

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Rosalind Reed Flora for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in Education presented on May 7, 1975

Title: THE EFFECT OF PARENT AND ADOLESCENT SELF

CONCEPT UPON ADOLESCENT'S PERCEIVED

COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS

Abstract approved: _____

Redacted for privacy

Dr. David W. Phelps

Purpose

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of self concept upon parent-adolescent communication patterns. Parental self concepts and the self concepts of their adolescent along with the adolescent's perceived quality of communication with their parents were examined to determine if (1) the parents' self concepts have a significant effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents, (2) the adolescent's self concept has a significant effect upon his perceived communication with his parents, (3) gender has a significant effect upon perceived communication patterns, and (4) the self concepts of the parents have a significant effect upon the self concept of the adolescent.

Procedure

The population consisted of 18 year old male and female university freshmen from two-parent, middle socioeconomic class families. A random sample of these students were assumed to be present in the lower division personal health classes at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. A total of 152 adolescents and their respective parents comprised the sample for the study.

Names, addresses, and demographic data were obtained from an information questionnaire. The adolescents were given The Tennessee Self Concept Scale and The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory to obtain measurements of self concept and perceived communication with parents respectively. Parents were mailed a Letter of Explanation and The Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Sample return comprised 89.4 percent. The Total Positive Scores from the TSCS were categorized into quartiles labeled high, medium-high, medium-low, and low self concept. The data were subjected to two and three-way analysis of variance factorial designs. The factors were fixed and the cell sizes were unequal.

Findings

1. Combined parental self concept seems to have had no effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with parents.

2. The adolescent's self concept appears to have had a significant effect upon his perceived communication with parents at the .01 level. Those adolescents who had low self concept perceived communication with their parents as significantly more non-constructive than those adolescents who had higher self concepts.

3. There was no significant difference between adolescent males and females in their perceived communication with their parents.

4. The mother's self concept appeared to significantly influence her daughter's perceived communication with her parents at the .05 level. Medium-low self concept mothers had daughters who perceived communication with their parents as significantly more non-constructive than daughters of high and medium-high self concept mothers.

5. The father's self concept did not appear to affect his daughter's perceived communication with parents.

6. Neither the mother's nor the father's self concept seemed to have any effect upon the son's perceived communication with parents.

7. Even when controlled for sex, the self concepts of the parents had no measurable effect upon their adolescent's self concept.

Discussion of the findings included suggestions for study

replication with design variations including controls for mother's educational level and specific changes in procedure and instruments. Consideration was given to the possibility of sex role influences upon communication patterns. Implications for education, especially in the areas of human sexuality and family living as well as for family counselors in experimental and applied areas, were presented.

The Effect of Parent and Adolescent Self Concept
Upon Adolescent's Perceived Communication
With Parents

by

Rosalind Reed Flora

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed May 7, 1975

Commencement June 8, 1975

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Professor of Health
in charge of major

Redacted for privacy

Head of Department of Health

Redacted for privacy

Dean of School of Education

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented May 7 1975

Typed by Ilene Anderton for Rosalind Reed Flora

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Rationale for the Study	2
Communication and Its Effect Upon the Self Concept	2
Self Concept and Its Effect Upon Communication	3
Sex Differences in Communication Patterns and The Self Concept	8
Parental Self Concept and Its Effect on Adolescent Self Concept	9
Definition of Terms	9
Limitations	11
Hypotheses	12
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Communication and Its Effect Upon the Self Concept	17
Self Concept and Its Effect Upon Communication	21
Sex Differences in Communication Pattern and Self Concept	22
Parental Self Concept and Its Effect on Adolescents' Self Concept	25
Summary	26
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	29
Population	29
Instruments	31
The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory	31
The Tennessee Self Concept Scale	34
Procedures	35
Analysis of Data	37
IV. RESULTS	39
Demography of the Sample	39
Results of the Hypotheses Tested	45

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
V. DISCUSSION	61
Hypothesis I	61
Hypothesis II	63
Hypothesis III	65
Hypothesis IV	66
Hypothesis V	69
Hypothesis VI	69
Hypothesis VII	71
Hypothesis VIII	74
Hypothesis IX	78
Hypotheses X, XI, XII, XIII	78
Suggestions and Implications	79
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
APPENDICES	101
APPENDIX A	101
APPENDIX B	112
APPENDIX C	115
APPENDIX D	122
APPENDIX E	128
APPENDIX F	132

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Freshmen of 18 years contacted in lower-division required health cours.	40
2. Drop-out and participation percentages	41
3. Socioeconomic characteristics of the sample.	42
4. Mothers' self concept score by level classification.	46
5. Fathers' self concept score by level classification.	46
6. Adolescents' self concept score by level classification.	47
7. Parent-adolescent communication scores by level classification.	47
8. Means and analysis of variance summary for sex, parent self concept, and adolescent self concept effects on communication.	49
9. Analysis of communication score means for adolescent self concept.	50
10. Means and analysis of variance summary for mother and father self concept effect upon daughter perceived communication.	52
11. Analysis of communication score means for mother self concept.	53
12. Means and analysis of variance summary for mother and father self concept effect upon son perceived communication.	55
13. Means and analysis of variance summary for sex and parent self concept effects upon the self concept of adolescents.	57

Table

Page

14. Means and analysis of variance summary for the mother self concept effect and father self concept effect on the daughter self concept.
15. Summary of statistical results for the mother self concept effect and father self concept effect on the son self concept.

59

60

THE EFFECT OF PARENT AND ADOLESCENT SELF CONCEPT UPON ADOLESCENT'S PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The main purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of self concept upon communication patterns between parent and adolescent. Will parents with a higher self concept have adolescents who perceive communication with their parents as more constructive than adolescents who have parents with lower concepts? In addition, what is the effect of the adolescent's self concept with regard to his communication pattern? Do parents with high self concepts have adolescents with high self concepts, and, as a result, do they have meaningful two-way communication; or does a low self concept lead to less meaningful communication patterns?

The self concept of the parent, the self concept of the adolescent, and the communication patterns are all tightly woven together, each possibly affecting the other. Previous research has theorized that communication patterns affect the self esteem of the communicators (Rogers, 1951; Ginott, 1965). Other researchers suspect that self concept may influence not only behavior in general (Sherif, 1968; Rogers, 1951), but, more specifically, the manner

in which we communicate (Rogers, 1951; Crowell, Katcher, and Miyamoto, 1955; Newcomb, 1963; Jandt, 1970).

It is the purpose of this study to try to observe the effect of self concept upon parent-adolescent communication, using two instruments as measures--one for self concept and the other for adolescent's perceived communication with parents.

Rationale for the Study

Communication and Its Effect Upon the Self Concept

The basis of research dealing with communication and the effect upon the self concept is derived from Ginott's theory (1965). This theory states that the manner in which the parent verbally interacts with his child in response to the child's behavior, or verbalizations, or both, will affect the self esteem of the child. If the parent is judgmental, the self esteem of the child will be lower than if the parent is more descriptive, positive, and empathetic.

Ginott's theory is based upon Rogerian theory (1951). As an individual matures and develops, he selects people in his environment who are important to him which are termed "significant others." The family serves as the primary socializing unit by providing him with goals and values from which the child develops

various patterns of behavior. These behavior patterns are the basis for interaction with others and also the basis on which verbal and non-verbal responses act as indicators to the child as to how people feel about him; positive responses elicit good feelings about his self, and negative ones elicit poor feelings. These feelings then serve to guide and maintain adjustment in his environment. The individual is not able to accept himself if he has been in a harsh, rejecting, judgmental atmosphere.

Rogers maintains that if the individual is allowed to "grow" and function in an environment characterized by permissiveness, and free expression of ideas without harsh and frequent evaluations; as a result, the person can learn to know and accept himself. His chances then are greater of attaining self-actualization. This necessitates the ability of a parent to communicate acceptance and trust to his child since he is usually the primary significant other (Miller, 1971, p. 2).

Self Concept and Its Effect Upon Communication

Other questions exist: for example, does a positive self concept lead to constructive communication patterns? Do constructive communication patterns lead to positive self concept? Chicken or egg questions?

Self concept is developed by (1) others' reactions to us and,

(2) comparing ourselves with others (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971; Rogers, 1951; Mead, 1934; Cooley, 1902). The way one perceives himself in terms of the way he should behave, where he belongs, how he looks, and who he is (self concept), is determined not just by his milieu, but also by the beliefs he brings into a situation from these reactions and comparison. Because he brings beliefs into any given situation, he reacts according to those perceptions of himself and the environment. Those people who see themselves as undesirable, worthless, or "bad" tend to act accordingly (Atchinson, 1958; Balester, 1956; Lefebber, 1964; Reckless, 1956).

People who feel threatened develop "tunnel vision." They cannot see anything except the threatening object or person; therefore, thought processes and resulting behavior patterns respond accordingly (Combs and Taylor, 1952; Pilisuk, 1958): perceived threat forces them to defend the perceptions, ideas or practices they already possess (Combs and Taylor, 1952; Perry, 1961).

Psychological literature abounds with studies and articles on the relationships with self concept and its effects on various variables, including intelligence, levels of aspiration, productivity, success in school, estimation of performance, blame for failure, psychosomatic complaints, body types, and anxiety. Therefore, the question one must ask: Is "the self concept the most important

single factor affecting behavior" (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971, p. 37)?

A significant percentage of human behavior consists of interaction with others in the form of verbal and non-verbal communication. Research has shown that if one accepts himself, he is more apt to accept others (Rogers, 1949, 1957; Berger, 1951; Phillips, 1951; McIntyre, 1952; Crandall and Bellerigi, 1954; Omwke, 1954; Fey, 1955; and Levanway, 1955). It also shows that the higher one's self concept, the less anxiety he possesses (Lipsitt, 1958; Castaneda et al., 1956; Coopersmith, 1959; Mitchell, 1959).

Therefore, it is hypothesized that the individual who has a more positive self concept either perceives less threat or can recognize threat and deal with it effectively (Chodorkoff, 1954). As a result, this individual is less defensive and more of a risk taker.

It would appear logical, then, that if one has a positive self concept, he would also have more constructive communication patterns: (1) he would accept others more since he accepts himself, (2) he would not become overtly defensive since he can deal with threat more readily than the individual with a negative self concept, and (3) a positive self concept individual who sees himself as "good" will tend to act accordingly.

If so, is it not feasible to hypothesize that the parent with a

more positive self concept not only will portray "good" feelings to his child about himself, but also will build and maintain that child's self concept through constructive communication?

There are further implications. A parent with a negative self concept through his non-constructive communication patterns may contribute to a negative self concept in his child. Because of (1) this "induced" negative self concept and (2) modeling, the child in turn uses non-constructive communication patterns with his peer group and, eventually, with his own children. A vicious circle. These non-constructive communication patterns not only may cause lowering of self esteem in others but also in the communicator himself, since he often may elicit defensive "backfire" aimed at lowering his self esteem (McCandless, 1967, p. 283).

It would seem logical therefore that constructive communication patterns between parents and children could well become one of the basic objectives of education. In addition, education centering on the self concept, its development, resistance to change, and relationship to communication patterns, could provide alternatives to use in extinguishing negative practices.

Following is an example of constructive communication between parent and child:

Eric, age nine, came home full of anger. The class was scheduled to go for a picnic, but it was raining. Mother decided to use a new approach. She refrained

from cliches that in the past had only made things worse:
 "There is no use crying over rained-out picnics. " "There
 will be other days for fun. " "I didn't make it rain, you know,
 so why are you angry at me? "

To herself she said, "My son has strong feelings about
 missing the picnic. He is disappointed. He is sharing his
 disappointment with me by showing me his anger. He is
 entitled to his emotions. I can best help him by showing
 understanding and respect for his feelings. " To Eric she
 said:

MOTHER: You seem very disappointed.

ERIC: Yes

MOTHER: You had everything ready and then the darn
 rain came.

ERIC: Yes, that's exactly right.

There was a moment of silence and then Eric said,
 "Oh well, there will be other days" (Ginott, 1965,
 pp. 25, 26).

Certain rules of communication are difficult to practice,
 especially when one's ego is being attacked--or one perceives one's
 ego is being attacked. In the example above the mother could have
 rattled off her cliches and become angry or resentful because
 Eric was attacking her. After all, look at all she's done for him.
 At that point she could have attacked his ego, undermining his self
 concept with a few statements such as "Why must you always act so
 miserable and unsociable. " "People aren't going to ever like you. "
 "You'll grow up just like your Uncle Harry! "

However, she did not feel her self concept threatened with his
 "attack" but analyzed the situation as best she could through his

perceptual framework. She feels good about herself as a result, and Eric is left--his emotions expressed--feeling good about himself.

Were two individuals to achieve this pattern of communication, they must (1) be educated in the theories behind its purpose and (2) practice consistently the concept. If the basic premise, that adolescents who perceive their communications with their parents as constructive have more positive self concepts than do adolescents who perceive their communication with their parents as non-constructive, is accepted, then there may be justification for further curriculum development and implementation in constructive communication, self concept, and other insights into mental health in general.

Sex Differences in Communication Patterns and The Self Concept

Another aspect of this study was to look at the sex differences in communication patterns and self concepts pertaining to intra-family relationships. Research in this area (Haring, 1966; Beaubien, 1970; Larson, 1970; Gecas, 1969) is summarized in Chapter II. The purpose of this aspect of the study was (1) to attempt to validate previous findings on communication patterns and gender, (2) to investigate self concepts effects on communication in relation to gender, and (3) to provide suggestions for further research as to possible reasons for any existing differences.

Parental Self Concept and Its Effect on Adolescent Self Concept

The present study looked at parental self concept and its effect upon the adolescent's self concept. This question was being explored in order to provide some evidence that a parent's self concept may be "communicated" to his children. It is possible that the parent's self concept is communicated verbally and non-verbally in either constructive or non constructive patterns which may result in similarly patterned self concept development on the part of the children.

Definition of Terms

1. Self concept/self esteem. --An organization of ideas, feelings, and perceptions about one's self which defines to the individual who and what he is (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971, pp. 39-40). "A personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 5). This will be measured by The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965). The higher the Total Positive Score, the more positive the self concept.

2. Communication. --How people exchange feelings and meanings as they try to understand one another's point of view (Bienvenu, 1969).

3. Constructive communication. --A level of communication in which there is understanding of the other's viewpoint. Messages that preserve the child's as well as the parent's self-respect and integrity (Ginott, 1965). The higher the score on The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (PACI), the higher the level of communication as perceived by the adolescent.

4. Non-constructive communication. --A level of communication in which there is little understanding of the other's viewpoint. Messages that do not preserve the child's or parent's self respect and integrity. The lower the score on the PACI, the lower the level of parent-adolescent communication as perceived by the adolescent.

5. Adolescent's perceives communication with parent. --The adolescent's score on The Parent-Adolescent Community Inventory.

6. High self concept adolescent/parent. --Those adolescents or parents having a Total Positive Score above the 75th percentile on The Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

7. Medium-high self concept adolescent/parent. --Those adolescents or parents having a Total Positive Score between the 50th and 75th percentiles.

8. Medium-low self concept adolescent/parent. --Those adolescents or parents receiving a Total Positive Score between the 25th and 50th percentiles.

9. Low self concept adolescent/parent. --Those adolescents or parents receiving a Total Positive Score below the 25th percentile.

10. High communication adolescents and parents. --Those adolescents and their respective parents who received a score above the 75th percentile on the PACI.

11. Medium-high communication adolescents and parents. --Those adolescents and their respective parents who received a score between the 50th and 75th percentiles on the PACI.

12. Medium-low communication adolescent and parent. --Those students and their respective parents who received a score between the 25th and 50th percentiles on the PACI.

13. Low communication adolescent and parent. --Those adolescents and their respective parents who received a score below the 25th percentile on the PACI.

14. Middle socioeconomic class. --Those families computed to be within the range of 23 to 52 on the McGuire and White Measurement of Socioeconomic Status Scale. This measurement is determined by father's occupation, father's education, and family's source of income (McGuire and White, 1955; see Appendix D).

Limitations

Before generalizations or inferences are made from this study, the following factors should be taken into consideration:

(1) The sample was comprised of 18 year old Oregon State University freshmen who were assumed to be randomly distributed in a required university class. These students and their respective parents who qualified and consented to participate in this study comprised 152 or 89.4 percent of the original sample.

(2) Both parents were living in the same home at the time of this study. All single parent homes were excluded.

(3) All families were from the middle socioeconomic class as determined by the McGuire and White Scale (1955; see Appendix D). The mother's education level or occupation is not included in this scale.

(4) The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) was used as a measurement of self concept. Those individuals scoring too high (above the 99th percentile) were eliminated (2 or 1.2%).

(5) The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (Bienvenu, 1969) was used as a measurement of the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents. One score is reported for communication with both parents.

Hypotheses

The central problem in this investigation was to investigate self concept effects upon parent-adolescent communication patterns. First, would the self concept of both parents have any effect upon the

communication patterns between themselves and their adolescent?

Hypothesis I: There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.

The second question was concerned with the adolescent's self concept effect upon his communication with his parents. Would those that view themselves more positively have more constructive communication patterns with their parents than would adolescents with more negative self concepts?

Hypothesis II: There is no significant adolescent self concept effect upon his perceived communication with his parents.

The third question was intended to explore any differences that might exist between the male and female adolescents in their communication with parents. The design matrix for these three hypotheses can be found in Appendix F.)

Hypothesis III: There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.

The fourth problem dealt with the effects that the mother and father may have had upon their son or daughter. Would the mother's self concept have more of an effect upon communication with her

son or daughter; or would the fathers? Following are four hypotheses which were tested (see Appendix F for matrix):

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent daughter's perceived communication with parents.

Hypothesis V: There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent daughter's perceived communication with her parents.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.

A fifth question dealt with the effect of parent self concepts upon the self concepts of their adolescents. Would their self concepts be "communicated" verbally or non-verbally to their sons or daughters by way of constructive or non-constructive patterns to a significantly measurable effect?

Hypothesis VIII: There are no significant self concept effects upon the self concepts of their adolescent.

The ninth hypothesis tested the question of any difference

between the males and female adolescents with regard to self concept.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent's self concept.

The final problem focused on determining if there were any differences between the mother's and father's self concept on their son's or daughter's self concept. Would mother's self concept have more of an effect upon her son's self concept than the father's? Or would it have more of an effect on the daughter's? Would the father's self concept affect the son's and the daughter's? (See Appendix F for design matrix.)

Hypothesis X: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her daughter.

Hypothesis XI: There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his daughter.

Hypothesis XII: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her son.

Hypothesis XIII. There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his son.

Subsidiary to these thirteen hypotheses were questions dealing with socioeconomic level and educational level of the mother.

Although hypotheses were not offered here, findings of the exploration have been incorporated into the discussion section.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Communication and Its Effect Upon the Self Concept

There are a number of studies which have centered around the effect of child-rearing practices upon the child's self-esteem. It may be inferred that communication patterns were involved. Research by Zembeck and Watson (1953), Sawell, Mussen, and Harris (1955), and Roseberg (1965), found that high self esteem is related to parental acceptance. Children who were found to have low self esteems came from families where conditions were characterized by a lack of worth of the child. Studies by Dittes and Capia (1962), Zimbardo and Formica (1963) and Sampson (1965) have all found that the development of the self concept is a function of parental appraisal of the child's behavior.

Other more recent studies have been concerned primarily with aspects of parent-child communication and its effect upon the child's adjustment, autonomy, satisfaction with communication, behavior of disturbed adolescents, and self evaluation. Ehrenwald (1963) studied family interaction on the basis of scored perceived attitudes expressed either verbally or non-verbally. He compiled an inventory which listed well adjusted children as having parents who communicated giving, supportive, and affectionate attitudes.

Costello (1969) found that the most consistent predictor of a child's perceived autonomy was his communication style with his primary (preferred) parent. In a study by Murphey (1963) the home of the students who gained the most in both autonomy and in relatedness to parents during their freshman year of college was described:

Two factors, among many mentioned, were (1) the ability of the parents to communicate stable consistent values to their child, and (2) the ability to express confidence and faith in them.

When Beaubien (1970) factor-analyzed the Adolescent-Parent Communication Check List, three categories resulted: (1) adolescent communication action, (2) parent reaction, and (3) adolescent satisfaction. Tests revealed that high adolescent communication action-low parent reaction was significantly related to low adolescent satisfaction.

McPherson (1968) found consistent differences in the behavior of disturbed adolescents and the type of verbal behavior of the parents. Another study revealed that families of high school drop-outs apparently had communication patterns revealing deflating ego patterns, lack of acceptance, and lack of understanding (Cervantes, 1966).

Gecas (1969) focused on the relationship between certain dimensions of parent-child interaction and the adolescent's self-evaluation. The Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Inventory, which

asks the child to recall how his parents treated him, and a twelve item semantic differential scale to assess self concept were used. The study states that parental support was consistently strongly associated with high self evaluation in the child.

Quadri (1971) administered the Parental Attitude Scale to 269 parents. To their children he gave the Aligaih Adjustment Inventory and a self concept check list. According to Quadri, children of accepting, permissive parents showed much better adjustment than those children of rejecting, over-protective parents.

There are a few recent studies dealing directly with communication patterns and self concept. Miller's (1971) study on the communication dimensions of mother-child interaction and their effects on the child's self esteem, also resulted in a significant relationship between maternal descriptiveness in negative situations and the self esteem of the child. In this case it was true for inner city children but not for the peripheral city and the suburban sample. The study resulted in a significant relationship between maternal empathy, genuineness, and positive regard toward the child and his self esteem for peripheral and suburban children. However, it was not confirmed that maternal descriptiveness is related to the self esteem of the child in both positive and negative situations. Tools used were (1) his own authored "A Parental Response

Inventory" and (2) Coopersmith's The Self Esteem Inventory (1960).

Bienvenu and McClain (1970) used the PACI and a 35 item self esteem check list to measure the relationship of perceived communication with parents and self esteem in 57 high school girls. A Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient resulted in .64. Their conclusions were, "Positive statements and attitudes may communicate healthy self regard, whereas destructive communication such as criticisms and ridicule may contribute to low self regard" (p. 344).

Other studies involving students and counselors have failed to provide evidence that positive communication patterns influence self concept. Hart (1972) found that trained counselors had a higher mean level of facilitative communication than did untrained counselors, but he found no significant difference in the self concepts of the counselees for the trained and untrained counselors in two week's time. Norton (1972), also, was unable to demonstrate any significant difference in the pre and post tests on self concepts of students who were taught by two-week-trained human relations teachers. He also administered the post test after only a two week period. In view of research showing the consistency of the self concept and its resistance to change (Taylor, 1953; Carlson, 1965; Culler, 1966), it is likely that a two week time period would be inadequate for any change to occur.

Finally, Speisman (1972) gave two secondary teachers facilitative communication training. These teachers then taught four classes of American history and psychology to 226 students. However, the students showed no significant gain in self concept on pre and post tests using The Tennessee Self Concept Scale. However, the uncontrolled variables of two teachers and the subject matters covered in the classroom are questionable.

Self Concept and Its Effect Upon Communication

Studies which center on the individual's self concept and its effect upon communication patterns are few, and some give only clues as to a possible relationship. Swift (1966) used two instruments, The Inventory of Family Life and The Personal Orientation Inventory to determine the parents' psychological health and child rearing attitudes. Parents who had a lower need to control the behavior of their child tended to feel that their own life was enriched, constructive, and productive. The parent could accept his own behavior as well as the behavior of his child.

Jandt (1970) used Berger's Scale for expressed acceptance of others to categorize subjects on self concept. Measures of subjects during and after a group discussion period revealed that males who scored as having a high acceptance of others (and therefore of self)

were rated by observers to have a greater expectancy (1) to receive satisfaction from the discussion, (2) to make more group maintaining communications, and (3) to receive more directed communications than those males expressing low acceptance.

Kennedy (1971) felt that her data on communication between college students and their parents suggested that:

. . . students carry a self-ideal, in part created by, and in part projected onto, their parents. This self-ideal may at times influence parent-student communication, causing students to be defensive in areas of which parents are unaware (Kennedy, 1971, p. 519).

The same pattern was also felt to be true for the parents.

Several of the mothers and some of the fathers stated they felt inadequate, would change some things about themselves, thought their students felt ashamed of them, and thought their students would like them to change (Kennedy, 1971, p. 519).

The variable of self concept or self perception in these relationships seems to have been a major factor in their communication patterns.

Sex Differences in Communication Pattern and the Self Concept

Jandt (1970) found sex differences in his study of acceptance of self, others, and communication. Females expressed greater satisfactions in their responses to other people, directed more communications to the group with which they were interacting, and made more assertive supportive communications than did the males

according to Jandt. He relates males made more assertive or dominant communications and more antagonistic communications than did females.

Alvy (1971) studied age, class, and sex differences in listener-adopted communications, "communications that reflected that the child developed and utilized assumptions about listeners' characteristics in what he said to listeners." These "listeners" were 11 by 14 inch full length drawings of people that differed in listener characteristics; for example, one was happy and another was angry. Results of two sets of communication tasks stated that for ages 6, 9, and 12, girls displayed a greater degree of emotional sensitivity to the listener than did the boys.

There are several studies dealing with sex differences in intra-family communication. Haring (1966) found in using an interview data recording technique that there is higher agreement in communication between mothers and adolescent daughters, less agreement between adolescent boys and mothers, less between girls and fathers, and the least between boys and fathers. The mother is preferred to the father as the main recipient of communication for both adolescent boys and girls. Haring further stated that boys, especially those with problems, are less free in their communication to others than are girls. However, the sample consisted of families at a youth service counseling center for adolescents and

parents. In number, 34 adolescents and their mothers were interviewed, but only 18 of the fathers.

Beaubien (1970), also, found that both boys and girls reported better communication with mothers than with fathers. However, she found with her instrument, The Adolescent-Parent Communication Checklist, that boys rated higher in communication with fathers than did girls.

Larson's (1970) study which used the PACI on 395 11th grade students found that girls reported more effective communication with parents than did boys. They were also more willing to disclose to mothers but not to fathers, and they spent more time in conversation with parents than did boys. He gave no theories for these sex differences but did give the psychosocial variables which were positively associated with parent-youth communication:

(a) lack of psychological distance between parent and youth as viewed by teen-ager; (b) adolescent feeling of being loved by parents; (c) reported happiness of adolescent with home life; (d) marital happiness of parents as perceived by adolescent; (e) adolescent perception of value consensus with parents; and (f) parent as opposed to peer orientation of teen-ager and decision making (D. A., v. 31, p. 4918A).

Disclosure of self and perceived disclosure of others in family relationships was the main concern of Daluiso's (1972) study. By using the Jourard Self Disclosure Questionnaire, he found that daughters received more disclosure from parents than did sons.

Sons disclosed less and perceived less disclosure than other family members. Boys disclosed more of themselves than they were disclosed to. Mothers received more disclosure than did fathers and disclosed more than fathers. The sample was 60 families randomly selected from junior high, senior high, and college student rosters.

Research confined to a college population by Kennedy (1971) reported the following sex differences:

Comparing responses of males and females, females generally reported more communication with parents than did males. Differences were significant ($p < 0.05$) in that females talked more with parents about world affairs and parents' feelings. Males more than females ($p < 0.05$) talked about personal matters more with mothers than with fathers.

However, Love (1970) did not find sex to be a significant variable in the level of parent-adolescent communication using the PACI on 1578 Louisiana and Florida public high school students.

Parental Self Concept and Its Effect on Adolescents' Self Concept

There have been a few studies on relationships of parent and child self concept, but no studies were found that attempted to determine effect. Gecas (1969) found that girls tended to have higher self evaluation scores than boys, and "the relationship between [parent's] support and self evaluation was stronger when the parent

was of the same sex as the respondent" (D. A. v. 30, 3562A). He concluded that:

The gender of the parent and the child and to some extent social class, affects not only the level of self-evaluation, but also significantly modifies the relationships between perceived behavior and the adolescents' self evaluation (D. A. v. 30, p. 3562A).

In an investigation of the relationships between parent and preschool children's self concept measurements, Taub (1972) found the mean self concept of parents having similar self concepts was not significantly related to their preschooler's self concept. However, he felt there was a relationship between the mean parental self concept and the child's self concept.

When there was dissonance between the mother's and child's self-concepts (from a distribution of differences), there was a significant correlation between the father's self-concept and his child's self-concept (D. A. V. 33, p. 6742A).

Summary

There are several conclusions that may be drawn from the research summarized in Chapter II. Self esteem of the child seems to be highly related to parental treatment of the child. The treatment which leads to high self esteem is characterized by acceptance, support, affection, and the ability to communicate stable consistent values. Attitudes conveying a lack of worth toward the child, along with ego deflating communication patterns and a lack of understanding,

results in children with lower self esteem.

One study resulted in a positive correlation between the child's perceived communication with his parents and the child's self concept. However, studies have failed to show significant increases in self concepts of students and counselees as a result of positive, facilitative, communication patterns.

There is also evidence to support the theory that self concept has an effect upon communication. Parents who feel positive about themselves tend to feel positive about their children and tend to provide a free atmosphere for growth. Those people with high self acceptance make more group maintaining communications than do those people with low self acceptance.

The mother seems to be the primary person to whom communication is directed by the children. Research appears to indicate that females in the United States at the present time usually have more open and responsive communication patterns than do males.

Studies are mixed as to who has the higher self concept, males or females. There is some evidence, however, that the self concept of the child shows significant positive correlation with that of the parents.

Nonetheless, although studies seem to support that positive interaction patterns lead to a more positive self concept in the child, there are few studies that tend to confirm any relationships with, or

effect of, the self concept upon communication patterns. It appears that there are differences in communication patterns for sex in the family, but no real evidence as to why.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Population

The population consisted of 18 year old male and female university freshmen from two-parent, middle socioeconomic class families. A random sample of these students were assumed to be present in the lower division personal health classes winter term at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. The course is a university requirement for graduation which students usually take their freshman year.

A total of 152 students and their parents comprised the sample for this study. The age group of 18 years was chosen primarily for two reasons: Taylor (1969), when comparing her results with Dubbe's (1965), concluded that:

. . . communication strain between parents and adolescents builds from the young teenage years through the older years in high school and eases when the adolescent gains more independence in the college setting (Taylor, 1969, p. 43).

Based on this statement, winter term was chosen to allow for this "easing" of communication between parents and adolescent. If the self concept has had significant effect upon communication between parents and adolescent, it is assumed that this effect would have endured this four or five month time span, eliminating the "togetherness strain" variable.

Another reason for choosing the 18 year age group was accessibility. Due to the recent federal legislation (PL 93-380), access to student records, even to the point of acquiring names and addresses for sampling purposes, was blocked by the public school officials' interpretation. At present, 18 year olds are allowed, by law, to participate in research without parental consent, therefore, making this study feasible.

Because significant differences among social classes had been found by Love (1970) and Taylor (1969) using The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory, and many studies (Ausubell and Auseubell, 1963; Erickson, 1963; Witty, 1967; Deutsch, 1960; Long and Henderson, 1968; Wylie, 1961; Clark and Trowbridge, 1971; Soares and Soares, 1969, 1970; Zirkel and Moses, 1971; and Trowbridge and Trowbridge, 1972) have resulted in significant differences among the social classes for self concept, the decision was made to control for socioeconomic level in this study. The McGuire and White Scale (1955; see Appendix D) was chosen to classify students as to their socioeconomic class level because it had been previously used by Love (1970) and Taylor (1969) in validation studies for the PACI. Those students not meeting the criteria for the middle socioeconomic class were eliminated from the study.

The present study was reviewed and approved by the Oregon State University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects.

This was done in accordance with the Policy on Protection of Human Subjects of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare (see Appendix A).

Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study, (see Appendix A): The Parent-Adolescent Communications Inventory (PACI) and The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS). Both are listed in Buros' Mental Measurement Yearbook, 7th Edition.

The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory

This inventory "was designed to help counselors, educators, and researchers assess parent-teen relations for purposes of individual counseling and for a better understanding of today's youth" (Bienvenu, 1969, p. 1). Although there are two forms, A for adolescents and P for parents, this study was concerned with only the A form. This form consists of 40 questions to be given to the adolescent. He could respond with Yes, Sometimes, or No according to the way he perceived his particular communication pattern with his parents at the time (see Appendix A). The higher the score, the more positive the parent-adolescent communication.

The first version of the inventory contained 36 items which were formulated from a review of literature, Bienvenu's clinical

experience, and an examination of existing instruments dealing with family interaction. These items were reviewed by a psychiatrist, a psychologist, and a psychiatric-social worker, who found all items to be relevant to intra-family communication. Scores from 376 high school students were obtained, and Chi-square test was run for each item between score responses and location in the upper or lower quarters on total score. Means were found to be within one point for the three groups of students, each group from a different school.

Further tests resulted in a significant t test when 78 regular session high school students and 97 summer-session students were compared. Based upon this and an item-analysis from the first study, an inventory of 40 items met the Chi-square test of discrimination between upper and lower quartiles at the .01 level. The sample consisted of 358 high school students.

Two further studies were made: one comparing delinquent and non-delinquent youth, and the second comparing honor students with remedial students. There were significant differences between groups for both studies.

Three reliability studies have been made. Using the Spearman-Brown split-half formula, the corrected correlation coefficient for odd-even was .86. A test-retest in three weeks for 84 teenage boys and girls revealed .78 coefficient of reliability and a second

test-retest reliability study provided a coefficient of .88 (Bienvenu, 1969).

In addition to the above information contained in the manual (Bienvenu, 1969), a doctoral study (Love, 1970) verified the high level of test-retest reliability and confirmed the assumption that all 40 items were related to a generalized factor called "parent-adolescent communication. " Even though five social variables (occupation and education of the father; income source and socio-economic status of the family; and educational level of the mother) were shown to have statistical significant relationships with the level of parent-adolescent communication, "the degree of association of each one however with total score, was quite low" (Love, 1970, p. 91). Age, grade placement, sex, race, ordinal position, religious preference, number of siblings, and mother's employment status were not significantly related to the total PACI score.

In another study (Larson, 1970), used the PACI with 1578 high school students to study aspects of the socio-cultural, psychosocial, and "processual" contexts in which parent-adolescent communication occurs. Larson found: (1) no significant differences between white and black adolescents when father's occupation status was controlled, (2) the scores were associated with the father's occupation status, and (3) sex role differences emerged for the responses.

Taylor (1969), reported that there was no significant relationship between scores and age, grade level, sex, rural-urban, ordinal position or source of family income.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale

There are two forms of the TSCS, the Counseling Form and the Clinical Form (see Appendix A). The counseling form was used in this study. A Total Positive Score was derived from this form, reflecting the overall level of self esteem; the higher the score, the more positive the self concept. The scale consists of 100 self-description items. The respondent selects one of five choices labeled from "completely false" to "completely true." Original items on the scale were derived from (1) surveys of literature on patient self concept, and (2) analysis of patient self reports. Final items were chosen, only after there was complete agreement, by seven clinical psychologists who acted as judges.

Norms were acquired from a sample of 626 persons varying in age, sex, and race. The manual states that further norming has not been considered necessary because

. . . it has been apparent that samples from the other populations do not differ appreciably from the norms, provided they are large enough samples (75 or more). Second, the effects of such demographic variables as sex, age, race, education, and intelligence on the scores of this Scale are quite negligible (Fitts, 1965, p. 13).

Test-retest reliability is .92 for the Total Positive Score. There are other scores which can be derived from the scale; Variability Scores, which reflect the amount of consistency from one area of self-perception to another, and a Distribution Score, which is a measure of extremity response styles. These scores were not used in the present study, but their reliabilities are also high (Fitts, 1965).

Validity was not only determined by the previously mentioned judges, but also by the testing of different population groups. Scores of 369 psychiatric patients and 626 non-psychiatric patients were significantly different at the .001 level. Other scores mentioned above have been tested as valid to the type of disorder as well as to the degree of disorder (Fitts, 1965).

Additional, lengthy and detailed information on reliability, validity, norms, and correlations with other tests of personality are available in the test manual.

Procedures

Questionnaires were given to all 18 year old students in eleven lower division personal health classes at Oregon State University. Verbal instructions informed the student as to the type of study, his right to confidentiality, and his right to refuse (see Appendix B). The questionnaires provided name, address, telephone number,

number of parents living with, parents occupation, education, and source of income (see Appendix B). Those students from single parent homes and from the upper and lower socioeconomic classes were eliminated. The remaining students, from two-parent homes and from the middle socioeconomic group, were administered The Tennessee Self Concept Scale and The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory in their respective classrooms. One-half were given the TSCS first, and the other half the PACI first, to counterbalance any fatigue variable.

Following the student's completion of these instruments, the respective parents were mailed (1) a Letter of Explanation (see Appendix C); (2) The Tennessee Self Concept Scale test booklet; (3) two coded counselor form answer sheets, one for father and one for mother; and (4) a return self-addressed stamped envelope. After a two week waiting period, a telephone follow-up was made to those parents who had not returned their questionnaires. A second telephone follow-up was also made. The total sample comprised all those students and their respective parents who consented to participate, completed, and returned their questionnaires after a first or second follow-up by telephone. Neither the students nor the parents were told the nature or purpose of the study beyond that given in the administration of the questionnaire, the Letter of Explanation, and the instrument instructions. This was

done in order to avoid any contamination of results.

Both instruments were scored by hand with the aid of a calculator. Only the Total Positive Score was derived from the Counselor Form of The Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Analysis of Data

The basic statistical models for the tests of the hypotheses were the two and three way analysis of variance design with fixed category levels. Analysis of variance was selected because (1) the data scales in this study were of the equidistant interval type, (2) the dependent variables were normally distributed, and (3) the variances were assumed to be common. All of these meet the criteria for the use of the F statistic (Courtney and Sedgwick, 1973).

In testing Hypotheses I, II, and III, a three-way analysis of variance with unequal cell size was used. The factors consisted of two levels of sex, four levels of adolescent self concept (TSCS), and four levels of parent self concept (TSCS). The dependent variable was the parent-adolescent communication (PACI). (See Definition of Terms for self concept and communication level criteria.) The design matrix can be found in Appendix F.

The remainder of the hypotheses were tested using two-way analysis of variance designs for unequal cell size and fixed categories. The number of levels for each factor varied with the specific

hypothesis as well as the independent and dependent variables. (All design matrices for hypotheses can be seen in Appendix F.)

For all tests of experimental hypotheses, findings for which the probability is greater than .05 were reported as non-significant. When a significant F value resulted in cases where more than two levels were present, t tests were run to determine the location of significant differences between the means.

The data were classified, coded, and punched onto computer cards. All tests were run using the CDC 3500 computer at Oregon State University.

IV. RESULTS

Demography of the Sample

The sample for this study was comprised of those 18 year old students from two-parent, middle socioeconomic class homes who (1) were enrolled in Oregon State University's required lower division personal health class during winter term of 1975; (2) agreed to participate in the study; and (3) whose parents returned and completed The Tennessee Self Concept Scale answer forms.

Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon is located in the Willamette Valley between the Coastal and the Cascade Mountain Ranges. The freshman class of 1975 accounted for 4,190 of the total university enrollment of 15,915 (Oregon Department of Higher Education, Oct. 1974). Most of these freshmen students were from the state of Oregon, 669 being classified as out-of-state residents. There were no statistics available as to how many freshmen were 18 years of age at the winter term data collection time; however, based on the average number of 18 year olds in the health classes winter term, the number is estimated at 1071 or about 25 percent. The distribution, of 18 year old students in the lower division university required health class, was assumed to represent a random group of freshmen enrollees.

All students identified as being 18 years of age in the 11 classes were contacted to fill out the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The 211 resulting responses were, then, screened according to sample requirements. A summary of the results is seen in Table 1. Nineteen students or 9.5 percent were from single parent homes and thus eliminated from the study. The 10.4 percent (22) from the lower socioeconomic class were eliminated, leaving a percentage of 80.6 (170) from the middle socioeconomic class. These 170 subjects comprised the sample for the study.

Table 1. Freshmen of 18 years contacted in lower-division required health course.

Given questionnaire	Single parent home (eliminated)	Lower soc-ec class (eliminated)	Middle soc-ec. class	Total in study
211	19	22	170	170
(100%)	(9.5%)	(10.4%)	(80.6%)	

Of the 170 sampled respondents, 2.5 percent of the students and 8.2 percent of the parents did not participate. Table 2 gives the numbers and percentages of those eliminated. (Two parents were eliminated due to too high a score on the TSCS [Fitts, 1965, p. 2].) This left a total of 152 families who participated in this study, comprising 89.4 percent of the total sample.

Table 2. Drop-out and participation percentages.

Total sample for study	Students failing to participate	Parents failing to participate	Total families participating
170	4	14	152
(100%)	(2.5%)	(8.2%)	(89.4%)

The socioeconomic characteristics are detailed in Table 3. As previously stated, all students were 18 years of age when given the questionnaire. The numbers of males and females were almost equal, being 73 and 79 respectively. In-state students comprised 88.5 percent (134) of the final sample, while out-of-state students total 11.8 percent (18). In general, this represented the total university freshmen out-of-state enrollment of 15.9 percent. Five students were living with one step parent. Four of these were step fathers.

Among the seven McGuire-White (1955) occupational classifications, the teacher, nurses, accountant, etc. group (see Appendix D) accounted for the largest proportion with 45.4 percent. This was followed by 32.2 percent for the salesman, postman, etc., category. These two groups together accounted for over three-fourths of the fathers' occupations in the sample. The judge, professor, physician group, etc., and the bookkeeper, carpenter, etc., ranked third and fourth respectively. No students listed their father's occupations in the last three "lower" rated occupations.

Table 3. Socioeconomic characteristics of the sample.

Variable	Classification	Number	Percent
Age	18	152	100.0
Sex	Male	73	48.0
	Female	79	52.0
Residence	Oregon	134	88.5
	Out-of-state	18	
Step Parent	Mother	1	0.65
	Father	4	2.6
Father's occupation *	1. judge, professor physician, etc.	22	14.5
	2. teacher, nurse, accountant, etc.	69	45.4
	3. salesman, postman, etc.	49	32.2
	4. bookkeeper, carpenter, etc.	12	7.9
	5. clerk, tenant farmer, etc.	0	0.0
	6. waitress, watchman, etc.	0	0.0
	7. odd job, unskilled, etc.	0	0.0
Source of income*	1. savings, investments	1	0.65
	2. profits, fees, etc.	42	27.6
	3. salary, etc.	99	65.1
	4. hourly wages, etc.	10	6.5
	5. odd job, unskilled, etc.	0	0.0
	6. welfare, charity, etc.	0	0.0

Table 3. Continued.

Variable	Classification	Number	Percent
Father's education*	1. graduate degree	39	25.7
	2. undergraduate degree	49	32.2
	3. 1-3 years college	36	23.7
	4. high school	47	30.9
	5. completed 9th	4	2.6
	6. completed 8th	0	0.0
	7. dropped out before 8th	0	0.0
Mother's education	1. graduate degree	12	7.9
	2. undergraduate degree	32	21.1
	3. 1-3 years college	60	39.9
	4. high school	47	30.9
	5. completed 9th	1	0.65
	6. completed 8th	0	0.0
	7. dropped out before 8th	0	0.0
Socioeconomic status*	1. upper middle	98	64.5
	2. lower middle	54	35.5
Mother's occupation	1. full-time outside employment	52	34.2
	2. part-time outside home	19	12.5
	3. helps with family business	11	7.2
	4. housewife	70	46.1

* Father's occupation, father's education, socioeconomic status and mother's education are computed according to the following: McGuire, C., and White, G. D. The measurement of social status, Research paper in human development No. 3 (revised). Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas Press, March, 1955 (see Appendix D).

The primary source of income for the families was, generally, what might be expected for a middle socioeconomic group. Salary rated highest with 65.1 percent followed by profits, fees, etc., with 27.6 percent. Over one-half, 57.9 percent, of the fathers had either undergraduate or graduate degrees. This is significantly higher than the national average of 10.7 percent and of Oregon's 11.8 percent (U. S. Census, 1970). The highest ranked education category for the mothers was 1-3 years of college, containing 39.1 percent followed by high school completion with 30.9 percent, and undergraduate degrees with 21.1 percent. Again, as might be expected, this is much higher than the national average of 12.1 years of schooling completed (U.S. Census, 1970).

The socioeconomic status reflects the father's occupation, education level, and source of income. The upper middle class was represented by 64.5 percent of the families, while the lower middle class accounted for 35.5 percent.

The mother's occupation, as well as the mother's education, was not included in the socioeconomic class ranking. The number of mothers who were housewives rated 46.1 percent. Several students commented that their housewife mothers were actively seeking employment. Others stated that their mothers were at-home artists or very actively involved in volunteer work. Mothers fully employed outside the home ranked second with 34.2 percent. The

remainder were either working part-time or involved in helping run a family-owned business.

Tables 4, 5 and 6 summarize the results of The Tennessee Self Concept Scale for mothers, fathers, and adolescents respectively. The Grand Means for each group are within two points of each other. The mothers with self concept scores falling within the upper quartile (Level I) had the highest percentage of 36.2. Of interest are the results revealing that 66.3 percent of the mothers had scores in the upper 50th percentile while the fathers and adolescents had 51.2 percent and 48.7 percent respectively.

The results of The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory are given in Table 7. Over 70 percent of the sample scored on or above the 75th percentile. However, the mean for all the communication scores was 80.88, slightly over the normed mean of 78.80.

Results of the Hypotheses Tested

This study analyzed thirteen hypotheses concerned with (1) the effects of self concept on communication patterns, (2) the effects of parental self concept on adolescent self concept, and (3) effects of gender with respect to perceived communication patterns, self concept, and self concept effects. The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory was administered to measure the adolescent's perceived communication with parents, and The Tennessee

Table 4. Mothers' self concept score by level classification.

Self concept level	Percentile	Mean	Number	Percent
I. High	75-99	386.236	55	36.2
II. Medium-High	50-74	358.847	46	30.1
III. Medium-Low	25-49	340.730	26	17.1
IV. Low	1-24	309.600	25	16.5
Grand Mean		348.853	152	

Table 5. Fathers' self concept score by level classification.

Self concept level	Percentile	Mean	Number	Percent
I. High	75-99	392.238	42	27.6
II. Medium-High	50-74	358.509	51	33.6
III. Medium-Low	25-49	336.727	33	21.7
IV. Low	1-24	309.461	26	17.1
Grand Mean		349.233	152	

Table 6. Adolescents' self concept score by level classification.

Self concept level	Percentile	Mean	Number	Percent
I. High	75-99	386.423	26	17.1
II. Medium-High	50-74	359.879	58	31.6
III. Medium-Low	25-49	337.645	31	20.3
IV. Low	1-24	306.892	37	24.3
Grand Mean		347.709	152	

Table 7. Parent-adolescent communication scores by level classification.

Self concept level	Percentile	Mean	Number	Percent
I. High	75-99	107.851	108	71.1
II. Medium-High	50-74	90.450	20	13.2
III. Medium-Low	25-49	78.571	21	13.8
IV. Low	1-24	46.666	3	0.2
Grand Mean		80.884	152	

Self Concept Scale was used to measure adolescent and parent self concept. Two and three-way analysis of variance procedures were used to determine if significant differences existed among the means.

Hypothesis I: There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.

The three-way analysis of variance summary is given in Table 8. Results revealed that the parents' self concept apparently had no significant effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents. Those adolescents who had parents with positive self concepts did not have significantly different PACI scores than those who had parents with self concepts classified as medium-high, medium low, or low (see Appendix F for the Matrix). This hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis II: There is no significant adolescent self concept effect upon his perceived communication with his parents.

As indicated in Table 8, the adolescent's self concept did appear to have had a significant effect upon his perceived communication with his parents. This hypothesis was rejected with the F value indicating significance at the .01 level. Table 9 gives the results of a multiple comparisons analysis of the means. This comparison

Table 8. Means and analysis of variance summary for sex, parent self concept, and adolescent self concept effects on communication (N = 152).

Classification	Mean communication score	N	Percent
<u>Sex</u>			
Female	102. 22	79	52. 0
Male	98. 25	73	48. 0
<u>Adolescents</u>			
High self concept	107. 46	26	17. 1
Medium-high self concept	103. 04	58	31. 6
Medium-low self concept	102. 39	31	20. 3
Low self concept	92. 11	37	24. 3
<u>Parents</u>			
High self concept	100. 79	38	25. 0
Medium-high self concept	101. 10	60	32. 9
Medium-low self concept	98. 77	35	23. 0
Low self concept	99. 53	19	12. 5

Source of variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex	1	238. 29	238. 29	1. 424	N. S.
Self concept of adolescent	3	3740. 18	1246. 73	7. 450	< . 01
Self concept of parent	3	27. 38	9. 13	0. 055	N. S.
Sex x Adolescent	3	591. 38	197. 13	1. 178	N. S.
Sex x Parent	3	858. 35	286. 12	1. 710	N. S.
Parent x Adolescent	9	1617. 86	179. 76	1. 074	N. S.
Sex x Adolescent x Parent	9	1517. 62	168. 62	1. 008	N. S.
Error	120	20081. 98	167. 35		
Total	151	28673. 04			

revealed that the low self concept adolescent group was significantly different from the high, medium-high, and medium-low self concept groups with respect to their communication with parents. Since the low self concept adolescent mean was lower compared to the means of the other three groups respectively, it was hypothesized that a low self concept does result in perceived non-constructive communication patterns with parents.

Table 9. Analysis of communication score means for adolescent self concept.

Means**	t Values		
	2	3	4
1	1.044	1.002	4.067*
2		.165	3.961*
3			3.360*

*Significant at the .001 level

**Mean 1 - High self concept adolescents

Mean 2 - Medium-high self concept adolescents

Mean 3 - Medium-low self concept adolescents

Mean 4 - Low self concept adolescents

Hypothesis III: There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.

The three-way analysis of variance resulted in no significant sex effect upon the PACI scores. There was no significant

difference between males and females in their perceived communication with their parents. Hypothesis III was retained.

None of the interaction F values were significant the the .05 level; therefore, the assumption was made that sex, parent self concept, and adolescent self concept were not affecting each other for the four levels being tested.

The following four hypotheses deal with effects the mother's self concept and the father's self concept may have upon their son's or daughter's perceived communication with their parents (see Appendix F for matrices).

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent daughter's perceived communication with her parents.

The two-way analysis of variance results are shown in Table 10. The F value for this hypothesis was significant at the .05 level; therefore, this hypothesis was rejected. The mother's self concept appeared to significantly influence her daughter's perceived communication with parents. Table 11 gives the results of a multiple comparisons analysis of the means. This comparison revealed that mean 3 for the medium-low self concept mothers was significantly different from means 1 and 2, the high self concept mothers and the medium-high self concept mothers. Medium-low self concept mothers were not significantly different from the low

Table 10. Means and analysis of variance summary for mother and father self concept effect upon daughter perceived communication.(N = 79).

Classification	Mean communication score	N	Percent		
<u>Mother</u>					
High self concept	105. 29	29	36. 7		
Medium-high self concept	106. 56	22	27. 8		
Medium-low self concept	92. 00	16	20. 3		
Low self concept	98. 67	12	15. 2		
<u>Father</u>					
High self concept	102. 89	16	20. 3		
Medium-high self concept	101. 26	33	41. 8		
Medium-low self concept	103. 73	15	19. 0		
Low self concept	102. 20	15	19. 0		
<hr/>					
Source of variance	df	SS	MS	F	P
Mother's self concept	3	1559. 613	519. 871	3. 768	< . 05
Father's self concept	3	974. 811	324. 937	2. 355	N. S.
Mother's x father's self concept	9	1652. 730	183. 636	1. 331	N. S.
Error	63	8693. 142	137. 986		
Total	78	12880. 296			

self concept mothers. None of the other means were significantly different from each other.

Table 11. Analysis of communication score means for mother self concept.

Means**	t Values		
	2	3	4
1	-.35	3.64*	1.64
2		3.78*	1.89
3			-1.48

*Significant at the .001 level

**Mean 1 - High self concept mothers

Mean 2 - Medium-high self concept mothers

Mean 3 - Medium-low self concept mothers

Mean 4 - Low self concept mothers

Hypothesis V: There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent daughter's perceived communication with her parents.

This hypothesis did not test out to be significant. The father's self concept as measured by the TSCS, did not appear to have any significant effect upon his daughter's perceived communication with her parents. This hypothesis was retained. Results are listed in Table 10.

The interaction F value was not significant indicating the

mother's and father's self concept did not affect each other for the four levels being studied.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.

These hypotheses were retained. Two-way analysis of variance resulted in no significant effects of the mother's self concept or the father's self concept upon the son's perceived communication with parents. There appeared to be no difference between the son's perceived communication patterns for high, medium-low, and low self concept mothers or fathers. These results can be seen in Table 12.

Again, the interaction F value was not significant indicating the mother's and father's self concepts had no effect on each other for the four levels.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent self concept.

The hypothesis was retained. Results given in Table 13 show that the F value did not reach the .05 level of significance. The

Table 12. Means and analysis of variance summary for mother and father self concept effect upon son perceived communication.(N = 73).

Classification	Mean communication score	N	Percent		
<u>Mother</u>					
High self concept	100.22	26	35.6		
Medium-high self concept	101.66	24	32.9		
Medium-low self concept	94.58	10	13.7		
Low self concept	97.79	13	17.8		
<u>Father</u>					
High self concept	96.54	27	36.9		
Medium-high self concept	100.77	17	23.3		
Medium-low self concept	91.21	18	24.7		
Low self concept	102.73	11	15.1		
Source of variation	df	SS	MS	F	P
Mother's self concept	3	380.632	126.877	.499	N. S.
Father's self concept	3	1006.326	335.442	1.320	N. S.
Mother's x father's self concept	9	3624.370	402.707	1.585	N. S.
Error	57	14485.364	254.129		
Total	72	19496.692			

self concept of the parents appeared to have no effect upon the self concept of the adolescents.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent self concept.

Although the self concept mean for females is higher than that of the males, a two-way analysis of variance resulted in no significant difference at the .05 level. The hypothesis was retained. A statistical summary is given in Table 13.

The interaction F value for sex and parent self concept was not significant.

The final four hypotheses assert that the mother's and father's self concept has no significant effect upon their son's or daughter's self concept (see Appendix F for the matrix).

Hypothesis X: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her daughter.

Hypothesis XI: There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his daughter.

The two-way analysis of variance for the above hypotheses resulted in F values that were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, these hypotheses were retained. Neither the self concept of the mother nor of the father had any significant effect upon the adolescent's self concept as measured by The Tennessee

Table 13. Means and analysis of variance summary for sex and parent self concept effects upon the self concept of adolescents (N = 152).

Classification	Mean self concept score	N	Percent		
<u>Sex</u>					
Females	351. 47	79	42. 0		
Males	341. 43	73	48. 0		
<u>Parent Self Concept</u>					
High self concept	354. 18	38	25. 0		
Medium-high self concept	343. 56	60	39. 5		
Medium-low self concept	346. 58	35	23. 0		
Low self concept	341. 48	19	12. 5		
Source of variance	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex	1	3226. 57	3226. 57	3. 826	N. S.
Parent self concept	3	3205. 75	1068. 58	1. 267	N. S.
Sex x parent self concept	3	5814. 64	938. 21	2. 298	N. S.
Error	144	121428. 32	843. 25		
Total	151	133675. 28			

Self Concept Scale. There was no significant interaction effect for mother's and father's self concept for the four levels.

Hypothesis XII: There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her son.

Hypothesis XIII: There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his son.

These above two hypothesis were retained. Results revealed that neither the father's self concept nor the mother's self concept had any significant effect upon their son's self concept. Again, there were no interaction effects for mother's and father's self concepts; therefore, it is assumed that they did not affect each other at the various levels. The two-way analysis of variance results are given in Table 15.

Subsidiary hypotheses tables for mother's educational level and socioeconomic differences with respect to the communication scores are given in Appendix E. Results of these have been incorporated into the discussion.

Table 14. Means and analysis of variance summary for the mother self concept effect and father self concept effect on the daughter self concept (N = 79).

Classification	Mean self concept score	N	Percent		
<u>Mother</u>					
High self concept	343.38	29	36.7		
Medium-high self concept	354.77	22	27.8		
Medium-low self concept	325.60	16	20.3		
Low self concept	361.13	12	15.2		
<u>Father</u>					
High self concept	334.91	16	20.3		
Medium-high self concept	350.28	33	41.8		
Medium-low self concept	351.95	15	19.0		
Low self concept	354.77	15	19.0		
<u>Source of</u>					
variance	df	SS	MS	F	P
Mother's self concept	3	6886.706	2295.568	2.69	N. S.
Father's self concept	3	1444.298	481.432	.564	N. S.
Mother's x father's self concept	9	6017.611	668.623	.783	N. S.
Error	63	53816.929	854.236		
Total	78	68165.544			

Table 15. Summary of statistical results for the mother self concept effect and father self concept effect on the son self concept (N = 73).

Classification	Mean self concept score	N	Percent		
<u>Mother</u>					
High self concept	353. 20	26	35. 6		
Medium-high self concept	345. 47	24	32. 9		
Medium-low self concept	326. 08	10	13. 7		
Low self concept	337. 29	13	17. 8		
<u>Father</u>					
High self concept	349. 98	27	36. 9		
Medium-high self concept	342. 95	17	23. 3		
Medium-low self concept	328. 65	18	24. 7		
Low self concept	340. 47	11	15. 1		
<hr/>					
Source of variance	df	SS	MS	F	P
Mother's self concept	3	4302.957	1434.319	1.612	N. S.
Father's self concept	3	3500.382	1166.744	1.311	N. S.
Mother's x father's self concept	9	5377.382	597.486	.671	N. S.
Error	57	50718.874	889.804		
Total	72	63899.595			

V. DISCUSSION

Hypothesis I

There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.

This hypothesis was retained. The results revealed that those adolescents who had parents with combined totaled self concept scores in the upper quartile did not have significantly different perceptions of communication with their parents than those adolescents who had parents with combined total self concept scores falling in the three lower quartiles. The assumption was that parents with higher self concepts would more often engage in constructive communication patterns with their children.

With a direct observation technique, Jandt (1970) was able to establish that those persons with high acceptance of others and self had more positive communication patterns; Kennedy (1971) concluded, also with the use of a direct observation technique, that self perception influenced communication between parent and adolescent. Bienvenu and McClain (1970) used the PACI and a communication check list to measure the relationship of perceived communication with parents and self esteem in adolescent females. Spearman

rank order correlation coefficient resulted in .64, indicating a positive relationship.

The present study, however, was unable to verify any significant parent self concept effect on family communication patterns with the use of these two instruments. Several explanations could account for this. First, there actually may be no significant self concept effect upon communication patterns.

Second, by combining the mother's self concept score with the father's self concept score, significant information may have been lost. To illustrate, the mother may have had a score located in the upper quartile while the father had a score in the lower quartile. When the scores were totaled, they fell around the 50th percentile.

Third, the validity of the two instruments might be questioned. Possibly the TSCS is not measuring the factor called self concept that has been theorized to be the independent variable in communication. (See Hypothesis VI for a more detailed discussion.) The PACI has been accused of being "highly fakable" in a review by Orr in Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook, 7th edition.

Fourth, the fact that the PACI attempts to measure communication with both parents instead of each parent individually, may have presented another variable. Results might be different if an instrument measuring the adolescent's communication with each

parent separately were administered. Using this method, it might be determined that the self concept of an individual parent has a significant effect upon the communication score. This potential difference is supported by Taylor's findings (1969). Using the PACI, she found that 85 percent of those adolescents who chose both parents to discuss a personal problem with, scored in the top half of the scores; however, only 65 percent of those who chose only their mother, scored in the top half.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant adolescent self concept effect upon his perceived communication with parents.

The adolescent's self concept did appear to have a significant effect upon his perceived communication with his parents. The F value was significant at the .01 level. The mean communication score for the low self concept adolescents was significantly lower from the high, medium-high, and medium-low self concept groups at the .001 level. Those adolescents with low self concepts perceive communication with their parents as much more non-constructive than the groups with higher self concepts. In addition, the means of the communication scores became progressively lower with each respective drop in the mean of the self concept scores.

Based on the results of this study, it can be hypothesized with a high degree of probability, that the self concept of the adolescent has a significant effect upon his perceived communication with parents; however, many questions still remain. As discussed by Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971), the self concept is formed by other's reactions to us. Those reactions then indicate to the individual how significant others feel about us, positively or negatively. The results of this study help substantiate the theory that positive responses elicit positive feelings about self and negative responses elicit negative feelings. The adolescents with low self concepts felt their communication with their parents was non-constructive.

Other questions remain: Were communication patterns perceived as non-constructive because the adolescent perceived himself poorly and became defensive, antagonistic, or withdrawn in his relationship with his parents? As a consequence of the adolescent's non-constructive communication pattern, did the parents then respond in ways that further destroyed the adolescent's self concept? Or did the parent's poor self concept elicit non-constructive communication patterns, therefore lowering the adolescent's self concept. The results of Hypothesis I did not establish that the parent's self concept had significant effect upon the self concept of their adolescent.

Even though the answers to these questions are not evident,

the results establish that there is apparently a relationship and a significant effect regarding the adolescent's self concept and his perceived communication with his parents. It therefore seems logical to concentrate educational efforts on trying to change these non-constructive interactions in a family.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with parents.

There was no significant difference between males and females in their perceived communication with their parents as measured by the PACI. This supports the findings of Bienvenu (1969), Taylor (1969), and Love (1970), all of whom used the PACI. These findings conflict with those of Daluiso (1972), Kennedy (1971), and Larson (1970), who all reported significant differences in communication for gender. If significant sex differences for adolescents do exist in communication with both parents, the PACI is apparently unable to measure it.

Some studies found significant sex differences when specific topics of problems in communication were studied (Slocum 1958; Templeton, 1962). In contrast, the PACI has been verified as measuring a "generalized factor called parent-adolescent communication" (Love, 1970). These differences in findings for sex might be

explained by the fact that different instruments or methods were used in these various studies to measure communication patterns. The fact that the PACI gives one score based on the adolescent's perceived communication pattern for both parents may again be a variable affecting results.

Hypothesis IV

There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent daughter's perceived communication with parents.

The mother's self concept was found to have a significant effect upon her daughter's perceived communication with parents. (However, no mother effects were found for sons [Hypothesis V] or father effects for daughter [Hypothesis VI].) This result apparently substantiates findings of related research not only for mother-daughter relationship patterns but also for female patterns in general.

The medium-low self concept mothers had daughters with the lowest mean communication scores. This was significantly different from the high and medium-high self concept mothers. Although the low self concept mother category had the second lowest adolescent mean communication level, it was not significantly different from the other levels. It might have been helpful to have had

a larger sample in order to increase the probability that more socres would fall into these levels (More mothers had daughters with communication scores above the 50th percentile [51] than below the 50th percentile [28].)

It may be inferred from the results that the mother is the daughter's preferred parent in communication. This is supported by Haring (1966): he found there was a significantly higher agreement in communication between mothers and adolescent daughters than between mothers and sons, fathers and daughters, or fathers and sons.

Beauvien (1970) also found that adolescents reported significantly better communication with the mother than the father.

Female adolescents were more willing to disclose to mothers but not to fathers in Larson's study (1970). Daluiso (1972) had similar findings with respect to disclosure.

Lastly, Kennedy (1971) found that females generally communicated more with both parents than did males. One reason might be seen in Lynn's theory (1959) that "whereas boys will tend to identify with a cultural stereotype of masculinity, girls will identify with aspects of their own mother's role rather than a general cultural stereotype" (p. 134).

Of greater importance in the present study is the finding that the self concept of the mother appears to have a significant effect

upon the daughter's perceived communication with parents. There is an implication here that since Hypothesis I was retained (combined parent self concept effect upon perceived adolescent-parent communication), sex variables need to be controlled in order to reveal effects. If the sex variable could be further controlled by having separate communication instruments, additional significant self concept effects and differences therein might be revealed.

Females in general have more open and responsive communication patterns than males according to the following research results. Jandt (1970) found that adult females expressed greater satisfactions in their responses to people, directed more communications to the group with which they were interacting, and made more assertive supportive communication than did males; males made more assertive, dominant, and antagonistic communications. Alvy (1971) found that for ages 6, 9, and 12, girls displayed a greater degree of emotional sensitivity to the listener than did the boys.

Two findings have emerged: (1) the mother's self concept does have a significant influence upon whether the communication pattern is perceived as constructive or non-constructive by her daughter, and (2) a positive or negative self concept of the adolescent significantly affects, positively or negatively, the perceived communication with the parent. Combined, these two

findings lend strong support to the theory that the lower one's self concept, the more non-constructive the communication patterns, and vice versa.

Hypothesis V

There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent daughter's perceived communications with parents.

The father's self concept as measured by the TSCS does not appear to have a significant effect upon his daughter's perceived communication with parents. A discussion of the female's preference for the mother as the preferred communicator has been given above. This preference for mother may account for the result of the father-daughter hypothesis. In Haring's study (1968), agreement in communication between daughter and father ranked third on the list. Agreement between mothers and sons ranked higher in communication than between father and daughter.

Hypothesis VI

There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent son's perceived communication with parents.

Results revealed no significant difference between the son's perceived communication for high, medium-high, medium-low, and low self concept mothers. This was not the case for female perceived communication and mother self concept effect, discussed under Hypothesis IV.

Since it was assumed that the daughters preferred the mother as the primary communicator in the family, may it be assumed that the son does not set as high a preference for the mother as does the daughter? This assumption is supported by the bulk of previous research findings.

Haring (1966) found that mothers and sons had less communication agreement than mothers and daughters. Larson (1970) states that the females spent more time in conversation with both parents than do males. Deluiso's (1972) findings revealed that sons disclosed less and perceived less disclosure than any other family member. Kennedy (1971), Daluiso (1972), and Haring (1966) all found that males preferred the mother over the father as a communicator. If this preference in the mother over the father exists, there is apparently still not a strong enough relationship for any significant self concept effect to emerge. This might be explained by the sex role identification process; in order for the male to identify with the father, he must "pull away" from the mother more

than does the female and thereby affecting communication--or self concept's effect upon communication.

Hypothesis VII

There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.

The self concept of the father did not have any significant effect upon the son's perceived communication with parents. A number of studies reveal that a low level of communication often exists between fathers and sons. Haring (1966) found that sons and fathers had the least communication agreement as compared to father-daughter, mother-son, and mother-daughter patterns. Results of Daluiso's study (1972) indicated that both sons and fathers disclosed less and were disclosed to, less than mothers and daughters. Larson (1970) and Kennedy (1971) found that males spent less time in communication with both parents than did females.

Apparently, previous researchers cited have offered no explanation for these sex differences. The emerging picture that the mother is the primary and preferred interactor and influencer with the children has, however, been accounted for with the explanation that she spends more time with them than does the father. Brenton (1966) characterizes this phenomena by stating:

The man is the instrumental or task leader, the bread winner, the authority figure, the one who gets things done, the parent who offers conditional love. The woman is the emotional or expressive-integrative leader, the one who keeps house and raises the children, the one solely responsible for binding the family's psychic wounds, the parent who offers unconditional love.

There is another factor that seems to be consistent in these findings--males have more non-constructive communication patterns than do females. These patterns are described by Jandt (1970) as being more dominant, aggressive, and antagonistic; by Alvy (1971) as less sensitive; by Haring (1966) as more inhibited; and by Hill and Sarason (1966) as more defensive. These factors could also account for the selection of the mother over the father.

A question that remains is what accounts for the apparent male non-constructive patterns? The sex role learning pattern imposed upon children by society may provide, at least, a partial answer.

One of the role patterns reinforced by males is the strong, independent, unemotional, immune to failure, image (McCandless, 1967). However, a human being has feelings that are part of the "human condition" (Powell, 1969), prominent among them are fear and anger. If a male is seldom allowed to show any emotions, he can learn to deny that those feelings even exist.

Society has given these feelings morals. Recent writers and

curriculum developers in the field of communication and relationships are trying to extinguish behaviors in which the individual judges his own feelings as well as the feelings of others (Primary Prevention . . . , 1974; E. R. C., 1965; Wallen, 1968; Powell, 1969). If individuals could deal with "feelings as facts" (Powell, 1969) and not as moral indications of one's self worth, destructive defensive mechanisms such denial or intensive feelings of guilt and anxiety involving "immoral" emotions, would no longer be "necessary". Possibly this would lend to more constructive communication patterns.

McCandless (1967), commenting on Hill and Sarason's findings (1966) that young boys are much more defensive than girls of the same age, states:

Parenthetically, this is an interesting derivation of our culture: Girls can admit their feelings, worry, cry, express emotion, be dependent, . . . Boys. . . are supposed to be able to take care of their own feelings privately. May this be one reason why the average American woman lives four or more years longer than the average American man since she can 'be herself,' while he must, according to cultural dictates, cope alone with his feelings and emotions (Mc Dandless, 1967, p. 268).

Marc Feigen Fasteau, a Harvard-trained lawyer and author of The Male Machine has the following to say on father-son relationships:

Boys grow up thinking that nothing ever fazes their fathers, that showing emotion is a terrible thing to

do . . . women are psychologically freer than men, more discriminating, not forced to give up the feeling area of their lives. . . (Cited in Diaminstein, 1975).

Recent literature abounds with writings on aspects and related consequences of our culture's sex role development processes (Lyn, 1959, 1961, 1962, 1966; Slater, 1961; Whiting, 1963; Rossi, 1964; Lindbeck, 1971; Knox and Kupferer, 1971; Money, 1972; Morrison and Borosage, 1973; Green, 1974). Excerpts from a few authors have been offered here as possible explanations for sex differences that seem to be continually appearing in communication patterns, including the differences found in this study.

Hypothesis VIII

There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent self concept.

The combined self concept of parents had no significant effect upon the self concept of their adolescent. This hypothesis was tested in order to provide some evidence that a parent's self concept may be communicated to the child verbally and non-verbally in either constructive or non-constructive patterns. If so, similar self concepts may have developed on the part of the children.

There are several studies which have explored the relationship of the parents' self concept with children's self concept. The findings of these studies conflict with the results of the present

study. Taub (1972) found the mean self concept of parents having similar self concepts was not significantly related to their pre-schooler's self concept. However, he did find a relationship between the mean parental self concept and their child's self concept.

Tocco (1970) found the mother's self concept scores were positively related to their children's (ages 5 and 6) self concept scores. Another study (Swift, 1966) used the Personal Orientation Inventory to measure the "psychological health" of the parents. Swift found that the better the parent's "psychological health", the less the parent needed to feel he had to control the behavior of his child. The parent was better able to accept his child's behavior as well as his own behavior.

However, the present study could not establish that the parents' self concept had a significant effect upon the 18 year old adolescent's self concept. Possible explanations for the disagreement between present results and previous studies follow:

First, as in Hypothesis I, the combining of the parents' self concept scores previous to the categorization of them into percentile levels, could have presented a variable. Was some information lost? If parents who both fell into the quartiles were selected to test for effects on their adolescents' self concept, would results lead to a different conclusion?

Second, the validity of The Tennessee Self Concept Scale may

be questioned. Suinn, reviewing the TSCS in Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook, 7th edition, criticizes the fact that "the norms are overrepresented in number of college students, white subjects, and persons in the 12-30 age bracket." Possibly, this could have been a variable in parent scores obtained in the present study.

Third, there are a number of arguments against the validity of any instrument which claims to measure self concept. McCandless presents one:

To obtain a poor self concept rating, an individual, when the usual techniques are employed, must say negative things about himself. . . . [This criticism could be validated] if it could be demonstrated that children judged as well-adjusted by some technique subject to the 'admission phenomenon' are, on some other measure, more willing to admit derogatory things about themselves than children judged as maladjusted (McCandless, 1967, p. 266).

McCandless adds that the willingness to admit derogatory things may be a lack of defensiveness, rather self rejection.

Taylor and Combs (1962) tested the defensiveness vs. the self rejection theory. Using the California Test of Personality and a behavior description check list, their findings indicated that "willingness to admit derogatory things about oneself is positively, not negatively, related to adjustment." McCandless (1967, pp. 267-268) further hypothesizes that these findings "suggest that honesty about oneself. . . is an important aspect of the self concept and may well be related to good adjustment. "

Other arguments concerning the validity of any attempted measurement of the self concept are abundant in the literature along with discussions of possible implications of many "self concept" variables, including complexity, congruency, consistency, and flexibility of the self concept (Lowe, 1961; Crowne and Stephens, 1961; Wylie, 1961; McCandless, 1967, pp. 289-291). A few of these controversies have been presented here as possible explanations for the results of the present study as well as possible factors to be considered in future research.

Fourth, in studies which explore familiar relationships of self concept, two variables seem to be constantly present: age of the child and measuring instruments. In Taub (1972), Tocco (1970), and Swift's (1966) studies, different instruments were used to measure the self concept within each study: one for the mother and another for the child. In the present study, the same instrument was selected for both the parent and the child, therefore, eliminating this variable. The above cited three studies sampled an age population of 5 and 6 year olds. It is assumed in self concept theory that "normal adults have more complex and broader self concepts than children..." (McCandless, 1967, p. 289). Since the mother is the primary interactor and a highly significant other in the child's life at age 5, is it suprising that positive self concept relationships have been found? However, as the child develops and matures, changes in the

self concept probably come about as a consequence of experiences in many environments. This, coupled with the addition of and change of significant others in his life (Combs, 1965, pp. 47-51), could account for the variance in self concept relationship findings for young children and their parents and adolescents and their parents.

Hypothesis IX

There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent self concept.

This hypothesis was retained. Females do not have significantly different self concepts from males as measured by the TSCS. This finding supports those of White (1968), Higgins (1971), and Beemer (1971) for the adolescent age group. Many studies and writings, which discuss various aspects of self concept, do not explore any sex differences (Rosenberg, 1965; Combs, Avilia, and Purkey, 1965; McCandless, 1967). This may be an indication, as are the results of the present study, that sex is not a factor in self concept.

Hypotheses X, XI, XII, XIII

X. There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her daughter.

XI. There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his daughter.

XII. There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her son.

XIII. There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his son.

These hypotheses, which controlled for sex in testing parent self concept effect on their adolescent were all retained. As measured by the TSCS, the mother's self concept has no effect on either her son's or daughter's self concept. Studies previously cited (Taub, 1972; Tocco, 1970; and Swift, 1966) did find parent-child self concept relationships. Explanations have been fully discussed under Hypothesis VIII.

Suggestions and Implications

Suggestions for further research include: (1) the provision of additional controls and specific changes in procedure, (2) replication, with the use of other instruments, and (3) the sampling of other populations. Results have implications for education, especially in the areas of human sexuality and family living, as well as for family counselors in experimental and applied areas.

Controlling for other variables may reveal parental self

concept effects upon the communication patterns between adolescents and parents. Possibly, variances within the samples were not common. One variable which is of special concern, is the educational level of the mother. Results of a subsidiary hypotheses, which explored the question of significant differences between the amount of mother's education for high, medium-high, and medium-low, and low levels of perceived adolescent communication, resulted in a significant F at the .05 level (see Appendix E). Findings revealed that the adolescents with low scores on The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory had mothers with less education than the mothers of adolescents with higher communication scores. (The t value was significant at the .01 level.) These findings support those of Taylor (1969) and Love (1970).

A question for further research arises: What is the factor in the educational process of the mother (other than amount) that accounts for her adolescent perceiving communication with his parents as more positive? Design did not control for sex. Would the significant difference hold true for both males and females?

A change in the analysis of data procedure for further control is recommended. As discussed in Chapter V, information may have been lost by adding both parents' self concept scores and assigning them to levels. This variable could be controlled by selecting parents who had scores falling in the same quartile. This may be

especially important since the PACI measures, with one score, adolescents' perceived communication with both parents.

The fact that The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory measures communication patterns for both parents may be a variable interfering with results. If two instruments, one for the father and one for the mother, were constructed and validated, factors affecting communication with the parents might better be isolated. Previous findings have shown that adolescents may often have a preference for one parent. This, coupled with the sex role identification variable, lends significant support to the development of separate instruments.

The use of other instruments may be warranted. For example, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory may be an alternative. Perhaps a measure of self acceptance instead of self concept should be tried based on the theory that

There are some who can regard themselves accurately who can face the fact that they are not all they would like to be. . . yet who live happily and constructively with this awareness. . . others [would be] in a constant turmoil because they are not what they think they should be (McCandless, 1967, p. 291).

Another option is to use a test reported to measure self actualization instead of self concept. The Personal Orientation Inventory is widely accepted for this measurement. An instrument which is designed to measure self acceptance or self actualization would eliminate the "derogatory remark" variable.

Other populations may be sampled: for example, another age group. Some studies have revealed significant self concept relationships for mothers and young children. With the development and administration of a communication instrument for this maturity level, self concept effects on communication may be revealed in this younger population. Since a younger adolescent population may be more dependent, in direct contact with their parents, and struggling for more independence, self concept effects on communication may result in other findings, possibly contrary to those for 18 year olds.

Findings revealed that (1) the self concept of the adolescent appears to have a significant effect on his perceived communication with his parents, and (2) the mother's self concept effect was significant for her daughter's perceived communication with parents. The lower the self concept the more negative the perceived communication.

In view of these results, it seems logical to concentrate education efforts on trying to change these non-constructive interactions in a family.

These efforts may well be based on the theories of Rogers (1951), Ginott, (1965), and Powell, (1969), all of whom maintain that positive relationships are fostered through communication characterized by the expression of open, honest feelings in an environment of acceptance, instead of condemnation. This climate

allows an individual to learn to know and accept himself, therefore, increasing his chances of attaining self actualization.

Since findings support that the mother's self concept has an effect upon her adolescent daughter's perceived communication with parents, further research might involve the implementation of a program designed to help mothers and daughters understand self concept and communication patterns. A program based on these objectives is the Communication Workshop for Parents of Adolescents (Brownstone and Dye, 1973). An evaluation of such a program might be done by comparing pre and post test results as one method of determining if attempts to improve self concept and communication patterns were successful.

Results of this study and others may have implications for curriculum and practicum in the areas of human sexuality, family living, and guidance counseling. Findings seem to reveal general sex differences in communication patterns. More research is needed to determine if the basis of these differences lie in the sex role identification process imposed by the family. If the identification process is partly responsible for certain patterns of communication, the positive and negative effects of this process should be revealed in order that destructive practices may be eliminated and positive practices maintained. Efforts are taking place now to

minimize the traditional differences in sex roles; therefore, communication research in the future may, as a result, indicate no sex differences.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of self concept upon parent-adolescent communication patterns. Parental self concept and the self concepts of their adolescent, along with the adolescent's perceived quality of communication with their parents were examined to determine if (1) the parents' self concept had an effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents, (2) the adolescent's self concept had an effect upon his perceived communication with his parents, (3) gender had an effect upon perceived communication patterns, and (4) the self concept of the parents had an effect upon the self concept of the adolescent.

Interest in this problem arose from the findings of recent research (Miller, 1971; Bienvenu and McClain, 1970) which provided support for the assumptions of Ginott (1965). Ginott maintained that the pattern of communication between parent and child would have an effect upon the self concept of the child. In turn, this study proposed the question, "Does the self concept have an effect upon the communication between parent and adolescent?" Other research questions centered around sex and parent self concept effects upon the adolescent's self concept.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.
2. There is no significant adolescent self concept effect upon his perceived communication with his parents.
3. There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent's perceived communication with his parents.
4. There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent daughter's perceived communication with her parents.
5. There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent daughter's perceived communication with her parents.
6. There is no significant mother self concept effect upon her adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.
7. There is no significant father self concept effect upon his adolescent son's perceived communication with his parents.
8. There is no significant parent self concept effect upon the adolescent self concept.
9. There is no significant adolescent sex effect upon the adolescent self concept.
10. There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her daughter.
11. There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his daughter.

12. There is no significant mother self concept effect upon the self concept of her son.

13. There is no significant father self concept effect upon the self concept of his son.

The population consisted of 18 year old male and female university freshmen from two-parent, middle socioeconomic class families. A random sample of freshmen students was assumed to be present in the lower division personal health classes at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. A total of 152 adolescents and their respective parents comprised the sample for the study.

Names, addresses, and demographic data were obtained from the Information Questionnaire. The adolescents were given The Tennessee Self Concept Scale and The Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory to obtain measurements of self concept and perceived communication with parents respectively. A Letter of Explanation and The Tennessee Self Concept Scale were mailed to parents. Sample return comprised 89.4 percent. The Total Positive Scores from the TSCS were assigned to quartiles levels labeled high, medium-high, medium-low, and low self concept. The data were subjected to two and three-way analysis of variance factorial designs. The factors were fixed and the cell sizes were unequal.

The major findings were:

1. Combined parental self concept seemed to have no effect

upon the adolescent's perceived communication with parents.

2. The adolescent's self concept appeared to have a significant effect upon his perceived communication with parents. Those adolescents who had low self concept perceived communication with their parents as significantly more non-constructive than those adolescents who had higher self concepts.

3. There was no significant difference between adolescent males and females in their perceived communication with their parents.

4. The mother's self concept appeared to significantly influence her daughter's perceived communication with her parents. Medium-low self concept mothers had daughters who perceived communication with their parents as significantly more non-constructive than daughters of high and medium-high self concept mothers.

5. The father's self concept did not appear to affect his daughter's perceived communication with parents.

6. Neither the mother's nor the father's self concept seemed to have any effect upon the son's perceived communication with parents.

7. Even when controlled for sex, the self concepts of the parents had no measurable effect upon their adolescent's self concept.

8. Results of a supplemental hypothesis revealed significant difference in the mother's educational level for her adolescent's perceived communication with parents. Those adolescents perceiving communication with parents as non-constructive had mothers with significantly lower educational levels than the mothers of those adolescents who perceived communication with parents as more constructive.

Discussion of the finding included suggestions for study replication with design variations including additional controls and specific changes in procedure and instruments. Consideration was given to the possibility of sex role influences upon communication patterns. Implications for education, especially in the areas of human sexuality and family living as well as for family counselors in experimental and applied areas were presented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alvy, Kerby T. The Development of Listener-Adopted Communications in Grade School Children From Different Social Class Backgrounds. Unpublished Dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1971.
- Atchinson, Calvin. A Comparative Study of the Self-Concept of of Behavior Problem and Non-Behavior Problem High-School Boys. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.
- Ausubell, R. and Ausubell, P. "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in H. A. Passow (ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.
- Baily, Melinda M. Vocal and Verbal Communication of Emotion by Parents of Schizophrenic and Non-Psychotic Disturbed Adolescents and Young Adults. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1972.
- Balester, R. J. The Self-Concept and Juvenile Delinquency. Unpublished dissertation, Vanderbilt University. 1956.
- Beaubien, Sister Clare Oliva. Adolescent-Parent Communication Styles. Unpublished dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970.
- Beemer, Lynda C. Developmental Changes in the Self-Concepts of Children and Adolescent. Unpublished dissertation, University of Maryland, 1971.
- Berger, E. M. "The Relation Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Other," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47. (1951), 778-782.
- Bienvenu, Millard J. Sr. A Counselor's Guide to Accompany a Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory. Saluda, North Carolina: Family Life Publications, Inc. 1969.
- _____. "Measurement of Parent-Adolescent Communication," The Family Coordinator. April, 1969, pp. 117-121.

- Bienvenu, Millard J. Sr. and McClain, Sylvia. "Parent-Adolescent Communication and Self-Esteem." Journal of Home Economics. Vol. 62, No. 5, (May, 1970). 344-345.
- Bills, Robert E. About People and Teaching. Vol. XXVIII, (December, 1955), No. 2 Bureau of School Service, College of Education, University of Kentucky.
- Brenton, Myron. The American Male. New York: Coward, McCann, and Geoghegan, Inc., 1966. in Human Sexuality: Contemporary Perspectives. "New Ways to Manliness" Myron Brenton. Eleanor S. Morrison and Vera Borosage. (eds.) Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1973, pp. 70-90.
- Brownstone, Jane E. and Dye, Carol J. Communications Workshop for Parents and Adolescents. Leader's Guide + Parent's Review. Champaign, Ill: Research Press, 1973.
- Cargile, Lee L. The Relationship of Counselor Self-Acceptance to Counselor Effectiveness as Found in Secondary School Counselors Employed in Four Counties of Northwest Arkansas. Unpublished dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1971.
- Carlson, R. "Stability and Change and the Adolescent's Self-Image." Child Development, 36, (1965.) 659-666.
- Castaneda, A., McCandless, B. R., and Palermo, D. S. "The Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale." Child Development, 27, (1956), 317-326.
- Cervantes, Lucius I. The Dropout. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.
- Chodorkogg, B. "Adjustment and the Discrepancy Between the Perceived and Ideal Self," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 10, (1954), 266-268.
- Clark, B. M. and Trowbridge, N. T. "Encouraging Creativity Through Inservice Teacher Education," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 4(1971), 87-94.

- Combs, Arthur W., Avila, Donald C., and Purkey, William W. Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1902.
- Coopersmith, Stanley. The Antecedents of Self Esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1967.
- _____. "A Method for Determining Types of Self Esteem, " Journal of Educational Psychology, 59, (1959), 89-94.
- Costello, Daniel E. A Study of the Relationships Between Family Communication Patterns and Adolescent Autonomy. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Courtney, E. Wayne and Sedgwick, Lorry K. Research and Statistics Learning Packets. Corvallis, Oregon: Division of Continuing Education, 1973.
- Crandall, J. J. and Bellugi, Ursula. "Some Relationships of Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Conceptualizations to Personal Social Adjustment, " Journal of Personality, 23, (1954), 224-232.
- Crowell, Laura, Katcher, Allan, and Miyamota, S. Frank. "Self Concepts of Communication Skill and Performance in Small Group Discussion, " Speech Monographs, XXII (1955), 20-27.
- Crowne, D. P. and Stevens, M. W. "Self-Acceptance and Self-Evaluative Behavior: A Critique of Methodology, " Psychology Bulletin, 58, (1961), 104-121.
- Culler, I. B. "Stability of Self Concept in Schizophrenia, " Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 71, (1966), 275-279.
- Daluiso, Victor E. Self-Disclosure and Perception of that Self-Disclosure Between Parents and Their Teenage Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. International University, 1972.

- Deutsch, M. "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement." Society for Applied Anthropology Itaca: Cornell University Press, 1960 (Monograph 2).
- Diaminstein, Barbaralee. "Men and Their Work." Field Newspaper Syndicate. Published in Register-Guard, Eugene, Oregon. April 9, 1975, p. 8E.
- DiCola, Joseph M. Persistence of 5th Graders of Varying Levels of Self-Esteem Under Various Conditions of Reinforcement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1971.
- Dittes, S. E. and Capra, P. C. "Affiliation: Comparability and Compatability," American Psychologist, 17, (1962), 329.
- Dubbe, M. C. "What Parents are Not Told May Hurt, A Study of Communication Between Teenagers and Parents," The Family Life Coordinator, 14 (1965), 57-110.
- Duncan, Lucius W. Parent-Counselor Conferences and Parent-Child Communications. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1968.
- Educational Research Council of America. Education in Human Behavior. Cleveland: E. R. C., 1965.
- Ehrenwald, Jan. "Family Dynamics and Communication Theory," The Journal of Communication. 13: (Sept. 1963), 191-198.
- Fasteau, Marc Feigen. The Male Machine. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Fey, W. F. "Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others: A Revaluation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50, (1955), 274-276.
- Fitts, William H. Manual: Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Gecas, Viktor, Parent-Child Interaction and Adolescent Self-Evaluation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

- Gibb, S. R. "Defensive Communication," The Journal of Communication, 11, (1961), 141-148.
- Ginott, Haim G. Between Parent and Child. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965.
- Green, Richard. Sexual Identity Conflict in Children and Adults. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1974.
- Haring, Jean. Freedom of Communication Between Parents and Adolescents with Problems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1966.
- Hart, Ross V. The Differential Effects of Counselors Trained in Facilitative Communication on the Self-Concepts, Problems and Level of Verbal Interaction of Mississippi-Delta Concentrated Employment Program Trainees. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Mississippi State University, 1972.
- Higgins, Edward C. Self-Esteem and Its Relationship to Socio-Economic Condition, Grade Level, Sex, Height, and Weight in a Suburban and an Inner City High School. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, 1971.
- Hill, K. T. and Sarason, S. B. "A Further Longitudinal Study of the Relation of Test Anxiety and Defensiveness to Test and School Performance Over the Elementary School Years." Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm., 31, (1966), 1-76.
- Jack, Rutha W. A Study of Children's Perception of Their Oral Communication Skills and of Their Self Esteem. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, 1971.
- Jandt, Fred E. An Experimental Study of Self-Concept and Satisfaction from Consummatory Communication. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1970.
- Kennedy, Carroll E. "Patterns of Parent-Student Communication," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 7 (Oct. 1971), 513-520.
- Knox, William E. and Kupferer, Harriet J. "A Discontinuity in the Socialization of Males in the United States," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Vol 17 (3) (July 1971), 251-261.

- Larson, Robert E. Adolescent Perceptions of Parent-Youth Communication: Patterns, Processes, and Correlates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Florida State University, 1970. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970-71, V 31, 4918-A.
- Lefebber, James. The Delinquent's Self Perception. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1964.
- Levanway, R. W. "The Effect of Stress on Expressed Attitudes Toward Self and Others." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50, (1955), 225-226.
- Lindbeck, Violette S. "The Cost of Sexual Apartheid." Sexuality: A Search for Perspective. Donald L. Grummon and Andrew M. Barclay, (eds.) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1971.
- Lipsitt, L. P.; Engen, T.; and Kay, H. "A Self-Concept Scale for Children and Its Relationship to the Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale." Child Development, 29, (1958), 463-472.
- Long, G. H. and Henderson, E. H. "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 113, (1968), 49-51.
- Love, David Nash W. Jr., Parent-Adolescent Communications as Related to Family Social Variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Florida State University, 1970.
- Lowe, C. M. "The Self-Concept: Fact or Artifact?," Psychology Bulletin 58, (1961), 325-336.
- Lynn, David B. "A Note on Sex Differences in the Development of Masculine and Feminine Identification." Psychological Review, 66:2 (1959), 126-35.
- _____. "Husband-Father Role in the Family," Marriage and Family Living. 1961, p. 3.
- _____. "Sex Role and Parental Identification," Child Development 33:3 (1962), 555-64.

- Lynn, David B. "The Process of Learning Parental and Sex-Role Identification," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 28, No. 4, (Nov. 1966), 465-70.
- McCandless, Boyd R. Children: Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- McGuire, C. and White, G. D. "The Measurement of Social Status," Research paper in human development, No. 3 (revised). Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas Press, March 1955.
- McIntyre, C. J. "Acceptance by Others and Its Relations to Acceptance of Self and Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, (1952), 624-625.
- McPherson, Sigrid R. Parents and Their Disturbed Adolescent Child. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1963.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Metz, Marshal T. and Miller, Monroe J. "What Type of Communication Increases Understanding Between Delinquents and Their Parents?" Colorado University, Boulder. Institute of Behavioral Science, May, 1971. 8 p. Paper presented at the Rocky Mountain Psychological Assoc. Conven. in Denver, Colorado, May 12-15, 1971.
- Miller, Thomas W. Differential Response Patterns of Parents as They Affect the Child's Self Esteem. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971.
- Mitchell, S. U. Jr. "Goal Setting Behavior as a Function of Self-Acceptance, Over and Underachievement, and Related Personality Variables," Journal of Educational Psychology, 50, (1959), 93-104.
- Money, John and Ehrhardt, Anke A. Man and Woman, Boy and Girl. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Morrison, Eleanor S. and Borosage, Vera, (eds.) Human Sexuality: Contemporary Perspectives. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1973.

- Murphey, E. B., et. al. "Development of Autonomy and Parent Child Interaction in Late Adolescent," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 33, No. 4 (July, 1963).
- Newcomb, Theodore, M. "The Prediction of Interpersonal Attraction," The American Psychologist, XI, (1956), 575-586.
- Norton, Byron E. Effects of Human Relations Training Upon Teacher Trainee's Level of Facilitative Communication, Self-Concept and Creativity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1972.
- Omwake, Katherine T. "The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others as Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18, (1954), 443-446.
- Parsons, T. and Bales, R. F. Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1955.
- Perry, P. C. Self Acceptance in Relation to Adjustment. Dissertation International Abstracts, 1961, 22, 317-318.
- Phillips, E. L. "Attitudes Toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 15, (1951), 79-81.
- Pilisuk, M. "Anxiety, Self Acceptance, and Open-Mindness," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 93, (1958), 249-276.
- Powell, John. Why I Am Afraid to Tell You Who I Am. Niles, Ill: Argus Communications, 1969.
- Primary Prevention in Mental Health. A joint project of the City of Salem, Salem School District 24J, and Marion County Mental Health Program funded by a grant from the State of Oregon, Mental Health Division. Project Report, Oct. 1974.
- Quadri, A. Jamil and Kaleem, G. A. (Aligarh Muslim Univ., India) "Effect of Parent Attitudes on Personality and Self-Esteem of Children," Behavioro-metric, Vol 1 (1) (1971), 19-24.

- Reckless, Walter; Dinitz, S.; and Murray, E. "Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 21, (1956), 744-746.
- Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory. Boston: Houghton-Mufflin Co., 1951.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and Adolescent Self Image. Princeton: Univ. Press, 1965.
- Rossi, A. "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," Daedalus, 2, (1964), 607-652.
- Santilli, Muriel. "Effects of Parent Communication Training on Child Behavior," State University of New York--Buffalo, Office of Education (DHEW) Washington, D.C., 1972.
- Sherif, Muzafer. "Self Concept," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, David L. Sills, (ed.), New York: Macmillan, Vol XIV, (1968), 151.
- Slater, P. "Parental Role Differentiation," American Journal Sociology, 3, (1961), 296-311.
- Slocum, W. L. "Some Factors Associated With Happiness in Unbroken Homes," The Family Life Coordinator, 6, (1958), 36-39.
- Soares, A. T. and Soares, L. M. "Self Concepts of Disadvantaged and Advantaged Students," Proceedings of the Seventh Eighth Convention, American Psychological Association, 1970.
- Speisman, Leonard. Relative Effectiveness of Short Term Facilitative Communication Training on Secondary Students' Self-Concept. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Mississippi, 1972.
- Stein, Sandra L. The Interrelationships Among Self-Esteem, Personal Values, and Interpersonal Values. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1969.

- Swift, Marshall J. Parent Child-Rearing Attitudes and Psychological Health of the Parent. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1966.
- Taub, Marvin Julius. An Investigation of the Relationship Between Parent and Child Self-Concept Measurements. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts, 1972-73, V. 33, 6742-A.
- Taylor, C. and Combs, A. W. "Self-Acceptance and Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 16, (1952), 89-91.
- Taylor, D. H. Parent-Adolescent Communication Patterns. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1969.
- Taylor, D. M. Consistency of the Self-Concept. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1953.
- Templeton, J. A. "The Influence of Family Size on Some Aspects of Teen-Agers' Attitudes, Behavior, and Perceptions of Home Life," The Family Life Coordinator, 11, (1962), 51-57.
- Thomas, Judith Ann W. An Evaluation of the Effect of a Language Arts Program on Self Concept and Communication Skills of Disadvantaged Junior High School Students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1971.
- Trowbridge, Norma and Trowbridge Lambert. "Self Concept and Socio-Economic Status," Child Study Journal, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1972), 123-143.
- Trowbridge, Norma. "Self Concept and Socio-Economic Class," Psychology in the Schools, 7, 1970, 3.
- Wackman, Daniel B. Family Communication Patterns and Adolescents' Responses in Role Conflict Situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1968.
- Wallen, John. "Constructive Openness," Northwest Regional Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, 1968.

- White, Maurice O. Alienation and Self-Esteem as They Relate to Race, Sex, Socioeconomic and School Variables in Urban High School Age Youth. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1968.
- Whiting, B. B. (ed.) Six Cultures: Studies of Child Rearing. New York: Wiley, 1963.
- Wiebe, Bernhard, and Williams, John D. "Self Disclosure to Parents by High School Seniors," Psychological Reports, Vol. 31 (3) (December, 1972), 690.
- Witty, P. A. (Ed.) The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged: Sixty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Wylie, Ruth C. The Self-Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature. Lincoln Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Zimbardo, P. and Formica, R. "Emotional Comparison and Self-Esteem as Determinants of Affiliation," Journal of Personality, 31, (1963), 141-162.
- Zirkle, P. A. and Moses, E. G. "Self Concept and Ethnic Group Membership Among Public School Students," American Educational Research Journal, 2, (1971), 253-265.

APPENDIX A

APPROVAL FROM THE COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION
OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

TEST INSTRUMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Written Instructions for PACI

Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory

Written Instructions for Adolescents on TSCS

Written Instructions for Parents on TSCS

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Committee for Protection of Human Subjects

Summary of Review

Title: The Effect of Parent and Adolescent Self-Concept Upon
Perceived Communication with Parents

Program Director: David Phelps (Rosalind Flora)

Recommendation:

XX Approval
 Provisional Approval
 Disapproval
 No Action

Remarks:

Date: 1/8/75

Signature: _____

cc: Dr. MacDonald

mep

J. Ralph Shay
Assistant Dean of
Research
Phone: 754-3437

FORM A

PARENT-ADOLESCENT COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

Developed by
Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr.

With this inventory you are offered an opportunity to make an objective study of communication between yourself and your parents to discover the good points in this relationship and also where you may be having problems. You will find it both interesting and helpful to make this study.

DIRECTIONS

1. The Parent-Adolescent Inventory is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers to it. The most helpful answer to each question is your indication of the way you feel at the moment.
2. Your answers to this inventory are confidential. You are not asked to sign your name or to identify yourself in any way. You can not receive a grade because all of the answers you give are considered right answers for you.
3. Use the following examples for practice. Put a check (✓) in one of the three blanks on the right to show how the question applies to you and to your ways of relating to your parents.

Do others try to see your side of things?

YES		NO
usually	sometimes	seldom
_____	_____	_____

Do you express your opinions to your parents?

YES		NO
usually	sometimes	seldom
_____	_____	_____

4. The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually. The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as seldom or never.

The middle column SOMETIMES should be marked when you definitely can not answer YES or NO. USE THIS COLUMN AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE. Most young people are able to give a yes or a no answer to these questions.

5. Read each question carefully and mark your personal answer to it. Be sure to answer every question.

PARENT-ADOLESCENT COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

	YES usually	sometimes	NO seldom
1. Is family conversation easy and pleasant at meals?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
2. Do your parents wait until you are through talking before "having their say?"	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
3. Do you pretend you are listening to your parents when actually you have tuned them out?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
4. Do you feel that your father lectures and preaches to you too much?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
5. Does your family do things as a group?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
6. Do your parents seem to respect your opinion?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
7. Do they laugh at you or make fun of you?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
8. Do you feel your mother wishes you were a different kind of person?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
9. Do either of your parents believe that you are bad?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
10. Does your family talk things over with each other?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
11. Do you discuss personal problems with your mother?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
12. Do you feel your father wishes you were a different kind of person?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
13. Do your parents seem to talk to you as if you were much younger than you actually are?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
14. Do they show an interest in your interests and activities?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
15. Do you discuss personal problems with your father?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
16. Does he pay you compliments or say nice things to you?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
17. Do your parents ask your opinion in deciding how much spending money you should have?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
18. Do you discuss matters of sex with either of your parents?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
19. Do you feel that your father trusts you?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
20. Do you help your parents understand you by saying how you think and feel?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
21. Does your mother pay compliments or say nice things about you?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
22. Does she have confidence in your abilities?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
23. Are your parents sarcastic toward you?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
24. Do you feel that your mother trusts you?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
25. Does your father have confidence in your abilities?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
26. Do you hesitate to disagree with either of your parents?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
27. Do you fail to ask your parents for things because you believe they will deny your requests?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
28. Does your mother criticize you too much?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
29. Does your father really try to see your side of things?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
30. Do either of your parents allow you to get angry and blow off steam?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
31. Do either of your parents consider your opinion in making decisions which concern you?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
32. Does your father criticize you too much?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
33. Do you find your mother's tone of voice irritating?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>

	YES usually	sometimes	NO seldom
34. Do your parents try to make you feel better when you are "down in the dumps?"	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
35. Does your mother really try to see your side of things?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
36. Do you find your father's tone of voice irritating?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
37. Do either of your parents explain their reason for not letting you do something?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
38. Do you feel that your mother lectures and preaches too much?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
39. Do you ask your parents about their reasons for decisions they make concerning you?	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
40. Do you find it hard to say what you feel at home?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ADOLESCENTS ON THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

Responses	Completely	Mostly	Partly false		
	false	false	and	Mostly	Completely
				true	true
	1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARENTS ON THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

Two answer sheets are provided, one for the FATHER and one for the MOTHER. Please check to make sure you have the correct one before beginning. BOTH PARENTS must take this questionnaire on the separate answer sheets provided or the study will be invalidated. It is NOT necessary to put your name on the answer sheets. This is in order to maintain your anonymity in this study.

Write ONLY on the answer sheet. Please do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

RESPONSES

Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

1.	I have a healthy body	1
2.	I am an attractive person	2
3.	I consider myself a sloppy person	3
4.	I am a decent sort of person	4
5.	I am an honest person	5
6.	I am a bad person	6
7.	I am a cheerful person	7
8.	I am a calm and easy going person	8
9.	I am a nobody	9
10.	I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble	10
11.	I am a member of a happy family	11
12.	My friends have no confidence in me	12
13.	I am a friendly person	13
14.	I am popular with men	14
15.	I am not interested in what other people do	15
16.	I do not always tell the trust	16
17.	I get angry sometimes	17
18.	I like to look nice and neat all the time	18
19.	I am full of aches and pains	19
20.	I am a sick person	20
21.	I am a religious person	21
22.	I am a moral failure	22
23.	I am a morally weak person	23
24.	I have a lot of self-control	24
25.	I am a hateful person	25
26.	I am losing my mind	26
27.	I am an important person to my friends and family . .	27
28.	I am not loved by my family	28
29.	I feel that my family doesn't trust me	29
30.	I am popular with women	30
31.	I am mad at the whole world	31
32.	I am hard to be friendly with	32
33.	Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.	33
34.	Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross .	34
35.	I am neither too fat nor too thin.	35
36.	I like my looks just the way they are	36
37.	I would like to change some parts of my body	37
38.	I am satisfied with my moral behavior	38
39.	I am satisfied with my relationship to God	39
40.	I ought to go to church more	40
41.	I am satisfied to be just what I am	41

42.	I am just as nice as I should be	42
43.	I despise myself	43
44.	I am satisfied with my family relationships	44
45.	I understand my family as well as I should	45
46.	I should trust my family more	46
47.	I am as sociable as I want to be	47
48.	I try to please others, but I don't overdo it	48
49.	I am no good at all from a social standpoint	49
50.	I do not like everyone I know	50
51.	Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke	51
52.	I am neither too tall nor too short	52
53.	I don't feel as well as I should	53
54.	I should have more sex appeal	54
55.	I am as religious as I want to be	55
56.	I wish I could be more trustworthy	56
57.	I shouldn't tell so many lies	57
58.	I am as smart as I want to be	58
59.	I am not the person I would like to be	59
60.	I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do	60
61.	I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living)	61
62.	I am too sensitive to things my family says	62
63.	I should love my family more	63
64.	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people	64
65.	I should be more polite to others	65
66.	I ought to get along better with other people	66
67.	I gossip a little at times	67
68.	At times I feel like swearing	68
69.	I take good care of myself physically	69
70.	I try to be careful about my appearance	70
71.	I often act like I am "all thumbs"	71
72.	I am true to my religion in my everyday life	72
73.	I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong	73
74.	I sometimes do very bad things	74
75.	I can always take care of myself in any situation	75
76.	I take the blame for things without getting mad	76
77.	I do things without thinking about them first	77
78.	I try to play fair with my friends and family	78
79.	I take a real interest in my family	79
80.	I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living)	81
82.	I get along well with other people	82
83.	I do not forgive others easily	83
84.	I would rather win than lose in a game	84

85.	I feel good most of the time	85
86.	I do poorly in sports and games	86
87.	I am a poor sleeper	87
88.	I do what is right most of the time	88
89.	I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead	89
90.	I have trouble doing the things that are right	90
91.	I solve my problems quite easily	91
92.	I change my mind a lot	92
93.	I try to run away from my problems	93
94.	I do my share of work at home	94
95.	I quarrel with my family	95
96.	I do not act like my family thinks I should	96
97.	I see good points in all the people I meet.	97
98.	I do not feel at ease with other people.	98
99.	I find it hard to talk with strangers	99
100.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today	100

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Verbal Instructions to Students Upon Administration
of Questionnaire

"All 18 year old students in the 100 personal health classes here at Oregon State have been chosen for a doctoral dissertation study dealing with parent-youth relationships. In order to do this, it is necessary that I obtain your name and address as well as other information about you and your family.

From these questionnaires certain students and their respective parents will be selected to participate in the research. All other questionnaires no longer needed will be destroyed. If you are one of these chosen, you will be contacted soon.

At this point I need and would very much appreciate your cooperation. If you now choose to take this questionnaire, it will require only 5 minutes of your time. All information you provide will be kept completely confidential. You do have a choice as to whether you will participate, and have the right to refuse if you do not choose to do so. You may withdraw from the study at any time.

Thank you very much for your participation. "

GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please print

Name: _____ Sex: Male Female
(circle one)

*Home Address: _____

Tel. Ph. No. _____

At home I live with: _____ Real mother _____ Real father Other
 _____ Step-mother _____ Step-father _____

Parent's name with whom you are living:

Mother's/Step-mother's _____

Father's/Step-father's _____

My father/step-father's work is (Explain what he does) _____

My mother's/step-mother's work is: _____

The main source of my family income is: Choose ONE of following:

1. Wages; hourly wages, piece work, or weekly pay check.
2. Savings and investments.
3. Odd jobs or seasonal work.
4. Welfare or Charity.
5. Salary, commissions or regular income paid on a monthly or semi-monthly basis.
6. Profits, fees, royalties, share of profit from a business or profession.

Draw a circle around the number of years of schooling your father/step-father has completed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	Other _____
Grade School	High School	College	

How much schooling has your mother/step-mother completed?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	Other _____
Grade School	High School	College	

APPENDIX C

LETTERS

Letter of Explanation

Son

Daughter

Research Findings Follow-Up Letter

February 21, 1975

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Jones,

Your son has expressed his desire to participate in a doctoral research study here at Oregon State University. As one part of a project concerned with parent-youth relations, you and other parents all over the United States along with their son or daughter are being asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Your son has already completed the same questionnaire.

Your names or your son's name will not appear on your questionnaires as we are only interested in gaining an over-all view from several hundred parents. All materials will be kept in strict confidence and each family will be assigned a number to insure anonymity. It is our hope that you will consent to participate. Participation is wholly voluntary and is expected to take about fifteen minutes of your time. Instructions are enclosed inside the questionnaire booklet.

As a parent myself, I appreciate both your interest and concern about improving parent-youth relations and I trust that this study will shed new light on this area. I will personally mail you a copy of the study's results when it is completed. In the meantime if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by mail through the above stated address.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the two answer sheets and the test booklet. YOUR COOPERATION IN RETURNING THESE NOW IS SINCERELY APPRECIATED. Thank you very much.

Sincerely

Rosalind R. Flora
Doctoral Candidate
Instructor

February 21, 1975

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Smith,

Your daughter has expressed her desire to participate in a doctoral research study here at Oregon State University. As one part of a project concerned with parent-youth relations, you and other parents all over the United States along with their son or daughter are being asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Your daughter has already completed the same questionnaire.

Your names or your daughter's name will not appear on your questionnaires as we are only interested in gaining an over-all view from several hundred parents. All materials will be kept in strict confidence and each family will be assigned a number to insure anonymity. It is our hope that you will consent to participate. Participation is wholly voluntary and is expected to take about fifteen minutes of your time. Instructions are enclosed inside the questionnaire booklet.

As a parent myself, I appreciate both your interest and concern about improving parent-youth relations and I trust that this study will shed new light on this area. I will personally mail you a copy of the study's results when it is completed. In the meantime if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by mail through the above stated address.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the two answer sheets and the test booklet. YOUR COOPERATION IN RETURNING THESE NOW IS SINCERELY APPRECIATED. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Rosalind R. Flora
Doctoral Candidate
Instructor

May 10, 1975

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Jones and John,

About two months ago you aided me a great deal by participating in a doctoral study here at Oregon State University. I promised you the results:

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of self concept upon the 18 year old student's perceived communication with his parents. Both parents and their son or daughter were given the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. In addition the sons or daughters were given an inventory which revealed how they felt about talking to their parents--whether they felt open and were accepted. The hypothesis was that if one has a high self concept, he will have more constructive communication patterns than those who have low self concepts. One hundred and fifty-two families participated.

The major findings were as follows:

1. Those 18 year old students with low self concepts felt that their communication with their parents was significantly more non-constructive while those 18 year olds with high self concepts felt that their communication with their parents was significantly more constructive.

2. The mother's self concept had a significant effect upon her daughter's perceived communication with her parents, but not her son's. The mothers with a lower self concept had daughters who perceived communication with their parents as more non-constructive than did the daughters of mothers with high self concepts.

3. The father's self concept had no significant effect upon his son's or daughter's perceived communication with their parents.

However, as with any research study, findings can only be accepted with a certain degree of probability for similar situations, but not all.

I am enclosing a sheet entitled "Constructive Openness" which discusses constructive communication patterns. I hope that it will be as much interest and use to you as it has been in my family and in my classes.

I am deeply indebted to you for your time and cooperation in this study. If it were not for you, it could not have been possible.

Sincerely,

Rosalind R. Flora, Ph. D.

CONSTRUCTIVE OPENNESS

Rarely do two persons talk openly about their reactions to each other's actions. Most of us withhold our feelings about the other (even in relations that are very important or dear to us) because we FEAR HURTING THE OTHER, MAKING HIM ANGRY, OR BEING REJECTED by him. Because we don't know how to be constructively open, we say nothing. The other person continues, totally unaware of our reaction to his actions. Likewise, we continue ignorant of the effect our actions produce in him. As a result, many relationships that could be productive and enjoyable gradually flounder and sink under the accumulated load of tiny annoyances, hurt feelings, and misunderstandings that were never talked about openly.

The following points increase the probability that openness will improve a relationship rather than harming it:

1. Openness must stem from a DESIRE TO IMPROVE YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OTHER. Openness is not an end in itself but a means to an end. We are not open with people about whom we do not care. When attempting to elicit an open sharing of reactions to each other, try to convey that this encounter indicates that you value your relation with the other and wish to improve it BECAUSE IT IS IMPORTANT TO YOU.
2. Aim at creating a SHARED UNDERSTANDING of your relationship. You wish to know how the other perceives and feels about your actions. You wish him to know how YOU PERCEIVE AND FEEL ABOUT his actions. FEELINGS ARE FACTS. They are not moral or immoral. ADMIT EMOTIONS AND THEN DECIDE HOW YOU ARE GOING TO HANDLE THEM.
3. Recognize that openness involves RISK TAKING. You cannot receive a maximum guarantee with minimum risk. Your willingness to risk your self-esteem, being rejected or hurt by the other, depends upon the importance of the relationship to you. Likewise, you cannot ask that the other person guarantee that he not become angry or feel hurt by your comments. The important point is that you are willing to risk his being himself--whatever he feels--in the effort to make the encounter into a learning situation for both of you.
4. Although the discussion may become intense, spirited, angry, or tearful, it should be NONCOERCIVE and not an attempt to get the other to change. Each should use the information as

he sees fit. The attitude should not be "Who's wrong and who's right" but "What can each of us learn from this discussion that will make our working together more productive and more satisfying? "

As a result of the discussion, one, both, or neither of you may act differently in the future. Each, however, will act with fuller awareness of the effect of his actions on the other as well as with more understanding of the other's intention. Any change, thus, will be a SELF-CHOSEN rather than to placate or submit to the other.

5. TIMING IS IMPORTANT. Reactions should be shared as close to the behavior that aroused them as possible so that the other will know exactly what behavior is being discussed. For example, behavior during the encounter itself can be commented on, e. g. , "What you just said is the kind of remark that makes me feel pushed away. "
6. Disturbing situations should be discussed as they occur rather than saving up massive accumulations of hurt feelings and annoyances and dumping them on the other all at one time.
7. PARAPHRASE THE OTHER'S comments about you to make sure that you understand them as he intends them. CHECK to make sure the other understands your comments in the way you intend them.
8. Statements are more helpful if you are. . .
 - a. SPECIFIC rather than general. "You bumped my cup, " rather than "You never watch where you're going. "
 - b. TENTATIVE rather than absolute. "You seem unconcerned about Jimmy, " rather than "You don't give a damn about Jimmy and never will. "
 - c. INFORMING rather than ordering. "I hadn't finished yet, " rather than "Stop interrupting me. "
9. Use perception-checking responses to insure that you are not making false assumptions about the other's feelings. "I thought you weren't interested in trying to understand my idea. Was I wrong? " "Did my last statement bother you? "

10. The LEAST HELPFUL kinds of statements are those that sound as if they are information about the other person but are really expressions of your own feelings coming out as. . .
 - a. Judgments about the other, "You never pay any attention. "
 - b. Name-calling, trait labelling, "You're a phony, " "you're too rude. "
 - c. Accusations--inputing undesirable motive to the other: "You always have to be in the center of attention. "
 - d. Commands and orders "Stop laughing", "Don't talk so much. "
 - e. Sarcasm. "You always look on the bright side of things, don't you? " (when the opposite is meant).
11. The most helpful kinds of information about yourself and your reactions are. . .
 - a. BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS: reporting the specific acts of the other that affect you. "You cut in before I had finished my sentence. "
 - b. DESCRIBING YOUR OWN FEELINGS: "I feel blue. " "I like what you just said. " You should try to describe your feelings in such a way that they are seen as temporary and capable of change rather than as permanent attitudes. For example, "At this point I'm very annoyed with you", rather than "I dislike you and I always will. "
12. PAST IS PAST!--Don't drag up to hurt or manipulate--only possibly to clarify feelings at the time (present).
13. When there is ANGER, there is HURT, Find the hurt.

Compiled from writings by
 John Walden
 Northwest Regional Lab
 Portland, Oregon

John Powell, Why I am Afraid
 to Tell You Who I Am

APPENDIX D

Measurement of Socio-Economic Status

McGuire-White Short Form

MEASUREMENT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Table 1. Source of income.*

1.	Inherited saving and investments; "old money" reputed to provide basic income.
2.	Earned wealth; "new money" has provided "transferable" investment income.
3.	Profits, fees, royalties, includes executives who receive a "share of profit."
4.	Salary, commissions, regular income paid on monthly or yearly basis.
5.	Wages on hourly basis; piece work; weekly checks as distinguished from monthly.
6.	Income from "odd jobs" or private relief; "sharecropping" or seasonal work.
7.	Public relief or charity; non-respectable incomes (reputation).

*The kind of income appears to be more important than the amount, and, in general, the reputed major source of income is symbolic of placement in the community. In the case of a widow, the SI and CC are that of the deceased husband. Investments, insurance, pensions, security benefits, et al are rated by the SI which made them possible unless considerable wealth ("1" and "2") is reputed. Other components correct for seeming discrepancies.

Weight x 4

Table 2. Educational attainment.*

-
1. Complete appropriate graduate work for a recognized profession at highest level; graduate of a generally recognized, high status, four-year college.
 2. Graduate from a four-year college, university, or professional school with a recognized bachelor's degree, including four-year teacher college.
 3. Attended college or university for two or more years; junior college graduate; teacher education from a normal school; R. N. from a nursing school.
 4. Graduate from high school or completed equivalent secretary education; includes various kinds of "post-high" business education or trade school study.
 5. Attended high school, completed grade nine, but did not graduate from high school; for persons born prior to 1900, grade eight completed.
 6. Completed grade eight, but did not attend beyond grade nine, for persons born prior to 1900, grades four to seven would be equivalent.
 7. Left elementary or junior high school before completing grade eight; for persons born prior to 1900, no education or attendance to grade three.
-

*Weight x 3

Actual education attained probably is not as important as the education a person is required to have. The same scale is used to rate aspiration.

Table 3. Occupations: levels and kinds *

	Rate Professionals	Proprietors	Businessmen	White Collar	Blue Collar	Service	Farm People
1.	Lawyer, judge, physician, engineer, professor, school supt, et al with post-baccalaureate study	Large businesses valued at \$100,000 or more depending on community	Top executives, President, et al of corporations, banks, public utilities	CPA; editor of newspaper, magazine; executive secy. of status organization			Gentleman farmer or land owners who do not supervise directly their property
2.	Nurses, teachers, librarians, and others with 4-yr. college degree	Business valued at \$50,000 to \$100,000	Asst., office, & dept. manager or supervisors; some mfg. agents	Accountant; insurance, real estate, stock salesmen; editorial writers			Land Operators who supervise properties & have an active urban life
3.	Professionals without 4-yr. college degree (usually have a diploma)	Business or equity valued from \$10,000 to \$50,000	Managers of small branches or buyers and salesmen of known mchdse.	Bank clerks, auto salesmen, postal clerks, RR or Tel. agent or supervisor	Small contractor who works or supervises his jobs		Farm owners with "hired" help"; operators of leased property or suprvs.
4.		Business or equity valued from \$5,000 to \$10,000	(Stenographer, bookkeeper; ticket agent, sales people in department stores, et al)		Foreman; master carpenter, electrician, et al; RR engineer	Police capt. tailor, RR conductor; watchmaker	Small landowner; operators of rented property hiring "hands"
5.		Business or equity valued from \$2,000 to \$5,000	(Dime store clerks, grocery clerks; telephone and beauty operators, et al.)		Apprentice to skilled trades repairmen; med. skilled workers	Policemen; barbers; LVN's, brakemen	Tenants or good farms; foreman; owners of farms who "hire out"

Table 3. Continued.

Rate Professionals	Proprietors	Businessmen	White Collar	Blue Collar	Service	Farm People
6.	Business or equity valued at less than \$2,000		(semi-skilled factory and production workers; assistants to skilled trade; warehousemen, watchmen)		Taxi and truck drivers; waiter, waitress, gas station attendant; aides	Sharecroppers; established farm laborers; subs'c farmers
7. "Reputed Lawbreakers"			(Heavy labor; odd-job men mine or mill hands, unskilled workers)		Domestic help; busboy, scrubwomen, janitor help	Migrant workers "Squatters and nesters"

*
weight x 5

Table 4. General conversion table for status indices.

Index score	Relative status level	Social Class prediction	Break points and intervals of indeterminacy	Life style	Intervals employed in correlation
12	A+	(UC)			
13-17	A	Upper Class	12-22	Super-ordinate	16 plus
18-22	A-				17-21
23-27	B+				22-26
28-32	B	(UM)	25-33	Dominant	27-31
33-37	B-	Upper-Middle		UM	32-26
38-41	C+	(LM)			37-41
42-46	C	Lower-Middle	38-50	Dominant	42-46
47-51	C-			LM	47-51
52-56	D+	(UL)			52-56
57-61	D	Upper-Lower	54-62	Alternate	57-61
62-66	D-				62-66
67-71	E+	(LL)			67-71
72-75	E	Lower-Lower	67-84	Deviant	72-76
76-84	E-				77 Minus

APPENDIX E

Additional Tables

MATRIX FOR SUBSIDIARY QUESTIONS

		SOCIOECONOMIC LEVEL			
Parent self concept	Adolescent perceived communication	I	II	III	IV
	I				
	II				
	III				
	IV				

Ho

There is no PACI effect

There is no Parent Self Concept Effect

There is no PACI x Parent Self Concept Effect

ANOVA TABLE
UNEQUAL CELL SIZE
FIXED DESIGN
4 x 4

Source of variance	df	SS	MS	F	P
Adolescent communication	3	133.695	44.565	.684	N. S.
Parent self concept	3	102.229	34.076	.523	N. S.
Communication x Parent self concept	9	430.569	47.841	.826	N. S.
Error	136	8926.388	65.635		
Total	151	9592.881			

MATRIX FOR SUBSIDIARY QUESTIONS

MOTHER'S EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Student self concept	Adolescent perceived communication	I	II	III	IV
	I				
	II				
	III				
	IV				
Ho		M 13.70	M 14.83	M 13.35	M 11.56

There is no PACI effect

There is no student self concept effect

There is no PACI x Student Self concept effect

ANOVA TABLE
UNEQUAL CELL SIZE
FIXED DESIGN
4 x 4

Source of variance	df	SS	MS	F	P
Adolescent communication	3	25.668	8.556	2.685	<.05
Adolescent self concept	3	4.246	1.415	.444	N.S.
Communication x Adolescent self concept	9	54.763	6.084	2.148	N.S.
Error	136	436.534	3.209		
Total	151	521.211			

ANALYSIS OF MOTHER'S EDUCATION
FOR COMMUNICATION LEVEL

Means	t values		
	2	3	4
1	-2.60*	.82	2.05**
2		2.66*	2.96*
3			1.47

*Significant at .01

**Significant at .05

APPENDIX F

MATRICES FOR HYPOTHESES

MATRIX FOR HYPOTHESES I, II, AND III

COMMUNICATION PACI SCORES

		<u>Sex</u>	
		Male	Female
Parents' self-concept	Adolescent self-concept	I II III IV	Adolescent self-concept I II III IV
	I		I
	II		II
	III		III
	IV		IV

Ho

1. There is no sex effect.
2. There is no adolescent self-concept effect.
3. There is no parent self-concept effect.
4. There is no sex x adolescent self-concept effect.
5. There is no sex x parent self-concept effect.
6. There is no adolescent self-concept effect x parent self-concept effect.
7. There is no sex x adolescent self-concept x parent self-concept effect.

MATRIX FOR HYPOTHESES IV AND V

COMMUNICATION PACI OF FEMALES

Father's self- concept	Mother's self- concept	I	II	III	IV
	I				
	II				
	III				
	IV				

Ho

1. There is no mother's self-concept effect.
2. There is no father's self-concept effect.
3. There is no mother's x father's self-concept effect.

MATRIX FOR HYPOTHESES VI AND VII

COMMUNICATION PACI OF MALES

Father's self- concept	Mother's self- concept	I	II	III	IV
	I				
	II				
	III				
	IV				

Ho

1. There is no mother's self-concept effect.
2. There is no father's self-concept effect.
3. There is no mother's x father's self-concept effect.

MATRIX FOR HYPOTHESES VIII AND IX

ADOLESCENT SELF CONCEPT

		Parent's self concept	I	II	III	IV
Sex	Females	I				
	Males	II				

Ho

1. There is no PTSCS effect
2. There is no sex effect
3. There is no PTSCS x sex effect

MATRIX FOR HYPOTHESES X AND XI

ADOLESCENT SELF CONCEPT

		Mother's self concept	<u>Male</u>			
			I	II	III	IV
Father's self concept	I					
	II					
	III					
	IV					

Ho

1. There is no mother self concept effect.
2. There is no father self concept effect.
3. There is no mother x father self concept effect.

MATRIX FOR HYPOTHESES XII AND XIII

ADOLESCENT SELF CONCEPT

	Mother's self concept	<u>Female</u>			
		I	II	III	IV
Father's self concept	I				
	II				
	III				
	IV				

Ho

1. There is no mother's self concept effect.
2. There is no father's self concept effect.
3. There is no mother's x father's self concept effect.