1984

Personality Correlates of Parental Maltreatment

Lorraine Helen Huckel
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Huckel, Lorraine Helen, "Personality Correlates of Parental Maltreatment" (1984). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1037.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1037

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF PARENTAL MALTREATMENT

BY

LORRAINE HELEN HUCKEL

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1984

ABSTRACT

This study investigates relationships among parent-child affectional interactions (nurturance vs. neglect and acceptance vs. rejection) and parental power assertion (verbal aggression and violence) experienced during childhood and adolescence, additional aspects of personal/familial history (incest, continuity of parental relationships, spousal violence, recent stressful life events, gender, family geographic mobility, family income, parental educational status), and current psychosocial functioning (self-esteem, psychophysiological distress, attributional style, anxiety, interpersonal affect, succorance, dominance, impulsivity, hostility-aggression, assertion, manifest rejection of children, violence approval, antisocial activity) in a mixed-sex sample group of 331 volunteer student subjects.

All variables were assessed on the basis of subjects' responses to a questionnaire comprised of eight standardized inventories (Family Relations Inventory, Conflicts Tactics Scale, Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Hopkins Symptom Checklist, Attribution Style Questionnaire, Jackson Personality Inventory, Personality Research Form, Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory, Lorr Assertiveness Scale, Manifest Rejection Index, Violence Scale) and a series of structured questions regarding personal/familial history (Family Data Form).

Independent principal components analyses applied to historical and current variables reduced variables within each set to several broad constructs. Analysis of 20 family/historical variables extracted six constructs: (a) parent-child affectional relationships; (b) parental power assertion; (c) spousal violence and incest; (d) recent stress and incest; (e) parental verbal aggression; and (f) socioeconomic status. Analysis of 30 current/psychosocial variables extracted five constructs:

(a) emotional instability; (b) violence approval; (c) self-assurance; (d) hostility-aggression; and (e) dependency-interdependency.

A canonical correlation analysis applied to 20 historical and 30 current variables retained three significant variates. The first variate indicates that high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance in conjunction with low levels of parental verbal aggression and violence are associated with high self-assurance and dependency-interdependency, and low emotional instability and hostility-aggression. The second variate indicates that gender and parental nurturance and acceptance are systematically related to violence approval and specific aspects of emotional instability, self-assurance, dependency-interdependency, and hostility-aggression. The third variate indicates that parental verbal aggression and violence and recent stressful life events are positively associated with emotional instability and specific aspects of violence approval, self-assurance, and hostility-aggression. An independent canonical correlation analysis applied to data obtained from female subjects indicates that incest and father-to-mother violence are positively associated with emotional instability and hostility-aggression, and negatively associated with self-assurance and dependency-interdependency.

Findings are interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that parental maltreatment -- manifested in neglect, rejection, aggression, and/or incest -- experienced during childhood and adolescence is associated with vulnerable intra- and interpersonal functioning during young adulthood. Implications for intervention with victims of parental maltreatment are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project represents an endpoint in a graduate career enriched by many people. My sincere appreciation goes to members of my committee who have provided essential expertise, guidance, and encouragement. Dr. Wayne Velicer has been an especially wise and patient teacher, helping to translate a perhaps overly ambitious project into a manageable and meaningful investigation.

Throughout graduate school I have benefited from Dr. Allan Berman's acceptance, trust, and perceptive advice, which has helped keep frustrations in perspective and essential goals and values in focus. His insistence on evaluating children's problems within the context of the total individual and his/her environment has substantially influenced my way of perceiving and responding to people as a psychologist.

Dr. Janet Kulberg's knowledge of developmental psychology and scholarly insistence on assessing methods by which behavioral scientists conduct research as an integral part of interpreting findings have significantly influenced my approach to conceptualizing and studying human development. Her respectful support, coupled with an expectation of competence, have contributed importantly to my growth as a professional.

Dr. Richard Gelles has provided valuable knowledge and encouragement for which I am grateful. His determination to examine aspects of family life previously ignored by social scientists has been critical in establishing a precedent and a methodology for investigating "private" familial interactions, including abuse and neglect of children. Dr. Donald Spence, Dr. John Stevenson, and Dr. John Long's thoughtful commentaries have contributed to the completion of this

project and are highly appreciated.

Dr. Joseph Rossi has provided invaluable expertise in data analysis and functioned as a knowledgeable consultant, ensuring the empirical integrity of this investigation. Ms. Betty Barrett has provided critical skills and support throughout as typist and editorial assistant. Her willingness to acquire new skills as a part of this process is especially appreciated. Mr. Stephen Naysnerski and Mr. Ronald Erikson deserve thanks for computer trouble-shooting, as does Dr. John Roche for patient editing. Essential financial support was provided by the National Institute of Mental Health (Grant #5-30415-279).

I am thankful to Drs. Susan Brady, Elizabeth Speicher-Dubin, Jeannie Burkhard, Dominic Valentino, John Stevenson, and Janet Kulberg for help in obtaining subjects and encouragement provided in this process. I am especially appreciative of subjects' time, energy, and diligence in providing detailed, sometimes disturbing, information without which this study would have been impossible.

My husband, Robert Bauer, has been a continuous source of tangible and emotional support. His willingness to do more than his share of parenting and home management, while also building his career, has been an example of compromise and commitment for which I am deeply grateful.

Ironically, my attention to this project has often resulted in my asking my children, Nathaniel and Amelia, to be patient and understanding beyond their years. They have done so to the best of their ability and, in the process, have reminded me of the vulnerability and resilience of children, and the responsibility and power inherent in being a parent. I thank them for not allowing me to lose sight of that which is of most value in my life.

Finally, during the course of this project I have become increasingly aware of my indebtedness to those whose love and guidance enriched my childhood and whose ways of living have provided courageous models of personal strength and joyful involvement with others. For this reason this project is dedicated with special gratitude to my mother, Frances Mikolajczyk Huckel, and to the memory of my father, Russell Wheeler Huckel, and my grandmother, Anielka Turek Mikolajczyk.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
The Costs of Ignorance	3
Obstacles to Studying Effects of Maltreatment	4
Overcoming Obstacles: The Present Study	6
Theoretical Constructs	8
Hypotheses	9
Design	9
II. Review of Developmental Literature	12
The Structure of Parent-Child Relationships	12
Parent-Child Relationships as Antecedents of	
Child Personality	14
Intrapersonal Functioning	15
Self-Esteem	15
Parent-Child Affectional Relationships	16
Parental Power Assertion	18
Psychophysiological Distress	20
Parent-Child Affectional Relationships	21
Parental Power Assertion	24
Attributional Style	26
Parent-Child Affectional Relationships	28
Parental Power Assertion	29
Interpersonal Functioning	29
Attachment-Dependency	30
Parent-Child Affectional Relationships	32
Parental Power Assertion	39
Hostility-Aggression	42
Parent-Child Affectional Relationships	44
Parental Power Assertion	49
Prosocial Functioning	56
Parent-Child Affectional Relationships	60
Parental Power Assertion	65
Overview	67

III. Review of Child Maltreatment Literature	70
Intellectual Status of Mistreated Children	71
Social-Emotional Status of Mistreated Children	75
Submissive Reaction Patterns	75
Aggressive Reaction Patterns	80
Reactions to Sexual Abuse	83
Overview	88
The Importance of Attachment	91
IV. The Present Study: Method	94
Subjects	94
Demographic Characteristics	94
Maltreatment Characteristics	95
Instruments	97
Historical Variables	98
Conflict Tactics Scales	98
Family Data Form	104
Family Relations Inventory	105
Current Variables	107
Attribution Style Questionnaire	107
Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory	109
Hopkins Symptom Checklist	111
Jackson Personality Inventory	113
Lorr Assertiveness Scale	115
Manifest Rejection Index	117
Personality Research Form	118
Tennessee Self Concept Scale	120
Violence Scale	123
Procedure	124
V. The Present Study: Results	126
Univariate Statistics	127
Historical Constructs:	
Component Structure of Twenty Variables	133
Current Constructs:	
Component Structure of Thirty Variables	138
Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs:	
Canonical Correlation Analysis of Fifty Variables	143
First Canonical Variate	149
Second Canonical Variate	152
Third Canonical Variate	155
Canonical Correlation Analyses Conducted	
Independently for Each Sex	158
Females	159
Males	160

VI. Discussion	161
The Structure of Family Relationships	161
The Structure of Personality Among Young Adults	169
Current Personality Correlates of	
Family/Historical Experiences	174
Overview	175
Personality Correlates of Parental	
Love Versus Maltreatment	177
Personality Correlates of Parental	
Emotional Maltreatment and Gender	185
Personality Correlates of Parental	
Aggression and Recent Stress	195
Recapitulation and Implications	204
Alternate Explanations	204
Beyond Previous Findings	206
Differential Effects of Global, Emotional,	
and Physical Maltreatment	208
The Potential to Mistreat Children	210
Treatment of Mistreated Children and Adults	212
Conclusion	215
References	219
Appendices	259
A. Family Interaction and Individual Development Study:	
Questionnaire	259
B. Preliminary Study: Component Structure of the	
Modified Conflicts Tactics Scale	315
C. Family Data Form: Scoring Procedures for	
Experimental Variables	335
D. Preliminary Study: Component Structure of the	
Family Relations Inventory	341
E. Preliminary Study: Component Structure of the	
Attribution Style Questionnaire	355
F. Preliminary Study: Component Structure of the	
Manifest Rejection Index	366
G. Preliminary Study: Component Structure of the	
Violence Scale	373
H. Scoring Key for True-False Scales	383
I. Scoring Key for Multichoice Scales	385
J. Family Interaction and Individual Development Study:	
Introductory Letter and Consent Form	387
K. Standardized Canonical Weights for Twenty Historical	
and Thirty Current Variables for Three Significant	
Canonical Variates	389
L. Zero-Order Correlations Among Twenty Historical and	
Thirty Current Variables	393

LIST OF TABLES

4-1.	Summary of Inventories of Twenty Historical and Thirty Current Variables	99
5-1.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for Twenty Historical and Thirty Current Variables	128
5-2.	Factor Loadings Obtained by Twenty Historical Variables Comprising Six Varimax Rotated Components	134
5-3.	Factor Loadings Obtained by Thirty Current Variables Comprising Five Varimax Rotated Components	139
5-4.	Canonical Loadings for Twenty Historical and Thirty Current Variables Comprising Three Significant Variates	145
B-1.	Five Items with Highest Loadings on Two Varimax Rotated Components for the CTS for All Relationships	323
B-2.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for Two Conflicts Tactics Scales for All Relationships	329
B-3.	Alpha Coefficients and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Parent-to-Child Conflict Tactics Scales for Elementary and High School Referent Years	330
B-4.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Among Conflicts Tactics Scales for All Relationships	331
C-1.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for FDF Variables	340
D-1.	Five Items with Highest Loadings on Four Varimax Rotated Components for the FRI-Father and FRI-Mother	346
D-2.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Alpha Coefficients, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Four FRI Scales	352
E-1.	Two Situations with Highest Loadings on Two Varimax Rotated Components for the Attribution Style Questionnaire	360
E-2.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for Two ASQ Composite Scales	363
F-1.	Five Items with Highest Loadings on One Manifest Rejection Index Component	371
G-1.	Four Items with Highest Loadings on Four Varimax Rotated Components for the Violence Scale	377
G-2.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Alpha Coefficients, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for the Four Violence Scales	380

LIST OF FIGURES

5-1. First Canonical Variate: Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs/Variables	150
5-2. Second Canonical Variate: Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs/Variables	153
5-3. Third Canonical Variate: Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs/Variables	156

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Parental maltreatment of children has long existed, but only within the last century has it been recognized as an issue meriting public and professional attention (Caffey, 1946; Gelles, 1974; Gil, 1970; Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemueller, & Silver, 1962; Radbill, 1980; Silverman, 1953; Straus, 1974; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Williams, 1980). Early and continued professional efforts have been devoted to defining and identifying severe physical maltreatment and developing guidelines for intervention (Arvanian, 1975; Ebeling & Hill, 1975; Justice & Justice, 1976; Kempe & Helfer, 1968, 1972; Martin, 1976). Secondly, professionals working with abusive families have attempted to elucidate causes of child maltreatment focusing primarily on overt parental actions resulting in injury to children (Fontana, 1976; Green, 1976; Lord & Weisfeld, 1974; Melnick & Hurley, 1969; Merrill, 1962; Newberger & Bourne, 1978; Spinetta & Rigler, 1972; Steele, 1970; Steele & Pollock, 1974; Williams & Money, 1980; Wright, 1976). Most recently, as it has become increasingly evident that physical abuse occurs in the context of additional parent-child relationship variables which impinge significantly on children, emotional and sexual maltreatment have begun to receive attention from practitioners and researchers alike (Burgess, Groth, Holmstrom, & Sgroi; 1978; Cantwell, 1980; DeFrancis, 1969; Finkelhor, 1979; Garbarino, 1978, 1979, 1981; Giarretto, 1976; Gil, 1981; Justice & Justice, 1979; Kempe & Helfer, 1980; Korbin, 1980; Martin, Beezley, Conway, & Kempe, 1974; Polansky, Borgman, & DeSaix, 1972; Polansky, Chalmers, Bittenwieser, & Williams, 1981; Williams & Money, 1980; Rohner, 1975; Zaphiris, 1981).

Results of collective efforts include a voluminous body of literature describing various forms of child maltreatment, associated environmental factors, and an ever-increasing number of intervention programs.

In contrast, comparatively little systematic attention has been focused on the effects of parental abuse and neglect, although it has been generally acknowledged that child maltreatment has pervasive consequences for victims, perpetrators, and society. Aggregate data based on case reports and scant follow-up studies of identified abuse victims into middle childhood have documented a wide range of detrimental effects of parental maltreatment including death, physical disability, neurological dysfunction, sensory impairment, intellectual deficits, and social-emotional disorders (Cook & Bowles, 1980; Elmer, 1967, 1977; Green, 1978a, 1978b; Kempe & Helfer, 1980; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1976; Martin et al., 1974; McCord, 1983; Muir, 1976; Reidy, Anderegg, Tracy, & Cotler, 1980; Silverman, 1980; Weston, 1980; Williams & Money, 1980). However, inherent design weaknesses limit the reliability and generalizability of available information regarding nonphysical sequelae of parental abuse and neglect and preclude conclusions regarding common, differential, additive, and interacting effects of physical, emotional, and sexual maltreatment.

At the same time that researchers in the field of child maltreatment have failed to engage in systematic study of the effects of experiencing parental abuse and neglect, child development researchers have extensively investigated relationships among a wide range of "normal" parenting practices and child personality variables (e.g., Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1945; Bandura & Walters, 1959; Becker, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1961a, 1961b; Eron, Walder, & Lefkowitz, 1971;

Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder, & Heusmann, 1977; Radke, 1946; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Rohner, 1975; Schaefer & Bell, 1957; Schaefer, Bell, & Bayley, 1959; Schutz, 1962; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Shoben, 1949; Slater, 1955, 1962; Whiting & Child, 1953; Williams, 1958; Yarrow, Campbell, & Burton, 1970). Curiously, despite their mutual focus on parent-child relationships, the two "disciplines" have conducted their research so independently that there is little indication in the literature of either field of any attempt to integrate conceptual or methodological frameworks.

The Costs of Ignorance

As a result of the lack of systematic information regarding nonphysical consequences of experiencing parental maltreatment, social service departments and mental health professionals have been seriously limited in their ability to recognize the range of effects of parental abuse and neglect on victims and, in turn, to make optimal treatment and placement recommendations (Gelles, 1980; Goldstein, Freud, & Solnit, 1973, 1979; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1980; Martin et al., 1974; Martin & Rodeheffer, 1976; Muir, 1976; Newberger & Bourne, 1978; Reidy et al., 1980; Zigler, 1976). A more insidious consequence has been the evolution of public policy based on the covert dual assumption that: (a) there may be no enduring psychosocial sequelae of parental maltreatment; and (b) children are sufficiently resilient to develop normally once severe maltreatment is identified and prevented from recurring.

Accordingly, the legal-welfare system has tended to limit its intervention to cases of parental maltreatment consisting of documented physical abuse and severe neglect, taking those steps believed necessary

to prevent recurrence of obvious maltreatment. Specifically, intervention has customarily involved monitoring or briefly treating abusive families with the goal of strengthening parenting skills; victims may or may not be removed from maltreating parents for evaluation and medical treatment, depending upon the apparent severity of abuse and neglect assessed in terms of the extent of injuries incurred and failure-to-thrive. Unless they evidence sufficient psychiatric symptomatology to require inpatient treatment, abused and neglected children rarely receive psychotherapeutic services (Alexander, 1980; Cohn, 1979; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1980; Martin & Rodeheffer, 1976; McQuiston & Kempe, 1980; Pike, 1976; Scheurer & Bailey, 1980). While many protective service departments and related professionals view the customary response to abused and neglected children as inadequate, justification for spending limited funds on psychological services for victims of parental maltreatment has been largely precluded by the absence of sound data documenting specific psychosocial correlates of experiencing parental abuse and neglect (Carroll, 1980).

Obstacles to Studying Effects of Maltreatment

One explanation for the dearth of systematic investigations exploring consequences of experiencing parental maltreatment is the existence of substantial methodological obstacles to conducting such research. Foremost among these is the definitional dilemma. Early definitions were characterized by a narrow, all-or-none focus on a single dimension of parent-child interactions, most commonly overt parental actions resulting in injury to children (Gelles, 1974; Gil, 1970; Kempe et al., 1962; Starr, 1979; Straus, 1974; Straus et al., 1980). In contrast, recent definitions have conceptualized child

maltreatment as a multifaceted phenomenon existing along a continuum and comprised of a broad range of parent-child interactions including commissions and omissions in caretaking (Fontana, 1971; Garbarino, 1980, 1981; Gil, 1975; Kempe & Helfer, 1980; Solomon, 1982; Williams, 1980; Zigler, 1980). While the latter conceptualization represents a constructive step toward acknowledging the inherent complexity of parent-child relationships, a substantial amount of work remains in order to translate this global definition of child maltreatment into reliable operational constructs which can be empirically investigated. Indeed, the few studies which have attempted to specify behavioral correlates of experiencing parental maltreatment have been criticized for their failure to operationally define, assess, and evaluate the influence of several kinds of maltreatment independently (Gelles, 1976; Kent, 1976; Martin et al., 1974; Reidy, 1977; Reidy et al., 1980; Zigler, 1976). Thus, coexisting with the definitional dilemma, the lack of empirically devised instrumentation for assessing parent-child interaction variables represents a substantial obstacle in its own right to investigating personality correlates of experiencing parental abuse and neglect.

A third methodological obstacle to investigating relationships between parental maltreatment and personality variables is sample selection. Prospective studies of abuse victims "caught," labeled, and "treated" by the medical-legal-welfare system have been consistently criticized for systematic biases in sample selection and failure to include comparison groups (Gelles, 1976, 1980; Martin et al., 1974; Newberger & Bourne, 1978). Moreover, unavoidable confounding of parental abuse and neglect with intervention services has prevented

6

these studies from effectively differentiating consequences of experiencing parental maltreatment from consequences associated with undergoing intervention (e.g., abrupt, recurrent, and/or long-term separations from parents and siblings; frequent changes in foster placements; maltreatment experienced in foster or residential care) (Alexander, 1980; Goldstein et al., 1973, 1979; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1980; Pike, 1976; Terr & Watson, 1980). Likewise, retrospective investigations which have attempted to correlate adult psychosocial variables (e.g., abusive parenting) with parental maltreatment experienced during childhood have been characterized by similar sample selection biases, failure to employ comparison groups, and reliance upon empirically unsound instruments to assess retrospective variables (Gelles, 1973, 1976). Finally, any attempt to utilize an independent screening procedure to identify an abuse sample and a matched comparison group for prospective study is likely to be precluded by respondents' anticipation of real consequences associated with reporting abuse to anyone outside the family including "...mandatory reporting of known or suspected child abuse and neglect, investigation of such reports by a social agency, and provision of services, where needed, to such child and family" (General Laws of Rhode Island, 1977, p. 45).

Overcoming Obstacles: The Present Study

The present investigation was conceived out of the conviction that an integration of the developmental and maltreatment literature bearing on the question of how parent-child relationship variables are related to the development of children and adolescents would facilitate a clearer understanding of the psychosocial vulnerabilities of abuse victims. This study's essential purpose, then, has been to integrate

theoretical constructs and methodological procedures of both specialties in designing and implementing an investigation of relationships among several theoretically distinguishable kinds of parental maltreatment experienced during childhood and adolescence and several distinct dimensions of psychosocial functioning assessed in young adulthood. More specifically, it was anticipated that the present study would: (a) document enduring psychosocial correlates of parental abuse and neglect indicative of vulnerable intra- and interpersonal functioning; (b) demonstrate that young adults who were victims of prior parental maltreatment are characterized by attitudinal and behavioral traits which place them at risk of perpetuating child maltreatment; and (c) suggest specific aspects of abuse victims' psychosocial functioning which might benefit from psychotherapeutic intervention.

Because there have been so few systematic investigations of psychosocial correlates of experiencing parental maltreatment, a major task of the present study has been to devise a conceptual framework and methodology capable of overcoming obstacles to conducting such research. First, a review of the literature relating to "good enough" and inadequate parenting was essential to facilitate a multidimensional definition of child maltreatment, rather than a simplistic focus on one aspect of parental behavior. Second, a substantial amount of work was required to translate an appropriately complex definition of maltreatment into distinct operational constructs which could be meaningfully and reliably quantified and investigated. Third, a review of the literature pertaining to the development of major attitudinal/behavioral systems comprising a sufficiently complex conceptualization of personality was necessary to facilitate selection

of criterion variables and pose meaningful hypotheses. Finally, a research design capable of circumventing systematic sample selection biases and accounting for potentially confounding variables had to be devised.

Theoretical Constructs

From the outset, parent-child relationships have been conceptualized as being comprised of two primary dimensions, the first of which represents the overall affectional quality of parent-child interactions and the second of which reflects the degree and means of control exerted in the context of parent-child relationships. The empirical validity of these factors has been attested to by their repeated emergence across a wide range of childrearing studies utilizing a variety of methodologies, instruments, and data sources (Becker, 1964; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schaefer et al., 1959; Schutz, 1962; Slater, 1962). Several additional characteristics of familial environments have also been viewed as comprising potentially important influences on psychosocial development including: (a) financial and educational resources; (b) geographic mobility; (c) continuity of parental relationships; (d) spousal violence; and (f) intrafamilial sexual victimization.

Psychosocial functioning has been conceptualized as being comprised of two broad theoretical dimensions relevant to the everyday functioning of essentially normal individuals. The first dimension, intrapersonal functioning, is represented by ten specific variables reflecting self-esteem, psychophysiological distress, and attributional style. The second dimension, interpersonal functioning, is represented by twenty specific variables reflecting attitudes and behaviors broadly

9

conceptualized in terms of dependency, hostility-aggression, and prosocial functioning.

Hypotheses

On the basis of a comprehensive review of the literature relevant to the question of personality correlates of experiencing parental maltreatment, three hypotheses were proposed. First, because parental rejection had been associated with a range of psychosocial variables suggestive of vulnerable intra- and interpersonal functioning, it was hypothesized that the overall quality of parent-child affectional relationships during childhood and adolescence would be directly associated with the quality of intra- and interpersonal functioning in young adulthood. Second, because physical punishment had been similarly associated with a range of psychosocial variables suggestive of vulnerable intra- and interpersonal functioning, it was hypothesized that the overall level of parental power assertion employed in the context of parent-child relationships during childhood and adolescence would be inversely associated with the quality of intra- and interpersonal functioning in young adulthood. Third, because additional familial environmental factors had been shown to be associated with parental maltreatment and the social-emotional functioning of mistreated children, it was hypothesized that three specific environmental variables -- discontinuity of parental relationships, spousal violence, and intrafamilial sexual victimization -- would be inversely associated with the quality of intra- and interpersonal functioning in young adulthood.

Design

In order to circumvent practical and ethical problems likely to

hamper any prospective study of identified abuse victims and minimize systematic sample selection biases, the present investigation employed a retrospective design and a student sample group. Most importantly, by selecting subjects from a population comprised of individuals 18 years of age or older, legal-ethical conflicts inherent in the contradiction between assuring subjects' confidentiality and complying with the legal mandate to report known or suspected abuse of minors were obviated. Subjects voluntarily responded to a questionnaire comprised of standardized inventories and precoded questions assessing personal and family history and current psychosocial functioning. Hypotheses were evaluated through the application of a canonical correlation analysis to the multiple historical and current variables.

Utilization of a student sample group was supported by the fact that previous investigations had demonstrated that parental violence and intrafamilial sexual victimization are sufficiently prevalent in the histories of university students to make an investigation of psychosocial correlates of parental maltreatment in this population both feasible and meaningful (Finkelhor, 1979; Mulligan, 1977; Steinmetz, 1975; Straus, 1971, 1974). Moreover, a review of the relevant literature indicated that the validity of child/student reports has been substantiated across a wide range of familial data including parent-child interactions and spousal violence (Bahr, Bowerman, Gecas, 1974; Bronson, Katten, & Livson, 1959; Kayser & Summers, 1973; Landis, 1957; Mulligan, 1977; Niemi, 1974; Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980). Finally, because university students occupy a unique life-cycle position characterized by high levels of extrafamilial involvement (with most students living outside their family home), it was expected that they

could assume a relatively objective stance in reflecting upon and reporting intrafamilial experiences, compared to child or adolescent subjects who are more dependent upon parents.

At the same time, recognition of potential liabilities of retrospective studies of relationships among childhood experiences and subsequent functioning compelled development of specific procedures to guard against threats to the reliability and validity of retrospective data collected in the present investigation (Cannell & Kahn, 1969; Lindquist, 1953; Schutz, 1962; Wohwill, 1973; Yarrow et al., 1970). While the use of university students to investigate psychosocial correlates of experiencing parental maltreatment during childhood and adolescence is thus believed justifiable, limitations inherent in utilizing a retrospective design and a nonrandom sample likely to be characterized by comparatively "mild" abusive experiences and sound financial and educational resources have been acknowledged from the outset and taken into account in interpreting findings.

With the conceptual framework, hypotheses, and design of the present investigation having been outlined, tasks of subsequent chapters are to: (a) review the developmental and maltreatment literature describing the structure of parent-child relationships and documented associations among parent-child relationship variables and child personality traits (Chapters II and III); (b) describe this study's methodology including demographic and maltreatment characteristics of the sample group and instrumentation used to assess experimental variables (Chapter IV and Appendices B through G); and (c) present and discuss results obtained in light of previous findings and examine implications for intervention with victims of parental maltreatment (Chapters V and VI).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTAL LITERATURE

Hypotheses proposed and tested in the context of the present investigation were developed on the basis of a critical review and integration of the developmental and maltreatment literature. The purpose of the present chapter is to: (a) outline the conceptual framework of parent-child relationships; and (b) review empirically documented associations among primary parent-child relationship variables and specific child personality variables from the perspective of the developmental literature.

The Structure of Parent-Child Relationships

An extensive number of studies have systematically investigated a broad range of "normal" parenting behaviors in an effort to determine the essential structure of parent-child relationships. Despite design and procedural weaknesses characterizing individual studies, definitional inconsistency across studies, and the variety of instruments and data sources represented, two bipolar dimensions have repeatedly emerged (Baldwin et al., 1945; Becker, 1964; Lorr & Jenkins, 1953; Roff, 1949; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Sewell, Mussen, & Harris, 1955; Schaefer, 1959; Slater, 1955; 1962; Zuckerman, Ribback, Monashkin, & Norton, 1958).

The first of these factors, customarily labeled Love-Hostility or Acceptance-Rejection, reflects the overall affectional quality of parent-child relationships. The positive pole is broadly defined by a high degree of affectionate, nurturant, respectful, and rewarding parental behaviors. Parents whose interactions with their children epitomize this pole neither overlook their children's needs nor

concentrate all their attention upon them; rather, they encourage their children to fulfill their potential within a context of parental approval and support (Brunkan & Crites, 1964). In contrast, the negative pole of the affectional relationship continuum reflects a deficit in affectionate caretaking, evidenced by parental behaviors oriented toward limiting or discounting the child's attempts to explore the environment through psychologically aversive techniques such as criticism and intimidation (Hurley, 1965). Parents whose interactions with their children epitomize the negative extreme of this factor fail to satisfy their children's physical needs, spend as little time as possible with them, withdraw when their children approach them seeking affection or support, and openly berate them. "In short, they manifest no positive interest in the child or his activities; at best, the child is only tolerated" (Brunkan & Crites, 1964).

The second essential dimension of parent-child relationships, customarily labeled Control-Autonomy, reflects the frequency and severity of inhibitory demands and methods of parental control of the child. The high extreme of this dimension, referred to as power assertion, is broadly defined by parental reliance upon punitive, authoritarian control techniques such as direct commands, threats, deprivations, physical force, and violence. The opposite extreme has been theoretically defined by parental reliance on love-oriented techniques (e.g., praise and reasoning) to elicit constructive alternatives to unwanted behavior, although it has customarily been operationally defined as the absence of intimidating and aggressive means of control.

Parent-Child Relationships as Antecedents
of Child Personality

Comparative analyses across individual investigations of parenting behaviors have resulted in several models depicting relationships among primary parent-child interaction dimensions and child personality variables (Becker, 1964; Becker, Peterson, Hellmer, Shoemaker, & Quay, 1959; Hewitt & Jenkins, 1946; Lasko, 1952; Medinnus, 1967; Peck, 1958; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schaefer, 1959; Shoben, 1949; Slater, 1955, 1962). Utilizing one of three major approaches, numerous studies have attempted to test predicted relationships. The first approach examines relationships among parent-child interaction and child personality variables concurrently and/or longitudinally in sample groups drawn from the general population. The second compares parent-child relationships among children and adolescents whose behavior has been identified as extreme (e.g., delinquent) and carefully matched control groups. The third approach investigates associations among young adults' recollections of their childhood parental relationships and various aspects of self-reported current psychosocial functioning.

Despite limitations characterizing individual studies and the variety of constructs and procedures represented, the accumulated weight of fairly consistent findings across investigations supports several conclusions regarding associations among parent-child affectional relationships and parental control practices, and child personality variables. However, the question of specific, differential effects of parental affection and control remains largely unresolved. That is, it has been almost impossible to disentangle effects of Love-Hostility and Control-Autonomy due to: (a) the lack of independence between

operational definitions of parental affection and control; (b) the failure of many studies to simultaneously assess both dimensions; and (c) the tendency for parental affection and control to covary systematically (i.e., high levels of parental affection have been shown to be associated with parental use of praise and reasoning, while low levels of parental affection have been associated with parental reliance on coercion and corporal punishment) (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Becker, 1964; Becker, Peterson, Luria, Shoemaker, & Hellmer, 1962; Feshbach, 1970).

Intrapersonal Functioning

Intrapersonal functioning denotes the internal and essentially private life of the individual. In the present context, three interrelated aspects of intrapersonal functioning are of interest: (a) self-esteem; (b) emotions and related somatic experience; and (c) beliefs regarding one's capacity to influence sources of satisfaction and distress (i.e., perceived personal control vs. helplessness).

While self-esteem, emotions, and beliefs are essentially private, even these most personal aspects of identity develop in the context of interpersonal relationships and are profoundly influenced by the treatment received by significant others, beginning with one's parents (Sullivan, 1953).

Self-Esteem

In the present context, self-esteem is defined as the overall attitude of approval or disapproval a person maintains with regard to him- or herself, reflecting the extent to which that individual believes him- or herself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy (Coopersmith, 1967).

Parent-Child Affectional Relationships. The pivotal role of parental acceptance and nurturance in facilitating the development of constructive self-worth, optimal levels of anxiety, and healthy defense mechanisms among offspring has long been emphasized by personality theorists (for reviews see Maddi, 1976; May, 1977). However, not until Rosenberg (1965) demonstrated that parental attention and concern were significantly related to adolescents' self-esteem in a large sample group of high school students, was there empirical documentation for predicted relationships among socialization experiences and self-esteem.

Building on Rosenberg's (1965) findings, Coopersmith (1967) investigated antecedents of self-esteem in a large sample group of male, preadolescents objectively classified as evidencing high-, middle-, or low self-esteem. Indices of maternal nurturance, acceptance, and involvement were tabulated on the basis of data obtained from respondents and their mothers utilizing several objective inventories and one projective measure (Thematic Apperception Test, Murray, 1938). Analyses of correlations among maternal variables and preadolescents' self-esteem consistently demonstrated that mothers of high-esteem children were more nurturant, accepting, and involved with their children than mothers of low-esteem children. Mothers of medium-esteem children evidenced interactions with their children which were generally similar to interactions between high-esteem children and their mothers, but mothers of medium-esteem children were more protective than mothers of high- or low-esteem children. Summarizing his findings, Coopersmith (1967) concluded:

The whole tenor of the results so far supports the general hypothesis that parental rejection results in feelings of personal insignificance. Thus, if we were asked to state a means of enhancing self-esteem, we could say that acceptance

in general--and more particularly concern, affection, and close rapport--appears to have enhancing effects. The way to ensure a child's assurance is to care and to express that care so that it becomes an inherent part of the relationship.... (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 174)

In addition it is likely that a minimum of devaluing conditions--that is, rejection, ambiguity, and disrespect--is required if high self-esteem is to be attained. (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 240)

Subsequently, several investigators have corroborated Coopersmith's conclusions. For example, Baumrind (1967) investigated childrearing practices associated with the development of competence (i.e., the tendency to actively influence one's surroundings while simultaneously evidencing social responsibility) in a mixed-sex sample group of preschool children and their parents. Children were observed at home and in school and rated on specific behaviors contributing to the operational definition of competence. Parents were observed and interviewed, on the basis of which they were rated in terms of level of nurturance (i.e., affectionate caretaking and involvement) and expectations and modeling regarding self-control. Results indicated that parents of children classified as competent were highly nurturant and involved with their children and had consistently and rationally modeled, encouraged, and rewarded self-control. In contrast, parents of children characterized as low in competence (i.e., passive and detached, or conflicted and irritable) were substantially less nurturant and involved with their children. Several additional childrearing investigations among preschool children and their parents have reported similar findings (Baldwin, 1949; Radke, 1946; Symonds, 1939; Watson, 1957).

The paramount importance of parental acceptance and nurturance in facilitating the development of healthy self-esteem has been further

documented among adolescent and young-adult sample groups. For example, Offer, Marohn, and Ostrov (1979) assessed normal and delinquent adolescent males in terms of self-image, overall adjustment, and level of communication and understanding with parents (using data obtained from subjects and parents). Data analysis indicated that delinquent boys, compared to normal boys, evidenced poorer self-images, less effective coping skills, poorer overall adjustment, and less communication and understanding in parental relationships. Similarly, Olweus (1978) demonstrated that "bullies," who in comparison to well-adjusted control boys, evidenced lower self-esteem, experienced less involvement and emotional closeness with parents and expressed more negative attitudes toward parents (based on subjects' and parents' reports). In a rigorously conducted retrospective investigation employing student subjects, Slater (1955) demonstrated that parental supportiveness and warmth experienced during childhood was directly associated with a wide range of variables interpreted as manifestations of positive self-esteem and assurance in young adulthood (e.g., self-confidence, ego strength, leadership, social participation, and poise). Finally, the general tenor of findings based on longitudinal investigations of relationships among adult functioning and earlier parent-child interactions (Block, 1971; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Offer & Offer, 1975; Tuddenham, 1959) have further corroborated the conclusion that the quality of parent-child affectional interactions during childhood and adolescence has an enduring relationship to offspring self-esteem.

Parental Power Assertion. Parental reliance upon intimidation, coercion, and force to control children constitutes an assault on the

child's autonomy and conveys a lack of respect for him/her as an individual. Consequently, parental power assertion can be expected to undermine the child's development of a healthy, autonomous self-concept based on a conviction of personal worth. Indeed, while few investigations have specifically assessed the relationship between parental punitiveness and child-adolescent self-esteem, those which have, have consistently confirmed the expectation that parental power assertion is inversely correlated with offspring self-esteem.

The most direct evidence in support of this conclusion was provided by Coopersmith (1967), who assessed relationships among type and severity of maternal control and preadolescents' self-esteem. Specifically, Coopersmith (1967) found that mothers of high-esteem children exercised control in a rewarding fashion (i.e., encouragement and praise for preferred behaviors) in contrast to mothers of middle- and low-esteem children who exercised control in a punitive fashion. Moreover, when mothers of high-esteem children did use punishment, they relied on management techniques (e.g., restraint, denial of privileges, brief separation) in contrast to mothers of middle- and low-esteem children who relied on love-withdrawal and physical punishment. Finally, in resolving parent-child conflicts, mothers of high-esteem children employed discussion, reasoning, and advising, in contrast to mothers of low- and medium-esteem children who relied on intimidation, coercion, and force. It bears emphasizing that mothers of high-esteem children were not lax in exercising control; rather, they were clear, consistent, and respectful in communicating expectations, enforcing limits, and rewarding prosocial behavior. In contrast, mothers of low-esteem children were unclear, inconsistent, and disrespectful in

communicating expectations (i.e., they failed to specify both unwanted and preferred behaviors) and enforcing limits. Thus, Coopersmith (1967) concluded that definitive parental expectations and limits convey care and concern for the child's welfare and provide values and standards by which the child can judge his/her competence, in contrast to laxity and inconsistency which convey indifference regarding the child's welfare and deprive him/her of external standards by which to measure performance.

Childrearing investigations among preschool children and their parents have corroborated Coopersmith's (1967) conclusions, with Symonds (1939), Radke (1946), and Baumrind (1967) independently reporting that children of highly restrictive, dominant, and/or punitive parents were less self-assured and socially competent than children whose parents relied on positive love-oriented discipline techniques (i.e., modeling and encouragement of desired behaviors and reasoning to resolve conflicts). Similarly, Olweus (1978) and Offer et al. (1979) independently demonstrated that aggressive adolescents, who had experienced high levels of coercive and aggressive parental control in conjunction with inconsistent parental expectations, had poorer self-images than well-matched normal controls. Finally, the general pattern of results based on longitudinal studies of personality development (Block, 1971; Kagan & Moss, 1962) are consistent with the conclusion that parental power assertion is inversely associated with child-adolescent self-esteem.

Psychophysiological Distress

Self-esteem has been correlated repeatedly with qualitative differences in affective functioning. That is, when the individual is

confronted by unfamiliar or stressful situations, feelings of low self-regard and assurance are associated with anxiety, depression, and related disturbances in autonomic functioning (Beck, 1973; Cannon, 1927; Coopersmith, 1967; Kaplan, 1979).

More specifically, anxiety has customarily been defined as a diffuse apprehension which is accompanied by a range of psychophysiological symptoms resulting from an increase in autonomic nervous system functioning and other manifest symptoms of distress including poor concentration, sleeplessness, and headaches (American Psychiatric Association, 1980; Chess & Hassibi, 1978; Izard, 1972; May, 1977; Seyle, 1956, 1974; Silver, 1979; Spielberger, 1972; Spielberger & Sarason, 1975, 1977). Depression has usually been conceptualized as a syndrome of behaviors, thoughts, and affects including dysphoria, self-deprecation, guilt, hopelessness, helplessness, poor concentration, apathy, withdrawal, somatic dysregulation, and vague physical complaints (Akiskal, Bitar, Puzantian, Rosenthal, & Walker, 1978; American Psychiatric Association, 1980; Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979; Depue, 1979; Izard, 1972; Malmquist, 1971). Based on the substantial overlap in manifest symptomatology characterizing anxiety and depression, in the present context the two syndromes are subsumed under the more general construct of psychophysiological distress.

Parent-Child Affectional Relationships. Although anxiety and depression per se have rarely been studied as outcome variables in childrearing studies, several empirical investigations have documented relationships among parental nurturance and acceptance and a variety of child-adolescent variables indicative of affective distress. For example, using well-validated inventories to assess adolescent boys'

affective experiences (completed by subjects and their mothers), Coopersmith (1967) demonstrated that high-esteem adolescents, who had experienced high levels of parental acceptance and nurturance, were more emotionally expressive and happy, and less despondent, distressed, tense, and physically symptomatic than low-esteem adolescents who had experienced low levels of parental acceptance and nurturance. In a longitudinal study among adolescents, Kaplan (1979) corroborated the reciprocal relationship between self-esteem and anxiety by demonstrating that deficient self-esteem or unmanageable anxiety frequently initiates a self-perpetuating cycle of increasing psychophysiological distress which culminates in deviant behavior, presumably adopted as a means of defending against further loss of esteem and overwhelming anxiety.

In a pioneering investigation of relationships among parenting practices and child personality variables, Sears, Maccoby, and Levine (1957) interviewed and rated mothers of normal five-year-olds in terms of hostility and restrictiveness, and seven years later, rated children on a wide range of social-emotional variables (Sears, 1961). Data analysis indicated that maternal hostility and restrictiveness experienced during early childhood were substantially related to preadolescents' self-aggression including suicidal ideation and behavior. Similarly, analyzing concurrent and longitudinal data collected in the Berkeley Growth Study, Bayley and Schaefer (1960) obtained substantial concurrent and longitudinal relationships among maternal hostility and overcontrol and indicators of child-adolescent maladjustment (e.g., unhappiness, sulkeness, coldness, hostility). Additionally, behavioral comparisons among preschool children whose parents were objectively classified as evidencing various levels of

emotional supportiveness and warmth have further corroborated relationships among parental neglect and rejection and child indicators of anxiety and depression (Baumrind, 1967; Radke, 1946; Symonds, 1939).

Investigations employing young adult sample groups have reported similar findings. For example, Slater's (1955) systematic investigation of young adults' recollections of early parent-child interactions and self-reports of current psychosocial functioning indicated that parental neglect and rejection experienced during childhood was directly associated with anxiety, depression, and psychasthenia in young adulthood. Similarly, Watson (1934) compared student ratings of parental acceptance and strictness and self-reports of current social-emotional functioning and found that parental rejection and punitiveness experienced during childhood was associated with high levels of anxiety, worry, guilt, and unhappiness in young adulthood. The general picture of results based on longitudinal investigations (Block, 1971; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Offer & Offer, 1975; Tuddenham, 1959) has also corroborated the pivotal role played by early parental nurturance and acceptance in the subsequent emotional functioning of young adults.

Finally, in a clinical study of overt depression among children, Poznanski and Zrull (1970) identified a small sample group of children who evidenced classical depressive symptomatology which had developed over the course of one or more years. Early childhood histories indicated that all of the children had been overtly rejected and neglected. Similarly, Jacobson, Fasman, and DiMascio (1975) explored early history factors associated with the development of depressive disorders and concluded that having been reared in a rejecting, abusive

atmosphere is one of four factors contributing to a heightened risk of becoming depressed in later life.

Parental Power Assertion. By definition, parental power assertion constitutes a threat to the child's well-being and, accordingly, can be expected to contribute to high levels of anxiety and associated somatic distress (Parke, 1972). Moreover, the fact that aversive treatment is administered by parents, on whom children are physically and emotionally dependent, can be expected to increase the likelihood that the child will experience chronic worry and conflict and attendant psychophysiological distress.

Although few studies have assessed associations among parental power assertion and indicators of child-adolescent anxiety and depression, those which have, have consistently documented a positive relationship between parental punitiveness and child-adolescent affective distress. For example, using preschool sample groups, Symonds (1939), Radke (1946), and Baumrind (1967) independently obtained significant relationships among parental restrictiveness (i.e., the tendency to be highly controlling and punitive) and insecure, inhibited child behaviors. Additionally, Coopersmith (1967) found that preadolescents who had experienced high levels of parental coercion and punitiveness (and low levels of parental reward and encouragement) were significantly more unhappy, despondent, distressed, tense, and symptomatic, and less emotionally expressive than subjects who had experienced low levels of parental coercion and punishment. Similarly, Sears (1961) obtained a substantial correlation between maternal restrictiveness assessed when subjects were five-years-old and preadolescents' self-aggression (including suicidal behavior) assessed

when subjects were 12-years-old. Bayley and Schaefer (1960) also obtained substantial concurrent and longitudinal relationships among maternal overcontrol during childhood and offspring traits indicative of maladjustment.

The relationship between parental power assertion and offspring affective distress has also been documented among young adult sample groups. For example, Slater (1955) assessed relationships among young adults' retrospective ratings of parental punishment and self-reports of current psychosocial functioning and found that severity of parental punishment during childhood and adolescence was directly associated with diffuse anxiety and psychophysiological distress during young adulthood. Similarly, Watson (1934) obtained significant correlations among young adults' retrospective reports of parental punitiveness and self-ratings of current anxiety, worry, guilt, and unhappiness.

Finally, clinical studies of children and adolescents characterized as over-inhibited, neurotic, highly anxious and/or depressed (Hewitt & Jenkins, 1946; Jacobson et al., 1975; Lewis, 1954; Poznanski & Zrull, 1970; Rosenthal, Ni, Finkelstein, & Berkwits, 1962) have consistently found that anxious, depressed children and adolescents have experienced parental relationships characterized by a high degree of restrictiveness and punitiveness. Summarizing findings from childrearing and child-clinical studies regarding the enduring influence of parental overcontrol, Feshbach (1970) concluded:

The combination of parental punitiveness plus the exercise of strict controls should induce in the child a strong conflict between anger toward the parents and anxiety over the expression of aggressive feelings. The constraint of the parents reduces realistic alternatives available to the child for resolution of the conflict. The probable outcome is internalization of the conflict manifesting itself in persistent tension, anxiety, self-devaluation, and

Attributional Style

Systematic differences in the way in which individuals account for positive and negative events in their lives have been empirically associated with qualitatively different kinds of affect and behavior (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Akiskal, 1979; Beck & Beck, 1972; Beck et al., 1979; Ellis, 1973; Garber, Miller, & Seaman, 1979; Janoff-Bulman, 1979; Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1982; Raps, Peterson, Jones, & Seligman, 1982). Specifically, a cognitive style characterized by internal (i.e., primarily due to self), stable (i.e., will nearly always be present), and global (i.e., affects nearly all situations) attributions for negative events, and external, unstable, and specific attributions for positive events has been correlated with well-validated measures of depressive symptomatology among normal and depressed sample groups (Raps, Peterson, Reinhard, Abramson, and Seligman, 1982; Seligman, Abramson, Semmel, & von Baeyer, 1979). Moreover, attributional style has been shown to be a highly accurate predictor of subsequent depressive symptomatology in normal subjects faced with real-life experiences having negative outcomes (Golin, Sweeney, & Shaeffer, 1981; Semmel, Peterson, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1980).

The concept of a depressive attributional style is based on the learned helplessness model of depression which postulates that when an individual is faced with an outcome that is independent of his/her responses, that individual acquires the belief that responding is futile. The significance of this phenomenon inheres in its generalizability beyond the learning environment; that is, in new situations the individual maintains a belief in

response-outcome-independence and expects that valued reinforcements cannot be obtained and aversive events cannot be reduced or eliminated by his/her responses. In turn, the expectancy of uncontrollability results in a decrease in response initiation, difficulty in learning that reinforcements are response contingent, and heightened emotionality including fear, anxiety, and depression. Moreover, heightened emotionality is especially likely when uncontrollable events are seen as traumatic; that is, the presence of highly aversive or life-threatening events and the absence of highly desirable or life-sustaining events. Finally, to the extent that the individual attributes the uncontrollability of negative outcomes to internal factors (i.e., holds him/herself responsible) and attributes positive outcomes to external factors (i.e., expects no control over sources of gratification) a reduction in self-esteem and an increase in depression are likely. (For reviews of the experimental literature demonstrating laboratory-induced helplessness and documenting the substantial overlap in symptomatology associated with learned helplessness and mild and severe depression, see Abramson et al., 1978; Garber et al., 1979; Peterson et al., 1982; Seligman et al., 1979).

The learned helplessness paradigm does not contend that a depressive attributional style comprises a sufficient cause of depression; rather, it postulates that a depressive attributional style is associated with an increased vulnerability to becoming depressed, given the specific environmental circumstance of a significant negative stressor (Abramson et al., 1978; Garber et al., 1979; Seligman et al., 1979). Accordingly, in the present context, attributional style is conceptualized as an aspect of intrapersonal functioning having

important implications regarding the individual's capacity for coping with stress.

Parent-Child Affectional Relationships. Garber et al. (1979) postulated that "... people who are particularly susceptible to depression may have had lives filled with situations in which they were unable to influence their sources of suffering and gratification" (p. 345). The viability of this hypothesis rests on the supposition that parental neglect and rejection -- which, by definition, comprise a deficit in responsive caretaking -- is the real-life equivalent of long-term experimental exposure to response-outcome noncontingency and, therefore, can be expected to result in cognitive, motivational, and affective symptoms associated with learned helplessness. Moreover, the extent of the young child's dependence upon parents for survival can be expected to make experiences of response-outcome-noncontingency in the context of parent-child relationships truly traumatic, thereby increasing the likelihood that negative affects will accompany the acquisition of a depressive attributional style. Finally, the child's immature cognitive processes (i.e., omnipotence and egocentrism) can be expected to increase the likelihood that attributions for response-outcome-noncontingency in the context of early parent-child relationships would include self-blame, thereby increasing the likelihood that a deficit in self-esteem would ensue (Erikson, 1950; Green, 1978a, 1978b; Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975; Piaget, 1952, 1954).

Developmental theory and research thus add credence to the hypothesis that parental neglect and rejection experienced during childhood contribute to the acquisition of a depressive attributional style among children (and, in turn, vulnerability to depression in the

face of significant environmental stressors). However, this hypothesis has not been empirically evaluated, and no direct evidence exists to support the expectation that parental neglect and rejection are associated with the acquisition of a depressive attributional style among offspring.

Parental Power Assertion. Parental intimidation and punitiveness toward children constitute an extreme form of aversive treatment which is frequently unpredictable and inescapable. Accordingly, parental reliance upon power assertive control techniques would be expected to create a real-life learning environment highly conducive to the development of a depressive attributional style among children and adolescents. However, this hypothesis has not been tested no empirical evidence exists to support the prediction that parental coercion and punitiveness are associated with the development of a depressive attributional style among offspring.

Interpersonal Functioning

Intra- and interpersonal functioning are intimately interrelated in that the individual's feelings and beliefs are translated into a wide range of social attitudes and behaviors which comprise a fairly consistent interpersonal style. It is readily acknowledged that parental relationships provide the primary learning environment in which the individual acquires a basic sense of trust versus mistrust and specific interpersonal attitudes and skills (Erikson, 1950; Sullivan, 1953).

A review of the developmental and personality literature suggests that the broad range of specific attitudes and behaviors which comprise interpersonal functioning can be conceptualized in terms of three broad

50

orientations or styles: (a) prosocial; (b) dependent; and (c) hostile-aggressive. An ideal or prosocial orientation is characterized by basic trust and manifested in constructive behaviors including empathic responsiveness to others and assertive social involvement and coping. Two less constructive orientations are characterized by deficient trust in self and/or others: (a) a dependent orientation is manifested by the tendency to perceive oneself as helpless and view powerful others as means to obtaining nurturance and assistance; and (b) a hostile-aggressive orientation is manifested by the tendency to feel resentful and suspicious and to aggress against others directly or indirectly with little objective provocation.

Attachment-Dependency

Murray (1938) defined dependency as behavior which seeks to obtain nurturance from other people and/or which indicates that reliance upon others is the individual's dominant method of goal achievement. Subsequently, Bowlby (1969; 1977) differentiated between the state of being dependent, defined as reliance on another to meet one's physical needs, and attachment which denotes an affectional bond that an individual forms between himself and another. Other investigators (Emmerich, 1966; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Rohner, 1975) have similarly distinguished between instrumental dependency (i.e., reliance on others to meet one's physical needs) and emotional or affectional dependency (i.e., seeking nurturance and attention for its own sake). In keeping with this distinction, in the present context, attachment denotes an affectional bond, and dependency denotes reliance on others to meet one's physical-emotional needs (in contrast to autonomy).

An extreme level of dependency is intrinsic to infancy, during

51

which time fully established infant-parent attachments ensure that parents will respond to infants' physical-emotional needs. Primary attachments endure over time, although the degree of dependency and specific behaviors through which they are manifested change in response to the child's developing physical, cognitive, and emotional capacities. Additionally, as the infant-child matures, "good enough" primary attachments provide a secure base from which the infant-child explores his/her world and establishes subsequent affectional bonds characterized by adaptive, age-appropriate, affirming interactions with an ever-widening circle of significant others. Ideally, after having progressed through various stages of differential attachments and degrees of increasing independence, the adult achieves a state of relatively autonomous instrumental functioning while simultaneously engaging in reciprocal attachments characterized by mutual trust, respect, pleasure, and support (i.e., interdependency).

While high levels of dependency and intense attachments are thus the hallmark of healthy infant development, continuance of immature dependent behaviors into childhood interferes with healthy social-emotional development by limiting the child's acquisition of alternative, increasingly autonomous strategies for coping with the environment. This conceptualization is supported by findings which demonstrate that attachment and dependency follow a similar developmental course during infancy, while beyond the first year of life, attachment is uncorrelated with dependency which begins to signify an alternative to autonomous functioning (Emmerich, 1966). Also consistent with this conceptualization are numerous empirical findings demonstrating that from preschool-age on, dependency is positively

associated with anxiety and negatively correlated with self-esteem, self-confidence, prosocial peer interaction, and peer acceptance and popularity (Baumrind, 1967; Caron, 1953; Coopersmith, 1967; Emmerich, 1964; 1966; Heathers, 1955; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Marshall & McCandless, 1957; McCandless, Balsbaugh, & Bennett, 1958; McCandless, Belous, & Bennett, 1961; Moore & Updegraff, 1964; Murphy, 1962; Schaefer & Bayley, 1963; Slater, 1955; Stith & Connor, 1962).

The present task is to specify relationships among primary parent-child interaction variables and: (a) the establishment of infant attachments; and (b) the development of dependency versus autonomy among children, adolescents, and young adults.

Parent-Child Affectional Relationships. Bowlby (1969) postulated that the quality of individual mother-infant attachments depends upon: (a) the mother's caretaking behaviors and behaviors antithetical to caretaking; and (b) the infant's attachment behaviors and behaviors antithetical to attachment. Empirical investigations contributing to and confirming Bowlby's hypotheses have been conducted by Schaffer and Emerson (1964) and Ainsworth and her colleagues (e.g., Ainsworth, 1963, 1967, 1979; Ainsworth & Bell, 1970; Ainsworth, Bell, & Stayton, 1971; Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969; Blehar, Lieberman, & Ainsworth, 1977).

Schaffer and Emerson (1964) studied 60 Scottish infants from early infancy to 18 months of age, during which time mothers were interviewed and infants were observed reacting to a specific set of separation situations on a monthly basis. Analysis of these data indicated that the quality of infants' attachments was significantly related to maternal responsiveness (i.e., immediacy of response to infant signaling behaviors) and the amount of mother-infant interaction initiated by

mothers (i.e., total time of maternal involvement beyond that necessary for routine care). When infants established attachments with individuals other than their mothers, the primary determinant of the intensity of these attachments was the amount of "relevant" sensory stimulation offered by attachment figures.

Similarly, Ainsworth (1963) found that the total amount of time spent by Ganda mothers in interactions with their infants was positively related to the security of infants' attachments (Ainsworth, 1963, 1967), a finding which has subsequently been corroborated and refined among American mother-infant pairs observed at home and in experimentally controlled attachment-exploration situations (Ainsworth & Bell, 1970; Ainsworth et al., 1971; Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969; Arsenian, 1943; Blehar et al., 1977; Cox & Campbell, 1968; Murphy, 1962; Rheingold, 1969; Rheingold & Eckerman, 1969; Rubenstein, 1967). Specifically, attachment studies have consistently differentiated among two groups of infants, a securely attached group and an insecurely or ambivalently attached group; a third group of infants, characterized as detached, has been less consistently identified. Specifically, infants characterized as securely attached repeatedly evidenced obvious pleasure in interacting with their mothers, were active and "confident" in initiating contact, engaged in frequent and active exploration of their surroundings, and were readily calmed by their mothers' presence or contact in unfamiliar situations. Mothers of these infants were repeatedly characterized as highly sensitive, responsive, accessible (as opposed to ignoring), cooperative (as opposed to interfering), and accepting (as opposed to rejecting) in interactions with their infants. In contrast, infants characterized as insecurely attached evidenced little or no pleasure in

interacting with their mothers, alternated between "clingy," excessively dependent behaviors and proximity/contact-avoiding behaviors, engaged in limited exploration, were highly distressed by change or unfamiliarity, and were not readily calmed by their mothers' presence or contact.

Mothers of these infants evidenced various degrees of insensitive, unresponsive, ignoring, interfering, and rejecting behaviors toward their infants; mothers of the most ambivalently attached infants (and mothers of infants characterized as detached) evidenced highly insensitive and inappropriate infant care. Moreover, several follow-up investigations (reviewed by Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) of attachment-study infants at ages two, three, and six have consistently indicated that the quality of infant-mother attachments assessed at age one is substantially related to the child's self-reliance, interpersonal competence, and overall adjustment at least through early school years.

In sum, accumulated findings across attachment studies indicate that: (a) qualitative aspects of mothers' affectional interactions with their infants are substantially related to the intensity and security of infants' attachments; (b) the state of being securely attached together with the presence of the attachment figure facilitates exploration behaviors; (c) after an attachment is established, attachment behaviors are intensified in the face of perceived threats to the relationship whether in the form of external "danger" or maternal behavior antithetical to attachment; (d) insecure attachment is associated with heightened dependency behaviors which are incompatible with exploration behaviors; and (e) qualitative differences in infant-mother attachments are associated with lasting differences in the child's subsequent social-emotional functioning.

Childrearing investigations have further documented the relationship among parental neglect and rejection and child dependency manifested in immature nurturance-, help-, and attention-seeking behaviors. For example, Smith (1958) and Marshall (1961) independently demonstrated that maternal rejection (assessed on the basis of mothers' responses to structured inventories) was significantly associated with objective dependency ratings among preschool children. Additionally, on the basis of systematic observations of mother-child interactions, Hatfield, Ferguson, Rau, and Alpert (1967) demonstrated that maternal warmth was positively associated with preschool children's independent behaviors. Additional childrearing studies employing a variety of sample groups, procedures, and data sources have further corroborated the conclusion that parental nurturance and involvement are associated with child self-reliance and interpersonal competence (Baldwin, 1949; Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967; McCord, McCord, & Verden, 1962; Offer & Offer, 1975; Radke, 1946; Siegelman, 1966; Symonds, 1939; Watson, 1957; Winder & Rau, 1962; Wittenborn, 1956). Additionally, in a retrospective investigation employing student subjects, Slater (1955) obtained an inverse relationship between parental supportiveness and warmth experienced during childhood and offspring dependency during young adulthood. Finally, the overall pattern of longitudinal results reported by Block (1971) is consistent with the conclusion that parental neglect and hostility experienced during childhood are associated with high levels of dependency and general immaturity during adulthood.

In contrast, a few childrearing studies have reported that parental rejection or hostility is associated with low dependency and/or high autonomy, with some investigations obtaining complex interactions among

parental rejection, child dependency, and the child's age and/or sex (Kagan & Moss, 1962; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Sears, Rau, & Alpert, 1965; Sears, Whiting, Nowlis, & Sears, 1953). For example, Sears et al. (1953, 1957, 1965) found that among preschool and elementary-age girls (but not boys), maternal hostility was negatively associated with dependency behaviors toward adults at home and in school. Attempting to account for the apparent sex-differentiated association between maternal hostility and child dependency, Sears et al. (1957) suggested that the effect of a given amount of maternal hostility is more severe for girls than for boys (presumably due to girls' stronger identification with mothers) and that girls attempt to cope with perceived severe maternal hostility by inhibiting dependency behaviors and intensifying autonomy strivings. Similarly, Kagan and Moss (1962) found that early (i.e., from birth to six years old) severe maternal hostility experienced by girls (but not boys) was associated with independence during adulthood. However, early maternal hostility toward girls was also associated with high demands for autonomy which may have directly facilitated daughters' independence strivings (Kagan & Moss, 1962).

An additional exception to the general rule of a positive relationship between maternal rejection and child dependency was reported by Bandura and Walters (1959) on the basis of their comparison of acting-out aggressive adolescents and a carefully-matched, nonaggressive control group. Aggressive subjects, who had experienced high levels of parental rejection (but not gross physical or emotional neglect), evidenced low levels of dependent behaviors and high levels of dependency anxiety. Interpreting their findings, Bandura and Walters

57

(1959) suggested that among highly aggressive adolescents, high levels of dependency anxiety in conjunction with low levels of overt dependency behaviors signify a defensive style of coping with dependency frustration encountered after the establishment of primary attachments. The pattern of relationships among parent behaviors and child personality traits obtained among additional adolescent sample groups identified as aggressive (Gleuck & Gleuck, 1950; Healy & Bronner, 1936; Offer et al., 1979) is consistent with this interpretation, as is Kagan and Moss' (1962) finding that males characterized as independent during adolescence evidenced conflict regarding dependency during adulthood. Further support for this line of reasoning has come from several studies which have documented an inverse relationship between dependency conflict and overt dependency behaviors among child and adolescent sample groups (Beller, 1957, 1962; Beller & Haeberle, 1961). For example, in a particularly applicable study conducted with male delinquents, Cairns (1961) obtained substantial positive correlations among a fantasy measure of dependency anxiety, a behavioral measure of avoidance of help-seeking (when help-seeking was objectively appropriate), and a self-report measure of resistance to social influence, findings which were subsequently replicated among adult subjects (Cairns & Lewis, 1962).

Finally, two additional lines of research have documented critical interrelationships among responsive, consistent maternal care, secure infant attachments, and subsequent healthy social development among children. First, numerous investigations of institution-reared children deprived of responsive caretaking and appropriate stimulation (Bowlby, 1951, 1953; Goldfarb, 1945; Heinicke, 1973; Pinneau, 1955; Spitz, 1945;

Spitz & Wolf, 1946) have repeatedly demonstrated that the extreme absence of environmental conditions conducive to the development of attachments during infancy and early childhood is associated with enduring social unresponsiveness (i.e., detachment) and generally vulnerable psychosocial functioning (Ainsworth, 1962; Casler, 1961; Rutter, 1972; Yarrow, 1961; 1964). On the other hand, institution-reared children who had experienced sufficient stimulation to facilitate attachments during infancy and were subsequently exposed to recurrent dependency frustration have been characterized as highly dependent (analogous to heightened dependency strivings observed among ambivalently attached home-reared infants described by Ainsworth, 1963, 1967) (Butterfield & Zigler, 1965; Stevenson & Fahel, 1961; Zigler, Balla, & Butterfield, 1966; Zigler & Williams, 1963). An additional independent line of research has shown that children exposed to varying degrees of real-life maternal separation evidence detachment, prolonged and intense ambivalent reaction patterns (characterized by heightened dependency behaviors alternating with intense dependency-avoiding behaviors), and lasting maladjustment (with the severity of disturbance being determined by the child's age, the length of separation, and the severity of social deprivation and environmental discontinuity during separations) (Birtchnell, 1972; Blehar, 1975; Bowlby, 1953, 1958, 1960, 1963, 1969, 1973, 1980; Bowlby, Ainsworth, Boston, & Rosenbluth, 1956; Heinicke & Westheimer, 1965; Robertson, 1952, 1953; Robertson & Robertson, 1971; Schaffer, 1958; Schaffer & Callender, 1959). On the basis of a critical review and integration of the parental deprivation and separation literature, Zigler (1966) concluded that reactions to the absence of a continuous relationship with a responsive and stimulating

59

attachment figure comprise two conflicting and enduring tendencies -- a dependent reaction pattern and a counter-dependent or hostile-aggressive reaction pattern.

Parental Power Assertion. Parental verbal and physical aggression can be conceptualized as comprising a unique subset of insensitive and unresponsive parental behaviors. To the extent that parental punitiveness is employed in the context of a parent-child relationship characterized by sufficient caretaking and stimulation to facilitate attachment, harsh punishment can be expected to contribute to the development of insecure infant attachments and high levels of infant-child dependency behaviors. In contrast, where severe punishment is administered by a consistently neglecting and rejecting parent, deficient attachment (or detachment) and an absence of dependency strivings can be expected to result among offspring (Bandura & Walters, 1963a, 1963b).

Overtly punitive maternal behaviors have rarely been observed in attachment studies, with the result being that there is no direct experimental evidence bearing on the relationship between parental punitiveness and the development of attachments and dependency behaviors among human infants and children. However, investigations of infant attachments among primates, most notably Harlow's (Harlow, 1971; Harlow & Harlow, 1965; Harlow, Harlow, & Suomi, 1971; Harlow & Suomi, 1970) pioneering research with rhesus macaque infants, have poignantly demonstrated that primate infants exposed to intermittently punitive mothers establish intense maternal attachments and heightened dependency strivings. Attempting to account for the association between harsh maternal punishment and heightened dependency among primate infants,

Dutton (1980) proposed the concept of "traumatic bonding" -- the development of a strong emotional tie between a victim of maltreatment and an attachment figure who intermittently intimidates and abuses the victim. On the basis of a review of the human and animal attachment literature and clinical reports documenting intense attachments and dependency among human infants and children alternately abused and "loved" by parents, Dutton concluded: "When the physical punishment is administered at intermittent intervals, and when it is interspersed with permissive and friendly contact, the phenomenon of 'traumatic bonding' seems most powerful" (Dutton, 1980, p. 2). Thus, despite the absence of direct evidence regarding the influence of parental punishment on attachment behaviors among human infants, the pattern of findings across human and animal attachment studies and clinical observations among abused children supports the inference that parental punitiveness in the context of at least a minimum level of caretaking and stimulation is associated with the development of insecure attachments and heightened dependency strivings among infants and children.

Childrearing investigations among preschool and school-age children have provided substantial (but not unanimous) support for the conclusion that parental punitiveness is associated with high levels of child dependency and low levels of autonomous functioning (Baldwin, 1949, 1955; Baumrind, 1967; Kagan & Moss, 1962; McCord et al., 1962; Murphy, 1962; Radke, 1946; Symonds, 1939; Winder & Rau, 1962). Similarly, in a retrospective investigation of parent-child relationships and adult psychosocial functioning, Slater (1955) found a substantial correlation between parental punitiveness and dependency among college students. A less direct relationship was reported by Bandura (1960, cited by Maccoby

& Masters, 1970), who found that among preadolescent boys, parental punishment for dependency was negatively associated with overtly dependent behaviors directed toward the punishing parent but positively associated with dependent behaviors directed toward permissive adults. Conversely, Bandura and Walters (1959) reported that aggressive adolescent boys, who had experienced high levels of parental punitiveness compared to nonaggressive controls, evidenced low levels of dependency. Other studies have obtained complex interactions among parental punitiveness, rewards or permissiveness for dependent behaviors, and child dependency. For example, Sears et al. (1957) found that punishment for dependent behaviors was positively related to child dependency at home only among children who were intermittently rewarded for dependent behaviors. Indeed, parental overprotectiveness and rewards for dependency (both of which tend to interfere with the child's acquisition of more mature and autonomous behaviors) have been consistently correlated with high levels of offspring dependency regardless of subjects' age and sex (Bandura, 1960, cited by Maccoby & Masters, 1970; Coopersmith, 1967; Finney, 1963; Heathers, 1953; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Levy, 1943; Smith, 1958).

Finally, several investigations have yielded opposite findings regarding relationships among parental punitiveness and boys' and girls' dependency behaviors. For example, Sears et al. (1953, 1957, 1965) obtained a direct relationship between maternal punishment and observed dependency at home and in school among boys and an inverse relationship among girls. Similarly, Baumrind and Black (1967) found that punitive parental control was negatively associated with autonomy among preschool boys and positively associated with autonomy among preschool girls.

Conversely, in a longitudinal investigation of personality development, Kagan and Moss (1962) found that maternal restrictiveness (i.e., punitiveness) was consistently correlated with dependency among females, but that among males, maternal restrictiveness, child dependency, and subjects' age were complexly interrelated. While some sex-differentiated associations among parental punitiveness and child dependency behaviors have been meaningfully accounted for on the basis of differential sex-role training (Kagan & Moss, 1962), the validity of such explanations is difficult to determine in the absence of father-child relationship data.

Exceptions notwithstanding, the preponderance of empirical findings regarding associations among parent-child relationship variables and offspring dependency behaviors are consistent with the general conclusion that parental emotional neglect and rejection and power assertive control techniques are associated with insecure infant-child attachments and high levels of child-adolescent dependency. However, where parental care has been extremely unresponsive and/or harsh punishment has been carried out in the absence of positive parental attention and affection, detachment and counter-dependent behaviors are more common among offspring.

Hostility-Aggression

Aggression has customarily been defined as behavior that results in personal injury, psychological devaluation, and/or destruction of property. However, most people do not aggress in conspicuous and direct ways that carry high risks of retaliation; rather, they tend to hurt others in ways that diffuse or obscure responsibility for detrimental actions (Bandura, 1976). Accordingly, a broad range of behaviors

reflecting hostile feelings and the intent to cause psychological or physical harm have been included in operational definitions of aggression.

Virtually every theory of human behavior has attempted to explain the acquisition and maintenance of aggressive reaction patterns. However, most systems have relied upon inherently untestable constructs, with the result being that few empirical studies comparing and evaluating the various theories have been conducted. Noteworthy exceptions include Dollard and Miller's (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939; Dollard & Miller, 1950) frustration-aggression model and Bandura and Walters' (1959; 1963a; 1963b) social learning theory, both of which have generated substantial research. Despite some conflicting results, the preponderance of findings have been parsimoniously accounted for on the basis of learning theory constructs (Bandura, 1976; Becker, 1964; Eron, 1961; Feshbach, 1970; Zigler & Child, 1969).

The major tenants of social learning theory postulate that: (a) aversive treatment may instigate aggressive actions by creating a general state of emotional arousal which facilitates a response aimed at coping; (b) specific aggressive behaviors are learned, either deliberately or inadvertently, by observing aggressive behaviors enacted by others; and (c) for a given individual in a given situation, the particular response facilitated by arousal is determined by the specific strategies that person has developed for coping with stress and the relative historical effectiveness of each potential response (Bandura, 1973).

When subjected to adversity some people seek help and support; others increase achievement efforts; others display withdrawal and resignation; some aggress; others experience heightened somatic reactivity; still others anesthetize

44

themselves against a miserable existence with drugs or alcohol; and most intensify constructive efforts to overcome sources of distress. (Bandura, 1976, p. 213)

Parent-Child Affectional Relationships. Theoretically, emotionally neglectful and/or rejecting parents can be expected to facilitate the acquisition of aggressive reaction patterns among children by: (a) engendering a heightened state of emotional arousal; (b) providing verbally (and/or physically) aggressive models; (c) failing to demonstrate and reinforce constructive strategies for coping with stress; and (d) failing to provide the child with sufficient motivation to develop internal controls and values inconsistent with destructive aggression (Bandura, 1973; Rosenzweig, 1944; Maslow, 1941, 1943).

Utilizing a variety of operational definitions and procedures, childrearing investigations have tended to support predicted associations among parent-child affectional interactions and child-adolescent aggression. For example, Becker et al. (1962) obtained positive correlations among parental hostility (i.e., combined mothers' and fathers' child-directed hostility assessed via structured inventory) and children's observed aggression at home and in preschool. Similarly, on the basis of a well-controlled observational study of preschool children and their parents, Baumrind (1967) found parental coldness and lack of involvement to be positively associated with hostile-aggressive child behaviors in school. Additionally, Sears et al. (1957) obtained a significant correlation between maternal lack of affection and child aggression at home among five-year-olds, and Lesser (1952) found a direct relationship between parental rejection and preadolescent boys' peer-rated overt aggression in school.

In contrast, subsequent attempts to replicate and expand Sears et al.'s (1957) original study have failed to obtain an association between lack of maternal affection and child aggression at home (Sears et al., 1963; Yarrow, Campbell, & Burton, 1968), and Sears' (1961) follow-up investigation of the original Sears et al. (1957) sample failed to obtain a significant relationship between early maternal lack of affection and overt child aggression. Sears (1961) did, however, obtain a significant relationship between prior maternal lack of affection and preadolescents' indirect aggression. Attempting to reconcile discrepancies, Becker (1964) argued that the tendency among investigators to ignore fathers' influence on children had contributed to inconsistent, although interpretable, findings. More pessimistically, Yarrow et al. (1968) attributed contradictory findings to methodological weaknesses characterizing individual studies (e.g., inadequate definitions of key variables, unreliability of measures, lack of independence between predictor and criterion measures) and contended that the relationship between parental rejection and child-adolescent aggression had not been reliably assessed in childrearing studies.

Since that time, more reliable and interpretable data regarding relationships among parental neglect and rejection and child-adolescent aggression have been provided by two rigorously designed, companion investigations. Initially, Eron et al. (1971) evaluated a large mixed-sex sample group of children at 8 years-of-age and their parents, and ten years later, Lefkowitz et al. (1977) re-evaluated a majority of subjects. A substantial methodological strength of these studies was the fact that antecedent and criterion variables were assessed on the basis of information obtained from several independent sources (i.e.,

parents, subjects, peers) via psychometrically verified procedures. Analysis of third-grade data demonstrated strong direct relationships among parental lack of nurturance and rejection and children's peer-rated school aggression (Eron et al., 1971). This conclusion was subsequently corroborated in a replication study conducted in Holland (cited by Eron et al., 1971). Analysis of longitudinal data suggested that parental lack of nurturance and rejection experienced during childhood were less important in determining young-adult aggression than in determining third-grade aggression (Lefkowitz et al., 1977). However, third-grade parental identification variables and young-adult aggression variables were substantially negatively correlated, with low parental identification proving to be the most potent predictor of young-adult aggression irrespective of subjects' sex. Interpreted in conjunction with well-documented associations among parental nurturance and acceptance and constructive parental identification among offspring (Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Kagan, 1958; Slater, 1955, 1961), the magnitude of the inverse relationship between parental identification and young-adult aggression supports the conclusion that parental neglect and rejection play a substantial role in the acquisition of enduring aggressive reaction patterns among offspring. Moreover, the magnitude of correlations obtained among third- and thirteenth-grade aggression ratings indicate that aggressive behaviors are characterized by substantial consistency over time and across situations, leading Lefkowitz et al. (1977) to conclude "a child early on learns a manner of responding to certain situations which is distinctive for him/her and is perpetuated probably because of the success it brings" (p. 78). Several independent reviews of empirical data documenting the substantial

stability of aggressive reaction patterns among a wide range of diverse sample groups (Gersten, Langner, Eisenberg, Simcha-Fagan, & McCarthy, 1976; Olweus, 1979; Patterson, 1979) corroborate Lefkowitz et al.'s (1977) conclusion.

An alternative approach to investigating antecedents of aggression compares children and adolescents identified as highly aggressive or delinquent (and their parents) and carefully matched control groups. Investigations of this kind have consistently obtained positive correlations among parental neglect and rejection and child-adolescent aggression. Exemplifying this approach, Bandura and Walters (1959) identified a sample group of aggressive delinquents of at least average intelligence, who lived in intact families in low delinquency neighborhoods, and whose parents were steadily employed, and a carefully-matched control group described by school personnel as neither markedly aggressive nor withdrawn. Neither group was characterized by a history of gross emotional or physical neglect. Parent-child relationships and adolescent hostility-aggression were assessed on the basis of data obtained from several independent sources (subjects, parents, teachers, peers). Data analysis indicated that: (a) delinquent subjects evidenced significantly more hostility and physical-, indirect-, and verbal aggression toward all targets (i.e., parents, peers, teachers) than control subjects; (b) parents of delinquent subjects were significantly less warm and more rejecting than control parents; (c) delinquent subjects felt more rejected by parents and experienced more ambivalence and anxiety about depending upon parents than control subjects; and (d) discrepancies between groups were more pronounced with respect to father-son relationships.

McCord, McCord, and Howard (1961) obtained similar findings using a slightly modified approach. They followed a small sample group of nondelinquent, aggressive boys and their parents and a carefully matched control group of nonaggressive boys and their parents over a five-year period beginning when subjects were nine years old. On the basis of data obtained from a wide range of sources (e.g., direct observation, school personnel, mental health professionals, police) each parent-child relationship was objectively rated as affectionate and accepting or cold and rejecting, and each subject was classified as normally assertive, nonaggressive, or overtly aggressive. Data analysis indicated that 95% of aggressive boys had at least one parent who was rated as rejecting, compared to the majority of assertive and nonaggressive boys whose parents were rated as accepting and affectionate. Corroborative findings were reported by Glueck and Glueck (1950), on the basis of their well-controlled comparison of delinquent boys and control boys matched for age, intelligence, and family socioeconomic status, and by Healy and Bronner (1936) on the basis of their careful comparison of delinquent boys and their nondelinquent siblings. More recent documentation of the substantial relationship between parental rejection experienced during childhood and adolescents' hostility and aggression was provided by Olweus's (1978) comparison of "bullies," "whipping boys," and control boys, and Offer et al.'s (1979) comprehensive longitudinal study of normal and delinquent adolescent males and females.

Finally, several clinically oriented studies of children with aggressive behavior problems (Bowlby, 1946; Friedlander, 1949; Gersten et al., 1976; Hewitt & Jenkins, 1946; Lewis, 1954) have reported similar

conclusions. For example, Bowlby (1946) investigated family histories of disturbed children and adolescents and found that parental rejection was significantly more prevalent in the histories of aggressive children and adolescents than in the histories of nonaggressive, otherwise disturbed children and adolescents.

In sum, despite some inconsistent findings, as a group, childrearing and delinquency investigations provide strong support for the conclusion that parental emotional neglect and rejection experienced during childhood are significantly associated with the development of enduring hostile attitudes and aggressive behaviors (overt and/or indirect) among children and adolescents.

Parental Power Assertion. Theoretically, unique characteristics of parental power assertion can be expected to make it a particularly salient antecedent of aggressive reaction patterns among children and adolescents (Bandura, 1976). Specifically, parental aggression: (a) is frightening and painful (and often unpredictable and inescapable), thereby comprising an extreme form of aversive treatment and a potent instigator to child-adolescent aggression (Buss, 1963; Graham, Charwat, Honig, & Welty, 1951; Goodenough, 1931; Parke, 1972; Ulrich, 1966); (b) provides the child-victim with a model of deficient self-control and specific aggressive behaviors which are rarely followed by negative consequences for the perpetrator, thereby lowering the child-victim's inhibitions against aggression and teaching specific aggressive behaviors (Allinsmith, 1954; Buss, 1961; Feshbach, 1970); and (c) precludes modeling and reinforcement of alternative, prosocial means for dealing with frustration and expressing anger (Hoffman, 1960; Parke, 1972). Conversely, the aversiveness of parental punishment contingent

upon child aggression might be expected to inhibit the child's direct expression of aggression due to fear of punishment, at least in the presence of punitive parents (Parke, 1972).

Extensive laboratory investigations assessing factors influencing the acquisition of aggressive behaviors among child subjects have provided fairly consistent support for the facilitating effects of observing an aggressive model. Empirical support for an enduring inhibiting effect of punishment on child aggression has been less impressive (Bandura, 1976; Bandura & Walters, 1963a, 1963b; Parke, 1972; Walters, 1966). However, generalizations from laboratory studies to real life are limited by the fact that experimental analogues of parental punishment have necessarily been restricted in mode, intensity, and duration, in contrast to the seemingly unlimited range, intensity, and duration of parental behaviors employed in the name of "disciplining" children (Helfer & Kempe, 1974; Kempe & Helfer, 1968, 1972, 1980).

Childrearing investigations have provided substantial support for the association between parental power assertion and child-adolescent aggression, despite some contradictory findings and reports of complex interactions among parental punishment, child aggression, and the sex and age of the child. For example, Sears et al. (1953) observed and rated a small sample group of preschool children in terms of overt aggressive behaviors and interviewed mothers to assess severity of maternal punishment (i.e., degree of physical pain or discomfort generated by the mother when the child engaged in undesirable behavior). Data analysis indicated that maternal punitiveness and child aggression in school were substantially related among boys, but among girls, mild

and severe maternal punishment were associated with low aggression, and moderate punishment was associated with high aggression. However, severe punishment of girls was also associated with low overall responding, and when activity level was taken into account, severely punished girls were more aggressive than mildly punished girls. Additionally, in a randomly-selected subset of this sample group, maternal punitiveness was positively correlated with doll-play aggression (Hollenberg & Sperry, 1951), suggesting that maternal punitiveness was associated with strong hostility among boys and girls, but that girls inhibited the direct expression of aggression in school.

Levin and Sears (1956) reported similar findings regarding the relationship between maternal punitiveness and doll-play aggression among preschool girls and boys. Additionally, Delaney (1965) and Gordon and Smith (1965) partially replicated Sears et al.'s (1953) findings of complex interactions among maternal punitiveness, child aggression, and the child's sex among independent sample groups of preschool children and their mothers. In contrast, Yarrow et al. (1968) failed to replicate Sears et al.'s (1953) findings regarding the relationship between maternal punitiveness and children's school aggression. Yarrow et al. (1968) did, however, obtain a positive correlation between severity of maternal punishment for child aggression and boys' and girls' home aggression.

A study conducted by Becker et al. (1962), in which the influence of both parents was assessed, suggested a potential explanation for inconsistent findings across earlier studies. Using a design similar to that used by Sears et al. (1953), Becker et al. (1962) replicated findings of the former study and obtained an additional correlation

between maternal punitiveness and boys' and girls' parent-rated aggression at home. Moreover, Becker et al. (1962) found that fathers' punitiveness was directly related to girls' school aggression, while for boys, high and low paternal punitiveness was associated with high levels of aggression in school. Becker (1964) reasoned:

Closer examination of the data suggested that the perplexing results might be a product of the failure to consider the frustrating effects of both parents. When hostility and punitiveness for both parents were summated, approximately linear relations to child aggression were found for both boys and girls at home, and boys at school. For girls at school, as the summated index increased, aggression increased but quickly reached an asymptote; it is as if sex-role appropriateness set a limit on the expression of aggression for girls outside of the home. (Becker, 1964, p. 178)

The importance of investigating father-child relationships was also demonstrated by Hoffman (1960) in a study which specifically evaluated associations among mothers' and fathers' child-directed power assertion (i.e., direct commands, threats, deprivations, and physical force) and preschool children's power-assertive interactions with peers and teachers. Hoffman (1960) postulated that parental power assertion constitutes an assault on the child's autonomy and arouses hostility and heightened autonomy strivings. He reasoned, however, that severely punished children would inhibit direct expression of hostility in the presence of punitive parents and displace hostile feelings and oppositional tendencies onto low-power targets (e.g., siblings, peers) and/or high-power targets in comparatively permissive settings (e.g., teachers). Hoffman (1960) tested his predictions in a small sample group of families, utilizing verbatim parental reports of parent-child interactions over a 24-hour interval and independent, objective ratings of children's power assertion and oppositional behaviors in school.

Data analysis indicated that mothers' power assertion was directly associated with children's peer-directed hostility and power assertion, and resistance to peers' and teachers' influence attempts. Although fathers' power assertion was not directly associated with children's power assertion, fathers' authoritarianism and power needs were associated with their own and their wives' child-directed power assertion. Hoffman (1960) concluded that fathers' influence was indirectly manifested through mothers' power-assertive interactions with children; that is, mother's power assertion "... seems to be partly a displaced reaction to her husband's power-relevant behavior toward her" (Hoffman, 1960, p. 138).

Substantial relationships between parental power assertion and offspring aggression have also been reported among older sample groups. For example, Allinsmith (1954) found that mothers' self-reported use of physical punishment was associated with aggressive story completion themes among male preadolescents. Additionally, subjects expressed significantly higher approval of the kind of punishment to which they had been predominantly exposed (i.e., physical versus psychological), suggesting that they had internalized parental values regarding punishment. Sears et al. (1957) and Eron et al. (1971) independently obtained substantial correlations between severity of parental punishment and overt child aggression (at home and in school, respectively) among mixed-sex sample groups of school-age children. However, follow-up investigations of both studies (Lefkowitz et al., 1977; Sears, 1961) failed to obtain significant relationships between severity of early parental punishment and overt adolescent aggression, although Sears (1961) did obtain a substantial correlation between early

maternal punitiveness and indirect adolescent aggression.

A comprehensive longitudinal investigation by Kagan and Moss (1962) further documented the complex nature of relationships among maternal restrictiveness (i.e., severity of mother's use of threats and punishment to enforce adherence to standards), offspring sex and age, and aggressive versus inhibited offspring behaviors. Specifically, Kagan and Moss (1962) found that severe maternal restrictiveness prior to age three was associated with concurrent and enduring inhibited behavior among offspring, while maternal restrictiveness after age three was positively associated with child-adolescent aggression, especially among boys. Moreover, adults who had been severely restricted during childhood evidenced high levels of hostility in response to frustration, manifested among men as a tendency toward "aggressive retaliation" and among women as "ease of anger arousal." Kagan and Moss (1962) attributed attenuated relationships among parent behaviors and offspring aggression among females to cultural sanctions against the overt expression of aggression by girls and women.

Weatherley (1962) corroborated the relationship between parental punitiveness and the inhibition of aggression among women in a study utilizing mothers' self-reported punishment techniques and daughters' (students) projectively assessed anger arousal and self-reported affective distress. Data analysis indicated that daughters of punitive mothers reported being more angry, unhappy, and tense than daughters of nonpunitive mothers. However, in contrast to nonpunitively reared women, punitively reared women failed to show an increase in aggressive story themes as the level of emotional arousal and aggressive pull in stimulus cards increased. Weatherley (1962) concluded that severely

55

punished women inhibited their expression of aggression despite increased emotional arousal and external provocation, in contrast to mildly punished women who responded appropriately to arousal and provocation. In turn, Weatherley (1962) reasoned, the inappropriate suppression of aggression evidenced by severely punished women contributed to their higher levels of affective distress. Independent support for this line of reasoning was provided by Slater's (1955) and Watson's (1934) findings of high levels of hostile, dependent behaviors and anxious, depressed affect among university students who recalled being severely punished as children.

Finally, investigations of childrearing practices among parents of adolescents identified as aggressive and carefully-matched controls have provided strong and consistent support for the relationship between parental power assertion, especially physical aggression, and adolescent aggression. For example, comparing parental disciplinary practices among parents of nondelinquent aggressive, assertive, and nonaggressive boys, McCord et al. (1961) found substantial relationships among maternal use of verbal intimidation and severe physical punishment, and adolescent aggression. Similarly, Bandura and Walters (1959) found substantially higher levels of punitive controls (e.g., severe deprivation of privileges, hitting) among parents of aggressive delinquents, compared to parents of nonaggressive boys, who preferred reasoning as a primary means of altering their sons' behavior. Olweus (1978) reported similar findings on the basis of his comparison of punishment tactics employed by parents of "bullies," "whipping boys," and control boys, as did Healy and Bronner (1936), Glueck and Glueck (1950), and Offer et al. (1979) on the basis of their comparisons of

punishment techniques employed by parents of aggressive delinquents and parents of nonaggressive, carefully-matched control adolescents.

In sum, the preponderance of findings across childrearing and delinquency studies support the general conclusion that parental power assertion, especially severe physical punishment, comprises a particularly salient contributor to the acquisition of enduring hostile-aggressive reaction patterns among children and adolescents. Additionally, findings of complex interactions among subjects' sex, age, and mode of aggressive expression are consistent with the interpretation that: (a) females who experience hostile, punitive parenting are more likely to suppress hostility and/or express aggression indirectly, in comparison to males who are more likely to express aggression actively; and (b) adolescents and young adults who, during childhood, experienced hostile, punitive parenting are more likely to express aggression indirectly, in comparison to preschool- and school-age children who are more likely to express aggression actively.

Prosocial Functioning

Prosocial functioning is not a single behavioral system. Rather, it is a generally constructive style of social interaction comprised of a cluster of related attitudes and behaviors including: (a) the capacity to trust and enjoy others; (b) a willingness to offer others emotional support and assistance based on concern for their welfare rather than self-serving motives (i.e., empathy or altruism); and (c) a readiness to initiate interpersonal interactions and express feelings and expectations constructively (i.e., assertion). In addition, prosocial functioning has been shown to be positively associated with self-esteem, and negatively associated with psychophysiological

distress, aggression, and dependency (Eisenberg, 1982; Coopersmith, 1967; Emmerich, 1964; Helmreich & Collins, 1967; Rosenthal, 1967a, 1967b).

Theoretically, the cornerstone of prosocial functioning is an attitude of basic trust (i.e., secure infant-parent attachments) which is acquired in the context of nurturant and responsive parent-child relationships (Ainsworth, 1967, 1977; Bowlby, 1969; Erikson, 1950; Sullivan, 1953). In turn, secure infant attachments encourage active environmental exploration, age-appropriate autonomy, increased peer contacts, and interpersonal competence among infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children. Later, the same parent-child relationship factors associated with the development of secure primary attachments and trust among infants -- acceptance, nurturance, and the absence of punitiveness -- facilitate strong parental identification among children and adolescents (i.e., the adoption of parental personality traits, values, and attitudes as an integral part of one's own unique personality) (Caron, 1953; Calonic & Thomas, 1973; Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Heinicke, 1953, cited by Slater, 1955; Lefkowitz et al., 1977; Levin, 1958; Mowrer, 1950; Seward, 1954; Sanford, 1955; Slater, 1955, 1961). In turn, constructive parental identification is associated with the development of conscience, internal controls, and the capacity to make moral judgments and experience guilt, which enable the child to effectively manage his/her behavior in accordance with parental expectations and values (Aronfreed, 1961; Haan, Smith, & Block, 1968; Heinicke, 1953, cited by Slater, 1955; Hoffman, 1970a, 1970b, 1977, 1982; Kagan, 1958; Kohlberg, 1963, 1964; Slater, 1955). Alternatively, less constructive parental identification, variously

labeled "defensive" (Mowrer, 1950), "positional" (Slater, 1961), or "identification with the aggressor" (Freud, 1946), has been shown to be associated with hostile, punitive parental behaviors. Based on fear of punishment, defensive identification involves copying specific characteristics of the parent (i.e., those which symbolize his/her desired position of power) and is associated with reliance on external controls and displacement of negatively sanctioned behaviors onto less powerful and/or more permissive targets, rather than development of internal controls and the acquisition of more constructive, prosocial response alternatives (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Hoffman, 1970a, 1970b; Parke, 1972).

In sum, effective socialization appears to occur because the child learns to value others through rewarding parental care and is thus motivated to adapt his/her behavior in accordance with the expectations of others to ensure ongoing gratification of his/her own needs as well as the needs of others. Additionally, in the context of loving and instructive parental relationships, the child observes appropriate and effective interpersonal behaviors, is helped to understand prosocial values governing interpersonal involvement, and learns a process of self-examination including consideration of the consequences of one's behavior for self and others (Hoffman, 1979; 1982). In contrast, the child whose parental relationships are unresponsive and unrewarding has little or nothing to gain by modifying his/her behavior in accordance with expectations of others. Indeed, in the context of neglectful, rejecting parental relationships, expectations regarding acceptable and unacceptable behaviors are likely to be unclear, inconsistent, and unrealistic, making it difficult for the child to know what is expected and to comply.

In order for a child to learn ego control, he must know what to learn and be drawn to do so. The contribution of parents is to provide both illustration and motivation, guiding the child toward certain forms and timing of behavior and away from the 'natural' state of unmodulated and immediate response. (Block, 1971, p. 263)

Having briefly sketched the development of a generally prosocial orientation, empirical findings bearing more directly on the issue of relationships among parent-child affectional interactions, parental disciplinary practices, and the development of two specific prosocial skills, empathy and assertion, among children and adolescents will be reviewed. Most conceptualizations of empathy have posited: (a) a cognitive component characterized by the capacity to view events from the standpoint of others; (b) an emotional component characterized by the capacity to accurately experience others' emotions vicariously; and (c) a behavioral component characterized by responsiveness to others' needs and epitomized in generous, sympathetic, and helpful behaviors (Feshbach, 1979; Hoffman, 1982; Pitkanen-Pulkkinen, 1979). Assertion has customarily been defined as a behavioral pattern of active coping with the environment and persistence in the pursuit of one's own needs when confronted with counterpressure (Feshbach, 1970). Most authors have also specified that assertion is ideally associated with self- and other acceptance and involves direct, honest, and appropriate expression of thoughts, feelings, and expectations in ways which do not violate another person's rights (Baumrind, 1967; Lange & Jakubowski, 1976; Lorr & More, 1980; Rich & Schroeder, 1976). Theoretically, empathy and assertion can be conceptualized as complimentary components of effective, gratifying interpersonal relationships; that is, an imbalance between empathy and assertion can be expected to be associated with less adaptive functioning in that empathic skills in the absence of

assertiveness is likely to result in an overemphasis on the needs of others (at the expense of self), while assertion without empathy is likely to result in an overemphasis on one's own needs (at the expense of others) (Feshbach, 1982; Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1982).

Parent-Child Affectional Relationships. Hoffman (1982)

postulated specific socialization experiences which are likely to contribute to the development of empathy including: (a) consistent parental affection and nurturance; (b) exposure to empathic models and role-taking opportunities; (c) inductive discipline techniques which call attention to the victim's pain or injury and encourage the child to imagine him/herself in the victim's place in situations where his/her actions have harmed others; and (d) experiencing a variety of affects rather than being protected from, or overwhelmed by, negative emotions. Similarly, assertion can be expected to be facilitated among children and adolescents by parental acceptance and respectful treatment, and modeling, instruction, and encouragement regarding constructive expression of independent feelings and ideas (Baumrind, 1967; Coopersmith, 1967).

Prosocial behaviors have rarely been studied in the context of childrearing research. However, factor analytic studies and cluster analyses of child-adolescent behaviors have repeatedly identified an affiliative factor, defined by empathic and assertive social interactions, which emerges during preschool years and evidences reasonable stability throughout childhood and into adolescence (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Becker & Krug, 1964; Emmerich, 1964, 1966; Heathers, 1955; Schaefer, 1961; Schaffer & Bayley, 1963). Moreover, numerous empirical studies have demonstrated that affiliative behaviors among

preschool- and school-age children are negatively associated with passivity, domination of others, interference with peers' ongoing activities, and destructive aggression (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Beller, 1959; Emmerich, 1964, 1966; Hoffman, 1960; Lieberman, 1977; Marshall & McCandless, 1957; McCandless et al., 1961; Moore & Updegraff, 1964; Stith & Connor, 1962; Winder & Rau, 1962). Additionally, numerous laboratory studies have documented significant relationships among exposure to nurturant and empathic treatment, empathic models, role-playing, inductive techniques, and children's empathic behaviors (Coates, Pusser, & Goldman, 1976; Friedrich & Stein, 1973; Harris, 1971; Hoffman, 1970a, 1970b; Rice & Grusec, 1975; Rushton, 1975, 1976, 1982; Staub, 1971; Yarrow, Scott, & Waxler, 1973).

The few childrearing studies which have specifically investigated relationships among parent-child interactions and children's prosocial behaviors have consistently obtained substantial relationships among parental nurturance and involvement and child behaviors interpretable as manifestations of empathy and/or assertion. For example, in one of the first such investigations Baumrind (1967) demonstrated that parents of preschool children rated as competent (i.e., the equivalent of assertive and empathic) were characterized as highly nurturant and actively involved with their children, in contrast to parents of less competent children (i.e., detached and passive, or irritable and aggressive) who were substantially less nurturant and involved. Similarly, Baldwin's (1949) study of democratic (i.e., warm, rational, permissive) versus autocratic households demonstrated that democratically reared children were substantially more outgoing and assertive than children reared in

autocratic households demonstrated that democratically reared children were substantially more outgoing and assertive than children reared in autocratic households. Less specific evidence of the importance of parental nurturance, acceptance, and involvement in facilitating the development of prosocial functioning, as opposed to immature, asocial, or antisocial functioning, has been provided by findings obtained in childrearing studies investigating the development of aggressive and dependent behaviors among preschool- and school-age children (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Levin, 1958; Radke, 1946; Sears, 1961; Sears et al., 1953; Symonds, 1939; Watson, 1957) and on the basis of longitudinal data collected for large sample groups assessed from early childhood through early- or middle-adulthood (Block, 1971; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Lefkowitz et al., 1977; Offer & Offer, 1975; Pitkanen-Pulkkinen, 1979).

Two recent, naturalistic studies have provided the most direct evidence of the relationship between parental nurturance and empathy and children's empathic behavior. In the first of these studies, Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, and King (1979) assessed a wide range of parental childrearing practices and child empathic behaviors (e.g., comforting, helping) via parents' reports and home observations over a two-year period beginning in the child's early infancy. Data analysis documented a substantial relationship between mothers' empathic caregiving and children's empathy. Zahn-Waxler and Radke-Yarrow (1982) discussed how the relationship between mothers' and children's empathy might be explained:

Observational learning, in which young children view significant others provide and receive comfort, may be an important contributor to altruism. So, too, might be children's own experiences with empathic caregiving: They themselves are distressed, and then experience comforting behavior from the caregiver. (Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1982, p. 127)

In a subsequent study of relationships among parent-child interactions and children's empathy, Grusec (1982) obtained mothers' structured daily reports of children's (i.e., 4-year-olds and 7-year-olds) empathic behaviors and family members' responses. Data analysis indicated that family members' reactions to children's unsolicited offers to help and comfort substantially influenced the frequency of children's subsequent empathic behaviors, indicating that parental sensitivity and responsiveness to children's attempts to be helpful plays a critical role in maintaining empathic or altruistic behavior. Discussing her findings, Grusec (1982) reasoned:

Perhaps children who were allowed to put the majority of their offers into effect, who gained feelings of efficacy and ability, were those who subsequently displayed most spontaneous altruism--they had had practice in showing concern for others, and they knew they could do it. Children whose offers were not accepted did not have the opportunity to display altruism; indeed, they learned they were deemed incapable of behaving effectively in this way, or that their help was not needed. Thus they ceased in their efforts to show concern for others. (Grusec, 1982, p. 152)

An additional line of evidence corroborating the role of parental nurturance and active involvement in the development of empathy and assertion among children has been provided by follow-up investigations of securely versus insecurely attached one-year-olds (Esterbrooks & Lamb, 1970; Main & Londerville, 1979, cited by Ainsworth, 1979; Matas, Arend, & Sroufe, 1978; Waters, Wittman, & Sroufe, 1979). Specifically, follow-up assessments of several independent sample groups conducted when children were two-, three-, and six-years-old have consistently demonstrated that securely attached children (who had experienced highly responsive, consistent, and involved maternal care during infancy) were more socially active and popular, evidenced more initiative and responsiveness in peer interactions, and were more sympathetic to peers'

distress, compared to insecurely attached children, who had experienced varying degrees of neglect and inappropriate maternal care during infancy.

Although little empirical data bears on the issue of relationships among parental nurturance and prosocial behaviors among older sample groups, several studies have provided relevant findings while investigating additional aspects of adolescent development. Three studies employing different approaches to evaluate independent hypotheses (i.e., Coopersmith, 1967; McCord et al., 1961; Olweus, 1979) are particularly noteworthy in their convergence of findings regarding the relationship between parental affectional supportiveness and adolescent assertiveness. All three studies began by classifying male adolescent subjects into three distinct categories on the basis of empirically verified criteria: (a) McCord et al. (1962) classified subjects as aggressive, normally assertive, or nonaggressive; (b) Coopersmith (1967) classified subjects as high-, middle-, or low self-esteem; and (c) Olweus (1979) classified subjects as "bullies," normal controls, or "whipping boys." In all three studies, data analyses indicated that "optimally" functioning adolescents evidenced positive self-esteem and constructive interpersonal skills including the capacity to react "realistically" and appropriately to provocation (i.e., assertively). Unlike aggressive boys, assertive boys were neither hostile nor rebellious, and unlike inhibited boys, they were not passive, anxious, or overdependent. Additionally, assertive behaviors of normal boys were instrumentally effective in that their assertiveness contributed to conflict-resolution and enhanced their acceptance and popularity among peers, in contrast to aggressive behaviors of

aggressive boys which exacerbated ongoing conflicts and reduced their acceptance and popularity among peers. Most importantly for the present purpose, all three studies found that normally assertive adolescents had experienced substantially higher levels of parental nurturance, acceptance, and age-appropriate involvement than aggressive or inhibited boys.

Similarly, Block (1971) concluded that his longitudinal findings replicated McCord et al.'s (1961) results and generally underscored the critical role of parental supportiveness and active involvement in facilitating the development of appropriate impulse control (as opposed to under- or overcontrol) and constructive social-emotional functioning among offspring. Finally, Slater's (1955) and Watson's (1934) findings based on students' recollections of parental relationships and self-reports of current social-emotional functioning add credence to this conclusion. Particularly noteworthy is the cluster of young-adult traits (e.g., social participation, poise, tolerance, role-taking ability) which Slater (1955) found to be substantially related to parental supportiveness and warmth.

Parental Power Assertion. Respectful parental treatment, rather than devaluing coercion and violence can be conceptualized as a requisite condition for the development of empathy and assertion among children and adolescents (Baumrind, 1967; Hoffman, 1982). Indeed, childrearing investigations which have demonstrated the importance of parental acceptance and nurturance in facilitating the development of prosocial skills among children and adolescents have also documented an inverse relationship between parental punitiveness and child-adolescent empathy (Baumrind, 1967; Baldwin, 1949; Slater, 1955) and assertion

(Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Block, 1971; Coopersmith, 1967; McCord et al., 1961; Olweus, 1979). Moreover, the general pattern of findings across childrearing studies indicates a substantial positive relationship among rational, consistent parental controls and prosocial child-adolescent behaviors. This relationship has been most directly documented in experimental and observational investigations of associations among inductive parenting techniques, and moral development and empathic behaviors among children and adolescents (for reviews, see Hoffman, 1970a & 1970b). For example, Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) obtained a positive association between parental use of inductive discipline and peer-rated "consideration of others" among 12-year-old girls, and Hoffman (1975) and Dlugokinski and Firestone (1974) independently corroborated this relationship among adolescent mixed-sex sample groups. Additionally, in an observational investigation of the development of empathic behaviors among young children, Zahn-Waxler et al. (1979) obtained a substantial relationship between mothers' use of inductive discipline in child-caused distress situations (i.e., affective, sometimes "moralistic" explanations about negative consequences for others of the child's hurtful behavior) and children's empathic behaviors.

In sum, ample evidence exists to support the conclusion that parental nurturance and acceptance and the absence of devaluing coercion and physical force are associated with the development of empathy and assertion among offspring. Moreover, the overall pattern of empirical findings indicates that it is not only the presence of parental emotional supportiveness and the relative absence of power-assertive control that are necessary for children to develop empathy and

assertion, but also the presence of clear parental expectations regarding interpersonal relationships evident in parental instruction, standards, and behavior vis-a-vis the child-adolescent.

Overview

The two-dimensional structure of parent-child relationships applied in the present review is an integral aspect of the child development literature. However, it has rarely been explicitly applied to so broad a range of offspring attitudes and behaviors. Having surveyed the literature with the goal of elucidating relationships among parental emotional supportiveness, parental power assertion, and major child-adolescent behavioral systems, the pivotal role of parental nurturance, acceptance, and "loving" controls (i.e., the absence of intimidation and violence and the presence of rational expectations and limits) in facilitating optimal psychosocial development among offspring has become eminently clear.

One way of summarizing the overall pattern of findings is to say that emotionally supportive and respectful (as opposed to power-assertive) parental treatment is associated with the development of what Swanson (1961) called an attitude of mastery -- an orientation rooted in the conviction of personal worth and characterized by a sense of well-being (i.e., relative absence of psychophysiological distress), basic trust, and prosocial functioning. In contrast, emotionally unsupportive, punitive parental treatment is associated with the development of a less constructive attitude of defense -- a dependent and/or hostile-aggressive orientation rooted in uncertainty regarding one's worth and manifested in psychophysiological distress, basic mistrust, high levels of dependent and/or aggressive behaviors, and low

levels of prosocial functioning (Haan, 1977).

Several factors contributing to this general picture are noteworthy. First, the evidence demonstrating the pervasive influence of parental treatment on offspring personality reviewed thus far has been obtained on the basis of research conducted with parent-child sample groups representing an essentially "normal" range of parenting practices. With the exception of delinquency and clinical studies, sample groups have been selected from the general population or from middle-class populations biased in the direction of socioeconomic advantage and associated "positive" biases in preferred childrearing practices (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Straus et al., 1980; Zussman, 1978). Thus, even within the restricted range of parent and child behaviors represented by "normal" sample groups, a wide range of detrimental effects of parental "maltreatment" (i.e., affectional neglect and rejection, and intimidation and violence) have been documented.

Second, despite the array of evidence supporting the conclusion that various levels of parental nurturance, acceptance, and power assertion are systematically associated with qualitative differences in child personality, it is still not possible to disentangle direct, independent effects of either affectional or disciplinary parental practices. In the absence of conclusive findings, the safest interpretation is that both parental affection and control contribute substantially to offspring psychosocial development.

Third, the unfortunate lack of family interaction data in childrearing research, most notably information describing father-child relationships, has substantially limited the ability of investigators to account for exceptions to general rules, especially complex interactions

among "parent" behaviors, offspring sex and age, and dependent and aggressive offspring behaviors. Similarly, the lack of multiple child personality variables within individual childrearing studies has precluded a clear understanding of relationships among offspring behavioral systems, as well as among offspring behavioral systems and parenting behaviors.

Finally, dangers inherent in drawing causal conclusions on the basis of correlational data require an awareness of various alternative interpretations regarding the direction of effects (Bell, 1968, 1971; Harper, 1975). Limitations and concerns notwithstanding, the accumulated weight of individual correlational studies in conjunction with corroborating evidence based on experimental and longitudinal studies enables cautious conclusions regarding the direction of effects among parental affectional and disciplinary practices, and offspring intra- and interpersonal attitudes and behaviors; that is, the literature supports the conclusion that parental treatment comprises a substantial and enduring influence on the social-emotional functioning of children.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF CHILD MALTREATMENT LITERATURE

While childrearing studies permit conclusions regarding child-adolescent personality correlates of a purportedly normal range of parenting practices, studies evaluating social-emotional variables in children identified as neglected and/or abused have begun to identify child personality correlates of extreme, negative parent-child interactions. Despite sample selection biases and the lack of rigorously selected control groups characterizing individual studies, the general pattern of findings indicates that inadequate parenting expressed via physical-emotional neglect, rejection, violence, and/or sexual victimization is substantially correlated with child-adolescent personality variables indicative of vulnerable psychosocial functioning.

The accumulated weight of report after report with similar findings gives us a most useful clinical picture of the mistreated child. This clinical picture is a somber one, a grim identification of deviations in development, biological inadequacy, and personality problems, both serious and long-lasting. (Martin, 1980, p. 347)

While initial professional efforts to identify and prevent ongoing abuse of children were, of necessity, focused on life-threatening parental violence, more recently maltreatment experts have focused on the malevolent effects on the developing child of parental emotional neglect and rejection.

The impact of inflicted injury upon the development of the child must be evaluated in light of the nature of the parent-child bond. It is important to clarify that the psychic damage is not due just to the dramatic physical attack that bursts into public view at the time of a reported abuse incident. Rather, physical abuse emerges from pervasive dysfunction in the family. Physical abuse is part of a persistent pattern of parent-child interaction rather than being an isolated incident. This is corroborated by research data suggesting that at least 60% of children reported have histories of being previously abused; that over 25% of these

children have siblings who were also previously abused; and that over 30% of the mothers and 40% of the fathers reported for physically attacking a child have been perpetrators of abuse in the past (Gil, 1970). (Martin & Rodeheffer, 1976, p. 12)

Faced with the real coexistence of several kinds of parental maltreatment, at least in identified populations, studies assessing the psychosocial functioning of maltreated children have not consistently differentiated among parental neglect, rejection, violence, and sexual victimization. Consequently, available findings permit general conclusions regarding cognitive and behavioral correlates of the syndrome of maltreatment while precluding firm conclusions regarding common, differential, and interacting effects of specific maltreating behaviors. (For poignant descriptions of specific parental behaviors comprising maltreatment and the far-reaching implications of the maltreating environment from the child-victim's point of view see Finkelhor, 1979, Appendix C; Helfer, 1980; Martin, 1976, pp. 17-23; and Zemdegs, 1980.)

Intellectual Status of Mistreated Children

Knowledge of the intellectual status of abused and neglected children provides an important context for understanding psychosocial correlates of experiencing parental maltreatment. Martin's (1972) description of the psychoeducational status of 42 school-age children with inflicted injuries is fairly representative of the empirical findings. Comprehensive neurological, psychological, and educational evaluations conducted shortly after subjects' initial hospitalizations indicated that 43% evidenced neurological damage; 33% were diagnosed as failure-to-thrive; 33% were functionally retarded; and 38% evidenced significant language delay (including 43% of children with IQ scores in

the normal range). Three years later, two-thirds of this sample group evidenced moderate improvement following therapeutic intervention including removal from the abusive environment. Among children who evidenced little or no improvement, continued deficient functioning was attributed to brain trauma and resultant neurological damage in seven instances, and to minimal or inappropriate intervention (i.e., failure to remove children from the abusive environment and/or frequent changes in foster home placement) in another seven cases. Numerous additional investigations have documented similarly high incidences of neurological impairment, mental retardation, language delay, learning disorders, perceptual-motor dysfunction, and gross motor incoordination among physically abused and severely neglected children compared to variously defined control groups and the expected incidence of each kind of dysfunction in the general population (Applebaum, 1980; Birrell & Birrell, 1968; Blager & Martin, 1976; Elmer, 1967; 1977; Elmer & Gregg, 1967; Fitch, Cadol, Goldson, Wendell, Swartz, and Jackson, 1976; Gregg & Elmer, 1969; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1972; Martin et al., 1974; Martin & Rodeheffer, 1976; Morse, Sahler, & Friedman, 1970; Polansky et al., 1972, 1981; Reidy et al., 1980).

In contrast, Martin et al. (1974) reported that among a large sample group of children with inflicted injuries ranging from soft tissue trauma to skull fractures, 14% evidenced superior intelligence, and a large number evidenced comparatively high scores on intellectual tasks requiring integration of abstract concepts. They interpreted these findings as indicating that many mistreated children perform substantially below their potential. Accounting for the difference between children who evidenced superior intelligence and those who

evidenced below average intelligence, Martin et al. (1974) noted that families of children with superior intelligence were highly achievement-oriented and intensely (even intrusively) concerned about their children's behavior and academic functioning. In contrast, families of children who evidenced below average intelligence were consistently unsupportive of learning and academic achievement.

It [learning] can be a very socially acceptable way of dealing with anxiety and stress.... When the family allows or encourages learning, what better escape for the abused child.... The dynamics of this adaptation are not all that dissimilar to that of obsessive-compulsive behavior. That is, the more the child knows, the more he is able to understand the world, and the more accurately he is able to anticipate what will happen next.... What one finds in the "bright" abused child is an inability to negotiate life with other people despite the store of facts and knowledge he has. (Martin & Rodeheffer, 1976, pp. 102-103)

Based on the total picture of abused and neglected children's intellectual status, several environmental factors in addition to neurological damage resulting from inflicted injuries have been implicated in the deficient cognitive and language functioning of mistreated children. Specifically, deficient functioning has been empirically associated with undernutrition (Chase & Martin, 1970; Craviato, DeLicardie, & Birch, 1966; Graham, 1967; Monckelberg, 1968; Ross Laboratories, 1970), inadequate medical care (e.g., hearing impairment due to untreated ear infections), parental affectional deprivation and stimulus deprivation experienced during infancy and early childhood (Ainsworth, 1962, 1973; Bowlby, 1951, 1953; Casler, 1961, 1965; U. S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, 1968; Goldfarb, 1945; Pinneau, 1955; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Prugh & Harlow, 1962; Rutter, 1972; Spitz, 1945; Spitz & Wolf, 1946; Yarrow, 1961, 1964), and parental rejection and punitiveness for experimental

speech and exploratory behavior (Fitch et al., 1976; Hurley, 1965, 1967; Johnson & Morse, 1968; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1972, 1980; Martin et al., 1974; Morse et al., 1970). The child's preoccupation with survival in a life-threatening environment is seen as facilitating high levels of anxiety and the acquisition of a passive-avoidant behavioral style which inhibit cognitive and language development and academic achievement.

Parental rejection of the child, whether expressed subtly and indirectly...or more overtly manifested through general negligence or even by direct punishment and attack on the child, would seem to carry a common core of unpleasant affective experience for the child. These unhappy experiences, particularly when delivered by persons controlling the child's food and love supplies, might commonly be expected, according to general behavior theory (Dollard and Miller, 1950), to result in the extinction of approach responses toward environmental objects associated with such persons and the simultaneous acquisition of avoidance responses, perhaps including the "stopping thinking" response.... Such aversive conditioning by the principal persons in the child's life would commonly generalize to related environmental objects and tasks. Within the realm of cognitive operations, the child experiencing such rejection might typically be expected to show a decreased curiosity in exploring and manipulating the world of people, objects, and ideas.... (Hurley, 1965, p. 20)

The interpretation that environmental factors beyond the infliction of physical injury contribute to the deficient cognitive, language, and academic functioning of mistreated children is supported by repeated findings of poorer intellectual, speech, and academic functioning and more severe emotional withdrawal among neglected children, compared to abused and nonabused sample groups (Kent, 1976; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981). Finally, the significance of parental neglect and rejection in undermining the cognitive and language development of mistreated children is attested to by repeated findings that improvement in abused and neglected children's cognitive, language, and academic performance is substantially related to removal from the maltreating environment and

the level of acceptance, nurturance, and stability afforded by the subsequent environment, even among neurologically impaired and functionally retarded children (Kent, 1976; Martin, 1972; Martin et al., 1974; Skeels, 1966; Skeels & Fillmore, 1937; Skodak & Skeels, 1945, 1949).

Social-Emotional Status of Mistreated Children

Behavioral reactions to parental maltreatment have been conceptualized in terms of two broad categories -- hypersubmissive and hyperaggressive (Gray & Kempe, 1976; Jenkins & Boyer, 1967, 1970; Martin, 1978, 1980; Newell, 1934; Peterson, 1961; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Rohner, 1975; Rolston, 1971; Zigler, 1966). Both reactions have been conceptualized as stemming from a poorly defined, critical self-concept. Hypersubmissive behaviors have been interpreted as direct manifestations of low self-esteem and overt depression, while hyperaggressive behaviors have been seen as attempts to defend against threats to self-esteem and deny depressive affect (Reykowski, 1979).

One useful way to categorize abused children is to divide them into those children who have, for the most part, tried to meet parental needs--the children who have "bought into the system," and those who have not bought into the system.... Those who are still trying to meet the demands of their parents...are overly compliant and hypervigilant to cues as to how to mold their behavior.... We often see in those 75 percent of children who are trying to please their parents, a true role reversal-- especially in the slightly older child.... They are mindful of the feelings of their parents. They may try to take care of their parents.... And yet, paradoxically, these care-taking children are usually quite indiscriminate in their seeming attachment to people....

At the other end of the spectrum are the other 25 percent of abused children. These are the children who are not compliant or withdrawn or trying to please. They are variously labeled as provocative, aggressive or hyperactive. (Gray & Kempe, 1976. pp. 58-59)

Submissive Reaction Patterns

Martin and Beezley (1977) spearheaded efforts to document

social-emotional sequelae of parental maltreatment in an investigation of 50 abused children from 3 to 13 years of age observed over a span of four and one-half years. Sample selection biases favored inclusion of the "best" of a random sample of abused children -- over half had injuries limited to soft tissue trauma and two-thirds of parents were involved in treatment services. Child personality traits were assessed through systematic observations at home and in school utilizing several independent data sources including clinical evaluations. The most frequent trait among these children was an impaired ability to experience pleasure: Sixty-six percent lacked "the capacity to play freely, to laugh, and to enjoy themselves in an uninhibited fashion. They did not complain, even when frustrated or tired, which suggested that they had learned to accept an unrewarding world" (Martin & Beezley, 1977, p. 376). Twenty-five percent evidenced extreme withdrawal and inattentiveness, 52% evidenced low self-esteem, and the majority of children who evidenced adequate self-esteem appeared to project a false sense of worth as a defense against low self-evaluations. Finally, 62% evidenced additional behavioral symptoms customarily interpreted as manifestations of emotional turmoil in children (e.g., sleep disturbance, enuresis, chronic temper tantrums, poor peer relationships, delinquent-type behaviors, oppositional behavior, hypervigilance, compulsivity, and significant learning problems).

Martin and Beezley's (1977) failure to include a comparison group precludes conclusive evidence of a higher incidence of disturbed behaviors among abused children compared to nonabused children on the basis of their study alone. However, the incidence of specific problem behaviors, especially depressive-like symptomatology, among their sample

group are substantially higher than expected rates for the general population of preadolescent children (Chess & Hassibi, 1978).

Additionally, by analyzing correlations among five emotional-environmental factors and the frequency and severity of child symptoms, Martin and Beezley (1977) demonstrated that the high rates of disturbed behaviors characterizing mistreated children were related to the emotional quality of parent-child relationships.

Our data do not confirm any relationship between the type of injury, nor age at which it was inflicted, and subsequent emotional development. Rather, at an average of four and one-half years after the original abuse, psychiatric symptoms were strongly associated with factors such as the impermanence of the subsequent home, instability of the family with whom the child was living, the acceptance or rejection the child was experiencing, and the emotional state of the parents or the parent surrogates (Martin & Beezley, 1977, pp. 382-383).

Martin and Beezley's (1977) conclusion regarding the primary significance of the affectional quality of parent-child interactions for the subsequent social-emotional development of abused and neglected children have been corroborated by several additional studies (Kent, 1976; Morse, et al., 1970; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Rohner, 1975). For example, Johnson and Morse (1968) reviewed protective service casework files of 100 children with inflicted injuries. Abused children and their siblings were judged to be deprived of parental care and affection in comparison to children in families receiving financial aid from child welfare (i.e., Aid to Families with Dependent Children). Abused infants and preschoolers were characterized by caseworkers as unsmiling, lethargic, fussy, and fearful. Abused school-aged children were described as gloomy, sullen, and depressed, or inconsiderate, disrespectful, and hyperactive. Moreover, their "nonabused" siblings were also seen as presenting high levels of depressive-like

symptomatology (and, like abused children, deficient intellectual performance), suggesting that parent-child relationship factors beyond physical abuse per se contributed to the delayed or disturbed development of overtly abused children and their emotionally neglected siblings.

In addition to several other observational studies which have identified high levels of emotional withdrawal, inhibited behavior, passivity, and acquiescence among abused and neglected children (Cohn, 1979; Kent, 1976; Pemberton & Benady, 1973; Rolston, 1971; Young, 1964), at least three systematic investigations have documented higher rates of depressive symptomatology among mistreated children in comparison to carefully selected, nonabused control children (Gaensbauer and Sands, 1979; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Reidy et al., 1980). For example, Gaensbauer and Sands (1979) observed symptoms of affective distress among mistreated infants and toddlers in a carefully controlled study of abused and/or failure-to-thrive children between six months and three years of age and a nonabused comparison group. Compared to control infant-mother dyads, mistreated infants and their mothers evidenced limited interaction and distorted affective communication. Additionally, in contrast to nonabused infants, mistreated infants and toddlers were severely limited in their capacity to express pleasure, and vacillated between withdrawal and unpredictable communication characterized by sad, angry, and distressed facial expressions. Terr's (1970) study of abused infants and children and their families observed over a six-year period conveyed a similar picture of early withdrawal and sadness on the part of children and distorted perceptions and responses among parents.

Reidy et al. (1980) compared small sample groups of school-aged abused children, severely neglected children, and nonabused control children. Data obtained from an objective behavioral checklist completed by subjects' teachers and standardized personality scales indicated that abused children, and to a lesser extent neglected children, evidenced substantially lower self-esteem and assurance than control children. Finally, focusing on extreme manifestations of depression and negative self-attitudes, Green and his colleagues (Green, 1967, 1968, 1978a, 1978b; Green, Gaines, & Sandgrund, 1974; Green, Sandgrund, & Gaines, 1974) investigated the incidence of self-destructive behaviors, including suicidal attempts, in small sample groups of abused, neglected, and control school-age children. Substantially higher incidences of self-destructive behaviors were repeatedly found among mistreated sample groups. In one study, for example, Green (1978b) found that 41% percent of abused children engaged in self-destructive behavior, compared to 17% of neglected children and 7% of control children.

In light of the customary focus on physical abuse in maltreatment research, Polanski et al.'s (1972, 1981) comprehensive investigations of antecedents and sequelae of severely neglectful parenting are particularly noteworthy. After identifying two independent sample groups of neglected preschool and school-age children (one rural and one urban) and two carefully matched control groups, Polanski et al. (1972, 1981) conducted extensive psychological evaluations with parents and children and objectively assessed home environments. A review of findings is beyond the scope of the present discussion, but Polanski et al.'s (1972, 1981) major finding -- that neglected children were

characterized by pervasive emotional withdrawal and inaccessibility -- is particularly relevant. Speculating about the process by which severely deprived children develop a deeply entrenched detachment from others, Polanski et al. (1972, 1981) write:

The infant desperately requires assurance that the physical care necessary to survival will be forthcoming. The issue for the infant is whether he comes to believe that intimacy with his mother will be rewarding or whether it will be unsatisfying and frightening. The infant given supplies inconsistently, matures with what Erikson (1950, Chap. 7) calls basic mistrust. To spare himself the pain he anticipates from reliance on humans, he invokes interconnected defensive maneuvers--refusal to care about other people, withdrawal, and numbing himself. Emotionally, he experiences futility, a feeling that nothing he does will guarantee affection and security. Behaviorally, we see lethargy and an unwillingness to act. (Polanski et al., 1972, p. 124)

We believe that around eleven or twelve, a fairly high proportion of these withdrawn and pitiable youngsters undergo a reorganization of defenses. Their anxious emptiness becomes hidden behind a shield of brittle, hostile defiance; in other words, they "turn mean." It was in relation to these processes that we speculated that massive affect-inhibition prevents normal empathizing with others, and makes it easier for massively deprived children to commit violence and even to murder. (Polanski et al., 1981, p. 135)

Aggressive Reaction Patterns

A wide range of specific behavioral traits reflecting aggressive reaction patterns to parental neglect and abuse have been described in numerous case reports and observational studies of mistreated children (Fontana, 1973; Friedman & Morse, 1974; Johnson & Morse, 1968; Martin & Beezley, 1977; Morse et al., 1970), and a few systematic investigations have documented high levels of aggressive behaviors among mistreated children in comparison to carefully matched, nonabused control groups (Kent, 1976; Reidy, 1977).

In the most ambitious of the control-group studies, Kent (1976) evaluated large sample groups of abused children, neglected children, and control children referred to protective services regarding adequacy

of parental care but not evidencing signs of abuse or severe neglect. All children were evaluated at intake utilizing information obtained from a variety of independent sources (e.g., family, school, police, hospital and mental health clinic records), and mistreated children were reevaluated three years later following intervention which included out-of-home placement. At intake 44% of abused children evidenced significant aggressive behavior toward adults and peers compared to 34% of neglected children and 21% of control children; 44% of abused children evidenced excessive disobedience compared to 29% of neglected children and 18% of control children; and 54% of abused children evidenced poor peer relationships compared to 42% of neglected children and 20% of control children. At follow-up, abused and neglected children had improved on all behavioral measures, although they continued to evidence high levels of problem behaviors compared to control children at intake. Similarly, Reidy (1977) documented higher levels of aggression among small sample groups of school-age abused and severely neglected children, in comparison to nonabused control children (Reidy et al., 1980). Teachers' objective ratings of subjects' school aggression, independent observers' ratings of subjects' free-play aggression, and subjects' projective responses to potentially aggressive story-scenes provided indices of aggressive behavior and fantasy. Abused children evidenced significantly higher levels of aggressive fantasy, free-play aggression, and school aggression compared to control children. Neglected children were similar to abused children in level of school aggression, but similar to control children in level of aggressive fantasy and free-play aggression. Kent (1976) and Reidy (1977) independently attributed abused children's aggressive behavior to

high levels of instigation to aggress and frequent modeling of specific aggressive behaviors in violent families, compared to control and neglecting families.

Numerous investigations of parental violence among delinquent sample groups have corroborated Kent's (1976) and Reidy's (1977) conclusions. For example, Lewis, Shanok, Pincus, and Glaser (1979) investigated the relationship between parental violence and aggressive crimes in a large sample group of incarcerated adolescent boys. Subjects provided information regarding their parents' use of corporal punishment, and staff rated subjects on a four-point violence scale ranging from no offenses against persons to serious and brutal offenses against persons. Seventy-five percent of boys rated as violent reported a history of frequent, severe physical punishment in contrast to 33% of boys rated as nonviolent. Moreover, 79% of violent boys reported witnessing extreme familial violence during childhood, in contrast to 20% of nonviolent boys. Steele (cited by Martin, 1972) found that 80% of a large sample group of consecutive juvenile offenders adjudicated for violent crimes reported a history of frequent, severe parental violence; 40% reported that parental beatings had rendered them unconscious; and the vast majority had experienced an incident of physical abuse within two weeks of their offense. Similarly, Welsh (1976a) obtained a high correlation between severity of parental punishment and level of aggressive criminal behavior in a sample group of court-referred male delinquents. Also noteworthy is Welsh's (1976b) finding that 75% of parents of delinquent adolescents approved of a parent beating (as opposed to hitting) his or her child, compared to 8% of a randomly selected sample of American parents (Harris, 1968, cited

by Welsh, 1976b). Using an alternate approach, Alfaro (1978) found that 42% of children identified as abused or neglected during one year in five New York counties were subsequently referred to juvenile court as delinquent or incorrigible (i.e., a rate five times that expected in the general population). In a companion study, 21% of boys and 29% of girls referred to juvenile court in one year in the same five counties were determined to have been previously identified as abused or neglected, and offenders with histories of parental maltreatment were found to have committed more violent offenses than delinquent adolescents without similar histories (Alfaro, 1978).

Looking at the relationship between parental abuse and subsequent lethal violence, Easson and Steinhilber (1961) found that eight middle-class boys who had attempted murder (one successfully) had been subjected to frequent and severe parental violence throughout childhood and adolescence. Similarly, Duncan, Frazier, Litin, Johnson, and Barron (1958) obtained childhood histories for six white, middle-class men of at least average intelligence convicted of first degree murder. Data collected from the men and their families indicated that four of the men had experienced frequent parental brutality throughout childhood and adolescence; the two men who did not present a violent parental history were actively psychotic. Additional studies documenting the prevalence of severe parental maltreatment in the childhood histories of convicted murderers were cited by Bromberg (1961), Curtis (1963), Duncan and Duncan (1971), and Martin (1980).

Reactions to Sexual Abuse

Incest, sexual abuse, and intrafamilial sexual victimization are generally synonymous terms denoting "...involvement of dependent,

developmentally immature children and adolescents in sexual activities that they do not fully comprehend, to which they are unable to give informed consent, or that violate the social taboos of family roles" (Kempe, 1978, p. 383). Investigations of social-emotional traits among mistreated children have provided little information regarding personality correlates of sexual abuse because investigators have customarily excluded known incest victims. However, some information regarding child-adolescent reactions to sexual abuse has been provided by studies which have specifically focused on the psychosocial status and subsequent development of identified incest victims and investigations which have assessed the incidence of sexual victimization among disturbed adolescent and adult populations.

In one of the earliest incest studies, Kaufman, Peck, and Tagiuri (1954) administered extensive standardized psychological evaluations to 11 adolescent victims of prolonged father-daughter incest (i.e., lasting one to six years). Depression, anxiety, guilt, and a wide range of psychophysiological symptoms were universal among subjects, while intellectual functioning below potential, learning difficulties, suicidal behaviors, sexual promiscuity, delinquent-type behaviors, and hostile-dependent, highly sexualized relationships with men and women were common. Nakashima and Zakus (1977) studied 23 victims of father-daughter incest shortly after abuse was identified and found high incidences of significant depressive symptomatology and learning and behavioral problems. Moreover, 14 of the 17 victims for whom follow-up data was obtained one to 12 years after incest was reported, evidenced continued depression or other psychiatric problems. Similarly, Lukianowicz (1972) followed 26 victims of father-daughter incest into

adulthood and found that nearly half evidenced promiscuity and disorganized antisocial behavior; one-quarter evidenced "frigidity," "hysterical" symptomatology, or significant depression including suicidal behavior; and one-quarter evidenced apparently adequate adjustment. Several additional studies based on clinical evaluations of sexually victimized children and adolescents at the time abuse was identified and/or at follow-up have reported similarly high incidences of depression, low self-esteem, acting-out delinquent-type behaviors, sexual promiscuity or incapacity, and significant relationship problems among incest victims (Anderson & Shafer, 1979; Burgess & Groth, 1980; Burgess et al., 1978; DeFrancis, 1969; Ferracuti, 1972; Finkelhor, 1979; Gagnon, 1965; Giarretto, 1976; Heims & Kaufman, 1963; Justice & Justice, 1979; Kempe, 1978; Sarles, 1975; Schechter & Roberge, 1976; Summit & Kryso, 1978).

Investigations documenting high incidences of sexual abuse among troubled adolescent and adult populations have consistently supported the conclusion that incest comprises a significant trauma with enduring psychosocial sequelae. For example, in contrast to estimates of incest in the general population which range from two cases per million (Weinberg, 1955) to five cases per thousand (Schechner, 1972), 44% of a large sample group of female adolescent drug abusers reported a history of incest (Odyssey Institute, cited by Giarretto, 1976). Seventy percent of an independent sample group of drug abusers (Weber, 1977) reported a similar history, as did 50% of adolescent runaway girls interviewed by Kempe (1978). In light of repeated findings that sexual adjustment comprises an aspect of psychosocial functioning which is highly vulnerable to the disruptive influence of intrafamilial sexual

victimization, incest rates among sexually "incapable" women and prostitutes are noteworthy. Baisden (1971) investigated family and sexual histories of a large sample group of women characterized by an "...inability to accept (their) own sexuality regardless of how (they) practice sex" and found that 90% had been raped during childhood, 23% by fathers or stepfathers. James (1980) found that 22% of 200 adult prostitutes reported a history of sexual assault by a family member (most frequently father) and that 65% of a small sample group of incarcerated adolescent prostitutes reported a history of "coerced sexual intercourse" although the identity of the perpetrator was not specified (James, 1971). Also noteworthy in the family histories of prostitutes are repeated findings of physical-emotional neglect and parental violence, frequently culminating in early emancipation (Davis, 1971; Gray, 1973; Greenwald, 1978; Jackman, O'Toole, & Geis, 1967).

Our experience supports the conjecture that early, traumatic sexual self-objectification may be one factor that influences some women to enter into prostitution or other "deviant" life-styles. To some degree, all women in this society experience sexual self-objectification.... It seems possible, however, that to be used sexually at an early age in a way that produces guilt, shame, and loss of self-esteem would be likely to lessen the victim's resistance to a perception of the female sex role as including the possibility of exploiting one's self as a salable commodity. (James, 1980, pp. 346-347)

In contrast to repeated findings of vulnerable social-emotional functioning among incest victims, a few studies have reported a lack of traumatic reactions among sexually abused children and/or no enduring consequences (Bender & Blau, 1937; Rascovsky & Rascovsky, 1950; Rasmussen, 1934, cited by Bender & Blau, 1937; Yorukoglu & Kempf, 1966). Based on a critical review of the literature, Henderson (1972) concluded that discrepancies reflected age-related differences in response to

sexual victimization. Specifically, the general consensus among investigators is that sexual abuse occurring prior to adolescence is associated with less severe symptomatology than abuse initiated or continuing after the onset of puberty, presumably due to the adolescent's increased perception of the inappropriate and exploitative nature of incestuous relationships and greater expectation of self-control. Kempe (1980), however, noted "...the major exception to this is the not uncommon situation where a very young girl is trained to be a sexual object, giving and receiving sexual pleasures as one way of gaining approval" (p. 210). An additional conclusion shared by most investigators is that male victims of sexual abuse perpetrated by either parent are at high risk for psychotic reactions (a conclusion presumably based on accumulated clinical data since no systematic studies of male incest victims have been reported in the literature).

Based on repeated findings that sexual victimization often occurs in the context of otherwise neglectful and/or abusive parent-child relationships, most investigators have attributed the vulnerable psychosocial functioning of incest victims to the entire maltreatment syndrome rather than to sexual abuse per se. For example, Nakashima and Zakus (1977) conducted extensive clinical evaluations of sexually abusive families and found that the majority were characterized by high levels of conflict and sexual incompatibility between spouses, conscious or unconscious sanctioning of incest by the mother, and fear of familial disintegration among all family members. Similarly, on the basis of their evaluations of sexually abusive families, Kaufman et al. (1954) emphasized the need to view incest and subsequent symptomatology in the context of the pervasive, multigenerational emotional deprivation

characteristic of such families, while other investigators (DeFrancis, 1969; Finkelhor, 1979; Kempe, 1978; Martin, 1976; Steele, 1980) have called attention to the coexistence of sexual victimization, physical abuse, and spousal violence.

Despite the growing consensus that incest occurs in the context of a generally neglectful and/or abusive environment and that sexually abused children and adolescents are at risk of vulnerable psychosocial development, no systematic studies comparing incest victims with carefully selected control subjects have been reported. As a result, there is no empirical data verifying clinical speculations regarding the relative saliency of specific maltreating behaviors for the subsequent development of sexually victimized children and adolescents.

Overview

In sum, the body of research assessing the social-emotional status of children identified as neglected and/or abused supports the conclusion that parental maltreatment, whether manifested primarily in physical-emotional neglect, overt emotional rejection, physical abuse, and/or sexual victimization, is associated with a range of child personality variables indicative of vulnerable psychosocial functioning. Specifically, victims of parental maltreatment have been shown to evidence three interrelated deficits: (a) an absence of a positive sense of personal worth; (b) an incapacity to experience joy; and (c) an inability to trust others and engage in gratifying interpersonal relationships. Behaviors through which mistreated children and adolescents manifest these essential deficits have been conceptualized in terms of two general reaction patterns -- hypersubmissive and hyperaggressive. While both sets of behaviors are self-defeating

outside the family system, they are adaptive in the "world of abnormal rearing" (Helfer, 1980) in that they facilitate the child's survival (with varying degrees of effectiveness).

Mistreated children characterized as submissive are shy, fearful, inhibited, and often overtly depressed. These children cope with their maltreating environments by compulsively assessing and attempting to fulfill even inappropriate expectations of powerful others. Their constant attention to external cues precludes awareness of their own feelings and thoughts and interferes with the development of the ability to make decisions based on internal cues. Thus, these children evidence a high degree of seemingly indiscriminate dependence while simultaneously evidencing a pseudo-mature capacity to provide others with physical-emotional support and affection in an attempt to ensure their acceptability. In short, the dependence and responsiveness manifested by these children does not reflect trust and enjoyment, but rather the opposite; their constant sense of vulnerability prompts them to seek protection from emotional and physical pain by fulfilling, as best they can, the expectations of those whom they fear. In contrast, mistreated children characterized as aggressive manifest their lack of trust in a hostile suspiciousness and a continuous, defensive attempt to control and dominate others. Frequently described as impulsive and disorganized, these children are less overtly anxious and depressed than their submissive counterparts, but their acting-out behaviors have been repeatedly interpreted as a means of coping with negative affects. Just as the submissive abused child's vigilance and hyper-self-control comprise a rigid coping style, the aggressive child's hostile reactivity reflects a firmly entrenched style indicative of a lack of alternative

coping strategies. It bears noting that the hypersubmissive and hyperaggressive reaction patterns identified among known victims of parental maltreatment substantially overlap (and extend) dependent and hostile-aggressive reaction patterns identified among sample groups selected from the general population.

Beyond the general submissive and aggressive reaction patterns shared by children exposed to various kinds of parental maltreatment, children and adolescents experiencing specific kinds of maltreatment have evidenced three partially specific behavioral tendencies. First, children and adolescents whose parental relationships are primarily characterized as neglectful have repeatedly evidenced more severe emotional withdrawal (even detachment) and more substantial intellectual, language, and academic deficits than otherwise mistreated children. These findings have been attributed to the extreme lack of attachment between parent and child and the accompanying lack of responsive caretaking and meaningful stimulation. Second, children and adolescents whose parental relationships are primarily characterized as physically abusive have repeatedly evidenced more difficulty managing their own aggression than otherwise mistreated children. This finding has been attributed to the general example of violence as a means of conflict resolution, the intensity and frequency of specific aggressive behaviors available for imitating, and the absence of models and rewards for alternative, prosocial means of coping with frustration and expressing anger in violent families. Third, children and adolescents whose familial relationships have included sexual victimization have repeatedly evidenced overt, severe problems in sexual adjustment, in contrast to otherwise mistreated children and adolescents for whom this

specific symptom has rarely been reported. This finding has been attributed to guilt and ambivalence regarding sexuality and the development of an identity based on "self as object" associated with being sexually exploited as one means of meeting parental (or powerful others') needs.

The Importance of Attachment

Partially specific reactions to different kinds of parental maltreatment notwithstanding, the fact that similar problem behaviors have been identified among children and adolescents who have experienced primary physical-emotional neglect, overt emotional rejection, parental violence, and incest has led investigators to search for a common "cause" underlying a wide range of specific maltreating behaviors. The result has been an increasing focus on deficient and/or distorted emotional bonds -- attachments -- between maltreating parents and their children (Frodi & Lamb, 1980; Gray & Kempe, 1976; Klaus & Kennell, 1970; Mahler, 1978; Martin, 1976; Melnick & Hurley, 1969; Money & Needleman, 1980; Scott, 1980; Steele, 1980; Steele & Pollock, 1974; Wilson, 1980). For the present purpose, the significance of the concept of attachment does not inhere in its potential to explain maltreatment, but rather in its potential to account for the similarly negative and severe effects of a wide range of seemingly diverse maltreating behaviors.

The affectional bonds a mother and father establish with their infant during the first days of life are crucial for his future welfare. When the bonds are solidly established, parents are motivated to learn about their baby's individual requirements and to adapt to meet his needs.... Fully developed specific ties keep parents from striking their baby who has cried for hours night after night--even when they are exhausted and alone. (Kennell, Voos, & Klaus, 1976, p. 53)

Conversely, the absence of parental attachment appropriately rooted in a realistic appreciation of the child's helplessness and dependency

reduces the likelihood that parents will responsively care for their infant, and in turn, that the infant will develop an appropriate attachment to his/her parents. To the extent that development of a healthy attachment to a reliable, responsive, and stimulating caretaker comprises an essential foundation for the development of trust, identity, and self-worth, failure or distortion in attachment can be expected to contribute to distorted development (Ainsworth, 1973, 1979; Bowlby, 1958; Erikson, 1950; Mahler, 1978; Murphy & Moriarty, 1976). Accordingly, both the hypersubmissive and hyperaggressive reaction patterns identified among mistreated children and adolescents can be conceptualized as originating in deficient and/or distorted parent-infant attachments.

The sense of trust described by Erikson can hardly be negotiated when the parent is not providing a predictable, safe, secure world for the infant. Object permanence and object constancy can hardly be accomplished satisfactorily when the parents themselves have such distortions of normal object relationships....

The (abused) child is not seen or valued as a person with rights, feelings, drives, and interests of his own. He is an extension of the parents. He is truly a need-satisfying object for the parent. The child must learn to exist in this atmosphere. The implications of this dynamic between parent and child are apparent in the abused child's problems with development of object relations, a sense of self, autonomy, initiative, and superego structures. (Martin & Rodeheffer, 1976, pp. 14 & 15)

One final issue regarding "effects" of parental maltreatment bears mentioning. Because studies which evaluate children and parents after abuse is identified leave the question of causality unresolved, the possibility that behavioral disturbances in children precede and contribute to maltreatment (rather than comprising reactions to maltreatment) must be considered. Several studies have evaluated physical and behavioral characteristics of neonates and, subsequently,

assessed the quality of parental care (Fitch et al., 1976; Friedrich & Boriskin, 1976; Gaines, Sandgrund, Green, & Power, 1978; Gregg & Elmer, 1969; Gray, Cutler, Dean, & Kempe, 1977; Martin, 1976; Martin et al., 1974; Schneider, Helfer, & Hoffmeister, 1980; Schwarzbeck, 1977). At the risk of oversimplifying complex issues, for the present purpose the most important conclusion of this body of literature is that there are no direct relationships among congenital abnormalities or "difficult" temperaments and child maltreatment; that is, although behavioral problems are over-represented among mistreated sample groups after abuse has been identified, prospective data do not support the "vulnerable child" hypothesis. In contrast, maternal attitudes and behaviors toward newborns have been shown to be predictive of subsequent maltreatment; that is, parents' interpretations of and attitudes toward infant behaviors comprise critical determinants of the parent-infant dyad's maltreatment risk.

The "vulnerable child" concept actually suggests that some parents are less tolerant than others of deviations in their children.... Abusive parents are part of a group of adults whose capacity to parent appropriately is tenuous. Their ability to have normal parental feelings and to perceive their children realistically is impaired even by rather minor stress. (Martin et al., 1974, p. 64)

The significance of this conclusion for the present study inheres in the fact that it supports cautious interpretations regarding the direction of effects underlying documented relationships between parental maltreatment and child-adolescent psychosocial functioning. Specifically, it is reasonable to conclude that the vulnerable intra- and interpersonal development characteristic of mistreated children and adolescents is a function, at least in part, of parental abuse and neglect.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESENT STUDY: METHOD

Subjects

The sample was comprised of 331 volunteer subjects, 205 women and 126 men, enrolled in introductory level psychology courses at a state university in the northeastern United States. The majority of subjects were white and middle-class, and all were at least 18 years of age.

A total of 350 respondents completed questionnaires, and one respondent began to fill out the questionnaire but refused to complete it. Due to inadequate data (i.e., obvious omissions, careless responding, or illegible responses), eight respondents were deleted prior to data entry. Preliminary analyses identified and deleted another 11 respondents who failed to supply sufficiently complete data for one or more experimental variables (nine of whom had lived in single-parent families and had appropriately omitted questions relating to spousal interactions).

Demographic Characteristics

Preliminary analyses indicated that the sample group was characterized by a significant restriction in range for all demographic variables assessed. Although subjects ranged in age from 18 to 37, 94% were between 18 and 22 years old, with the mean age being 20. Racial variability was extremely skewed: Ninety-seven percent of subjects were Caucasian, with Orientals, Native Americans, and Blacks comprising the remaining 3% of the sample.

Socioeconomic status, assessed in terms of family income and parental education, was skewed in the direction of the upper middle class. A substantial majority of subjects' families (70%) had incomes

exceeding \$35,000; an additional 26% of families had incomes ranging from \$15,000 to \$35,000; and the remaining 4% of families earned between \$7,500 and \$15,000. No subjects indicated that their families' income was less than \$7,500. Similarly, 91% of subjects' mothers and 86% of fathers had earned a high school degree; 56% of mothers and 66% of fathers had obtained some education beyond high school; 27% of mothers and 43% of fathers had earned a bachelor's degree; and 5% of mothers and 16% of fathers had obtained a graduate degree.

Subjects' place of residence during childhood and adolescence, assessed in terms of geographical location and "hometown" population size, was also characterized by little variability. Sixty-three percent of subjects had spent the majority of their lives in the state in which they were attending college; 20% had grown up in neighboring New England states; and 15% came from other eastern states. Only 2% of the sample came from a geographical region other than the eastern seaboard. The majority of subjects (66%) had grown up in communities with populations ranging from 2,500 to 100,000, while 20% came from suburban-urban communities (population over 100,000), and the remaining 14% came from small towns or fringe areas (population up to 2,500).

Religious affiliation was primarily Roman Catholic (71%) and secondarily Protestant (20%), with Jews comprising 4% of the sample. The predominant ethnic backgrounds were Italian (24%) and Irish (24%), with the remaining 52% of the sample being fairly evenly distributed across a wide range of other ethnic backgrounds.

Maltreatment Characteristics

Preliminary analyses indicated that maltreatment variables were characterized by a substantial restriction in range. Consistent with

expectations and previous findings among student sample groups (Brunkan & Crites, 1964), parental neglect and rejection scales evidenced extremely limited variability, with both maternal and paternal nurturance being significantly skewed.

However, a substantial minority of subjects had been victims of parental aggression. Eleven percent of subjects indicated that both parents had used severe aggression (e. g., hit with a hard object, kicked, punched, choked) in resolving conflicts with them on one or more occasions during two distinct referent periods (i.e., one during elementary years and one during junior-senior high school years); these subjects, then, had experienced parental violence with some degree of consistency across time and relationships. Another 21% of subjects reported that both parents had shoved or slapped them on one or more occasions during both referent years; these subjects, then, had experienced mild parental physical force with some degree of consistency across time and relationships. Incidence rates of mild and severe aggression utilized by either parent during a single referent year were substantially higher; for example, 73% of subjects had been shoved or slapped by mothers on at least one occasion during the elementary referent year, and 20% of subjects had been the victim of fathers' severe aggression on at least one occasion during the junior-senior referent year. Additionally, 22% percent of subjects were injured by at least one parent during one referent year; approximately 10% were injured by one or both parents during both referent years; and approximately 10% believed that parents were out of control when directing aggression toward them. These statistics suggest, then, that approximately 10% of subjects had been victims of injurious violence

perpetrated by mothers and fathers with some degree of consistency over the course of childhood and adolescence.

The incidence of parent-to-parent violence reported by subjects was approximately equal for mothers and fathers, although fathers' violence resulted in more frequent injuries. Specifically, 18% of fathers and 19% of mothers used violence against a spouse during the single referent year assessed; 12% of mothers and 5% of fathers were injured. Incidence rates for parent-to-child and spousal violence among the present sample group are similar to incidence rates reported by a nationally representative sample group of parents (Straus et al., 1980). This finding does not necessarily indicate that violence occurs among families of students at the same rate as in the general population; rather, this finding is likely to reflect differences in data-collection procedures across studies and differential response biases among child/student- and parent sample groups.

Eleven percent of subjects reported having had at least one experience of sexual victimization perpetrated by a family member, predominantly same-generation male relatives (i.e., brothers, cousins) and uncles. The present rate of incest is nearly equivalent to the incest rate obtained previously among a similar, student sample group (Finkelhor, 1979).

Instruments

The questionnaire (Appendix A) used in this study was comprised of 839 items including eight standardized inventories which assessed several familial relationship variables and a broad range of individual psychosocial variables. Also included was a series of questions assessing demographic and historical variables. In determining the

sequence in which individual scales and items were presented, an effort was made to systematically vary content and response format to maximize attention and minimize fatigue and careless responding.

Table 4-1 summarizes the inventories comprising the questionnaire and the specific variables assessed by each. Each inventory is described in detail below, and preliminary analyses conducted on selected inventories are described in independent appendices (Appendices B through G).

Historical Variables

Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS). The Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979) was used to determine the level of verbal aggression and physical aggression expressed by parents toward subjects and by parents toward each other over the course of subjects' childhood and adolescence. It is comprised of a list of specific actions which a family member might employ in the context of a conflict with another family member. Subjects customarily respond using a multichoice response scale to indicate the number of times each action was employed during a specified 12-month period for each relationship under investigation (Appendix A, pp. 360-378).

The CTS is comprised of three conceptually distinct scales which have been verified in factor analytic studies (Jorgensen, 1977; Straus, 1979): (a) Reasoning (the use of rational discussion and argument); (b) Verbal Aggression (the use of verbal and nonverbal acts to symbolically hurt or threaten another person); and (c) Violence (the use of physical force against another person).

Normative and psychometric data based on a nationally representative sample of over 2,000 families were reported by Straus

Table 4-1

Summary of Inventories for Twenty Historical and
Thirty Current Variables

Inventory/ Scale or Variable	Items per Scale/Variable
HISTORICAL VARIABLES	
<u>Conflict Tactics Scales</u> (108 Items)	
Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression	14
Mother-to-Child Violence	22
Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression	14
Father-to-Child Violence	22
Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression	7
Mother-to-Father Violence	11
Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression	7
Father-to-Mother Violence	11
<u>Family Data Form</u> (55 Items)	
Gender	1
Total Family Income	1
Mother's Educational Status	1
Father's Educational Status	1
Family Geographic Mobility	1
Continuity of Parental Relationships	11
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization	4
Recent Stressful Life Events	23
Antisocial Activity	13

Table 4-1 Continued

Inventory/ Scale or Variable	Items per Scale/Variable
HISTORICAL VARIABLES	
<u>Family Relations Inventory</u> (80 Items)	
Father Acceptance	20
Father Nurturance	20
Mother Acceptance	20
Mother Nurturance	20
CURRENT VARIABLES	
<u>Attribution Style Questionnaire</u> (36 Items)	
Bad Composite	18
Good Composite	18
<u>Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory</u> (66 Items)	
Resentment	8
Suspicion	10
Assault	10
Verbal Aggression	13
Indirect Aggression	9
Negativism	5
Irritability	11
<u>Hopkins Symptom Checklist</u> (45 Items)	
Anxiety	7
Depression	11
Interpersonal Sensitivity	7
Obsessive-Compulsive	8
Somatization	12

Table 4-1 Continued

Inventory/ Scale or Variable	Items per Scale/Variable
<u>CURRENT VARIABLES</u>	
<u>Jackson Personality Inventory (40 Items)</u>	
Anxiety	20
Interpersonal Affect	20
<u>Lorr Assertiveness Scale (16 Items)</u>	
Defense of Rights and Interests	8
Social Assertiveness	8
<u>Manifest Rejection Index (20 Items)</u>	
Manifest Rejection	20
<u>Personality Research Form (60 Items)</u>	
Dominance	20
Impulsivity	20
Succorance	20
<u>Tennessee Self Concept Scale (54 Items)</u>	
Personal	18
Family	18
Social	18
<u>Violence Scale (25 Items)</u>	
Violence in War	9
Corporal Punishment of Children	4
Penal Code Violence	4
Institutional Violence	8

(Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980). Internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .62 to .88 for Verbal Aggression and Violence scales. Reasoning scales obtained reliability coefficients in the 50's. The CTS was rigorously designed to maximize the instrument's acceptability and overall response rate. The effectiveness of these efforts was demonstrated by statistics which showed that refusal rates for individual items did not increase as social desirability decreased and that total completion rates were equivalent to completion rates obtained in studies using comparable instruments to collect information of a more benign nature (Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980).

Several studies provided evidence of the CTS's construct and concurrent validity. For example, incidence rates reported on the CTS for specific acts of verbal and physical aggression (Bulcroft & Straus, 1975; Jorgensen, 1977; Mulligan, 1977; Steinmetz, 1977a; Straus, 1974) have consistently been equivalent to incidence rates based on in-depth interviews (Gelles, 1974; Straus et al., 1980). Additionally, child/student reports of conflict resolution techniques used between their parents and parents' reports of conflict resolution techniques used by themselves were equivalent (Bulcroft & Straus, 1975; Straus, 1979). Finally, correlations obtained among CTS scale scores and demographic variables and between CTS scale scores within families have repeatedly been consistent with predictions based on relevant theory and available empirical findings (Allen & Straus, 1979; Bulcroft & Straus, 1975; Jorgensen, 1977; Mulligan, 1977; Steinmetz, 1977a, 1977b; Straus, 1973, 1974; Straus et al., 1980).

Although the CTS is an empirically robust instrument, the response format limits data collection to a single, arbitrarily selected referent

year, thereby preventing assessment of conflict resolution strategies more representative of those utilized over the duration of familial relationships. In order to expand the CTS to obtain data describing the level of verbal and physical aggression utilized over the duration of parent-child relationships, the CTS was modified in several ways for use in this investigation. Several new and reworded items were included, and the response format was extended so that subjects provided CTS data describing each parent-child relationship for two distinct 12-month periods. Additionally, extended instructions intended to maximize the availability of retrospective material were used.

Subjects' responses to the modified version of the CTS were submitted to a series of preliminary psychometric analyses to provide an empirical basis for incorporating revisions within the previously validated scoring system (Appendix B). On the basis of results obtained and consistent with the CTS's original scoring system, 18 items comprising two empirically derived components were tabulated to obtain two scale scores for each subject with regard to each relationship, that is, eight scale scores for each subject: (a) Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression; (b) Mother-to-Child Violence; (c) Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression; (d) Father-to-Child Violence; (e) Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression; (f) Mother-to-Father Violence; (g) Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression; and (h) Father-to-Mother Violence. Parent-to-child scales reflect the level of verbal and physical aggression employed by each parent in resolving conflicts with subjects for the two referent years assessed. These scales are interpreted as representing the level of each kind of aggression employed over the duration of each parent-child relationship. Parent-to-parent scales reflect the level of verbal and

physical aggression used by each parent in resolving conflicts with the other parent for the single referent year assessed.

Family Data Form (FDF). The Family Data Form was used to obtain individual and family demographic and historical information from each subject. Developed by the investigator specifically for use in this study, it consists of 89 questions which subjects are asked to answer by selecting the most appropriate response from a set of predetermined options or by providing the specific information requested (Appendix A, pp. 259-260 & 302-314).

After a critical review of several instruments which had been constructed for research of a similar nature, specific items were adapted from earlier questionnaires (Cohen, 1968; Finkelhor, 1979; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Kulik, Stein, & Sarbin, 1968; Mulligan, 1977; Walker, 1980a, 1980b), and several new items were written by the investigator. Due to the factual nature of the information sought and because many of the items had been previously administered in studies using similar sample groups, pretesting of the FDF was judged not to be necessary.

Subjects' responses to the FDF served two purposes. First, responses to specific items (Appendix A, pp. 259-260) were tabulated to obtain univariate statistics describing the sample group in terms of six demographic variables not included as experimental variables in subsequent analyses: (a) age; (b) racial background; (c) ethnic background; (d) religious affiliation; (e) geographical residence during childhood and adolescence; and (f) "hometown" populations. Nominal scores were obtained for these variables directly from subjects' responses to the item assessing each variable.

Second, responses to additional items were tabulated to obtain scores for each subject for one current and eight historical variables included as experimental variables in subsequent analyses. Univariate statistics for items comprising FDF experimental variables were examined, and a rationally sound scoring procedure characterized by good face validity was devised for each variable (Appendix C). FDF experimental variables include: (a) Gender; (b) Total Family Income; (c) Mother's Educational Status; (d) Father's Educational Status; (e) Family Geographic Mobility; (f) Continuity of Parental Relationships (level of permanence characterizing parental relationships); (g) Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization (presence or absence of sexual overtures and experiences with a family member); (h) Recent Stressful Life Events (number of stressors experienced in the preceding 12 months); and (i) Antisocial Activity (general level of antisocial behavior prior to age 18).

Family Relations Inventory (FRI). The Family Relations Inventory (Brunkan & Crites, 1964) was used to determine subjects' perceptions of their parents' attitudes toward themselves over the course of their childhood and adolescence. The FRI consists of 202 true-false items, each of which refers to a specific parental behavior, and yields six scale scores; that is, one for each of three parental attitudes (Acceptance, Avoidance, Concentration) with respect to mother and father separately (Appendix A, pp. 260-267).

Normative statistics based on responses obtained from several mixed-sex, student sample groups were reported by Brunkan and Crites (1964). Internal consistency reliabilities for individual scales ranged from .82 to .92, with the exception of Father Concentration which was

.59. Test-retest (one-month interval) reliabilities ranged from .90 to .98 for Acceptance and Avoidance scales and from .73 to .80 for Concentration scales.

Evidence of the FRI's construct validity came from analyses of the scales' intercorrelations which indicated that relationships among scales were consistent with Roe's (1957) conceptualization of the three parental attitudes (Brunkan & Crites, 1964) and findings of independent empirical investigations utilizing similar constructs (Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schaefer, 1959; Schaefer, Bell, & Bayley, 1960; Slater, 1962). Finally, FRI scale scores were shown to accurately discriminate among comparison groups (college students versus prison inmates and college students seeking counseling versus the normative sample group) expected to differ with respect to perceived parental acceptance and avoidance (Brunkan & Crites, 1964; Medvene, 1973).

In the present study Concentration scales were not administered due to their relative psychometric weakness and the lack of consistent empirical support for concentration as a distinct construct underlying parent-child relationships. Additionally, because no information regarding the FRI's component structure was reported in the literature describing it, preliminary psychometric analyses were conducted on subjects' responses to the 141 items administered as a part of the present investigation to determine the inventory's component structure and devise an empirically based scoring system (Appendix D). On the basis of results obtained, for the present investigation 80 FRI items comprising four empirically derived components were tabulated to obtain four scale scores: (a) Father Nurturance; (b) Father Acceptance; (c) Mother Acceptance; and (d) Mother Nurturance. Nurturance scales reflect

the level of Nurturance versus Neglect (parental investment, encouragement, and physical-emotional support) characterizing subjects' parental relationships over the course of childhood and adolescence. Acceptance scales represent the level of Acceptance versus Rejection (parental approval, understanding, and respectful valuing) characterizing subjects' parental relationships over the course of childhood and adolescence.

Current Variables

Attribution Style Questionnaire (ASQ). The Attribution Style Questionnaire (Peterson et al., 1982) was used to assess each subject's characteristic style of making attributions for bad and good outcomes. It is a self-report instrument consisting of 12 hypothetical situations, half describing bad outcomes and half describing good outcomes. Subjects respond by indicating the major cause of each outcome and rating each cause on a multichoice scale in terms of internality (totally due to self versus totally due to others), stability (will always be present versus will never again be present), and globality (affects all situations in one's life versus affects only this situation). The recommended scoring system yields two composite scores; one combining internality, stability, and globality attributions for bad outcomes, the Bad composite, and one combining corresponding attributions for good outcomes, the Good Composite (Appendix A, pp. 291-298).

Normative statistics based on responses obtained from a mixed-sex, student sample group were reported by Peterson et al. (1982). Bad and Good Composite scales obtained internal consistency reliabilities of .72 and .75, respectively, and test-retest (five-week interval)

reliabilities of .64 and .70, respectively (Peterson et al., 1982).

Several lines of research have provided evidence of the ASQ's criterion and discriminate validity (Peterson & Seligman, 1980). For example, Seligman et al. (1979) demonstrated that ASQ composite scores were significantly correlated with well-validated depression inventories (Beck Depression Inventory, Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961; Multiple Affect Adjective Check List, Zukerman & Lubin, 1965). Additionally, consistent with theoretical constructs underlying the ASQ, Raps, Peterson, Jonas, and Seligman (1982) demonstrated that hospitalized unipolar depressed patients obtained significantly higher Bad Composite scale scores (and lower Good Composite scale scores) than schizophrenic and surgical patient comparison groups. Finally, several longitudinal studies have documented an association between ASQ scores and subsequent development of depressive symptomatology in subjects faced with real-life experiences having negative outcomes (Golin et al., 1981; Peterson & Seligman, 1980; Semmel et al., 1980).

No studies demonstrating the ASQ's component structure were reported in the literature describing the instrument, and available psychometric statistics provide only preliminary evidence of the newly revised instruments' reliability. Consequently, several preliminary analyses were conducted on subjects' responses to the ASQ as a part of the present investigation in an effort to document its structure and determine the reliability of the scoring system proposed by Peterson et al. (1982) (Appendix E). On the basis of results obtained and consistent with the original scoring system, for the present study 36 ASQ items were tabulated to obtain two scale scores: (a) Bad Composite (reflecting the level of internality, stability, and globality

characterizing subjects' attributions for bad outcomes); and (b) Good Composite (reflecting the level of internality, stability, and globality characterizing subjects' attributions for good outcomes).

Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (B-D). The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957) was used to assess each subject's level of hostility and characteristic mode and level of aggressive expression. It is a 66-item self-report inventory which utilizes a true-false response format and yields seven hostility-aggression scales: (a) Resentment (jealousy and hatred of others associated with real or fantasized maltreatment); (b) Suspicion (projection of hostility onto others, distrustfulness); (c) Assault (physical violence against others); (d) Verbal Aggression (arguing, threatening, shouting, cursing); (e) Indirect Aggression (malicious gossip, temper tantrums, slamming doors); (f) Irritability (quick temper, grouchiness, rudeness); and (g) Negativism (oppositional behavior, usually directed against authority figures) (Appendix A, pp. 279-286).

Buss and Durkee (1957) reported normative statistics for the inventory. Test-retest (five-week interval) reliabilities ranged from .46 to .82, with most scales achieving stability coefficients in the mid-60's to low-70's (Buss, 1961). Social desirability has been shown to play a minor role in subjects' responses to the Buss-Durkee (Buss & Durkee, 1957; Geen & George, 1969; Heyman, 1977; Leibowitz, 1968; Young, 1976).

The internal structure of the Buss-Durkee has received fairly consistent empirical support. Independent factor analyses at the scale level applied to responses obtained from separate male and female sample groups extracted two factors. The first, described as an attitudinal

factor (level of experienced hostility), was comprised of Resentment and Suspicion scales; the second, described as a behavioral component (mode of aggressive expression), was comprised of the remaining scales (Buss & Durkee, 1957). A principal components analysis conducted at the item level extracted six Varimax rotated components that overlapped substantially with original scales (Velicer, Govia, Cherico, & Corriveau, 1984). Scale intercorrelations, which ranged from .11 to .66 with the majority being under .35, further verified the Buss-Durkee's multiscale structure.

The outcome of Buss-Durkee validity studies has been mixed. Attempts to validate scale scores against ratings of psychiatric patients by psychiatrists, psychologists, and nurses have produced low correlations (Buss, Fischer, & Simmons, 1962; Edmunds, 1976). On the other hand, several investigators have documented significant relationships among Buss-Durkee scale scores and experimental behavioral measures of hostile responding, such as aggressive behavior displayed in role-playing, number and intensity of shocks given in retaliation for shocks received, and aggressive content of word associates (Buss et al., 1962; Geen & George, 1969; Knott, 1970; Leibowitz, 1968; Petzel & Michaels, 1973; Simpson & Craig, 1967). Moreover, the potential practical discriminative value of the Buss-Durkee was demonstrated by Renson, Adams, and Tinkleberg (1978) who found that violent chronic alcohol abusers scored significantly higher on the Buss-Durkee than did nonviolent chronic alcohol abusers. Finally, Lothstein and Jones (1978) found the Buss-Durkee to be more accurate than either the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI, Hathaway & McKinley, 1951) or Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control (IE) Scale (1966) in

discriminating violent from nonviolent prisoners.

For the present investigation the Buss-Durkee was scored to obtain seven scale scores for each subject (Resentment, Suspicion, Assault, Verbal Aggression, Indirect Aggression, Irritability, and Negativism) by tabulating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale according to the original scoring system (Appendix H).

Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (Derogatis, Lipman, Rickels, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974) was used to assess each subject's current experience of psychophysiological distress. It is comprised of 58 items, each of which refers to a specific symptom commonly reported by psychiatric outpatients, and yields five scale scores: (a) Anxiety (manifest symptoms of anxiety including restlessness, nervousness, and tension); (b) Depression (symptoms of clinical depression including vegetative signs, poor concentration, hopelessness, and dysphoric mood); (c) Interpersonal Sensitivity (feelings of inadequacy and inferiority regarding interpersonal functioning); (d) Obsessive-Compulsive (neurotic symptoms including obsessional thoughts and actions experienced as compelling but unwanted); and (e) Somatization (bodily discomfort and dysfunction including gastrointestinal, respiratory, and gross musculature symptoms). In responding to the inventory, subjects are asked to indicate how much each symptom has bothered them over the course of the previous week using a 4-point Likert-type rating scale (Appendix A, pp. 286-288).

Normative statistics based on a sample group comprised of over 2,000 psychiatric outpatients and normal adults were reported by Derogatis et al. (1974). Internal consistency reliabilities for the

five scales ranged from .84 to .87 calculated on the basis of over 1,000 HSCL profiles (Derogatis et al., 1974). Test-retest (one-week interval) reliabilities ranged from .75 to .82 based on data obtained from nearly 500 outpatients prior to the initiation of formal treatment (Rickels, Lipman, Park, Covi, Uhlenhuth, & Mock, 1971). Although no information demonstrating the HSCL's freedom from response biases has been reported, several studies (Fiske, 1971; Norman, 1967; Rorer, 1965) have shown that neither acquiescence nor social desirability play a substantial role in clinically oriented self-report scales using clearly defined response alternatives.

The factorial structure of the HSCL has been extensively documented through clinical-rational clustering (Lipman, Covi, Rickels, Uhlenhuth, & Lazar, 1968) and factor analytic studies (Lipman, Rickels, Covi, Derogatis, & Uhlenhuth, 1969; Williams, Lipman, Rickels, Covi, Uhlenhuth, & Mattsson, 1968) utilizing HSCL data obtained from large sample groups selected from diverse populations.

Construct and criterion validity of the HSCL have been demonstrated by several research programs utilizing a broad range of sample groups (Derogatis, Lipman, Covi, Rickels, & Uhlenhuth, 1970; Derogatis et al., 1974). One group of studies (Covi, Lipman, & Derogatis, 1973; Lipman, Cole, Park, & Rickels, 1965; Raskin, Schutterbrandt, Reatig, & McKeon, 1970; Rickels et al., 1971; Uhlenhuth, Rickels, Fisher, Park, Lipman, & Mock, 1966) consistently showed HSCL scale scores to be highly and differentially sensitive to specific treatment effects associated with the administration of anxiolytics, antidepressants, and phenothiazines in outpatient sample groups. A second group of studies (Jacobs, Garcia, Rickels, & Preucel, 1974; Parloff, Kelman, & Frank, 1954; Prusoff &

Kelerman, 1974; Rickels, Lipman, Garcia, Covi, & Fisher, 1972; Schwartz, Evans, Garcia, Rickels, & Fisher, 1973) demonstrated the sensitivity of all five HSCL scores to changes in emotional status among nonpsychiatric patients with low initial symptom scores.

Given the substantial empirical support for the HSCL's structure, for the present study the original 45-item scoring system was employed to obtain five scale scores for each subject (Anxiety, Depression, Interpersonal Sensitivity, Obsessive-Compulsive, and Somatization) by tabulating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale (Appendix I).

Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI). The Jackson Personality Inventory (Jackson, 1976) was used to assess two dimensions of each subject's psychosocial functioning: (a) Anxiety (the tendency to become readily upset, feel apprehensive about the future, and worry over seemingly inconsequential matters); and (b) Interpersonal Affect (the tendency to value close emotional ties and identify closely with other people and their problems). The JPI is a true-false, self-report instrument developed primarily for use with normal populations and consists of sixteen 20-item bipolar scales. Forty items comprising Anxiety and Interpersonal Affect scales were administered in the context of the present investigation (Appendix A, pp. 279-286).

Normative data were reported for a mixed-sex sample group of 5,000 high school and college students representing a broad geographical cross section of the United States and Canada (Jackson, 1976). Neither alpha coefficients nor stability statistics associated with JPI scales were reported in the literature describing the instrument. Desirability and acquiescence were shown to play a minor role in subjects' responses to

the JPI, with Anxiety obtaining correlations of $-.29$ and $.29$ with desirability and acquiescence, respectively, and Interpersonal Affect obtaining correlations of $.11$ and $.10$ with the respective scales (Jackson, 1976).

A rigorous program of empirical studies has demonstrated the JPI's convergent and discriminate validity (Jackson, 1976). One approach involved comparing JPI scale scores with self- and peer ratings obtained from students residing in common housing units. A multimethod factor analysis (Jackson, 1975, cited by Jackson, 1976) applied to this data set indicated that a majority of trait dimensions were defined by substantial loadings obtained by convergent measures while divergent loadings were low and insignificant. Specifically, the JPI Anxiety scale achieved a loading of $.80$ on the Anxiety factor, and the JPI Interpersonal Affect scale achieved a loading of $.77$ on the Interpersonal Affect factor (Jackson, 1976). Additionally, specific JPI scale scores have been shown to accurately discriminate between comparison groups expected to differ on specific scales on the basis of trait definitions and relevant theoretical and empirical literature (Jackson, 1976). For example, a study exploring relationships among personality traits and attitudes toward minority groups demonstrated that Interpersonal Affect was significantly correlated with positive attitudes toward minorities (Gardner, 1973). Finally, correlations obtained among specific JPI scale scores and well-validated criterion measures (MMPI, Hathaway & McKinley, 1951; Bentler Psychological Inventory [BPI], cited by Jackson, 1976; and the Personality Research Form [PRF], Jackson, 1967) were consistent with expectations based on relevant theory and characteristics of each measure. Noteworthy

findings with respect to the Anxiety scale included correlations of $-.74$ and $.43$ obtained between it and the BPI Stability scale and the MMPI Psychasthenia (Pt) scale, respectively. Findings of note regarding the Interpersonal Affect scale included correlations of $.70$, $.55$, and $.39$ obtained between it and the PRF Nurturance scale, the PRF Affiliation scale, and the BPI Generosity scale, respectively.

Given the strength of empirical evidence supporting the JPI's scale structure, the 40 items administered in the present study were scored to obtain two scale scores for each subject (Anxiety and Interpersonal Affect) by tabulating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale according to the original scoring system (Appendix H).

Lorr Assertiveness Scale. The Lorr Assertiveness Scale (Lorr & More, 1980) was used to assess each subject's ability to express feelings or wants when such expression risks loss of social reinforcement or even punishment (Rich & Schroeder, 1976). It is a 32-item self-report inventory which utilizes a true-false response format and yields four scale scores. In the context of the present study, 16 items comprising two scales were administered: (a) Social Assertiveness (the tendency to initiate and terminate social interactions involving strangers, friends, or authority figures easily and comfortably); and (b) Defense of Rights and Interests (the tendency to stand up for one's rights and refuse unreasonable requests) (Appendix A, pp. 279-286).

Normative statistics for the Lorr were reported by Lorr and More (1980). Alpha coefficients ranged from $.72$ to $.90$, with Social Assertiveness and Defense of Rights and Interests achieving reliabilities of $.90$ and $.83$, respectively. Low correlations obtained

among the four assertiveness scales and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) indicated that subjects' responses to the Lorr were not appreciably affected by social desirability responding (Lorr & More, 1980).

The Lorr's structure was documented in a principal components analysis applied to responses obtained from a large, mixed-sex sample group of students and utility company employees. Cattell's (1966) Scree test retained four Varimax rotated factors which replicated the four theoretical scales. Scale intercorrelations ranged from .33 to .54, with the majority being in the high thirties, further supporting the discriminability of the four kinds of assertive behavior.

Evidence of the Lorr's discriminative validity came from data which indicated that the four scales were related to criterion measures in specific ways predictable on the basis of conceptual models of assertiveness and characteristics of each criterion measure. Specifically, three of the four assertiveness scales (all but Independence) demonstrated significant correlations with Lorr's self-esteem inventory (cited by Lorr & More, 1980). On the other hand, low correlations obtained between Lorr scales and a measure of tolerance versus hostility (Interpersonal Style Inventory, Lorr & Youniss, 1973) indicated that the four assertiveness scales did not overlap with either tolerant or hostile attitudes and behaviors (Lorr & More, 1980).

Consistent with the original scoring system, the 16 Lorr Assertiveness Scale items administered in the present study were scored to obtain two scale scores for each subject (Social Assertiveness and Defense of Rights and Interests) by tabulating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale (Appendix H).

Manifest Rejection Index (MR Index). The Manifest Rejection Index (Hurley, 1965) was used to assess each subject's tendency to assume a negative and punitive stance toward children. It is a self-report instrument which consists of 30 statements describing specific child behaviors and potential parental responses. Subjects are asked to respond to each item by indicating their level of agreement with the parental attitude or behavior described using a multichoice scale. The recommended scoring system combines responses for all items to obtain a single total scale score (Appendix A, pp. 299-300).

Normative statistics for the MR Index were reported for students (Hurley & Hohn, 1971) and a large, primarily middle-class sample of parents (Eron & Walder, 1961; Eron et al., 1971; Hurley, 1965). Stability was demonstrated by a test-retest reliability coefficient of .68 based on repeated administrations to a small sample group at the beginning and end of a course in child psychology (Hurley & Laffey, 1957).

Studies which have attempted to document the Index's validity have produced mixed results. A correlation of .46 was obtained between the MR Index and an objectively based Punishment Index (Eron, 1961; Eron, Walder, Toigo, & Lefkowitz, 1963), indicating that the MR Index discriminated among parents who reported expressing various levels of punitiveness (verbally and behaviorally) toward children (Hurley, 1965). Correlations obtained between the MR Index and demographic variables were consistent with relevant theory and previous empirical findings, providing further evidence of the MR Index's validity (Baldwin et al., 1945; Hurley, 1959, 1962; Miller & Swanson, 1960). On the other hand, the Index failed to discriminate between a small group of abusive

mothers and a matched control group, indicating that it is not a valid instrument for studying abusive parents under conditions where anonymity cannot be assured (Melnick & Hurley, 1969).

Despite efforts taken to ensure the content validity of the Index, no information documenting its internal consistency or component structure was reported in the literature describing it. Therefore, as a part of the present study several preliminary analyses were conducted on subjects' responses to items comprising the Index to determine its component structure and devise an empirically based scoring system (Appendix F). On the basis of results obtained, in the context of the present investigation a single Manifest Rejection scale score was obtained for each subject by tabulating the unweighted sum of 20 MR Index items.

Personality Research Form (PRF). The Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967) was used to assess three dimensions of each subject's interpersonal functioning: (a) Dominance (the tendency to express oneself forcefully, control one's environment, and influence or direct others); (b) Impulsivity (the tendency to express feelings and thoughts freely and to act without deliberation or delay); and (c) Succorance (the tendency to seek sympathy, protection, and reassurance and to feel insecure or helpless when such support is unavailable). The JPI is a true-false, self-report inventory developed to assess personality traits relevant to the functioning of normal individuals and consists of fifteen 20-item bipolar scales. Sixty PRF items comprising Dominance, Impulsivity, and Succorance scales were administered in the context of this investigation (Appendix A, pp. 279-286).

Summary statistics were reported for a mixed-sex sample group of

1,000 college students (Jackson, 1967). Internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .48 to .90, with Dominance, Impulsivity, and Succorance scales obtaining alpha coefficients ranging from .85 to .88, .66 to .83, and .78 to .85, respectively. Data from two investigations attested to the stability of PRF scale scores (Bentler, 1964; Jackson, 1967). Specifically, Jackson and Skippon (cited in Jackson, 1967) obtained test-retest (two-week interval) reliabilities for parallel forms ranging from .72 to .92. Taking both stability studies into account, Dominance, Impulsivity, and Succorance scales achieved reliabilities ranging from .81 to .91. Several analyses have demonstrated that response biases play a minor role in subjects' responses to PRF scales (Bentler, 1964; Jackson, 1967; Jackson & Lay, 1967; Trott & Jackson, 1968). For example, Jackson (1967) demonstrated that less than 5% of PRF scale variances (on average) was attributable to social desirability responding.

Numerous studies have provided sound evidence of the PRF's convergent and discriminate validity. For example, a series of studies (Jackson, 1967; Jackson & Guthrie, 1967, 1968; Kusyszyn, 1968; Kusyszyn & Jackson, 1967) correlated PRF scale scores with trait and behavior ratings obtained from lay "judges" who had naturally occurring opportunities to observe subjects. Substantial correlations were obtained among PRF scale scores and their respective trait and behavior ratings, with the majority of convergent coefficients for Dominance, Impulsivity, and Succorance scales exceeding .50. Additionally, correlations obtained among specific PRF scale scores and well-validated criterion measures (California Psychological Inventory [CPI], Megargee, 1972; Strong Vocational Interest Blank [SVIB], Campbell, 1974) have

repeatedly been consistent with predictions based on relevant theory and characteristics of each measure. Noteworthy findings with respect to the Dominance scale included correlations of .78, .47, and .43 obtained between it and CPI Dominance, Social Presence, and Capacity for Status scales, respectively; substantial correlations were also obtained between Dominance and SVIB career dimensions of Personnel Manager, Guidance Counselor, Public Administrator, and Sales Manager. Consistent with expectations, the Impulsivity scale obtained correlations of $-.53$, $-.50$, and $.46$ with CPI Self Control, Good Impression, and Flexibility scales, respectively; additionally, substantial correlations were obtained between Impulsivity and SVIB career dimensions of Advertising, Author-Journalist, and Lawyer. Findings of note with respect to the Succorance scale included correlations of $.40$ and $.29$ obtained between it and CPI Femininity and Responsibility scales, respectively; the absence of a single substantial correlation between Succorance and 37 SVIB career dimensions is noteworthy (Seiss & Jackson, 1967; Stricker, cited by Jackson, 1976).

Given the substantial evidence supporting the PRF's scale structure, the 60 PRF items administered in the present study were scored in accordance with the original scoring system to obtain three scale scores for each subject (Dominance, Impulsivity, and Succorance) by tabulating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale (Appendix H).

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS). The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) was used to assess each subject's level of self-acceptance with regard to personal functioning, family relationships, and social functioning. It is comprised of 100

self-descriptive statements to which subjects respond using a 5-point Likert-type scale to indicate their perception of the degree to which each item applies to themselves. The manual describes an elaborate scoring system which derives thirty scale scores from the complete inventory. In the context of the present study 54 items comprising three scales were administered: (a) Personal Self-Concept; (b) Family Self-Concept; and (c) Social Self-Concept (Appendix A, pp. 288-290).

Normative data for all major indices of the TSCS were reported for a large, mixed-sex sample group ranging representing a broad range of ethnic, socioeconomic, and educational levels (Fitts, 1965).

Test-retest (two-week interval) reliabilities ranged from .60 to .92, with Personal, Family, and Social scales achieving coefficients of .85, .89, and .90, respectively. Additionally, Fitts (1965) reported that individual profile patterns evidenced remarkable stability over the course of a year or more. Interscale correlations were consistent with the theoretical classification of items. While the major dimensions were relatively independent of each other, scores which were logically related showed appreciable correlations (e.g., significant positive correlations were obtained between Personal, Family, and Social scale scores). Fitts (1965) failed to report additional data describing the TSCS's internal structure and relationship to response biases.

Independent factor analytic studies (Rentz & White, 1967; Vacchiano & Strauss, 1968) have produced inconsistent findings.

Several lines of research have demonstrated the TSCS's construct and criterion validity. One approach involved demonstrating that TSCS scale scores accurately discriminated between comparison groups whose self-perceptions were expected to differ on the basis of relevant theory

and available empirical data. For example, TSCS scale scores consistently discriminated between patient and nonpatient comparison groups and among diagnostic categories within patient groups (Congdon, 1958; Fitts, 1965; Havener, 1961; Huffman, 1964; Piety, 1958; Wayne, 1963). Similarly, selected TSCS scale scores accurately and predictably discriminated between delinquent and nondelinquent comparison groups (Atchison, 1958); among outstandingly (psychologically) healthy adults, normal adults, and outpatient comparison groups (Fitts, 1965); among juvenile first offenders, repeated offenders, and a control group (Lefebber, 1965); and between paratroopers able to withstand the stress of training and those unable to do so (Gividen, 1959). A second group of studies (Hall, 1964; McGee, 1960, cited by Fitts, 1965; Sundby, 1962) demonstrated that relationships among specific TSCS scale scores and well-validated criterion measures (MMPI, Hathaway & McKinley, 1951; Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Edwards, 1954; Internal-External Locus of Control [IE] Scale, Rotter, 1966; Eysenck Personality Inventory, Eysenck & Eysenck, 1963) were consistent with relevant theory and characteristics of each measure. Finally, several studies demonstrated that significant changes in selected TSCS scale scores occurred following psychotherapy (Ashcraft & Fitts, 1964; Fitts, 1965) and in response to stress and failure (Gividen, 1959), with the the differences in all cases being in the expected direction.

Although the TSCS's theoretical structure and complex scoring system have not been empirically verified, Personal, Family, and Social scales consistently evidenced significant, predictable relationships in TSCS validity studies. Based on these findings, the 54 TSCS items administered in this study were scored in accordance with the original

scoring system to obtain three scale scores for each subject (Personal, Family, and Social Self-Concept) by tabulating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale (Appendix I).

Violence Scale. The Violence Scale (Bardis, 1973) was used to assess each subject's attitudes toward instrumental physical aggression. It consists of 25 items, each of which asks subjects to evaluate specific acts of violence in a specific context utilizing a multichoice response scale. All items are stated in the direction of violence approval. The recommended scoring system combines responses for all items to obtain a single total scale score (Appendix A, pp. 298-299).

Bardis (1973) reported normative statistics for the Violence Scale based on several small sample groups. Internal consistency was demonstrated by split-half (odd-even) reliability coefficients of .92 and .89 (Bardis, 1973). Stability was demonstrated by a test-retest reliability coefficient of .94. Evidence of the Violence Scale's validity came from data which indicated that differences in scale scores obtained by comparison groups (males and females; socioeducational classes) were consistent with expectations based on relevant theory and available empirical data (Bardis, 1973).

Because no information regarding the Violence Scale's component structure is reported in the literature describing it, as a part of the present study preliminary psychometric analyses were conducted on subjects' responses to Violence Scale items to determine the scale's component structure and devise a refined, empirically based scoring system (Appendix G). On the basis of results obtained, for the present investigation the 25 Violence Scale items were tabulated to obtain four scale scores which reflect subjects' level of approval of physical

aggression in four distinct sociocultural contexts: (a) Violence in War; (b) Corporal Punishment of Children; (c) Penal Code Violence; and (d) Institutional Violence (violence used by societal authorities to control or punish individuals or groups engaging in violent behavior, e.g., riots).

Procedure

Subjects were solicited during regularly scheduled class meetings at which time the study's major focus (i.e., family relationships and individual development), procedure (i.e., questionnaire), and terms for participation (i.e., subjects were to be 18 years of age or older and would obtain extra credit points in exchange for participation) were explained. Students indicated their willingness to participate by signing up for a prescheduled, three-hour data-collection session.

Data collection began with the investigator requesting students to read an introductory letter and consent form (Appendix J) and consider carefully their decision regarding participation. Those who indicated their willingness to participate by signing the provided consent form were instructed to begin filling out the questionnaire. The investigator remained in the administration room throughout each data-collection session.

Subjects were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists" (American Psychological Association, 1981) throughout their involvement in this study. Additionally, upon completion of data collection the investigator provided respondents with a handout about family violence and intervention services for dealing with ongoing abuse or feelings regarding past abuse. Finally, the investigator indicated her availability to meet briefly with individual students to provide

support regarding abuse issues and facilitate referrals for intervention or treatment services.

CHAPTER V

THE PRESENT STUDY: RESULTS

Data analysis consisted of three phases: (a) preliminary analyses; (b) data reduction; and (c) hypothesis testing. To briefly review preliminary procedures, univariate statistics at the item level were tabulated, on the basis of which 11 respondents who failed to provide sufficiently complete data were omitted from the sample group, and missing values for individual items were replaced by sample means or medians. Additionally, data obtained for specific items were used to tabulate nominal scores describing the sample group in terms of maltreatment characteristics and six demographic variables not included as experimental variables in subsequent analyses (see Chapter IV). Also at a preliminary level, subjects' responses to items comprising selected inventories were submitted to a series of analyses to document each instruments' internal structure and devise an empirically based scoring system where no a priori system existed or the reliability of the original system was in question (See Appendices B through G).

At the data reduction level, independent principal components analyses were conducted on the 20x20 intercorrelation matrix calculated for historical variables and the 30x30 intercorrelation matrix calculated for current variables. Because the purpose of these analyses was to reduce the multiple individual variables within each set to several broad, conceptually meaningful and empirically verified constructs, interpretative "power" was the primary criterion for determining the number of components retained. Velicer's (Velicer, 1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion and Cattell's (1966) Scree test were employed to suggest

initial values, and Varimax rotations were performed on resulting component patterns. The final number of components was determined by examining several rotated component patterns and selecting the one solution for historical variables and the one solution for current variables which most meaningfully and parsimoniously accounted for all variables in each set.

At the hypotheses testing level, intercorrelation matrices calculated independently for the 20 historical and 30 current variables and for the two sets of variables combined were submitted to a canonical correlation analysis (BMDP6M, Dixon, 1981; SPSSX, 1983). Wilks' Lambda was used to determine the number of significant functions. Canonical loadings were interpreted in conjunction with components extracted in independent principal components analyses of historical and current variables to determine the nature of relationships among the broad constructs underlying the two sets of variables. Implicit in this interpretation was the assumption that historical constructs are causally related to current constructs.

Univariate Statistics

A scale score was obtained for each of 20 historical and 30 current variables by calculating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each scale. Scale scores were transformed to standardized z-scores, and the normalcy of each variable's distribution was statistically assessed. Five variables which were determined to be significantly skewed were normalized through the application of one of three transformations (i.e., $\log [x+1]$, base ten, or x -squared) depending upon the specific procedure which proved most effective with respect to each variable.

Table 5-1 presents mean scale scores, standard deviations, and

Table 5-1

Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients
for Twenty Historical and Thirty Current Variables

Inventory/ Scale	Range of Scores	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha
HISTORICAL VARIABLES					
<u>Conflict Tactics Scales</u>					
Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression	0- 70	321	17.1	11.8	.87
Mother-to-Child Violence	0-110	326	6.1*	8.2	.88
Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression	0- 70	323	12.6	10.9	.87
Father-to-Child Violence	0-110	330	4.2*	6.2	.85
Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression	0- 35	311	9.3	7.3	.85
Mother-to-Father Violence	0- 55	319	1.0	3.2	.89
Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression	0- 35	308	8.6	7.6	.88
Father-to-Mother Violence	0- 55	316	1.1	4.0	.93

Table 5-1 Continued

Inventory/ Scale	Range of Scores	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha
HISTORICAL VARIABLES					
<u>Family Data Form</u>					
Total Family Income	1- 6	342	5.4	1.5	--
Mother's Educational Status	1- 10	342	5.4	1.9	--
Father's Educational Status	1- 10	337	6.0	2.4	--
Family Geographic Mobility	1- 3	341	1.5	.6	--
Continuity of Parental Relationships	1- 3	342	1.6	.7	--
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization	1- 3	289	.2	.6	--
Recent Stressful Life Events	1- 23	342	5.0	2.9	--
Antisocial Activity	0- 52	342	8.2	6.7	.81
<u>Family Relations Inventory</u>					
Father Acceptance	0- 20	339	11.5	4.7	.84
Father Nurturance	0- 20	339	17.2*	2.4	.88
Mother Acceptance	0- 20	339	14.9	4.2	.84
Mother Nurturance	0- 20	339	18.0*	2.7	.81

Table 5-1 Continued

Inventory/ Scale	Range of Scores	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha
CURRENT VARIABLES					
<u>Attribution Style Questionnaire</u>					
Bad Composite	18-126	328	71.4	10.9	.64
Good Composite	18-126	328	94.4	11.8	.77
<u>Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory</u>					
Resentment	0- 8	339	3.6	2.2	.69
Suspicion	0- 10	339	3.9	2.2	.60
Assault	0- 10	339	4.6	2.5	.70
Verbal Aggression	0- 13	339	7.6	2.6	.64
Indirect Aggression	0- 9	339	5.5	2.0	.61
Negativism	0- 5	339	2.4	1.3	.45
Irritability	0- 11	339	6.1	2.5	.64
<u>Hopkins Symptom Checklist</u>					
Anxiety	7- 28	338	11.4	3.5	.79
Depression	11- 44	338	18.8	5.1	.82
Interpersonal Sensitivity	7- 28	338	12.0	3.4	.76
Obsessive- Compulsive	8- 32	338	14.6	3.9	.77
Somatization	12- 48	338	18.2*	5.1	.84
<u>Jackson Personality Inventory</u>					
Anxiety	0- 20	340	13.6	3.8	.77
Interpersonal Affect	0- 20	340	13.3	3.7	.74

Table 5-1 Continued

Inventory/ Scale	Range of Scores	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha
CURRENT VARIABLES					
<u>Lorr Assertiveness Scale</u>					
Defense of Rights and Interests	0- 8	342	5.7	1.9	.63
Social Assertiveness	0- 8	342	4.8	2.6	.82
<u>Manifest Rejection Index</u>					
Manifest Rejection	0- 80	340	33.5	8.9	.79
<u>Personality Research Form</u>					
Dominance	0- 20	335	10.8	4.1	.77
Impulsivity	0- 20	335	10.2	3.3	.64
Succorance	0- 20	335	10.8	4.0	.78
<u>Tennessee Self Concept Scale</u>					
Personal	18- 90	339	65.7	7.6	.79
Family	18- 90	339	69.1	8.4	.81
Social	18- 90	339	68.0	8.0	.83
<u>Violence Scale</u>					
Violence in War	0- 36	340	14.4	6.5	.83
Corporal Punishment of Children	0- 16	340	4.6	3.3	.81
Penal Code Violence	0- 16	340	7.8	3.9	.79
Institutional Violence	0- 32	340	9.8	5.3	.78

Table 5-1 Continued

Note. Sample sizes vary across scales because preliminary analyses of individual inventories were based on complete data (i.e., subjects who failed to respond to any item comprising an inventory were omitted from all preliminary analyses of that inventory). For all variables the lowest obtainable score corresponds to the (theoretical) absence of the attitude, trait, or symptom assessed and the highest obtainable score corresponds to an extreme level of the respective attitude, trait, or symptom. Prior to scoring, item responses were recoded as necessary, and summary statistics are comparable to normative statistics previously reported for each scale.

* Indicates variables with significantly skewed distributions prior to normalization.

alpha coefficients obtained by the present sample group for 20 historical and 30 current experimental variables. Examination of summary statistics indicates that the majority of scales are characterized by a substantial amount of variability; skewed scales are indicated with an asterisk in Table 5-1. An informal comparison of summary statistics with normative data reported for each inventory indicated that mean scale scores and standard deviations obtained by the present sample group were similar to respective statistics obtained by normative sample groups.

Historical Constructs:

Component Structure of Twenty Variables

A principal components analysis was performed on the intercorrelation matrix calculated for 20 historical variables. The MAP criterion retained one component, and the Scree test retained seven components. While the single-component solution failed to discriminate among theoretically distinct historical dimensions, the seven-component solution was characterized by redundancy. Therefore, a second principal components analysis was conducted on the 20x20 intercorrelation matrix, this time imposing a six-factor solution. The resulting Varimax rotated component pattern was readily interpretable and accounted for 61% of the total variance. All 20 variables obtained a loading greater than .30 on at least one component, and seven variables obtained a loading greater than .30 on more than one component. Table 5-2 presents the variables comprising the six historical components and Varimax loadings obtained by each.

The first component, labeled Parental Power Assertion, is comprised of four CTS scales assessing parental use of verbal-symbolic

Table 5-2

Factor Loadings Obtained by Twenty Historical Variables
Comprising Six Varimax Rotated Components

Variable/Inventory	Loading
Component 1. PARENTAL POWER ASSERTION	
Mother-to-Child Violence (CTS)	.86
Father-to-Child Violence (CTS)	.80
Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression (CTS)	.67*
Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression (CTS)	.48*
Gender (FDF)	.32*
Component 2. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	
Father's Education (FDF)	.79
Mother's Education (FDF)	.77
Total Family Income (FDF)	.55
Family Geographic Mobility (FDF)	.42*
Component 3. PARENT-CHILD AFFECTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	
Mother Acceptance (FRI)	.79
Mother Nurturance (FRI)	.78
Father Nurturance (FRI)	.62*
Father Acceptance (FRI)	.55*
Continuity of Parental Relationships (FDF)	.36
Family Geographic Mobility (FDF)	-.33*
Component 4. SPOUSAL VIOLENCE AND INCEST	
Father-to-Mother Violence (CTS)	.82
Mother-to-Father Violence (CTS)	.82
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization (FDF)	.45*

Table 5-2 Continued

Variable/Inventory	Loading
Component 5. PERSONAL STRESS AND INCEST	
Recent Stressful Life Events (FDF)	.71
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization (FDF)	.49*
Gender (FDF)	-.56*
Component 6. PARENTAL VERBAL AGGRESSION	
Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression (CTS)	.83
Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression (CTS)	.72
Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression (CTS)	.65*
Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression (CTS)	.37*
Father Nurturance (FRI)	-.37*
Father Acceptance (FRI)	-.33*

Note. * Indicates variables obtaining loadings > .30 on two or more components. Gender: 1 = F; 2 = M.

and physical aggression in resolving parent-child conflicts. More specifically, this component reflects parental use of words, passive-aggressive actions, object-directed aggression, and especially physical force and violence to intimidate, control, punish, and hurt children. Consistent with the frequently reported finding of higher levels of parental aggression in disciplining boys, as compared to girls, Gender obtained a substantial loading on this component (Becker, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1961a, 1961b; Feshbach, 1970; Lips & Colwill, 1978; Straus et al., 1980).

The second component, labeled Socioeconomic Status, consists of four FDF variables assessing Mother's and Father's Educational Status, Total Family Income, and Family Geographic Mobility. The substantial contribution to this component by Family Geographic Mobility suggests that in the present sample group frequent change of residence is associated with upward social mobility.

The third component, labeled Parent-Child Affectional Relationships, is primarily defined by four FRI scales assessing parental nurturance and acceptance. It reflects the level of physical-emotional support and unconditional acceptance of children by parents conveyed in the context of day-to-day interactions. Substantial loadings obtained by FDF variables Continuity of Parental Relationships and Family Geographic Mobility (inverse) are consistent with the interpretation that the affectional quality of parent-child relationships is enhanced by object and environment permanence (Ainsworth, 1973; Bowlby, 1969; Fraiberg, 1969; Garbarino, 1981; Mahler, 1978; Martin et al., 1974).

The fourth component, labeled Spousal Violence, consists primarily of two CTS scales reflecting the use of physical aggression

between spouses. The substantial loading obtained by the FDF variable Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization indicates that in the present sample group, spousal violence is associated with sexual abuse of children. This combination of variables suggests an underlying theme of deficient parental communication skills and a "deviant" life-style and/or value system (DeFrancis, 1969; Finkelhor, 1979, 1980; Giarretto, 1976; Gruber & Jones, 1983; Justice & Justice, 1979; Kempe, 1978; Nakashima & Zakus, 1977; Summit & Kryso, 1978).

The fifth component, labeled Personal Stress and Incest, is primarily comprised of two FDF variables, Recent Stressful Life Events and Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization. The substantial loading obtained by Gender is consistent with the well-documented relationship between being female and a victim of incest (DeFrancis, 1969). Given that Recent Stressful Life Events was assessed with respect to the previous 12-month period, this combination of variables is suggestive of a relationship between being sexually victimized by a family member during childhood and/or adolescence and experiencing high levels of personal crises and environmental instability during young adulthood (Kaufman et al., 1954; Lukianowicz, 1972).

The sixth component, labeled Parental Verbal Aggression, is primarily defined by four CTS scales reflecting parental reliance on verbal commands, threats, passive-aggressive actions, and object-directed aggression in response to intrafamilial conflicts (i.e., between spouses and between parents and children). Substantial negative loadings obtained by FRI Father Nurturance and Father Acceptance scales indicate an inverse relationship between parental verbal-symbolic aggression and the overall affectional quality of father-child

relationships (Becker, 1964; Hoffman, 1960).

Current Constructs:

Component Structure of Thirty Variables

A principal components analysis was performed on the intercorrelation matrix calculated for 30 current variables. The MAP criterion retained five components, and the Scree test retained seven components. The Varimax rotated component pattern associated with the five-factor solution was readily interpretable and accounted for 54% of the total variance. All 30 variables obtained a loading greater than .30 on at least one component, and nine variables obtained a loading greater than .30 on more than one component. Table 5-3 presents the variables comprising the five current components and Varimax loadings obtained by each.

The first component, labeled Emotional Instability, is primarily defined by five HSCL scales assessing relatively distinct dimensions of psychophysiological distress -- Depression, Anxiety, Obsessive-Compulsive, Somaticism, and Interpersonal Sensitivity. Additionally, three TSCS scales assessing self-acceptance regarding personal, family, and social functioning contributed substantial negative loadings, consistent with the frequently reported finding of an inverse relationship between self-worth and anxious, depressive symptomatology (Beck et al., 1979; Becker, 1979; Brown & Harris, 1978; Coopersmith, 1967; Lipsitt, 1958).

The second component, labeled Violence Approval, is comprised of four Violence Scales and the Manifest Rejection Index, each of which assesses attitudes toward instrumental aggression in a specific sociocultural context. This component reflects a general tendency to

Table 5-3

Factor Loadings Obtained by Thirty Current Variables
Comprising Five Varimax Rotated Components

Variable/Inventory	Loading
Component 1. EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY	
Depression (HSCL)	.83
Anxiety--state (HSCL)	.82
Obsessive-Compulsive (HSCL)	.76
Somaticism (HSCL)	.75
Interpersonal Sensitivity (HSCL)	.72
Personal Self-Concept (TSCS)	-.52*
Family Self-Concept (TSCS)	-.38*
Irritability (B-D)	.35*
Social Self-Concept (TSCS)	-.32*
Component 2. VIOLENCE APPROVAL	
Institutional Violence (VS)	.82
Violence in War (VS)	.78
Corporal Punishment of Children (VS)	.75
Penal Code Violence (VS)	.71
Manifest Rejection of Children (MRI)	.64

Table 5-3 Continued

Variable/Inventory	Loading
Component 3. SELF-ASSURANCE	
Social Assertiveness (Lorr)	.73
Dominance (PRF)	.70
Social Self-Concept (TSCS)	.67*
Defense of Rights and Interests (Lorr)	.56
Personal Self-Concept (TSCS)	.53*
Family Self-Concept (TSCS)	.43*
Resentment (B-D)	-.39*
Composite Attributions for Bad Outcomes (ASQ)	-.37
Composite Attributions for Good Outcomes (ASQ)	.33
Component 4. HOSTILITY-AGGRESSION	
Verbal Aggression (B-D)	.77
Indirect Aggression (B-D)	.69*
Assault (B-D)	.67
Irritability (B-D)	.66*
Negativism (B-D)	.54
Resentment (B-D)	.53*
Suspicion (B-D)	.48
Impulsivity (PRF)	.43
Antisocial Activity (FDF)	.37*
Anxiety--trait (JPI)	.35*

Table 5-3 Continued

Variable/Inventory	Loading
Component 5. DEPENDENCY--INTERDEPENDENCY	
Succorance (PRF)	.76
Interpersonal Affect (JPI)	.68
Anxiety--trait (JPI)	.63*
Antisocial Activity (FDF)	-.43*
Indirect Aggression (B-D)	.31*

Note. * Indicates variables obtaining loadings > .30 on two or more components.

endorse violence as an essential means of conflict resolution; that is, for purposes of national defense and controlling and punishing children and criminals, and private individuals engaging in violent behavior (Gelles & Straus, 1975; Snortum & Ashear, 1972; Starr & Cutler, 1972).

The third component, labeled Self-Assurance, is primarily defined by three TSCS scales assessing self-acceptance regarding social, personal, and family functioning, two Lorr Assertiveness Scales, and the PRF Dominance scale. As a group, these variables convey a theme of self-acceptance, confidence, and interpersonal competence. Consistent with the well-documented finding of a direct relationship between self- and other acceptance, the B-D Resentment scale obtained a substantial negative loading (Coopersmith, 1967; Reese, 1961; Slater, 1955, 1962). Substantial loadings obtained by two ASQ Composite scales assessing attributions for bad (inverse) and good outcomes are consistent with the previously documented association between low self-esteem and a depressive attributional style (Beck et al., 1979).

The fourth component, labeled Hostility-Aggression, primarily consists of seven B-D scales assessing hostile feelings and a wide range of aggressive behaviors. This component reflects a general tendency to be suspicious and resentful of others and to readily engage in aggressive behaviors, especially verbal abuse, assault, object-directed aggression, and antisocial activities ranging from "victimless" offenses to person-directed offenses (i.e., FDF Antisocial Activity). The PRF Impulsivity scale obtained a substantial loading, consistent with previously reported findings of an inverse relationship between aggressive, acting-out behaviors and level of inhibitory control (Buss & Plomin, 1975; Offer et al., 1979; Olweus, 1978). The substantial

loading obtained by the JPI (trait) Anxiety scale is indicative of an association between self-consciousness and tension, and engaging in aggressive actions, consistent with previously documented associations among high levels of anxiety, hostile attitudes, and aggressive behaviors (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Coopersmith, 1967; Hill & Sarason, 1966; Kaplan, 1979; Mitchell, 1959).

The fifth component, labeled Dependency-Interdependency, is defined by five scales including the PRF Succorance scale, JPI Interpersonal Affect and (trait) Anxiety scales, the FDF Antisocial Activity scale (inverse), and the B-D Indirect Aggression scale. Taken together, these seemingly diverse scales share a theme of generally optimistic interpersonal involvement characterized by the capacity to identify closely and empathize with others, a readiness to seek and offer help and emotional support, and a tendency to feel anxious when support is unavailable or interpersonal relationships are threatened. Substantial loadings obtained by Antisocial Activity (inverse) and Indirect Aggression are consistent with previous empirical findings documenting the role played by anxiety and empathy in inhibiting direct expressions of hostility or anger, especially in the context of valued interpersonal relationships (Becker, 1964; Buss & Durkee, 1957; Feshbach, 1970; Feshbach & Feshbach, 1969; Olweus, 1975, 1978; Sears et al., 1953).

Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs:

Canonical Correlation Analysis of Fifty Variables

A canonical correlation analysis was applied to intercorrelation matrices calculated for the 20 historical variables, 30 current variables, and the two sets of variables combined. Wilks' Lambda (.03)

indicated a significant multivariate effect for at least one canonical variate, $F(600, 4778) = 1.80, p < .001$. After removing the first variate, Wilks' Lambda (.07) indicated a significant effect for at least one additional variate, $F(551, 4615) = 1.47, p < .001$. After removing the second variate, Wilks' Lambda (.13) indicated a significant effect for at least one additional variate, $F(504, 4443) = 1.23, p < .001$. A significant effect was not found after removing the third variate. Canonical correlations for variates one through three are .74, .67, and .55, respectively.

Seven of the 20 historical variables and 7 of the 30 current variables failed to obtain a loading greater than .30 on any significant variate, although the majority of these variables obtained a loading greater than .25 on at least one significant variate. Eight historical and 10 current variables obtained a loading greater than .30 on more than one significant variate. Table 5-4 presents canonical loadings obtained by the 20 historical and 30 current variables for the three significant variates. Appendix K presents corresponding standardized canonical weights. A comparison of loadings and weights indicated that the highest loading and the highest weight for historical and current sides of each variate correspond to the same variable. This finding attests to the reliability of the canonical loadings.

Variables obtaining loadings greater than .30 on a canonical variate were interpreted as contributing substantially to that variate (these variables are indicated with an asterisk in Table 5-4). Canonical loadings were interpreted in conjunction with components extracted in independent principal components analyses of historical and current variables to determine relationships among historical and

Table 5-4

Canonical Loadings for Twenty Historical and Thirty Current
Variables Comprising Three Significant ($p < .001$) Variates
 ($n = 331$)

Original Variable	Canonical Variable Loadings		
	1	2	3
HISTORICAL			
Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression	-.52*	-.18	.41*
Mother-to-Child Violence	-.29**	.02	.67*
Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression	-.50*	-.11	.26**
Father-to-Child Violence	-.39*	.16	.55*
Total Family Income	.11	-.07	.26
Mother's Educational Status	.17	-.02	-.04
Father's Educational Status	.14	-.02	.01
Family Geographic Mobility	-.06	-.26	.05
Father Acceptance	.45*	.41*	.04
Father Nurturance	.52*	.39*	.06
Mother Acceptance	.74*	.27**	.17
Mother Nurturance	.61*	.41*	.14

Table 5-4 Continued

Original Variable	Canonical Variable Loadings		
	1	2	3
HISTORICAL			
Continuity of Parental Relationships	.20	.34*	.20
Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression	-.27	-.11	.02
Mother-to-Father Violence	-.17	.06	.08
Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression	-.30	-.28	.02
Father-to-Mother Violence	-.23	-.13	.24
Recent Stressful Life Events	-.16	-.18	.41*
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization	-.19	-.21	.14
Gender	-.51*	.75*	-.10
CURRENT			
Anxiety (State)	-.23	-.07	.36*
Depression	-.32*	-.31*	.36*
Interpersonal Sensitivity	-.35*	-.10	.18
Obsessive-Compulsive	-.28**	.06	.31*
Somatization	-.25**	-.17	.29**
Violence in War	-.12	.40*	.21

Table 5-4 Continued

Original Variable	Canonical Variable Loadings		
	1	2	3
CURRENT			
Corporal Punishment of Children	-.18	.38*	.15
Penal Code Violence	-.06	.36*	.31*
Institutional Violence	-.22	.45*	.02
Manifest Rejection	-.08	.33*	.31*
Personal Self-Concept	.42*	.23	.03
Family Self-Concept	.81*	.36*	-.13
Social Self-Concept	.51*	-.07	.18
Defense of Rights and Interests	.19	.26**	.22
Social Assertiveness	.26**	-.03	.38*
Dominance	.14	.43*	.35*
Bad Composite	-.21	-.09	.13
Good Composite	.11	-.03	.13
Resentment	-.43*	.09	.16
Suspicion	-.19	.02	.46*
Assault	-.17	.49*	.19
Verbal Aggression	-.23	.31*	.13
Indirect Aggression	-.21	.07	.06

Table 5-4 Continued

Original Variable	Canonical Variable Loadings		
	1	2	3
CURRENT			
Negativism	-.30**	.03	.02
Irritability	-.27**	-.04	.08
Antisocial Activity	-.52*	.35*	.14
Impulsivity	-.21	-.12	.01
Succorance	.32*	-.34*	.25**
Interpersonal Affect	.35*	-.46*	.06
Anxiety (Trait)	-.06	-.34*	-.00

Note. * Indicates variables obtaining loadings > .30.

** Indicates variables obtaining loadings > .25 and < .30
and interpreted as a part of a broad construct.

current constructs. (Appendix L presents zero-order correlations among the 20 historical and 30 current variables.)

First Canonical Variate

The first canonical variate documents relationships among Parent-Child Affectional Relationships and Parental Power Assertion on the historical side, and Emotional Instability, Self-Assurance, Dependency-Interdependency, and Hostility-Aggression on the current side. Figure 5-1 depicts relationships among historical and current constructs as defined by the first variate.

On the historical side, variables obtaining substantial loadings replicate two components retained in the principal components analysis of historical variables. The first, Parent-Child Affectional Relationships, reflects the overall level of physical-emotional caretaking and unconditional acceptance of children by parents. The second, Parental Power Assertion, reflects parental reliance upon verbal-symbolic aggression, physical force, and violence in controlling and punishing children.

On the current side, variables obtaining high loadings overlap substantially with four components retained in the principal components analysis of current variables. The first, Emotional Instability, reflects the level of current psychophysiological distress, especially depressive symptomatology and feelings of inadequacy regarding interpersonal functioning. The second current construct contributing to this variate is Self-Assurance. However, the specific pattern of loadings indicates that in this context, Self-Assurance reflects high self- and other acceptance and interpersonal competence without domination of others and defense of one's rights. The third construct

Figure 5-1. First Canonical Variate: Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs/Variables.

contributing to the current side of this variate is Hostility-Aggression. However, the specific pattern of loadings indicates that in the context of the first variate, Hostility-Aggression reflects resentment and hatred of others expressed through oppositional behavior (especially in relation to authority figures), antisocial activity, and rude, quick-tempered interactions. In contrast, overt forms of aggression directed at the target of frustration do not substantially contribute to this construct as defined on the first variate. The final current construct contributing to the first variate is Dependency-Interdependency. In this context, this construct is primarily defined by Interpersonal Affect and Succorance and reflects an interpersonal orientation characterized by reciprocal acceptance and support.

Examined together, the two sides of the first canonical variate indicate that parental nurturance and acceptance experienced during childhood and adolescence are positively associated with self-acceptance and an optimistic orientation toward others characterized by liking, a readiness to perceive others as sources of support, and a reciprocal capacity to offer others encouragement and help during young adulthood. Conversely, parental nurturance and acceptance experienced during childhood and adolescence are negatively associated with psychophysiological distress, especially depressive symptomatology, and an attitude of hostile resentment expressed via oppositional behavior, irritability, and antisocial behavior during young adulthood.

The first variate also indicates that parental verbal aggression and violence experienced during childhood and adolescence are positively associated with psychophysiological distress, especially depression, and

an attitude of resentment expressed via oppositional behavior, irritability, and antisocial behavior during young adulthood. Conversely, parental verbal aggression and violence experienced during childhood and adolescence are negatively associated with self-acceptance and an optimistic interpersonal orientation during adulthood. Importantly, the linear combination of variables contributing to this variate indicates that it is the combination of parent-child affectional interactions and parental power assertion which is most substantially related to psychosocial constructs represented on the current side of this variate.

Second Canonical Variate

The second canonical variate documents relationships among Gender and Parent-Child Affectional Relationships on the historical side, and Emotional Instability, Self-Assurance, Dependency-Interdependency, Hostility-Aggression, and Violence Approval on the current side. Figure 5-2 depicts relationships among historical and current constructs as defined by the second variate.

On the historical side, this variate is primarily defined by the single variable, Gender. Additional variables defining the historical side of the second variate replicate the Parent-Child Affectional Relationships construct retained in the principal components analysis of historical variables. This construct reflects the level of parental nurturance and acceptance characterizing parent-child interactions during childhood and adolescence.

On the current side, variables contributing substantial loadings correspond closely to five components extracted in the principal components analysis of current variables. The first, Emotional

Solid line denotes positive relationship.

Broken line denotes negative relationship.

Figure 5-2. Second Canonical Variate: Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs/Variables.

Instability, is represented in this context by depressive symptomatology, rather than the whole range of psychophysiological distress symptoms. The second current construct represented on this variate, Violence Approval, reflects a general tendency to endorse violence as an essential means of conflict resolution; that is, for purposes of national defense and controlling and punishing children and criminals, and private citizens engaging in violent behavior. The third current construct, Self-Assurance, as defined on this variate reflects self-acceptance regarding family functioning and a tendency to actively influence or control ones' environment. The fourth construct contributing to the current side of this variate is Hostility-Aggression. However, the specific pattern of loadings indicates that in this context, Hostility-Aggression reflects a tendency toward overt, active expression of aggression, unassociated with hostile attitudes, passive-aggression, and object-directed aggression. The final current construct represented on the second variate, Dependency-Interdependency, reflects a theme of interpersonal involvement characterized by reciprocal acceptance and support and a tendency to feel anxious when interpersonal support is unavailable or relationships are threatened.

Examined together, the two sides of the second canonical variate indicate that being female is positively associated with depressive symptomatology, close identification with and responsiveness to others, a readiness to look to others for moral support and help in problem-solving, and a tendency to feel insecure when interpersonal support is unavailable and/or relationships are threatened. Additionally, being female is negatively associated with actively

influencing one's environment, actively expressing aggression, and endorsing violence as a means of conflict resolution. Conversely, being male is positively associated with actively controlling one's environment, actively expressing aggression, and endorsing the use of instrumental violence across a broad range of sociocultural contexts. Additionally, being male is negatively associated with depressive symptomatology, close identification and responsiveness to others, and the tendency to feel insecure when interpersonal support is unavailable and/or relationships are threatened.

The second canonical variate also indicates that parental nurturance and acceptance experienced during childhood and adolescence are positively associated with actively influencing one's environment, actively expressing aggression, and endorsing violence as a means of conflict resolution during young adulthood. Additionally, parental nurturance and acceptance are negatively associated with depressive symptomatology, close identification with and responsiveness to others, and the tendency to feel insecure in the absence of interpersonal support and when relationships are threatened. Significantly, the linear combination of variables defining this variate indicates that it is the combination of gender and parent-child affectional interactions which is most substantially related to psychosocial traits represented on the current side of this variate.

Third Canonical Variate

The third canonical variate documents relationships among Parental Power Assertion and Recent Stressful Life Events on the historical side, and Emotional Instability, Self-Assurance, Hostility-Aggression, and Violence Approval on the current side. Figure 5-3 depicts relationships

Solid line denotes positive relationship.

Figure 5-3. Third Canonical Variate: Relationships Among Historical and Current Constructs/Variables.

among historical and current constructs as defined by the third variate.

On the historical side, variables contributing to the third variate replicate the Parental Power Assertion construct retained in the principal components analysis of historical variables. However, as defined in the context of this variate, Parental Power Assertion reflects parental reliance primarily on physical force and violence to control and punish children and adolescents. An additional variable contributing to the third variate, Recent Stressful Life Events, reflects the level of environmental instability and personal crises experienced in the previous 12 months.

On the current side, variables obtaining high loadings overlap with four components extracted in the principal components analysis of current variables. The first, Emotional Instability, reflects the level of psychophysiological distress manifested by a wide range of symptomatology. However, feelings of inadequacy regarding interpersonal functioning do not contribute to this construct as defined on the third variate. The second current construct represented on this variate is Violence Approval. The pattern of loadings indicates that in the context of this variate, Violence Approval reflects a rejecting, punitive stance toward children and criminals, while attitudes toward instrumental aggression for purposes of national defense and protection of property are not represented. The third construct contributing to the current side of this variate is Self-Assurance, although a limited interpretation is indicated. That is, the combination of Assertiveness and Dominance in the absence of self-esteem variables is suggestive of a defensive control of others, rather than assertion based on a conviction of personal worth and respect for others. The fourth current construct,

Hostility-Aggression, as defined on this variate reflects an attitude of hostile distrustfulness, rather than a generalized hostile-aggressive reaction pattern.

Examined together, the two sides of the third variate indicate that parental power assertion, especially physical force and violence, experienced during childhood and adolescence are positively associated with psychophysiological distress, an attitude of hostile distrustfulness expressed via the tendency to control one's environment and dominate others, and a rejecting and punitive attitude toward children and criminals during young adulthood. The third variate also indicates that personal crises and environmental instability experienced during young adulthood are positively associated with psychophysiological distress, an attitude of distrustfulness manifested in a tendency to control one's environment and dominate others, and a rejecting and punitive attitude toward children and criminals. Importantly, the linear combination of variables defining this variate indicates that it is the combination of parental power assertion and recent stress which is most substantially associated with psychosocial traits represented on the current side of this variate.

Canonical Correlation Analyses Conducted

Independently for Each Sex

The substantial contribution by the single variable, Gender, to the second canonical variate retained in the analysis of mixed-sex sample group data suggested that separate analyses for females and males might further clarify the nature of relationships among historical and current constructs. Therefore, independent canonical correlation analyses were applied to intercorrelation matrices calculated for 19 historical

variables (i.e., excluding gender), 30 current variables, and for the two sets of variables combined for data obtained from female and male subjects.

Females

For the analysis of data obtained from female subjects ($n = 205$), Wilks' Lamda (.01) indicated a significant effect for at least one canonical variate, $F(570, 2595) = 1.42$ $p < .001$. After removing the first variate, Wilks' Lamda (.03) indicated a significant effect for one additional variate, $F(522, 2501) = 1.22$ $p < .002$. A significant effect was not found after removing the second variate. Canonical correlations for variates one and two were .76 and .63, respectively.

The two variates closely replicated results of the canonical correlation analysis of mixed-sex sample group data, with two noteworthy differences. First, loadings obtained by current variables comprising Emotional Instability, Self-Assurance, and Hostility-Aggression constructs tended to be higher than comparable loadings obtained in the analysis of mixed-sex sample group data. This finding suggests that relationships among family/historical variables and young-adult psychosocial functioning are generally stronger and more predictable among women than among men. Second, Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization and Father-to-Mother Violence contributed substantially to the historical side of the first variate, suggesting that both incest and witnessing spousal violence (i.e., fathers' abuse of mothers) comprise significant and enduring influences in the lives of women. Specifically, among women, intrafamilial sexual victimization and spousal violence during childhood and adolescence are negatively associated with self-esteem, and positively associated with

psychophysiological distress, an attitude of hostile resentment expressed via passive-aggressive behavior and object-directed aggression, and antisocial behavior during young adulthood.

Males

For the analysis of data obtained from male subjects ($n = 126$), Wilks' Lamda (.001) indicated a significant multivariate effect for at least one canonical variate, $F(570, 1324) = 1.26$, $p < .001$. After removing the first variate, Wilk's Lamda (.003) indicated a marginally significant effect for one additional variate, $F(522, 1279) = 1.14$, $p < .04$. Canonical correlations for variates one and two were .81 and .75, respectively.

The two variates partially replicated results of the canonical correlation analysis of mixed-sex sample group data, but fewer current variables obtained substantial loadings. This finding suggests that family/historical variables are less predictably related to young-adult psychosocial functioning among men than among women (consistent with results of the independent analysis of data obtained from female subjects). Beyond this general conclusion, discrepancies were not readily interpretable. It was concluded that the reduced sample size, in conjunction with potential selection biases specific to men in the present sample group, contributed to less reliable findings based on the analysis of data obtained from male subjects.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This study has attempted to determine if there are enduring personality correlates of emotional, physical, and sexual maltreatment experienced during childhood. Consistent with expectations, present results: (a) document personality characteristics indicative of vulnerable intra- and interpersonal functioning among young adults who experienced parental maltreatment during childhood; (b) demonstrate that young adults who experienced parental maltreatment are characterized by attitudinal and behavioral traits which place them at risk of perpetuating child maltreatment; and (c) suggest specific aspects of abuse victims' psychosocial functioning which might benefit from psychotherapeutic intervention.

The task of the present chapter is to discuss findings from the perspective of these goals and hypotheses. That is, results will be reviewed and interpreted in light of previous findings, and implications for intervention with victims of parental maltreatment will be discussed.

The Structure of Family Relationships

Twenty family/historical variables were selected for inclusion in this study based on previous research which suggested that each one comprises a significant influence on the psychosocial development of children (Chapters II & III). Based on the assumption that these variables were systematically related, the multiple individual variables were submitted to a principal components analysis to reduce them to several broad, conceptually meaningful constructs. The resulting component pattern describes the structure of parent-child relationships

and additional aspects of family life which impinge on children.

The first family/historical construct, Parental Power Assertion reflects parental use of words, passive-aggressive actions, object-directed aggression, and physical force and violence to intimidate, control, punish, and hurt children. The second, Socioeconomic Status, reflects the level of parental financial and educational resources. The third, Parent-Child Affectional Relationships, reflects the overall level of physical-emotional support and unconditional acceptance of children by parents conveyed in the context of day-to-day interactions. The fourth, Spousal Violence and Incest, reflects physical aggression between spouses and sexual victimization of children, primarily by same-generation, older male relatives. The fifth family/historical construct, Personal Stress and Incest, reflects childhood experiences of intrafamilial sexual victimization, predominantly among women, and subsequent high levels of personal crises and environmental instability. The sixth construct, Parental Verbal Aggression, reflects parental reliance on verbal-symbolic aggression as a means of resolving conflicts between spouses and between parents and children.

Several aspects of the structure of family/historical experiences as defined in the present analysis are noteworthy. With regard to the total picture, constructs which emerged are generally consistent with previous research and verify the two-dimensional structure of parent-child relationships comprising the conceptual framework of the present study. Beyond this general conclusion, the pattern of loadings defining specific constructs provides important information regarding the social-emotional functioning of families.

First, the emergence of Parental Power Assertion as a cohesive construct defined by maternal and paternal use of verbal and physical child-directed aggression indicates that individual children's parental relationships are likely to be characterized by a fairly consistent level of aggression across parents and over time (confirmed by substantial zero-order correlations among individual aggression scales; Appendix B). For example, when one parent resorts to physical force and violence in controlling and punishing children, present findings indicate that there is a strong likelihood that the other parent also uses aggression in dealing with children ($r = .66$). This finding corroborates previous reports that parental power assertion comprises a cohesive and stable parenting pattern within families (Hoffman, 1960; Slater, 1955; Straus et al., 1980). The magnitude of the relationship between mothers' and fathers' child-directed aggression documented here emphasizes the necessity of conceptualizing abusive families as systems when planning and implementing intervention strategies. That is, effective intervention with abusive families is likely to require helping both parents learn more constructive ways of resolving conflicts with children regardless of which parent is identified as abusive.

Likewise, the emergence of Parent-Child Affectional Relationships as a cohesive construct defined by maternal and paternal nurturance and acceptance indicates that children's parental relationships tend to be characterized by a fairly consistent level of love or hostility (confirmed by zero-order correlations among individual affectional scales; Appendix C). In addition, substantial associations indicated by this construct among emotional neglect, rejection, geographic mobility, and discontinuity of parent-child relationships (e.g., separations,

divorce) indicate that emotionally neglectful, rejecting families are characterized by high levels of environmental and emotional stress. These findings confirm present predictions and corroborate previous reports of high levels of environmental instability and familial disorganization among emotionally neglectful families characterized as financially and/or culturally disadvantaged (Martin et al., 1974; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981). Moreover, present findings extend previously documented associations among emotional deprivation and environmental/familial stress by documenting high levels of environmental instability and familial disorganization among emotionally unsupportive families characterized by relatively sound financial and educational resources. The relationship between environmental/familial stress and parental capacity to respond to children's emotional needs indicates that effective intervention in emotionally neglectful and rejecting families at all socioeconomic levels is likely to require helping parents cope constructively with tangible and emotional stresses impinging on them. Consistent with this conclusion, Polanski et al. (1972, 1981) argued that existing intervention programs are insufficient to meet the needs of families characterized by severe emotional deprivation and advocated the development of proactive, instrumentally supportive approaches to such families who need to be met "well over half way" by helping professionals.

An important, as yet unresolved question in childrearing and child maltreatment research regards the extent of relationships among parent-child affectional interactions and parental power assertion (Becker, 1964; Feshbach, 1970). In the present study, the fact that Parent-Child Affectional Relationships and Parental Power Assertion

emerged as separate constructs confirms their empirical uniqueness. At the same time, zero-order correlations obtained among parental affectional and power-assertion variables (the majority of which exceed .30) indicate that the two parenting dimensions are substantially related. Both the distinguishability of affectional and control dimensions and their systematic covariation are consistent with previous findings (Becker, 1964; Feshbach, 1970). Corroboration of the substantial relationship between parent-child affectional interactions and parental power assertion confirms the growing contention among child maltreatment experts (based primarily on clinical experience and accumulated observational data) that effective intervention with families identified as abusive must be based on an assessment of parents' capacity to respond to children's emotional needs as well their capacity to stop physically abusing children (e.g., Cantwell, 1980; Helfer, 1980; Martin, 1976, 1978; Martin et al., 1974; Steele, 1980).

The emergence of Spousal Violence and Incest as a cohesive construct corroborates previous reports of an association between spousal violence and sexual victimization of children (DeFrancis, 1969; Finkelhor, 1979, 1980). In addition, this constructs supports the interpretation that incest and violence between spouses are indicative of an underlying pattern of disturbed family functioning (DeFrancis, 1969; Finkelhor, 1979; Gelles, 1974; Kaufman et al., 1954; Kempe, 1980; Roy, 1977; Steele, 1980; Steinmetz, 1975; Straus, 1974; Nakashima & Zakus, 1977; Walker, 1979). An important distinction between past and present findings is that previous research has primarily investigated father-daughter incest, while present young adults were sexually victimized predominately by same-generation, older male relatives (i.e.,

cousins and/or brothers) or uncles. Thus, the association between spousal violence and sexual victimization of children indicated by this construct suggests a familial environment characterized by: (a) violent behavior on the part of both parents (although differential injury rates indicate that fathers' violence is more "effective" and mothers' violence may be largely defensive); (b) deficient parental modeling of constructive interpersonal interactions; (c) parental failure to teach and enforce traditional societal values and taboos regarding familial relationships; and (d) parental failure to provide adequate supervision and protection of children. The suggestion that violence between spouses is associated with inadequate supervision and protection of children, including an increased risk of intrafamilial sexual victimization, indicates that professionals working with families in which spousal violence is an identified problem need to be aware of the variety of ways in which deficient parental impulse control impacts on children, both directly and indirectly (Finkelhor, 1979; Justice & Justice, 1979; Kempe, 1980).

Indeed, the emergence of an additional construct, Personal Stress and Incest, underscores the need for such concern. Specifically, this construct documents an association between being sexually victimized by a family member during childhood and/or adolescence and subsequently experiencing high levels of personal crises and environmental instability. This finding is consistent with previous reports of a "disorganized lifestyle" among incest victims followed into adulthood (Lukianowicz, 1972; Nakashima & Zakus, 1977). Moreover, because incest in this context reflects sexual victimization perpetrated primarily by same-generation, older male relatives, this construct indicates that:

(a) experiences of sexual victimization perpetrated by family members other than fathers comprise a significant influence in the lives of victims; and/or (b) factors associated with parental failure to protect children from intrafamilial sexual victimization (beyond incest per se; e.g., inadequate parental models) are associated with subsequent high levels of personal crises among incest victims. The obvious practical importance of this finding is that it underscores the necessity of child-focused intervention in incestuous families and the need for further research aimed at identifying antecedents and consequences of sexual abuse perpetrated by family members other than fathers.

Finally, the emergence of Parental Verbal Aggression as a distinct dimension of family interaction is noteworthy. This construct indicates that among some families, parental verbal-symbolic aggression comprises a cohesive conflict-resolution style not associated with physical aggression (i.e., independent of a generally aggressive parenting style characterized by high levels of verbal aggression and violence). Given that all social systems are characterized by some conflict, this construct may represent a comparatively constructive family conflict-resolution style; that is, verbal-symbolic aggression may facilitate some degree of resolution and/or give "vent" to feelings in a manner that prevents escalation of conflicts to the point of violence (Straus, 1979). This interpretation is supported by previous reports that individuals who readily resort to violence in response to interpersonal conflict lack alternative, verbal conflict-resolution strategies (Toch, cited by Bandura, 1971; Walker, 1979).

Potential merits of verbal conflict-resolution strategies notwithstanding, substantial contributions by paternal neglect and

rejection to this construct indicate that it represents a less-than-ideal family-interaction pattern. Specifically, this construct indicates that high levels of verbal conflict between parents and verbal aggression directed at children by parents (especially fathers) are associated with children feeling emotionally estranged from and unsupported by fathers. In contrast, parental verbal conflict and mothers' child-directed verbal aggression (unassociated with parental physical aggression) do not appear to be systematically related to mother-child affectional interactions. Thus, fathers' and mothers' verbal power assertion have a different significance in the overall context of parent-child relationships.

One interpretation of this finding is that mothers' child-directed verbal power assertion (unassociated with parental physical aggression) reflects a pragmatic approach to directing and managing child behavior in the context of generally supportive and involved childcare, reminiscent of an authoritative parenting style described in the childrearing literature (Baldwin, 1949; Baumrind, 1967). Additionally, given the substantial amount of time mothers and children customarily spend together, mothers' verbal aggression may represent a low percentage of overall parenting time.

In contrast, fathers' verbal power assertion is likely to occur in the context of less total time spent with children, making it less likely that children interpret fathers' verbal aggression as one aspect of total care-taking. Moreover, given the comparatively limited amount of interaction between fathers and children in traditional households, father-child relationships (i.e., attachments) may be less fully established, and fathers' verbal power assertion may indeed be

indicative of low nurturance and acceptance of children. Fathers' verbal power assertion may thus resemble the authoritarian parenting style described in the childrearing literature (Baldwin, 1949; Baumrind, 1967).

In light of this interpretation, it is noteworthy that a substantial majority of present families conform to traditional family roles regarding childcare; that is, 75% of mothers were responsible for subjects' day-to-day care during childhood, in contrast to 1% of fathers, and 21% of mothers and fathers equally. While this line of reasoning is speculative, if this pattern of family interaction is corroborated in subsequent research, practical implications regarding traditional family roles and parent-child relationships should be examined. For example, traditional family roles may indeed be associated with insecure, ambivalent father-child attachments which are vulnerable to emotional disruption in response to parental conflict and child-directed verbal aggression, in contrast to more fully established, secure mother-child attachments which may be characterized by greater resiliency.

The Structure of Personality Among Young Adults

Thirty attitudinal and behavioral variables representing a broad conceptualization of essentially normal personality functioning and which previous literature had indicated were relevant to the issue of child maltreatment (Chapter III) were included in the present study. While each variable was conceptualized as contributing unique information, a substantial amount of overlap was apparent from the outset. In order to reduce the multiple individual variables to several broad, conceptually meaningful constructs, current/psychosocial

variables were submitted to a principal components analysis. The resulting component pattern describes the structure of personality during young adulthood; that is, how a given set of attitudes and behaviors cluster together to comprise broad personality constructs among young adults.

The first of these constructs, Emotional Instability, reflects an overall level of current psychophysiological distress and vulnerability versus health and resilience. The second, Violence Approval, reflects values associated with violence utilized by societal authorities to enforce regulations and punish unwanted behavior in a variety of sociocultural contexts (e.g., families, prisons, universities). The third current/psychosocial construct, Self-Assurance, reflects an overall attitude of personal worth, assurance, and assertion versus self-criticism and perceived helplessness. The fourth, Hostility-Aggression, reflects an orientation of suspicious resentment expressed via a wide range of overtly and indirectly aggressive behaviors. The fifth current/psychosocial construct, Dependency-Interdependency, reflects a generally optimistic interpersonal orientation characterized by a tendency to see others as important resources, capable of providing emotional support and help in problem-solving, and the reciprocal tendency to provide others with assistance and emotional support.

Several aspects of the structure of personality as defined in the present analysis are noteworthy. With regard to the overall picture, constructs which emerged are generally consistent with previous personality research and provide verification of the present study's ad hoc model of intra- and interpersonal functioning. Beyond this general

statement, the pattern of loadings defining specific constructs merits consideration.

The emergence of Emotional Instability as a distinct personality component provides an empirical basis for this study's conceptualization of a predominately internal or private personality dimension and corroborates previous findings of an inverse relationship between self-worth and psychophysiological symptomatology (Coopersmith, 1967; Kaplan, 1979). Contrary to the conceptualization that cognitions regarding one's capacity to influence sources of gratification and distress in one's environment comprise an essentially internal experience, attribution indices did not contribute substantially to this construct.

Attribution indices did contribute to the Self-Assurance construct, indicating that beliefs regarding one's capacity to influence others and valued outcomes comprise an integral aspect of interpersonal functioning. Indeed, the cluster of variables defining the Self-Assurance construct indicates that it represents the convergence of personal beliefs and public behaviors, documenting substantial interrelationships among self- and other acceptance, a belief in personal control, and a readiness to take action to influence one's environment through constructive assertion (Beck, 1979; Coopersmith, 1967; Reese, 1961; Seligman, 1975; Semmel et al., 1980; Slater, 1955).

The emergence of Hostility-Aggression as a cohesive construct is consistent with the conceptualization that hostile attitudes are associated with a wide range of overtly and indirectly aggressive behaviors (Bandura, 1973; Bardis, 1973; Buss & Durkee, 1957).

Contributions to this construct by anxiety and impulsivity suggest that

hostility, tension, and worry over loss of interpersonal support are expressed via aggressive behaviors among individuals with deficient impulse control, an interpretation which is consistent with previous findings (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Offer et al., 1975; Olweus, 1978). Indeed, variables defining this component overlap substantially with an "immature" behavioral construct repeatedly identified among "normal" children (e.g., Baumrind & Black, 1967; Becker & Krug, 1964; Emmerich, 1964, 1966; Heathers, 1955; Murphy, 1962; Winder & Rau, 1962) and a "conduct disorder" factor repeatedly identified among disturbed children and adolescents (Gersten et al., 1976; Patterson, 1979; Peterson, 1961).

The emergence of Violence Approval as a distinct, cohesive construct indicates that values regarding the use of violence are at least partially independent of the individual's characteristic level of hostility and aggression. This finding supports Feshbach's (1970) contention that an individual characterized by low levels of personal hostility and aggression is not necessarily less likely than a highly aggressive individual to condone aggression by authorities designated to enforce regulations and punish undesirable behavior. This construct also indicates that endorsing violence as a means of conflict resolution, behavior control, and punishment in one sociocultural context is associated with violence approval in other social systems. This finding corroborates previous reports of substantial relationships between condoning corporal punishment of children and endorsing capital punishment of criminals (Gelles & Straus, 1975; Snortum & Ashear, 1972; Starr & Cutler, 1972).

The final current/psychosocial construct, Dependency-Interdependency, reflects a generally affiliative

interpersonal orientation. However, the range of conceptually distinguishable traits defining this construct suggests that two specific interpersonal styles are nested within this higher-order construct. The first, dependency, reflects an immature reliance on others associated with low self-reliance and a tendency to feel helpless and anxious when interpersonal support is not available or relationships are threatened. The second, interdependency, reflects a mature capacity for reciprocal relationships based on adequate self-reliance and mutual trust, pleasure, empathy, and responsiveness. This interpretation is supported by results of previous child-adolescent personality studies which have repeatedly identified distinct dependency and "interpersonal" (i.e., prosocial) constructs (e.g., Baumrind & Black, 1967; Becker & Krug, 1964; Emmerich, 1964, 1966; Heathers, 1955; McCandless et al., 1961; Moore & Updegraff, 1964). At the same time, the emergence of Dependency-Interdependency as a single construct underscores the substantial overlap among behavioral manifestations of affiliation based on deficient self-reliance and overdependency, and overt manifestations of affiliation based on instrumental autonomy and emotional interdependency (Maccoby & Masters, 1970).

Contributions to this construct by anxiety, indirect aggression, and antisocial behavior (inverse) indicate that close interpersonal identifications, empathy, and anxiety regarding loss of valued relationships inhibit antisocial behaviors and direct expressions of aggression, while also facilitating expression of angry and/or hostile feelings through indirectly aggressive behaviors. This interpretation is partially supported by empirical data which indicate that empathy is inversely related to destructive aggression and that empathy training is

associated with a reduction in overt aggression (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Feshbach, 1979, 1982; Feshbach & Feshbach, 1969; Pitkanen-Pulkkinen, 1979). In addition, this line of reasoning is consistent with theoretical conceptualizations of "pathological" altruism which posit that overconcern regarding other's needs and feelings contributes to reduced interpersonal competence (Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1982). Finally, associations among anxiety and affiliative and aggressive behaviors documented by this construct verify the present study's ad hoc conceptualization of optimal interpersonal functioning as consisting of an appropriate balance between empathy (i.e., responsiveness to others' based on an accurate perception of their feelings and concern for their welfare) and assertion (i.e., active coping with the environment including persistence in pursuit of one's own needs based on adequate self-concern).

Current Personality Correlates of Family/Historical Experiences

Hypotheses regarding relationships among family/historical experiences and current/psychosocial functioning were tested via a canonical correlation analysis applied to the two sets of variables. Three significant variates were interpreted in conjunction with empirically derived family/historical and current/psychosocial constructs. To further clarify findings, independent canonical correlation analyses were applied to data obtained for each sex separately. The first variate retained in the analysis of women's data was interpreted.

Consistent with expectations, the overall pattern of findings indicates that parental maltreatment experienced during childhood and

adolescence is associated with personality characteristics indicative of vulnerable psychosocial functioning during young adulthood. In addition, present findings suggest that specific aspects of the overall syndrome of parental maltreatment (i.e., emotional, physical, sexual abuse) are associated with differential, additive, and interacting psychosocial vulnerabilities among offspring.

Overview

The first variate retained in the analysis of mixed-sex sample group data depicts relationships among Parent-Child Affectional Relationships and Parental Power Assertion on the historical side, and Emotional Instability, Self-Assurance, Hostility-Aggression, and Dependency-Interdependency on the current side. The first variate retained in the analysis of women's data replicated this variate, with the significant addition of Spousal Violence and Incest on the historical side.

The linear combination of variables defining this variate indicates that high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance and low levels of parental verbal aggression and violence (and among women incest and father-to-mother violence) experienced during childhood and adolescence are associated in young adulthood with: (a) low levels of psychophysiological distress; (b) high self-esteem and social assertiveness; (c) low resentment and low levels of negativistic, irritable, and antisocial behaviors; and (d) high interpersonal involvement, empathy, responsiveness, and reliance on others. Conversely, high levels of parental neglect and rejection and high levels of parental verbal aggression and violence (and among women incest and father-to-mother violence) experienced during childhood and

adolescence are associated in young adulthood with: (a) high levels of psychophysiological distress, especially depression; (b) low self-esteem and social assertiveness; (c) high resentment and high levels of negativistic, irritable, and antisocial behaviors; and (d) low interpersonal involvement, empathy, responsiveness, and reliance on others.

The second canonical variate depicts relationships among Gender and Parent-Child Affectional Relationships on the historical side, and Emotional Instability, Violence Approval, Self-Assurance Hostility-Aggression, and Dependency-Interdependency on the current side. Specifically, the linear composite of variables defining this variate indicates that being female and experiencing low levels of parental nurturance and support during childhood and adolescence are associated in young adulthood with: (a) high levels of depression; (b) low violence approval; (c) low satisfaction regarding family functioning and low dominance and assertion of rights; (d) low levels of verbal aggression, assault, and antisocial behaviors; and (e) high interpersonal involvement, empathy, responsiveness, reliance on others, and anxiety regarding potential threats to interpersonal relationships. Conversely, being male and experiencing high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance during childhood and adolescence are associated during young adulthood with: (a) low levels of depression; (b) high violence approval; (c) high satisfaction regarding family functioning and high dominance and assertion of rights; (d) high levels of verbal aggression, assault, and antisocial behaviors; and (e) low interpersonal involvement, empathy, responsiveness, reliance on others, and anxiety regarding loss of interpersonal relationships.

The third canonical variate depicts relationships among Parental Power Assertion and Recent Stress on the historical side, and Emotional Instability, Violence Approval, Self-Assurance, Hostility-Aggression, and Dependency-Interdependency on the current side. Specifically, the linear composite of variables defining this variate indicates that high levels of parental verbal aggression and violence experienced during childhood and adolescence and high levels of recent stressful life events are associated during young adulthood with: (a) high levels of psychophysiological distress; (b) high manifest rejection of children and approval of violence in controlling and punishing children and criminals; (c) high dominance and social assertiveness; (d) high suspicion of others; and (e) high dependence on others. Conversely, low levels of parental verbal aggression and violence experienced during childhood and adolescence and low levels of recent stressful life events are associated during young adulthood with: (a) low levels of psychophysiological distress; (b) low manifest rejection of children and approval of violence in controlling and punishing children and criminals; (c) low dominance and social assertiveness; (d) low suspicion of others; and (e) low dependence on others.

Personality Correlates of Parental Love Versus Maltreatment

The pattern of variables defining the first variate conveys a composite picture of the young adult who experienced highly affectionate, acceptant caretaking and a minimum of parental verbal aggression and violence (and among women incest and father-to-mother violence) as an emotionally stable, resilient, self-assured individual whose relationships with others are based on acceptance, pleasure,

empathy, responsiveness, and honest expression of feelings.

Importantly, this variate indicates that it is the combination of parental responsiveness to children's emotional needs and low levels of parental aggression which is associated with the most healthy and gratifying social-emotional functioning during young adulthood.

The association depicted here between affectionate, respectful parental care and constructive psychosocial development among offspring is not a new finding. Indeed, the general pattern of relationships was predicted on the basis of previous research and, in turn, corroborates and extends earlier findings. Specifically, individual traits contributing to the overall picture of healthy, gratifying social-emotional functioning among young adults have been repeatedly associated with parental warmth, supportiveness, nonpunitiveness, and rational controls in childrearing investigations representing a diverse range of sample groups and procedures (Chapter II). Moreover, the overall pattern of present findings essentially replicates Slater's (1955) results based on a retrospective investigation of parental relationships and current psychosocial functioning among students and substantially overlaps with Block's (1971) results based on a comprehensive longitudinal investigation extending from early childhood into adulthood. In addition, the cluster of traits defining the current/psychosocial side of this variate is equivalent to an affiliative/prosocial construct repeatedly identified in child-adolescent personality studies (e.g., Baumrind & Black, 1967; Becker & Krug, 1964; Emmerich, 1964, 1966).

In addition to corroborating previous findings regarding constructive social-emotional development, the pattern of variables

contributing to the present picture of emotional health and resilience among young adults provides verification of this study's ad hoc model of optimal psychosocial functioning as consisting of constructive self-esteem, psychophysiological health, interpersonal assertion, and empathic responsiveness to others. In addition, relationships among parental love (i.e., affectionate, affirmative, and respectful caretaking) and constructive offspring social-emotional functioning depicted by this variate verify the distinction between a dependent-affiliative orientation (based on deficient self-reliance and anxiety) and a more mature, interdependent-affiliative orientation (based on adequate self-reliance and reciprocal pleasure, empathy, and responsiveness). Specifically, whereas the principal components analysis of personality variables retained a single affiliative construct (i.e., Dependency-Interdependency), the first variate distinguishes between mature and immature affiliative orientations by demonstrating that relatively mature affiliative traits are associated with affectionate and respectful parental treatment, while the least mature aspects of this construct (i.e., high levels of anxiety associated with the fear of loss of interpersonal support and high levels of indirect aggression) are not. "A mature orientation in our society would then be based predominantly on empathic and cognitive processes, and minimally on anxiety" (Hoffman, 1979, p. 965).

In contrast to this picture of the healthy, happy young adult who experienced affectionate and respectful parental care, the first variate conveys a composite picture of the young adult who experienced emotionally neglectful and rejecting parental treatment and high levels of parental verbal aggression and violence (and among women incest and

father-to-mother violence) as an emotionally unstable, vulnerable, and self-conscious individual whose interpersonal relationships are characterized by high levels of resentment and indirectly expressed aggression, and low levels of gratifying involvement.

Importantly, the linear composite of variables defining this variate indicates that it is the combination of inadequate parental response to children's emotional needs and parental reliance on power-assertive, abusive control techniques which is associated with the most severe psychosocial vulnerability among young adults. Therefore, in the context of this variate, parental emotional neglect, rejection, verbal abuse, and violence can be conceptualized as comprising specific manifestations of the syndrome of parental maltreatment. Moreover, among women, intrafamilial sexual victimization and exposure to father-to-mother violence comprise additional components of maltreating environments.

The general pattern of associations among parental maltreatment and vulnerable psychosocial functioning among young adult offspring depicted here corroborates and extends earlier findings (Chapters II & III). Individual traits contributing to the overall picture of inadequate social-emotional functioning among mistreated young adults have been repeatedly associated with parental coldness, rejection, restrictiveness, and punitiveness in childrearing and child maltreatment investigations representing a wide range of populations and procedures. For instance, representative of childrearing investigations employing "normal" sample groups, Coopersmith (1967) found that adolescents who had experienced low levels of maternal nurturance, acceptance, and involvement and high levels of maternal control and punitiveness were

characterized by a pervasive absence of self-worth and substantial psychophysiological distress. Additionally, numerous investigators have reported that severely punished, rejected children (especially girls) evidence high levels of emotional distress, irritability, and passive withdrawal (e.g., Ainsworth et al., 1978; Baumrind, 1967; Radke, 1946; Sears et al., 1953; Symonds, 1939; Watson, 1957). In a comprehensive longitudinal investigation, Kagan and Moss (1962) documented low levels of dependence and reliance on others and high levels of hostile reactivity among adults who were emotionally rejected and severely punished as children. Finally, several investigators have found high levels of suppressed resentment and anger, submissiveness, irritability, unsatisfactory relationships, and psychophysiological symptomatology among students severely punished and emotionally rejected as children (Slater, 1955; Watson, 1934; Weatherley, 1962).

Looking to the maltreatment literature, the resemblance between the composite picture of the mistreated young adult depicted by this variate and hypersubmissive, hyperaggressive, and detached reaction patterns repeatedly identified among abused and neglected children and adolescents is striking (Johnson & Morse, 1968; Martin & Beezley, 1977; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Reidy et al., 1980). For example, Martin and Beezley (1977) reported that even relatively "mildly" abused children and adolescents consistently evidence a pervasive absence of self-worth and an impaired ability to experience pleasure. Similarly, Reidy et al. (1980) found that abused and neglected children evidence substantially lower self-esteem and assurance than nonabused children. Additional symptoms repeatedly identified among emotionally and physically mistreated children and adolescents include oppositional

behaviors, poor peer relationships characterized by avoidance and aggressiveness, destructiveness, delinquent-type behaviors, and chronic psychophysiological distress (Martin & Beezley, 1977).

Perhaps most striking (and ominous) is the similarity between the interpersonal avoidance and emotional unresponsiveness documented here among mistreated young adults and the inaccessibility and detachment characteristic of emotionally neglected, rejected children and their parents (Polanski et al., 1972, 1981). That is, like emotionally mistreated children and their inadequate parents, mistreated young adults evidence little trust or expectation of interpersonal gratification, a defensive-avoidance of reliance on others, and little sense of commitment or responsibility to others; thus, they can "afford" to act out distress and hostility (at least in ways which carry little threat of retaliation) because they have "nothing to lose."

Despite the overall similarity between previously studied mistreated children and adolescents and present mistreated young adults, there is one noteworthy difference. In contrast to the generally hyperaggressive reaction pattern documented among a minority of mistreated children and adolescents, aggression among present mistreated young adults is acted out predominately through rude, passive-aggressive, antisocial behaviors, rather than overt aggression directed at the target of frustration. The lack of overt, directly expressed aggression among mistreated young adults was not anticipated, but is readily accounted for on the basis of systematic selection factors working against inclusion of overtly aggressive individuals in student populations (e.g., mistreated children who repeatedly engage in outright defiance of authority are likely to be identified and treated

as delinquent).

In addition, the absence of elevated levels of overt aggression among present mistreated young adults is consistent with results of numerous studies conducted among "normal" children and adolescents (i.e., not identified as abused or delinquent). For example, Coopersmith (1967) found that neglected, rejected, dominated, and severely punished adolescents express hostility in object-directed destructiveness and passive-aggressive behaviors, but not in overt person-directed aggression "presumably because such acts require qualities of initiative and assertiveness that are lacking in individuals with low self-esteem" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 138). Several other investigators have reported that parental hostility and punitiveness are associated with suppression of hostile feelings and indirectly expressed aggression among females and older offspring (i.e., similar to present mistreated young adults), while among boys and school-age children, parental hostility and punitiveness are more frequently associated with overtly expressed aggression (e.g., Eron et al., 1971; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Lefkowitz et al., 1977; Sears, 1961; Sears et al., 1953; Watson, 1934, 1957; Weatherley, 1962).

An additional noteworthy aspect of relationships between parental maltreatment and young adult psychosocial functioning depicted by this variate is the fact that intrafamilial sexual victimization and father-to-mother violence are shown to contribute to the overall impact of parental maltreatment among women. These findings verify present predictions and corroborate previous reports of vulnerable social-emotional functioning among incest victims (Kaufman et al., 1954; Lukianowicz, 1972; Nakashima & Zakus, 1977) and children and adolescents

who witness spousal violence (Gelles, 1974; Roy, 1977; Steinmetz, 1977a, 1977b; Straus, 1977; Walker, 1979). In addition, present findings extend conclusions of previous incest research, which has documented disturbed social-emotional functioning among victims of father-daughter incest, by demonstrating that even relatively "mild" experiences of sexual victimization perpetrated by family members other than fathers (e.g., siblings, cousins, uncles) are associated with pervasive psychosocial vulnerability among victims during young adulthood.

A final aspect of present findings meriting discussion regards the potential among mistreated young adults to mistreat children. Indeed, the overall pattern of relationships among parental maltreatment and offspring psychosocial functioning depicted here suggests that mistreated young adults, compared to young adults raised by emotionally supportive and respectful parents, are characterized by attitudinal and behavioral traits which place them at risk of perpetuating child maltreatment. This speculation is based on the fact that the set of social-emotional traits characterizing mistreated young adults overlaps substantially with previous descriptions of maltreating parents based on systematic investigations and accumulated clinical experience (e.g., Frodi & Lamb, 1980; Gray et al., 1977; Kempe & Kempe, 1978; Lord & Weisfeld, 1974; Melnick & Hurley, 1969; Merrill, 1962; Morris & Gould, 1963; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Spinetta & Rigler, 1972; Steele & Pollock, 1974).

For example, the present set of young adult personality traits associated with parental maltreatment overlaps substantially with a trait cluster identified among abusive parents consisting of high levels of hostility, irritability, aggressiveness, and a lack of concern for

others (Merrill, 1962). Indeed, not only are present mistreated young adults characterized by high levels of resentment, irritability, and aggressiveness; but they are emotionally detached from others and express hostility in ways which carry little risk of retaliation, suggesting that their lack of overt aggression is based on fear of retaliation more than concern for others. Thus, the resentment and emotional detachment characterizing mistreated young adults may portend later difficulty in establishing emotional bonds with their own infants. And, without sufficient empathic connection to their infants, young adults who have been mistreated by their own parents and have little or no concept of adequate parenting are at risk of neglecting children's needs and/or venting hostile-aggressive feelings on "targets" who have no power to retaliate. "Becoming an adult does not mean shedding one's personality for another but rather using the personality that one has to meet the emergencies of the adult years" (Symonds & Jensen, 1961, p. 196). In sum, the fact that mistreated young adults have key personality traits in common with abusive parents supports the contention that they are at risk of mistreating children and underscores the need for aggressive intervention among victims of parental abuse and neglect, ideally, before they become parents.

Personality Correlates of Parental Emotional Maltreatment and Gender

Information regarding relationships among gender, parent-child affectional interactions during childhood and adolescence, and psychosocial functioning among young adults is provided by the second canonical variate. Specifically, the pattern of variables defining this variate conveys a composite picture of the young woman who experienced low levels of parental nurturance and acceptance as anxious (i.e.,

self-conscious and worried over loss of interpersonal support), depressed, dissatisfied with family relationships, generally disapproving of instrumental violence, unassertive and nonaggressive, and closely involved with, dependent upon, and responsive to others. In contrast, this variate conveys a composite picture of the young man who experienced high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance as happy (i.e., not depressed), self-assured (i.e., not anxious), satisfied with family relationships, generally approving of instrumental violence, dominant and assertive, overtly aggressive, involved in antisocial activity, and independent of and unresponsive to others.

Importantly, the linear composite of variables defining this variate indicates that it is the combination of being female and experiencing high levels of parental neglect and rejection which is associated with the most self-conscious, dependent functioning among young adults. Conversely, this variate indicates that it is the combination of being male and experiencing high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance which is associated with the most self-assured, aggressive functioning among young adults. In addition, the fact that parental verbal aggression and violence do not contribute to this variate indicates that parental emotional maltreatment unassociated with physical abuse is systematically related to specific psychosocial vulnerabilities among offspring. Moreover, the substantial contribution to this variate by continuity of parental relationships indicates that interruptions in parental care contribute to the overall impact of parental neglect and rejection on offspring.

Relationships depicted here among gender, parental emotional supportiveness, and young adult psychosocial functioning suggest several

viable interpretations. First, the predominant contribution by gender suggests that this variate primarily reflects relationships between gender and psychosocial functioning. According to this interpretation, each sex is associated with distinct social-emotional assets and "liabilities." That is, women evidence well-established empathic skills and relatively weak dominant-assertive skills; moreover, they "err" in the direction of overdependency and self-consciousness and are vulnerable to depression. In comparison, men evidence well-established dominant-assertive skills and relatively weak empathic skills; moreover, they "err" in the direction of overt aggressiveness, antisocial behavior, and interpersonal detachment. At the same time, the absence of contributions to this variate by personal and social self-esteem, generalized psychophysiological distress, hostility, and indirect- and passive aggression indicates that young men and women do not differ with respect to these aspects of social-emotional functioning or in terms of overall psychological health versus vulnerability. In sum, sex-related traits depicted here reflect differences between women and men in interpersonal orientation and document specific (essentially opposite) psychosocial "risks" associated with each sex.

The present pattern of sex-differentiated traits corroborates previous reports of substantial differences between men and women in dominance versus dependency, affiliation, empathic responsiveness to others, active aggression, violence approval, self-assurance versus self-consciousness, and depression (e.g., Bardis, 1973; Becker, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1961a, 1961b; Feshbach, 1982; Lefkowitz et al., 1977; Lips & Colwill, 1978; Lott, 1981; Mischel, 1970). Indeed, the consistency of findings contributing to composite pictures of female and

male "personalities" supports the interpretation that sex-related traits depicted by this variate reflect stereotypical differences between women and men and, perhaps, sex-related differences in readiness to acknowledge various behaviors (e.g., women may be more comfortable "admitting" dependent behaviors while men may more readily admit to aggressive behaviors).

Substantial contributions to this variate by parent-child affectional interactions indicate that this variate also reflects relationships between parental responsiveness to children's emotional needs and subsequent psychosocial functioning among offspring. One interpretation is that this variate reflects essentially identical (and additive) relationships between parental emotional supportiveness and offspring psychosocial functioning and between gender and psychosocial functioning. That is, being male and experiencing high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance may have equivalent "effects" on personality development; and, conversely, being female and experiencing low levels of parental nurturance and acceptance may have similar effects on personality development. According to this interpretation, then, parental nurturance and acceptance are positively associated with self-assured, dominant-aggressive offspring behaviors and negatively associated with depressed, self-conscious, affiliative-dependent offspring behaviors.

This line of reasoning is partially supported by previous research which indicates that: (a) highly permissive parenting (i.e., unconditional acceptance and lack of age-appropriate expectations for socially responsible behavior) is associated with immature, self-centered offspring behaviors characterized by an overemphasis on

one's own needs and potency in the absence of sufficient responsiveness to others' needs and potency (i.e., dominant-aggressiveness); and (b) restrictive, rejecting parenting is associated with immature, vulnerable offspring behaviors characterized by an overemphasis on others' expectations and power in the absence of sufficient recognition of one's own feelings and capabilities (i.e., passive-dependency) (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Coopersmith, 1967; Sears et al., 1953; Slater, 1955; Weatherley, 1962). This pattern of findings has been convincingly explained on the basis of the argument that extremely indulgent parents fail to teach and motivate children to acknowledge and respond to others' feelings and needs, while rejecting parents undermine the development of autonomy, self-assurance, and assertion by failing to acknowledge children's feelings and abilities.

Despite support for this perspective in general, several points argue against accepting it as a sufficient interpretation of present findings. First, parent-child affectional interactions as assessed in this study reflect parental affection, involvement, respect, and reasonable limits (e.g., "My father/mother had the knack of knowing just when to 'put his/her foot down.'"). Thus, high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance are more indicative of authoritative parenting than permissive/indulgent parenting, and low levels of parental nurturance and acceptance are more indicative of neglect and rejection than authoritarian/restrictive parenting (Baumrind, 1967; Baldwin, 1949). And, authoritative parenting has been repeatedly associated with assertive, socially responsible behavior among offspring (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; Baldwin, 1949; Block, 1971; Grusec, 1982; Hoffman, 1975; Offer & Offer, 1975). On the basis previous research and present

operational definitions of parental nurturance and acceptance, then, parent-child affectional interactions could be expected to be positively associated with offspring self-assurance, assertion, and interpersonal involvement and responsiveness and negatively associated with offspring dependency and aggression. (Indeed, this expectation was confirmed by relationships depicted on the first canonical variate). An additional argument against accepting the interpretation that gender and parental emotional supportiveness have equivalent effects on personality development is that previous research indicates that associations among parental responsiveness to children's emotional needs and offspring personality are complexly interrelated with gender (e.g., Kagan & Moss, 1962; Lefkowitz et al., 1977; Sears et al., 1953, 1957, 1965).

A more defensible interpretation is that this variate reflects:

(a) some relationships between gender and psychosocial functioning which are partially independent of parent-child affectional interactions; (b) some relationships between parental emotional supportiveness and offspring psychosocial functioning which are partially independent of gender; and (c) complex interactions among parental emotional supportiveness, gender, and young adult psychosocial functioning. Relying on previous findings to clarify details, this interpretation suggests that: (a) gender is related to violence approval, assertion-aggression, and affiliation-dependence; (b) parental nurturance and acceptance are related to satisfaction with family relationships, assertion, dependence, anxiety, and depression; and (c) relationships among gender and assertion-aggression and affiliation-dependence are enhanced by variations in parental nurturance and acceptance, and relationships among parental nurturance and

acceptance and offspring satisfaction regarding family functioning, assertion, dependence, anxiety, and depression are partially determined by gender.

According to this line of reasoning, then, relationships between being female and being affiliative and nonaggressive are exaggerated by parental neglect and rejection such that emotionally unsupported girls are likely to manifest extreme (i.e., more vulnerable and less mature) aspects of affiliation and nonaggression (e.g., dependency, nonassertion, anxiety, depression). That is, the greater importance which females attribute to interpersonal relationships increases the likelihood that girls will be distressed by parental neglect and rejection and attempt to accommodate to parental demands, thereby establishing dependent, nonassertive behavioral patterns. On the other hand, if girls experience sufficiently high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance, they can be expected to evidence independence, assertiveness, and low levels of anxiety and depression as young adults. However, in order for girls to develop these skills, they are likely to require exceptionally high levels of parental emotional support; that is, parents must be sufficiently nurturant and accepting of daughters to encourage and reward assertive, independent behaviors. This interpretation suggests that girls' greater need of parental emotional support in developing independent, assertive behaviors is due, in part, to the fact that sex-role socialization among females tends to encourage affiliation-dependency and discourage assertion-aggression (Lipps & Colwill, 1978; Lott, 1981).

At the other extreme, this variate suggests that relationships between being male and being assertive-aggressive and nonaffiliative are

exaggerated by high levels of parental nurturance and acceptance, such that highly nurtured and accepted boys are likely to manifest extreme (i.e., less mature and more self-centered) aspects of aggressiveness and nonaffiliation (e.g., overt aggressiveness, antisocial behaviors, unresponsiveness to others). This interpretation suggests that in order for boys to inhibit aggression and manifest concern for others, they may require less global parental acceptance (i.e., more limits on aggression) and more "shaping" of prosocial, empathic attitudes and behaviors (i.e., inductive discipline), perhaps in part because sex-role socialization among males tends to encourage assertion-aggression and discourage affiliation-dependency (Bronfenbrenner, 1961a; 1961b; Feshbach, 1982; Lott, 1981). On the other hand, if boys experience high levels of parental neglect and rejection, they can be expected to evidence nonassertion, dependency, anxiety, and depression as young adults, although this variate suggests that males "tolerate" some degree of parental unsupportiveness before manifesting overt signs of distress and vulnerability. (Indeed, this interpretation is consistent with present results of independent analyses of women's and men's data which document more substantial relationships between parental maltreatment and vulnerable psychosocial functioning among women than among men.)

The interpretation that this variate reflects complex inter-relationships among gender, parental emotional supportiveness, and young adult psychosocial functioning is both internally consistent and defensible on the basis of a diverse array of empirical findings. Indeed, this line of reasoning overlaps substantially with Bronfenbrenner's (1961a, 1961b) contention, based on extensive cross-cultural research, that being female is associated with a

substantial risk of oversocialization while being male is associated with a greater risk of undersocialization. Moreover, Bronfenbrenner (1961a, 1961b) argued that constructive psychosocial development is likely to be associated with different optimal levels of parental acceptance and control for males and females. While repeated findings of differential socialization "risks" associated with each sex have important practical implications, a more complete exploration of these issues is beyond the scope of the present investigation. (For reviews of hypothesized antecedents and implications of sex-differentiated personality traits, see Lipps & Colwill, 1978; Lott, 1981; and Mischel, 1970.)

The more important aspect of this variate for the present purpose is the pattern of relationships which it suggests between parent-child affectional interactions and offspring psychosocial functioning. To briefly reiterate, then, the most logical and empirically defensible interpretation of this variate indicates that parental neglect and rejection are associated among young adult offspring with low satisfaction regarding family relationships, nonassertiveness, dependency, depression, and anxiety regarding loss of interpersonal support. Moreover, relationships among parental neglect and rejection and offspring passive-dependency, depression, and anxiety are stronger among women than among men; that is, girls are more vulnerable to potential negative effects of parental neglect and rejection while boys evidence some degree of resilience in the face of deficient parental emotional support (at least within the limited range of neglect and rejection represented here).

Presently documented relationships among parental neglect and

rejection and anxious, depressive, dependent offspring behavioral patterns corroborate previous findings of high levels of submissive dependency and affective distress among "normal" children, adolescents, and adults (i.e., not identified as mistreated or delinquent) exposed to parental emotional hostility during childhood (e. g. Bayley & Schaefer, 1960; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Block, 1971; Radke, 1949; Sears, 1961; Slater, 1955; Smith, 1958). In addition, present findings are consistent with repeated reports of hypersubmissive, depressive functioning among mistreated children and adolescents (e. g., Gray & Kempe, 1976; Johnson & Morse, 1968; Kent, 1976; Martin & Beezley, 1977; Reidy et al., 1980; Rohner, 1975) and data indicating that parental rejection comprises a primary antecedent of depression (Jacobson et al., 1975; Poznanski & Zrull, 1970).

In contrast, the present association between parental neglect and rejection and offspring dependency differs from previous reports of counter-dependent (i.e., detached) reaction patterns among severely neglected children (Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Rohner, 1975) and hyperaggressive reaction patterns among children and adolescents identified as mistreated and/or delinquent (e.g., Alfaro, 1978; Bandura & Walters, 1959; Kent, 1976; McCord et al., 1961; Offer et al., 1979; Olweus, 1978; Reidy, 1977). These few, but important, differences between past and present findings are readily interpretable given that: (a) systematic selection biases contribute to the exclusion of severely emotionally mistreated and/or hyperaggressive young adults among student populations, in contrast to extreme levels of emotional deprivation previously associated with detached reaction patterns; and (b) parental power assertion is not systematically related to offspring psychosocial

functioning depicted by this variate, in contrast to substantial interrelationships among parental emotional rejection, parental punitiveness, and previously documented hyperaggressive reaction patterns among children and adolescents.

A final noteworthy aspect of this variate regards the lack of contributions by personal and social self-esteem, generalized psychophysiological distress, hostility, and indirect- and passive aggression. These "negative" findings suggest that parental emotional maltreatment, within the limited range represented here and unassociated with parental power assertion, is associated with a relatively restricted range of psychosocial vulnerabilities among offspring (in comparison to the pervasive influence of emotional and physical maltreatment combined, as depicted by the first canonical variate). However, the generalizability of this conclusion is limited by the substantial restriction in range of parent-child affectional interactions in this study, and present findings should not be interpreted as implying that more severe emotional maltreatment is similarly associated with a "limited" range of effects on offspring personality (especially given sound evidence to the contrary).

Personality Correlates of Parental Aggression and Recent Stress

Information specific to relationships among parental power assertion, especially physical force and violence, recent stress, and psychosocial functioning among young adults is provided by the third canonical variate. The pattern of variables defining this variate conveys a composite picture of the young adult who experienced a minimum of parental verbal aggression and violence during childhood and adolescence and low levels of environmental stress during the previous

year as emotionally stable, trusting, unassertive and nondominant, independent, and likely to endorse acceptant, nonpunitive attitudes toward children and criminals. In contrast, this variate conveys a composite picture of the young adult who experienced high levels of parental verbal aggression and violence during childhood and adolescence and high levels of environmental stress during the previous year as emotionally unstable (i.e., highly symptomatic), suspicious, assertive and dominant, dependent, and likely to endorse rejecting, punitive attitudes toward children and criminals.

Importantly, the linear composite of variables defining this variate indicates that it is the combination of parental verbal abuse and violence experienced during childhood and adolescence and high levels of recent environmental stress that is associated with the most severe psychosocial vulnerability among young adults (with respect to this variate). In addition, the fact that parental nurturance and acceptance do not contribute to this variate indicates that parental aggression unassociated with emotional maltreatment is systematically related to specific psychosocial vulnerabilities among offspring.

Relationships among parental aggression, recent stress, and young adult psychosocial functioning indicated by this variate suggest several interpretations. First, predominant contributions by parental verbal and physical aggression suggest that this variate primarily reflects relationships among parental verbal abuse and violence and offspring psychosocial functioning. According to this interpretation, young adults who experienced parental verbal abuse and violence during childhood and adolescence are characterized by high levels of psychophysiological distress, suspiciousness, dominance, assertion, and

dependency, and endorse hostile-punitive attitudes toward children and criminals.

Support for this interpretation comes from both the childrearing and maltreatment literature. Specifically, numerous investigations have documented high levels of affective distress, somatic symptomatology, and submissive dependency among normal (i.e., not identified as mistreated or delinquent) children, adolescents, and adults exposed to severe parental punishment (e.g., Bayley & Schaefer, 1960; Coopersmith, 1967; Sears, 1961; Slater, 1955; Watson, 1934, 1957) and among children and adolescents identified as abused (e.g., Kent, 1976; Gray & Kempe, 1976; Martin & Beezley, 1977; Reidy et al., 1980). Additionally, present associations among parental coercion and violence and high levels of offspring dominance and assertion are consistent with Hoffman's (1960) finding that children whose parents utilize high levels of threats and physical punishment engage in high levels of peer- and teacher-directed power-assertive interactions and resist peers' influence attempts. Moreover, present associations among parental coercion and violence and offspring approval of aggression as a means of punishing children and criminals corroborate previous reports by Allinsmith (1954), Snortum and Ashear (1972), and Starr and Cutler (1972).

At the same time, the substantial contribution by recent stressful life events indicates that this variate also reflects relationships among environmental stress and psychophysiological distress, suspiciousness, dominance, assertion, dependency, and endorsement of hostile-punitive attitudes toward children and criminals. However, the interpretation that environmental stress is directly associated (i.e.,

irrespective of abuse history) with these aspects of psychosocial functioning is only partially supported by previous findings. Specifically, exposure to chronic and/or severe stress has been repeatedly associated with an increase in psychophysiological symptomatology (Brown & Harris, 1978; Depue, 1979; Seyle, 1956) and intensification of "prepotent" dominant-assertive, dependent, and compulsive coping strategies (Bandura, 1973). In contrast, there is no empirical support for direct associations (i.e., irrespective of learning history) among environmental stress and high levels of suspiciousness and hostile-punitive attitudes toward children and criminals. On the contrary, human beings are characterized by substantial individual differences in responses to stress, with response alternatives being largely determined by learning history (Bandura, 1973; Depue, 1979; Seligman, 1975). Moreover, dominance, assertion, and dependency as assessed here reflect enduring characteristics, rather than situational reactions to recent stress (Jackson, 1967; Lorr & More, 1980).

These factors, in conjunction with predominant contributions to this variate by maternal and paternal aggression, support the interpretation that this variate primarily reflects relationships among parental verbal abuse and violence and offspring psychosocial functioning which are exacerbated by environmental stress. According to this interpretation, when already vulnerable abused young adults are exposed to high levels of environmental stress, they experience an increase in depression, anxiety, and somatic distress, intensify prepotent obsessive-compulsive, dominant, and dependent coping strategies, and project increasing levels of hostility onto others,

especially children and criminals. Moreover, high levels of emotional-physical reactivity among severely punished young adults may inhibit effective management of even normal stresses, thereby contributing to personal crises and a self-perpetuating cycle of increasing environmental stress and internal distress (Brown & Harris, 1978; Depue, 1979; Kaplan, 1979).

Several aspects of inter-relationships among parental aggression, stress, and psychosocial functioning among young adults suggested by this interpretation merit elaboration. First, the finding that severely punished young adults endorse violence as a means of punishing children and criminals to a greater extent than nonabused young adults, but are no more likely than nonabused young adults to condone violence in other contexts, supports Gelles and Straus' (1975) contention that attitudes regarding violence directed toward children and criminals are specifically influenced by the level of aggression experienced in the context of parent-child relationships. Moreover, the fact that severely punished young adults believe in the legitimacy of violence used by high-power authorities (e.g., parents, police officers) to punish persons in low-power positions (e.g., children, criminals) and engage in high levels of dominant, assertive behaviors (but not destructive aggression) is consistent with the theory of "defensive" identification (Mowrer, 1950; Slater, 1961). According to this conceptualization, children and adolescents who experience high levels of parental aggression identify with the parent/aggressor's powerful position and copy specific parental characteristics which symbolize his/her position of power but, out of fear of punishment, do not aggress against high-power targets (Freud, 1946). "Such identification is not

200

necessarily a global one leading to indiscriminate aggressive discharge; in many of our patients [i.e., abusive parents] we see a rather narrowly channeled specific identification with a 'parent-against-child' aggressor" (Steele & Pollock, 1974, p. 108). Thus, severely punished young adults who experience sufficient parental nurturance to facilitate identification with the aggressor/parent are unlikely to challenge authority by engaging in antisocial aggression; rather, they identify with authority and play out this identification by engaging in socially acceptable forms of aggression (e.g., dominance, assertion) and by condoning violence as a means of enforcing "legitimate" authority and societal sanctions vis-a-vis low-power "targets".

This interpretation implies that although severely punished young adults are not generally aggressive, they can be expected to utilize force and violence in the context of specific relationships; that is, relationships characterized by a substantial power imbalance, associated with little risk of retaliation, and imbued with the moral "rightness" of punishment. Indeed, combined with previous research which indicates that aggressive behaviors are learned in conjunction with role-specific cues (e.g., Bandura, 1976; Parke, 1972), present associations among parental aggression and offspring dominance and hostile-punitive attitudes toward children suggest that severely punished young adults are at risk of utilizing force and violence in controlling and punishing children (and other low-power targets, given a position of authority). This speculation is supported by the fact that the high levels of psychophysiological reactivity, obsessive-compulsive behaviors, hostile suspiciousness, dominance, and hostile-punitive attitudes toward children characterizing severely punished young adults overlap

substantially with a trait cluster previously identified among abusive parents (e.g., Lord & Weisfeld, 1974; Merrill, 1962; Steele & Pollack, 1974).

Additional aspects of present findings, interpreted in conjunction with previous data, add credence to the contention that severely punished young adults are at risk of perpetuating physical child maltreatment. Specifically, this variate suggests that severely punished young adults intensify hostile-dominant tendencies, especially toward children, when they experience high levels of environmental stress. Importantly, the tendency among severely punished young adults to increase hostile-punitive attitudes toward children is apparent during a stage of life characterized by comparatively few external demands. Thus, severely punished young adults might be expected to evidence increasing levels of child rejection during subsequent life stages characterized by greater stress; indeed, previous research has demonstrated that rejecting, punitive attitudes toward children increase during childrearing years (Hurley, 1971). Finally, numerous studies have documented substantial associations among endorsement of corporal punishment of children, environmental stress, and physical abuse of children (e.g., Straus, 1977, 1980; Straus et al., 1980; Welsh, 1976b).

High levels of hostility, dominance, and assertiveness among severely punished young adults suggests a further interpretation. Indeed, it must be acknowledged that dominance and assertion represent potentially "prosocial" forms of aggression which, when associated with constructive self-esteem and interpersonal trust, comprise important components of gratifying interpersonal functioning (i.e., equivalent to the Self-Assurance component retained in the principal components

analysis of psychosocial variables). However, the pattern of variables defining the third variate suggests that the dominant interpersonal style characterizing present mistreated young adults is not associated with self-esteem and basic trust in others. That is, associations among parental violence and offspring suspiciousness and psychophysiological distress indicate that mistreated young adults do not trust others and do not experience a general sense of well-being. This pattern of relationships suggests, then, that the dominant interpersonal style characterizing mistreated young adults serves a largely defensive, rather than affiliative or prosocial, function.

Importantly, this line of reasoning implies that severely punished young adults' interpersonal relationships are likely to be characterized by some degree of discomfort, consistent with previous reports of unsatisfactory relationships among severely punished or abused children, adolescents, and adults (e.g., Baumrind, 1967; Helfer, 1980; Kent, 1976; Martin, 1980; Martin & Beezley, 1977; Reidy, 1977; Slater, 1955; Watson, 1934; Weatherley, 1962). Indeed, present associations among parental violence and hostile, dominant, dependent offspring behaviors suggest that at least some severely punished young adults are characterized by "competing" dependent and hostile-dominant tendencies, whereby they wish for emotional support and protection from others and, simultaneously, believe that others cannot be counted on to provide support and protection. Moreover, the fact that this variate is defined by parental aggression unassociated with emotional maltreatment is consistent with the interpretation that interpersonal ambivalence among severely punished young adults stems from having been physically attacked and hurt by parents who were also affectionate and emotionally supportive at

least some of the time (and on whom they depended for physical care and protection). While speculative, this line of reasoning is supported by extensive data from childrearing and child maltreatment research demonstrating that children exposed to parental punitiveness in the context of at least some affection evidence ambivalent attachments and heightened dependency behaviors alternating with hostile-aggressive behaviors directed toward parents, teachers, and peers (e.g., Ainsworth, 1979; Martin & Beezley, 1977).

In sum, the pattern of variables defining this variate indicates that parental verbal aggression and violence are associated with offspring psychophysiological distress, suspiciousness, dominant-assertion, dependency, and endorsement of hostile-punitive attitudes towards children and criminals. In addition, this variate indicates that when already vulnerable mistreated young adults encounter high levels of environmental stress, they experience heightened somatic and psychological distress and intensify prepotent hostile-dominant, dependent, and compulsive coping strategies. Finally, present findings suggest that severely punished young adults are likely to utilize violence in the context of relationships characterized by a substantial power/authority imbalance, most notably parent-child relationships.

At the same time, the absence of contributions to this variate by indirect-, passive-, and antisocial aggression and interpersonal involvement indicates that parental violence unassociated with emotional maltreatment is not systematically related to hyperaggressive or emotionally detached behavioral patterns. However, the generalizability of this conclusion is limited by the restriction in the range of violence characterizing families of students in comparison to the

severity and frequency of parental abuse documented in the maltreatment literature (Helfer & Kempe, 1974; Kempe & Helfer, 1968, 1972, 1980).

Recapitulation and Implications

Results of this investigation confirm the hypothesis that parental maltreatment -- manifested in neglect, rejection, verbal abuse, violence, and/or incest -- is associated with enduring psychosocial vulnerability among offspring. In addition, findings suggest that specific manifestations of the syndrome of parental maltreatment (i.e., emotional, physical, sexual abuse) are associated with differential, additive, and interacting effects on victims. Confidence in present findings is bolstered by the fact that the overall pattern of relationships among family/historical experiences and current psychosocial functioning among young adults is consistent with the preponderance of findings from both the child development and child maltreatment literature. Cautious conclusions regarding the direction of effects from parent to child (and past to present) are supported by the substantial overlap among this study's findings and results of longitudinal investigations utilizing independent predictor and outcome data sources.

Alternate Explanations

Confidence in present findings notwithstanding, potential limitations and alternate explanations for relationships obtained merit consideration. An essential question regards the possibility that relationships among parent-child interactions and offspring psychosocial functioning documented here are attributable to some third factor rather than a direct association between parental attitudes and behaviors and offspring personality. For example, present findings may reflect

general response tendencies (e.g., desirability, readiness to admit deviance) especially given the present study's reliance on self-report procedures. However, additional methodological features of this study argue against this interpretation. That is, instruments employed had been carefully devised to suppress the influence of response sets and biases, and the variety of response formats is likely to have minimized the influence of systematic response tendencies across family/historical and current/psychosocial inventories. Moreover, the fact that present findings support hypotheses based on a carefully devised a priori conceptual framework and corroborate previous findings based on a diverse range of procedures and populations makes it unlikely that findings are attributable to systematic response tendencies or method variance.

Additional potential threats to the validity of findings include the present study's retrospective design and reliance on student reports of family interaction patterns. Again, additional aspects of this study's procedures argue against the interpretation that findings primarily reflect systematic distortions in retrospectively collected data (e.g., search after meaning). Specifically, the fact that retrospective variables were assessed via structured inventories which asked for recognition of past experiences by focusing on specific behaviors, in specific circumstances, and requiring specific responses can be expected to have maximized the accuracy of retrospective data. In addition, the validity of child/student reports of family interaction patterns (including emotional tone and abusive behaviors) when utilizing objective inventories with precoded response alternatives has been substantially documented (e.g., Bronson et al., 1959; Mulligan, 1977;

Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980). Finally, the tangibility, consistency, and emotional saliency associated with intrafamilial abuse can be expected to have contributed to accurate recall of abusive experiences.

Additional sources of unmeasured variance potentially confounding present findings include offspring temperament and behavioral characteristics during childhood. However, while information regarding these aspects of young adults' histories might have facilitated an understanding of interactions among parent and child characteristics, there is little reason to expect that inclusion of these variables would have substantially altered findings. For example, significant associations among offspring temperament and current psychosocial functioning would be unlikely to significantly alter associations among parental maltreatment and offspring psychosocial vulnerability, although they would provide additional information regarding antecedents of current functioning.

Beyond Previous Findings

Limitations notwithstanding, unique characteristics of the present study distinguish it from previous attempts to identify nonphysical sequelae of parental maltreatment and facilitate clarification and extension of previous findings. Specifically, in contrast to previous studies which have investigated psychosocial correlates of extreme, global parental maltreatment among children identified by the legal-medical-welfare system as mistreated, the present study investigated personality correlates of physical, emotional, and sexual maltreatment among young adults whose parental relationships varied from extremely positive to extremely negative (only 1% of whom reported

207

involvement with protective services).

As a result, psychosocial vulnerabilities among present mistreated young adults are not attributable to iatrogenic effects of being identified as abused and/or neglected and undergoing intervention services. In addition, findings support cautious conclusions regarding differential, additive, and interacting effects of emotional-, physical-, and emotional-physical (and sexual) maltreatment (i.e., global maltreatment). Moreover, by virtue of the fact that present victims of parental maltreatment are at least 18 years of age, findings support the conclusion that personality correlates of parental maltreatment endure into adulthood. And, because present young adults experienced relatively "mild" maltreatment, findings support the conclusion that associations among parental maltreatment and vulnerable offspring psychosocial functioning are robust. That is, despite the restriction in the range of maltreatment experienced by present young adults and systematic selection biases obviously favoring less vulnerable, more adaptive victims, parental maltreatment is shown here to be associated with substantial psychosocial vulnerability among offspring, in comparison to parental love and respectful treatment which are shown to be associated with psychosocial health and resiliency.

At the same time, the generalizability of present findings is limited due to selection factors which contribute to a restriction in the range of maltreatment and demographic characteristics and, to a lesser extent, psychosocial variables. Cognizance of the limited distribution of maltreatment characteristics is essential in drawing implications of present findings for victims of severe parental abuse and/or neglect, especially with respect to conclusions regarding the

200

relatively "limited" influence of specific manifestations of parental maltreatment (i.e., emotional or physical abuse/neglect) on the subsequent social-emotional functioning of victims.

Differential Effects of Global, Emotional, and Physical Maltreatment

Not surprisingly, present findings indicate that global parental maltreatment, consisting of emotional and physical abuse (and among women incest and father-to-mother violence), is associated with the most pervasive psychosocial vulnerability among offspring. Specifically, young adults who were emotionally and physically abused by parents do not value themselves, experience a wide range of psychophysiological symptomatology, are resentful and emotionally detached from others, and vent hostility in passive- and indirect aggressiveness and a wide range of antisocial activities. The inadequate psychosocial functioning of these young adults is perhaps most apparent in their deficient self-worth and lack of interpersonal attachments; they neither see others as sources of gratification and support, nor evidence concern for others.

In contrast, parental emotional maltreatment (unassociated with parental aggression) is associated with less pervasive vulnerability among offspring. Young adults who were emotionally unsupported by parents evidence low satisfaction regarding family functioning, are depressed and worried about potential loss of interpersonal support, and are generally passive and dependent in their relationships with others. It is as if they have been sensitized to criticism and interpersonal loss through rejecting, unreliable parental relationships, and their current functioning is oriented toward obtaining the nurturance and affirmation which they have not experienced in the context of parental

interactions. Similarly, parental physical maltreatment (unassociated with emotional maltreatment) is associated with less psychosocial vulnerability than global maltreatment. That is, young adults who were physically abused experience a broad range of psychophysiological symptomatology, are suspicious, dominant, and/or dependent in their relationships with others, and endorse rejecting, punitive attitudes towards children and criminals. It is as if they have been sensitized to the power aspects of relationships through coercive, violent parental treatment and assume a power-assertive interpersonal stance to avoid being controlled by others and re-experiencing the vulnerability they associate with low-power roles. While attitudinal/behavioral patterns associated with either emotional or physical maltreatment are indicative of social-emotional vulnerability, the fact that young adults who experienced either kind of maltreatment independently are involved with others (albeit via self-limiting patterns) offers the potential of gratification and reflects more adaptive functioning than the emotional detachment and hostile-aggressiveness characterizing young adults whose parental relationships were both emotionally and physically abusive.

Differential developmental patterns associated with emotional-, physical-, and global maltreatment have important practical implications, underscoring the necessity of basing intervention among maltreating families on careful assessments of parental responsiveness to children's emotional needs as well as parental violence. However, in considering practical implications of present findings (especially regarding the relatively restricted psychosocial vulnerability associated with either emotional or physical abuse), it is essential to remain cognizant of the limited generalizability of conclusions, given

the relatively "mild" maltreatment experienced by present young adults in contrast to the extreme neglect, rejection, violence, and sexual abuse experienced by children and adolescents in the general population. (Indeed, previous findings suggest that severe parental maltreatment, even if primarily emotional or physical, is likely to be associated with extreme and pervasive psychosocial vulnerability among victims.)

The Potential to Mistreat Children

"The abusive/neglectful parent is to be recognized as having a special character disorder developed through certain parental inputs and deprivations.... To say that abuse/neglect is a child-rearing style, practiced, learned, and transmitted is insufficient (Flanzraich & Steiner, 1980, p. 574). Indeed, available information indicates that the potential to mistreat children inheres in attitudinal/behavioral patterns which contribute to an incapacity to adequately empathize with and respond to children's needs and/or a psychological readiness to resort to aggression as a means of controlling and punishing children (e.g., Gray et al., 1977; Kempe & Kempe, 1978; Lord & Weisfeld, 1974; Melnick & Hurley, 1969; Merrill, 1962; Morris & Gould, 1963; Polanski et al., 1972, 1981; Spinetta & Rigler, 1972; Steele & Pollock, 1974).

Present findings indicate that mistreated young adults, compared to young adults raised by emotionally supportive and respectful parents, are characterized by attitudinal and behavioral traits which place them at risk of mistreating children. This speculation is supported by the fact that social-emotional traits characterizing mistreated young adults overlap substantially with descriptions of maltreating parents based on systematic investigations and accumulated case reports (e.g., Frodi & Lamb, 1980; Gray et al., 1977; Kempe & Kempe, 1978; Lord & Weisfeld,

1974; Melnick & Hurley, 1969; Merrill, 1962; Morris & Gould, 1963; Polanski et. al., 1972, 1981; Scott, 1980; Spinetta & Rigler, 1972; Steele & Pollock, 1974). For example, abusive parents have been repeatedly characterized as lacking in self-worth, depressed, emotionally distressed and unstable, hostile, dependent, socially isolated, lacking in flexible strategies for coping with stress, and endorsing rejecting and punitive attitudes toward children.

In addition, offspring traits associated with emotional-, physical-, and global parental maltreatment in this study overlap substantially with well documented trait clusters representing relatively distinct "types" of abusive parents (e.g., Lord & Weisfeld, 1974; Melnick & Hurley, 1969; Merrill, 1962). One such typology (Merrill, 1962) classifies abusive parents as: (a) hostile-aggressive individuals characterized by high levels of anger, irritability, and aggressiveness; (b) passive-dependent individuals characterized by submissive dependency, passivity, depression, and low levels of overt aggression; or (c) rigid-obsessive individuals characterized by overcontrol, compulsiveness, lack of warmth, and marked child rejection attitudes. The extent of overlap among Merrill's (1962) typology and traits associated with each kind of parental maltreatment in this study is striking.

However, unlike Merrill's (1962) trait clusters, personality characteristics associated with each kind of abuse in this study do not necessarily reflect clusters within individuals (i.e., profiles). Nevertheless, the fact that mistreated young adults evidence key traits repeatedly identified among abusive parents demonstrates that mistreated young adults are similar to abusive parents to some (as yet

undetermined) degree, in comparison to young adults who experienced nurturant, acceptant, and respectful parental treatment. This finding underscores the need for intervention and prevention strategies aimed at helping victims of parental maltreatment develop more constructive intra- and interpersonal attitudes and behaviors, ideally, before they become parents.

Treatment of Mistreated Children and Adults

Present findings demonstrate that victims of even relatively mild parental maltreatment who have not had the "benefit" of psychotherapeutic services evidence social-emotional vulnerabilities as young adults, in comparison to young adults who experienced nurturant, acceptant, and respectful parental treatment. Numerous implications for intervention, treatment, and prevention are suggested by present findings. While an extensive exploration of implications is beyond the scope of the present discussion, brief consideration of a few "principles" of intervention suggested by present findings is indicated.

First, specific social-emotional vulnerabilities identified among mistreated young adults indicate potential target areas for intervention with victims of parental abuse and/or neglect: (a) deficient self-esteem and assurance; (b) high levels of psychophysiological distress; and (c) self-limiting interpersonal attitudes and behaviors. In addition, differential psychosocial vulnerabilities associated with specific kinds of parental maltreatment suggest that psychological treatment needs of children and young adults exposed to different kinds of parental maltreatment may differ systematically. These findings emphasize the need for: (a) psychological evaluations among identified victims of parental maltreatment as a customary and integral aspect of

intervention; and (b) prescriptive, victim-oriented psychotherapeutic services.

Second, if the whole pattern of present findings is considered, associations among constructive parental treatment and optimal offspring psychosocial functioning provide information regarding the process by which victims of parental maltreatment might be helped to grow beyond their vulnerabilities. That is, mistreated children and adults may need to experience the nurturance, acceptance, and respectful treatment which they have not experienced in the context of parental relationships if they are to acquire more constructive and gratifying social-emotional attitudes and behaviors. At the risk of oversimplifying complex issues, this line of reasoning suggests that curative factors in the treatment of abused and/or neglected children and adults are likely to inhere in the extent to which they are constructively nurtured, accepted, and treated with respect by would-be "helpers" (e.g., foster parents, teachers, friends, paraprofessional parenting coaches, professional therapists), as much if not more than in techniques geared toward eliminating specific symptoms. "Abuse/neglect is an experience that touches the deepest part of a child's developing ego. New expanding and appropriate experiences must be given to these children, guided by an understanding of the ego distortion they developed in interaction with their home environment" (Flanzraich & Steiner, 1980, p.574).

Interestingly, several recently implemented treatment programs reflect this philosophy (e.g., Ebeling & Hill, 1975; Kempe & Kempe, 1978; Kempe & Helfer, 1980; Martin, 1976; Polanski et al., 1981; Williams & Money, 1980). For example, one particularly promising program (Flanzraich & Steiner, 1980) prescribes psychotherapeutic

"reparenting" experiences for mistreated children on the basis of an assessment of commissions and omissions in parental treatment and children's developmental stage and predominant interpersonal needs (e.g., emotionally mistreated children are initially provided with consistent, responsive nurturance and acceptance in the context of constructive direction and limits; physically abused children are provided with opportunities for "power-esteem sharing" in conjunction with constructive direction and limits).

Finally, present findings suggest that victims of parental abuse and neglect develop "adaptive" coping styles which, while facilitating their survival in a "world of abnormal rearing," reduce their chances of being identified as in need of intervention and their readiness to seek and/or invest in treatment. This interpretation is reminiscent of Steele and Pollock's (1974) observation regarding the isolation and hopelessness characteristic of abusive parents who were abused as children: "Most of our patients had been living for years with a significant amount of emotional difficulty, feeling it was not worthwhile or not possible to look for help from anyone. They had not been able to engender in their environment any useful, sympathetic awareness of their difficulties" (Steele & Pollock, 1974, p. 95).

Indeed, even if victims of parental maltreatment receive psychotherapeutic services, their detachment and hostile distrust of others are likely to prolong, if not preclude, establishment of therapeutic relationships. In short, effective treatment of mistreated children and adults is likely to require a great deal of cognitive understanding, compassion, emotional energy, flexibility, and outreach.

In the final analysis then, if victims of parental maltreatment are

215

to be appropriately identified as in need of psychotherapeutic services and if potential benefits of treatment are to be maximized, systems and individuals in the position of planning and providing intervention with victims of parental maltreatment (including university-affiliated and private "helping" professionals) need to be adequately informed regarding the wide range of psychological "scars" associated with abuse and neglect experienced in the context of parental relationships.

Conclusion

Although parental abuse and neglect of children has recently commanded an increasing amount of public and professional attention, comparatively little systematic information is available regarding the impact of parental maltreatment on its victims. As a result, systems and individuals responsible for intervention in maltreating families have been limited in their ability to recognize the range of psychological injuries incurred by victims, and public policy has evolved on the basis of the assumption that "successful" intervention in maltreating families consists of prevention of ongoing physical abuse and severe neglect.

This investigation has been conducted in the hope that identification of specific social-emotional vulnerabilities among victims of parental maltreatment would comprise a beginning step toward better understanding the psychological needs of abused and neglected children and adults. Thus, this study has attempted to document specific psychosocial vulnerabilities among mistreated young adults and, in so doing, demonstrate the need for prescriptive, victim-oriented intervention in maltreating families.

Results are both simple and complex. Simply stated, they

demonstrate that parental love manifested in affectionate, affirmative caretaking and a minimum of coercive, aggressive control are essential to self-love and the establishment of trust and joyful involvement with others; and, conversely, parental maltreatment manifested in neglect, rejection, verbal abuse, violence, and/or incest is associated with enduring psychosocial vulnerability evident in deficient self-worth, pervasive psychophysiological symptomatology, and a lack of appropriate and gratifying interpersonal relationships. This conclusion is what might be called a "trivial" result in that it confirms empirically what is already "known" intuitively; and yet, it needs to be stated because it is one of those implicit truths which is so obvious that it is too often overlooked.

On a more complex level, results confirm hypotheses that: (a) emotional- and physical- parental maltreatment are inversely related to the overall quality of intra- and interpersonal functioning among young adult offspring; and (b) discontinuity of parental relationships, spousal violence, and intrafamilial sexual victimization are positively associated with parental maltreatment and inversely related to the quality of intra- and interpersonal functioning among young adult offspring. Moreover, results suggest that specific kinds of parental maltreatment (i.e., emotional, physical, sexual) are associated with differential, additive, and interactional effects on victims.

Specifically, young adults who experienced physical and emotional parental maltreatment evidence pervasive vulnerability including deficient self-worth, a wide range of psychophysiological symptomatology, a hostile-aggressive behavioral pattern, and emotional detachment from others. Incest and father-to-mother violence comprise

additional components of this globally abusive environment and contribute to the overall impact of parental maltreatment among women. Emotionally mistreated young adults evidence more restricted psychosocial vulnerability manifested in a depressive, submissive-dependent orientation toward others. Physically mistreated young adults evidence pervasive psychophysiological distress, hostile-dominant and/or dependent orientations toward others, and marked child-rejection attitudes.

In addition, findings demonstrate that mistreated young adults are characterized by attitudinal/behavioral traits which place them at risk of perpetuating child maltreatment. Finally, results indicate specific "target" areas of psychosocial functioning among victims of parental maltreatment which might benefit from psychotherapeutic intervention and suggest that curative factors in effective treatment are likely to inhere in the very process of experiencing and "testing" consistent, affirmative, and respectful relationships with others (i.e., constructive reparenting).

Confidence in findings is bolstered by the fact that the overall pattern of relationships between family/historical experiences and current psychosocial functioning among young adults is consistent with the predominance of findings from the child development and child maltreatment literature. However, caution is indicated in drawing implications of present findings for children exposed to severe parental abuse and neglect, given the restriction in the range of maltreatment and socioeconomic characteristics represented in this investigation.

In short, results of this study demonstrate that parental maltreatment manifested in neglect, rejection, verbal abuse,

violence, and/or incest is associated with enduring psychosocial vulnerability among victims. The essential task is to utilize accumulated knowledge regarding the psychological needs of victims of parental maltreatment in developing and implementing a broader range of prescriptive intervention, treatment, and support programs for abused and neglected children, adolescents, and adults.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, J. Y., Seligman, M. E., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 49-74.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1962). The effects of maternal deprivation (Public Health Papers No. 14). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1963). The development of infant-mother interaction among the Ganda. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), Determinants of infant behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 67-112). London: Methuen.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1967). Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1973). The development of infant-mother attachment. In B. M. Caldwell & H. M. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 3, pp. 1-94). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1977). Social development in the first year of life: Maternal influences on infant-mother attachment. In J. M. Tanner (Ed.), Developments in psychiatric research viewpoints in review: Essays based on the Sir Geoffrey Vickers' lectures of the Mental Health Trust and Research Fund. London: Hodder.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1979). Infant-mother attachment. American Psychologist, 34, 932-937.
- Ainsworth, M. D., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. Child Development, 41, 49-67.
- Ainsworth, M. D., Bell, S. M., & Stayton, D. J. (1971). Individual differences in strange situation behavior of one-year-olds. In H. R. Schaffer (Ed.), The origins of human social relations (pp. 17-71). London: Academic Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D., & Wittig, B. A. (1969). Attachment and exploratory patterns of one-year-olds in a strange situation. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), Determinants of infant behavior (Vol. 4, pp. 111-136). London: Methuen.
- Akiskal, H. S. (1979). A biobehavioral approach to depression. In R. A. Depue (Ed.), The psychobiology of the depressive disorders: Implications for the effects of stress (pp. 409-437). New York: Academic Press.
- Akiskal, H. S., Bitar, A. H., Puzantian, V. R., Rosenthal, T. L., & Walker, P. W. (1978). The nosological status of neurotic depression: A prospective 3-4 year follow-up examination in the light of the primary-secondary and the unipolar-bipolar dichotomies. Archives of General Psychiatry, 35, 756-766.

- Albee, G. W., & Joffe, J. M. (Eds.). (1977). Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 1. The issues. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Alexander, H. (1980). Long-term treatment. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 288-296). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Alfaro, J. D. (1978). Summary report on the relationship between child abuse and neglect and larger socially deviant behavior. New York: New York State Assembly Select Committee on Child Abuse.
- Allen, C. M., & Straus, M. A. (1979). Resources, power, and husband-wife violence. In M. A. Straus & G. T. Hotaling (Eds.), The social causes of husband-wife violence (pp. 188-208). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Allinsmith, B. B. (1954). Parental discipline and children's aggression in two social classes. Dissertation Abstracts International, 14, 708. (University Microfilm No. 00-07595)
- Alvy, K. T. (1975). Preventing child abuse. American Psychologist, 30, 921-928.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). Diagnostic & statistical manual, III. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (1981). Ethical principals of psychologists. Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, L. M., & Shafer, G. (1979). The character-disordered family: A community treatment model for family sexual abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49, 436-444.
- Applebaum, A. S. (1980). Developmental retardation in infants as a concomitant of physical child abuse. In G. J. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 304-310). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Aronfreed, J. (1961). The nature, variety, and social patterning of moral responses to transgression. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 63, 223-240.
- Arsenian, J. M. (1943). Young children in an insecure situation. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 38, 225-249.
- Arvanian, A. L. (1975). Dynamics of separation and placement. In N. B. Ebeling & D. A. Hill (Eds.), Child abuse: Intervention and treatment (pp. 117-122). Acton, MA: Publishing Sciences Group, Inc.
- Ashcraft, C., & Fitts, W. H. (1964). Self-concept change in psychotherapy. Psychotherapy, 1, 115-118.

- Atchison, C. O. (1958). A comparative study of the self-concept of behavior problem and non-behavior problem high school boys. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 1010.
- Bahr, S. J., Bowerman, C. E., & Gecas, V. (1974). Adolescent perceptions of conjugal power. Social Forces, 52, 357-367.
- Baisden, M. J. (1971). The world of rosaphrenia: The sexual psychology of the female. Sacramento: Allied Research Society.
- Baldwin, A. L. (1949). The effect of home environment on nursery school behavior. Child Development, 20, 49-62.
- Baldwin, A. L. (1955). Behavior and development in childhood. New York: Dryden Press.
- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, J., & Breese, F. H. (1945). Patterns of parent behavior. Psychological Monographs, 58(3, Whole No. 268).
- Bandura, A. (1960). Relationship of family patterns to child behavior disorders (Progress Report, U. S. Public Health Research Grant M-1734). Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1976). Social learning analysis of aggression. In E. Ribes-Inesta & A. Bandura (Eds.), Analysis of delinquency and aggression (pp. 203-232). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1959). Adolescent aggression: A study of the influence of child-training practices and family interrelationships. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963a). Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963b). Aggression in child psychology; sixty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1, 364-415.
- Bardis, P. D. (1973). Violence: Theory and quantification. Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 1, 121-146.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychological Monograph, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38, 291-328.
- Bayley, N., & Schaefer, E. S. (1960). Maternal behavior and personality development: Data from the Berkeley growth study. Psychiatric Research Reports, 13, 155-173.

- Beck, A. T. (1973). The diagnosis and management of depression. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Beck, A. T., & Beck, R. W. (1972). Screening depressed patients in family practice: A rapid technic. Postgraduate Medicine, 52, 81-85.
- Beck, A. T., Rush, A. J., Shaw, B. F., & Emery, G. (1979). Cognitive therapy of depression. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 4, 561-571.
- Becker, J. (1979). Vulnerable self-esteem as a predisposing factor in depressive disorders. In R. A. Depue (Ed.), The psychobiology of the depressive disorders: Implications for the effects of stress (pp. 317-334). New York: Academic Press.
- Becker, W. C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1, pp. 169-208). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Becker, W. C., & Krug, R. S. (1964). A circumplex model for social behavior in children. Child Development, 35, 371-396.
- Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Hellmer, L. A., Shoemaker, D. J., & Quay, H. C. (1959). Factors in parental behavior and personality as related to problem behavior in children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 23, 107-118.
- Becker, W. C., Peterson, D. R., Luria, Z., Shoemaker, D. J., & Hellmer, L. A. (1962). Relations of factors derived from parent-interview ratings to behavior problems of five-year-olds. Child Development, 33, 509-535.
- Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review, 75, 81-95.
- Bell, R. Q. (1971). Stimulus control of parent or caretaker behavior by offspring. Developmental Psychology, 4, 63-72.
- Beller, E. K. (1957). Dependency and autonomous achievement striving related to orality and anality in early childhood. Child Development, 28, 287-315.
- Beller, E. K. (1959). Exploratory studies of dependency. New York Academy of Science, 21, 414-426.
- Beller, E. K. (1962). A study of dependency and aggression in early childhood. (Unpublished progress report, Project M-849). Child Development Center, New York City.
- Beller, E. K., & Haeberle, A. W. (1961). Dependency and the frustration-aggression hypothesis. Unpublished manuscript, Child Development Center, New York City.

- Bender, L., & Blau, A. (1937). The reaction of children to sexual relations with adults. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 7, 500-518.
- Bentler, P. M. (1964). Response variability: Fact or artifact (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 65, 6049.
- Berardo, F. M. (1976). Beyond the college student: An editorial comment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 211.
- Birrell, R. G., & Birrell, J. H. (1968). The maltreatment syndrome in children: A hospital survey. Medical Journal of Australia, 2, 1023-1029.
- Birtchnell, J. (1972). Early parent death and psychiatric diagnosis. Social Psychiatry, 7, 202-210.
- Blager, F., & Martin, H. P. (1976). Speech and language of abused children. In H. P. Martin (Ed.), The Abused Child (pp. 83-92). Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Blehar, M. C. (1975). Anxious attachment and defensive reactions associated with day care. In U. Bronfenbrenner & M. A. Mahoney (Eds.), Influences on human development (2nd ed., pp. 282-297). Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.
- Blehar, M. C., Lieberman, A. F., & Ainsworth, M. D. (1977). Early face-to-face interaction and its relation to later infant-mother attachment. Child Development, 48, 182-194.
- Block, J. (1971). Lives through time. Berkeley: Bancroft Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1946). Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home backgrounds. London: Baillier, Tindall and Cox.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). Maternal care and mental health. World Health Organization, 3, 355-533.
- Bowlby, J. (1953). Psychopathological process set in train by early mother-child separation. Journal of Mental Science, 99, 265-272.
- Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to his mother. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 39, 350-373.
- Bowlby, J. (1960). Separation anxiety. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 41, 89-113.
- Bowlby, J. (1963). Pathological mourning and childhood mourning. Journal of American Psychoanalysis Association, 11, 500-541.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Vol. I. Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss: Vol. II. Separation, anxiety, and anger. New York: Basic Books.

- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. British Journal of Psychiatry, 130, 201-210, 421-431.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Vol. III. Loss, sadness and depression. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J., Ainsworth, M. D., Boston, M., & Rosenbluth, D. (1956). The effects of mother-child separation: A follow-up study. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 29, 211-247.
- Bromberg, W. (1961). The mold of murder; a psychiatric study of homicide. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1958). Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology (pp. 400-425). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961a). Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo & B. M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and interpersonal behavior (pp. 239-271). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961b). Toward a theoretical model for the analysis of parent-child relationships in a social context. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior (pp. 90-109). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Bronson, W. C., Katten, E. S., & Livson, N. (1959). Patterns of authority and affection in two generations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58, 143-152.
- Brown, G. W., & Harris, T. O. (1978). Social origins of depression. New York: Free Press.
- Brunkan, R. J., & Crites, J. O. (1964). An inventory to measure the parental attitude variables in Roe's theory of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 11, 3-12.
- Bulcroft, R. S., & Straus, M. A. (1975). Validity of husband, wife, and child reports of conjugal violence and power (Mimeographed paper V16). Durham, University of New Hampshire, Family Violence Research Program.
- Burgess, A. W., & Groth, N. (1980). Sexual victimization of children. In R. Volpe, M. Breton, & J. Mitton (Eds.), The maltreatment of the school-aged child (pp. 79-89). Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Burgess, A. W., Groth, A. N., Holmstrom, L. L., & Sgroi, S. M. (1978). Sexual assault of children and adolescents. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Buss, A. (1961). The psychology of aggression. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Buss, A. H. (1963). Physical aggression in relation to different frustrations. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 67, 1-7.
- Buss, A., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 343-349.
- Buss, A., Fischer, H., & Simmons, A. (1962). Aggression and hostility in psychiatric patients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26, 84-89.
- Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1975). A temperament theory of personality development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Butterfield, E. C., & Zigler, E. (1965). The effects of success and failure on the discrimination learning of normal and retarded children. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 70, 25-31.
- Caffey, J. (1946). Multiple fractures in the long bones of infants suffering from chronic subdural hematoma. American Journal of Roentgenology, 56, 163-173.
- Cairns, R. B. (1961). The influence of dependency inhibition on the effectiveness of social reinforcement. Journal of Personality, 29, 466-488.
- Cairns, R. B., & Lewis, M. (1962). Dependency and the reinforcement value of a verbal stimulus. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26, 1-8.
- Calonico, J. M., & Thomas, D. L. (1973). Role-taking as a function of value similarity and affect in the nuclear family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, 655-665.
- Campbell, D. P. (1974). Manual for the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cannell, C. F., & Kahn, R. L. (1969). Interviewing. In G. Lindzey & G. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 526-595). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Cannon, W. B. (1927). Bodily changes in pain, hunger, fear and rage (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Cantwell, H. B. (1980). Child neglect. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 183-197). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Caron, H. S. (1953). Expressive and adaptive similarities between parent and child: A study of identification (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 66, 146.
- Carroll, C. A. (1980). The function of protective services in child abuse and neglect. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 275-287). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Casler, L. (1961). Maternal deprivation: A critical review of the literature. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 26.
- Casler, L. (1965). The effects of extratactile stimulation on a group of institutionalized infants. Genetic Psychological Monograph, 71, 137-175.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The score test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1, 245-275.
- Chase, H. P., & Martin, H. P. (1970). Undernutrition and child development. New England Journal of Medicine, 282, 933-939.
- Chess, S., & Hassibi, M. (1978). Principles and practice of child psychiatry. New York: Plenum Press.
- Coates, B., Pusser, H. E., & Goldman, I. (1976). The influence of "Sesame Street" and "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" on children's social behavior in the pre-school. Child Development, 47, 138-144.
- Cohen, H. L. (1968). BPLAY--A community support system, phase one. In E. Ribes-Inesta & A. Bandura (Eds.), Analysis of delinquency and aggression (pp. 147-169). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohn, A. H. (1979). An evaluation of three demonstration child abuse and neglect treatment programs. Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 18, 283-291.
- Congdon, C. S. (1958). Self theory and chlorpromazine treatment (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 2654.
- Cook, J. V., & Bowles, R. T. (Eds.). (1980). Child abuse: Commission and Omission. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Covi, L., Lipman, R. S., & Derogatis, L. R. (1973, May). Drugs and group therapy in neurotic depression. Paper presented at the 126th Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Honolulu.
- Cox, F. N., & Campbell, D. (1968). Young children in a new situation with and without their mothers. Child Development, 39, 123-131.
- Craviato, J., DeLicardie, E. R., & Birch, H. G. (1966). Nutrition, growth and neurointegrative development. Pediatrics, 38, 319-372.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Curtis, G. C. (1963). Violence breeds violence--perhaps? American Journal of Psychiatry, 120, 386-387.

- Davis, N. J. (1971). The prostitute: Developing a deviant identity. In J. M. Henslin (Ed.), Studies in the sociology of sex (pp. 297-322). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- DeFrancis, V. (1969). Protecting the child victim of sex crimes committed by adults. (Available from American Humane Association, Children's Division, P. O. Box 1266, Denver, CO 80201)
- Delaney, E. J. (1965). Parental antecedents of social aggression in young children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 26, 1763. (University Microfilm No. 65-08590)
- DeLissovoy, V. (1978). Parent education: White elephant in the classroom? Youth & Society, 9, 315-338.
- Depue, R. A. (Ed.). (1979). The psychobiology of the depressive disorders: Implications for the effects of stress. New York: Academic Press.
- Derogatis, L. R., Lipman, R. S., Covi, L., Rickels, K., & Uhlenhuth, E. (1970). Dimensions of out-patient neurotic pathology: Comparisons of a clinical versus an empirical assessment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 164-171.
- Derogatis, L. R., Lipman, R. S., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E. H., & Covi, L. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): Self-report symptom inventory. Behavioral Science, 19, 1-15.
- Devereux, E. C., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Rodgers, R. R. (1969). Child-rearing in England and the United States: A cross-national comparison. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31, 257-270.
- Dixon, W. J. (1981). BMDP Statistical Software: 1981. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dlugokinski, E. L., & Firestone, I. J. (1974). Other centeredness and susceptibility to charitable appeals: Effects of perceived discipline. Developmental Psychology, 10, 21-28.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. (1950). Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Duncan, G. M., Frazier, S. H., Litin, E. M., Johnson, A. M., & Barron, A. J. (1958). Etiological factors in first-degree murder. Journal of the American Medical Association, 168, 1755-1758.
- Duncan, J. W., & Duncan, G. M. (1971). Murder in the family: A study of some homicidal adolescents. American Journal of Psychiatry, 127, 74-78.

- Dutton, D. G. (1980). Traumatic Bonding. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Earhart, E. M. (1980). Parent education: A lifelong process. Journal of Home Economics, 72, 39-43.
- Easson, W. M., & Steinhilber, R. M. (1961). Murderous aggression by children and adolescents. Archives of General Psychology, 4, 27-35.
- Ebeling, N. B., & Hill, D. A. (Eds.). (1975). Child abuse: Intervention and treatment. Acton, MA: Publishing Sciences Group, Inc.
- Edmunds, G. (1976). The predictive validity of the Buss-Durkee Inventory. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 32, 818-820.
- Edwards, A. L. (1953). The relationship between the judged desirability of a trait and the probability that the trait will be endorsed. Journal of Applied Psychology, 37, 90-93.
- Edwards, A. L. (1954). Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Eisenberg, N. (Ed.). (1982). The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Ellis, A. (1957). Outcome of employing three techniques of psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 13, 344-350.
- Ellis, A. (1973). Humanistic psychotherapy: The rational-emotive approach. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Elmer, E. (1967). Children in jeopardy. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Elmer, E. (1977). A follow-up study of traumatized children. Pediatrics, 59, 237-279.
- Elmer, E., & Gregg, G. L. (1967). Developmental characteristics of abused children. Pediatrics, 40, 596-602.
- Emmerich, W. (1964). Continuity and stability in early social development. Child Development, 35, 311-332.
- Emmerich, W. (1966). Continuity and stability in early social development: II. Teacher's ratings. Child Development, 37, 17-27.
- Erikson, E. H. (1950). Childhood and society. New York: Norton.
- Eron, L. D. (1961). Progress report: Psychosocial development of aggressive behavior (Project M1726 USPHS).
- Eron, L. D., & Walder, L. O. (1961). Test burning: II. American Psychologist, 16, 273-294.

- Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Lefkowitz, M. M. (1971). Learning of aggression in children. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., Toigo, R., & Lefkowitz, M. M. (1963). Social class, parental punishment for aggression, and child aggression. Child Development, 34, 849-867.
- Esterbrooks, M. A., & Lamb, M. E. (1970). The relationship between quality of infant-mother attachment and infant peer competence in initial encounters with peers. Child Development, 50, 380-387.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1963). Manual for the Eysenck Personality Inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Ferracuti, F. (1972). Incest between father and daughters. In H. Resnick & M. Wolfgang (Eds.), Sexual behaviors: Social, clinical, and legal aspects. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1979). Empathy training: A field study in affective education. In S. Feshbach & A. Fraczek (Eds.), Aggression and behavior change: Biological and social processes (pp. 234-249). New York: Praeger.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1982). Sex differences in empathy and social behavior in children. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 315-338). New York: Academic Press.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (1969). The relationship between empathy and aggression in two age groups. Developmental Psychology, 1, 102-107.
- Feshbach, S. (1970). Aggression. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology (3rd ed., pp. 159-259). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Finkelhor, D. (1979). Sexually victimized children. New York: The Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1980). Risk factors in the sexual victimization of children. Child Abuse and Neglect, 4, 265-273.
- Finney, J. C. (1963). Maternal influences on anal or compulsive character in children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 103, 351-367.
- Fiske, D. W. (1971). Measuring the concepts of personality. Chicago: Aldine.
- Fitch, M. J., Cadol, R. V., Goldson, E., Wendell, T., Swartz, D., & Jackson, E. (1976). Cognitive development of abused and failure-to-thrive children. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 1, 32-37.
- Fitts, W. H. (1965). Manual: Tennessee (Department of Mental Health) Self Concept Scale. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests.

- Flanzraich, M., & Steiner, G. L. (1980). Therapeutic interventions that foster ego development in abused/neglected children. In G. J. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 569-574). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fontana, V. J. (1971, October). Which parents abuse children? Medical Insight, pp. 18-21.
- Fontana, V. J. (1973). Somewhere a child is crying. New York: Macmillan.
- Fontana, V. J. (1976). Somewhere a child is crying: Maltreatment--causes and prevention. New York: New American Library.
- Fraiberg, S. (1969). Libinal Object Constancy and Mental Representation. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 24, 9-47.
- Frankl, V. (1960). The doctor and the soul. New York: Knopf.
- Frankl, V. (1963). Man's search for meaning. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Freud, A. (1946). The ego and the mechanisms of defense. New York: International Universities Press.
- Friedlander, K. (1949). Neurosis and home background. In A. Freud (Ed.), The psychoanalytic study of the child. New York: International Universities Press.
- Friedman, S. B., & Morse, C. W. (1974). Child abuse: A five-year follow-up of early case finding in the emergency department. Pediatrics, 54, 404-410.
- Friedrich, L. K., & Stein, A. H. (1973). Aggressive and pro-social television programs and the nature of preschool children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 38(4, Serial No. 151).
- Friedrich, W. N., & Boriskin, J. A. (1976). The role of the child in abuse: A review of the literature. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 46, 580-590.
- Frodi, A. M., & Lamb, M. E. (1980). Infants at risk for child abuse. Infant Mental Health Journal, 1, 240-247.
- Gaensbauer, T. J., & Sands, K. (1979). Distorted affective communications in abused infants and their potential impact on caretakers. Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 18, 236-250.
- Gagnon, J. (1965). Female child victims of sex offenses. Social Problems, 13, 176-192.
- Gaines, R., Sandgrund, A., Green, A. H., & Power, E. (1978). Etiological factors in child maltreatment: A multivariate study of abusing, neglecting, and normal mothers. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 531-540.

- Garbarino, J. (1978). The elusive "crime" of emotional abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 2, 89-100.
- Garbarino, J. (1979, Summer). What is emotional abuse? Caring, 5(2), 1-2. (Available from National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, 111 E. Wacker Drive, Suite 510, Chicago, IL 60601)
- Garbarino, J. (1980). What kind of society permits child abuse? Infant Mental Health Journal, 1, 270-281.
- Garbarino, J. (1981). An ecological approach to child maltreatment. In L. J. Pelton (Ed.), The social context of child abuse and neglect. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Garber, J., Miller, W. R., & Seaman, S. F. (1979). Learned helplessness, stress, and the depressive disorders. In R. A. Depue (Ed.), The psychobiology of the depressive disorders: Implications for the effects of stress (pp. 335-363). New York: Academic Press.
- Gardner, R. C. (1973). Ethnic stereotypes: The traditional approach, a new look. The Canadian Psychologist, 14, 133-148.
- Geen, R., & George, R. (1969). Relationship of manifest aggressiveness to aggressive word associations. Psychological Reports, 25, 711-714.
- Gelles, R. J. (1973). Child abuse as psychopathology: A sociological critique and reformulation. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 43, 611-621.
- Gelles, R. J. (1974). The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, R. J. (1976). Demythologizing child abuse. The Family Coordinator, 25, 135-141.
- Gelles, R. J. (1978). Violence towards children in the United States. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 580-592.
- Gelles, R. J. (1980). A profile of violence towards children in the United States. In G. Gerbner, C. J. Ross, & E. Zigler (Eds.), Child abuse: An agenda for action (pp. 82-105). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1975). Family experience and public support of the death penalty. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45, 596-613.
- General Laws of Rhode Island. (1977; Supplement, 1983). Rhode Island Child Abuse and Neglect Law. Vol. 6A, Title 40, Chapter 11.
- Gertsen, J. C., Langner, T. S., Eisenberg, J. G., Simcha-Fagan, O., & McCarthy, E. D. (1976). Stability and change in types of behavior disturbance of children and adolescents. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 4, 111-127.

- Giarretto, H. (1976). Humanistic treatment of father-daughter incest. In R. E. Helfer & C. H. Kempe (Eds.), Child abuse and neglect: The family and the community (pp. 143-158). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Gil, D. G. (1970). Violence against children. Physical child abuse in the United States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gil, D. G. (1975). Unraveling child abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45, 346-358.
- Gil, D. G. (1981). The United States versus child abuse. In L. A. Pelton (Ed.), The social context of child abuse and neglect. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Gividen, G. M. (1959). Stress in airborne training as related to the self-concept, motivation and biographical factors. Unpublished masters thesis, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goldfarb, W. (1945). Effects of psychological deprivation in infancy and subsequent stimulation. American Journal of Psychiatry, 102, 18-33.
- Goldstein, J., Freud, A., & Solnit, A. J. (1973). Beyond the best interests of the child. New York: The Free Press.
- Goldstein, J., Freud, A., & Solnit, A. J. (1979). Before the best interests of the child. New York: The Free Press.
- Golin, S., Sweeney, P. D., & Shaeffer, D. E. (1981). The causality of causal attributions in depression: A cross-lagged panel correlational analysis. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90, 14-22.
- Goodenough, F. L. (1931). Anger in young children. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gordon, J., & Smith, E. (1965). Children's aggression, parental attitudes and the effects of an affiliation-arousing story. Journal of Personal Social Psychology, 1, 654-659.
- Gordon, T. (1977). Parent effectiveness training: A preventive program and its delivery system. In G. W. Albee & J. M. Joffe (Eds.), Primary prevention of psychopathology: Vol. 1. The issues (pp. 175-186). Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Graham, F., Charwat, W., Honig, A., & Welty, P. (1951). Aggression as a function of the attack and the attacker. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 46, 512-520.
- Graham, G. G. (1967). Effect of infantile malnutrition on growth. Federal Proceedings, 26, 139-143.
- Gray, D. (1973, January). Turning out: A study of teenage prostitution. Urban Life and Culture, pp. 401-425.

- Gray, J. D., Cutler, C. A., Dean, J. G., & Kempe, C. H. (1977). Prediction and prevention of child abuse and neglect. Child Abuse and Neglect, 1, 45-58.
- Gray, J., & Kempe, R. (1976). The abused child at time of injury. In H. P. Martin (Ed.), The abused child (pp. 57-65). Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Green, A. H. (1967). Self-mutilation in schizophrenic children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 17, 234-244.
- Green, A. H. (1968). Self-destructive behavior in physically abused schizophrenic children. Archives of Genetic Psychiatry, 19, 171-179.
- Green, A. H. (1976). A psychodynamic approach to the study and treatment of child-abusing parents. American Journal of Child Psychiatry, 15, 414-429.
- Green, A. H. (1978a). Psychopathology of abused children. Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 17, 92-103.
- Green, A. H. (1978b). Self-destructive behavior in battered children. American Journal of Psychiatry, 135, 579-582.
- Green, A. H., Gaines, R. W., & Sandgrund, A. (1974). Child abuse: Pathological syndrome of family interaction. American Journal of Psychiatry, 131, 882-886.
- Green, A. H., Sandgrund, A., & Gaines, R. W. (1974, May). Psychological sequelae of child abuse and neglect. Paper presented at the 127th annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Detroit, MI.
- Greenwald, H. (1978). The call girl. San Diego: Decision Books.
- Gregg, G. S., & Elmer, E. (1969). Infant injuries: Accident or abuse. Pediatrics, 44, 434-439.
- Grigg, A. E. (1959). Childhood experience with parental attitudes: A test of Roe's hypothesis. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 6, 153-156.
- Grollman, E. A. (1971). Suicide: Prevention, intervention, postvention. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gruber, K. J., & Jones, R. J. (1983). Identifying determinants of risk of sexual victimization of youth: A multivariate approach. Child Abuse and Neglect, 7, 17-24.
- Grusec, J. A. (1982). The socialization of altruism. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 139-166). New York: Academic Press.
- Haan, N. (1977). Coping and defending: Processes of self-environment organization. New York: Academic Press.

- Haan, N., Smith, M. B., & Block, J. (1968). Moral reasoning of young adults: Political-social behavior, family background, & personality correlates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 183-201.
- Hall, J. D. (1964). An investigation of acquiescence response set, extraversion, and locus of control as related to neuroticism and maladjustment (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers). Dissertation Abstracts International, 65, 6060.
- Harlow, H. F. (1971). The affectional systems. In H. F. Harlow, J. L. McGaugh, & R. F. Thompson (Eds.), Psychology (pp. 42-71). San Francisco: Albion Press.
- Harlow, H. F., & Harlow, M. K. (1965). The affectional systems. In A. M. Schrier, H. F. Harlow, & F. Stollnitz (Eds.), Behavior of nonhuman primates (Vol. 2, pp. 287-334). New York: Academic Press.
- Harlow, H. F., Harlow, M. K., & Suomi, S. J. (1971). From thought to therapy: Lessons from a primate laboratory. American Scientist, 59, 538-549.
- Harlow, H. F., & Suomi, S. J. (1970). Nature of love--simplified. American Psychologist, 25, 161-168.
- Harper, L. V. (1975). The scope of offspring effects: From caregiver to culture. Psychological Bulletin, 82, 784-801.
- Harris, M. B. (1971). Models, norms and sharing. Psychological Reports, 29, 147-153.
- Hatfield, J. S., Ferguson, P. E., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. (1967). Mother-child interaction and the socialization process. Child Development, 38, 365-414.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1951). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (rev. manual). New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Havener, P. H. (1961). Distortions in the perception of self and others by persons using paranoid defenses (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 61, 332.
- Healy, W., & Bronner, A. F. (1936). New light on delinquency and its treatment. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Heathers, G. (1953). Emotional dependence and independence in a physical threat situation. Child Development, 24, 169-179.
- Heathers, G. (1955). Emotional dependence and independence in nursery school play. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 87, 37-57.
- Heims, L. W., & Kaufman, I. (1963). Variations on a theme of incest. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 33, 311-321.

- Heinicke, C. (1973). Parental deprivation in early childhood. In J. Scott & E. Senay (Eds.), Separation and depression: Clinical and research aspects (pp. 141-160). Washington, D. C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Heinicke, C. M., & Westheimer, I. (1965). Brief separations. New York: International Universities Press.
- Helfer, R. E. (1978). Childhood comes first: A crash course in childhood for adults. East Lansing, MI: Privately published.
- Helfer, R. E. (1980). Retraining and relearning. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 391-400). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Helfer, R. E., & Kempe, C. H. (Eds.). (1974). The battered child (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Helmreich, R. L., & Collins, B. E. (1967). Situational determinants of affiliative preference under stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 79-85.
- Henderson, D. J. (1972). Incest: A synthesis of data. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 17, 299-313.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Frankie, G. (1967). Effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 119-125.
- Hewitt, L. E., & Jenkins, R. L. (1946). Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: The dynamics of their origin. Chicago: State of Illinois.
- Heyman, S. (1977). Dogmatism, hostility, aggression, and gender roles. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 694-698.
- Hill, K. T., & Sarason, S. B. (1966). A further longitudinal study of the relation of test anxiety and defensiveness to test and school performance over the elementary school years. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 31, 1-76.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1960). Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child. Child Development, 31, 129-143.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1970a). Moral development. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology (Vol. 3, 3rd ed., pp. 261-360). New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1970b). Conscience, personality, and socialization techniques. Human Development, 13, 90-126.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 937-943.

- Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Moral internalization: Current theory and research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 10, pp. 86-135). New York: Academic Press.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1979). Development of moral thought, feeling, and behavior. American Psychologist, 34, 958-966.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 281-313). New York: Academic Press.
- Hoffman, M. L., & Saltzstein, H. D. (1967). Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 45-57.
- Hollenberg, E. H., & Sperry, M. S. (1951). Some antecedents of aggression and effects of frustration in doll play. Personality, 1, 32-43.
- Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11, 213-218.
- Huffman, T. B. (1964). Relationships between the self concept and three psychopathological types. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Nashville.
- Hurley, J. R. (1959). Maternal attitudes and children's intelligence. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 15, 291-292.
- Hurley, J. R. (1962). Achievement pressure: An attitude correlate of college course grades. Psychological Reports, 10, 695-702.
- Hurley, J. R. (1965). Parental acceptance-rejection and children's intelligence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 11, 19-31.
- Hurley, J. R. (1967). Parental malevolence and children's intelligence. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31, 199-204.
- Hurley, J. R., & Hohn, R. L. (1971). Shifts in childrearing attitudes linked with parenthood and occupation. Developmental Psychology, 4, 324-328.
- Hurley, J. R., & Laffey, J. J. (1957). Influence of a conventional child psychology course upon attitudes toward children. Collected Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, 42, 299-306.
- Izard, C. E. (1972). Patterns of emotions: A new analysis of anxiety and depression. New York: Academic Press.
- Jackman, N. R., O'Toole, R., & Geis, G. (1967). The self-image of the prostitute. In J. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), Sexual Deviance (pp. 133-146). New York: Harper and Row.
- Jackson, D. N. (1967). Personality Research Form Manual. Goshen, NY: Research Psychologists Press, Inc.

- Jackson, D. N. (1976). Jackson Personality Inventory Manual. Goshen, NY: Research Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Jackson, D. N., & Guthrie, G. M. (1967). The convergent and discriminant validation of Personality Research Form scores. University of Western Ontario Research Bulletin, London, Ontario.
- Jackson, D. N., & Guthrie, G. M. (1968). Multitrait-multimethod evaluation of the Personality Research Form. Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 177-178.
- Jackson, D. N., & Lay, C. (1967). Homogeneous dimensions of personality scale content. University of Western Ontario Research Bulletin, London, Ontario.
- Jacobs, D., Garcia, C. R., Rickels, D., & Preucel, R. W. (1974). A prospective study on the psychological effects of therapeutic abortion. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 15, 423-434.
- Jacobson, S., Fasman, J., & DiMascio, A. (1975). Deprivation in the childhood of depressed women. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 160, 5-8.
- James, J. (1971). A formal analysis of prostitution--final report. State of Washington, Department of Social and Health Services.
- James, J. (1980). Self-destructive behavior and adaptive strategies in female prostitutes. In N. L. Farberow (Ed.), The many faces of suicide (pp. 341-359). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1798-1809.
- Jenkins, R. L., & Boyer, A. (1967). Types of delinquent behavior and background factors. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 14, 65-76.
- Jenkins, R. L., & Boyer, A. (1970). Effects of inadequate mothering and inadequate fathering on children. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 16, 72-78.
- Johnson, B., & Morse, H. (1968). The battered child: A study of children with inflicted injuries. Denver: Denver Department of Welfare.
- Jorgensen, S. R. (1977). Societal class heterogamy, status striving, and perception of marital conflict: A partial replication and revision of Pearlin's contingency hypothesis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 653-689.
- Justice, B., & Justice, R. (1976). The abusing family. New York: Human Sciences Press.

- Justice, B., & Justice, R. (1979). The broken taboo: Sex in the family. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Kagan, J. (1958). Socialization of aggression and the perception of parents in fantasy. Child Development, 29, 311-320.
- Kagan, J., & Moss, H. A. (1962). Birth to maturity: A study in psychological development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1979). Anxiety, self-derogation, and deviant behavior. In W. E. Fann, I. Karacan, A. D. Porkorny, & R. L. Williams (Eds.), Phenomenology and treatment of anxiety (pp. 299-310). New York: SP Medical & Scientific Books.
- Kaufman, I., Peck, A. L., & Tagiuri, C. K. (1954). The family constellation and overt incestuous relations between father and daughter. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 24, 266-277.
- Kayser, B. D., & Summers, G. F. (1973). The adequacy of student reports of parental SES characteristics. Sociological Methods and Research, 1, 303-315.
- Kempe, C. H. (1978). Sexual abuse, another hidden pediatric problem: The 1977 C. Andersen Aldrich Lecture. Pediatrics, 62, 382-389.
- Kempe, C. H. (1980). Incest and other forms of sexual abuse. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 198-214). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kempe, C. H., & Helfer, R. E. (Eds.). (1968). The battered child (1st ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kempe, C. H., & Helfer, R. E. (Eds.). (1972). Helping the battered child and his family. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Kempe, C. H., & Helfer, R. E. (Eds.). (1980). The battered child (3rd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kempe, R. S., & Kempe, C. H. (1978). Child abuse. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kempe, C. H., Silverman, F. N., Steele, B. F., Droegemueller, W., & Silver, H. K. (1962). The battered-child syndrome. Journal of the American Medical Association, 181, 17-24.
- Kennell, J., Voos, D., & Klaus, M. (1976). Parent-infant bonding. In R. E. Helfer & C. H. Kempe (Eds.), Child abuse and neglect: The family and the community (pp. 25-53). Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Kent, J. T. (1976). A follow-up study of abused children. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 1, 25-31.
- Klaus, M. H., & Kennell, J. H. (1970). Mothers separated from their newborn infants. Pediatric Clinic of North America, 17, 1015-1037.

- Knott, P. (1970). A further methodological study of the measurement of interpersonal aggression. Psychological Reports, 26, 807-809.
- Kohlberg, L. (1963). Moral development and identification. In H. W. Stevenson (Ed.), Child psychology. 62nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 277-333). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1964). Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. I (pp. 383-433). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Korbin, J. E. (1980). The cross-cultural context of child abuse and neglect. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 21-35). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kulik, J. A., Stein, K. B., & Sarbin, T. R. (1968). Dimensions and patterns of adolescent antisocial behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 375-382.
- Kusyszyn, I. (1968). Comparison of judgmental methods with endorsements in the assessment of personality traits. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 227-233. (Abstract)
- Kusyszyn, I., & Jackson, D. N. (1967). A multimethod factor-analytic appraisal of endorsement and judgment methods in personality assessment. American Psychologist, 22, 595.
- Landis, J. T. (1957). Values and limitations of family research using student subjects. Marriage and Family Living, 19, 100-105.
- Lange, A. J., & Jakubowski, P. (1976). Responsible assertive behavior: Cognitive/behavioral procedures for trainers. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Lasko, J. R. (1952). Parent-child relationships: Report from the Fels Research Institute. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 22, 300-304.
- Lazarus, A. (1968). Learning theory and the treatment of depression. Behavior Research & Therapy, 6, 83-89.
- Lefebber, J. (1965). The delinquent's self-concept (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California). Dissertation Abstracts International, 65, 2052.
- Lefkowitz, M. M., Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Heusmann, L. R. (1977). Growing up to be violent: A longitudinal study of the development of aggression. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc.
- Leibowitz, G. (1968). Comparison of self-report and behavioral techniques of assessing aggression. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 21-25.

- Lesser, G. S. (1952). Maternal attitudes and practices and the aggressive behavior of children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Levin, H. (1958). Permissive childrearing and adult role behavior. In D. E. Dulony, R. L. DeValois, D. C. Beardsley, & M. R. Winterbottom (Eds.), Contributions to modern psychology (pp. 307-312). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levin, H., & Sears, R. R. (1956). Identification with parents as a determinant of doll play aggression. Child Development, 27, 135-153.
- Levy, D. M. (1943). Maternal overprotection. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lewis, D. O., Shanok, S. S., Pincus, J. H., & Glaser, G. H. (1979). Violent juvenile delinquents: Psychiatric, neurological, psychological, and abuse factors. Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 18, 307-319.
- Lewis, H. (1954). Deprived children. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lieberman, A. F. (1977). Preschooler's competence with a peer: Relations with attachment and peer experience. Child Development, 48, 1277-1287.
- Lindquist, E. F. (1953). Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Lipman, R. S., Cole, J. O., Park, L. C., & Rickels, K. (1965). Sensitivity of symptom and non-symptom-focused criteria of outpatient drug efficacy. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 24-27.
- Lipman, R. S., Covi, L., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E. H., & Lazar, B. A. (1968). Selected measures of change in outpatient drug evaluation. In Psychopharmacology: A review of progress 1957-1959. (Public Health Service Publication No. 1836). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Lipman, R. S., Rickels, K., Covi, L., Derogatis, L. R., & Uhlenhuth, E. H. (1969). Factors of symptom distress: Doctor ratings of anxious neurotic outpatients. Archives of General Psychiatry, 21, 328-338.
- Lips, H. M., & Colwill, N. L. (1978). The psychology of sex differences. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lipsett, L. P. (1958). A self-concept scale for children and its relationship to the Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale. Child Development, 29, 463-472.
- Lord, E., & Weisfeld, D. (1974). The abused child. In A. R. Roberts (Ed.), Childhood deprivation (pp. 64-83). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

- Lorr, M., & Jenkins, R. L. (1953). Three factors in parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 17, 306-308.
- Lorr, M., & More, W. W. (1980). Four dimensions of assertiveness. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 2, 127-138.
- Lorr, M., & Youniss, R. P. (1973). An inventory of interpersonal style. Journal of Personality Assessment, 37, 165-173.
- Lothstein, L. M., & Jones, P. (1978). Discriminating violent individuals by means of various psychological tests. Journal of Personality Assessment, 42, 237-243.
- Lott, B. (1981). Becoming a woman: The socialization of gender. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Lukianowicz, N. (1972). Incest: I. Paternal incest: II. Other types of incest. British Journal of Psychiatry, 120, 301-313.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Masters, J. C. (1970). Attachment and dependency. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Charmichael's manual of child psychology (3rd ed., pp. 73-157). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Maddi, S. R. (1976). Personality Theories: A comparative analysis (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- Mahoney, M. J., & Arnkoff, D. (1978). Cognitive and self-control therapies. In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis (2nd ed., pp. 689-722). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mahler, M. (1978). The psychological birth of the human infant. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). The psychological birth of the infant: Symbiosis and individuation. New York: Basic Books.
- Malmquist, C. P. (1971). Depressions in childhood and adolescence. New England Journal of Medicine, 284, 887-893, 955-961.
- Marshall, H. R. (1961). Relations between home experiences and children's use of language in play interactions with peers. Psychological Monographs, 75(Whole No. 509).
- Marshall, H. R., & McCandless, B. R. (1957). Relationships between dependence on adults and social acceptance. Child Development, 28, 413-425.
- Martin, H. P. (1972). The child and his development. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), Helping the battered child and his family (pp. 93-114). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
- Martin, H. P. (Ed.). (1976). The abused child: An interdisciplinary approach to developmental issues and treatment. Cambridge: Ballinger.

- Martin, H. P. (1978). A child-oriented approach to prevention of abuse. In A. M. Franklin (Ed.), Child abuse: Prediction, prevention, and follow-up. New York: Churchill Livingstone Publishers.
- Martin, H. P. (1980). The consequences of being abused and neglected: How the child fares. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 347-365). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, H. P., & Beezley, P. (1977). Behavioral observations of abused children. Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology, 19, 373-387.
- Martin, H. P., Beezley, P., Conway, E. F., & Kempe, C. H. (1974). The development of abused children--Part I: A review of the literature: Part II: Physical neurologic, and intellectual outcomes. Advanced Pediatrics, 21, 25-73.
- Martin, H. P., & Rodeheffer, M. A. (1976). The psychological impact of abuse on children. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 1, 12-16.
- Maslow, A. H. (1941). Deprivation, threat and frustration. Psychological Review, 48, 364-366.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). Conflict, frustration and the theory of threat. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 38, 81-86.
- Matas, L., Arend, R. A., & Sroufe, L. A. (1978). Continuity of adaptation in the second year: The relationship between quality of attachment and later competence. Child Development, 49, 547-556.
- May, R. (1977). The meaning of anxiety (rev. ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- McCandless, B. R., Balsbaugh, C., & Bennett, H. L. (1958). Preschool-age socialization and maternal control techniques. American Psychologist, 13, 320. (Abstract)
- McCandless, B. R., Belous, C. B., & Bennett, H. L. (1961). Peer popularity and dependence on adults in preschool age socialization. Child Development, 32, 511-518.
- McCord, J. (1983). A forty year perspective on effects of child abuse and neglect. Child Abuse & Neglect, 7, 266-270.
- McCord, W., McCord, J., & Howard, A. (1961). Familial correlates of aggression in nondelinquent male children. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62, 79-93.
- McCord, W., McCord, J., & Verden, P. (1962). Familial and behavioral correlates of dependency in male children. Child Development, 33, 313-326.
- McQuiston, M., & Kempe, R. S. (1980). Treatment of the child. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 379-390). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Medinnus, G. R. (1967). Readings in the psychology of parent-child relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Medvene, A. M. (1973). Early parent-child interactions of educational-vocational and emotional-social clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 94-96.
- Megargee, E. I. The California psychological inventory handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Melnick, B., & Hurley, J. R. (1969). Distinctive personality attributes of child-abusing mothers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 746-749.
- Merrill, E. J. (1962). Physical abuse of children--an agency study. In V. DeFrancis (Ed.), Protecting the battered child (pp. 1-15). Denver: American Humane Association.
- Michel, W. (1970). Sex-typing and socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Charmichael's manual child psychology (3rd ed., pp. 3-72). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Miller, D. R., & Swanson, G. E. (1960). Inner conflict and defense. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Mitchell, J. V. (1959). Goal-setting behavior as a function of self-acceptance, over- and underachievement, and related personality variables. Journal of Educational Psychology, 50, 93-104.
- Monckelberg, F. (1968). The effect of early marasmic malnutrition on subsequent physical and psychological development. In N. S. Scrimshal & J. E. Gordon (Eds.), Malnutrition, learning and behavior (pp. 269-277). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Money, J., & Needleman, A. (1980). Impaired mother-infant pair bonding in the syndrome of abuse dwarfism: Possible prenatal, perinatal, and neonatal antecedents. In G. J. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 228-246). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Moore, S., & Updegraff, R. (1964). Sociometric status of preschool children related to age, sex, nurturance-giving, and dependency. Child Development, 35, 519-524.
- Morris, M. G., & Gould, R. W. (1963). Role reversal: A necessary concept in dealing with the "battered child syndrome." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 33, 298-299.
- Morse, C. W., Sahler, O. J., & Friedman, S. B. (1970). A three-year follow-up study of abused and neglected children. American Journal of Diseases of Children, 120, 439-446.
- Mowrer, O. H. (1950). Learning theory and personality dynamics. New York: Ronald.

- Muir, M. R. (1976). Psychological and behavioral characteristics of abused children. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 1, 16-19.
- Mulligan, M. (1977). An investigation of factors associated with violent modes of conflict resolution in the family. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Rhode Island, Kingston.
- Murphy, L. B. (1962). The widening world of childhood. New York: Basic Books.
- Murphy, L. B., & Moriarty, A. E. (1976). Vulnerability, coping, & growth: From infancy to adolescence. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). Explorations in personality. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nakashima, I. I., & Zakus, G. E. (1977). Incest: Review and clinical experience. Pediatrics, 60, 696-701.
- Newberger, E. H., & Bourne, R. (1978). The medicalization and legalization of child abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 593-607.
- Newell, H. W. (1934). Psychodynamics of maternal rejection. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 4, 387-401.
- Niemi, R. G. (1974). How family members perceive each other. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Norman, W. T. (1967). On estimating psychological relationships: Social desirability and self report. Psychological Bulletin, 67, 273-293.
- Offer, D. (1969). The psychological world of the teen-ager: A study of normal adolescent boys. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Offer, D., Marohn, R. C., & Ostrov, E. (1979). The Psychological World of the Juvenile Delinquent. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Offer, D., & Offer, J. B. (1975). From teenage to young manhood: A psychological study. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Olweus, D. (1975). Development of a multi-faceted aggression inventory for boys. Reports from the Institute of Psychology, 6, University of Bergen, Norway.
- Olweus, D. (1978). Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Olweus, D. (1979). Stability of aggressive reaction patterns in males: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 852-875.

- Parke, R. D. (1972). Some effects of punishment on children's behavior. The young child: Review of research Vol. II. (Available from National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1834 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20009.)
- Parloff, M. B., Kelman, H. C., & Frank, J. D. (1954). Comfort, effectiveness and self-awareness as criteria of improvement in psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychiatry, 5, 343-351.
- Patterson, G. R. (1979). Treatment for children with conduct problems: A review of outcome studies. In S. Feshbach & A. Fraczek (Eds.), Aggression and behavior change (pp. 83-132). New York: Praeger.
- Peck, R. F. (1958). Family patterns correlated with adolescent personality structure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 57, 347-350.
- Pemberton, D. A., & Benady, D. R. (1973). Consciously rejected children. British Journal of Psychiatry, 123, 575-578.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (1980, July). Helplessness and attributional style in depression. Paper delivered at the Heidelberg Symposium on the Development of Metacognition, Heidelberg, OH.
- Peterson, C., Semmel, A., von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. I., & Seligman, M. E. (1982). The Attributional Style Questionnaire. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6, 287-299.
- Peterson, D. R. (1961). Behavior problems of middle childhood. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25, 205-209.
- Petzel, T., & Michaels, E. (1973). Perception of violence as a function of levels of hostility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 35-36.
- Piaget, J. (1952). The language and thought of the child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Piaget, J. (1954). The construction of reality in the child. New York: Basic Books.
- Piety, K. R. (1958). The role of defense in reporting on the self concept (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 1869.
- Pike, V. (1976). Permanent planning for foster children: The Oregon project. Children Today, 5(6), 22-25, 41.
- Pinneau, S. R. (1955). The infantile disorders of hospitalism and anaclitic depression. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 429-452.
- Pitkanen-Pulkkinen, L. (1979). Self-control as a prerequisite for constructive behavior. In S. Feshbach & A. Fraczek (Eds.), Aggression and behavior change (pp. 250-270). New York: Praeger.

- Polansky, N. A., Borgman, R. D., & DeSaix, C. (1972). Roots of futility. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.
- Polansky, N. A., Chalmers, M. A., Battenwieser, E., & Williams, D. P. (1981). Damaged parents: An anatomy of child neglect. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Poznanski, E., & Zrull, J. P. (1970). Child depression: Clinical characteristics of overtly depressed children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 23, 8-15.
- Prugh, D. C., & Harlow, R. G. (1962). Masked deprivation in infants and young children. In Deprivation of maternal care: A reassessment of its effects (Public Health Papers, No. 14, pp. 9-30). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Prusoff, B. A., & Kelerman, G. L. (1974). Differentiating depressed from anxious neurotic outpatients: Use of discriminant function for separation of neurotic affective states. Archives of General Psychiatry, 30, 302-309.
- Radbill, S. X. (1980). Children in a world of violence: A history of child abuse. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 3-20). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Radke, M. J. (1946). The relation of parental authority to children's behavior and attitudes. University of Minnesota Institute of Child Welfare Monograph, 22.
- Raps, C. S., Peterson, C., Jonas, M., & Seligman, M. E. (1982). Patient behavior in hospitals: Helplessness, reactance, or both? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 1036-1041.
- Raps, C. S., Peterson, C., Reinhard, K. E., Abramson, L. Y., & Seligman, M. E. (1982). Attributional style among depressed patients. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 9, 102-108.
- Rascovsky, M. W., & Rascovsky, A. (1950). On consummated incest. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 31, 42-47.
- Raskin, A., Schutterbrandt, J. G., Reatig, N., & McKeon, J. J. (1970). Differential response to chlorpromazine, imipramine, and placebo among subgroups of hospitalized depressed patients. Archives of General Psychiatry, 23, 164-173.
- Reese, H. W. (1961). Relationships between self-acceptance and sociometric choices. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62, 472-474.
- Reidy, T. J. (1977). The aggressive characteristics of abused and neglected children. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 1140-1145.

- Reidy, T. J., Anderegg, T. R., Tracy, R. J., & Cotler, S. (1980). Abused and neglected children: The cognitive, social and behavioral correlates. In G. J. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 284-290). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Renson, G., Adams, J., & Tinkleberg, J. (1978). Buss-Durkee assessment and validation with violent versus nonviolent chronic alcohol abusers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 360-361.
- Rentz, R. R., & White, W. F. (1967). Congruence of the dimensions of self-as-object and self-as-process. The Journal of Psychology, 67, 277-285.
- Reykowski, J. (1979). Intrinsic motivation and intrinsic inhibition of aggressive behavior. In S. Feshbach & A. Fraczek (Eds.), Aggression and behavior change: Biological and social processes (pp. 158-182). New York: Praeger.
- Rheingold, H. L. (1969). The effect of a strange environment on the behavior of infants. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), Determinants of infant behavior (Vol. 4, pp. 137-166). London: Methuen.
- Rheingold, H. L., & Eckerman, C. O. (1969). The infant's free entry into a new environment. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 8, 271-283.
- Rice, M. E., & Grusec, J. E. (1975). Saying and doing: Effects on observer performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 584-593.
- Rich, A. R., & Schroeder, A. E. (1976). Research issues in assertiveness training. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 1081-1096.
- Rickels, K., Lipman, R. S., Garcia, C. R., Covi, L., & Fisher, E. (1972). Evaluating clinical improvement in anxious outpatients: A comparison of normal and treated neurotic patients. American Journal of Psychiatry, 128, 119-123.
- Rickels, K., Lipman, R. S., Park, L. C., Covi, L., Uhlenhuth, E. H., & Mock, J. E. (1971). Drug, doctor warmth and clinic setting in the symptomatic response to minor tranquilizers. Psychopharmacologia, 20, 128-152.
- Robertson, J. (1952). A two-year-old goes to hospital [Film]. New York: New York University Film Library.
- Robertson, J. (1953). A guide to the film "A two-year-old goes to hospital." London: Tavistock Child Development Research Unit.
- Robertson, J., & Robertson, J. (1971). Young children in brief separation: A fresh look. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 26, 264-315.

- Roe, A. (1957). Early determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 4, 212-217.
- Roe, A., & Siegelman, M. (1963). A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 34, 355-369.
- Roff, M. A. (1949). A factorial study of the Fels parent behavior scales. Child Development, 20, 29-44.
- Rohner, R. P. (1975). They love me, they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection. New Haven: Human Relations Area File Press.
- Rolston, R. (1971). The effect of prior physical abuse on the expression of overt and fantasy aggressive behavior in children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 171, 2453B-3086B. (University Microfilms No. 71-29, 389).
- Rorer, L. G. (1965). The great response style debate. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 129-156.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenthal, M. K. (1967a). The generalization of dependency behavior from mother to stranger. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 8, 117-133.
- Rosenthal, M. K. (1967b). The effect of a novel situation and anxiety on two groups of dependency behavior. British Journal of Psychology, 58, 357-364.
- Rosenthal, M. J., Ni, E., Finkelstein, M., & Berkwits, G. K. (1962). Father-child relationships and children's problems. Archives of General Psychiatry, 7, 360-373.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1944). An outline of frustration theory. In J. Hunt (Ed.), Personality and the behavior disorders (Vol. 1). New York: Ronald Press.
- Ross Laboratories. (1970). Iron nutrition in infancy. 62nd Ross Conference in Pediatric Research. Columbus: Author.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1, Whole No. 609).
- Roy, M. (1977). Battered women: A psychosociological study of domestic violence. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Rubenstein, J. (1967). Maternal attentiveness and subsequent exploratory behavior in the infant. Child Development, 38, 1089-1100.
- Rushton, J. P. (1975). Generosity in children: Immediate and long term effects of modeling, preaching, and moral judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 459-466.

- Rushton, J. P. (1976). Socialization and the altruistic behavior of children. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 898-913.
- Rushton, J. P. (1982). Social learning theory and the development of prosocial behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 77-105). New York: Academic Press.
- Rutter, M. (1972). Maternal deprivation reconsidered. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 16, 241-252.
- Sanford, R. N. (1955). The dynamics of identification. Psychological Review, 62, 106-118.
- Sarles, R. M. (1975). Incest: Symposium on behavioral pediatrics. Pediatric Clinic of North America, 22, 633-642.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1961). Converging conceptual models for maternal behavior and for child behavior. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior (pp. 124-146). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Schaefer, E. S., & Bayley, N. (1963). Maternal behavior, child behavior, and their intercorrelations from infancy through adolescence. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 28 (3).
- Schaefer, E. S., & Bell, R. Q. (1957). Patterns of attitudes toward child rearing and the family. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54, 391-395.
- Schaefer, E. S., Bell, R. Q., & Bayley, N. (1959). Development of a maternal behavior research instrument. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 95, 83-104.
- Schaefer, E. S., Bell, R. Q., & Bayley, N. (1960). Consistency of maternal behavior from infancy to preadolescence. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61, 1-6.
- Schaffer, H. R. (1958). Objective observations of personality development in early infancy. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 31, 174-183.
- Schaffer, H. R., & Callender, W. M. (1959). Psychological effects of hospitalization in infancy. Pediatrics, 24, 528-539.
- Schaffer, H. R., & Emerson, P. E. (1964). The development of social attachments in infancy. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 29(3, Serial No. 94).
- Schechner, R. (1972). Incest and culture: A reflection on Claude Levi-Strauss. Psychoanalytic Review, 58, 563-572.

- Schechter, M. D., & Roberge, L. (1976). Sexual exploitation. In R. E. Helfer & C. H. Kempe (Eds.), Child abuse and neglect: The family and the community (pp. 127-142). Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Scheurer, S. L., & Bailey, M. M. (1980). Guidelines for placing a child in foster care. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 297-305). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schneider, C., Helfer, R. E., & Hoffmeister, J. K. (1980). Screening for the potential abuse: A review. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 420-430). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schutz, W. C. (1962). Firo: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Schwartz, D. J., Evans, P. C., Garcia, C. R., Rickels, K., & Fisher, E. (1973). A clinical study of lactation suppression. Obstetrics and Gynecology, 42, 599-606.
- Schwarzbeck, C. (1977, March). Identification of infants at risk for child abuse: Observations and inferences in the examination of the mother-infant dyad. Paper presented at the meeting of the Children's Hospital National Medical Center, Washington, D. C.
- Scott, W. J. (1980). Attachment and child abuse: A study of social history indicators among mothers of abused children. In G. J. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 130-142). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sears, R. R. (1961). Relation of early socialization experiences to aggression in middle childhood. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 63, 466-492.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Company.
- Sears, R. R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. (1965). Identification and child rearing. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sears, R. R., Whiting, J. W., Nowlis, V., & Sears, P. S. (1953). Some childrearing antecedents of aggression and dependency in young children. Genetic Psychological Monograph, 47, 135-236.
- Seiss, T. F., & Jackson, D. N. (1967). A personalogical approach to the interpretation of vocational interests. Proceedings of the 75th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 353-354.
- Seligman, M. E. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Seligman, M. E., Abramson, L. Y., Semmel, A., & von Baeyer, C. (1979). Depressive attributional style. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 88, 242-247.

- Semmel, A., Peterson, C., Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. L., & Seligman, M. E. (1980). Predicting depressive symptoms from attributional style and failure. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Seward, J. P. (1954). Learning theory and identification. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 84, 201-210.
- Sewell, W. H., Mussen, P. H., & Harris, C. W. (1955). Relationships among child-training practices. American Psychological Review, 20, 137-148.
- Seyle, H. (1956). The stress of life. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Seyle, H. (1974). Stress without distress. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Shoben, E. J. (1949). The assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child development. Genetic Psychological Monographs, 39, 101-148.
- Siegelman, M. (1966). Loving and punishing parental behavior and introversion tendencies in sons. Child Development, 37, 985-992.
- Silver, L. B. (1979). Recognition and treatment of anxiety in children and adolescents. In W. E. Fann, I. Karacan, A. D. Porkorny, & R. L. Williams (Eds.), Phenomenology and treatment of anxiety (pp. 93-109). New York: SP Medical & Scientific Books.
- Silverman, F. N. (1953). The roentgen manifestations of unrecognized skeletal trauma in infants. American Journal of Roentgenology, 69, 413-426.
- Silverman, F. N. (1980). Radiologic and special diagnostic procedures. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd. ed., pp. 215-240). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Simpson, H., & Craig, K. (1967). Word associations to homonymic and neutral stimuli as a function of aggressiveness. Psychological Reports, 20, 351-354.
- Skeels, H. M. (1966). Adult status of children with contrasting early life experiences: A follow-up study. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 31(3, Serial No. 105).
- Skeels, H. M., & Fillmore, E. A. (1937). The mental development of children from underprivileged homes. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 50, 427-439.
- Skodak, M., & Skeels, H. M. (1945). A follow-up study of children in adoptive homes. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 66, 21-58.
- Skodak, M., & Skeels, H. M. (1949). A final follow-up study of one hundred adopted children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 75, 85-125.

- Slater, P. E. (1955). Psychological factors in role specialization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Slater, P. E. (1961). Toward a dualistic theory of identification. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1, 113-126.
- Slater, P. E. (1962). Parental behavior and the personality of the child. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 101, 53-68.
- Smith, H. T. (1958). A comparison of interview and observation measures of mother behavior. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 57, 278-282.
- Snortum, J., & Ashear, V. (1972). Prejudice, punitiveness and personality. Journal of Personality Assessment, 36, 291-296.
- Solomon, R. S. (1982). Child maltreatment: A critical review of the literature and intervention programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rhode Island). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 4132B.
- Spielberger, C. D. (Ed.). (1972). Anxiety: Contemporary theory and research. New York: Academic Press.
- Spielberger, C. D., & Sarason, I. (Eds.). (1975). Stress and anxiety (Vol. 1). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spielberger, C. D., & Sarason, I. (Eds.). (1977). Stress and anxiety (Vol 2). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spinetta, J. J., & Rigler, D. (1972). The child-abusing parent: A psychological review. Psychological Bulletin, 11, 296-304.
- Spitz, R. A. (1945). Hospitalism: An inquiry into the genesis of psychiatric conditions in early childhood. In A. Freud (Ed.), The psychoanalytic study of the child (Vol. 1, pp. 53-74). New York: International University Press.
- Spitz, R. A., & Wolf, L. M. (1946). Anaclitic depression: An inquiry into the genesis of psychiatric conditions in early childhood. In A. Freud (Ed.), The psychoanalytic study of the child (Vol 2, pp. 323-342). New York: International University Press.
- SPSSX Users' Guide. (1983). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Starr, J., & Cutler, N. (1972). Sex role and attitudes toward institutional violence among college youth: The impact of sex-role identification, parental socialization, and socio-cultural milieu. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- Starr, R. H. (1979). Child abuse. American Psychologist, 34, 872-878.
- Staub, E. (1971). A child in distress: The influence of nurturance and modeling on children's attempts to help. Developmental Psychology, 5, 124-132.

- Stedman, L. A. (1948). An investigation of knowledge of and attitudes toward child behavior. (Available from Center for Instructional Services, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907)
- Steele, B. F. (1970). Parental abuse of infants and small children. In E. J. Anthony & T. Benedek (Eds.), Parenthood: Its psychology and psychopathology (pp. 449-477). Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Steele, B. F. (1980). Psychodynamic factors in child abuse. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 49-85). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Steele, B. F., & Pollock, C. B. (1974). A psychiatric study of parents who abuse infants and small children. In R. E. Helfer & C. H. Kempe (Eds.), The battered child (2nd ed., pp. 89-133). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1974). Occupational environment in relation to physical punishment and dogmatism. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus (Eds.), Violence in the family (pp. 167-172). New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1975). Intra-familial patterns of conflict resolution: Husband/wife; parent/child; sibling/sibling (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 75, 5586A.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977a). The cycle of violence: Assertive, aggressive, and abusive family interaction. New York: Praeger.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977b). The use of force for resolving family conflict: The training ground for abuse. The Family Coordinator, 26, 19-26.
- Stevenson, H. W., & Fahel, L. (1961). The effect of social reinforcement on the performance of institutionalized and noninstitutionalized normal and feeble-minded children. Journal of Personality, 29, 136-147.
- Stith, M., & Connor, R. (1962). Dependency and helpfulness in young children. Child Development, 33, 15-20.
- Stollak, G. E. (1973). An integrated graduate-undergraduate program in the assessment, treatment, and prevention of child psychopathology. Professional Psychology, 4, 158-169.
- Stollak, G. E., Scholom, A., Kallman, J. R., & Saturansky, C. (1973). Insensitivity to children: Responses of undergraduates to children in problem situations. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1, 169-180.
- Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. C. (1972). Short, homogeneous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28, 191-193.
- Straus, M. A. (1971). Some social antecedents of physical punishment: A linkage theory interpretation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 658-663.

- Straus, M. A. (1973). A general systems theory approach to a theory of violence between family members. Social Science Information, 12, 105-125.
- Straus, M. A. (1974). Leveling, civility and violence in the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 13-29, plus addendum 36, 442-445.
- Straus, M. A. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife beating. Victimology, 1, 54-76.
- Straus, M. A. (1977). A sociological perspective on the prevention and treatment of wifebeating. In M. Roy (Ed.), Battered women: a psychosociological study of domestic violence (pp. 194-239). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton.
- Summit, R., & Kryso, J. (1978). Sexual abuse of children: A clinical spectrum. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 237-250.
- Sundby, E. S. (1962). A study of personality and social variables related to conformity behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 63, 3471.
- Swanson, G. E. (1961). Determinants of the individual's defense against inner conflict: Review and reformulation. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.), Parental attitudes and child behavior (pp. 5-41). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Symonds, P. M. (1939). The psychology of parent-child relationships. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Symonds, P. M., & Jensen, A. R. (1961). From adolescent to adult. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Taylor, J. B. (1961). What do attitude scales measure: The problem of social desirability. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 62, 386-390.
- Terr, L. C. (1970). A family study of child abuse. American Journal of Psychiatry, 127, 125-131.

- 255
- Terr, L. C., & Watson, A. S. (1980). The battered child rebrutalized: Ten cases of medical-legal confusion. In G. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 536-546). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trott, D. M., & Jackson, D. N. (1968). An experimental analysis of acquiescence. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 2, 278-288.
- Tuddenham, R. D. (1959). The constancy of personality ratings over two decades. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 60, 3-29.
- Uhlenhuth, E. H., Rickels, K., Fisher, S., Park, L. C., Lipman, R. S., & Mock, J. (1966). Drug, doctor's verbal attitude and clinic setting in the symptomatic response to pharmacotherapy. Psychopharmacologia, 9, 392-418.
- Ulrich, R. (1966). Pain as a cause of aggression. American Zoology, 6, 643-662.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare. (1968). Perspectives on human deprivation: Biological, psychological and sociological. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Utton, A. C. (1962). Recalled parent-child relations as determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 9, 49-53.
- Vacchiano, R. B., & Strauss, P. S. (1968). The construct validity of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 24, 323-326.
- Velicer, W. F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. Psychometrika, 41, 321-327.
- Velicer, W. F., Govia, M., Cherico, N. P., & Corriveau, D. P. (1984). Item format and the structure of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1980a). Battered women. In A. M. Brodsky & R. Hare-Mustin (Eds.), Women and psychotherapy (pp. 339-363). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Walker, L. E. (1980b). [Battered Woman Syndrome Study: Questionnaire]. (Available from Battered Women Research Center, Colorado Women's College, Denver, CO)
- Walters, R. H. (1966). Implications of laboratory studies on aggression for the control and regulation of violence. Annals of American Academy of Political & Social Science, 364, 60-72.
- Waters, E., Wittman, J., & Sroufe, L. A. (1979). Attachment, positive affect, and competence in the peer group: Two studies in construct validation. Child Development, 50, 821-829.

- Watson, G. A. (1934). A comparison of the effects of lax versus strict home training. Journal of Social Psychology, 5, 102-105.
- Watson, G. A. (1957). Some personality differences in children related to strict or permissive parental discipline. Journal of Psychology, 44, 227-249.
- Wayne, S. R. (1963). The relation of self-esteem to indices of perceived and behavioral hostility (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 64, 5554.
- Weatherley, D. (1962). Maternal permissiveness toward aggression and subsequent TAT aggression. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 65, 1-5.
- Weber, E. (1977, April). Sexual abuse begins at home. Ms, pp. 64-67.
- Weinberg, S. K. (1955). Incest behavior. New York: Citadel Press.
- Welsh, R. S. (1976a). Severe parental punishment and delinquency: A developmental theory. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 5, 17-21.
- Welsh, R. S. (1976b). Violence, permissiveness and the overpunished child. Pediatric Psychology, 1(2), 68-71.
- Welsh, R. S. (1980, Winter). The belt theory of discipline. Discipline, 1(1), 3-6. (Available from The National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives in the Schools, 833 Ritter Hall South, Philadelphia, PA 19122)
- Weston, J. T. (1980). The pathology of child abuse and neglect. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 241-271). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Whiting, J. W., & Child, I. L. (1953). Child training and personality: A cross-cultural study. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Williams, G. J. (1980). Child abuse and neglect: Problems of definition and incidence. In G. J. Williams & J. Money (Eds.), Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home (pp. 1-6). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, G. J., & Money, J. (Eds.). (1980). Traumatic abuse and neglect of children at home. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, H. V., Lipman, R. S., Rickels, K., Covi, L., Uhlenhuth, E. H., & Mattsson, N. B. (1968). Replication of symptom distress factors in anxious neurotic outpatients. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 3, 199-212.
- Williams, W. C. (1958). The PALS Tests: A technique for children to evaluate both parents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22, 487-495.

- Wilson, A. L. (1980). Promoting a positive parent-baby relationship. In C. H. Kempe & R. E. Helfer (Eds.), The battered child (3rd ed., pp. 401-419). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Winder, C. L., & Rau, L. (1962). Parental attitudes associated with social deviance in preadolescent boys. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 64, 418-424.
- Wittenborn, J. R. (1956). A study of adoptive children: III, relationship between some aspects of development and some aspects of environment for adoptive children. Psychological Monographs, 70(3, Whole No. 410).
- Wohlwill, J. F. (1973). The study of behavioral development. New York: Academic Press.
- Wright, L. (1976). The "sick but slick" syndrom as a personality component of parents of battered children. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 32, 41-45.
- Yarrow, L. J. (1961). Maternal deprivation--toward an empirical and conceptual reevaluation. Psychological Bulletin, 58, 459-490.
- Yarrow, L. J. (1964). Separation from parents during early childhood. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1, pp. 89-136). New York: Russell Sage.
- Yarrow, L. J., Campbell, J. D., & Burton, R. V. (1968). Child rearing: An inquiry into research and methods. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yarrow, L. J., Campbell, J. D., & Burton, R. V. (1970). Recollections of childhood: A study of the retrospective method. Monographs of the Society of Research in Child Development, 35(5, Whole No. 38).
- Yarrow, M., Scott, P., & Waxler, C. (1973). Learning concern for others. Developmental Psychology, 8, 240-260.
- Yorukoglu, A., & Kempf, J. P. (1966). Children not severely damaged by incest with a parent. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 5, 111-124.
- Young, I. L. (1964). Wednesday's children: A study of child neglect and abuse. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Young, I. L. (1976). Personality characteristics of high and low aggressive adolescents in residential treatment. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 32, 814-816.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., & Radke-Yarrow, M. (1982). The development of altruism: Alternative research strategies. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 109-137). New York: Academic Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R. A. (1979). Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. Child Development, 50, 319-330.

- Zaphiris, A. G. (1981, May). Community responses to sexual abuse and their effects on the family. Workshop sponsored by the Rhode Island Department for Children and Their Families, Providence, RI.
- Zemdegs, J. (1980). Outraged: What it feels like to be an abused child. In R. Volpe, M. Breton, & J. Mitton (Eds.), The maltreatment of the school-aged child (pp. 91-107). Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Zigler, E. (1966). Research in personality structure in the retardate. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation (Vol. 1, pp. 77-108). New York: Academic Press.
- Zigler, E. (1976, February). Controlling child abuse: An effort doomed to failure. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), Newsletter of the Division on Developmental Psychology (pp. 17-30). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Zigler, E. (1980). Controlling child abuse: Do we have the knowledge and/or the will? In G. Gerbner, C. J. Ross, & E. Zigler (Eds.), Child abuse: An agenda for action. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zigler, E., Balla, D., & Butterfield, E. C. (1966). The effects of preinstitutional social deprivation upon changes in intelligence and social deprivation. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University.
- Zigler, E., & Child, I. L. (1969). Socialization. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 450-589). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Zigler, E., & Williams, J. (1963). Institutionalization and the effectiveness of social reinforcement: A three-year follow-up study. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 66, 197-205.
- Zuckerman, M. (1959). Reversed scales to control acquiescence response set in the parental attitude research instrument. Child Development, 30, 523-532.
- Zuckerman, M., & Lubin, P. (1965). Manual for the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Zuckerman, M., Ribback, B. B., Monashkin, I., & Norton, J. A. (1958). Normative data and factor analysis in the PARI. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22, 165-171.
- Zussman, J. U. (1978). Relationship of demographic factors to parental discipline techniques. Developmental Psychology, 14, 685-686.
- Zwick, W. R., & Velicer, W. F. (1982). Factors influencing four rules for determining the number of components to retain. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 17, 253-269.

APPENDIX A

FAMILY INTERACTION AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT STUDY:

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

Now that you are ready to begin, you need to keep the following things in mind while filling out the questionnaire:

1. Please do not write on the questionnaire booklet.
2. Answer the questions on the separate answer sheet by either filling in the blanks with the information requested (e.g., your age) or writing in the number corresponding to the multiple-choice answer which best fits for you (i.e., best describes your history, your opinion, or how you feel, depending upon the specific question).
3. Do your best to provide all the information asked for--if in some cases you are not entirely certain of the answer, please give your best estimate of the correct response, being certain not to skip any questions.
4. Check often to be certain that the space in which you are writing your answer on the answer sheet corresponds to the question which you are answering in the questionnaire booklet--both the questionnaire and the answer sheet are marked with a line in the left margin after every ten questions to help you check your questionnaire and answer sheet frequently.

Please begin by answering the first set of questions which ask for specific information about your personal history.

1. What was your age at your last birthday?

2. What is your sex?

1 = Female

2 = Male

3. What is your class standing?

1 = Freshman

3 = Junior

5 = Graduate student

2 = Sophomore

4 = Senior

6 = Special student

4. Where do you currently live?

1 = Residence hall

4 = Your family's apartment or house

2 = Fraternity/sorority house

5 = A friend's apartment or house

3 = Your own apartment or house

5. What is your marital status?

1 = Single

4 = Widowed

2 = Married

5 = Living with someone as if

3 = Separated/divorced

married

6. Do you have any children?

1 = Yes

2 = No

7. How many brothers and/or sisters do you have?

8. How many step/half brothers and/or sisters do you have?

9. What is your position in your family?

1 = Only child	3 = Middle child of three or more
2 = Oldest child	4 = Youngest child

10. Which of the following best describes where you have lived for the majority of your life?

1 = Farm	5 = Large town--25,000 to 100,000
2 = Fringe--lived in country, but parent(s) employed in town	6 = Suburban-urban community in metropolitan area--100,000 to 500,000
3 = Small town--up to 2,500	7 = City--larger than 500,000
4 = Medium town--2,500 to 25,000	

11. What is your predominant racial background?

1 = Black	3 = Native American
2 = Caucasian/white	4 = Oriental

12. What is your predominant ethnic background?

1 = British Isles (specify)	4 = Italian	7 = Scandinavian
2 = French	5 = Latin American	8 = Slavic
3 = German	6 = Portuguese-	9 = Other (specify)

13. What is your predominant religious background?

1 = Roman Catholic	3 = Jewish	5 = Other (specify)
2 = Protestant	4 = No religion	

14. In what part of the country have you spent the majority of your life?

1 = Rhode Island	4 = Southeast	7 = Southwest
2 = Other New England	5 = Northwest	8 = Midwest
3 = East Coast-Central	6 = West Coast-Central	9 = Not raised in the U.S.

15. Do you have or have you had any serious medical problems (i.e., debilitating or life-threatening illnesses or injuries)?

1 = Yes (specify)	2 = No

The statements which follow concern your relationships with your mother and father from as far back as you can remember. For most people some parts of childhood and adolescence were less satisfactory than they might have been--for this reason, many of the questions ask you to recall what actually happened between you and your parents as you were growing up, compared to how you would have liked your relationship with each of them to have been.

Because everyone tends to forget some parts of their childhood, especially unpleasant experiences, we know that it may be difficult to remember past events accurately. In order to help yourself remember your past as accurately as possible, please take a few minutes now to think back over your childhood and adolescence. Let your mind focus on particular events and try to create a mental picture of the places you lived, your

mother and father, your brothers and sisters and the ways you spent your time. Try to recall some things that interested you, some things you liked and disliked, and some of the feelings you had about yourself and the people around you. In short, try to briefly reconstruct your childhood and adolescence.

Now, read each statement and decide whether it applies to your relationships with your mother or your father. If the statement applies, answer True by putting a number "1" in the appropriate space on the answer sheet; if it does not apply, answer False by putting a number "2" in the appropriate space. Keep in mind that we are interested in your impressions based on as much as you can remember about your relationships with your mother and your father. (If you did not have a father or a mother, answer regarding the person who acted most like a father or mother and indicate his or her relationship to you.)

16. I am answering regarding:

1 = Mother

2 = Stepmother

3 = Someone else (specify)

17. I am answering regarding:

1 = Father

2 = Stepfather

3 = Someone else (specify)

18. My father was often "too busy to listen" to me.

19. If I was right about something, my father generally told me so.

20. If I got into a quarrel, my father would try to show me who was right and why.

21. My father seldom asked my opinion on anything.

22. My father thinks I should have as much opportunity as possible within reasonable limits.

23. My mother told me that she wished that I had never been born.

24. My mother explained sex matters to me if I asked her about them.

25. My mother gave me encouragement when I needed it most.

26. My father would explain things to me when I was working with him.

27. I felt that my father understood me.

28. I could "talk back" to my mother if I didn't overdo it.

29. My mother was willing to listen to my side of the story and give it consideration.

30. My mother never seemed to notice my "pet" projects.

31. I hardly ever felt that my mother criticized me unjustly.

32. If I asked my father about sex matters, he would explain them in a manner that I understood.

33. My advances toward my father were often met very coldly.

1 = True2 = False

34. My mother didn't seem to care about teaching me how to act in social situations.
35. My father had little patience with me when I helped him on an unfamiliar task.
36. I could tell my mother about my dates without fearing that she would ask prying questions.
37. I seldom sat on my father's lap when I was a child.
38. I seldom talked over personal problems with my mother.
39. My mother never seemed to be very concerned about what I did or where I had been.
40. I could depend on my mother to come through in a pinch.
41. My mother always had time to listen to my stories about the day's events.
42. It was hard for me to talk about my personal thoughts and problems to my father.
43. I spent more time with a nurse or baby sitter during childhood than I did with my mother.
44. Only occasionally did my mother kiss or hug me.
45. As a child I was able to have some secrets without any objections from my mother.
46. I can remember going hungry because no one prepared my meals.
47. My mother explained things to me when I worked with her.
48. At times when I needed him most, my father was usually busy or not around.
49. My father didn't care about what kind of grades I got in school.
50. I often felt that my father wished he could get rid of me.
51. I can't recall that I ever really discussed my plans for the future with my father.
52. My father gave me a chance to present my side of the story and would give it consideration.
53. My father didn't seem to care if I "wandered off" for as long as half a day.
54. My mother saw to it that I got sufficient medical care when I needed it.
55. At meals my mother required that I eat only as much as I wanted rather than having to clean up my plate.
56. I seldom felt that my father criticized me unjustly.
57. My mother showed little concern over my illnesses.

1 = True2 = False

58. My mother praised more than she blamed but didn't overdo either one.
59. My mother didn't seem to care if I drank alcohol when I was young.
60. My father seldom gave me gifts—even on special occasions.
61. If I asked my father a question, he would generally tell me to ask my mother.
62. I felt that my mother understood me.
63. When I was a child my mother gave me about as much "freedom" as my friends' mothers gave them.
64. My mother usually wasn't home when I returned from school.
65. When I was a child my father would let me have my secrets without interfering.
66. My father liked to have my friends come to our house.
67. My father was usually interested in what I was doing.
68. I seldom received gifts from my mother—even on special occasions.
69. My father spent very little time with me when I was growing up.
70. My father used to "snap" at me frequently.
71. My mother would let me work at a task until I asked for help.
72. I often felt that I was tolerated more than I was accepted by my mother.
73. My father was not concerned about the company I kept.
74. I could "talk back" to my father if I didn't overdo it.
75. My mother would explain things to me just to the point of satisfying my curiosity.
76. It was all right with my mother when I brought friends home with me.
77. My mother didn't mind if I got my playclothes dirty.
78. My mother asked for my opinion and considered it seriously.
79. My mother asks rather than tells me to do things.
80. I enjoyed helping my father do odd jobs.
81. I could tell my father about things that happened on a date without being afraid of prying questions being asked.
82. My father tried to look at my companions through my eyes.

1 = True2 = False

83. My mother usually treated others with more consideration and courtesy than she did me.
84. My mother would tell me to do something over and over again.
85. My father permitted me to take an occasional alcoholic drink at home after I was in high school.
86. I could rely upon my father if it was necessary.
87. Some of the best times in my childhood were when my father brought me toys as a surprise.
88. If I got into serious trouble my father would do what he could to help me out.
89. My mother never bought anything "just for me" (for example, candy or gum) when I went to the store with her.
- _____ 90. My mother's attitude was that children are just naturally bad.
91. My father would let me work at a task until I asked for help.
92. My father would often abide by my will even though he did not agree.
93. My mother often made promises to me, but rarely kept them.
94. There were many times when I wished that my father better understood how I felt about things.
95. My mother didn't care how messy I was when I was young.
96. I felt like my father was a good friend as well as a parent.
97. My mother always had time to listen if I had a problem to discuss.
98. I hardly ever took any of my personal problems to my father.
99. My father usually ignored me when there were other adults around.
- _____ 100. My mother would take time out to play with me if I wanted her to.
101. My father seldom encouraged me in anything.
102. When I was learning table manners my mother didn't mind if I sometimes used my fingers after trying with the silverware.
103. My mother trusted me.
104. My mother didn't seem interested in explaining things to me.
105. My father would never let me "putter around" in his workshop.

1 = True2 = False

106. I can remember my father encouraging me to make "small" decisions when I was quite young.
107. When I got into serious trouble I could expect very little help from my father in getting things straightened out.
108. My father was not very much interested in showing me how to act in social situations.
109. If I kissed or hugged my mother, she seemed to be embarrassed.
- _____ 110. My mother seldom seemed interested in my opinion.
111. My father never bought anything "just for me" (for example, candy or gum) when I went to the store with him.
112. My father always seemed to be very busy when I asked him for something.
113. When I was learning table manners my father didn't mind if I used my fingers after trying to use the silverware.
114. My father seldom took the time to explain things to me so that I could understand them.
115. My father had the knack of knowing just when to "put his foot down."
116. My mother seldom "tucked" me into bed.
117. My father never seemed interested in the things I did at school.
118. Quite often I would get a quick, emphatic "NO" from my father even though my request was reasonable.
119. When my father promised me something, I knew that he would keep the promise.
- _____ 120. My father was a willing listener if I had a problem.
121. My mother seldom gave me much "moral support."
122. I found it next to impossible to have a heart to heart talk with my mother.
123. My mother didn't care about what kind of grades I got in school.
124. At times when I needed her most my mother was usually busy or not around.
125. My mother showed little affection toward me.
126. I hardly ever sat on my mother's lap when I was young.
127. My father often acted as if I was disgusting to him.
128. My father asked for my opinion and considered it seriously.

1 = True2 = False

129. My mother showed little concern if I "wandered off" for as long as half a day.
- _____ 130. I felt as if my father was concerned about how I was growing up.
131. My mother treated me pretty much as her equal.
132. My father praised more than he blamed but didn't overdo either one.
133. My mother always seemed to be very busy when I asked her for something.
134. My father often put off seeking medical help when I needed it.
135. If I got into serious trouble, my mother thought it was up to me to straighten things out.
136. My mother never seemed interested in the things I made for her in school.
137. My father would explain things to me just to the point of satisfying my curiosity.
138. My father used to help me with my hobbies.
139. I could depend on my father for encouragement when I needed it most.
- _____ 140. My mother was often "too busy to listen" to me.
141. My father used to spend time playing games with me.
142. My mother knew just how far to let things go before "putting her foot down."
143. I can remember my mother encouraging me to make "small" decisions when I was quite young.
144. I felt that my mother could have kept my clothes nicer.
145. I could go out and play without first asking my mother.
146. My father seldom showed any interest in my "pet" projects.
147. I enjoyed doing little jobs for my mother.
148. I often felt that my mother wished she could get rid of me.
149. If I got into serious trouble, my mother would do what she could to help me out.
- _____ 150. My mother would lend a helping hand on a project if I desired it.
151. My father trusted me.
152. When I was a child my father gave me about as much "freedom" as my friends' fathers gave them.

1 = True2 = False

153. My mother tried to look at my companions through my eyes.
154. My mother usually dressed me about the same as my friends.
155. My father didn't care when I got home from school or dates.
156. There were very few times that my mother tried to teach me to do something.
157. Because my mother never objected, I ate pretty much what I wanted at home.
158. When I was in high school, my mother didn't mind if I took an occasional alcoholic drink at home.
159. My father threatened to evict me when I behaved very badly.

In the next section, we are asking you to be even more specific about how you got along with each of your parents. No matter how well any two people get along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have fights because they are in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. When this happens, there are many different things that people do to settle their disagreements. We are interested in knowing specific things that your mother and father did to settle their differences with you or when they were angry with you for any reason.

We hope that you will answer carefully and honestly even though it may be difficult to remember details about things which happened a long time ago. In order to help yourself remember as accurately as possible, please take another few minutes now to think back over your childhood, focusing first on your elementary school years.

Do the best you can to settle your thoughts on one year that stands out as having been a particularly difficult time in terms of the number of conflicts you had with your mother and the things she did to settle these differences. Try to picture yourself and your mother during that time, recalling the place you lived, other family members, your friends, some of the ways you spent your time.

Taking all this into account, read each of the statements below and on the answer sheet write in the number corresponding to the answer which indicates, to the best of your knowledge and memory, how often your mother did each of these things to settle differences with you during that year. (If you did not have a mother, or did not live with her during your elementary school years, please answer for the person who acted most like your mother during that time.) (Begin Answer Sheet page 2.)

_____ 160. I am answering regarding:

1 = Mother

2 = Stepmother

3 = Someone else (specify)

161. My age during the year for which I am providing information:

Responses (Mother--Elementary Year)

- | 1
<u>Never</u> | 2
<u>Once</u>
That Year | 3
<u>Rarely-</u>
2-3 Times | 4
<u>Sometimes-</u>
Less than Once
a Month | 5
<u>Often-</u>
About Once
a Month | 6
<u>Very Often-</u>
About Once
a Week | 7
Don't
Know |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| 162. | Discussed or tried to discuss the issue calmly... | | | | | |
| 163. | Got information to backup her side of things... | | | | | |
| 164. | Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things... | | | | | |
| 165. | Took away something or some privilege... | | | | | |
| 166. | Isolated you (e.g., sent you to your room)... | | | | | |
| 167. | Threatened consequences, but did nothing... | | | | | |
| 168. | Cried... | | | | | |
| 169. | Sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else... | | | | | |
| 170. | Withdrew by having a drink (alcohol) or using another drug... | | | | | |
| 171. | Yelled, cursed or insulted you... | | | | | |
| 172. | Did or said something to spite you... | | | | | |
| 173. | Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed you for being selfish, unfair or bad)... | | | | | |
| 174. | Stomped out of the room, house or yard... | | | | | |
| 175. | Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something... | | | | | |
| 176. | Threw a hard object at you... | | | | | |
| 177. | Pushed, scratched, grabbed or shoved you... | | | | | |
| 178. | Slapped you (with an open hand) on the hand or body... | | | | | |
| 179. | Slapped you (with an open hand) in the face or head... | | | | | |
| 180. | Hit you with a hard object on the hand or body... | | | | | |
| 181. | Hit you with a hard object in the face or head... | | | | | |
| 182. | Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist... | | | | | |
| 183. | Beat you up... | | | | | |
| 184. | Choked or tried to choke you... | | | | | |
| 185. | Burned you... | | | | | |

Responses (Mother--Elementary Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	<u>That Year</u>	<u>2-3 Times</u>	<u>Less than Once</u>	<u>About Once</u>	<u>About Once</u>	<u>Know</u>
			<u>a Month</u>	<u>a Month</u>	<u>a Week</u>	

186. Threatened you with a knife or gun...

187. Used a knife or gun against you...

188. Other (specify)...

189. During any of these conflicts, were you ever physically hurt?

1 = Yes

2 = No

190. If you were hurt, what was the result of your most severe injury?

1 = Not serious enough to require treatment

2 = Treated at home

3 = Treated in a doctor's office, treatment center or emergency room

4 = Required admission to a hospital

191. During the above conflicts, was your mother:

1 = Always thinking clearly and in control

2 = Usually thinking clearly and in control

3 = Usually not thinking clearly and out of control

4 = Almost always not thinking clearly and out of control

5 = Don't know

Before answering the next set of statements, please shift your attention to your relationship with your father during your elementary school years. Again, do the best you can to settle your thoughts on a year that stands out as having been a particularly difficult time in terms of the number of conflicts you had with your father and the things he did to settle these differences.

Picturing your interactions with your father, please read each of the statements below and on the answer sheet write the number corresponding to the answer which indicates, to the best of your knowledge and memory, how often your father did each of these things to settle differences with you during that year. (If you did not have a father, or did not live with him during your elementary school years, please answer for the person who acted most like your father during that time.)

192. I am answering regarding:

1 = Father

2 = Stepfather

3 = Someone else (specify)

193. My age during the year for which I am providing information:

Responses (Father—Elementary Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	That Year	2-3 Times	Less than Once a Month	About Once a Month	About Once a Week	Know

194. Discussed or tried to discuss the issue calmly...
195. Got information to backup his side of things...
196. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things...
197. Took away something or some privilege...
198. Isolated you (e.g., sent you to your room)...
199. Threatened consequences, but did nothing...
200. Cried...
201. Sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else...
202. Withdrew by having a drink (alcohol) or using another drug...
203. Yelled, cursed or insulted you...
204. Did or said something to spite you...
205. Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed you for being selfish, unfair or bad)...
206. Stomped out of the room, house or yard...
207. Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something...
208. Threw a hard object at you...
209. Pushed, scratched, grabbed or shoved you...
210. Slapped you (with an open hand) on the hand or body...
211. Slapped you (with an open hand) on the face or head...
212. Hit you with a hard object on the hand or body...
213. Hit you with a hard object in the face or head...
214. Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist...
215. Beat you up...
216. Choked or tried to choke you...
217. Burned you...

Responses (Father—Elementary Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	<u>That Year</u>	<u>2-3 Times</u>	<u>Less than Once</u>	<u>About Once</u>	<u>About Once</u>	<u>Know</u>
			<u>a Month</u>	<u>a Month</u>	<u>a Week</u>	

218. Threatened you with a knife or gun...

219. Used a knife or gun against you...

220. Other (specify)...

221. During any of these conflicts, were you ever physically hurt?

1 = Yes

2 = No

222. If you were hurt, what was the result of your most severe injury?

1 = Not serious enough to require treatment

2 = Treated at home

3 = Treated in a doctor's office, treatment center or emergency room

4 = Required admission to a hospital

223. During the above conflicts, was your father:

1 = Always thinking clearly and in control

2 = Usually thinking clearly and in control

3 = Usually not thinking clearly and out of control

4 = Almost always not thinking clearly and out of control

5 = Don't know

Before answering the next set of statements, please focus your attention on your junior and senior high school years. Settle your thoughts on one year that stands out as having been a particularly difficult time in terms of the number of conflicts you had with your mother and the things she did to settle these differences. Because adolescence is a time when people tend to disagree with their parents quite frequently and intensely, and because this period of your life is fairly recent, we expect that you will have an easier time recalling details about your family relationships during this time. In fact, if no particular year stands out, you may find it easiest for you to answer this set of statements for your last year in high school.

Taking all of this into account, please read each of the statements below and on the answer sheet write the number corresponding to the answer which indicates, to the best of your knowledge and memory, how often your mother did each of these things to settle differences with you during that year. (If you did not have a mother, or did not live with her during your junior/senior high school years, please answer for the person who acted most like your mother during that time.)

224. I am answering regarding:

1 = Mother

2 = Stepmother

3 = Someone else (Specify)

225. My age during the year for which I am providing information:

Responses (Mother—Junior/Senior High School Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	That Year	2-3 Times	Less than Once	About Once	About Once	Know
			a Month	a Month	a Week	

226. Discussed or tried to discuss the issue calmly...
227. Got information to backup her side of things...
228. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things...
229. Took away something or some privilege...
230. Isolated you (e.g., sent you to your room)...
231. Threatened consequences, but did nothing...
232. Cried...
233. Sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else...
234. Withdrew by having a drink (alcohol) or using another drug...
235. Yelled, cursed or insulted you...
236. Did or said something to spite you...
237. Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed you for being selfish, unfair or bad)...
238. Stomped out of the room, house or yard...
239. Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something...
240. Threw a hard object at you...
241. Pushed, scratched, grabbed or shoved you...
242. Slapped you (with an open hand) on the hand or body...
243. Slapped you (with an open hand) in the face or head...
244. Hit you with a hard object on the hand or body...
245. Hit you with a hard object in the face or head...
246. Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist...
247. Beat you up...
248. Choked or tried to choke you...
249. Burned you...

Responses (Mother--Junior/Senior High School Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	That Year	2-3 Times	Less than Once	About Once	About Once	Know
			a Month	a Month	a Week	

250. Threatened you with a knife or gun...

251. Used a knife or gun against you...

252. Other (specify)...

253. During any of these conflicts, were you ever physically hurt?

1 = Yes

2 = No

254. If you were hurt, what was the result of your most severe injury?

1 = Not serious enough to require treatment

2 = Treated at home

3 = Treated in a doctor's office, treatment center or emergency room

4 = Required admission to a hospital

255. During the above conflicts, was your mother:

1 = Always thinking clearly and in control

2 = Usually thinking clearly and in control

3 = Usually not thinking clearly and out of control

4 = Almost always not thinking clearly and out of control

5 = Don't know

Before filling in the next set of statements, please shift your attention to your relationship with your father during your junior and senior high school years. Focus on a year that stands out as having been particularly difficult in terms of the number of conflicts you had with your father and the things he did to settle these differences. Again, if no particular year stands out, you may choose to answer for your last year in high school.

Picturing your interactions with your father, please read each of the statements below and on the answer sheet write the number corresponding to the answer which indicates, to the best of your knowledge and memory, how often your father did each of these things to settle differences with you during that year. (If you did not have a father, or did not live with him during your junior/senior high school years, please answer for the person who acted most like your father during that time.)

256. I am answering regarding:

1 = Father

2 = Stepfather

3 = Someone else (specify)

257. My age during the year for which I am providing information:

Responses (Father--Junior/Senior High School Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	That Year	2-3 Times	Less than Once	About Once	About Once	Know
			a Month	A Month	a Week	

258. Discussed or tried to discuss the issue calmly...

259. Got information to backup his side of things...

260. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things...

261. Took away something or some privilege...

262. Isolated you (e.g., sent you to your room)...

263. Threatened consequences, but did nothing...

264. Cried...

265. Sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else...

266. Withdrew by having a drink (alcohol) or using another drug...

267. Yelled, cursed or insulted you...

268. Did or said something to spite you...

269. Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed you for being selfish, unfair or bad)...

270. Stomped out of the room, house or yard...

271. Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something...

272. Threw a hard object at you...

273. Pushed, scratched, grabbed or shoved you...

274. Slapped you (with an open hand) on the hand or body...

275. Slapped you (with an open hand) in the face or head...

276. Hit you with a hard object on the hand or body...

277. Hit you with a hard object in the face or head...

278. Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist...

279. Beat you up...

280. Choked or tried to choke you...

281. Burned you...

Responses (Father--Junior/Senior High School Year)

1 <u>Never</u>	2 <u>Once</u> That Year	3 <u>Rarely-</u> 2-3 Times	4 <u>Sometimes-</u> Less than Once a Month	5 <u>Often-</u> About Once A Month	6 <u>Very Often-</u> About Once A Week	7 Don't Know
-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------

282. Threatened you with a knife or gun...

283. Used a knife or gun against you...

284. Other (specify)...

285. During any of these conflicts, were you ever physically hurt?

1 = Yes

2 = No

286. If you were hurt, what was the result of your most severe injury?

1 = Not serious enough to require treatment

2 = Treated at home

3 = Treated in a doctor's office, treatment center or emergency room

4 = Required admission to a hospital

287. During the above conflicts, was your father:

1 = Always thinking clearly and in control

2 = Usually thinking clearly and in control

3 = Usually not thinking clearly and out of control

4 = Almost always not thinking clearly and out of control

5 = Don't know

Now we would like to know specific things which your mother and your father did in attempting to settle their differences with each other. Please think back over the course of their relationship, as far back as you can remember, and focus your attention on one year that stands out as having been particularly difficult in terms of the number of conflicts they had and the ways each one attempted to settle these conflicts. Again, you may decide to answer for your last year in high school if no other year particularly stands out.

Please read each of the statements below and on the answer sheet write the number corresponding to the answer which indicates, to the best of your knowledge and memory, how often your mother and your father did each of the things listed during that year. (If you did not live with your mother and father enough to be able to answer this set of questions regarding their relationship, please answer for the people who acted most like parents and with whom you spent the majority of your time.)

288. I am answering regarding:

1 = Mother and Father

2 = Mother and Stepfather

3 = Father and Stepmother

4 = Other (specify)

5 = I lived with one parent, and
this section does not apply to me

Responses (Mother-Father—Any Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	That Year	2-3 Times	Less than Once	About Once	About Once	Know
			a Month	a Month	a Week	

289. My age during the year for which I am providing information:
290. My mother discussed or tried to discuss the issue calmly...
291. My father discussed or tried to discuss the issue calmly...
292. My mother got information to backup her side of things...
293. My father got information to backup his side of things...
294. My mother brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things...
295. My father brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things...
296. My mother threatened consequences, but did nothing...
297. My father threatened consequences, but did nothing...
298. My mother cried...
299. My father cried...
300. My mother sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else...
301. My father sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else...
302. My mother withdrew by having a drink (alcohol) or using another drug...
303. My father withdrew by having a drink (alcohol) or using another drug...
304. My mother yelled, cursed or insulted my father...
305. My father yelled, cursed or insulted my mother...
306. My mother did or said something to spite my father...
307. My father did or said something to spite my mother...
308. My mother threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed my father for being selfish, unfair or bad)...
309. My father threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed my mother for being selfish, unfair or bad)...
310. My mother stomped out of the room, house or yard...
311. My father stomped out of the room, house or yard...

Responses (Mother-Father--Any Year)

1 <u>Never</u>	2 <u>Once</u> That Year	3 <u>Rarely-</u> 2-3 Times	4 <u>Sometimes-</u> Less than Once a Month	5 <u>Often-</u> About Once a Month	6 <u>Very Often-</u> About Once a Week	7 Don't Know
312.						
313.						
314.						
315.						
316.						
317.						
318.						
319.						
320.						
321.						
322.						
323.						
324.						
325.						
326.						
327.						
328.						
329.						
330.						
331.						
332.						
333.						
334.						
335.						

Responses (Mother-Father--Any Year)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Rarely-</u>	<u>Sometimes-</u>	<u>Often-</u>	<u>Very Often-</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	That Year	2-3 Times	Less than Once	About Once	About Once	Know
			a Month	a Month	a Week	

336. Other (specify for mother)...

337. Other (specify for father)...

338. During any one of these conflicts, was your mother ever physically hurt?

1 = Yes

2 = No

339. If your mother was hurt, what was the result of her most severe injury?

1 = Not serious enough to require treatment

2 = Treated at home

3 = Treated in a doctor's office, treatment center or emergency room

4 = Required admission to a hospital

340. During any one of these conflicts, was your father ever physically hurt?

1 = Yes

2 = No

341. If your father was hurt, what was the result of his most severe injury?

1 = Not serious enough to require treatment

2 = Treated at home

3 = Treated in a doctor's office, treatment center or emergency room

4 = Required admission to a hospital

CONTINUE WITH PART II

PART II

On the following pages you will find a series of statements which people use to describe themselves. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you.

If you agree with a statement and decide that it does describe you, answer True by putting a number "1" in the appropriate space on the answer sheet; if you disagree with a statement and feel that it does not describe you, answer False by putting a number "2" in the appropriate space. (Begin Answer Sheet page 3.)

- 342. I seldom strike back, even if someone hits me first.
- 343. I prefer not to spend a lot of time worrying about a person whose condition can't be helped.
- 344. I am a calm, easy-going type of person.
- 345. If I have had an accident, I want sympathy from no one.
- 346. My motto is "Never trust strangers."
- 347. I admire free, spontaneous people.
- 348. I would enjoy being a club officer.
- 349. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.
- 350. It is difficult for me to start a conversation with a stranger.
- 351. When arguing, I tend to raise my voice.
- 352. I sometimes spread gossip about people I don't like.
- 353. I would feel discouraged and unhappy if someone I know lost his job.
- 354. When I am waiting for anything, I usually get very anxious.
- 355. I always appreciate it when people are concerned about me.
- 356. When people yell at me, I yell back.
- 357. I have a reserved and cautious attitude toward life.
- 358. I am not very insistent in an argument.
- 359. If somebody hits me first, I let him have it.
- 360. When someone repeatedly kicks the back of my chair in a theatre, I don't say anything.
- 361. I have known people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.
- 362. Unless somebody asks me in a nice way, I won't do what they want.
- 363. I don't really care if my friends follow my advice or not.
- 364. Something has to be very important before I worry much about it.

1 = True2 = False

365. I am perfectly capable of solving my personal problems without consulting anyone.
366. When I really lose my temper, I am capable of slapping someone.
367. I find that I sometimes forget to "look before I leap."
368. I try to control others rather than permit them to control me.
369. When I am mad, I sometimes slam doors.
- _____ 370. When I meet new people I usually have little to say.
371. I don't let a lot of unimportant things irritate me.
372. I lose my temper easily but get over it quickly.
373. I am so sensitive to the moods of my friends that I can almost feel what they are feeling.
374. I get worried when I am expecting someone and he does not arrive on time.
375. I often seek out other people's advice.
376. Since the age of ten, I have never had a temper tantrum.
377. Rarely, if ever, do I do anything reckless.
378. I have little interest in leading others.
379. I am always patient with others.
- _____ 380. It is uncomfortable for me to exchange a purchase I've found to be defective.
381. I seldom feel that people are trying to anger or insult me.
382. I don't seem to get what's coming to me.
383. I try to keep my feelings toward people rather neutral.
384. People have told me that I have very steady nerves.
385. I would not like to be married to a protective person.
386. When I get mad, I say nasty things.
387. The people I know who say the first thing they think of are some of my most interesting acquaintances.
388. I feel confident when directing the activities of others.
389. Occasionally when I am mad at someone I will give him the "silent treatment."
- _____ 390. I feel uncomfortable around people I don't know.

1 = True2 = False

391. Lately, I have been kind of grouchy.
392. I know that people tend to talk about me behind my back.
393. I would like to spend a great deal of my time helping less fortunate people.
394. Occasionally I feel so nervous that I begin to get all choked up.
395. When I need money, it makes me feel good to know that someone can help me out.
396. I sometimes carry a chip on my shoulder.
397. I am not an "impulse-buyer."
398. I would make a poor judge because I dislike telling others what to do.
399. When I look back on what's happened to me, I can't help feeling mildly resentful.
400. When a friend borrows something of value to me and returns it damaged, I don't say anything.
401. I would rather concede a point than get into an argument about it.
402. When I disapprove of my friends' behavior, I let them know it.
403. I think I could keep myself from worrying if a friend became ill.
404. I rarely dwell on past mistakes.
405. If I feel sick, I don't like to have friends or relatives fuss over me.
406. If I let people see the way I feel, I'd be considered a hard person to get along with.
407. I have often broken things because of carelessness.
408. I am quite good at keeping others in line.
409. There are a number of people who seem to be jealous of me.
410. I find it difficult to make new friends.
411. I sometimes show my anger by banging on the table.
412. Once in a while I cannot control my urge to harm others.
413. I am often very sentimental where my friends are concerned.
414. I frequently worry about whether I am doing my work well.
415. I think it would be best to marry someone who is more mature and less dependent than I.
416. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.

1 = True2 = False

417. I make certain that I speak softly when I am in public places.
418. Most community leaders do a better job than I could possibly do.
419. I demand that people respect my rights.
- _____ 420. When someone interrupts me in a serious conversation, I find it hard to ask him/her to wait a minute.
421. I never get mad enough to throw things.
422. I don't waste my sympathy on people who have caused their own problems.
423. I usually solve any problems I may have and then forget them.
424. I usually make decisions without consulting others.
425. I could not put someone in his place, even if he needed it.
426. I enjoy arguments that require good quick thinking more than knowledge.
427. I seek out positions of authority.
428. Whoever insults me or my family is asking for a fight.
429. At a party I find it easy to introduce myself and join a group conversation.
- _____ 430. Sometimes people bother me just by being around.
431. I am quite affectionate toward people.
432. I become upset when something interferes with my schedule.
433. I usually tell others of my misfortunes because they might be able to assist me.
434. I get into fights about as often as the next person.
435. I am not one of those people who blurt out things without thinking.
436. I think it is better to be quiet than assertive.
437. I never play practical jokes.
438. If I have been "short-changed," I go back and complain.
439. When someone makes a rule I don't like, I am tempted to break it.
- _____ 440. I have no patience with someone who is just looking for a shoulder to cry on.
441. I am not a "high-strung" person.
442. I prefer not being dependent on anyone for assistance.
443. I can remember being so angry that I picked up the nearest thing and broke it.

1 = True2 = False

444. I often get bored at having to concentrate on one thing at a time.
445. When I am with someone else I do most of the decision-making.
446. It makes my blood boil to have somebody make fun of me.
447. It's easy for me to make "small talk" with people I've just met.
448. Other people always seem to get the breaks.
449. I tend to get strongly attached to people.
450. I don't worry very much about the future.
451. The thought of being alone in the world frightens me.
452. I often make threats I don't really mean to carry out.
453. I always try to be fully prepared before I begin working on anything.
454. I would make a poor military leader.
455. When people are bossy, I take my time just to show them.
456. If the food I am served in a restaurant is unsatisfactory, I complain to the waiter.
457. I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly than I expected.
458. I rarely get upset when someone else makes a fool of himself.
459. Once in a while I get very upset about things that have happened in the past.
460. I prefer to face my problems by myself.
461. I can't help being a little rude to people I don't like.
462. It seems that emotion has more influence over me than does calm meditation.
463. When two persons are arguing, I often settle the argument for them.
464. Almost every week I see someone I dislike.
465. I find it easy to talk with all kinds of people.
466. I often find myself disagreeing with people.
467. I tend to get quite involved in other people's problems.
468. I am not a very excitable person.
469. If I ever think that I am in danger, my first reaction is to look for help from someone.

1 = True2 = False

- _____ 470. At times I feel I get a raw deal out of life.
471. I generally rely on careful reasoning in making up my mind.
472. I would not do well as a salesman because I am not very persuasive.
473. I sometimes have the feeling that others are laughing at me.
474. If a friend betrays a confidence, I express my annoyance to him/her.
475. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting anyone.
476. I never get too upset about other people's misfortunes.
477. I often think about the possibility of an accident.
478. When I was a child, I disliked it if my mother was always fussing over me.
479. I used to think that most people told the truth but now I know otherwise.
- _____ 480. Often I stop in the middle of one activity in order to start something else.
481. If I were in politics, I would probably be seen as one of the forceful leaders of my party.
482. Even when my anger is aroused, I don't use "strong language."
483. When I am attracted to a person I've not met, I actively try to get acquainted.
484. When I am angry, I sometimes sulk.
485. When I talk about someone I like very much, I have a very hard time hiding my feelings.
486. I seldom get "butterflies" in my stomach.
487. I like to be with people who assume a protective attitude toward me.
488. I generally cover up my poor opinion of others.
489. If I am playing a game of skill, I attempt to plan each move thoroughly before acting.
- _____ 490. I feel incapable of handling many situations.
491. People who continually pester you are asking for a punch in the nose.
492. When an acquaintance takes advantage of me, I confront him/her.
493. When someone is bossy, I do the opposite of what he asks.
494. I try to keep out of other people's problems.
495. I sometimes feel jittery.

1 = True2 = False

496. I am usually very self-sufficient.
497. If I have to resort to physical violence to defend my rights, I will.
498. Most people feel that I act spontaneously.
499. I try to convince others to accept my political principles.
- _____ 500. I sometimes pout when I don't get my own way.
501. I am irritated a great deal more than people are aware of.
502. I usually feel very sad when a movie has an unhappy ending.
503. Once in a while my stomach feels as if it were tied in knots.
504. When I was a child, I usually went to an adult for protection if another child threatened me.
505. If someone doesn't treat me right, I don't let it annoy me.
506. I think that people who fall in love impulsively are quite immature.
507. I would not want to have a job enforcing the law.
508. If somebody annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him.
509. I don't know any people that I downright hate.
- _____ 510. I am not a very emotional person.
511. Sometimes I get upset about financial matters.
512. I prefer to take care of things for myself, rather than have others watch out for me.
513. I have no enemies who really wish to harm me.
514. Life is no fun unless it is lived in a carefree way.
515. With a little effort, I can "wrap most people around my little finger."
516. I often feel like a powder keg ready to explode.
517. There are a number of people who seem to dislike me very much.
518. I get embarrassed for a speaker who makes a mistake.
519. I seem to worry about things less than other people do.
- _____ 520. I usually feel insecure unless I am near someone whom I can ask for support.
521. I like to take care of things one at a time.

1 = True2 = False

522. I don't have a forceful or dominating personality.

523. Although I don't show it, I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.

The following section is made up of a list of problems and physical complaints that many people have from time to time. Please read each one carefully and, in the appropriate space on the answer sheet, write in the number corresponding to the answer that best describes: How much each problem has bothered or distressed you during the past week including today. (Begin Answer Sheet page 4.)

Responses

1	2	3	4
<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little Bit</u>	<u>Quite a Bit</u>	<u>Extremely</u>

524. Headaches...

525. Nervousness or shakiness inside...

526. Being unable to get rid of bad thoughts or ideas...

527. Faintness or dizziness...

528. Loss of sexual interest or pleasure...

529. Feeling critical of others...

530. Bad dreams...

531. Difficulty in speaking when you are excited...

532. Trouble remembering things...

533. Worried about sloppiness or carelessness...

534. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated...

535. Pains in the heart or chest...

536. Itching...

537. Feeling low in energy or slowed down...

538. Thoughts of ending your life...

539. Sweating...

540. Trembling...

541. Feeling confused...

542. Poor appetite...

Responses

	1	2	3	4
	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little Bit</u>	<u>Quite a Bit</u>	<u>Extremely</u>
543. Crying easily...				
544. Feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex...				
545. A feeling of being trapped or caught...				
546. Suddenly scared for no reason...				
547. Temper outbursts you could not control...				
548. Constipation...				
549. Blaming yourself for things...				
550. Pains in the lower part of your back...				
551. Feeling blocked in getting things done...				
552. Feeling lonely...				
553. Feeling blue...				
554. Worrying too much about things...				
555. Feeling no interest in things...				
556. Feeling fearful...				
557. Your feelings being easily hurt...				
558. Having to ask others what you should do...				
559. Feeling others do not understand you or are unsympathetic...				
560. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you:..				
561. Having to do things very slowly to insure correctness...				
562. Heart pounding or racing...				
563. Nausea or upset stomach...				
564. Feeling inferior to others...				
565. Soreness of your muscles...				
566. Loose bowel movements...				
567. Trouble falling asleep...				

Responses

1	2	3	4
<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little Bit</u>	<u>Quite a Bit</u>	<u>Extremely</u>

568. Having to check and double-check what you do...
569. Difficulty making decisions...
570. Wanting to be alone...
571. Trouble getting your breath...
572. Hot or cold spells...
573. Having to avoid certain things, places or activities because they frighten you...
574. Your mind going blank...
575. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body...
576. A lump in your throat...
577. Feeling hopeless about the future...
578. Trouble concentrating...
579. Feeling weak in parts of your body...
580. Feeling tense or keyed up...
581. Heavy feelings in your arms or legs...

The next section is made up of statements which people use to describe themselves. After reading each statement carefully, write in the number corresponding to the one response that best describes the way you see yourself.

Responses

1	2	3	4	5
<u>Completely</u>	<u>Mostly</u>	<u>Partly True-</u>	<u>Mostly</u>	<u>Completely</u>
<u>True</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>Partly False</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>False</u>

582. I am a cheerful person.
583. My friends have no confidence in me.
584. I am a friendly person.
585. I am a nobody.
586. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.
587. I am not interested in what other people do.

Responses

1	2	3	4	5
Completely	Mostly	Partly True-	Mostly	Completely
<u>True</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>Partly False</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>False</u>

588. I am a calm and easy going person.
589. I am not loved by my family.
- _____ 590. I am popular with men.
591. I am a hateful person.
592. I am a member of a happy family.
593. I am mad at the whole world.
594. I have a lot of self-control.
595. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.
596. I am popular with women.
597. I am losing my mind.
598. I am an important person to my friends and family.
599. I am hard to be friendly with.
- _____ 600. I am satisfied to be just what I am.
601. I should trust my family more.
602. I am as sociable as I want to be.
603. I despise myself.
604. I am satisfied with my family relationships.
605. I am no good at all from a social standpoint.
606. I am just as nice as I should be.
607. I am too sensitive to things my family say.
608. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.
609. I am not the person I would like to be.
- _____ 610. I understand my family as well as I should.
611. I should be more polite to others.
612. I am as smart as I want to be.

Responses

1	2	3	4	5
<u>Completely</u>	<u>Mostly</u>	<u>Partly True-</u>	<u>Mostly</u>	<u>Completely</u>
<u>True</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>Partly False</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>False</u>

613. I should love my family more.
614. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.
615. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.
616. I treat my parents as well as I should (use past tense if parents are not living).
617. I ought to get along better with other people.
618. I can always take care of myself in any situation.
619. I give in to my parents (use past tense if parents are not living).
- _____ 620. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.
621. I do things without thinking about them first.
622. I try to play fair with my friends and family.
623. I do not forgive others easily.
624. I take the blame for things without getting mad.
625. I quarrel with my family.
626. I get along well with other people.
627. I change my mind a lot.
628. I take a real interest in my family.
629. I do not feel at ease with other people.
- _____ 630. I solve my problems quite easily.
631. I do not act like my family thinks I should.
632. I see good points in all the people I meet.
633. I try to run away from my problems.
634. I do my share of work at home.
635. I find it hard to talk with strangers.

In the following section several situations, which most people experience from time to time, are described. Please read the description of each situation carefully and: 1) imagine yourself actually in the situation; 2) decide on the major cause as you see it; 3) write this cause in the appropriate space on the answer sheet; and 4) answer the questions regarding each situation by writing in the one number which most accurately represents your belief about the situation, assuming it were to happen to you, and its major cause.

Situation: YOU MEET A FRIEND WHO COMPLIMENTS YOU ON YOUR APPEARANCE.

636. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).
637. Is the cause of your friend's compliment due to something about you or something about the other person or circumstances? (Select the one number that best represents your belief and write it in the appropriate space on the answer sheet.)

<u>Totally due</u> <u>to the other</u> <u>person or</u> <u>circumstances</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Totally due</u> <u>to me</u>
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------

638. In the future when you are with your friends, will this cause again be present? (Select one number.)

<u>Will never</u> <u>again be</u> <u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Will always</u> <u>be present</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

639. Is the cause something that just affects interacting with friends, or does it also influence other areas of your life? (Select one number.)

<u>Influences</u> <u>just this</u> <u>particular</u> <u>situation</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Influences</u> <u>all situations</u> <u>in my life</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

640. How important would this situation be if it happened to you? (Select one number.)

<u>Not at all</u> <u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Extremely</u> <u>important</u>
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

Situation: YOU HAVE BEEN LOOKING FOR A JOB UNSUCCESSFULLY FOR SOME TIME.

641. Write down one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).
642. Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<u>Totally due to</u> <u>other people or</u> <u>circumstances</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Totally due</u> <u>to me</u>
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------

643. In the future when looking for a job, will this cause again be present?

<u>Will never</u> <u>again be</u> <u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Will always</u> <u>be present</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

644. Is the cause something that just influences looking for a job or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<u>Influences</u> <u>just this</u> <u>particular</u> <u>situation</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Influences</u> <u>all situations</u> <u>in my life</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

645. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u> <u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Extremely</u> <u>important</u>
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

Situation: YOU BECOME VERY RICH.

646. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).

647. Is the cause of your becoming rich due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<u>Totally due to</u> <u>other people or</u> <u>circumstances</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Totally due</u> <u>to me</u>
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------

648. In the financial future, will this cause again be present?

<u>Will never</u> <u>again be</u> <u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Will always</u> <u>be present</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

649. Is the cause something that just affects obtaining money or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<u>Influences</u> <u>just this</u> <u>particular</u> <u>situation</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Influences</u> <u>all situations</u> <u>in my life</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

650. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u> <u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Extremely</u> <u>important</u>
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

Situation: A FRIEND COMES TO YOU WITH A PROBLEM AND YOU DON'T TRY TO HELP HIM/HER.

651. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).
652. Is the cause of your not helping your friend due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

653. In the future when a friend comes to you with a problem, will this cause again be present?

Will never
again be
present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

654. Is the cause something that just affects what happens when a friend comes to you with a problem, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences
just this
particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences
all situations
in my life

655. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

Situation: YOU GIVE AN IMPORTANT TALK IN FRONT OF A GROUP AND THE AUDIENCE REACTS NEGATIVELY.

656. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).
657. Is the cause of the audience reacting negatively due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

658. In the future when giving talks, will this cause again be present?

Will never
again be
present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

659. Is this cause something that just influences giving talks or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences
just this
particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences
all situations
in my life

660. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u>										<u>Extremely</u>
<u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			<u>important</u>

Situation: YOU DO A PROJECT WHICH IS HIGHLY PRAISED.

661. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).

662. Is the cause of being praised due to something about you or something about the other people or circumstances?

<u>Totally due to</u>									<u>Totally due</u>
<u>other people or</u>									<u>to me</u>
<u>circumstances</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

663. In the future when doing a project, will this cause again be present?

<u>Will never</u>									<u>Will always</u>
<u>again be</u>									<u>be present</u>
<u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

664. Is this cause something that just affects doing projects or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<u>Influences</u>									<u>Influences</u>
<u>just this</u>									<u>all situations</u>
<u>particular</u>									<u>in my life</u>
<u>situation</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

665. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u>										<u>Extremely</u>
<u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			<u>important</u>

Situation: YOU MEET A FRIEND WHO ACTS HOSTILELY TOWARD YOU.

666. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).

667. Is the cause of your friend acting hostile due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<u>Totally due to</u>									<u>Totally due</u>
<u>other people or</u>									<u>to me</u>
<u>circumstances</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

668. In the future when interacting with friends, will this cause again be present?

<u>Will never</u>									<u>Will always</u>
<u>again be</u>									<u>be present</u>
<u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

669. Is the cause something that just influences interacting with friends or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences
just this
particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences
all situations
in my life

670. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

Situation: YOU CAN'T GET ALL THE WORK DONE THAT OTHERS EXPECT OF YOU.

671. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).

672. Is the cause of your not getting the work done due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

673. In the future when doing the work that others expect, will this cause be present?

Will never
again be
present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

674. Is the cause something that just affects doing work that others expect of you or does it influence other areas of your life?

Influences
just this
particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences
all situations
in my life

675. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

Situation: YOUR SPOUSE(BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND) HAS BEEN TREATING YOU MORE LOVINGLY.

676. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).

677. Is the cause of your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend) treating you more lovingly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

678. In future interactions with your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend) will this cause again be present?

<u>Will never</u> <u>again be</u> <u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Will always</u> <u>be present</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

679. Is this cause something that just affects how your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend) treats you or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<u>Influences</u> <u>just this</u> <u>particular</u> <u>situation</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Influences</u> <u>all situations</u> <u>in my life</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

680. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u> <u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Extremely</u> <u>important</u>
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

Situation: YOU APPLY FOR A POSITION THAT YOU WANT VERY BADLY (e.g., IMPORTANT JOB, GRADUATE SCHOOL ADMISSION, etc.) AND YOU GET IT.

681. Write down one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).

682. Is the cause of your getting the position due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<u>Totally due to</u> <u>other people or</u> <u>circumstances</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Totally due</u> <u>to me</u>
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------

683. In the future when applying for a position, will this cause again be present?

<u>Will never</u> <u>again be</u> <u>present</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Will always</u> <u>be present</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

684. Is the cause something that just influences applying for a position or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<u>Influences</u> <u>just this</u> <u>particular</u> <u>situation</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Influences</u> <u>all situations</u> <u>in my life</u>
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

685. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u> <u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Extremely</u> <u>important</u>
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

Situation: YOU GO OUT ON A DATE AND IT GOES BADLY.

686. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).
687. Is the cause of the date going badly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

688. In the future when dating, will this cause again be present?

Will never
again be
present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

689. Is the cause something that just influences dating or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences
just this
particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences
all situations
in my life

690. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

Situation: YOU GET A RAISE.

691. Write down the one major cause (in the appropriate space on the answer sheet).
692. Is the cause of your getting a raise due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

693. In the future on your job, will this cause again be present?

Will never
again be
present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

694. Is this cause something that just affects getting a raise or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences
just this
particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences
all situations
of my life

695. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

<u>Not at all</u>								<u>Extremely</u>
<u>important</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>important</u>

Below is a list of statements concerning the use of violence. Please read each statement and, in the appropriate space on the answer sheet, write in the number corresponding to the one response which best describes your personal opinion. (Violence here means words and actions aimed at property damage and personal injury.) (Begin Answer Sheet page 5.)

Responses

	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>

696. Every nation should have a war industry.
697. The death penalty should be part of every penal code.
698. University police should use violence against violent student demonstrators.
699. War in self-defense is perfectly right.
- _____ 700. Parents should encourage their children to use violence in self-defense.
701. The majority should use violence against violent minority groups.
702. War is often necessary.
703. Private citizens should be allowed to carry guns.
704. The government should send armed soldiers to control violent university riots.
705. The manufacture of weapons is always necessary.
706. When a schoolchild misbehaves habitually, the teacher should use physical punishment.
707. Prison guards should be allowed to use violence against prisoners when necessary.
708. War can be just.
709. Violent crimes should be punished violently.
- _____ 710. Hitting a child when he does something bad on purpose teaches him a good lesson.
711. Killing of civilians should be accepted as an unavoidable part of war.
712. The police force of a university should carry guns.
713. A violent revolution can be perfectly right.
714. A child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically.

Responses

1	2	3	4	5
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>

715. A soldier should never hesitate to use violence.
716. Capital punishment is often necessary.
717. The government should use violence to control violent riots.
718. Punishing a child physically when he deserves it will make him a responsible and mature adult.
719. Universities should use violence against students who destroy university property.
720. Violence against the enemy should be part of every nation's defense.

Before answering the next set of questions, please shift your attention to a point in the future, perhaps five or ten years from now. Imagine yourself as married—or living with someone as if married—and as a parent: Create a mental image of the home and neighborhood in which you might live and picture yourself interacting with your husband or wife and children. (Even if you do not intend to be married or to have children, try to imagine yourself as a husband or wife and as a parent, just for the moment.) Keeping this picture in mind, read each of the following statements and decide how much each one agrees or disagrees with your own opinion regarding parents and their children. Select the one number that best represents your personal opinion and write it in the appropriate space on the answer sheet.

Responses

1	2	3	4	5
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Tend to Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Tend to Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>

721. It is hard to make some children really "feel bad."
722. Children do not "act lazy" without some important reason.
723. Children should not be allowed to argue with their parents.
724. It is healthy for children to sometimes express anger toward parents.
725. A wise parent will teach the child just who is boss at an early age.
726. When children get into serious trouble it is really their parents' fault.
727. Young children who refuse to obey should be whipped.
728. Spanking children usually does more harm than good.
729. Most children get more sympathy and kindness than is good for them.
730. Making a child feel loved is the surest way to get good behavior.

Responses

1	2	3	4	5
<u>Strontly Agree</u>	<u>Tend to Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Tend to Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>

731. Most children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.
732. It is good for children to sometimes "talk-back" to their parents.
733. A great deal of discipline is necessary to train children properly.
734. Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.
735. An intelligent child should not be shamed for poor school work.
736. Firm and strong discipline make for a strong character in later life.
737. Most children enjoy helping their parents.
738. Children must be constantly "kept after" if they are to do well later in life.
739. Babies rarely cry "just to get attention."
740. Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.
741. Often it is a mistake to immediately punish a child who has been very bad.
742. A naughty child sometimes needs a slap in the face.
743. It is normal and healthy for children to occasionally disobey parents.
744. Most children need more discipline than they get.
745. Parents should not insist that young children eat unwanted foods.
746. When parents speak, children should obey.
747. Sneakiness in children is usually caused by poor training methods.
748. Children are happier under strict training than they are under lenient training.
749. Very strict discipline may destroy what might have developed into a fine personality.
750. Most children need more kindness than they usually receive.

As you answer the next set of statements, continue to focus your thoughts on the future and to imagine yourself as a parent. Keeping in mind the fact that any two people, no matter how well they get along, have disagreements and become angry with each other from time to time, rate the following techniques by which parents settle differences with their children or express their annoyance, frustration or anger. Do this by selecting the one number along each scale which best represents your personal opinion or belief about each technique, and writing that number in the appropriate space on the answer sheet.

Technique: REASONING/ARGUING (e.g., discussing calmly or heatedly, short of yelling; getting information to support an idea; asking another person to help settle things)

751.	<u>Unnecessary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Necessary</u>
752.	<u>Not normal</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Normal</u>
753.	<u>Bad</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Good</u>

Technique: VERBAL AGGRESSION (e.g., yelling; insulting; saying something spiteful)

754.	<u>Unnecessary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Necessary</u>
755.	<u>Not normal</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Normal</u>
756.	<u>Bad</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Good</u>

Technique: NONPHYSICAL CONTROL (e.g., limit-setting; timing out; taking something away)

757.	<u>Unnecessary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Necessary</u>
758.	<u>Not normal</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Normal</u>
759.	<u>Bad</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Good</u>

Technique: PHYSICAL AGGRESSION (e.g., pushing; grabbing; shoving; slapping; spanking)

760.	<u>Unnecessary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Necessary</u>
761.	<u>Not normal</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Normal</u>
762.	<u>Bad</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Good</u>

Technique: EXTREME PHYSICAL AGGRESSION (e.g., punching; hitting with an object; beating up; kicking; choking; threatening to use or using a weapon)

763.	<u>Unnecessary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Necessary</u>
764.	<u>Not normal</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Normal</u>
765.	<u>Bad</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>Good</u>

CONTINUE WITH PART III

PART III

The final section of the questionnaire asks for additional information about your family history. Please do your best to provide all the information asked for--if in some cases you are not entirely certain of the answer, give your best estimate of the correct response. As with previous sections, if you did not have a mother or a father, or did not live with her/him, please answer the appropriate questions in terms of the person who acted most like a mother or a father. (Continue Answer Sheet Pg. 5.)

766. What is your mother's age?

767. What is your mother's current (or most recent) occupation? Please specify her title (e.g., special education teacher) and major responsibilities (e.g., teaching children with learning disabilities).

768. Additionally, please indicate which of the following categories best describes your mother's occupation.

- 1 = Unskilled or semiskilled worker (e.g., factory worker, hospital aide, truck driver)
- 2 = Skilled worker or foreman (e.g., machinist, carpenter, cook)
- 3 = Farmer (owner-operator or renter)
- 4 = Clerical or sales person (but not manager)
- 5 = Proprietor (i.e., owner of a business), except farm owner
- 6 = Professional (e.g., architect, teacher, nurse) or managerial position (e.g., department head, store or office manager)
- 7 = No occupation outside home
- 8 = Don't know

769. Please indicate which of the following comes closest to your mother's annual income before taxes.

1 = \$7,500 or less	5 = \$35,001 to \$50,000
2 = \$7,501 to \$15,000	6 = \$50,001 or over
3 = \$15,001 to \$25,000	7 = Don't know
4 = \$25,001 to \$35,000	

770. Please indicate the highest level of education attained by your mother.

- 1 = Some elementary school
- 2 = Completed elementary school
- 3 = Some high school
- 4 = Completed high school
- 5 = Professional, business or technical training in addition to high school
- 6 = Some college
- 7 = Completed college (i.e., 4 years)
- 8 = Professional, business or technical training in addition to college
- 9 = Some graduate work
- 10 = Completed graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D., M.D.)

771. Did your mother have any of the following medical-psychiatric problems before you were 18 years old? (Answer "Yes" or "No" for each problem listed separately.)

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No (if "No" for A through H, skip to #774)

- A. Alcohol abuse
- B. Drug abuse
- C. Severe anxiety
- D. Severe depression, single incident
- E. Severe depression, chronic (i.e., long-lasting)
- F. Manic-depressive illness (i.e., repeated depressions alternating with periods of reduced depression and/or high activity level and mood)
- G. Schizophrenia
- H. Other (specify)

772. If your mother had any of the above medical-psychiatric problems, to what extent did these problems (collectively) affect her ability to take care of you when she was at her worst (e.g., fix meals, run and maintain your home, share in or supervise your activities, help you solve day-to-day problems)?

1 = Never	5 = Once a month
2 = Once a year	6 = Once a week
3 = 2-3 times a year	7 = Daily
4 = Less than once a month	8 = Don't know

773. Assuming that the above problem(s) interfered with your mother's ability to take care of you from time to time, on whom did you rely for care, help or support during these times?

1 = No one	5 = Grandparent(s)
2 = Father	6 = Neighbor/family friend
3 = Stepfather	7 = Your friend
4 = Brother(s)/sister(s)	8 = Other (specify)

774. Was there a time before you were 18 years old when you did not live with your mother for any reason other than a marital separation, divorce or her death?

1 = Yes 2 = No (skip to question #778)

775. If yes, please indicate your age (e.g., from 6-6 1/2) during each separation for up to five separations, beginning with the first.

776. If yes, use the response options listed below to indicate the reason for each of the separations specified in your previous answer, beginning with the first.

1 = Her illness/hospitalization	5 = Your job, education or travel
2 = Your illness/hospitalization	6 = Desertion/abandonment
3 = Family emergency	7 = Foster placement
4 = Her job, education or travel	8 = Other (specify)

777. If yes, please indicate the person(s) with whom you lived during each of the separations specified in your previous answers, beginning with the first.

1 = Father	5 = Aunt/uncle
2 = Stepfather	6 = Neighbor/family friend
3 = Brother(s)/sister(s)	7 = Foster parent(s)
4 = Grandparent(s)	8 = Other (specify)

778. What is your father's age?

779. What is your father's current (or most recent) occupation? Please specify his title (e.g., special education teacher) and major responsibilities (e.g., teaching children with learning disabilities).

780. Additionally, please indicate which of the following categories best describes your father's occupation.

- 1 = Unskilled or semiskilled worker (e.g., factory worker, hospital aide, truck driver)
- 2 = Skilled worker or foreman (e.g., machinist, carpenter, cook)
- 3 = Farmer (owner-operator or renter)
- 4 = Clerical or sales person (but not manager)
- 5 = Proprietor (i.e., owner of a business), except farm owner
- 6 = Professional (e.g., architect, teacher, nurse) or managerial position (e.g., department head, store or office manager)
- 7 = No occupation outside home
- 8 = Don't know

781. Please indicate which of the following comes closest to your father's annual income before taxes.

1 = \$7,500 or less	5 = \$35,001 to \$50,000
2 = \$7,501 to \$15,000	6 = \$50,001 or over
3 = \$15,001 to \$25,000	7 = Don't know
4 = \$25,001 to \$35,000	

782. Please indicate the highest level of education attained by your father.

- 1 = Some elementary school
- 2 = Completed elementary school
- 3 = Some high school
- 4 = Completed high school
- 5 = Professional, business or technical training in addition to high school
- 6 = Some college
- 7 = Completed college (i.e., 4 years)
- 8 = Professional, business or technical training in addition to college
- 9 = Some graduate work
- 10 = Completed graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D., M.D.)

783. Did your father have any of the following medical-psychiatric problems before you were 18 years old? (Answer "Yes" or "No" for each problem listed separately.)

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No (if "No" for A through H, skip to #786)

- A. Alcohol abuse
- B. Drug abuse
- C. Severe anxiety
- D. Severe depression, single incident
- E. Severe depression, chronic (i.e., long-lasting)
- F. Manic-depressive illness (i.e., repeated depressions alternating with periods of reduced depression and/or high activity level and mood)
- G. Schizophrenia
- H. Other (specify)

784. If your father had any of the above medical-psychiatric problems, to what extent did these problems (collectively) affect his ability to take care of you when he was at his worst (e.g., fix meals, run and maintain your home, share in or supervise your activities, help you solve day-to-day problems)?

1 = Never	5 = Once a month
2 = Once a year	6 = Once a week
3 = 2-3 times a year	7 = Daily
4 = Less than once a month	8 = Don't know

785. Assuming that the above problem(s) interfered with your father's ability to take care of you from time to time, on whom did you rely for care, help or support during these times?

1 = No one	5 = Grandparent(s)
2 = Mother	6 = Neighbor/family friend
3 = Stepmother	7 = Your friend
4 = Brother(s)/sister(s)	8 = Other (specify)

786. Was there a time before you were 18 years old when you did not live with your father for any reason other than a marital separation, divorce or his death?

1 = Yes 2 = No (skip to question #790)

787. If yes, please indicate your age (e.g., from 6-6 1/2) during each separation for up to five separations, beginning with the first.

788. If yes, use the response options listed below to indicate the reason for each of the separations specified in your previous answer, beginning with the first.

1 = His illness/hospitalization	5 = Your job, education or travel
2 = Your illness/hospitalization	6 = Desertion/abandonment
3 = Family emergency	7 = Foster placement
4 = His job, education or travel	8 = Other (specify)

789. If yes, please indicate the person(s) with whom you lived during each of the separations specified in your previous answers, beginning with the first.

1 = Mother	5 = Aunt/uncle
2 = Stepmother	6 = Neighbor/family friend
3 = Brother(s)/sister(s)	7 = Foster parent(s)
4 = Grandparent(s)	8 = Other (specify)

790. Please indicate which of the following comes closest to your family's total annual income before taxes.

1 = \$7,500 or less	5 = \$35,001 to \$50,000
2 = \$7,501 to \$15,000	6 = \$50,001 or over
3 = \$15,001 to \$25,000	7 = Don't know
4 = \$25,001 to \$35,000	

791. Are your natural parents living together? (Begin Answer Sheet page 6.)

1 = Yes (skip to question #801)	4 = No, due to the death of my parent(s)
(skip to question #797)
2 = No, due to a marital separation	5 = Other (specify)
3 = No, due to a divorce	

792. If your parents are separated or divorced, how old were you when they began living apart?

793. With whom did you live after your parents' separation and/or divorce?

1 = Mother only	4 = Father only
2 = Mother primarily	5 = Father primarily
3 = Mother and father equally	6 = Other (specify)

794. If you lived primarily with one parent, how often did you visit or see your other parent?

1 = Not at all	7 = About every two weeks, predictably
2 = Occasionally, unpredictably	8 = About weekly, predictably
3 = Frequently, unpredictably	9 = More often than weekly,
predictably
4 = 1-2 times a year, predictably	10 = Other (specify)
5 = 3-6 times a year, predictably	
6 = About monthly, predictably	

795. How did your parent's separation and/or divorce affect your relationship with your mother?

1 = Became much closer	4 = Became somewhat distant
2 = Became a little bit closer	5 = Became very distant
3 = No real change	6 = Other (specify)

796. How did your parent's separation and/or divorce affect your relationship with your father?

1 = Became much closer	4 = Became somewhat distant
2 = Became a little bit closer	5 = Became very distant
3 = No real change	6 = Other (specify)

797. If your parents' marriage ended, did your mother remarry or live with someone as if married? (If yes, please indicate your age at the time.)

1 = Yes

2 = No (skip to #799)

798. If you have a stepfather (or someone who acts like a stepfather), looking back over your relationship with him how close have you and he been?

1 = Very close

3 = Somewhat close

5 = Distant

2 = Close

4 = Not close

799. If your parents' marriage ended, did your father remarry or live with someone as if married? (If yes, please indicate your age at the time.)

1 = Yes

2 = No (skip to #801)

800. If you have a stepmother (or someone who acts like a stepmother), looking back over your relationship with her how close have you and she been?

1 = Very close

3 = Somewhat close

5 = Distant

2 = Close

4 = Not close

801. Over the course of your childhood, who was primarily responsible for your day-to-day care?

1 = Mother

9 = Several different baby sitters in your home

2 = Father

10 = Consistent day care home/center

3 = Mother and father equally

11 = Several different day care homes/centers

4 = Stepmother

12 = Other (specify)

5 = Stepfather

6 = Grandparent

7 = Brother(s)/sister(s)

8 = One or two consistent baby sitters in your home

802. Please indicate if any of the following people lived in your home before you were 18 years old. (Answer "Yes" or "No" for each person listed.) Additionally, for anyone who did live with you, estimate how long he/she did so.

Responses: 1 = Yes

2 = No

A. Married sister or brother

E. Aunt/uncle

B. Sister- or brother-in-law

F. Cousin

C. Grandmother

G. Friend

D. Grandfather

H. Other (specify)

803. What is the largest number of people who have lived in your family home at any one time before you were 18 years old? Additionally, please indicate your age at that time.

804. How many different apartments and/or houses did you live in before you were 18 years old?

805. How many times before you were 18 years old did moving involve your changing schools and/or losing contact with your friends?

806. Please indicate if any of the following people have died. (Answer "Yes" or "No" for each person listed.) Additionally, for anyone who has died, indicate your age at the time of his/her death.

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No

A. Mother	H. Paternal grandfather
B. Father	I. Stepfather
C. Sister	J. Stepmother
D. Brother	K. Stepsister
E. Maternal grandmother	L. Stepbrother
F. Maternal grandfather	M. Close friend
G. Paternal grandmother	N. Other (specify)

807. Before you were 18 years old, how often did you engage in the following activities? (Choose one response for each behavior listed.)

Responses: 1 = Never 3 = 2-5 times 5 = More than 10 times
2 = Once 4 = 6-10 times

A. Pranks	G. Disorderly conduct
B. Vandalism	H. Breaking and entering
C. Shoplifting	I. Drug dealing
D. Theft	J. Fire setting/arson
E. Auto theft	K. Physical assault--no weapon
F. Driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs (nonprescribed)	L. Physical assault--weapon
	M. Sexual assault

808. Please indicate which of the following changes or problems you have experienced during the last year. (Answer "Yes" or "No" for each change/problem listed.)

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No

- A. Began, ended or changed schools
- B. Left home (e.g., to go to school, to live independently)
- C. Moved to different neighborhood or town
- D. Major change in social/recreational activities
- E. Major change in sleeping habits (e.g., hours slept, time of day slept)
- F. Major change in eating habits
- G. Big increase in hours worked or job responsibilities
- H. Troubles with job (e.g., not getting along with fellow workers)
- I. Troubles with school work (e.g., too much work, failing a course)
- J. Serious personal illness or injury
- K. Serious problem with health or behavior of a family member
- L. Troubles with relatives
- M. A lot worse off financially
- N. Separated or divorced
- O. Big increase in arguments with spouse or partner
- P. Pregnancy
- Q. Kicked out of school or suspended
- R. Minor violation of the law
- S. Major violation of the law
- T. Death of a close friend
- U. Death of a close family member
- V. Physically assaulted
- W. Sexually assaulted

It is now generally realized that many people have sexual experiences while they are still growing up. Some of these are with friends and some are with relatives or family members. Some are very upsetting and painful and some are not. We would like you to try to remember the sexual experiences you had while growing up--by "sexual," we mean a broad range of things, anything from "playing doctor" to sexual intercourse, in fact anything that might have seemed "sexual" to you.

809. Please read the following list of sexual experiences and indicate if you have had any of these experiences with a family member or relative or with anyone against your will. Use the response options listed below to indicate each person with whom you have had each of the experiences listed. (Write in as many responses for each experience as is accurate.)

<u>Responses:</u>	1 = Stranger	6 = Stepfather
	2 = Acquaintance	7 = Other male relative
	3 = Friend--same age	8 = Mother (someone like a mother)
	4 = Friend--adult	9 = Stepmother
	5 = Father (someone like a father)	10 = Other female relative
		11 = No one

- A. This person requested you to do something sexual
- B. This person kissed or hugged you in a sexual way
- C. This person showed his/her sex organs to you
- D. You showed your sex organs to this person
- E. This person forced you to watch sexual acts
- F. This person took sexual pictures of you
- G. This person fondled you in a sexual way
- H. You fondled this person in a sexual way
- I. You and this person had oral sex
- J. You and this person had intercourse, but without attempting penetration
- K. You and this person had intercourse
- L. You and this person had anal sex
- M. This person involved you in prostitution
- N. Other (specify)

(If you have not had any of the experiences listed above with a family member or relative, skip to question #834.)

810. If you have had any of the above sexual experiences with a male relative other than your father or stepfather, please try to be more specific about these experiences. (If you have had these experiences with more than one male relative, please focus on the one relationship which you feel has had the most impact on you, in answering the following set of questions.)

Using the response options below, please indicate how often you have had each kind of experience with this person.

<u>Responses:</u>	1 = Attempted, but resisted	3 = Several incidents
	2 = Single incident	

- A. This person requested you to do something sexual
- B. This person kissed or hugged you in a sexual way
- C. This person showed his sex organs to you
- D. You showed your sex organs to this person
- E. This person forced you to watch sexual acts
- F. This person took sexual pictures of you

Responses: 1 = Attempted, but resisted 3 = Several incidents
 2 = Single incident

- G. This person fondled you in a sexual way
- H. You fondled this person in a sexual way
- I. You and this person had oral sex
- J. You and this person had intercourse, but without attempting penetration
- K. You and this person had intercourse
- L. You and this person had anal sex
- M. This person involved you in prostitution
- N. Other (specify)

811. What is this person's relationship to you?

1 = Cousin	4 = Brother-in-law
2 = Brother	5 = Uncle
3 = Stepbrother	6 = Grandfather

812. How old was this person when these experiences began?

813. How old were you when these experiences began?

814. Over how long a time did this go on?

815. Did this person do any of the following things to pressure or coerce you?
 (Answer "Yes" or "No" for each behavior listed.)

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No

- A. Promised a reward
- B. Said or implied that you were obligated
- C. Threatened to tell someone
- D. Verbally abused you (e.g., called you names)
- E. Threatened to deprive you of some privilege
- F. Threatened to abandon you or your family
- G. Threatened to hurt you physically
- H. Used physical force (e.g., restrained, pushed, bullied)
- I. Used physical violence (e.g., slapped, punched, beat you up)
- J. Threatened to use or did use a weapon

816. How did you feel at the time?

1 = Shocked	3 = Interested	5 = Conflicted/confused
2 = Afraid	4 = Pleased	6 = Angry

817. In retrospect, how do you feel about these experiences?

1 = Very positive	3 = Neutral	5 = Very negative
2 = Mostly positive	4 = Mostly negative	6 = Conflicted/confused

818. If you have had any of the above sexual experiences with your father or step-father, please try to be more specific about these experiences.

Using the response options below, please indicate how often you have had each kind of experience with this person.

Responses: 1 = Attempted, but resisted 3 = Several incidents
 2 = Single incident

- A. This person requested you to do something sexual
- B. This person kissed or hugged you in a sexual way
- C. This person showed his sex organs to you
- D. You showed your sex organs to this person
- E. This person forced you to watch sexual acts
- F. This person took sexual pictures of you
- G. This person fondled you in a sexual way
- H. You fondled this person in a sexual way
- I. You and this person had oral sex
- J. You and this person had intercourse, but without attempting penetration
- K. You and this person had intercourse
- L. You and this person had anal sex
- M. This person involved you in prostitution
- N. Other (specify)

819. What is this person's relationship to you?

1 = Father 2 = Stepfather 3 = Someone like a father (specify)

820. How old was this person when these experiences began?

821. How old were you when these experiences began?

822. Over how long a time did this go on?

823. Did this person do any of the following things to pressure or coerce you?
(Answer "Yes" or "No" for each behavior listed.)

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No

- A. Promised a reward
- B. Said or implied that you were obligated
- C. Threatened to tell someone
- D. Verbally abused you (e.g., called you names)
- E. Threatened to deprive you of some privilege
- F. Threatened to abandon you or your family
- G. Threatened to hurt you physically
- H. Used physical force (e.g., restrained, pushed, bullied)
- I. Used physical violence (e.g., slapped, punched, beat you up)
- J. Threatened to use or did use a weapon

824. How did you feel at the time?

1 = Shocked	3 = Interested	5 = Conflicted/confused
2 = Afraid	4 = Pleased	6 = Angry

825. In retrospect, how do you feel about these experiences?

1 = Very positive	3 = Neutral	5 = Very negative
2 = Mostly positive	4 = Mostly negative	6 = Conflicted/confused

826. If you have had any of the above sexual experiences with any female relative, please try to be more specific about these experiences.

Using the response options below, please indicate how often you have had each kind of experience with this person.

- Responses: 1 = Attempted, but resisted 3 = Several incidents
 2 = Single incident

- A. This person requested you to do something sexual
- B. This person kissed or hugged you in a sexual way
- C. This person showed her sex organs to you
- D. You showed your sex organs to this person
- E. This person forced you to watch sexual acts
- F. This person took sexual pictures of you
- G. This person fondled you in a sexual way
- H. You fondled this person in a sexual way
- I. You and this person had oral sex
- J. You and this person had intercourse, but without attempting penetration
- K. You and this person had intercourse
- L. You and this person had anal sex
- M. This person involved you in prostitution
- N. Other (specify)

827. What is this person's relationship to you?

1 = Cousin	5 = Aunt
2 = Sister	6 = Grandmother
3 = Stepsister	7 = Mother
4 = Sister-in-law	8 = Stepmother

828. How old was this person when these experiences began?

829. How old were you when these experiences began?

830. Over how long a time did this go on?

831. Did this person do any of the following things to pressure or coerce you?
(Answer "Yes" or "No" for each behavior listed.)

Responses: 1 = Yes 2 = No

- A. Promised a reward
- B. Said or implied that you were obligated
- C. Threatened to tell someone
- D. Verbally abused you (e.g., called you names)
- E. Threatened to deprive you of some privilege
- F. Threatened to abandon you or your family
- G. Threatened to hurt you physically
- H. Used physical force (e.g., restrained, pushed, bullied)
- I. Used physical violence (e.g., slapped, punched, beat you up)
- J. Threatened to use or did use a weapon

832. How did you feel at the time?

1 = Shocked 3 = Interested 5 = Conflicted/confused
2 = Afraid 4 = Pleased 6 = Angry

833. In retrospect, how do you feel about these experiences?

1 = Very positive 3 = Neutral 5 = Very negative
2 = Mostly positive 4 = Mostly negative 6 = Conflicted/confused

834. Has a private or public agency (e.g., Department for Children and Their Families/Protective Services) been involved with your family as the result of a question regarding the adequacy of child care?

1 = Yes 2 = No (skip to #837) 3 = Don't know

835. If yes, please specify the reason to the best of your knowledge.

1 = Suspected neglect 5 = Actual physical abuse
2 = Suspected physical abuse 6 = Actual sexual abuse
3 = Suspected sexual abuse 7 = Don't know
4 = Actual neglect 8 = Other (specify)

836. If yes, please specify the outcome to the best of your knowledge.

1 = 1 or 2 visits with a social worker 7 = Child/children lived with relatives
2 = Ongoing visits with a social worker 8 = Child/children lived in a foster home
3 = Family received counseling 9 = Child/children placed in Children's Home
4 = Parents received counseling 10 = Child/children hospitalized
5 = Child/children received counseling 11 = Don't know
6 = Child/children attended a day care center 12 = Other (specify)

837. If you have had any major stressful experiences which have not been covered above, please indicate what these experiences were and your age at the time.
838. Many people have known one or two very significant people--someone who accepts and believes in them, someone who has helped them through difficult times, someone whom they aspire to be like (e.g., parent, sister, teacher, coach). If there have been people who have played this kind of role in your life, please list the most significant ones in terms of their relationship to you.
839. Many people have also had one or two significant experiences which have helped them to "grow up," to become "better" people and to sort out and cope with problems in their lives (e.g., a special job, counseling, a religious experience, or even a serious illness or accident). If you have had experiences which have played this kind of role in your life, please indicate what the most significant ones were.

Thank you for the time and energy you have given to participate in this research. Please feel free to express any reactions or questions to the investigator or your professor. Additionally, if you have found that some of the information requested has raised uncomfortable personal issues or feelings--especially regarding abusive experiences--and you would like to speak confidentially with the investigator regarding your concerns, she can be reached as indicated in the introductory letter.

Finally, if you would be willing to consider taking part in a related follow-up study, please print your name, address and the date on the enclosed card and turn it in with your answer sheets. The proposed study would be conducted approximately 5 years from now and would hopefully be funded to enable payment of subjects. (Your name on the card would not represent a commitment to participate in future research; rather, it would be a statement of your consent to be contacted as a potential participant in the specified follow-up study.)

Again, thank you.

APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY STUDY: COMPONENT STRUCTURE OF
THE MODIFIED CONFLICTS TACTICS SCALE

Violence within families has long existed, but only within the last century has it been recognized as an issue meriting public and professional attention (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Walker, 1979; Williams, 1980). Since that time, substantial professional efforts have been devoted to defining family violence, elucidating causal and contributing factors, and developing and implementing intervention programs. At the same time, few empirical investigations of family violence have been conducted due to the existence of substantial methodological obstacles to studying socially undesirable behaviors, especially those which take place "behind closed doors." Foremost among obstacles hampering systematic investigations has been the inherent difficulty of translating conceptual definitions of aggression between family members into operational constructs which can be submitted to empirical analyses.

In the context of their pioneering research exposing family violence, Straus and his colleagues spearheaded efforts to systematically measure aggression between family members beginning with extensive structured interviews (Gelles, 1974; 1978) and culminating in the development of the Conflicts Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979). Despite widespread acknowledgement of the need for objective measurement of family violence, the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) is the only published instrument which assesses the frequency of occurrence of specific aggressive actions between family members.

The CTS consists of a list of actions which a family member might

employ in response to a conflict with another family member. The response format has characteristically been comprised of five to seven choices indicating the number of times each action was employed during a specified 12-month period; a 2-item response format indicating whether or not each action ever occurred in the context of the relationship under investigation has also been included.

The CTS was rigorously designed to minimize respondent defensiveness and maximize the instrument's acceptability and overall response rate. The effectiveness of these steps was demonstrated by comparative statistics which showed that: (a) refusal rates for individual items did not increase as social desirability decreased; and (b) CTS completion rates were nearly equivalent to completion rates obtained in studies using comparable instruments to collect information of a more benign, impersonal nature (Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980).

CTS items were written to represent three conceptually distinct methods of conflict resolution: (a) Reasoning (the use of rational discussion and argument); (b) Verbal Aggression (the use of verbal and nonverbal acts to symbolically hurt or threaten another person); and (c) Violence (the use of physical force against another person) (Straus, 1979). Subsequent factor analytic studies of CTS responses assessing conflict resolution tactics used between spouses yielded three empirically derived factors which corresponded closely to the three theoretical scales (Jorgensen, 1977; Straus, 1979).

Normative and psychometric data based on a nationally representative sample of over 2,000 families were reported by Straus (Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980). Internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .50 to .88, with parent-to-child Verbal Aggression and

Violence scales achieving coefficients of .77 and .62, respectively, and spousal Verbal Aggression and Violence scales each achieving a coefficient of .88. Reasoning scales obtained reliability coefficients in the .50's.

Concurrent validity of the CTS was demonstrated by Bulcroft and Straus (1975) who found that child/student reports of conflict resolution tactics used between their parents and parents' reports of conflict resolution tactics used by themselves were equivalent. Additional evidence of the CTS's concurrent validity was provided by a comparison of conjugal violence incidence rates reported by independent samples of students for their parents (Straus, 1974) and spouses for themselves and each other (Straus, 1979) which proved to be nearly identical.

Several studies have provided evidence of the CTS's construct validity. For example, the consistently high rates of verbal and physical aggression reported on the CTS in numerous independent studies (Bulcroft & Straus, 1975; Jorgensen, 1977; Mulligan, 1977; Steinmetz, 1977a; Straus, 1974) were equivalent to incidence rates based on in-depth interviews (Gelles, 1974; Straus et al., 1980). Additionally, correlations obtained among CTS scale scores and socioeconomic and spousal relationship variables and between CTS scale scores across generations within the same family have repeatedly been consistent with predictions based on relevant theory and available empirical findings (Allen & Straus, 1979; Bulcroft & Straus, 1975; Jorgensen, 1977; Mulligan, 1977; Steinmetz, 1977a, 1977b; Straus, 1973, 1974; Straus et al., 1980).

In sum, the CTS is an empirically robust instrument. Its

theoretical structure has been empirically documented, and Verbal Aggression and Violence scales have demonstrated sound reliability and validity. Despite its psychometric strengths, however, application of the CTS has been limited to investigations of relationships among family conflict variables and other family relationship- and demographic variables. The potential usefulness of the CTS for investigating relationships among intrafamilial violence and parent or child personality variables has yet to be explored.

One inherent aspect of the CTS limiting its applicability as a predictor variable is its response format which, by focusing on a single, arbitrarily selected referent year (from the respondent's perspective), precludes gathering information of a more representative nature; that is, data reflecting the level of verbal and physical aggression employed over the duration of each relationship under investigation. An additional general limitation of the CTS is its failure to reliably assess constructive conflict resolution strategies.

Given the need for an objective measure of conflict resolution strategies employed over the duration of familial relationships and the documented reliability and validity of the CTS in assessing intrafamilial verbal and physical aggression for a single referent year, the purpose of the present study is to investigate the feasibility of modifying the CTS so that it measures conflict resolution tactics representative of those utilized over the duration of each relationship assessed. Accordingly, the CTS was modified for use in the present study, and the component structure of the modified CTS was investigated to determine how new and revised aspects of the scale might be incorporated within the previously validated scoring system.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

The sample was comprised of 334 undergraduate volunteer subjects, 209 women and 125 men, in attendance at a northeastern state university. The majority of subjects were white and middle class, and all were at least 18 years of age. Subjects were solicited during regularly scheduled class meetings and obtained extra credit points in exchange for participation. The CTS was administered during a prescheduled data-collection session in the context of a comprehensive questionnaire assessing a broad range of demographic and psychosocial variables.

The Instrument

The CTS is a self-report inventory comprised of a list of specific actions, varying in number from 14 to 19, which a family member might employ in response to a conflict with another family member (Appendix A, pp. 267-278). The response format is comprised of five to seven choices indicating the number of times each action was employed during a specified 12-month period (usually the respondent's or target child's last year of high school); a 2-choice response format indicating whether or not each action ever occurred in the context of the relationship under investigation has also been included (Mulligan, 1977; Straus, 1979). The empirically verified scoring system yields three scale scores for each relationship assessed -- Reasoning, Verbal-Symbolic Aggression, and Violence (Straus, 1979).

The CTS was modified in several ways for use in this study. First, several items were revised to facilitate discrimination between "mild" and "severe" forms of the "same" action. Second, two new items written to assess potentially constructive conflict-resolution strategies and

two new items specifying severe acts of violence were included. Third, the response format was extended so that subjects were asked to provide CTS data describing each parent's relationship with themselves for two separate 12-month periods which stood out in their minds as being difficult in terms of the number of conflicts with the respective parent (one during their elementary school years and one during their junior-senior high school years), rather than for the original referent periods of the last senior high school year and ever. Fourth, extended instructions specifically designed to maximize the availability of retrospective material to respondents and, in turn, the accuracy of CTS data which they reported were used (Cannell & Kahn, 1969; Schutz, 1962). (Appendix A, pp. 267-278 presents instructions and items administered in this study and Table B-1 presents information denoting which items were revised from previous versions of the CTS and which were written specifically for use in the present study.)

Results

Component Structure

Initially, independent principal components analyses were applied to intercorrelation matrices computed for four 25-item parent-to-child CTS data sets (i.e., Mother-to-Child Elementary Year; Mother-to-Child High School Year; Father-to-Child Elementary Year; Father-to-Child High School Year) and two 23-item parent-to-parent CTS data sets (i.e., Mother-to-Father; Father-to-Mother). Velicer's (1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion was used to determine the number of components retained, and Varimax rotations were performed on resulting component patterns.

Four of the six principal components analyses extracted two

components, accounting for between 30% and 50% of the total variance, and two analyses extracted three components. The first two components extracted in all six analyses overlapped substantially with Straus' (1979) Verbal Aggression and Violence scales. Additionally, the analysis of Mother-to-Child Elementary Year items extracted a third component defined primarily by two new items describing contingency management strategies for resolving parent-child conflicts, and the analysis of Mother-to-Father items extracted a third component defined by severe acts of violence. However, examination of the plots of the eigen roots (Scree Test; Cattell, 1966) and the small number of variables defining the third component in both analyses indicated that these components were unstable. Consequently, intercorrelation matrices calculated for Mother-to-Child Elementary Year and Mother-to-Father items were reanalyzed, this time imposing two-factor solutions. In both cases, the two components extracted were identical to those which emerged in analyses of the other four data sets, with 34% and 45% of the total variance in each analysis, respectively, being explained by the two components.

Component patterns which emerged from the six analyses conducted in the present study were compared to results reported by Straus (1979). Items which failed to obtain a substantial loading on Verbal Aggression or Violence components defined in present analyses or in Straus' factor analyses were deleted, and the 18 remaining items (which were the same for all six data sets) were submitted to a second set of independent principal components analyses to verify initial results. All six analyses yielded two components which were identical to Verbal Aggression and Violence factors previously defined and accounting for

322

between 39% and 65% of the total variance. Table B-1 presents the five items which achieved the highest loadings for Verbal Aggression and Violence components for each relationship and referent year separately and a listing of additional items allocated to each component.

A comparison of loadings obtained in the present analyses and those reported by Straus (1979) indicated that the two sets of components were generally equivalent, with two noteworthy exceptions. First, in contrast to previous factor analytic studies which extracted a reasoning factor, present analyses failed to substantiate reasoning as a distinct dimension of conflict-resolution tactics; rather, items comprising the Reasoning scale (Appendix A; p. 268; items 162, 163, & 164) obtained moderate to high negative loadings on Violence and/or Verbal Aggression components in the majority of present analyses. Even when a third component was retained, the Reasoning factor was not replicated. Second, two items -- "Threatened with a knife or gun" and "Used a knife or gun" -- which contributed substantially to Violence factors defined in Straus' (1979) analyses failed to obtain consistently high loadings on Violence components retained in present analyses.

Several additional aspects of the present findings merit mentioning. First, all items which were revised to facilitate finer discrimination between "mild" and "severe" forms of the "same" physically aggressive action contributed substantially and consistently to Violence components extracted in present analyses. Second, one of two new items citing physically aggressive behaviors -- "Choked" -- contributed substantially and consistently to Violence components defined in present analyses. In contrast, the other new item specifying a physically aggressive act -- "Burned" -- failed to contribute to

Table B-1

Five Items with Highest Loadings on Two Varimax Rotated
Components for the CTS for All Relationships

Mother-to-Child		Component Loading	
Item Number	Item	Elementary Year (n = 321)	High School Year (n = 334)
Component 1. Violence			
176.	Threw a hard object at you. (R)	.70	.64
180.	Hit you with a hard object on the hand or body. (S)	.69	.78
181.	Hit you with a hard object in the face or head. (S)	.84	.72
182.	Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist.	.76	.67
183.	Beat you up.	.78	.70
Additional Items--177*(R), 178*(S), 179*(S), 184(N), 186**, 187**.			
Component 2. Verbal Aggression			
169.	Sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else. (R)	.57	.70
171.	Yelled, cursed or insulted you.	.70	.75
172.	Did or said something to spite you.	.74	.77
173.	Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed you for being selfish, unfair, or bad).	.68	.71
174.	Stomped out of the room, house or yard.	.69	.74
Additional Items--167(R), 175*.			

Table B-1 Continued

Father-to-Child		Component Loading	
Item Number	Item	Elementary Year+ (n = 325)	High School Year (n = 331)
Component 1. Violence			
208.	Threw a hard object at you. (R)	.71	.80
211.	Slapped you (with an open hand) in the face or head. (S)	.62	.70
213.	Hit you with a hard object in the face or head. (S)	.77	.84
214.	Kicked, bit or hit you with a fist.	.68	.82
215.	Beat you up.	.68	.72
Additional Items--209*(R), 210*(S), 212(S), 216(N), 218**, 219**.			
Component 2. Verbal Aggression			
203.	Yelled, cursed or insulted you.	.68	.71
204.	Did or said something to spite you.	.72	.73
205.	Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed you for being selfish, unfair or bad). (R)	.64	.58
206.	Stomped out of the room, house or yard.	.75	.73
207.	Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something.	.68	.62
Additional Items--199(R), 201(R).			

Table B-1 Continued

Parent-to-Parent		Component Loading	
Item Number	Item	Mother-Father+ (n = 303)	Father-Mother++ (n = 297)
Component 1. Violence			
314.	Pushed, scratched, grabbed or shoved the other. (R)	.81	.86
316.	Slapped the other (with an open hand) on the hand or body. (S)	.81	.85
318.	Slapped the other (with an open hand) in the face or head. (S)	.82	.78
322.	Hit the other with a hard object on the hand or body. (S)	.90	.82
326.	Kicked, bit or hit the other with a fist.	.83	.86
Additional Items--320*(R), 324(S), 328, 330(N), 332, 334.			
Component 2. Verbal Aggression			
300.	Sulked, pouted or avoided the issue by doing something else. (R)	.72	.59
304.	Yelled, cursed or insulted the other.	.81	.82
306.	Did or said something to spite the other.	.80	.86
308.	Threatened to withdraw love or respect (e.g., blamed the other for being selfish, unfair or bad). (R)	.72	.80
310.	Stomped out of the room, house or yard.	.73	.76
Additional Items--296(R), 312*.			

Table B-1 Continued

Note. Items without asterisks obtained loadings $> .30$ on one component.

* Indicates items with loadings $> .30$ on both components.

** Indicates items with loadings $< .30$.

+ MAP criterion retained three components; reported loadings were obtained by imposing a two-factor solution.

++ MAP criterion retained four components; reported loadings were obtained by imposing a two-factor solution.

(N) Indicates new items. (R) Indicates reworded items.

(S) Indicates items rewritten to allow discrimination between "mild" and "severe" forms of the "same" action.

CTS items not scored on any component are: 162, 163, 164, 165(N), 166(N), 168, 170(N), 185(N), and corresponding items for each subsequent CTS data set.

Additional items are listed in Appendix A, pp. 267-278.

present components; in fact, this item was omitted because it was characterized by no variance in five of the six data sets. Third, two new items written to represent contingency management as a potentially constructive means of resolving parent-child conflicts (Appendix A, p. 268, items 165 & 166) contributed substantially to an unstable third component in the analysis of Mother-to-Child Elementary Year CTS items; however, in two other analyses, these items obtained substantial positive loadings on Verbal Aggression components, and in one analysis, on the Violence component.

Scale Scores and Reliability

A scale score corresponding to each of the two components associated with each relationship and referent year was obtained by calculating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each component. The same items contributed to Verbal Aggression (7 items) and Violence (11 items) scale scores for all six data sets.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between corresponding Mother-to-Child scales for the two referent years and corresponding Father-to-Child scales for the two referent years to assess relationships between Verbal Aggression and Violence scales within each parent-child relationship for the two referent years. Correlations between corresponding scales ranged from .62 to .74 (see Table B-2), indicating that Verbal Aggression and Violence scales within each parent-child relationship for the two referent years were substantially related. The magnitude of these correlations provided empirical support for calculating total Verbal Aggression and Violence scale scores for Mother-to-Child and Father-to-Child by combining corresponding scale scores for each parent-child relationship across

referent years.

Alpha coefficients were calculated for each scale with respect to each relationship and referent year, as well as for total Verbal Aggression and Violence scales for each parent-child relationship (i.e., collapsed across referent years). Reliabilities for individual scales for each relationship and referent year ranged from .71 to .93, indicating at least adequate internal consistency for all scales and suggesting that inclusion of new and revised items improved the reliability of Verbal Aggression and Violence scales for all relationships assessed. Total parent-to-child scales, which obtained reliabilities ranging from .85 to .93 (see Table B-2), evidenced higher internal consistency than parent-to-child scales calculated for individual referent years, which obtained reliabilities ranging from .71 to .82 (see Table B-3).

Mean scale scores and standard deviations obtained by the present sample group for total parent-to-child Verbal Aggression and Violence scales and for parent-to-parent scales for the single referent year assessed are presented in Table B-3. Examination of summary statistics indicates that all scale scores were skewed in the direction of low aggression, consistent with previously reported data for student sample groups and a nationally representative, normative sample group.

Product-moment correlation coefficients obtained among CTS scales calculated on the basis of total parent-to-child scale scores are presented in Table B-4. The magnitude of correlations obtained indicates that Verbal Aggression and Violence scales within the same relationship are substantially related, as are corresponding scales across relationships.

Table B-2

Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for
Two Conflicts Tactics Scales for All Relationships

<u>Relationship/ Scale</u>	<u>Range of Scores</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Alpha</u>
<u>Mother-to-Child</u>					
Verbal Aggression	0- 70	321	17.1	11.8	.87
Violence	0-110	326	6.1	8.2	.88
<u>Father-to-Child</u>					
Verbal Aggression	0- 70	323	12.6	10.9	.87
Violence	0-110	330	4.2	6.2	.85
<u>Mother-to-Father</u>					
Verbal Aggression	0- 35	311	9.3	7.3	.85
Violence	0- 55	319	1.0	3.2	.89
<u>Father-to-Mother</u>					
Verbal Aggression	0- 35	308	8.6	7.6	.88
Violence	0- 55	316	1.1	4.0	.93

Note. Coefficients were calculated based on
parent-to-child scale scores obtained by combining data
within each relationship across referent years.

Table B-3

Alpha Coefficients and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation
Coefficients for Parent-to-Child Conflicts Tactics Scales
for Elementary and High School Referent Years ($n = 326 - 334$)

Relationship/ Scale/ Year	Mother-to-Child				Father-to-Child			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<u>Mother-Child</u>								
Verbal Aggression								
1. Elem	.78	.66	.52	.45	.49	.43	.27	.23
2. H.S.		.82	.36	.53	.43	.57	.33	.35
Violence								
3. Elem			.81	.65	.26	.25	.52	.37
4. H.S.				.82	.31	.41	.55	.61
<u>Father-Child</u>								
Verbal Aggression								
5. Elem					.78	.73	.49	.36
6. H.S.						.80	.45	.46
Violence								
7. Elem							.71	.62
8. H.S.								.81

Note. Alpha coefficients are listed along the diagonal.

Table B-4

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Among
Conflicts Tactics Scales for All Relationships (n = 326 - 334)

Relationship/ Scale	Mother- Child	Father- Child		Mother- Father		Father- Mother	
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<u>Mother-Child</u>							
1. Verbal Aggression	.55	.56	.36	.54	.27	.45	.26
2. Violence		.34	.62	.27	.20	.22	.28
<u>Father-Child</u>							
3. Verbal Aggression			.51	.44	.24	.64	.29
4. Violence				.21	.28	.25	.30
<u>Mother-Father</u>							
5. Verbal Aggression					.40	.77	.30
6. Violence						.37	.64
<u>Father-Mother</u>							
7. Verbal Aggression							.45

Note. Coefficients were calculated based on
parent-to-child scale scores obtained by combining data
within each relationship across referent years.

Discussion

The results of this study generally replicate findings of previous CTS factor analytic studies, confirming that the CTS is comprised of two robust and internally consistent components -- Verbal Aggression and Violence -- each of which represents a distinct dimension of conflict-resolution tactics. Moreover, consistent with expectations, present results provide empirical support for incorporating new and revised aspects of the CTS within the previously validated scoring system and suggest specific directions for further development of the scale.

The most significant finding is the high degree of correspondence demonstrated by Mother-to-Child and Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression and Violence scale scores for elementary and high school referent years (within each relationship). Specifically, analyses of parent-to-child data for the two referent years extracted equivalent component patterns, and within each relationship corresponding scales for the two referent years were substantially related. Additionally, total parent-to-child Verbal Aggression and Violence scales demonstrated exceptionally strong internal consistency. Parent-to-child scale scores based on data obtained for two distinct referent years can be expected to comprise a more representative estimate of the level of verbal and physical aggression employed over the duration of each parent-child relationship than scale scores based on data obtained for a single, arbitrarily selected referent year.

Several additional aspects of the present results merit discussion. First, the fact that neither reasoning nor contingency management emerged as empirically distinct components can be attributed to the

small number of items representing each theoretical dimension. This interpretation is consistent with Straus' (1979) explanation regarding the Reasoning scale's relative psychometric weakness and indicates that the empirical viability of reasoning and contingency-management dimensions might be improved by inclusion of additional items representing each one. Second, the emergence in present analyses of unstable components representing mild and severe forms of physical aggression bears emphasizing. In conjunction with a similar finding reported by Straus (1979), this finding suggests that the Violence component is comprised of two or more specific factors which might be empirically differentiated by inclusion of additional items representing both ends of the violence continuum. Construction of reliable scales to assess severe and mild forms of physical aggression, reasoning, and contingency management would enable the CTS to measure a wider range of familial conflict resolution tactics, thereby substantially expanding its applicability as a research tool in studies assessing relationships among family interaction variables and hypothetically related variables.

In sum, results of this study generally corroborate the previously documented structure of the CTS and confirm the expectation that specific modifications of the instrument would not compromise its sound psychometric characteristics. Specifically, present findings verify that: (a) the CTS is comprised of two robust scales -- Verbal Aggression and Violence -- for each relationship assessed; and (b) Verbal Aggression and Violence Scales for each parent-child relationship for two distinct referent years can be meaningfully combined to obtain total Mother-to-Child and Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression and Violence Scales which evidence exceptionally high internal consistency.

554

Additionally, present results suggest that the CTS includes four empirically unstable components reflecting reasoning, contingency management, and mild and severe forms of physical aggression. Future research aimed at improving the empirical viability of each of these theoretical dimensions can be expected to substantially expand the usefulness of the Conflict Tactics Scales.

APPENDIX C

FAMILY DATA FORM: SCORING PROCEDURES
FOR EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES

The Family Data Form (FDF) was used to obtain demographic and historical information describing each subject. Developed specifically for use in the present investigation, the FDF consists of 89 questions which subjects are asked to answer by selecting the most appropriate response from a set of predetermined options or by providing the specific information requested (Appendix A, pp. 259-260 & 302-314).

Subjects' responses to the FDF served two purposes. First, nominal scores for six demographic variables were obtained directly from responses to items assessing these variables, and univariate statistics describing the sample group were calculated. Second, univariate statistics for items assessing eight experimental variables were examined, and a rationally based scoring procedure characterized by good face validity was devised for each. Essential steps in scoring FDF experimental variables are outlined below.

Total Family Income was assessed by three questions (Appendix A; pp. 302, 304, & 306; items 769, 781, & 790). For the majority of subjects, a total income score was tabulated directly from responses to a single question indicating subjects' family's total yearly income. For subjects who failed to provide this information, total family income was estimated by selecting the maximum value from mother's reported income, father's reported income, and the sample mean, after it was determined by a series of student's t tests that failure to report family income was not systematically associated with any other demographic variable. Mother's Educational Status and Father's Educational Status were independently assessed by separate but parallel

questions, and a single score for each variable was tabulated directly from subjects' responses (Appendix A, pp. 303 & 304; items 770 & 782). Family Geographic Mobility was assessed by a single question (Appendix A, p. 307; item 804). Responses were trichotomized so that each subject obtained a mobility score of 1, 2, or 3, corresponding to low, moderate, and high mobility, respectively.

Continuity of Parental Relationships was assessed by a series of parallel questions presented with respect to mother and father separately and one conjoint question (Appendix A; pp. 303-308; items 771, 772, 774, 775, 783, 784, 786, 787, 791, 792, & 806). Responses to each item were dichotomized to indicate whether subjects had or had not experienced the death of the parent specified or a significant disruption in their relationship with that parent prior to the age of 18. Responses for all items were then tabulated so that each subject obtained a continuity score of 0, 1, or 2; with 0 indicating low continuity in maternal and paternal relationships; 1 indicating low continuity in maternal or paternal relationships; and 2 indicating high continuity in maternal and paternal relationships.

Recent Stressful Life Events was assessed by a question listing 23 specific stressors (i.e., primarily negative life changes) adapted from Holmes and Rahe's (1967) Stressful Life Events Scale (Appendix A, p. 308; item 808). A single stress score was tabulated for each subject by totaling the number of stressful life events reported for the preceding 12-month period.

Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization was assessed by a comprehensive series of questions adapted from inventories developed by Finkelhor (1979) and Walker (1980a, 1980b) (Appendix A; pp. 309-310 & 311-312; items 809, 810, 818, & 826). Although it was initially expected that a

post hoc scoring system would be devised to reflect various levels of intensity and/or severity of incestuous experiences, the complexity of data obtained prohibited development of an empirically based scoring system reflecting qualitative aspects of sexual victimization within the context of the present study. Instead, sexual victimization data was combined across relationships to obtain a single gross indicator of intrafamilial sexual victimization utilizing a two-step process. First, for subjects who provided complete data, responses to individual items were trichotomized to indicate whether subjects: (a) had not had the specified sexual experience with a family member; (b) had been requested by a family member to engage in the specified sexual activity on at least one occasion; or (c) had engaged in the specified sexual activity with a family member on at least one occasion. Responses were then combined across items so that each subject obtained a total sexual victimization score of 0, 1, or 2; with 0 indicating no familial sexual experience; 1 indicating one or more requests by a family member to engage in sexual activity; and 2 indicating participation in sexual activity with a family member on one or more occasions. Fifty-three subjects who failed to provide information regarding sexual victimization were assumed not to have had any sexual experiences with a family member (i.e., were assigned a score of 0). This decision was based on the fact that directions for this series of items appeared to be interpreted by some respondents as indicating that these items should be left blank if they had had no intrafamilial sexual experiences (judging from respondents' questions and comments regarding these items). This interpretation is supported by the fact that the resulting incidence of intrafamilial sexual victimization reported by the present sample group was nearly equivalent to the incidence rate obtained by an

independent investigator utilizing a similar measure and a similar sample group (Finkelhor, 1979).

Antisocial Activity was assessed by a single question listing 13 specific antisocial behaviors adapted from delinquency checklists developed by Kulik, Stein, and Sarbin (1968) and Cohen (1968) (Appendix A, p. 308; item 807). In responding to the checklist, subjects are asked to indicate the number of times they engaged in each specific antisocial behavior prior to the age of 18, utilizing a 5-point Likert-type response format. A principal components analysis was conducted on the intercorrelation matrix calculated for the 13 items comprising the checklist in order to determine its component structure. Velicer's (1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion retained one component which accounted for 33% of the total variance, with all but two items obtaining a factor loading exceeding .35. The 13 items together achieved an alpha coefficient of .81, indicating sound internal consistency. On the basis of these findings, a total antisocial activity score was tabulated for each subject by combining reported frequencies for all 13 items.

Table C-1 presents summary statistics obtained by the present sample group for all FDF experimental variables. Examination of summary statistics indicates that scores for all three socioeconomic variables were skewed in the direction of high socioeconomic status, consistent with previous findings utilizing similar sample groups (Mulligan, 1977; Steinmetz, 1974; Straus, 1971). Summary statistics for remaining FDF experimental variables indicate that these scores were skewed to varying degrees in the direction anticipated for a student sample group. Specifically, FDF variable scores were skewed in the direction of high continuity of parental relationships, low mobility, low recent stressful

life events, low intrafamilial sexual victimization, and low antisocial activity.

Table C-1

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for FDF Variables

Variable	Range of Scores	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Total Family Income	1-6	342	5.37	1.48
Mother's Educational Status	1-10	342	5.38	1.91
Father's Educational Status	1-10	337	6.04	2.42
Family Mobility	1-3	341	1.46	.64
Continuity of Parental Relationships	0-2	342	1.56	.69
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization	0-2	289	.24	.64
Recent Stressful Life Events	0-23	342	5.01	2.90
Antisocial Activity	0-52	342	8.16	6.70

Note. For all variables, the lowest possible score corresponds to the low end of the variable assessed, and the highest possible score corresponds to the high end of the variable assessed.

APPENDIX D

PRELIMINARY STUDY: COMPONENT STRUCTURE OF
THE FAMILY RELATIONS INVENTORY

Parent-child interactions have long been accepted as comprising important influences on development, but not until the mid-1930's did parent-child interaction variables become a primary focus in child development research (e.g., Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1945; Bandura & Walters, 1959; Becker, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1958, 1961a, 1961b; Eron, Walder, & Lefkowitz, 1971; Kagan & Moss, 1962; Radke, 1946; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schaefer & Bell, 1957; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957; Shoben, 1949; Slater, 1955, 1962; Whiting & Child, 1953; Yarrow, Campbell, & Burton, 1970). Initially, in an effort to translate theoretical models of parent-child interactions into operational constructs which could be empirically investigated, numerous assessment devices were developed.

The majority of parent-child relationship measures are structured interviews intended to assess parent behaviors and attitudes from parents' point of view (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Eron et al., 1971; Schaefer, Bell, & Bayley, 1959; Sears et al., 1957; Sewell, Mussen, & Harris, 1955; Yarrow et al., 1970). Despite the fact that children's perceptions of parental relationships have been conceptualized as comprising important influences on development in their own right, few instruments measure parent-child interactions from the child's point of view (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, & Rodgers, 1969; Offer, 1969; Williams, 1958). And, although several research questions might be meaningfully investigated by measuring adults' recollections of parental relationships during childhood, instruments which assess parent-child interaction variables retrospectively are

almost nonexistent (Brunkan & Crites, 1964; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schutz, 1962; Slater, 1955). Finally, the majority of parent-child relationship measures were constructed without benefit of rigorous empirical techniques and lack basic data documenting their structure, reliability, and validity (Yarrow et al., 1970). Indeed, the lack of empirically sound instrumentation for assessing parent-child interactions has represented a substantial obstacle to systematically investigating relationships among parent-child interactions and hypothetically related variables.

One of the few objective instruments developed to assess adults' perceptions of their parents' attitudes toward themselves during childhood is the Family Relations Inventory (Brunkan & Crites, 1964). Comprised of 202 true-false items, the Family Relations Inventory (FRI) yields six scale scores -- one for each of three parental attitudes of Acceptance, Avoidance, and Concentration with respect to mother and father separately.

Construction of the FRI began with over 300 items, each of which cited concrete parental behaviors intended to represent one of the three parental attitudes described by Roe (1957). Content validity was assured by selecting items for each scale from those which had been unanimously assigned to one of the three attitude categories by several independent judges. Preliminary normative and psychometric statistics were reported by Brunkan and Crites (1964). Internal consistency estimates for individual scales ranged from .82 to .92, with the exception of Father Concentration which was .59. Test-retest reliabilities (one-month interval) ranged from .90 to .98 for Acceptance and Avoidance scales, and from .73 to .80 for Concentration scales.

Evidence of the FRI's construct validity came from analyses of the scales' intercorrelations which indicated that relationships among scales were consistent with predictions based on Roe's (1957) conceptualization of the three parental attitudes. Specifically, Acceptance and Avoidance scales consistently obtained high negative correlations (supporting the prediction that an attitude of acceptance precludes an attitude of avoidance, and conversely), while Concentration scales were moderately correlated with the other scales (Brunkan & Crites, 1964). Additionally, scale intercorrelations were consistent with findings of numerous independent empirical investigations of parent-child relationships utilizing similar constructs (Grigg, 1959; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Schaefer, 1959; Schaefer, Bell, & Bayley, 1960; Slater, 1962; Utton, 1962). Finally, comparisons of FRI data reported by sample groups drawn from different populations (i.e., college students vs. prison inmates; college students seeking counseling vs. the normative sample group) indicated that group differences in perceived parental attitudes were consistent with predictions based on relevant theory and available empirical data (Brunkan & Crites, 1964; Medvene, 1973).

Although the FRI possesses good face validity, its theoretical structure appears overly simplistic given the inherent complexity of parent-child relationships and the breadth of parent behaviors represented by the inventory's 202 items. Indeed, the theoretical structure has not been empirically verified in factor analytic studies. Accordingly, the purpose of the present study is to investigate the FRI's component structure and devise an empirically based scoring procedure.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

The sample was comprised of 339 undergraduate volunteer subjects, 211 women and 128 men, in attendance at a northeastern state university. The majority of subjects were white and middle class, and all were at least 18 years of age. Subjects were solicited during regularly scheduled class meetings and obtained extra credit points in exchange for participation. The FRI was administered during a prescheduled data-collection session in the context of a comprehensive questionnaire assessing a broad range of demographic and psychosocial variables.

The Instrument

The Family Relations Inventory consists of 202 true-false items and yields six scale scores, one for each of three parental attitudes -- Acceptance, Avoidance, and Concentration -- with respect to mother and father separately. In the context of the present investigation, only the 141 items comprising Acceptance and Avoidance scales were administered (Appendix A, pp. 260-267). Items comprising Concentration scales were omitted due to their relatively weak psychometric characteristics and the lack of consistent empirical support for concentration as a distinct and essential construct underlying parent-child interactions (Becker, 1964; Brunkan & Crites, 1964; Roe & Siegelman, 1963). In the context of the present study, extended instructions specifically designed to maximize the availability of retrospective material to respondents and, in turn, the accuracy of FRI data which they reported were used (Cannell & Kahn, 1969; Schutz, 1962).

Results

Component Structure

Because of the substantial amount of item redundancy among FRI father and mother scales, the entire set of items was divided into two subsets -- subsequently referred to as FRI-Father and FRI-Mother -- and submitted to separate, parallel analyses. Independent principal components analyses were conducted on intercorrelation matrices calculated for the 69 FRI-Father and the 72 FRI-Mother items. Velicer's (1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion was used to determine the number of components retained, and a Varimax rotation was performed on the resulting component patterns. Items characterized by complex or insubstantial loadings were deleted, and intercorrelation matrices calculated for the remaining FRI-Father and FRI-Mother items were submitted to additional independent principal components analyses to verify initial results.

FRI-Father Items. The initial principal components analysis conducted on the 69x69 matrix of intercorrelations calculated for FRI-Father items yielded two components which accounted for 23% of the total variance. Nine items which obtained a loading greater than .30 on both components and 15 items which failed to achieve a loading greater than .30 on either component were deleted, and a principal components analysis was conducted on the remaining 40 items to verify initial results. Again, the MAP criterion retained two components which accounted for 29% of the total variance. Table D-1 presents the five items which achieved the highest loadings on each of the two FRI-Father components and a listing of additional items achieving a loading exceeding .30 for each component.

Table D-1

Five Items with Highest Loadings on Four Varimax Rotated
Components for the FRI-Father and FRI-Mother

FRI-Father (<u>n</u> = 339)		
Item Number	Item	Component Loading
Component I. Nurturance		
67.	My father was usually interested in what I was doing.	.60
69.	My father spent very little time with me when I was growing up. (R)	.61
86.	I could rely upon my father if it was necessary.	.60
107.	When I got into serious trouble I could expect very little help from my father in getting things straightened out. (R)	.59
117.	My father never seemed interested in the things I did at school. (R)	.60
Additional Items--48(R), 49(R), 50(R), 60(R), 73(R), 88, 101(R), 112(R), 114(R), 115, 119, 120, 130, 146(R), 155(R).		
Component II. Acceptance		
27.	I felt that my father understood me.	.61
42.	It was hard for me to talk about my personal thoughts and problems to my father. (R)	.63
94.	There were many times when I wished that my father better understood how I felt about things. (R)	.55
96.	I felt like my father was a good friend as well as a parent.	.63
98.	I hardly ever took any of my personal problems to my father. (R)	.61
Additional Items--20, 21(R), 22, 32, 35(R), 56, 70(R), 74, 81, 82, 92, 118(R), 128, 132*, 152.		

Table D-1 Continued

FRI-Mother (<u>n</u> = 339)		
Item Number	Item	Component Loading
Component I. Acceptance		
29.	My mother was willing to listen to my side of the story and give it consideration.	.59
31.	I hardly ever felt that my mother criticized me unjustly.	.52
62.	I felt that my mother understood me.	.65
78.	My mother asked for my opinion and considered it seriously.	.61
122.	I found it next to impossible to have a heart to heart talk with my mother. (R)	.56
Additional Items--36, 38(R), 45, 58, 79, 83*(R), 97, 100, 103, 131, 142, 143 147 150, 153.		
Component II. Nurturance		
30.	My mother never seemed to notice my "pet" projects. (R)	.55
*104.	My mother didn't seem interested in explaining things to me. (R)	.53
124.	At times when I needed her most my mother was usually busy or not around. (R)	.64
136.	My mother never seemed interested in the things I made for her in school. (R)	.55
144.	I felt that my mother could have kept my clothes nicer. (R)	.47
Additional Items--34(R), 39(R), 43(R), 46(R), 57(R), 68(R), 89(R), 109(R), 116(R), 121(R), 126*(R), 129(R), 133(R), 140*(R), 149.		

Note. Loadings were calculated after reversed items (R) were recoded in the direction of acceptance or nurturance.

* Indicates items with loadings > .30 on two components.

Items which obtained a loading greater than .30 were selected for interpretation. The first component, labeled Father Nurturance, was comprised of 20 items which shared a theme of parental investment, encouragement, and physical-emotional support. The 7 positively stated items described parental behaviors reflecting concern, availability, and trustworthiness, while the 13 negative items specified actions associated with parental absence, emotional withdrawal, unreliability, and neglect. The second component, labeled Father Acceptance, was comprised of 20 items which shared a theme of parental approval, understanding, and respectful valuing. The 13 positively stated items cited parental behaviors conveying a sense of empathy and respect for the child-adolescent's individuality and age-appropriate independence, in contrast to the 7 negative items which described parental actions reflecting a tone of criticism, lack of communication and understanding, and emotional rejection.

FRI-Mother Items. The initial principal components analysis conducted on the 72x72 matrix of intercorrelations calculated for FRI-Mother items yielded four components which accounted for 25% of the total variance. Components defined by this pattern of loadings were not clearly interpretable, and an examination of the plot of the eigen roots (Scree Test; Cattell, 1966) and the MAP criterion indicated that the third and fourth components were unstable. Consequently, a second principal components analysis was conducted on the original 72x72 intercorrelation matrix, this time imposing a two-factor solution. The resulting components accounted for 19% of the total variance. Ten items which obtained a loading greater than .30 on both components and 20 items which failed to achieve a loading greater than .30 on either

component were deleted. The remaining 40 items were submitted to another principal components analysis to verify initial results. The MAP criterion retained two components which accounted for 26% of the total variance. All items obtained a loading greater than .30 on at least one component, and five items obtained a substantial loading on both components. Table D-1 presents the five items which achieved the highest loadings on each of the two FRI-Mother components and a listing of additional items achieving a loading greater than .30 for each component.

The first component, labeled Mother Acceptance, was similar to Father Acceptance in item content and overall tone. Of the 20 items (10 positive and 10 negative) comprising Mother Acceptance, 9 were equivalent to items comprising Father Acceptance. Like its FRI-Father counterpart, Mother Acceptance was characterized by a theme of parental approval, understanding, and valuing. The second component, labeled Mother Nurturance, was also similar to its FRI-Father counterpart, having 9 items in common and sharing a theme of parental investment, encouragement, and physical-emotional support. However, 11 additional items comprising Mother Nurturance focused heavily on behaviors having to do with the expression of physical affection and tangible caregiving, compared to additional Father Nurturance items which focused more heavily on shared activities and problem-solving as an expression of support. A further difference between the two Nurturance components was that Mother Nurturance was comprised almost exclusively of negative items (19 of the 20) with the result being that Mother Nurturance conveyed a more definitive tone of physical-emotional neglect.

Relationship of Components to Original Scales. The 141 items administered in this study were originally conceptualized by Brunkan and Crites (1964) as comprising two hypothetically opposite parental attitudes -- Acceptance and Avoidance -- which together were seen as indicative of the overall quality of affective interactions between parent and child. Original Acceptance scales convey a globally positive attitude toward children communicated through a variety of nurturant and accepting behaviors. Original Avoidance scales reflect a generally negative attitude toward children demonstrated by a wide range of neglectful and rejecting behaviors. Finer discrimination of parental attitudes is precluded by conceptualizing the affective domain of parent-child relationships as a univariate construct despite the multidimensional structure suggested by the breadth of parent behaviors described.

Components derived in present analyses represent both a merging and a refinement of scales proposed by Brunkan and Crites (1964). Specifically, Nurturance components are comprised of a subset of items from original Acceptance scales which describe parental behaviors associated with physical-emotional support of children and from original Avoidance scales citing parental behaviors reflecting unresponsiveness and neglect. Empirically derived Acceptance components are comprised of a different set of items from original Acceptance scales which specify parental behaviors conveying approval and respect and from original Avoidance scales citing parental behaviors reflecting criticism and rejection. Thus, in contrast to the hypothetical structure proposed by Brunkan and Crites (1964) which reflects a global assessment of the affectional quality of parent-child relationships, the empirically

derived structure distinguishes between two qualitatively distinct, bipolar dimensions of affective interaction between parent and child -- Nurturance versus Neglect and Acceptance versus Rejection.

Scale Scores and Reliability

Scale scores corresponding to each of the four empirically derived components were obtained by calculating the unweighted sum of the 20 items allocated to each component; reversed items were recoded before summation. Table D-2 presents mean scale scores and standard deviations obtained by the present sample group for the four FRI scales. Examination of summary statistics indicates that all four scale scores were skewed in the direction of nurturance or acceptance.

Alpha coefficients calculated for each of the four FRI scales and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients computed among scales are presented in Table D-2. Alpha coefficients ranged from .81 to .88, indicating that all four scales possess adequate internal consistency. The magnitude of product-moment correlation coefficients obtained, which ranged from .24 to .53, indicates moderate to substantial relationships among the four scales.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that the affectional quality of parent-child interactions as assessed by the FRI is represented by two distinct dimensions defining each parent-child relationship. The first, Nurturance, reflects a theme of physical-emotional support versus unresponsiveness and neglect; the second, Acceptance, reflects a theme of parental approval and respect versus criticism and rejection. This interpretation of the FRI's structure represents a refinement of the theoretical structure and scoring system proposed by Brunkan and Crites

Table D-2

Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Alpha Coefficients, and
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for the
Four FRI Scales (n = 339)

				Pearson Correlations		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Alpha	F Acc	M Nurt	M Acc
<u>Father</u>						
Nurturance	17.22	2.36	.88	.51	.44	.27
Acceptance	11.52	4.66	.84	--	.24	.35
<u>Mother</u>						
Nurturance	18.04	2.72	.81		--	.53
Acceptance	14.92	4.24	.84			--

Note. The theoretical range of scores for all scales
 extends from zero to 20.

(1964). Whereas the original scoring system results in two inversely related scale scores which together reflect the general positive versus negative quality of affectional interactions between parent and child, empirically derived components reflect two qualitatively distinct dimensions of the affectional domain of parent-child relationships.

Moreover, the results of this study suggest a direction for the refinement of theoretical models of parent-child relationships which conceptualize the affective domain of parent-child interactions in terms of an overly global, univariate construct of acceptance versus rejection (Becker, 1964; Roe & Siegelman, 1963; Solomon, 1982). In this regard, present results are consistent with recent conceptualizations of inadequate parenting styles which view neglect (i.e., low nurturance) as distinct from rejection (i.e., low acceptance) (Polansky, Chalmers, Bittenwieser, & Williams, 1981; Rohner, 1975). However, researchers in the field of child maltreatment have not yet succeeded in translating theoretical constructs of acceptance-rejection and nurturance-neglect into operationally defined constructs associated with specific parental behaviors. Therefore, the two FRI components documented in this study may find practical application in subsequent investigations of inadequate, as well as "good enough," parenting.

In sum, the results of this study indicate that the FRI is comprised of four empirically derived components (i.e., two with respect to each parent) which reflect qualitatively distinct dimensions of the affective domain of parent-child relationships: Father Nurturance; Father Acceptance; Mother Nurturance; and Mother Acceptance. While the refined, empirically based scoring system yields scale scores characterized by adequate internal consistency, additional information

regarding the stability, generalizability, and validity of the refined scales is needed before the FRI can be accepted as an empirically verified instrument.

APPENDIX E

PRELIMINARY STUDY: COMPONENT STRUCTURE OF
THE ATTRIBUTION STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Conservative estimates of the incidence of depression indicate that 12% of the adult population in the United States will have a depressive episode of sufficient severity to warrant treatment (Beck, 1973). Moreover, suicide ranks tenth on the list of causes of death among adults in the United States (second among college students, surpassed only by accidents), and the vast majority of people who commit suicide suffer some degree of depression (Grollman, 1971). In response to the urgent need to reduce the suffering and loss of life associated with depression, extensive research and applied efforts have been devoted to early identification, treatment, and prevention of depressive disorders (Albee & Joffe, 1977; Beck & Beck, 1972; Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979; Depue, 1979).

The centrality of hopelessness, perceived helplessness, and self-defeating cognitions in the etiology and persistence of depression has been emphasized by numerous clinicians and researchers (Akiskal, 1979; Beck et al., 1979; Bowlby, 1980; Ellis, 1973; Frankl, 1960, 1963; Seligman, 1975). One such conceptualization -- the learned helplessness model -- asserts that depression-prone individuals are characterized by a cognitive style whereby responsibility for negative events is attributed to internal, stable, and global factors, and responsibility for positive events is attributed to external, unstable, and specific factors (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Garber, Miller, & Seaman, 1979). Consistent with this conceptualization, individual differences in attributional style have been shown to predict which subjects, when subsequently faced with real-life negative events, develop depressive

symptomatology (Golin, Sweeney, & Shaeffer, 1981; Semmel, Peterson, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1980). Moreover, psychotherapy outcome studies have documented significant symptom reduction following treatment aimed at teaching depressed individuals to alter "faulty" cognitions (Beck et al., 1979; Garber et al., 1979; Lazarus, 1968; Mahoney & Arnkoff, 1978).

Cognitive models of depression which identify risk factors potentially accessible to group assessment and re-education suggest promising applications for large-scale intervention and prevention efforts. Unfortunately, empirical quantification of essential constructs underlying cognitive models of depression has lagged behind theoretical advances, limiting the reliability and generalizability of research aimed at evaluating predicted relationships among cognitive processes, depressive symptomatology, and specific treatment approaches.

One of the few self-report inventories assessing cognitions regarding responsibility for bad and good outcomes is the Attribution Style Questionnaire (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1982). The Attribution Style Questionnaire (ASQ) consists of 12 hypothetical situations, half describing bad outcomes and half describing good outcomes. Subjects are asked to respond by imagining themselves in each of the situations, identifying the major cause of each outcome, and rating each cause on a multichoice scale in terms of internality (i.e., totally due to self vs. totally due to others), stability (i.e., will always be present vs. will never again be present), and globality (i.e., affects all situations in one's life vs. affects only this situation). A major advantage of this format is that it allows objective quantification of subject-generated attributions,

rather than constraining subjects' responses to a limited set of predetermined options. Several scoring systems have been proposed, but the most empirically sound system yields two scores -- one combining internality, stability, and globality attributions for bad outcomes (i.e., the Bad Composite) and one combining corresponding attributions for good outcomes (i.e., the Good Composite).

Normative statistics for the ASQ based on responses obtained from a mixed-sex sample group of students were reported by Peterson et al. (1982). Composite scales demonstrated moderate reliability, with Bad and Good Composite scales having achieved alpha coefficients of .72 and .75, respectively, and test-retest (five-week interval) reliability coefficients of .64 and .70, respectively (Peterson et al., 1982).

Several lines of research have provided evidence of the ASQ's criterion and discriminate validity (Peterson & Seligman, 1980). An early approach involved correlating ASQ scores with scores obtained on well-validated depression inventories. For example, Seligman, Abramson, Semmel, and von Baeyer (1979) reported that the Bad Composite scale obtained significant correlations of .48 with the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI; Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961) and .24 with the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List (MAACL; Zukerman & Lubin, 1965). In a study utilizing an alternate approach, Raps, Peterson, Reinhard, Abramson, and Seligman (1982) demonstrated that hospitalized unipolar depressed patients obtained significantly higher internal, stable, and global scores for bad outcomes (and higher external, unstable, and specific scores for good outcomes) than schizophrenic and surgical patient comparison groups. Finally, longitudinal studies have demonstrated an association between ASQ scores and the subsequent

550

development of depressive symptomatology (Peterson & Seligman, 1980). For example, Semmel et al. (1980) demonstrated that high initial Bad Composite scores (and to a lesser extent, low initial Good Composite scores) were associated with the development of depressive symptomatology in students faced with real-life experiences having negative outcomes (Abramson et al., 1978).

Curiously, in contrast to the substantial efforts devoted to demonstrating the ASQ's external validity, no studies documenting its internal or component structure have been reported, and its scoring system lacks empirical verification. The purpose of the present study is to investigate the ASQ's component structure and assess the reliability of the proposed scoring system (Peterson et al., 1982).

Method

Subjects and Procedure

The sample was comprised of 328 undergraduate volunteer subjects, 205 women and 123 men, in attendance at a northeastern state university. The majority of subjects were white and middle class, and all were at least 18 years of age. Subjects were solicited during regularly scheduled class meetings and obtained extra credit points in exchange for participation. The ASQ was administered during a prescheduled data-collection session in the context of a comprehensive questionnaire assessing a broad range of demographic and psychosocial variables.

The Instrument

The Attribution Style Questionnaire (Peterson et al., 1982) is a self-report instrument which consists of 12 hypothetical situations, 6 describing bad outcomes and 6 describing good outcomes. Subjects are asked to imagine themselves in each of the situations and to name the

major cause of the outcomes described; they are then asked to rate each cause on a 7-point Likert-type scale in terms of internality, stability, and globality, and to rate each situation on a similar scale in terms of its importance to them (Appendix A, pp. 291-298). The recommended scoring system yields two composite scores -- one combining internality, stability, and globality attributions for bad outcomes (i.e., Bad Composite) and one combining corresponding attributions for good outcomes (i.e., Good Composite).

Results

Component Structure

A principal components analysis was applied to the 36x36 matrix of intercorrelations computed on ASQ internality, stability, and globality ratings for each of the 12 situations. Velicer's (1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion was used to determine the number of components retained, and a Varimax rotation was performed on the resulting component pattern.

Two components emerged which accounted for 21% of the total variance. Twelve of the 36 items failed to achieve a loading greater than .30 on either component, and no items obtained substantial loadings on both components. Table E-1 presents the two situations contributing the highest loadings on each of the two components and a listing of additional items allocated to each component.

The first component was comprised exclusively of items assessing attributions for good outcomes and overlapped substantially with Peterson et al.'s (1982) Good Composite scale. Items which were expected to contribute to this component (i.e., internality, stability, and globality attributions for good outcomes) obtained loadings ranging

Table E-1

Two Situations with Highest Loadings on Two Varimax Rotated
Components for the Attribution Style Questionnaire (n = 328)

Situation/ Item Number	Item	Component Loading
---------------------------	------	----------------------

Component I. Good Composite

Situation: YOU GET A RAISE.

692. Is the cause of your getting a raise due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances? .62

693. In the future on your job, will this cause again be present? .63

694. Is this cause something that just affects getting a raise or does it also influence other areas of your life? .65

Situation: YOU APPLY FOR A POSITION THAT YOU WANT VERY BADLY AND YOU GET IT.

682. Is the cause of your getting the position due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances? .54

683. In the future when applying for a position, will this again be present? .59

684. Is the cause something that just influences applying for a position or does it also influence other areas of your life? .59

Additional Items--637, 638*, 639*, 647*, 648*, 649, 662, 663, 664, 677, 678, 679.

Component II. Bad Composite

Situation: YOU GO OUT ON A DATE AND IT GOES BADLY.

687. Is the cause of the date going badly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances? .25

Table E-1 Continued

Situation/ Item Number	Item	Component Loading
688.	In the future when dating, will this cause again be present?	.57
689.	Is the cause something that just influences dating or does it also influence other areas of your life?	.58
Situation: YOU GIVE AN IMPORTANT TALK IN FRONT OF A GROUP AND THE AUDIENCE REACTS NEGATIVELY.		
657.	Is the cause of the audience reacting negatively due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?	.26
658.	In the future when giving talks, will this cause again be present?	.49
659.	Is this cause something that just influences giving talks or does it also influence other areas of your life?	.56
Additional Items--642*, 643, 644*, 652*, 653, 654*, 667, 668, 669, 672*, 673, 674.		

Note. Items without asterisks obtained loadings > .30.

* Indicates items with loadings < .30.

Additional items are listed in Appendix A, pp. 291-298.

from .24 to .65, with the majority achieving loadings exceeding .50.

The second component was comprised entirely of attributions for bad outcomes and overlapped moderately with Peterson et al.'s (1982) Bad Composite scale. Items which were expected to contribute to this component (i.e., internality, stability, and globality attributions for bad outcomes) obtained loadings ranging from .05 to .58, with the majority achieving a loading greater than .30. Contrary to Peterson et al.'s (1982) conceptualization of the Bad Composite scale, none of the items assessing internality attributions achieved a substantial loading on this component.

Scale Scores and Reliability

Although one-third of the items failed to contribute substantially to the component to which they theoretically belong, the majority of these items obtained loadings on the predicted component approaching significance, and no item contributed negatively to its theoretical component. Therefore, Good and Bad Composite scale scores were obtained by calculating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each component according to the scoring system recommended by Peterson et al. (1982); that is, by summing all responses associated with good outcomes and, independently, all responses associated with bad outcomes (Appendix I). Table E-2 presents mean scale scores and standard deviations obtained by the present sample group for Good and Bad Composite scales. Examination of summary statistics indicates that both scale scores were skewed in the direction of high internality, stability, and globality, consistent with summary statistics previously reported for nondepressed sample groups (Peterson et al., 1982).

The Good Composite scale obtained a coefficient alpha of .77,

Table E-2

Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients
for Two ASQ Composite Scales ($n = 328$)

Scale Name	Range of Scores	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Alpha
Bad Composite	18-126	71.4	10.9	.64
Good Composite	18-126	94.4	11.8	.77

demonstrating moderate reliability. The Bad Composite scale obtained a coefficient alpha of .64, indicating less adequate internal consistency than was originally apparent based on Peterson et al.'s (1982) data. The two scales obtained a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of .00, corroborating the lack of relationship between Good and Bad Composite scales.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that the ASQ is comprised of two empirically distinct components, the first of which represents attributions for good outcomes and the second of which represents attributions for bad outcomes. The empirical structure generally corroborates the theoretical structure proposed by Peterson et al. (1982).

However, one third of the items failed to obtain substantial loadings on the component to which they theoretically belong, and both components evidenced only moderate internal consistency. Moreover, a large percentage of the scale's total variance was unexplained by empirically derived components, suggesting that response styles and biases substantially influence ASQ responses. These findings indicate that the reliability and validity of the ASQ might be improved by modifying individual items to more accurately reflect theoretical constructs of internality, stability, and globality, and the response format to more effectively control for a potential problem with response biases.

The fact that internality attributions failed to contribute substantially to the empirically derived Bad Composite component raises significant questions as to: (a) whether the ASQ actually assesses

internality; and (b) whether internality, in fact, comprises an essential attributional dimension characterized by meaningful variability across individuals. Given the pivotal role attributed to perceived internality of responsibility for negative outcomes in the learned helplessness paradigm, subsequent research is warranted to determine if the structure documented in this study is replicated in independent sample groups and to resolve the substantive questions prompted by present findings.

In sum, present results generally substantiate the structure of the ASQ proposed by Peterson et al. (1982). However, Bad and Good Composite scales demonstrate only moderate internal consistency, and response biases appear to be inadequately controlled. Additionally, the finding that internality attributions contribute minimally to empirically derived components is contrary to the importance attributed to internality in theoretical conceptualizations of learned helplessness and, in turn, the ASQ. Future research with the ASQ should be directed toward: (a) suppressing the influence of response biases; (b) improving the scales' reliability; (c) resolving discrepancies between the scale's theoretical structure and the empirical structure indicated by present results; and (d) examining implications of present findings for the learned helplessness model of depression.

APPENDIX F

PRELIMINARY STUDY: COMPONENT STRUCTURE OF

THE MANIFEST REJECTION INDEX

Within the present century parental maltreatment of children has been recognized as an issue meriting serious public and professional concern (Kempe & Helfer, 1980; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Williams, 1980; Williams & Money, 1980). Initial attention centered on physically abusive parental behaviors resulting in injury to children, but more recently child abuse experts have expressed increasing concern regarding other deleterious aspects of maltreating environments, most notably emotional neglect and rejection which often underlie overtly abusive behaviors (Kempe & Helfer, 1980; Martin, 1976; Martin, Beezley, Conway, & Kempe, 1974; Polansky, Chalmers, Bittenwieser, & Williams, 1981; Rohner, 1975). As efforts to understand causal and contributing factors associated with child maltreatment have intensified, cultural attitudes toward children and ignorance regarding child development and constructive child-care methods have been increasingly implicated (Albee & Joffe, 1977; Alvy, 1975; Garbarino, 1980; Korbin, 1980; Straus et al., 1980; Welsh, 1980; Williams & Money, 1980).

Coinciding with these efforts, educators have renewed attempts to make parent education a public responsibility, arguing that lack of accurate information about children's needs and capacities increases the risk of parents perceiving children as intentionally frustrating and deserving of punishment (DeLissovoy, 1978; Earhart, 1980; Gordon, 1977; Stedman, 1948; Stollak, 1973; Stollak, Scholom, Kallman, & Saturansky, 1973). While the association between lack of child-rearing skills and punitive attitudes and behaviors toward children is generally accepted,

systematic information about young people's knowledge and attitudes regarding children is limited. If education for parenthood is to be embraced as a potentially valuable means of preventing child maltreatment, an essential starting point is an assessment of attitudes toward children among adolescents and young adults.

Unfortunately, few instruments for measuring child-rearing attitudes are currently available. The majority of child-attitude inventories cited in the literature are unobtainable or lack basic information documenting their structure, reliability, and validity. Of those which are available, most are structured interviews or self-report inventories which are intended for use with parents and require substantial administration time. One exception is the Manifest Rejection (MR) Index (Hurley, 1965), a brief self-report inventory which measures overtly rejecting attitudes toward children.

The MR Index consists of 30 statements describing specific child behaviors and needs, and potential parental responses. Subjects indicate their level of agreement with the parental attitude or behavior described using a Likert-type scale, and responses are tabulated to obtain a total scale score. Individual items describe concrete parental behaviors which restrict contact with children, inhibit legitimate demands for attention and considerate care, and/or impose harsh disciplinary sanctions. Good face validity was demonstrated by the fact that the majority of MR Index items were independently rated as rejecting by three out of four child development specialists. In an effort to control for the influence of response biases, the direction of scored responses is varied (Taylor, 1961).

Means and standard deviations were reported for college students

(Hurley & Hohn, 1971) and a large, primarily middle-class sample of parents (Eron & Walder, 1961; Eron, Walder & Lefkowitz, 1971; Hurley, 1965). A test-retest reliability coefficient of .68 was reported for a small sample group of students tested at the beginning and end of a course in child psychology (Hurley & Laffey, 1957).

Validity data was provided by a study in which a large sample group of parents responded to the MR Index and a Punishment Index administered in the context of in-depth, structured interviews (Eron, 1961; Eron & Walder, 1961; Eron, Walder, Toigo, & Lefkowitz, 1963). A correlation of .46 was obtained between the MR Index and the Punishment Index, demonstrating that the MR Index meaningfully discriminated among subjects who verbally and behaviorally expressed various levels of punitiveness toward children (Hurley, 1965). Significant positive correlations obtained between the MR Index and measures of socioeconomic status, parents' educational level, and children's intelligence, all of which were consistent with relevant theory and previous empirical findings, provided additional evidence of the scale's validity (Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1945; Hurley, 1959, 1962, 1965; Miller & Swanson, 1960). In contrast, the MR Index failed to discriminate between a small sample group of women identified as having physically abused their young children and a matched control group, indicating that it is not a valid instrument for studying abusive parents under conditions where anonymity cannot be assured (Melnick & Hurley, 1969).

No information documenting the MR Index's internal or component structure has been reported. While it is likely that the Index reflects a unitary construct, the fact that several items were not unanimously rated as rejecting by expert judges suggests that these items detract

from the scale's reliability. The purpose of the present study is to document the component structure of the MR Index and devise an empirically based scoring system which maximizes the Index's internal consistency.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

The sample was comprised of 340 undergraduate volunteer subjects, 212 women and 128 men, in attendance at a northeastern state university. The majority of subjects were white and middle class, and all were at least 18 years of age. Subjects were solicited during regularly scheduled class meetings and obtained extra credit points in exchange for participation. The MR Index was administered during a prescheduled data-collection session in the context of a comprehensive questionnaire assessing a broad range of demographic and psychosocial variables.

The Instrument

The Manifest Rejection Index (Hurley, 1965) consists of 30 statements describing specific child behaviors and needs, and potential parental responses. Subjects indicate their level of agreement with each statement using a 5-point Likert-type scale. The recommended scoring system combines all responses to obtain a total scale score (Appendix A, pp. 299-230).

Results

Component Structure

An initial principal components analysis was performed on the 30x30 intercorrelation matrix computed for MR Index items using Velicer's (1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion to determine the number of components retained. The single

component which emerged accounted for 15% of the total variance, and 13 of the 30 items failed to achieve a loading greater than .30. After deleting 10 items which achieved the lowest loadings, a second principal components analysis was applied to the 20x20 intercorrelation matrix computed for the remaining items to verify initial results. The single component which emerged accounted for 20% of the total variance, and the majority of items achieved loadings in the mid-40's to high-50's. Table F-1 presents the five items which obtained the highest loadings on the single component and a listing of additional items obtaining substantial loadings.

Items which obtained a loading greater than .30 were selected for interpretation. The highest loadings were contributed by items which endorse strong parental control of children achieved through power-assertive, often physically abusive, techniques. As a group, these items convey an assumption that strict, even severe, discipline is in the best interest of the child who is portrayed as needing to be taught to control his/her "bad" character and impulses.

Scale Score and Reliability

A scale score corresponding to the single empirically derived component was obtained by calculating the unweighted sum of the 20 items achieving the highest loadings; reversed items were recoded before summation. The theoretical range of scores extends from zero, indicating a total absence of manifest rejection, to 80 indicating extremely high levels of rejection. The present sample group obtained a mean scale score of 33.52 and a standard deviation of 8.86, indicating that scores were characterized by a substantial amount of variability.

Alpha coefficients were calculated for the original (30-item) MR

Table F-1

Five Items with Highest Loadings on One Component of
the Manifest Rejection Index ($n = 340$)

Item Number	Item	Component Loading
727.	Young children who refuse to obey should be whipped.	.55
731.	Most children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.	.54
734.	Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.	.58
736.	Firm and strong discipline make for a strong character in later life.	.56
740.	Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.	.59
Additional Items--723, 724*(R), 725, 728(R), 729, 732*(R), 733, 735(R), 738, 742, 744, 745(R), 746*, 748, 749*(R).		

Note. Loadings were calculated after reversed items (R) were recoded in the direction endorsing rejection.

Items without asterisks obtained loadings $> .30$.

* Indicates items with loadings $> .25$ and $< .31$.

Additional items are listed in Appendix A, pp. 299-230.

Index and for the 20-item Index to estimate and compare the internal consistency reliability of the two scales. The 20-item Index demonstrated slightly improved internal consistency, obtaining a coefficient alpha of .79, compared to the original Index which obtained a corresponding coefficient of .73.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that the MR Index is comprised of a single component which reflects overtly rejecting attitudes toward children, consistent with the hypothetical structure proposed by Hurley (1965). Additionally, present findings indicate that several MR Index items detract from the scale's internal consistency and that a revised 20-item version of the scale possess higher reliability than the original 30-item Index.

Present findings suggest two ways in which the MR Index might be further improved. First, the fact that even the refined scale possesses only moderate reliability points to the need to improve the Index's internal consistency by inclusion of new items which more accurately represent the construct of manifest rejection. Second, the fact that a large percentage of the scale's variance was unexplained suggests that response biases are inadequately controlled (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Systematic efforts to suppress the influence of response biases can be expected to increase the MR Index's validity (Edwards, 1953; Zuckerman, 1959).

In sum, results of this study confirm that the MR Index represents a unitary construct reflecting overtly rejecting, punitive attitudes toward children. While the refined, 20-item MR Index comprises an adequate measure of manifest rejection for use in research where anonymity is assured, further modification of the scale is desirable.

APPENDIX G

PRELIMINARY STUDY: COMPONENT STRUCTURE OF THE VIOLENCE SCALE

Human aggression has long been recognized as a phenomenon warranting serious study, and virtually every theory of human behavior has attempted to explain the acquisition and maintenance of aggressive reaction patterns. However, empirical quantification of hostile feelings, aggressive behaviors, and attitudes toward violence has lagged behind the development of theory, substantially hampering systematic investigations of hypothesized relationships among aggression and other antecedent and dependent variables (Bardis, 1973; Buss, 1961; Olweus, 1975).

Initial attempts to measure hostile feelings and aggressive behaviors consisted of projective devices and structured interviews administered in the context of child development studies. Later, several self-report inventories were constructed which combined hostile attitudes and a wide range of aggressive behaviors in a single score. More recently, multidimensional hostility-aggression inventories, which assess hostile feelings and several kinds of aggressive behaviors independently, have been developed (Buss & Durkee, 1957; Olweus, 1975). In contrast, only one objective instrument which assesses attitudes toward violence has been published (Violence Scale, Bardis, 1973), despite the important mediating role attributed to values regarding aggression in translating hostile feelings into aggressive behaviors (Bardis, 1973; Feshbach, 1970; Gelles & Straus, 1975; Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder, & Heusmann, 1977; Olweus, 1978; Starr & Cutler, 1972; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Whiting & Child, 1953; Zigler & Child, 1969)

The Violence Scale is a 25-item self-report inventory which

utilizes a Likert-type response format to obtain a single scale score reflecting respondents' level of approval of instrumental aggression utilized in a variety of sociocultural contexts. All items are stated in the direction of violence approval, a procedure justified by data demonstrating that subjects' responses to preliminary equivalent forms, one mixed in terms of the direction of scored responses and the other unidirectional, yielded nearly identical results (Bardis, 1973).

Normative statistics for the Violence Scale were reported by Bardis (1973). Internal consistency was demonstrated by split-half reliability coefficients of .92 (excluding Item 1) and .89 (excluding Item 25) based on responses obtained from two small sample groups. Stability was demonstrated by a test-retest reliability coefficient of .94.

Preliminary evidence of the Violence Scale's validity came from data which indicated that differences in scale scores obtained by comparison groups (i.e., males vs. females, socioeducational classes) were consistent with expectations based on relevant theory and available empirical data (Bardis, 1973).

Although the Violence Scale possesses good face validity, its theoretical structure appears overly simplistic given the inherent complexity of attitudes toward violence and the breadth of aggressive behaviors and sociocultural contexts represented by the scale's 25 items. Indeed, the Violence Scale's theoretical structure has not been empirically documented, and its scoring system lacks empirical verification. The purpose of the present study is to investigate the Violence Scale's component structure and devise a refined, empirically based scoring system for the inventory.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

The sample was comprised of 340 undergraduate volunteer subjects, 212 women and 128 men, in attendance at a northeastern state university. The majority of subjects were white and middle class, and all were at least 18 years of age. Subjects were solicited during regularly scheduled class meetings and obtained extra credit points in exchange for participation. The Violence Scale was administered during a prescheduled data-collection session in the context of a comprehensive questionnaire assessing a broad range of demographic and psychosocial variables.

The Instrument

The Violence Scale is a 25-item self-report inventory which utilizes a 5-point Likert-type response format. All items are stated in the direction of violence approval. The recommended scoring system combines responses for all items to obtain a single total scale score representing a global assessment of respondents' attitudes toward physical aggression utilized in a variety of sociocultural contexts (Appendix A, pp. 298-299).

Results

Component Structure

An initial principal components analysis was applied to the 25x25 matrix of intercorrelations computed for Violence Scale items using Velicer's (1976; Zwick & Velicer, 1982) Minimum Average Partial Correlation (MAP) criterion to determine the number of components retained. After rotating the resulting component pattern to a Varimax solution, three components emerged which accounted for 46% of the total

variance. Components defined by this pattern of loadings were not clearly interpretable, and an examination of the plot of the eigen roots (Scree Test; Cattell, 1966) and the Map criterion indicated that a four-factor solution should be considered.

Consequently, a second principal components analysis was conducted, this time imposing a four-factor solution. Resulting components accounted for 51% of the total variance. All but one item achieved a loading greater than .30 on at least one component, and the pattern of loadings defining the four components was readily interpretable. Table G-1 presents the four items which achieved the highest loadings on each of the four components and a listing of additional items which obtained substantial loadings on two components.

The first component, labeled Violence in War, is comprised of nine items subscribing to violence as a necessary and justifiable aspect of war, revolution, or national defense. The second component, labeled Corporal Punishment of Children, consists of four items explicitly condoning the use of violence toward children by parents and teachers as a means of punishing unwanted behavior. The third component, labeled Penal Code Violence, is comprised of four items endorsing the use of violence by societal authorities as an essential means of dealing with criminal behavior. The fourth component, labeled Institutional Violence consists of seven items condoning the use of violence primarily by institutional authorities, and to a lesser extent private citizens, to control or punish violent behavior not necessarily defined as criminal (e.g., demonstrations, riots).

Table G-1

Four Items with Highest Loadings on Four Varimax Rotated
Components for the Violence Scale (n = 340)

Item Number	Item	Component Loading
Component I. Violence in War		
696.	Every nation should have a war industry.	.70
699.	War in self-defense is perfectly right.	.60
705.	The manufacture of weapons is necessary.	.67
708.	War can be just.	.71
Additional Items--702, 711*, 713, 715*, 720*.		
Component II. Corporal Punishment of Children		
*706.	When a school child misbehaves habitually, the teacher should use physical punishment.	.47
710.	Hitting a child when he does something bad on purpose teaches him a good lesson.	.81
714.	A child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically.	.80
718.	Punishing a child physically when he deserves it will make him a responsible and mature adult.	.75
Component III. Penal Code Violence		
697.	The death penalty should be part of every penal code.	.85
*707.	Prison guards should be allowed to use violence against prisoners when necessary.	.39
709.	Violent crimes should be punished violently.	.74
716.	Capital punishment is often necessary.	.80

Table G-1 Continued

Item Number	Item	Component Loading
Component IV. Institutional Violence		
698.	University police should use violence against violent student demonstrators.	.65
701.	The majority should use violence against violent minority groups.	.62
704.	The government should send armed soldiers to control violent university riots.	.71
719.	Universities should use violence against students who destroy university property.	.61
Additional Items--700*, 703, 712, 717*.		

Note. * Indicates items with loadings > .30 on one other component. Additional items listed in Appendix A, pp. 298-299.

Scale Scores and Reliability

A scale score corresponding to each of the four empirically derived components was obtained by calculating the unweighted sum of items allocated to each component. Table G-2 presents mean scale scores and standard deviations obtained by the present sample group for the four violence scales. Examination of summary statistics indicates that three of the four scale scores (i.e., all but Violence in War) were skewed in the direction of low violence approval.

Alpha coefficients calculated for each of the four scales and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients computed among scales are presented in Table G-2. Alpha coefficients ranged from .78 to .83, indicating that all four scales possess adequate internal consistency. The magnitude of product-moment correlations among scales, which ranged from .40 to .63, indicates that the four scales share a common factor, potentially reflecting a generalized attitude toward instrumental violence and/or the influence of response biases.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that attitudes toward instrumental violence as assessed by the Violence Scale are comprised of four empirically distinct components reflecting values associated with physical aggression in four specific sociocultural contexts: Violence in War; Corporal Punishment of Children; Penal Code Violence; and Institutional Violence. This interpretation of the Violence Scale's structure represents a refinement of the theoretical unidimensional structure and scoring system proposed by Bardis (1973). Whereas the original scoring system precludes discrimination among attitudes regarding violence associated with a variety of perpetrators, victims,

Table G-2

Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Alpha Coefficients, and
Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for the Four
Violence Scales (n = 340)

Scale Name	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Alpha	Pearson Correlations		
				Child	Penal	Inst
War	14.36	6.45	.83	.44	.49	.63
Child	4.58	3.29	.81	--	.40	.55
Penal	7.79	3.89	.79		--	.57
Institutional	9.78	5.34	.78			--

Note. The theoretical range of scores differs according to the number of items comprising each scale: Violence in War extends from zero to 36; Corporal Punishment of Children extends from zero to 16; Penal Code Violence extends from zero to 16; Institutional Violence extends from zero to 32.

and justifications, the revised scoring system reflects the inherent complexity of attitudes toward violence and the breadth of sociocultural contexts represented by individual Violence Scale items.

Present results suggest several directions for subsequent research with the Violence Scale. First, the internal consistency of individual scales could be improved by modifying individual items and/or increasing the number of items comprising each scale. Second, because the magnitude of correlations among Violence Scales suggests that response biases substantially influence scale scores, subsequent research should take specific steps to suppress response biases (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Edwards, 1953; Taylor, 1961; Zuckerman, 1959). Third, the multidimensional taxonomy of attitudes toward violence indicated by present findings suggests that additional scales could be constructed. For example, although spousal relationships have been shown to be characterized by substantial aggression (Straus, 1976; Straus et al., 1980), the Violence Scale does not assess attitudes regarding violence between spouses.

In sum, results of this study indicate that the Violence Scale is comprised of four components which reflect distinguishable, although correlated, dimensions of attitudes toward violence. Present findings also suggest a new taxonomy for conceptualizing values regarding instrumental aggression. While the refined scoring system yields four internally consistent scales, further information regarding the reliability, generalizability, and validity of the Violence Scale is needed. Research aimed at further improving the scales' internal consistency, suppressing the influence of response biases, and developing new scales reflecting attitudes toward violence in

sociocultural contexts not currently represented by the Violence Scale can be expected to improve the scale's reliability and validity and expand its usefulness.

APPENDIX H

SCORING KEY FOR TRUE-FALSE SCALES

Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (Appendix A, pp. 279-286)

ASSAULT (10)		INDIRECT AGGRESSION (9)		IRRITABILITY (11)		NEGATIVISM (5)
<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>
359	342	352	376	372	371	362
361	475	369	421	391	379	389
366		411	437	396	505	439
412		443		430		455
428		484		446		493
434		500		461		
491				501		
497				516		

VERBAL AGGRESSION (13)		RESENTMENT (8)		SUSPICION (10)	
<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
349	401	382	509	346	381
351	425	399		392	513
356	482	406		409	
386	488	448		416	
402		464		457	
419		470		473	
452		523		479	
466				517	
508					

Jackson Personality Index (Appendix A, pp. 279-286)

ANXIETY (20)		INTERPERSONAL AFFECT (20)	
<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
353	343	354	344
373	363	374	364
393	383	394	384
413	403	414	404
431	422	432	423
449	440	459	441
467	458	477	450
485	476	495	468
502	494	503	486
518	510	511	519

Appendix H Continued

Lorr Assertiveness Scale (Appendix A, pp. 279-286)

SOCIAL ASSERTIVENESS (8)		DEFENSE OF RIGHTS AND INTERESTS (8)	
<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
429	350	438	360
447	370	456	380
465	390	474	400
483	410	492	420

Personality Research Form (Appendix A, pp. 279-286)

SUCCORANCE (20)		IMPULSIVITY (20)		DOMINANCE (20)	
<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>	<u>True</u>	<u>False</u>
355	345	347	357	348	358
375	365	367	377	368	378
395	385	387	397	388	398
415	405	407	417	408	418
433	424	426	435	427	436
451	442	444	453	445	454
469	460	462	471	463	472
487	478	480	489	481	490
504	496	498	506	499	507
520	512	514	521	515	522

Note. Numbers within each list correspond to items as numbered in the Family Interaction and Individual Development Questionnaire (Appendix A). Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of items comprising each scale. Prior to scoring, item responses were recoded as necessary, and all items comprising a single scale were scored in the direction of increasing trait or symptom presence.

APPENDIX I

SCORING KEY FOR MULTICHOICE SCALES

Attribution Style Questionnaire (Appendix A, pp. 291-298)

BAD COMPOSITE (18)			GOOD COMPOSITE (18)		
<u>I</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>G</u>
642	643	644	637	638	639
652	653	654	647	648	649
657	658	659	662	663	664
667	668	669	677	678	679
672	673	674	682	683	684
687	688	689	692	693	694

Hopkins Symptom Checklist (Appendix A, pp. 286-288)

ANXIETY (7)		DEPRESSION (11)		INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY (7)	
525	562	528	552	529	559
540	573	538	553	534	560
546	580	542	554	547	564
556		543	555	557	
		545	577		
		549			

OBSESSIVE-COMPULSIVE (8)		SOMATIZATION (12)	
532	568	524	571
533	569	527	572
551	574	535	575
561	578	537	576
		550	579
		565	581

Manifest Rejection Index (Appendix A, pp. 299-300)

Positive	(20)	Reversed
723	736	724
725	738	728
727	740	732
729	744	735
731	746	
733	748	
734		

Appendix I Continued

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Appendix A, pp. 288-290)

PERSONAL (18)		FAMILY (18)		SOCIAL (18)	
<u>Positive</u>	<u>Reversed</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Reversed</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Reversed</u>
582	585	586	583	584	587
588	591	592	589	590	593
594	597	598	595	596	599
600	603	604	601	602	605
606	609	610	607	608	611
612	615	616	613	614	617
618	621	622	619	620	623
624	627	628	625	626	629
630	633	634	631	632	635

Note. Numbers within each list correspond to items as numbered in the Family Interaction and Individual Development Questionnaire (Appendix A). Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of items comprising each scale. Prior to scoring, item responses were recoded as necessary, and all items comprising a single scale were scored in the direction of increasing trait or symptom presence.

APPENDIX J
FAMILY INTERACTION AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT STUDY:
INTRODUCTORY LETTER AND CONSENT FORM

Department of Psychology
University of Rhode Island

Dear Student:

We are asking you to participate in a study of family interaction patterns and individual development by filling out this questionnaire. Some of the questions are very personal and have to do with parts of family life which people have traditionally been hesitant to talk about or to study. However, if social scientists are to help families become healthier environments for living and growing up, more information is needed about how families interact and the specific ways in which people who have been raised in different kinds of families feel, think, and act as adults. With this in mind we hope that you will decide to participate.

To help you decide, you need to know a little more about the questionnaire. Some of the information we are asking you to provide you may not want others to know about. Some of your family experiences may have been painful and embarrassing; some may even have been against the law. Nevertheless, we believe you are perfectly safe in participating in this study, and we want to inform you of the steps we are taking to safeguard your privacy and to ensure your right to freely decide whether or not to participate.

First of all, please keep in mind that you are under no obligation to participate. Much as we would like your cooperation, you should feel free not to fill out a questionnaire. If initially you decide to participate and later change your mind, feel free to stop answering the questions at any point.

Second, your responses are anonymous and confidential. All questionnaires will be guarded extremely carefully, with no one but the researchers having access to them.

Third, because of the laws which limit the participation of legal minors in research of this sort, if you are under 18 years of age, we will not be able to use your questionnaire. Therefore, although we are sorry to have to exclude anyone from participating in this study, if you are not at least 18 years old, please do not fill out a questionnaire.

Fourth, because of the nature of this research, it is important that we have your fully informed consent before using your questionnaire. If you choose to participate, make a check in the box on the following page indicating your consent, and sign your name and today's date in the appropriate space. Additionally, make a check in the box indicating whether or not you would like to know more about this study.

Fifth, although the questionnaire is quite long, we are doing this study because we feel it will provide valuable information, and we hope that you will bear with us in answering all of the questions as carefully and honestly as you can. If you are uncertain as to the meaning of any questions, please feel free to ask the investigator for assistance.

Department of Psychology
University of Rhode Island

Finally, please feel free to express to the investigator or your professor any questions or concerns you may have regarding the issues raised in this questionnaire. If you find that some of the information we are asking you to provide is painful and you would like to speak confidentially with the investigator regarding your feelings, she can be reached through the Psychological Consultation Center (792-4263) or through Delta Consultants (789-3694).

Thank you for your cooperation,

Lori Huckel
Principal Investigator
April, 1983

I have read the above, and I agree to participate [].
I have read the above and have decided not to participate [].

(Signature) _____ (Date) _____

I would like to know more about this study:
In a lecture/discussion [];
In a handout [].

I am not interested in knowing more about this study [].

When you have read and completed this form, please hand it in, and if you have decided to participate, begin filling out the questionnaire.

Code No. _____

APPENDIX K

STANDARDIZED CANONICAL WEIGHTS FOR TWENTY HISTORICAL
AND THIRTY CURRENT VARIABLES FOR THREE SIGNIFICANT
($p < .001$) CANONICAL VARIATES ($n = 331$)

Original Variable	Canonical Weights		
	1	2	3
HISTORICAL			
Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression	-.24	-.24	.23
Mother-to-Child Violence	-.26	-.06	.57
Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression	-.13	.21	.09
Father-to-Child Violence	-.24	.16	.11
Total Family Income	-.03	-.02	.31
Mother's Educational Status	-.04	.12	-.03
Father's Educational Status	.05	-.09	-.07
Family Geographic Mobility	.06	-.16	.02
Father Acceptance	.03	.20	.01
Father Nurturance	.17	.17	.04
Mother Acceptance	.47	.06	.27
Mother Nurturance	.21	.17	.05

APPENDIX K Continued

Original Variable	Canonical Weights		
	1	2	3
HISTORICAL			
Continuity of Parental Relationships	-.05	.16	.30
Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression	.03	.32	-.09
Mother-to-Father Violence	.07	.17	-.15
Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression	.03	-.36	-.21
Father-to-Mother Violence	-.06	.02	.31
Recent Stressful Life Events	-.08	-.04	.42
Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization	-.09	-.09	.13
Gender	-.43	.70	-.14
CURRENT			
Anxiety (State)	-.07	.27	.13
Depression	-.02	-.33	.60
Interpersonal Sensitivity	-.05	-.02	-.32
Obsessive-Compulsive	-.05	.38	.15
Somatization	-.03	-.29	-.05
Violence in War	.00	.08	.16

APPENDIX K Continued

Original Variable	Canonical Weights		
	1	2	3
CURRENT			
Corporal Punishment of Children	-.06	.03	.05
Penal Code Violence	.09	-.03	.31
Institutional Violence	-.17	.16	-.36
Manifest Rejection	.16	.02	.18
Personal Self-Concept	-.16	.03	.22
Family Self-Concept	.66	.45	-.27
Social Self-Concept	.08	-.23	.16
Defense of Rights and Interests	.07	.05	.14
Social Assertiveness	-.01	-.10	.29
Dominance	.07	.27	.18
Bad Composite	-.04	-.01	.12
Good Composite	.01	-.07	.01
Resentment	-.08	.17	-.10
Suspicion	.06	-.20	.51
Assault	.12	.24	.05
Verbal Aggression	-.09	.07	-.06
Indirect Aggression	-.07	.12	-.07

APPENDIX K Continued

Original Variable	Canonical Weights		
	1	2	3
CURRENT			
Negativism	-.01	-.10	-.04
Irritability	.13	-.03	-.05
Antisocial Activity	-.41	.20	.08
Impulsivity	-.02	-.06	-.06
Succorance	.25	-.00	.27
Interpersonal Affect	.18	-.24	.00
Anxiety (Trait)	-.13	-.21	-.22

APPENDIX L
ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS AMONG TWENTY HISTORICAL
AND THIRTY CURRENT VARIABLES (n = 333-342)

Current Variables	Historical Variables						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1.	-.12	-.11	-.09	-.12	.17	.08	.14
2.	.09	-.03	.09	.06	-.08	-.06	-.06
3.	-.09	-.10	-.27	-.17	.25	.13	.13
4.	-.05	-.09	-.09	-.03	.21	.19	.14
5.	.09	.07	-.01	.02	.03	.12	.12
6.	-.01	.04	-.11	-.01	.08	.08	.11
7.	-.05	.03	-.16	-.02	.23	.08	.15
8.	-.08	-.09	-.17	-.11	.12	.06	.08
9.	-.09	-.09	-.18	-.12	.14	.01	.15
10.	-.10	-.04	-.13	-.11	.27	.16	.23
11.	-.14	-.21	-.22	-.22	.26	.15	.23
12.	-.08	-.12	-.26	-.20	.28	.14	.18
13.	-.05	-.13	-.13	-.07	.23	.16	.21
14.	-.09	-.11	-.17	-.21	.25	.15	.19
15.	-.10	-.06	-.11	-.10	.12	-.05	.13
16.	.00	.09	.16	.05	-.02	-.05	.03
17.	.09	.16	.15	.23	-.06	.05	.00
18.	.08	.12	.17	.16	-.07	.10	-.06
19.	.17	.19	.18	.24	-.05	.06	-.04
20.	-.08	-.08	-.18	-.11	.06	.01	.04

APPENDIX L Continued

Current Variables	Historical Variables						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
21.	.01	.11	.18	.10	.04	.01	.01
22.	.18	.15	.32	.24	-.22	-.09	-.16
23.	.37	.38	.53	.45	-.43	-.26	-.32
24.	.14	.19	.32	.25	-.19	-.05	-.13
25.	.13	.13	.02	.05	.05	.07	-.01
26.	.02	.00	-.06	.02	.01	.11	-.08
27.	.15	.15	.05	.10	.06	.14	.03
28.	.11	.02	-.02	.00	.03	.04	.07
29.	.08	.07	.00	.01	-.01	.15	-.05
30.	-.06	-.09	-.15	-.15	.11	.13	.21
	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1.	.10	.08	.02	.08	.00	-.04	.03
2.	.00	-.12	-.03	-.11	.01	.07	-.01
3.	.12	.13	.09	.07	.05	-.05	-.06
4.	.13	.06	.07	.07	.03	.01	-.08
5.	.20	-.01	.06	-.04	-.01	.00	-.02
6.	.13	.03	.05	.00	-.04	.05	.04
7.	.11	.16	.12	.18	.10	.04	.06
8.	.06	.02	.01	.02	-.02	-.03	-.03
9.	.07	.06	.02	.05	.01	-.02	-.05
10.	.14	.14	.04	.14	.05	.00	.03
11.	.13	.10	.03	.13	.10	-.03	-.02

APPENDIX L Continued

Current Variables	Historical Variables						
	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
12.	.13	.13	.05	.13	.05	-.05	-.01
13.	.17	.12	.04	.09	.02	-.03	-.07
14.	.16	.08	.02	.11	-.01	.01	-.02
15.	-.03	.09	.03	.13	.04	.01	-.04
16.	-.09	.04	-.03	.11	-.02	.07	.08
17.	.07	-.02	.05	-.05	-.03	.07	.00
18.	.12	-.07	-.01	-.04	.08	.14	.11
19.	.12	-.05	.06	-.08	.02	.09	.02
20.	.01	.05	.04	.05	.06	.04	.12
21.	.03	.04	.07	.05	.08	.09	.03
22.	-.07	-.08	-.01	-.12	-.02	.02	-.07
23.	-.23	-.21	-.08	-.25	-.17	.00	.10
24.	-.07	-.03	.02	-.02	.07	.12	.09
25.	.10	-.08	-.08	-.12	-.05	-.01	-.02
26.	.17	-.04	-.04	-.10	-.07	-.01	-.08
27.	.10	-.07	-.11	-.08	-.05	.02	-.03
28.	.10	.00	-.03	-.01	-.03	-.05	-.05
29.	.16	-.08	-.07	-.11	-.06	.01	.00
30.	.26	.02	.15	.04	.14	-.02	-.06
	O	P	Q	R	S	T	
1.	-.01	.02	-.07	.02	.15	.01	
2.	-.01	.12	-.01	-.01	.05	-.05	

APPENDIX L Continued

Current Variables	Historical Variables					
	O	P	Q	R	S	T
3.	.01	-.04	-.03	-.03	.17	.17
4.	-.07	-.09	.13	.02	.16	.05
5.	.04	-.17	.09	-.01	-.01	.26
6.	.09	-.12	.14	.03	.05	.17
7.	.05	-.04	.00	-.02	-.01	.05
8.	.05	.02	.06	.03	.06	.13
9.	.01	-.03	.01	-.02	.13	.03
10.	.02	.02	-.04	.03	.20	-.01
11.	-.01	.05	-.09	.07	.28	-.09
12.	.01	-.03	-.03	.06	.14	.01
13.	-.03	.00	.00	.00	.14	.10
14.	.01	.03	-.02	.00	.13	-.05
15.	-.01	.05	-.13	.06	.12	-.17
16.	.09	.04	-.09	.07	.06	-.38
17.	.00	.00	.12	-.01	.00	.03
18.	.06	.05	.07	.13	-.01	-.14
19.	.00	-.07	.17	.05	.01	.12
20.	.11	.09	.01	.12	.12	-.02
21.	.13	.00	-.03	-.03	.06	-.35
22.	-.07	-.07	.15	-.02	-.13	-.05
23.	.02	-.05	.17	-.13	-.12	-.11
24.	.06	.05	.03	.07	-.05	-.22
25.	-.01	-.07	.16	-.05	-.01	.25

APPENDIX L Continued

Current Variables	Historical Variables					
	O	P	Q	R	S	T
26.	-.03	-.07	.12	-.06	-.02	.29
27.	.00	-.05	.15	-.06	-.04	.24
28.	-.02	-.04	.13	-.12	-.07	.34
29.	.01	-.08	.15	-.04	-.01	.19
30.	-.02	-.01	-.02	.16	.10	.35

Note. 1 = ASQ Bad Composite; 2 = ASQ Good Composite;
 3 = B-D Resentment; 4 = B-D Suspicion; 5 = B-D Assault;
 6 = B-D Verbal Aggression; 7 = B-D Indirect Aggression;
 8 = B-D Negativism; 9 = B-D Irritability; 10 = HSCL Anxiety;
 11 = HSCL Depression; 12 = HSCL Interpersonal Sensitivity;
 13 = HSCL Obsessive-Compulsive; 14 = HSCL Somaticism;
 15 = JPI Anxiety; 16 = JPI Interpersonal Affect;
 17 = Lorr Defense of Rights and Interest; 18 = Lorr Social Assertiveness;
 19 = PRF Dominance; 20 = PRF Impulsivity;
 21 = PRF Succorance; 22 = TSCS Personal Self-Concept;
 23 = TSCS Family Self-Concept; 24 = TSCS Social Self-Concept;
 25 = VS Violence in War; 26 = VS Corporal Punishment of Children;
 27 = VS Penal Code Violence;
 28 = VS Institutional Violence; 29 = MRI Manifest Rejection of Children;
 30 = FDF Antisocial Activity; A = FRI Father Acceptance; B = FRI Father Nurturance;
 C = FRI Mother Acceptance; D = FRI Mother Nurturance;
 E = CTS Mother-to-Child Verbal Aggression; F = CTS

APPENDIX L Continued

Mother-to-Child Violence; G = CTS Father-to-Child Verbal Aggression; H = CTS Father-to-Child Violence; I = CTS Mother-to-Father Verbal Aggression; J = CTS Mother-to-Father Violence; K = CTS Father-to-Mother Verbal Aggression; L = CTS Father-to-Mother Violence; M = FDF Total Family Income; N = FDF Mother's Educational Status; O = FDF Father's Educational Status; P = FDF Family Geographic Mobility; Q = FDF Continuity of Parental Relationships; R = FDF Intrafamilial Sexual Victimization; S = Recent Stressful Life Events; T = Gender. r values of .13 and .17 are significant at the .01 and .001 levels, respectively.