perception toward one's own parents. Thus, a subject had the opportunity to state characteristics not represented on the semantic differential.

P.P. DESCRIPTION

The P.P. asked the examinee to reveal personal aspects of the family. The P.P. measured perceptions in the family, which is a culturally patterned bisocial unit embracing two or more generations, both sexes, a constellation of persons sharing each other's identity, with a way of life, and a related quality of struggle and growth. The P.P. asked the individual to judge his perception of his own mother and father. The person assessed the personal relationship that was shared with both parents as it pertained to the development of his self-esteem.

The P.P. is divided in four parts: 1) a questionnaire composed of ten questions that asks for social background and family history, 2) a 14-item questionnaire that evaluates the offspring's perception of his own mother and father, 3) a 12-item semantic differential rating form that assesses the perception of parents as experienced by the offspring, 4) a 2-item self-report questionnaire that asks for general perceptions of characteristics that are important in parents.
The first section of the P.P. was composed of ten questions that are adapted from the work of Atwater (1983). These questions were appropriate because they ask for the factors which influence the offspring's development. The questions were also brief enough to gather important background information on each individual. The questionnaire asked for general information regarding sex, age, status of parents, birth position, marital status, and family size. The answers were easily interpreted. The questionnaire provided the necessary historical background on each individual that maximized the meaning of the measurement.

The B.R.F. was designed for teachers and parents to obtain ratings on adolescents' behavior. The B.R.F. was selected as it contained questions that are important in the evaluation of adults as well as adolescents. The appraisal questions which began with the term "child" were replaced with the word mother or father, i.e. "Did your child," was altered in the following manner: "Did your father," or "Did your mother." Questions relating to teachers or classmates were changed to apply to the family setting.

The importance of identifying with mother and father is crucial to the personality development of the individual. Therefore, the last question was added to the adaptation of the B.R.F. (Atwater, ibid.). The questions asked the individual to select an answer on a positive or negative continuum.
The questions asked can be completed in a short period of time. The format allowed for quick scoring and presented little difficulty in interpretation of results.

The third section of the P.P. employed a semantic differential adapted from the work of Osgood. The semantic differential is a measurement that evaluates the offspring's perception of parents, as perceived by the offspring. The semantic differential consists of twelve items representing a sample of personality traits that are important in the assessment of mother and father. Each item is presented in terms of a positive and negative. Each statement's order of polarity is reversed for each successive term in order to assure accuracy. Items were rated by the examinee on a Lickert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The Lickert scale acted as an effective numerical scoring procedure that assessed the importance of each item on the semantic differential.

The Lickert method is the most widely used of the self-report methods. Examinees indicated their agreement or disagreement or disapproval or approval with the twelve items on the semantic differential by circling the appropriate number on a five point scale. The examinees were permitted to record only one rating on the Lickert scale for each word phrase. The subjects were asked to respond to the perceptions existing for their parents. The assumption of the Lickert scale is that there is a direct correspondence between people's attitudes toward an object and their written recorded responses.
The Lickert scale is one of the most sophisticated and important methods of recording an individual's self-reported summated ratings (Anderson and Berkowski, 1977, pp. 462-463). There was no time limit for this section of the measurement; however, it could be completed in a matter of minutes. Also, the interpretation and scoring of the semantic differential was easily achieved.

The last section of the measurement consists of a self-report that asks the individual to list the single words that best characterize what is important in a mother and father. This question was selected in order to obtain additional information that characterizes parents which might have been eliminated in the P.P. The question was relevant since it is objective, while also inferring the description of the individual's own mother and father.

In summary, the P.P. dealt with the perception of parents. The P.P. is self-administering and can be given orally if verbal feedback is desired. The items and questions were printed in a booklet, and the examinee recorded his answers in the provided spaces. Although the P.P. is composed of four brief sections without time limit, each examinee was able to complete the form in 20 to 30 minutes. The P.P. measured the adults' perception to parents; therefore, the questions and items were designed for an adult population. All questions and items on the inventory apply to both mother
and father. The format of the P.P. was effective because it measured the consistency of examinee responses to related questions and items that were relevant to the family setting.

Each question or item was assigned in two groups: 1) mother, and 2) father. In order to collect information regarding role differences of mother and father, identical questions applied to both parents. Every other P.P. began with question sets beginning with father followed by questions sets for mother and vice versa.

SUBJECTS RATIONALE

This study focused on two groups of subjects: 1) young adults and 2) older adults. The decision to study these two groups of adults was based upon the need to analyze the effects of self-esteem and the perception of parents over the continuum of time. Selection of these two populations revealed: 1) the effects that perception of mother and father had on offsprings' prior feelings of self-esteem, and 2) determination of the influences that perception of parents have on future feelings of self-esteem. Theoretically, it can be anticipated that positive or negative perception of parents is significantly related to attitudes and feelings toward self.

Perception of parents gives a person a sense of who he is and a sense of sameness and continuity. It enables the formulation of close relationships with others, as in marriage and friendship. During the development of adult life, each
individual experiences periods of transition, growth, and re-evaluation. Through the study of younger and older adults, self-esteem as it relates to perception of parents can be examined in terms of the stages of adult life. Therefore, the two populations studied in this research revealed whether aspects of personality development, with respect to perception of parents, remain fixed or change over time with maturation.

The specific age groups were selected on the basis of work by Daniel Levinson. Levinson, like Erikson, specified the stages of adult life transition that are critical to each individual (Levinson, 1978, pp. 18-40). Levinson states that the ages of seventeen to twenty-two are the periods of early adult transition, and the ages of sixty-five and over also involve periods of transition into late adulthood. Levinson mentions that the ages in which the periods occur are fairly fixed, and the order in which they occur is unchanged. His main contribution is his delineation of how adulthood is characterized by periods of consolidation, transition, and re-evaluation. During the periods of consolidation, people stabilize their relationships. The object of these periods is comfort, stability, and predictability. The periods of transition and re-evaluation are important because people reassess the utility of gains made in the previous consolidation period. Goals, styles of work, aspects of marriage, and relationships with parents are reevaluated and often significantly altered.
The young and old populations represent the "polarity of human development" (Levinson, 1978, p. 210). Levinson states that younger and older people symbolize the struggle of mortality and immortality. Old people feel that a phase of their life is coming to an end, and young individuals feel the quality of rejuvenation. Levinson (1978) states that the old need to feel youth's potential for growth. Although the old go through a stage of feeling life's end, they must also find positive reasons for being older. Therefore, the selection of both populations enabled the researcher to study critical areas of adult perception of parents as they affect the self-esteem of the individual.

DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS

The testing population of sixty-five subjects was composed of two groups: 1) forty-four undergraduate college students from Oregon State University composed of twenty males and twenty-four females, ranging in age between seventeen and twenty-five years, and 2) twenty-one older adults over the age of sixty-five, consisting of ten males and eleven females.

The second population of subjects was selected from a nursing home in a suburb of the Seattle area. In order to protect the rights of privacy and confidentiality, the name and location of the nursing home was withheld. Both populations were selected on the basis of availability.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Four areas were focused upon: 1) age groups which consisted of older and younger adults, 2) two instruments which included a measure of self-esteem (P.O.I.) and an instrument that examined the offsprings' perception of parents (P.P.), and 3) differences in positive and negative perceptions of mother and father.

Analysis of variance (A.O.V.) was the best suited tool for the design of this study. A.O.V. was chosen because it is a parametric statistic which assumes that the data was not selected from a population which is distributed in a particular manner, i.e. a normal distribution. A.O.V. was selected over other statistical tools because of its computational simplicity. A.O.V. is also a powerful tool which is suitable for treating small samples and can be useful for making observations from different populations (Siegel, 1956, pp. 7, 33, 159-161).

PROCEDURE

Each population was evaluated in an identical manner. The subjects were tested on days of the week which were convenient for the university and the nursing home. In order to protect the rights of privacy and confidentiality, each subject was not required to identify himself. A packet which consisted of the P.O.I. and P.P. with identification numbers that matched the measurements to each other was handed out to each group of subjects.
Before the packets were distributed, the researcher seated the subjects randomly and explained the nature of the study. The purpose of the research was discussed in an informal manner with each population. They were told that this study was furthering the examination of the relationship between adult offspring and their parents.

Each subject had four days to complete the evaluations and return them to the researcher of this study. In order to ensure complete results at O.S.U., two classes of undergraduate students were measured. The P.O.I. and P.P. were returned by one class as extra credit under the threat of suffering a grade which would reflect the student's failure to turn in the packet. The second class, tested under the same procedures, was asked to voluntarily participate in the study and return the packets on a voluntary basis. The older subjects were residents of the nursing home who volunteered to participate in this study. A nurse was assigned to collect P.O.I. and P.P. packets at the end of the four-day period. Following the handing out of packets to all subjects, questions were answered regarding performance procedures and other details. After all questions had been answered, the subjects were told to complete P.O.I. and P.P. evaluations.

A total of sixty tests was distributed to the young population. Sixteen packets were either not returned or not completed. This resulted in a population of forty-four young subjects that could be evaluated.
A total of twenty-two tests was distributed to the older population. Only one was not returned, leaving a total population of twenty-one older subjects to be measured for this study.

**SUMMARY OF METHOD**

This study examined the effects that the offsprings' perception of parents have in determining the self-esteem of the adult. Two corollary areas were studied: 1) the self-esteem of the adult as measured by the P.O.I. and 2) the perception of those same people with regard to their parents as measured by the P.P. Examination of the research showed that subjects who have positive perceptions of their parents may have positive perceptions of themselves. A prediction of this study was that subjects who have a negative perception of their parents may score lower on measures of self-esteem than others who have positive perceptions of their parents.

Subjects participating in the study consisted of young adults between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five and older adults aged sixty-five and older. The total of sixty-five subjects consisting of thirty adult males and thirty-five adult females participated in this study. Subjects were selected from the Oregon State University and greater Seattle area based upon the researcher's availability of collecting data within his own personal environment.
Analysis of variance (A.O.V.) was the statistical tool selected for treating the data.

NULL HYPOTHESIS

This study tested the hypothesis that no significant difference in self-esteem can be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

RESULTS

Analysis of variance (A.O.V.) was the statistical procedure selected for treating the data. Multiple t-tests and Pearson's product-moment r's were also used for measuring the consistency of the comparisons to be made in this study. The decision to use t-tests was based on the underlying assumptions of the t-test found in Siegel (Siegel, 1956, pp. 19-20). T-tests, along with A.O.V.'s provided the researcher with another tool to examine the significance level of the variables to be studied.

Pearson's product-moment r was used because of the basic assumptions found in Runyon and Naber (Runyon and Naber, 1977, pp. 132-133) that state the effectiveness of Pearson's product-moment r when used to measure the relationship between variables.

Variables measured were: 1) young and old combined capacity scores (C) with regard to parents; 2) young and old combined self-regard scores (SR) with regard to parents; 3) young capacity scores (C) only with regard to parents; 4) old capacity scores (C) only with regard to parents; 5) young self-regard scores (SR) only with regard to parents; 6) old self-regard scores (SR) only with regard to parents; 7) young and old capacity scores (C) compared to each other; and 8) young and old self-regard scores (SR) compared to each other.
The 14-item questionnaire and 12-item semantic differential was also examined to determine if there was any significant difference in the measurement themselves.

The self-regard and capacity scores were also measured in differentiated groups with regard to mother and father in the 14-item questionnaire and the 12-item semantic differential. The two questionnaire's mother and father scores were also analyzed in different combinations in order to look for any significant difference in perception of parents between young subjects, old subjects, and all subjects combined.

The self-acceptance scale (SA) was not utilized for this study because the scores could not be adequately separated into positive and negative groups for both populations. As a result of the sporadic scores, the acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses was not included for this study.

To test for consistency for significance, the data was set up in two groups: 1) positive and negative groupings of P.O.I. (SR) and (C) scores compared to the raw data of the perception of mother and father scores, and 2) the raw data from the (SR) and (C) P.O.I. scores compared to the raw data of the perception of mother and father scores. Levels for significance were examined at the .01, .001, .0001, .02, .02, .002, 0002, .025, .05, .005, .0005, and .07, .007, .0007 levels. There was no pattern to the n.s. results because they were examined at all of the above levels for significance.
This section represents the findings of the data for Group 1.*

**TABLE I(A)** - Young and old combined positive and negative (SR) scores with regard to M1/F1 and M2/F2.

| Positive (SR) | N = 39 | Mean = 2.2317 | Stand. Deviation = .378 |
| Negative (SR) | N = 26 | Mean = 2.2622 | Stand. Deviation = .467 |

**TABLE I(B) t-TEST** - Young and old combined positive and negative (SR) scores with regard to M1/F1 and M2/F2.

\[
t = .282 \\
\text{df} = 48 \\
p< n.s.
\]

**TABLE I(C) A.O.V.** - Young and old combined positive and negative (SR) scores with regard to M1/F1 and M2/F2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All subjects + and -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.09(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scores for M1/F1 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2/F2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.099</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation was that a significant difference in self-esteem could be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, the results showed that no significant difference could be found.

* The notations M1 and M2 refer to the 14-item questionnaire, and the notations M2 and F2 refer to the 12-item semantic differential.
TABLE II(A) - Young and old combined positive and negative (C) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

Positive (C)  N = 23  Mean = 2.2025  Stand. Deviation = .422
Negative (C)  N = 42  Mean = 2.2727  Stand. Deviation = .412

TABLE II(B) t-TEST - Young and old combined positive and negative (C) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

t = .5194
df = 44
p< n.s.

TABLE II(C) A.O.V. - Young and old combined positive and negative (C) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All subjects + and - (C) scores for $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.057</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation was that a significant difference in capacity for intimate contact could be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, the results showed that no significant difference could be found.
TABLE III A.O.V. - Young and old subjects differentiated positive and negative (SR) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiated + and - (SR) scores to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.66(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10.772</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation was that a significant difference in self-regard scores could be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
TABLE IV(A) - Young and old subjects differentiated positive and negative (C) scores with regard to M$_1$/F$_1$ and M$_2$/F$_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Positive (C)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2128</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Negative (C)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.1876</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Positive (C)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9760</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Negative (C)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3481</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV(B) A.O.V. - Young and old subjects differentiated positive and negative (C) scores with regard to M$_1$/F$_1$ and M$_2$/F$_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated (C) scores for young and old subjects to M$_1$/F$_1$ and M$_2$/F$_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.90(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.712</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation was that a significant difference in capacity for intimate contact could be shown to separate young and old subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
TABLE V(A) - Young subjects' (SR) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

Positive (SR) $N = 36$  Mean = 2.2117  Stand. Deviation = .369
Negative (SR) $N = 08$  Mean = 2.1511  Stand. Deviation = .446

TABLE V(B) t-TEST - Young subjects' (SR) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

$t = .357$
$df = 9$
$p < n.s.$

TABLE V(C) A.O.V. - Young subjects' (SR) scores with regard to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.16(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.161</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation was that a significant difference in self-regard scores could be shown to separate young subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
TABLE VI(A) - Young subjects' (C) scores with regard to M₁/F₁ and M₂/F₂.

Positive (C)  N = 22  Mean = 2.218  Stand. Deviation = .429
Negative (C)  N = 22  Mean = 2.1876 Stand. Deviation = .330

TABLE VI(B) t-TEST - Young subjects' (C) scores with regard to M₁/F₁ and M₂/F₂.

\[ t = .218 \]
\[ df = 39 \]
\[ p < n.s. \]

The expectation was that a significant difference in capacity for intimate contact could be shown to separate young subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
TABLE VII(A) - Old subjects' (SR) scores with regard to M₁/F₁ and M₂/F₂.

Positive (SR)  N = 03  Mean = 2.4717  Stand. Deviation = .493
Negative (SR)  N = 18  Mean = 2.3090  Stand. Deviation = .479

TABLE VII(B) t-TEST - Old subjects' (SR) scores with regard to M₁/F₁ and M₂/F₂.

\[ t = .6472 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ p < \text{n.s.} \]

TABLE VII(C) A.O.V. - Old subjects' (SR) scores with regard to M₁/F₁ and M₂/F₂.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old subjects' (SR) scores to M₁/F₁ and M₂/F₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.16(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.611</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation was that a significant difference for capacity for intimate contact could be shown to separate old subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
TABLE VIII - This table shows that not enough data could be used to test for levels of significance with old subjects' (C) scores to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (SR)</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.9760</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (SR)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3401</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the focus of this study is the effects of self-esteem in relation to adult offspring's perception of parents, various combinations of (SR) scores were run and analyzed.

**TABLE IX(A) - Young and old combined (SR) scores to \( M_1/F_1 \) and \( M_2/F_2 \).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young (SR)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young (SR)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young (SR)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.331</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE IX(B) t-TEST - Young and old combined (SR) scores to \( M_1/F_1 \) and \( M_2/F_2 \).**

\[
t = .2674
\]

\[
df = 34
\]

\[
p< n.s.
\]

The expectation was that a significant difference in (SR) scores could be shown to separate all subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
TABLE X(A) - Young subjects' positive (SR) scores and old subjects' positive (SR) scores to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

Young Positive (SR) N = 36 Mean = 2.2117 Stand. Dev. = .379
Old Positive (SR) N = 03 Mean = 2.4717 Stand. Dev. = .493

TABLE X(B) t-TEST - Young subjects' positive (SR) scores and old subjects' positive (SR) scores to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

\[ t = .4662 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ p < \text{n.s.} \]

TABLE X(C) - Young subjects' negative (SR) scores and old subjects' negative (SR) scores to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

Young Negative (SR) N = 08 Mean = 2.1511 Stand. Dev. = .446
Old Negative (SR) N = 18 Mean = 2.3090 Stand. Dev. = .479

TABLE X(D) t-TEST - Young subjects' negative (SR) scores and old subjects' negative (SR) scores to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$.

\[ t = .821 \]
\[ df = 14 \]
\[ p < \text{n.s.} \]

A significant difference in (SR) scores could be shown to separate young and old subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents; however, no significant difference could be found.
Within group comparisons were also made to test the significance between the 14-item questionnaire and the 12-item semantic differential.

**TABLE XI(A) - The difference of scoring with all subjects across different measures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M₁/M₂</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.2133</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁/F₂</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.2748</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XI(B) t-TEST - The difference of scoring with all subjects across different measures.**

\[
t = .733
\]

\[
df = 129
\]

p < n.s.

The findings show that there is no significant difference in scoring for all subjects with regard to parents on both the 14-item questionnaire and the 12-item semantic differential.
TABLE XII(A) - Differences in separated scoring on the 14-item questionnaire with all subjects.

\[ M_1 \quad N = 65 \quad \text{Mean} = 2.4719 \quad \text{Stand. Dev.} = .472 \]

\[ F_1 \quad N = 65 \quad \text{Mean} = 2.5097 \quad \text{Stand. Dev.} = .472 \]

TABLE XII(B) - Differences in separated scoring on the 14-item questionnaire with all subjects.

\[ t = .461 \]
\[ df = 129 \]
\[ p< n.s. \]

The results show no significant difference in scoring with all subjects on the 14-item questionnaire.

TABLE XIII(A) - Differences in separated scoring on the 12-item semantic differential with all subjects.

\[ M_2 \quad N = 65 \quad \text{Mean} = 1.9548 \quad \text{Stand. Dev.} = .587 \]

\[ F_2 \quad N = 65 \quad \text{Mean} = 2.0399 \quad \text{Stand. Dev.} = .601 \]

TABLE XIII(B) t-TEST - Differences in separated scoring on the 12-item semantic differential with all subjects.

\[ t = .822 \]
\[ df = 129 \]
\[ p< n.s. \]

The results show no significance of scoring with all subjects on the 12-item semantic differential.
TABLE XIV(A) - The difference in scoring between the 14-item questionnaire to the 12-item semantic differential.

Measure One  N = 65  Mean = 2.4908  Stand. Dev. = .406
Measure Two  N = 65  Mean = 1.9973  Stand. Dev. = .492

TABLE XIV(B) t-TEST - The difference in scoring between the 14-item questionnaire to the 12-item semantic differential.

\[ T = 6.286 \]
\[ df = 125 \]
\[ p< \text{significant at .01} \]

The results concur with the expectation that both measurements are different.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M₁</th>
<th>F₁</th>
<th>M₂</th>
<th>F₂</th>
<th>Young/Old</th>
<th>All SR +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young/Old</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All(SR)+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All(C)+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results .637 indicate that M₁ and M₂ scores are well correlated. Similarly, .624 shows that F₁ and F₂ scores are well correlated. However, correlations .482 for M₁ and F₁ and .372 for M₂ and F₂ are lower. This gives evidence for higher correlation between mother and father scores on the 14-item questionnaire and the 12-item semantic differential.
The following data represents the findings with the raw data from the P.O.I. and the raw data of the P.P.

**TABLE XVI(A)** - The difference in all subjects' (SR) scores compared to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Negative (SR)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Negative (SR)</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Positive (SR)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.89</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Positive (SR)</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XVI(B) A.O.V.** - The difference in all subjects' (SR) scores compared to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (SR) scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7561.4</td>
<td>2520.5</td>
<td>30.85 sig. at .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5065.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12627.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings show that the young subjects' (SR) scores were higher than the old subjects' (SR) scores.
TABLE XVII(A) - All subjects' differentiated (C) scores as compared to each other.

Old Negative (C) N = 20 Mean = 33.5 Stand. Dev. = 12.2
Young Negative (C) N = 22 Mean = 40.8 Stand. Dev. = 7.9
Young Positive (C) N = 22 Mean = 49.8 Stand. Dev. = 9.3
Old Positive (C) N = 01 Mean = 47.3 Stand. Dev. = 11.0

TABLE XVII(B) A.O.V. - All subjects' differentiated (C) scores as compared to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>11.01 sig. at .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>9827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings show that the young subjects' (C) scores were higher than the old subjects' (SR) scores.
### TABLE XVIII(A) - Old and young subjects' positive and negative (SR) scores compared to perception of $M_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Stand. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Negative (SR)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.654</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Negative (SR)</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Positive (SR)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Positive (SR)</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XVIII(B) A.O.V. - Old and young positive subjects' positive and negative (SR) scores compared to perception of $M_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (SR) scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1.80 (n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.338</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings also show that young and old subjects had no significant difference in (SR) in how they perceived mother on measurement one.
TABLE XIX A.O.V. - Young and old (SR) scores with regard to F₁.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (SR) scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.408</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings also show young and old subjects had no significant difference in (SR) scores with regard to their perception of father on measurement one.

TABLE XX A.O.V. - Young and old (SR) scores with regard to M₂.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (SR) scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.679</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that no significance in SR scores can be shown to separate subjects with regard to mother on measurement two.
**TABLE XXI A.O.V.** - All (SR) scores with regard to F₂.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (SR) scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.58 (n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.838</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings also indicate no difference in SR scores with regard to perception of father on measurement two.

**TABLE XXII(A)** - Young and old subjects' combined (SR) scores compared to each other.

Old Subjects (SR) N = 21 Mean = 37.455 Stand. Dev. = 14.9
Young Subjects (SR) N = 44 Mean = 53.682 Stand. Dev. = 8.93

**TABLE XXII(B) t-TEST** - Young and old subjects' combined (SR) scores compared to each other.

\[ t = 4.438 \]
\[ df = 27 \]
\[ p < \text{significant at .0001} \]

The findings show that older subjects had a significantly lower SR score than young subjects.
TABLE XXIII(A) - Combined (C) scores compared to each other.

Old Subjects (SR) N = 21  Mean = 35.409  Stand. Dev. = 12.8
Young Subjects (SR) N = 44  Mean = 48.159  Stand. Dev. = 9.65

TABLE XXIII(B) t-TEST - Combined (C) scores compared to each other.

\[ t = 4.125 \]
\[ df = 33 \]
\[ p < \text{significant at .0002} \]

The findings indicate that the older subjects had a significantly lower (C) score than young subjects.
The results show that older subjects had a significantly lower rating of mother and father than the young subjects on measurement one.
TABLE XXV(A) FOR M2 – Differences of young and old subjects' rating of parents on measurement two.

Old Subjects (SR) N = 21 Mean = 2.0341 Stand. Dev. = .638
Young Subjects (SR) N = 44 Mean = 1.9151 Stand. Dev. = .564

TABLE XXV(B) t-TEST FOR M2 – Differences of young and old subjects' rating of parents on measurement two.

\[ t = .742 \]
\[ df = 37 \]
\[ p < n.s. \]

TABLE XXV(C) FOR F2 – Differences of young and old subjects' rating of parents on measurement two.

Old Subjects (SR) N = 21 Mean = 1.9621 Stand. Dev. = .701
Young Subjects (SR) N = 44 Mean = 2.6788 Stand. Dev. = .549

TABLE XXV(D) t-TEST FOR F2 – Differences of young and old subjects' rating of parents on measurement two.

\[ t = .683 \]
\[ df = 34 \]
\[ p < n.s. \]

The results show that there is no significant difference in the rating of mother and father for all subjects on measurement two.
LIMITS

It was difficult to find captive groups of adult subjects for evaluation. The young population was larger in number than the older population, because of the different locations. The school where the young subjects were measured provided a larger number of individuals who were mentally and physically capable of taking each measurement than did the selected nursing home for older subjects. Therefore, the statistical analysis of variance resulted in unequal cell sizes for both populations.

In addition, not all young and old subjects who received P.O.I. and P.P. packets returned them for statistical analysis. There were also packets that were discarded because they were not completed.

Although most of the data was complete with both populations on the 14-item questionnaire and the 12-item semantic differential, many young and old subjects did not complete the ten questions that asked for personal history. They also did not complete the last two questions asking for qualities important to mother and father. Perhaps the reason for incomplete answers on the questions was a desire for each subject to remain totally anonymous, or the questions required too much explanation regarding self.

Each subject was aware that the P.P. would be evaluated and scored by this researcher. Therefore, an important limitation appeared to be the reluctance of adult offspring to present parents in a socially unacceptable manner.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

DISCUSSION

This study predicted a relationship between self-esteem and perception of parents: 1) positive self-perception and positive perception of parents; 2) negative perception associated with negative perception of parents. Capacity to formulate intimate contact was a relevant factor for this study. The research predicted that: 3) positive intimate contact with others would be associated with positive perception of parents, and 4) negative intimate contact with others and negative perception of parents.

The primary area of study examined the null hypothesis that no significant difference in self-perception can be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents.

To ensure accuracy for this study, the results were analyzed in several ways: 1) division of P.O.I. scores into positive and negative groups with regard to the raw data of the P.P. (refer to Tables I-XV), 2) the raw data from the P.O.I. compared to the raw data of the P.P. (refer to Tables XVI-XXV), 3) the young and old populations were examined in separated and combined groups with several combinations of young and old (SR) and (C) scores compared to each other, and 4) the statistical analyses were composed of Pearson's product moment r multiple t-tests, and multiple analysis of variances.
After analysis with the young and old (SR) scores divided into positive and negative groups with regard to perception of parents (refer to Tables I, III, V, and VII) and the raw data (SR) scores as compared to perception of parents (refer to Tables XVIII, XIX, XX, and XXI), the results indicate that no significant difference in self-esteem can be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents.

After analysis with the young and old (C) scores divided into positive and negative groups with regard to parents (refer to Tables II, IV, VI, and VIII), the results also indicate that no significant difference in intimate contact can be shown to separate subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents.

Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

It is important to understand the reasons behind the findings that younger and older adult offsprings' perceptions of mother and father cannot be a predictor of self-esteem or intimate contact. However, there are other findings to note before proceeding.

The findings with the raw data show significant differences in young and old (SR) and (C) scores (refer to Tables XVI and XVII). This was expected because of the different environments used to collect the data. The nursing home population is a more confined group of individuals and its level for mobility beyond its physical surroundings is limited.
The confinement of the older population within this 24-hour-a-day facility was thought to be a major factor in causing lower (SR) and (C) scores for the older subjects.

The older subjects' (SR) and (C) scores may also be a result of lowered status, poverty, poor accommodations, isolation, medical difficulties of the aged, and abandonment by the family. In addition, the older subjects may see limited futures because they are retired or unemployed and require the care of a nurse or a nurse's aid.

The results of the P.P. (refer to Tables XIV and XV) also illustrate that the 14-item questionnaire is a different measurement than the 12-item semantic differential. The findings showed that the P.P. was composed of two measurements. However, it seems that the 14-item questionnaire has a higher correlation of mother and father scores than the 12-item semantic differential.

This suggests that the 14-item questionnaire had perhaps more depth to the questions. The higher correlation may also be due to the rating scales of both instruments. The rating scale for the 14-item questionnaire asked for more descriptive evaluations of parents (see appendix), and the 12-item semantic differential was perhaps less descriptive or meaningful through the use of the single word phrases and the 1-5 Lickert scale (see appendix).
The differences in the depth of the 14-item questionnaire and the 12-item semantic differential are also noted in Tables XXIV and XXV. The following tables indicate a significant difference in perception of parents for young and old subjects on the 14-item questionnaire, and there are no significant differences in scoring of parents on the 12-item semantic differential. This means that the older subjects had a lower rating for their perception of parents than the younger populations (refer to Table XVI). However, when the older subjects' lower (SR) and (C) scores were compared to $M_1/F_1$ and $M_2/F_2$, no significant differences could be found (refer to Tables I-VIII and XVIII-XXIII). Although the findings in Table XXIV and XXV may present a discrepancy in both measurements of the P.P., the results in Table XXIV are significant to the major findings of this study.

In order to understand why the older subjects would have a lower perception of parents and the reasons behind the finding that resulted in acceptance of the null hypothesis, it is necessary to examine the changing roles of mother and father within the family.

Although there are differences among the theorists in Chapter I, there are noticeable similarities. People such as Lewin (Lewin, 1951, pp. 57-58) who study perception acknowledge the influences that each individual's relationship with significant others has on the early development of his personality. Several theorists such as Rogers and Sullivan
(Sullivan, 1953, pp. 22-23; Rogers, 1964, p. 125) focus upon the psychological stages which characterize adulthood. They describe the unfolding of the individual's reliance upon himself to understand the world around him as he relates to the broader society. During childhood, the offspring responds to certain biological drives and motivations which are important determinants of behavior such as those described by Freud (Freud, 1938, pp. 747-755). However, with maturation, new and different social and personal motives change the individual's behavior.

Erikson (1963) also shows an expanded view of the stages of personality development by discussing the sociopsychological implications that lead to ego identity. According to him, each stage is associated with one or a few core psychological crises or problems. Erikson has been especially influential in broadening the scope of personality theory by including the adolescent to adult transition which is characterized by social relationships with the family and significant others.

The learning theorists also suggest that behavior is changeable (Skinner, 1953, p. 31), which is reflected in a child's behavior change from dependency on others to the functional autonomy of adulthood (Atwater, 1983, p. 105). For the most part, the above-mentioned theorists agree that the individual's awareness of himself influences his behavior. However, they have differing opinions regarding
the extent to which the individual seeks to integrate the self-system into a concept of the total organism. They seek an overall framework that can encompass self-world relationships. They theorize that the personality is influenced by the individual's contacts with such figures as peers, teachers, siblings, and parents.

Studies such as Coopersmith's indicate that parental acceptance and warmth are directly related to an individual's self esteem. It was also demonstrated by researchers such as Ferguson and Allen (Ferguson and Allen, 1978, pp. 345-347) how the offspring's view of parents influences his ability to relate to others. These and other studies (see Chapter I) present a comprehensive view of the offspring's perception of parents. They deal only with the issue of perception of mother and father from the perspective of the child. This researcher's study suggests that acceptance of parents, while being important during the personality development of the child, is not a critical factor in strengthening the adult offspring's self-esteem or capacity for intimate contact with others (refer to Tables I-VIII and XVI-XXI). Although the family provides the primary source of identification for the offspring, the child must grow into his own sense of identity in order to become an adult. Gould (Gould, 1978, pp. 49-60) states that at the ages of 16, 17, and 18, there is a need for the child to take on his own view of the world and become an independent adult.
Within the early ages of adulthood there exists a conflict on the part of the offspring concerning his unwillingness to separate from parents and his need to develop a sense of self. As the offspring enter adulthood, they continue their struggle with independence and dependence. Through the maturation process, the adult passes through transitional stages of dependency to autonomy and relies more on his own judgments and perceptions of the world, rather than those of his parents. Atwater (Atwater, 1983, p. 337) states that the adult's attachment to parents is different from that of the child. He points out that the adult's role and child oriented tasks change with separation from parents. As the child enters adulthood, he begins to develop his behavioral and emotional autonomy. The latter is consistent with the findings of this study that show young and old adult subjects' perceptions of mother and father having no significant effect on (SR) or (C) scores.

The adolescent's world changes with his entrance into adulthood. The adult has more contact with peers, workers, teachers, and friends. The adult, while continuing to be assisted by his family's guidance system, becomes freer to operate on his own. The autonomy that develops with the adult is a gradual transformation process. The periods of adult transformation result in sequential changes of the perception of mother and father in determining the adult offspring's identity. During the ages between seventeen
and twenty-five, there is a decline of importance of perception of parents as a factor in personality development. Coopersmith's (1967), Sears' (1970), and Dickstein's (1978) results are consistent with the theory that positive and negative perception of parents is important in the development of the child offspring's self-perception and ability to relate to others. This study (refer to Tables I-VIII and XVI-XXI) provides the necessary explanation of the changing perception of parents that occurs with adult offspring's maturation. As the adult matures and becomes more autonomous, his personal views crystalize, and his separation conflict with parents wanes. Gould (1978) and Atwater (1983) show that during the aging process, the adult settles down and his dependence on parents and family change with his new found identity. Although parents are less of a factor in decision making for the adult, the offspring have absorbed and integrated their parents' point of view into their own self-system. The adult offspring's identity and independence are a combination of his and his parents' goals, values, morals, and strivings. His identity is crystallized out of a multitude of competing and cooperating parental values. Identity is molded by the manner in which the adult offspring can stabilize his personal and parental viewpoints under the pressure of changing life conditions. By adapting a mixture of the parents' teachings and his own standards, the adult offspring can solidify and establish an identity which can facilitate personal growth
and change. This finding is also consistent with Tables XXIV and XXV that show the older subjects' rating of mother and father to be lower than the young subjects. Therefore, it can be suggested that the latter stages of adult life result in an increased emotional and behavioral autonomy.

The findings of this study demonstrate that adulthood becomes a time for each individual to realize he is on his own. Perceptions of parents become less of a factor with the onset of occupational specialization, marriage, parenthood, maturity, and ultimately, old age. As the adult ages, it becomes clear that he is the final authority over the conduct of his own life. As the years unfold, an individual's self-esteem and capacity for intimate contact are less affected by the perceptions he has of his mother and father.

Therefore, the direction of the results point to an important step in the study of the possible relationship between adult perception of parents and expressed self-concept.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUDING REMARKS

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study have supported the null hypothesis that no significant differences in self-perception or capacity for intimate contact can be shown to separate young and old adult subjects who express positive or negative evaluations of their parents. Subjects were administered the P.O.I. which assesses self-regard and capacity for intimate contact, followed by a second measure, the P.P., which evaluated the positive and negative perceptions of mother and father. Self-esteem was the primary focus of the study. However, capacity for intimate contact was also included in the research because self-concept is influenced by the relationships that individuals establish with others. Results were analyzed using Pearson's product-moment r's, multiple t-tests, and multiple analysis of variances. Subjects' (SR) and (C) scores, as well as perception of parents, were examined in combined groups and differentiated groups of young and old individuals. Perception of mother and father was also looked at individually and in combined groups.

The findings of this study suggest that perception of parents in the adult offspring is not as critical as it is in the child. The adult offspring experiences autonomy through strengthened self-reliance and broadening experiences
with significant others. Perception of parents changes with personality development. This study helps provide the link between research pertaining to the child and research which examines the adult offspring's changing perception of mother and father. Since this research is in its infancy, no measurement that examines the adult's perception of parents could be found; therefore, the P.P. was developed. Recommended refinement and continual testing of P.P. by itself and with other instruments is advised.

Although further research may develop in many ways, this study would like to see a focus upon: 1) different age levels in order to further examine sequential changes in perception of parents, 2) cultural and cross cultural studies that can examine perception of mother and father for different ethnic groups, 3) study of sub-populations such as criminals or psychiatric patients, 4) male and female offspring differences of perception of parents, 5) individuals with and without biological parents in order to further understand the orphan, 6) longitudinal studies with identical subjects in order to assist in understanding the various developmental stages of perception of parents, 7) repeated research of this study with the same and different projective and non-projective instruments can help examine possible differences and similarities with the same variables, and 8) use of the P.P. in counseling situations to explore and examine the personal issues that each client has with his mother and father.
This study began by discussing the importance that perception of parents has on the development of the self-concept and capacity for intimate contact of the adult offspring. A major finding of this research resulted in understanding the changes that occur with perception of parents throughout the personality development of the adult.

This researcher will continue to study the effects that perception of parents has on the life of all individuals.
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APPENDIX

The following Appendix contains the P.P. and P.O.I. measurements which were implemented for this study.
PERCEPTION OF PARENTS

Please answer the following questions:

1. What is your sex? Male ____ / Female ____

2. What is your birthdate? ____ / ____ / ____

3. Are your parents your biological mother and father? Yes ____ / No ____

4. If your answer to number 3 was no, do you have any step-parent?
   Mother: Yes ____ / No ____
   Father: Yes ____ / No ____

5. Are your parents alive?
   Mother: Yes ____ / No ____
   Father: Yes ____ / No ____

6. In your family were you the:
   Oldest ____
   Youngest ____
   Middle ____
   Other ____

7. If you checked "other" in number 6, please clarify your birth position in the family ____________________.

8. Are you married ____ / single ____ / divorced ____ / widowed ____?

9. Do you have children? Yes ____ / No ____

10. Including yourself, how many people were in your family? ____
PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS THAT PERTAIN TO YOUR OWN FATHER. CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

1. Did your father adapt easily to new situations, feel comfortable in new settings, enter easily into new activities?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

2. Did your father hesitate to express his opinions, as evidenced by extreme caution, failure to contribute, or a subdued manner in speaking situations?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

3. Did your father become upset by failures or strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting or withdrawing?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

4. How often was your father valued or sought after for positive support by his peers?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

5. Did your father become restless or nervous when procedures were changed in the family?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

6. Did your father receive much support from your mother as evidenced by seeking nearness?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

7. When your father was criticized, did he become either upset for sullen and withdrawn?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

8. Did your father depreciate his work or activities and indicate he was not doing as well as expected?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

9. Did your father show confidence and assurance in his actions towards you?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

10. To what extent did your father show a sense of self esteem, self respect, and an appreciation of his own worth?
    Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___
11. Did your father brag or boast about his exploits or accomplishments?
   Always___  Usually___  Sometimes___  Seldom___  Never___

12. Did your father tend to dominate your mother?
   Always___  Usually___  Sometimes___  Seldom___  Never___

13. Did your father ever ask for your support or guidance?
   Always___  Usually___  Sometimes___  Seldom___  Never___

14. Do you identify with your father?
   Always___  Usually___  Sometimes___  Seldom___  Never___
PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS THAT PERTAIN TO YOUR OWN MOTHER. CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

1. Did your mother adapt easily to new situations, feel comfortable in new settings, enter easily into new activities?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

2. Did your mother hesitate to express her opinions, as evidenced by extreme caution, failure to contribute, or a subdued manner in speaking situations?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

3. Did your mother become upset by failures or strong stresses as evidenced by such behaviors as pouting or withdrawing?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

4. How often was your mother valued or sought after for positive support by her peers?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

5. Did your mother become restless or nervous when procedures were changed in the family?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

6. Did your mother receive much support from your father as evidenced by seeking nearness?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

7. When your mother was criticized, did she become either upset for sullen and withdrawn?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

8. Did your mother depreciate her work or activities and indicate she was not doing as well as expected?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

9. Did your mother show confidence and assurance in her actions towards you?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

10. To what extent did your mother show a sense of self esteem, self respect, and an appreciation of her own worth?
    Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___
11. Did your mother brag or boast about her exploits or accomplishments?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

12. Did your mother tend to dominate your father?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

13. Did your mother ever ask for your support or guidance?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___

14. Do you identify with your mother?
   Always___ Usually___ Sometimes___ Seldom___ Never___
PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Please circle the number in each item (a-l) which most clearly describes your own father.
   a. GOOD 1 2 3 4 5 BAD
   b. DIRTY 1 2 3 4 5 CLEAN
   c. VALUABLE 1 2 3 4 5 WORTHLESS
   d. INCONSISTENT 1 2 3 4 5 CONSISTENT
   e. STRONG 1 2 3 4 5 WEAK
   f. IMPATIENT 1 2 3 4 5 PATIENT
   g. ACTIVE 1 2 3 4 5 PASSIVE
   h. UNTRUSTING 1 2 3 4 5 TRUSTING
   i. COLD 1 2 3 4 5 WARM
   j. INEXPRESSIVE 1 2 3 4 5 EXPRESSIVE
   k. INDEPENDENT 1 2 3 4 5 DEPENDENT
   l. UNLIKEABLE 1 2 3 4 5 LIKEABLE

2. Please circle the number in each item (a-l) which most clearly describes your own mother.
   a. GOOD 1 2 3 4 5 BAD
   b. DIRTY 1 2 3 4 5 CLEAN
   c. VALUABLE 1 2 3 4 5 WORTHLESS
   d. INCONSISTENT 1 2 3 4 5 CONSISTENT
   e. STRONG 1 2 3 4 5 WEAK
   f. IMPATIENT 1 2 3 4 5 PATIENT
   g. ACTIVE 1 2 3 4 5 PASSIVE
   h. UNTRUSTING 1 2 3 4 5 TRUSTING
   i. COLD 1 2 3 4 5 WARM
   j. INEXPRESSIVE 1 2 3 4 5 EXPRESSIVE
   k. INDEPENDENT 1 2 3 4 5 DEPENDENT
   l. UNLIKEABLE 1 2 3 4 5 LIKEABLE
PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. List the single words that best characterize what you see as important in a father.

2. List the single words that best characterize what you see as important in a mother.
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Everett L. Shostrom, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacked between the lines in the column headed "a." If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacked between the lines in the column headed "b." If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you an avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in the booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.
1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
    b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
    b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
    b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
    b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
    b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.
17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.  
       b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.

18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.  
       b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.  
       b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.

20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.  
       b. My moral values are self-determined.

21. a. I do what others expect of me.  
       b. I feel free not to do what others expect of me.

22. a. I accept my weaknesses.  
       b. I don't accept my weaknesses.

23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.  
       b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.

24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.  
       b. I am hardly ever cross.

25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.  
       b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.  
       b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.  
       b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

       b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.  
       b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.  
       b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.  
       b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.  
       b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.
33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.  
b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.  
b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.  
b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.  
b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.  
b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes, and values.  
b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes, and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.  
b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.  
b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.  
b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.  
b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.  
b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.  
b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.  
b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.  
b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.

47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.  
b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.  
b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
49. a. I like everyone I know.
   b. I do not like everyone I know.

50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
     b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.

51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
     b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes 
        people act right.

52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
     b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.

53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
     b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.

54. a. Impressing others is most important.
     b. Expressing myself is most important.

55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
     b. I can feel right without always having to please others.

56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is 
     right.
     b. I will not risk a friendship in order to say or do what is right.

57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
     b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.

58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
     b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.

59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
     b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in 
        the future.

60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
     b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.

61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
     b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.

62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings 
     than to carefully evaluate the situation.
     b. There are very few times when it is more important to express 
        feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.

63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
     b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.

64. a. Appearances are all-important.
     b. Appearances are not terribly important.
65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
   b. I gossip a little at times.

66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
   b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.

67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
   b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
   b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.

69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
   b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
   b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
   b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
   b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

74. a. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
   b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
   b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
   b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
   b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

78. a. Self-interest is natural.
   b. Self-interest is unnatural.

79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
   b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.
81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
   b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.
82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
   b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
   b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.
84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
   b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.
85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
   b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.
86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
   b. I can be silly when I feel like it.
87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
   b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.
88. a. I worry about the future.
   b. I do not worry about the future.
89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
   b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.
90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
   b. I prefer to use good things now.
91. a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.
93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
   b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel bubbling up within me.
   b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.
95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
   b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
96. a. I am orthodoxy religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxy religious.
97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
b. I am not free of guilt.

98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.

99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.

100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.
b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.

101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether it is returned.
b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it will be returned.

102. a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
b. Only living for the moment is important.

103. a. It is better to be yourself.
b. It is better to be popular.

104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
b. Wishing and imagining are always good.

105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
b. I spend more time actually living.

106. a. I am loved because I give love.
b. I am loved because I am lovable.

107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will love me.
b. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.

108. a. I can let other people control me.
b. I can let other people control me if I am sure they will not continue to control me.

109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
b. As they are, people do not annoy me.

110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.
b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.

111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."

112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.
113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.  
   b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.

114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.  
   b. I have never had an experience where life seemed just perfect.

115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.  
   b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.

116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.  
   b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.  
   b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.  
   b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.  
   b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.  
   b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.  
   b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.  
   b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.

123. a. I am able to risk being myself.  
   b. I am not able to risk being myself.

124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.  
   b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all the time.

125. a. I suffer from memories.  
   b. I do not suffer from memories.

126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.  
   b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.  
   b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

128. a. I am self-sufficient.  
   b. I am not self-sufficient.

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.  
   b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
130. a. I always play fair.
b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.

139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
b. People do not have an instinct for evil.

140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.

141. a. People are both good and evil.
b. People are not both good and evil.

142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
b. My past is a handicap to my future.

143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.

144. a. For me, past, present, and future is in meaningful continuity.
b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.

145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.
146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.

147. a. People are basically good.
b. People are not basically good.

148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.

149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.

150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

This answer sheet is for recording your answers to the Personal Orientation Inventory. Print your name in the boxes provided. Then blacken in the letter circle below which matches each letter of your name. Read each statement in the booklet and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you. Blacken in the corresponding circle A or B on this sheet using a number 2 pencil. See Sample (00). If you wish to change your answer, erase your first mark completely. Make no stray marks on this sheet.
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At the suggestion of the committee, this glossary has been added in the hope of clarifying the terms which have special uses in this study.

Behavior. Any response made by a person. Behavior is made up of an individual's feelings, drives, impulses, emotions, and conscious and unconscious thoughts.

Behaviorist. A school of thought that maintains that units of behavior are observable responses to environmental stimuli. The behaviorist uses the systematic application of the principles of learning to alter behavior.

Capacity for Intimate Contact. A person's ability to develop meaningful and contactful relationships with other human beings.

Communication. The exchange of information: information is defined as the reduction of uncertainty which is encoded and transmitted over a channel interfered by noise which is reversed and decoded; the reverse process known as feedback.

Culture. A society's shared beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors.

Family. A psychological field in which the transactional processes between parents, between parents and children, and between significant others take place.

Field Theory. A concept formulated by Kurt Lewin that believes that a person is a complex energy field in which behavior can be thought of as a change in some state of the
field during a given unit of time. Lewin also postulated that the presence within the field of psychological tensions indicates states of readiness or preparation for action.

Humanistic - Existentialist. A philosophical approach which focuses on the individual's ability to establish a personal and authentic relationship with another person. The human to human encounter and the authenticity of the here-and-now experience are stressed. The humanistic - existentialist person concentrates on the uniqueness of the individual and the idea that each individual strives to reach personal fulfillment.

Identity. A person's ability to recognize his individuality. Identity enables the individual to distinguish himself from another person or thing.

Interpersonal Theory. A system of therapy based on Harry Stack Sullivan's interpersonal theory of psychiatry. Sullivan emphasized the role of personal relationships and the study of individuals in relationship to significant others. Sullivan believed that the unit of study is the interpersonal situation, not the individual alone. Interpersonal theory postulates that personality manifests itself in the person's behavior in relation to others.

Maturation. The process by which a person experiences growth and change in his sense of self with regard to his relationship with the environment and significant others.
Perception. A mental process by which information is meaningfully organized in an intellectual, sensory, and emotional manner. Through perception an individual can recognize and interpret stimuli that confronts him.

Self. A conscious and unconscious process by which an individual develops a sense of identity.

Self Regard. An individual's affirmation of self because of worth or strength.

Self Theory. A philosophical approach which sees individuals striving to become fully functioning and possessing an inner core of positive tendencies. According to self theorists, a person develops a sense of awareness through his immediate experiencing with others. Self theory is phenomenological and is rooted in the concept that an individual structures himself according to his perceptions of reality.